

1 SOUTHCENTRAL ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6
7 VOLUME II

8
9 AHTNA Heritage Center
10 Copper Center, Alaska
11 October 22, 2015
12 8:37 a.m.

13
14
15 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

16
17 Ralph Lohse, Chairman
18 Lee Adler
19 Judy Caminer
20 Eleanor Dementi
21 Greg Encelewski
22 Andy McLaughlin
23 MaryAnn Mills
24 Michael Opheim
25 James Showalter
26 Gloria Stickwan
27
28
29 Regional Council Coordinator, Donald Mike

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 Recorded and transcribed by:
40
41 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
42 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
43 Anchorage, AK 99501
44 907-243-0668/sahile@gci.net

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Copper Center, Alaska - 10/22/2015)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I would like to call this fall meeting of the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council back into session. We're working on proposals at this point in time. We have a couple other things that have come up that we may have to shift some gears along the way. Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to remind people or public to please sign in. If you wish to testify, please fill out the blue testimony card. For staff or anybody in the audience that has documents to share with the Council, please provide me a copy. If I don't have a copy, it's not part of the public administrative record. So I need to get a copy and so does our court reporter, so please provide me a copy also.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that said, welcome everybody. Ivan, did you have something you wished to say?

MR. I. ENCELEWSKI: Ivan Encelewski. Donald, does that include the presentation we submitted?

MR. MIKE: Yes.

Mr. I. ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We are on WP16-17, Unit 13 caribou, Page 106. That's to remove the restrictions on the pipeline road so that we are the same as the State. Just as a little note, I talked to the BLM this year and while it was only in a proposal form they were allowing that to happen already this year. So this is kind of a laundry proposal. Our presenter will now present it to us.

MR. EVANS: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Members of the Council. My name is Tom Evans and once again I work for the Fish and Wildlife Service, Office

1 of Subsistence Management.

2

3

4 Proposal WP16-17 was submitted by the
5 Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory
6 Council, requests that the restriction prohibiting
7 Federally qualified subsistence users from hunting
8 caribou within the Trans-Alaska Oil Pipeline
9 right of way in Unit 13 remainder be rescinded. As
10 Ralph already mentioned, you can find this on Page 106
11 of your book.

12

13 The proponent states that it's an undue
14 burden on
15 Federally qualified subsistence users and is not
16 related to any conservation concerns and under the
17 State regulations there are no restrictions.

18

19 In 2012, the Board adopted Proposal
20 WP12-25 to add an additional nine days to the beginning
21 of the fall caribou season to give more opportunity to
22 Federally qualified subsistence users.

23

24 From 2001 to 2013, fall population
25 estimates of the Nelchina Caribou Herd have remained
26 fairly stable, between 30-50,000 animals. The bull:cow
27 ratios have been increasing. They had 38 per 100 cows
28 between 2008 and 2010 and it increased to 80 per 100
29 cows in 2011 to 2013 and the State management
30 recommendation is 40 per 100, so that's well above the
31 recommended management goal.

32

33 This is a popular hunt for many users
34 because of its easy accessibility and proximity to
35 Fairbanks and Anchorage. The 2013-2014 Federal harvest
36 was 279, which was below the 2003-2013 average harvest
37 of 479. The majority of the caribou taken under State
38 regulations, which is about 81 percent, which is
39 expected given that the Federal lands account for only
40 about 15 percent of the total lands in the unit.

41

42 The Nelchina Caribou population is
43 stable and the latest estimate in 2012-2013 was a
44 little over 50,000.

45

46 The effects of this proposal.
47 Rescinding the restriction for Federally qualified
48 hunters and allowing them the same opportunity under
49 the State regulations, this would allow them to hunt
50 under the Trans-Alaska Pipeline right-of-way without
51 fear of getting a citation. There are no real

1 conservation concerns for the Nelchina caribou
2 population.

3
4 OSM's preliminary conclusion is to
5 support WP16-17.

6
7 Thank you.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

10
11 Any questions.

12
13 (No comments)

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, we don't
16 have any consultations, do we, Donald? We still don't
17 for this, do we, tribal consultations?

18
19 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. We did have
20 consultations on these wildlife proposals with the
21 tribes and ANCSA corporations and I have a summary from
22 our Native liaison, which I can share with you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Did you say we have
25 some to be shared?

26
27 MR. MIKE: Yes, Mr. Chair. I got a
28 summary of the tribal consultations on wildlife
29 proposals. Let's see, for Bristol Bay, Western
30 Interior, North Slope, Eastern Interior, Southcentral
31 Regions, these consultations occurred September 30th,
32 2015 and tribes included the Chickaloon Village Tribes.
33 If you wish, I can read the summary into the record.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You could do that.
36 Does it apply to this proposal at all?

37
38 MR. MIKE: No, it doesn't.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Then let's read it in
41 another time. Okay. At this point in time do we have
42 any ADF&G comments.

43
44 MR. CRAWFORD: Good morning, Mr.
45 Chair. This is Drew Crawford with the Alaska
46 Department of Fish and Game in Anchorage. The
47 Department's preliminary recommendation is to support
48 Proposal WP16-17. This proposal will align Federal
49 regulations with existing State regulations for hunting
50 caribou in Unit 13.

1 Over.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mr.
4 Crawford. Do we have any questions for Mr. Crawford.

5

6 MR. CRAWFORD: I have an update for you
7 whenever it's convenient for you. You asked me a
8 question during your discussions yesterday of WP16-16,
9 the Paxson Closed Area. I have an answer for you when
10 you're ready to receive it.

11

12 Over.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We will ask for
15 that after we finish the deliberations on 16-17.

16

17 MR. EVANS: So Donald just brought to
18 my attention in the proposal in your book it says
19 support Proposal 16-16 under the 17 thing, so we just
20 need to change that in the Council book.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So, with that,
23 we go on to Interagency Staff Committee and I don't
24 think we have any at this point in time that wishes to
25 testify, do we.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Other Regional
30 Councils.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Game Advisory
35 Committees. Do we have any submitted.

36

37 MR. MIKE: None, Mr. Chair.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Summary of
40 written public comments. I see we have a written
41 public comment.

42

43 Donald.

44

45 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. The summary
46 starts on Page 117 of your meeting materials. This was
47 received from the AHTNA Traditional Use Committee.
48 AHTNA supports Proposal WP16-17 to remove regulatory
49 language that hunting within the Alaska Oil Pipeline
50 right-of-way is illegal. As the proposal states,

1 hunting in the Alaska Oil Pipeline right-of-way under
2 Federal
3 regulation is more restrictive than State regulations.
4 Federal regulations should allow more liberal hunting
5 opportunities than State regulations. Hunting for
6 moose under State regulations in the Alaska Oil
7 Pipeline right-of-way is not regulated.

8

9 That concludes the summary of written
10 comments, Mr. Chair.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. And you
13 haven't received any requests for public testimony.

14

15 MR. MIKE: No.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. A motion to put
18 this on the table is acceptable at this point in time
19 by the Regional Council.

20

21 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chairman. I'll
22 move to put WP16-17 on the table.

23

24 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Second.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I hear a second for
27 it. Any discussion. This was our proposal to start off
28 with. Like it's been pointed out, all this does is
29 align and it gives Federal hunters equal opportunity
30 with State hunters. And there's no conservation
31 concern. Do we need any further discussion on it.

32

33 MS. MILLS: Call for the question.

34

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

37

38 IN UNISON: Aye.

39

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

42

43 (No opposing votes)

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries
46 unanimously. At this time I'm going to ask Mr.
47 Crawford to give us the information we asked for
48 yesterday.

49

50 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Chair. I was

1 incorrect about the proposal number. It's WP16-15, the
2 closure of the Federal lands for the Kenai Mountains
3 Caribou Herd. The question you asked yesterday was why
4 does this Department continue to allow a harvest given
5 such a low population estimate. The 120 to 130 figure
6 was a partial survey and there were likely more animals
7 out there. Continuing a limited hunt with a very small
8 take was considered okay.

9

10 Further information was that the 130
11 was the last count we had. There were not many
12 collars, but they were accounted for and the conditions
13 were not great, it was patchy snow, but I'm confident
14 we were well above the 300 to 400 animals. Two hundred
15 is optimistic in my mind.

16

17 The reason we continued the hunt was
18 that an introduced population with an objective of
19 providing animals to harvest. Harvest was not driving
20 the population in my opinion. This is the area
21 management biologist. The animals were in poor
22 condition and there were likely other factors like
23 predation. We haven't looked into the predation aspect
24 in enough detail to determine the extent, but we have
25 seen evidence of wolf predation, carcasses when we are
26 collaring, and we know moose numbers are lower than in
27 the past.

28

29 Over.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mr.
32 Crawford. That's kind of, I think, what we thought
33 too, that the count might be low. Even so, the herd is
34 declining. I think that we still think that our
35 original decision is proper at this point in time
36 because of what's going on with the animals. Thank you
37 muchly for looking all that up for us.

38

39 MR. CRAWFORD: You're welcome.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now we are
42 going on to WP16-18.

43

44 MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
45 Members of the Council. Proposal WP16-18 was submitted
46 by the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence
47 Resource Commission. It requests that brown bears be
48 allowed to be hunted over bait in Units 11 and 12 with
49 a season from April 15 to June 15 in Unit 11 and April
50 15 to June 30th in Unit 12. Again, this can be found

1 on Page 118 of your Council books.

2

3 The proponent claims that the proposed
4 changes would increase harvest opportunity for
5 Federally qualified subsistence users, particularly in
6 heavily forested areas where brown bears do not
7 concentrate.

8

9 In 2012, the Alaska Board of Game
10 permitted brown bears to be taken over bait in Unit 12
11 and in 2015 permitted this in Unit 11.

12

13 There's limited information on brown
14 bears for both Units 11 and 12. In 2000, one survey
15 was conducted in Unit 12. At that time the population
16 estimate was 400 bears in Unit 12. For Unit 11,
17 there's been an average of 17.3 bears taken per year.
18 The mean for Unit 12 is 19 bears per year, which was
19 well within the State management objectives of a three-
20 year mean of 28 bears with 55 percent being male.

21

22 Non-local residents typically harvest
23 most of the bears in Unit 12. Locals took one to five
24 bears respectively in Units 11 and 12 during the period
25 between 2005-2006 to 2009-2010.

26

27 The State legalized brown bear baiting
28 in 2012. There was no substantial increase in the
29 harvest of brown bears after the legalization of bait
30 stations to take brown bears despite an 80 percent
31 increase in the number of bear baiting stations that
32 were set up. Local residents, including Federally
33 qualified subsistence users, take less than 30 percent
34 of the combined harvest in Units 11 and 12.

35

36 Adopting this proposal would allow
37 brown bear baiting on Federal public lands within the
38 Wrangell-St. Elias and provide more opportunity for
39 Federally qualified users. The potential harvest by
40 Federally qualified users is expected to be small. The
41 effects of the brown bear population is unknown given
42 that there are no recent population estimates to
43 develop sustainable harvest levels and thus a
44 conservative approach may be recommended. Food-
45 conditioned brown bears may become a public safety
46 issue.

47

48 OSM's preliminary conclusion is to
49 defer on this proposal to allow for more discussion
50 prior to the Council's recommendation for the Board.

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
4 questions. I have one question on the recommendation
5 to defer. You said to defer to have more discussion on
6 it. Is that to get more information? I mean it sounds
7 like you have fairly good information with what you
8 presented us. More time for the Council to discuss it
9 or more time for the public to discuss it?

10

11 MR. EVANS: This is to give more time
12 for -- Wrangell-St. Elias had some recommendations
13 concerning bear baiting. Since those recommendations
14 haven't followed through, the local land user, which is
15 primarily Wrangell-St. Elias in these areas, it was
16 just to give more time. So at this time it was thought
17 that this would be the best recommendation at this
18 time.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So it's basically
21 recommendations from Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
22 as the landowner.

23

24 MR. EVANS: Correct.

25

26 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

29

30 MS. CAMINER: I guess one thing I
31 heard or maybe I didn't hear, and it is a little bit
32 confusing that there's data for 12 and maybe not data
33 for 11. So I thought you said that the population in
34 11 is not well known. Did I hear that right?

35

36 MR. EVANS: The population is not well
37 known in really either unit, but they had some more
38 recent data on population in Unit 12, but that's
39 correct, there's not good population for brown bears in
40 Unit 11.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

43

44 MS. STICKWAN: Bait station for black
45 bear bait station is allowed, is that correct? I
46 wasn't sure about that right now.

47

48 MR. EVANS: That is correct.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

1 MS. CAMINER: Well, maybe, Tom, another
2 question. Looking at the justification on 128 it does
3 talk about the Park Service regulations that are
4 somewhere in the process that do address this. So I
5 don't know if you know the status or if Park Service
6 would want to speak to that.

7
8 MR. VEACH: Good morning, Mr. Chairman
9 and Regional Council members. My name for the record
10 is Eric Veach. I work with Wrangell-St. Elias National
11 Park. I do have some talking points I could share just
12 a brief amount of information on the current status of
13 the wildlife reg. The National Park Service proposed
14 regulations to restrict wildlife harvest methods for
15 sport hunting in National Preserves and to adjust
16 language in other regulations addressing subsistence.

17
18 We listen to and appreciate the
19 comments of any subsistence users provided on the draft
20 rule and we're still considering those comments as we
21 produce a final set of regulations. The National Park
22 Service will be sure to communicate the final
23 regulations to the Regional Advisory Councils and the
24 Park Subsistence Resource Commissions.

25
26 So, essentially, what those talking
27 points are saying is that the regulation is still in
28 process. It hasn't been published yet. It does appear
29 that there was some indication this morning that we may
30 see a regulation published tomorrow. I just got that
31 off the Federal Register, so I haven't heard anything
32 official or seen any press release or anything beyond
33 that. So that's really all the information I have to
34 share on the proposed wildlife regulations. So
35 essentially the final rule hasn't been published yet.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And these would be
38 wildlife regulations that apply to Park and Preserve on
39 hunting methods and means and take and everything like
40 that. Basically would they override -- I mean if
41 they're the Park regulations, do they override -- let's
42 say we have some subsistence regulations. The Park
43 regulations are the final regulations, aren't they, on
44 National Park property?

45
46 MR. VEACH: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is
47 correct. So regulations published under 36 CFR
48 typically do supercede regulations published under 50
49 CFR, which is where you find the Federal subsistence
50 regulations.

1 As to your question as to whether or
2 not these regulations apply to Park or Preserve, again
3 we don't have a final regulation out. The proposed
4 regulation process that we went through addressed sport
5 hunting and that is these talking points that I just
6 read to you. Sport hunting, of course, covers general
7 hunting under State regulations, is actually only
8 allowed on the Preserve. So if you want to hunt in the
9 Park, you have to hunt under Federal regulations as a
10 local rural resident.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But the Park
13 regulations will be covering both Park and Preserve,
14 won't they, the ones that we're talking about that
15 might come out tomorrow?

16
17 MR. VEACH: Those regulations were
18 designed to address hunting under State regulations
19 which only occurs in the Preserve.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any more
22 questions for Tom.

23
24 MR. ADLER: I have one.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Lee.

27
28 MR. ADLER: I didn't hear anything
29 about how far the bait station is away from human
30 habitation. Sometimes that can be a problem if the
31 bait station is too close. Like in Glennallen there's
32 some bear bait stations that are a mile or so away. It
33 drew a couple grizzlies and a couple blacks in. I
34 haven't been there this year, but sometimes that's a
35 problem if they're too close to human habitation. So
36 is there anything about that in your regulations?

37
38 MR. EVANS: I do not know that on the
39 regulations if there's any distance requirements, but
40 you're correct that, you know, bears that have become
41 accustomed to eating human food can be problem bears
42 and that's well documented in many other areas in the
43 United States and Alaska as well. So it is of concern.
44 I can get an answer for you later and see if there are
45 any distance restrictions from human habitation.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In answer to that, I
48 know -- and I think we can ask Mr. Crawford that too,
49 but I think under State regulations there are
50 limitations on close to roads, trails, houses, human

1 habitation and things like that. There are distance
2 regulations in the State regulations, which all the
3 bear baiting stations have been registered under State
4 regulations up to this point in time.

5
6 The question with this proposal, since
7 there are already black bear bait stations, is whether
8 or not to allow to hunt brown bears along with black
9 bears and I know that that was a little controversial
10 when they opened it up in Unit 13. I have some friends
11 that were avid black bear baiters, but more for the
12 camera than for the gun.

13
14 When they started putting bait stations
15 in places where they thought there might be grizzlies,
16 they were shocked at how many grizzlies there were
17 close to human habitation and in Unit 13 right in the
18 community. One of them had seven and not very far from
19 human habitation, but far enough to be legal. He had
20 seven different grizzlies come and visit his bait
21 station. He got pictures of them. So he was really
22 surprised to find that there were that many grizzlies
23 around.

24
25 That's the question with this proposal,
26 is just whether to allow the taking of brown bear along
27 with black bear. The problem was that as soon as that
28 -- like you said, as soon as that became legal, the
29 number of bait stations jumped fantastically because
30 there were a lot of people interested in possibly
31 getting a brown bear or at least seeing a brown bear
32 and that could happen out there.

33
34 The big question to me, living out
35 there, is the fact that you're getting more and more
36 human activity in the National Park area and with bait
37 stations you do get bears used to eating human food.
38 In fact, talking to some of my friends in the Kenny
39 Lake area, the most popular bear bait that they found
40 is the best is buttered popcorn. So you've got the
41 possibility that you could get bears used to eating
42 human food in an area that has 50,000 visitors in the
43 summertime type thing.

44
45 Tom.

46
47 MR. EVANS: So I found an answer for
48 Lee's question here by just reading the regulations
49 here. No person may use bait within one mile of a
50 house or another permanent dwelling, campground or

1 developed recreational facility. No person may use
2 bait within one quarter mile of a public maintained
3 road or trail. So that's the restrictions that are
4 currently in effect.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

7
8 MS. CAMINER: I guess to follow up on
9 your thoughts, Mr. Chair, is that -- you know, I don't
10 know how it would be done, whether brown bear stations
11 would be set up then in completely different locations
12 than the black bear stations have been set up. Besides
13 the food conditioning, if we don't know a lot about the
14 population -- or I think I'm remembering from our
15 handicraft discussions that brown bears reproduce a lot
16 more slowly than the black bears. Just those potential
17 effects.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Well, the
20 recommendation is to defer, but let's go through the
21 whole process and see what we as a Council decide.
22 Thank you for your information. With that, do we have
23 any agencies that wish to testify.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If we don't have any
28 agencies, how about the Alaska Department of Fish and
29 Game.

30
31 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is
32 Drew Crawford with the Alaska Department of Fish and
33 Game in Anchorage. The Department's preliminary
34 recommendation is to support Proposal WP16-18. This
35 proposal would align the Federal regulations with
36 current State practices.

37
38 Over.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mr.
41 Crawford. If I understood the way that you said that,
42 then currently that is a legal means of hunting under
43 State regulations in Unit 11 and 12 also.

44
45 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, sir.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mr.
48 Crawford. Okay. Do we have any Fish and Game or
49 Regional Councils that wish to speak to this at this
50 point, Donald?

1 MR. MIKE: No.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How about the SRC. I
4 don't see Barbara.
5
6 MS. CAMINER: No, she went to
7 Fairbanks.
8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: She's in Fairbanks.
10 Do we have nothing from -- Gloria.
11
12 MS. STICKWAN: Yes. The Wrangell-
13 St.Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission
14 supports the proposal as written. The proposal was
15 submitted by the Commission. This proposal does not
16 pose a conservation concern. Based on recent
17 experience in Unit 11 where brown bear baiting was
18 recently authorized under the State of Alaska
19 regulations, it is not anticipated that harvest would
20 increase significantly. Regarding concerns about food
21 conditioning, most of the bait used is natural
22 materials. Baiting of black bears is already allowed
23 and brown bear are already feeding at bait stations.
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Gloria.
26 Okay. With that, do we have any written public
27 comments.
28
29 MR. MIKE: Yes, Mr. Chair. Written
30 public comments begins on Page 130 of your meeting
31 materials and ends on 134. On Page 130 Dave Bachrach
32 of Homer, Alaska opposes WP16-18 stating public safety
33 concerns posed by food-conditioned bears are
34 universally recognized by natural resource agencies
35 throughout the range of the species.
36
37 If you turn to page 132, I think this
38 was in error. It addresses WP16-70, so it doesn't
39 apply to this proposal. The Ahnta Subsistence
40 Committee submitted its written comments in support of
41 WP16-18 to allow Federally qualified hunters to use
42 bait in Unit 11 and Unit 12. Taking bears over bait
43 has been and still is a method to harvest black and
44 brown bears in the Copper Basin communities. The AHTNA
45 people customarily and traditionally use snares to kill
46 bears to protect drying salmon on fish racks. There
47 isn't a conservation concern for black or brown bears
48 in Unit 11 or 12.
49
50 That concludes the summary of written

1 public comments, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald.

4 Okay. Do we have any public testimony at this point in
5 time.

6

7 MR. MIKE: None received.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In that case, a motion
10 to accept WP16-18 is in order, so we can discuss it.

11

12 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I so move.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved. Do I
15 have a second.

16

17 MS. MILLS: Second.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
20 seconded to support WP16-18. Discussion by the
21 Regional Council. Gloria.

22

23 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to say
24 these areas are remote areas in Unit 11, 12. There's
25 very few people that live in those areas. The bait
26 stations probably wouldn't be close to homes. Brown
27 bears are thought to be healthy in those areas and they
28 already allow bait stations for black bears, so it's
29 already occurring. We haven't heard any problems with
30 baiting over in that area. Maybe in Unit 13 because
31 Unit 13 is a populated area. That's probably why. Only
32 three black bears were harvested over bait station last
33 year, so I don't believe it's going to increase the
34 brown bear baiting any more than it has been for black
35 bear.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Gloria.

38

39 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I'll make a
40 couple comments, I guess. I would support this. I
41 don't believe that the Federal subsistence should be
42 stronger or more restrictive than the State and I see
43 no conservation concern and I think it's managed okay.
44 So I'd definitely support it.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Andy.

47

48 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
49 I would just concur with what the other two members
50 said there. I don't see a conservation concern. It

1 does nothing but help out subsistence users.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Comments from anybody
4 else. Go ahead, Gloria.

5

6 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to say that
7 the Mentasta Herd is less than 300 and it's thought to
8 be because of brown bears taking the calves of the
9 Mentasta Herd as the moose calves as well. This would
10 help to increase the Mentasta Herd over there. It's
11 really low. It's less than 300, I think.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Gloria. I
14 had that down in my notes to mention that too. I think
15 we're finding that calf predation in Unit 11 is mostly
16 bear predation, more than wolves. Where the black bear
17 takes just the calf, the brown bear takes the calf and
18 the cow.

19

20 Judy.

21

22 MS. CAMINER: Well, I'm struggling with
23 this one and I guess if we're talking a predator
24 control measure here.....

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No.

27

28 MS. CAMINER:then we're not. I'm
29 sure we're not, but that would be a concern to me. I
30 guess I just wondered if we really don't have much on
31 the population. It's harder to make a decision that
32 way.

33

34 Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Judy.
37 Well, one thing that's been expressed both by the State
38 and from what I hear from what his thing was, at this
39 point in time there's no direct conservation concern on
40 brown bears. The take is low enough that even if there
41 would be a slight increase from locals and subsistence
42 qualified hunters, it still is a pretty small
43 percentage of the take and it's a pretty small take.

44

45 The big thing to me is just like Greg
46 says. It's a currently allowed practice. It hasn't
47 made a drastic increase in harvest. It's kind of hard
48 to allow a non-subsistence hunter into the area when
49 you're living there and you can't do it under Federal
50 subsistence regulations. I would just say that as long

1 as the State currently allows it, it would be pretty
2 hard for me to vote against allowing it for a Federally
3 qualified subsistence hunter.

4

5 Tom.

6

7 MR. EVANS: I don't know if you'd want
8 to make it sort of a recommendation maybe for the
9 annual report or something that the bear population be
10 monitored. You know, brown bears, if there's a
11 relatively small population, they keep their cubs two
12 or three years. If they get knocked down fairly low,
13 it takes a long time for them to recover. That might
14 be something you might want to consider for your annual
15 report as something to recommend.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any further
18 discussion.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The recommendation by
23 OSM is to defer. If nobody has any further discussion,
24 then the question is in order.

25

26 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'll call for the
27 question.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
30 called. All in favor of supporting the Proposal WP16-
31 18 that requests that brown bears be allowed to be
32 hunted over bait in Units 11 and 12, and this was
33 submitted by the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
34 Subsistence Resource Commission, signify by saying aye.

35

36

37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Those opposed signify
40 by saying nay.

41

42 (No opposing votes)

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Those that are
45 abstaining signify by saying aye.

46

47 MS. CAMINER: Aye.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have one abstaining
50 and the motion passes. Now let us go on to the next

1 one, which is WP16-19. I'll let Robbin present it.

2

3 MS. LAVINE: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
4 Members of the Council. I'm Robbin LaVine with the
5 Office of Subsistence Management, anthropologist. I
6 will be providing a summary of the analysis of WP16-19
7 found on Page 137 of your books.

8

9 This proposal was submitted by the
10 AHTNA Heritage Foundation and it requests permission to
11 harvest either one bull moose or two caribou between
12 July 15th and August 31st by Federal registration
13 permit for the AHTNA Heritage Foundation's Culture
14 Camp.

15

16 The proponent requests a modification
17 of the current regulations for the AHTNA Heritage
18 Foundation Culture Camp which would allow the
19 opportunity to harvest one bull moose or two caribou 16
20 days earlier than what is in current regulations for
21 Unit 13. The proponents claim that an early start for
22 the hunting effort gives the participants greater
23 opportunity and increases the chance of success in the
24 harvest of large game, something that has not happened
25 during the two previous attempts.

26

27 In 2004, the Board adopted Proposal
28 WP04-26, establishing the current unit-specific
29 regulation that allows the Glennallen BLM Field Office
30 Manager to issue permits to the AHTNA Heritage
31 Foundation Culture Camp director for either one bull
32 moose or two caribou.

33

34 By 2010, the process for issuing
35 harvest permits state-wide for cultural and educational
36 programs had gone through a number of changes. WP10-03
37 requested the addition of a general provision in
38 Federal subsistence management regulations to allow the
39 harvest of fish and wildlife by participants in a
40 cultural or educational program. The Board adopted the
41 proposal with unanimous support from all Regional
42 Advisory Councils, creating Federal regulation Subpart
43 100.25(g). This regulations allows a
44 culture camp or education program to deal directly with
45 the land manager by delegated authority on an annual
46 basis once an initial permit is approved.

47

48 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
49 support Proposal WP16-19 with modification to remove
50 the AHTNA Heritage Culture Camp from Unit 13 specific

1 regulations and delegate authority to the BLM land
2 manager.

3

4 A culture camp permit exists for the
5 AHTNA Heritage Foundation Culture Camp to harvest one
6 bull moose or two caribou. The AHTNA Heritage
7 Foundation Culture Camp was established prior to
8 regulation 100.25(g). By removing the AHTNA Heritage
9 Foundation Culture Camp from regulation and moving
10 authorization by a letter of delegation to BLM, AHTNA
11 can request a permit directly from the land manager on
12 an annual basis outside of the regulatory process.
13 This would allow both AHTNA and BLM staff to address
14 fluctuating camp and harvest dates with greater
15 flexibility.

16

17 Finally, BLM staff state that allowing
18 for the opportunity of an early harvest by the AHTNA
19 Culture Camp would be a small deviation from the
20 current practice and that the harvest of one antlered
21 bull moose or two caribou would not be biologically
22 significant.

23

24 So, in conclusion, for those reasons,
25 we support the proposal with the modification to remove
26 it from regulation and delegate authority to the BLM
27 land managers.

28

29 I'll take questions.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Robbin. I
34 have one question. If it is in regulation, it's
35 protected. If it's a delegated thing, how much could
36 that fluctuate depending on who's doing the delegation?
37 In other words, if the BLM land manager -- I mean under
38 current BLM land management we would have no concern,
39 but we have no way of looking down the future to see
40 who's going to be managing the BLM department in
41 Glennallen. Hopefully it will stay like it is. But if
42 the Culture Camp is in regulation, then it has a
43 guaranteed or protected opportunity to take that one
44 bull moose or two caribou. If it's not in regulation,
45 could the BLM manager refuse to issue a permit?

46

47 MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair. It's my
48 understanding that in many ways it would be in
49 regulation with the new subpart 100.25(g). It is in
50 regulation and all that they would have to do would be

1 to address timing. I imagine in regulation -- well, I
2 should defer. If anyone is listening and can help me
3 out on this. It would primarily be timing and to have
4 a confirmation of whether it would one antlered bull or
5 two caribou, sex to be determined.

6

7 Is BLM staff here? I'll do a Hail
8 Mary.

9

10 MR. SHARP: This is Dan Sharp with BLM.
11 I believe your interpretation is correct that it's
12 there for more administrative efficiency and along for
13 AHTNA's timing needs and it's not a restrictive
14 measure. In general, these sort of repetitive actions
15 the Board is repeatedly delegating authority simply for
16 the administrative efficiency.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Who are we talking to
19 right here?

20

21 MR. SHARP: This is Dan Sharp with BLM.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Dan. In
24 other words, the efficiency is there, but is the hunt
25 or the ability to take them protected in any way?

26

27 MR. SHARP: Well, you know, unless
28 there's biological concerns that would arise and the
29 delegated authority is always at the discretion of the
30 Board and they can rescind that at any time. It's not
31 an absolute guarantee and the Board is not giving up
32 any of its authority with respect to the delegation. I
33 suspect if it's the last cow moose they probably
34 wouldn't get a permit, but in general I think this was
35 pretty much a given. I guess there's no sure thing
36 anywhere. It depends on the camp, if that's an annual
37 thing. I don't know. I guess I view this more as a
38 housekeeping proposal and I don't assign any
39 controversy to it personally.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Dan. Judy
42 has a question for you.

43

44 MS. CAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So
45 looking at Page 147 or Appendix A, is this an example
46 of what the delegation letter would look like, which
47 pretty much does say to annually issue?

48

49 MR. SHARP: The wording is probably
50 there. If you see something that needs fine-tuning or

1 that provides an additional assurance, but I think a
2 lot of this is from a boilerplate in general.

3

4 MS. LAVINE: Through the Chair. Ms.
5 Caminer, yes, it is a standard letter that we issue as
6 far as delegation of authority.

7

8 MS. CAMINER: But this is an example of
9 a new letter rather than the existing letter.

10

11 MR. TEITZEL: Through the Chair. Yes,
12 this is a new letter specifically for this purpose.
13 This is Dennis Teitzel, field manager, Glennallen. To
14 clarify some of Dan's remarks also. To deny the permit
15 would be a decision. All decisions are appealable. So
16 if the Heritage Camp did not agree with the reasons for
17 -- if the permit were ever denied and they did not
18 agree with those reasons or think they were valid, they
19 would have an appeal opportunity to either the district
20 manager or the State Director to override that
21 decision.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

24

25 MS. CAMINER: Well, I guess my comment
26 on that is you're kind of putting the burden back on
27 subsistence users to work through the bureaucracy
28 there. I guess maybe can anyone else give us examples
29 where something like this already is occurring so
30 people might feel better about this process of not
31 having it in the reg book?

32

33 MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair. Ms. Caminer.
34 This is Robbin LaVine for the record. We have begun
35 issuing culture camps under the new regulation. As we
36 say, after the initial permit is in regulation itself
37 or once they have a culture camp permit, then they
38 don't have to deal with us, OSM. They can go to BLM
39 directly. They can determine this year our elders
40 would like to meet at this time of year or depending on
41 the weather and depending on certain activities they
42 can change the dates. In regulation, they don't have
43 that flexibility.

44

45 Once a permit has been assigned, they
46 have up to five years to -- I believe we have it in the
47 letter and I'll read directly from your letter on Page
48 148. You may not approve a permit if a repeat permit
49 has not been issued within the previous five years. You
50 will issue timely decisions. So basically it just

1 means to use that permit sometime within five years.
2 So you have some flexibility there as well.

3
4 The only thing that would change at the
5 end of five years is you would need to reapply through
6 OSM again. Otherwise, if you're using the permit for
7 your culture camp on an annual basis, that should
8 continue in perpetuity unless the Board makes a
9 different decision and more likely based on your
10 recommendations.

11
12 Thank you.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

15
16 Mary Ann.

17
18 MS. MILLS: Yes, Mary Ann Mills. I
19 know the Kenaitze Indian Tribe does have -- we do get
20 our yearly permit from the manager. I believe from
21 BLM. I'm not sure. And we haven't had any problems.
22 Yearly our children go out. I know James Showalter was
23 one of the people that would take the children out and
24 show them how to process a moose and it worked very
25 well. I don't know what the appeals process would be
26 if there was a disagreement. We've never had one.

27
28 So that might be something to discuss.

29
30 Thank you.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

33
34 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I just wanted to
35 make a comment on the appeals process. It doesn't
36 work, so that I'm not comfortable with at all.
37 Delegation of authority, it gets away from us. If
38 there was a way that that camp is in regulation. I
39 mean the appeal process is a crap shoot.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Greg. Any
42 other comments. Gloria.

43
44 MS. STICKWAN: So do you call Fish and
45 Game and talk to them about -- when you get a request,
46 do you call Fish and Game about allowing to take a
47 moose or caribou?

48
49 MR. TEITZEL: Through the Chair.
50 Currently we would only talk or confer with other

1 agencies or OSM if we were considering denying the
2 permit. Currently our process would be to speak with
3 the RAC Chair here initially to at least talk that
4 through and explain our position, get their position on
5 that, how the board would feel and then also, if there
6 was a biological concern, we would have conferred with
7 both ADF&G and then OSM through the subsistence to
8 confer with them if we have solid reasoning and
9 justification to do that, but for approving a permit we
10 don't -- if we don't think there's a reason to not
11 approve the permit, we wouldn't necessarily consult
12 with any other agencies over that. Only if we had a
13 concern and we're considering not issuing that permit
14 would we do that.

15

16 MS. STICKWAN: You wouldn't close it
17 because there's a hunt close to -- well, we're
18 proposing to change it, but just because it was close
19 to the hunting season you wouldn't deny it because of
20 that. I heard that before from Fish and Game. They
21 tried to deny our culture camp because the culture camp
22 was during the hunting season and that was the reason
23 for them to -- they were going to deny us because of
24 that.

25

26 MR. TEITZEL: Through the Chair. That
27 actually is one of the reasons we -- when this
28 opportunity came up and we spoke with AHTNA about doing
29 this was to get it on the front end before hunting
30 season started because we knew that was a potential
31 conflict that had occurred in the past. The main
32 reason was the timing of the camp so the opportunity
33 for the take was there during the camp as opposed to
34 waiting until hunting season opened, which could have
35 occurred after the camp was over and not give that
36 opportunity. But we would not -- because of hunting
37 season that -- in my reasoning, that doesn't make sense
38 because there's other hunters out there and it would
39 just be another hunter with everybody else.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask you a
42 question. This proposal requests permission to harvest
43 either one bull moose or two caribou between July 15th
44 and April 31st. What would happen if this proposal
45 just said request permission to harvest either one bull
46 moose or two caribou by Federal registration permit for
47 the AHTNA Heritage Foundation's Cultural Camp? That
48 would take out that limitation of flexibility. It
49 would allow you to have the flexibility then to do it
50 when the cultural camp was in session and there would

1 be no limitation.

2

3 I mean this one actually puts a
4 limitation on it. That's one of the justifications for
5 having delegated authority is to give you that
6 flexibility. Do you think something like that would be
7 -- I mean that would put it in regulation that they get
8 one bull moose or two caribou for the cultural camp, so
9 it would only be when the cultural camp was in session.

10

11 Robbin.

12

13 MS. LAVINE: I just wanted to clarify.
14 I thought I heard you say April.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If I said April, I
17 meant -- I would say request permission to harvest
18 either one bull moose or two caribou between January
19 1st and December 31st by Federal registration permit.
20 That's what I would put in if I was going to do it, you
21 know. In other words, basically taking out the
22 limitation. To me, we're talking about delegation for
23 flexibility and the flexibility could be there either
24 by removing the July 15th-August 31st or by just saying
25 annually by Federal registration permit, you know.

26

27 MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair. I believe that
28 even within regulation annually we issue permits by an
29 annual delegated letter of authority, is that correct?

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

32

33 MS. LAVINE: Forgive me, I'm a year on
34 yet, so I'm still developing knowledge.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That doesn't mean from
37 January 1st to December 31st, annually?

38

39 MR. TEITZEL: You know, I don't know
40 the answer to that. For your question of do we need to
41 have a timeframe in there for which the permit would be
42 valid or to issue that permit, I don't know if there's
43 a situation where that would not work. Because I know
44 initially that was kind of the thought, was just say
45 issue one and that way it gave the full flexibility. I
46 think there is a good enough working relationship
47 locally with the culture camp, AHTNA, Incorporated and
48 the villages that a mutually beneficial agreement could
49 be reached on when that permit would be valid as
50 opposed to just doing anything else.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It does say by
2 registration permit, which means that they'd have to
3 come in to get the permit. The only thing this does is
4 it limits the timeframe of the permit between that
5 period. If we took that timeframe out, they still have
6 to come in and get a permit. It still has to apply to
7 all of the things this says and it's by registration
8 permit, but there would be no limitation -- I mean if
9 they would decide to have their cultural camp on the
10 1st of June to mid June, they could do it because it
11 would be for the cultural camp. To me, that's the only
12 thing you gain by the letter of delegation is you gain
13 the flexibility to do it at any time that they need it.

14
15

16 You could put it in regulation and
17 leave that same flexibility in it, which would
18 basically say they could do it. You know, they are
19 allowed to do it period. And then you'd have to have a
20 registration permit, which means you go to BLM, get
21 your registration permit, the BLM knows when, where and
22 everything else, just like a delegation of authority,
23 but it would be protected. I was thinking it would be
24 protected in regulation that way, but maybe that's not
25 necessary.

26

27 MR. TEITZEL: Mr. Chair. Perhaps a
28 wording of the permit being valid 15 days prior to the
29 start of the culture camp through the end of the
30 culture camp. Because I believe current regulations
31 are August 1st till the camp ends.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

34

35 MR. TEITZEL: That way there is a
36 timeframe that the permit is only valid for and not
37 just valid for the entire year that it's issued.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Very good point right
40 there.

41

42 MS. STICKWAN: I don't understand what
43 he just said. Did you just say it was open all year?

44

45 MR. TEITZEL: Through the Chair. Kind
46 of the way we're discussing would be a permit that
47 would be valid for -- the way I'm understanding it,
48 would be valid for a 12-month period for the year, but
49 to clarify that word the delegation and the permit to
50 where the take would be authorized for 14 days prior to

1 the start of the culture camp until the end of the camp
2 because current regulations say August 1st through
3 September 20th or the end of the camp, whichever is
4 earlier, and that way -- because the intent is to issue
5 it for a take in association with the camp for the
6 processing of that animal and that would keep that
7 intent there and would keep that.....

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Keep the camp going.

10

11 MR. TEITZEL: Yeah, keep the camp
12 going. I'm also thinking this as I'm talking. If the
13 decision was to have a second culture camp that year
14 and a take hadn't been taken with the first one, we
15 could issue a second permit and take for that second
16 camp. So that would allow us some flexibility.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's what I was
19 thinking. I wasn't thinking that you'd issue a permit
20 for the whole year, but that the permit could be issued
21 any time in the year for the cultural camp. In other
22 words, what limitations you want to put at the start
23 and the end. To me, the end is the end. If they
24 decided they wanted their cultural camp -- I'm not
25 saying they would, but if they decided they wanted
26 their cultural camp in April and May, they could have a
27 cultural camp in April and May and this permit could be
28 issued for that. In other words, it wouldn't be
29 limited to July 15th to August 31st, but it would be
30 available to them once a year at whatever time they
31 chose to have their culture camp. Does that seem
32 legitimate?

33

34 MR. TEITZEL: Yes, it does, Mr. Chair.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria, do you see
37 what I mean?

38

39 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah. I'd rather have
40 what you're saying because deaths occur and they've had
41 to cancel the camp because of that or postpone it.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. That would give
44 them the flexibility to have the camp when they want to
45 have the camp and not be limited to a time period by
46 regulation.

47

48 MR. TEITZEL: Mr. Chair. And that is
49 exactly the situation that brought up this proposal
50 because they were holding the camp earlier and earlier

1 and we couldn't accommodate the issuing of the permit
2 for that camp in a timely manner.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
5 questions for Robbin at this point in time.

6
7 (No comments)

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We will go on
10 now to the rest of our deliberation and we may call you
11 back. Are there any other Federal agencies that have
12 any comments to put on this.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Native, village or
17 tribal agencies.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Interagency Staff
22 Committee.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And Alaska Department
27 of Fish and Game. Are you there, Drew.

28
29 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Chair. Drew
30 Crawford, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The
31 Department's preliminary recommendation for Proposal
32 WP16-19 is to support as modified by OSM.

33
34 Over.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mr.
37 Crawford. With that, we'll go on to other Regional
38 Councils or Fish and Game Advisory Committees or
39 Subsistence Resource Commissions. Do we have any.

40
41 MR. MIKE: None.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: None. Written public
44 comments.

45
46 MR. MIKE: No written public comments.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Request for public
49 testimony.

50

1 MR. MIKE: Nothing received, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Nothing received for
4 public testimony. At this point in time then a motion
5 to accept WP16-19 is in order. Do I hear such a
6 motion.

7

8 MS. MILLS: Yes. I move to accept
9 WP16-19. Did we want that with the modification of
10 delegating authority?

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think we should put
13 the proposal on the table the way it is and then we can
14 decide as a Council whether we want delegated authority
15 or to change the proposal.

16

17 MS. MILLS: Okay. Then to accept WP16-
18 19.

19

20 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Second it.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
23 seconded to accept WP16-19. Now we can have some
24 discussion. Greg.

25

26 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Why did you think I
27 was going to discuss it?

28

29 (Laughter)

30

31 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I'll make my
32 case. Ralph, I thought he did an excellent job at the
33 end there. I personally have a problem with the
34 delegation of authority because we've had bad
35 experience with the appeal process. This could work
36 just fine if your relationship is right and works
37 right. I would much prefer to see it in regulation and
38 it's there and they have the right to do it and if
39 they're allowed to, they take it when the camp is
40 early, they take it when the camp is late and
41 everything is good and there's no question. It's
42 there. And there doesn't seem to be a conservation
43 concern, so I see no reason that it's just not put
44 right in the regulation. That's my opinion and I'm for
45 it.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

48

49 MS. MILLS: Yes. On the language,
50 another consideration could contain the language in

1 coordination with their yearly culture camp. So
2 whenever they have their yearly culture camp they could
3 put in for this permit.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

6

7 MS. STICKWAN: It's my understanding
8 that the delegation of authority would allow us to be
9 flexible when we hold a camp and I would be in favor of
10 that because BLM has been so far allowing the permit.
11 There hasn't been any problem. It would be easier to
12 work with a local rather than trying to work with the
13 OSM office, which is a little bit harder to work with.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

16

17 MS. CAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
18 Gloria is bringing up a really good point. The way I
19 believe I maybe now understand it is this culture camp
20 would be included in the regulation that does list all
21 the culture camps that have annual activities and
22 permits and, for the most part, I guess, delegated
23 authorities. Those culture camps have to apply to OSM
24 and then they have to apply to the local land
25 management agency. So, in that sense, the delegated
26 authority saves a step for the camp.

27

28 The other -- maybe I should ask if
29 that's correct first before I make my other point.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Robbin.

32

33 MS. LAVINE: Through the Chair, Ms.
34 Caminer. I believe you are correct in that taking the
35 camp out of regulation saves a step and that you don't
36 have to go through the Office of Subsistence
37 Management.

38

39 MS. CAMINER: But to follow up, this
40 camp is a recognized activity that's in the regulation.

41

42 MS. LAVINE: It is. When in regulation
43 though, I believe that on an annual basis the
44 application must first be made 60 days prior to the
45 beginning of camp for the permit on an annual basis and
46 then on an annual basis a new letter of delegated
47 authority will be issued on an annual basis to the BLM.
48 I believe that subpart 100.25 puts the delegation of
49 authority kind of in the laps of BLM. It's there, you
50 don't have to apply for it on an annual basis and can

1 go directly to them.

2

3

Thank you.

4

5

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy, could you explain that again to me. I got lost on what you said. I would think that if it was in regulation, then they would not have to go to OSM because it's already on the books and all they'd have to do is go to the BLM and get their permit. Just the same as I get my caribou permit. It's in regulation. I go to BLM and get my permit if it's in regulation. That's so they don't have to apply every year. They just go pick it up.

14

15

So, from that standpoint, that's why I see being in regulation protects the process and makes it simpler. If it's in regulation that I can have two caribou, I just go to BLM to get my permit for two caribou. If it's in regulation that they can have one for the camp, they go to BLM and BLM already has the authority to issue that permit.

22

23

MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair. I've been corrected and thank you so much for being patient with me. You are correct. I believe actually what we've been trying to do is cut the step out of having to -- if you want to change the dates, having to first go through the regulatory process as we are doing now. But I imagine your creative wording might take care of that.

31

32

Thank you.

33

34

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: From that standpoint, if we're going to do this, we need an amendment. We need to add an amendment to this to take the wording out that's in it and put wording in it that will satisfy the fact that they can apply -- that it's between a certain date that they set up the culture camp.

41

42

Robbin.

43

44

MS. LAVINE: What I heard in your earlier discussion was that you didn't put dates in, that you said that the AHTNA Heritage Culture Camp could have a permit to hunt one bull moose or two caribou 15 days prior to the start date of the culture camp, ending on the day that the camp ends. I believe I also heard that if something occurred and a harvest

50

1 did not happen at that original culture camp, another
2 permit could be issued for the same amount. Again, 15
3 days prior to the beginning of a camp, ending on the
4 day the camp is designated to end.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Go ahead, Greg.

7

8 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'd like to make that
9 amendment.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We have an
12 amendment on the table to strike July 15th through
13 August 31st and allow the cultural camp, and the
14 wording may need to be cleaned up, to have a permit
15 whenever they're having the cultural camp valid from 15
16 days prior to a cultural camp to the end of the
17 cultural camp with the permit being capable of, if not
18 used, being carried over to a second cultural camp.
19 Does that sound good?

20

21 MR. ENCELEWSKI: It sounds real good.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have that all on
24 tape so that we can get close to that. You said you
25 make that amendment.

26

27 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yes, I did.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I have a second.

30

31 MS. STICKWAN: I second.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
34 seconded to amend it. Do I need to repeat it again or
35 are we close enough.

36

37 MR. ENCELEWSKI: We got it.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We got it. Okay. The
40 amendment is on the table. Any discussion on the
41 amendment.

42

43 MS. STICKWAN: This would allow us to
44 have a culture camp 15 days prior to our day until the
45 camp closed. I think that would allow if something
46 happens we can hold a later camp.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes. Then you can
49 carry it over to another camp. Judy.

50

1 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. We have not
2 heard there are any conservation concerns and this is
3 certainly beneficial to the subsistence users.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody want to call
6 the question.

7
8 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'll call the
9 question.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
12 called on the amendment that's in front of us to strike
13 between July 15th and August 31st and substitute the
14 language that allows them to have it prior to a
15 cultural camp to the end of a cultural camp and to
16 carry it over to another cultural camp if it's unused
17 and that's a rough paraphrase of it. All in favor of
18 the amendment signify by saying aye.

19
20 IN UNISON: Aye.

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

24
25 (No opposing votes)

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries for the
28 amendment. So now we have Proposal WP16-19 before us
29 as amended. Any further discussion.

30
31 (No comments)

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, the
34 question is in order.

35
36 MS. CAMINER: Question.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
39 called. All in favor of WP16-19 as amended signify by
40 saying aye.

41
42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
45 saying nay.

46
47 (No opposing votes)

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. We
50 now have WP16-19 supported and the idea is they can

1 have their cultural camp and have one bull moose or two
2 caribou.

3

4 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Good job.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Let's take a
7 break so everybody can get rid of their coffee.

8

9 (Off record)

10

11 (On record)

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll call this meeting
14 back into session. Next is Proposal WP16-20.

15

16 MR. EVANS: Once again my name is Tom
17 Evans. I work for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
18 Office of Subsistence Management. I'll be presenting a
19 summary of Proposal WP16-20 along with Judy Putera
20 here, who is a biologist with Wrangell-St. Elias
21 National Park and Preserve.

22

23 Proposal WP16-20 was submitted by
24 Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory
25 Council, requests that the harvest limit for sheep on
26 Federal public lands in Unit 11 be modified from one
27 sheep to one ram with a 3/4 curl horn or larger.
28 Again, this could be found on Page 150 of your RAC
29 books.

30

31 The reason the proponent submitted the
32 proposal was to reduce hunting pressure on ewes and
33 younger rams. They considered a conservative approach
34 was needed due to declines in the sheep population, low
35 densities and the relatively easy access from the road
36 system. It's still a meaningful priority for Federally
37 qualified subsistence users as they can harvest a ram
38 with 3/4 curl or larger versus the full curl under
39 State regulations.

40

41 A little bit on the biological
42 background. Aerial surveys have been conducted in
43 selected trend count areas by the Alaska Department of
44 Fish and Game and Wrangell-St. Elias staff. There are
45 many sheep populations in Unit 11. The population
46 estimates and sheep densities are variable depending on
47 these populations. So it's not just like one big sheep
48 population in Unit 11 or Unit 12. There are many sub-
49 populations within these areas. Typically the
50 densities are greater in the northern versus the

1 southern portion of the range.

2

3 Overall the sheep populations in
4 Wrangell-St. Elias have declined approximately 30-50
5 percent since the late 1980s. In the analysis it
6 probably says 50 percent, but new information has come
7 to light, so they may not have declined quite as much
8 as 50 percent.

9

10 Currently most of the sheep harvests
11 are full curl rams. At this point I'd like to mention
12 a couple things. I handed out a sheet early on that
13 each one of you has on your desk that shows some
14 modifications to the tables in the back, has some
15 updated numbers. I'm not going to really do much with
16 that. I just wanted to let you know that those were
17 updated numbers that you can keep with the analysis.

18

19 I'll go over a little bit of the
20 harvest history here. Since 1991 the sheep harvest
21 along with the number of hunters has declined. The
22 mean number of sheep harvested per year from 2005 to
23 2014 was 53. From 2005 to 2014 non-local residents
24 averaged 31 compared to local residents that averaged
25 17.

26

27 We considered some other alternatives
28 for this proposal and I'll let Judy address those.
29 They deal with some research objectives that folks
30 would like to do with this population.

31

32 MS. PUTERA: Thank you, Tom. I don't
33 know if you guys recall, but probably around 2007 or
34 '08 there was a proposal with the Board of Game to
35 establish an any ram season and I believe that was
36 under a permit system in Unit 13D and I think also in
37 14. About that time there was a lot of discussion that
38 came up again about what's the best harvest strategy
39 for rams. Is that full curl or greater or some less
40 restrictive harvest.

41

42 So I got to talking to Tom Lohuis, who
43 at that time was a research biologist for Dall sheep
44 for Alaska Department of Fish and Game. We started
45 talking and thought Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
46 would be a great place to test some of the theory
47 behind an either full curl only harvest or some type of
48 less restrictive harvest. The theory behind that is if
49 you harvest only full curl or larger rams, you are in
50 effect leaving a greater proportion of still mature

1 rams in the population say greater than 3/4 but less
2 than full curl, would be the dominant rams and would be
3 doing some of the breeding.

4
5 The theory on the other hand in the
6 less restrictive harvest would be that you would be
7 taking a greater number of mature rams, say greater
8 than 3/4 curl, out of the population leaving more of
9 the juvenile rams to do the breeding. Essentially the
10 theory is, just being immature rams, they wouldn't be
11 doing a good job. Harassing ewes and different things.
12 No offense to all the juvenile males in the room.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There aren't any young
15 males in the room.

16
17 (Laughter)

18
19 MS. PUTERA: Oh, gosh, I hope that
20 doesn't go on the record. I'm always opening my mouth
21 when I shouldn't. Anyway. And then also this could
22 affect the ewe population, low pregnancy and
23 parturition rates. And then also just the fact that
24 the juvenile rams would be expending so much energy
25 participating in the rut and breeding to a greater
26 extent that they would be subject to a higher mortality
27 and a greater overwinter mortality or less survival
28 over the winter.

29
30 So long story short, Park Service put
31 in a proposal to get funding for this project in
32 Wrangell-St. Elias because we do have within the entire
33 Park and Preserve we have Unit 12, which has been a
34 full curl only harvest for a long time and then in Unit
35 11 we have had this sort of less restrictive harvest
36 for both State and Federal hunters. A third area
37 possibly would be south of the Chitina River. It's
38 hard park. There's very little hunting going on over
39 there, so that could almost serve as sort of a control.

40
41 So we put in this proposal with Fish
42 and Game, with Tom Lohuis, and funding from both
43 agencies is being contributed and we've entered into a
44 cooperative agreement. We'd like to start this project
45 -- we'll be doing a little preliminary work this winter
46 as far as flying around and looking for areas where
47 sheep are rutting and trying to figure out a plan for
48 when we -- what we plan to do is put on radio collars
49 on juvenile rams next fall before the rut.

50

1 Part of that study would be looking at
2 -- we'll be capturing juvenile rams before the rut,
3 putting radio collars on them, GPS collars and then
4 we'll be taking blood, doing some C screening, looking
5 at blood for trace minerals for health issues, we'll be
6 looking at rump fat and then we'll be doing a
7 physiological measure of energy expenditure over the
8 rut, which I'm not really going to go into, but that's
9 kind of Tom Lohuis's expertise in wildlife physiology.
10 And then we'll be capturing these same animals after
11 the rut and looking at those indices and then we'll be
12 looking at survival dispersal and habitat use sort of
13 throughout the year with those radio collars and we'll
14 be doing that for two years.

15
16 With that in mind, my thought is to
17 defer the proposal until the end of that study so that
18 we might have better data to make a decision. The
19 other option that I thought about would be to make it
20 an any ram harvest and eliminate the ewe harvest and
21 then address these concerns again on the next cycle
22 pending the results of our study.

23
24 The other thing I did want to mention
25 is that just recently we found out that there's a
26 professor at UAF whose gotten quite a large grant from
27 NASA to use remote sensing products to quantify changes
28 in vegetation and snow extent in alpine ecosystems and
29 this is specifically going to be tied to Dall sheep
30 populations throughout the state. There are a number
31 of things going on. Some parks or areas have ewes with
32 collars on.

33
34 So there's going to be movement data
35 from radio collars including what we're doing here at
36 Wrangell and just population surveys and just all the
37 different kind of Dall sheep work that's going on in
38 the Park are going to be looked at with this NASA
39 study and they're going to look at -- I can't remember
40 exactly, but a 20 or 30-year span of remote sensing
41 products all the way through 2018 and they'll be doing
42 modeling work and looking at snow extent, icing is a
43 big issue, so it's all kind of tied to climate change.
44 Shrub expansion higher up into alpine areas and so
45 forth.

46
47 With that I'll turn it back over to
48 Tom.

49
50 MR. EVANS: Okay. So this alternative

1 was to potentially either defer the proposal or have it
2 be one ram instead of one ram with 3/4 curl, which was
3 what the proponent proposed. OSM did not select the
4 alternative one ram basically because there's potential
5 for disturbance to the ewes and younger rams if it was
6 any ram. And that was one of the reasons why the
7 proponent submitted the proposal was to reduce the
8 disturbance to ewes. Younger rams sometimes hang out
9 with ewes.

10

11 The effects of adopting the proposal
12 would help reduce disturbance to cows and ewes while
13 still providing a meaningful priority to Federally
14 qualified subsistence users because they would have the
15 3/4 versus the full curl under the State regulations.
16 The changes to the regulations would hopefully aid in
17 the recovery of the sheep populations.

18

19 OSM's preliminary conclusion to this is
20 to support Proposal WP16-20.

21

22 Thank you.

23

24 MS. PUTERA: I just wanted to add
25 another, I guess, thought. We did conduct some sheep
26 surveys this past summer in 2015 that didn't make it
27 into the proposal and those are indicated in your
28 updated sheet. I wanted to bring Unit 12 into it also,
29 so Fish and Game surveyed three fairly large units over
30 in Unit 12 within the Preserve.

31

32 I wanted to mention Frank Robbins, the
33 Fish and Game biologist for Unit 11 is here today, so
34 if there are any questions I'd be happy to bring him
35 up, conducted surveys in count area 11 and 12 and those
36 are kind of the longer-term count areas that are
37 generally done every other year or every year.

38

39 In all five of those units that were
40 surveyed this summer we saw definite increases in the
41 sheep populations in those areas.
42 The lamb:ewe ratios were very high. I also wanted to
43 point out that they're having greater than 40 rams per
44 100 ewes and 11 of the 13 count units that we've
45 surveyed during 2013 through 2015.

46

47 I just wanted to let you know about
48 that too.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I have a

1 couple questions to ask. I'm looking at your table
2 here on the take, sheep harvest Unit 11, page 157.
3 Since 2011, which is four years, five years, it looks
4 to me like only three ewes have been taken in that time
5 period, one ewe a year for 11, for 13, for 15. If you
6 take out the anomaly of 2006, the mean drops even more
7 yet.

8

9 If one of your sheep hunters takes a
10 coyote, that saves more ewes than what the sheep
11 hunters have taken. I would imagine since they're ewes
12 they were local. I just was wondering what was the
13 percentage of immature rams that the locals took. Do
14 you have anything on that at all?

15

16 MS. PUTERA: Frank, is that something
17 you can answer?

18

19 MR. ROBBINS: Frank Robbins, Alaska
20 Department of Fish and Game, Glennallen. I can sort of
21 answer it. Of the roughly 45 to 50 rams that are
22 harvested in Unit 11 annually, four to seven would be
23 sub full curl.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sub full curl.

26

27 MR. ROBBINS: Right.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Four to seven. And
30 that's counting the ewe and everything.

31

32 MR. ROBBINS: Right. In recent years,
33 the last five years, there's been less than one ewe
34 harvested annually and then say four to seven sub full
35 curl rams.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And those would have
38 had to have been taken by local residents under a
39 subsistence program.

40

41 MR. ROBBINS: That's the assumption,
42 right.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But now when they were
45 less than full curl how many -- this would be my next
46 question. How many were less than 3/4 curl?

47

48 MR. ROBBINS: I don't have that data
49 with me.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean can you just
2 visualize any idea?
3
4 MR. ROBBINS: What do you think, Tom,
5 three or four?
6
7 MR. EVANS: Maybe.
8
9 MR. ROBBINS: Three or four.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Three or four a year?
12
13 MR. ROBBINS: Uh-huh (affirmative).
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So even the locals are
16 going after big ones.
17
18 MR. ROBBINS: I'll say that of the rams
19 harvested in Unit 11, bigger ones are prevalent.
20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. That's why I'm
22 wondering about the proposal, with the state of the
23 sheep out there, whether it actually is going to make
24 much of an effect. That one ewe or zero, the fact you
25 take ewes out doesn't make much difference. If you've
26 got four sub 3/4 curl, that's not a very big impact
27 either. I like the fact that there's going to be some
28 research done on it.
29
30 I still haven't figured out how taking
31 out older mature sheep, which are the preferred
32 breeding stock, helps the younger sheep. I mean makes
33 it harder for the younger sheep but cuts down the
34 breeding success when you take out the breeding stock.
35 It's hard for me to get my thoughts around this
36 illustration on the bottom of Page 157. I would think
37 the presence of a large sheep there definitely would
38 save the young sheep some effort, but would increase
39 the breeding success too.
40
41 Anyway, have you got any thoughts --
42 while you're sitting there do you got any thoughts
43 you'd like to present on this proposal.
44
45 MR. ROBBINS: No. I could expand a
46 little bit on the more recent survey activity. A
47 little background. The Glennallen office is charged
48 with survey and inventory for all sheep within Unit 11
49 and 13. As you can imagine, there's a significant
50 amount of sheep range in those areas. With that in

1 mind, we try to survey the Wrangells every other year.

2

3 We have four principal count areas that
4 we try to fly and replicate every other year. Two of
5 those are on the western face of the Wrangells. The
6 other two are in the south, the Upper Chitina. This
7 year we were able to survey the two count areas on
8 either side of Long Glacier on the western face of the
9 Wrangells. Attempted to survey the southern count
10 areas and I think we attempted three times and it was
11 socked in all three times. We turned around and came
12 home.

13

14 The count areas we did successfully
15 survey we had an outstanding lamb crop. Long Glacier,
16 which is on sort of the western/southwestern face of
17 the Wrangells, we had count areas on either side. The
18 southern count area 12 we observed 45 lambs to 100
19 ewes, which is a record. I can't find a higher lambing
20 rate in our records. About 40 lambs to 100 ewes north
21 of Long Glacier. We've been successful in surveying
22 those areas the last three, four attempts, so every
23 other year for the past five, six years.

24

25 Our data indicates the numbers are
26 stable. I'm hesitant to say that they're increasing,
27 but we did see more sheep. In count area 12
28 significantly more sheep, both lambs and ewes. So
29 fingers crossed and maybe we'll see a slow increase
30 here. I can certainly say, at least the most recent
31 survey efforts we've got, indicates a stable
32 population. Maybe hopefully increasing. There was
33 lots of lambs this year.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was looking at your
36 Crystalline Hills one because I look at that fairly
37 frequently on the way home. I know we counted more
38 sheep on the Crystalline Hills this year than we've
39 seen -- this spring and this fall than we've seen in
40 recent years. It's not anywhere near like what it was
41 20 or 30 years ago, but we definitely found more than
42 we've seen in the past and it seemed like a lot of ewes
43 -- a lot of lambs is what it basically boiled down to.
44 I see the number of full curl rams aren't very high.

45

46 It's interesting because I can remember
47 the first year I came here in one bunch I saw 11 full
48 curl rams on the Crystalline Hills just in one bunch.
49 But that was, for lack of a better way of putting it,
50 probably courtesy of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

1 because until 1959 we had a U.S. Fish and Wildlife
2 Service conservation officer stationed in Chitina who
3 was involved in predator control and there weren't very
4 many predators out in the Wrangells at that time.

5
6 Just to give you an example, in one
7 straight flight from Long Lake to Mt. Drum, no
8 circling, no zig-zagging, no going low, just a straight
9 flight, I counted 274 bull moose that I could see the
10 horns on. The last time I made that same flight I
11 counted four. It was different back then. I figured
12 there had to be way over 300 sheep on the Crystalline
13 Hills back in the early '70s, late '60s. It was
14 amazing.

15
16 But this is good. It's good to see an
17 increase. I like the fact that we're actually getting
18 some research and some numbers on these sheep because
19 they were declining for a number of years.

20
21 Any other questions for the folks up
22 there. Lee.

23
24 MR. ADLER: I'd like to make a comment
25 today. I've looked at your data here throughout the
26 counts and things are better than I thought. Some of
27 the areas are looking pretty good, yet the area that
28 I've hunted since 1970 and I've flown every year -- in
29 fact, this year I flew a count and the area that I
30 count and have hunted so much is from basically the
31 Klawasi down to Long Glacier, which includes the
32 Nadina, Dadina, Chetaslina, Chichokna and Cheshnina,
33 all those drainages.

34
35 Those drainages the decline hasn't come
36 back at all. In fact, I got the worst lowest counts
37 this year I've ever got. The three main drainages of
38 Nadina, Dadina and Chetaslina and Chichokna only found
39 four sheep. I used to count two or three hundred. I
40 mean I'm not blind. I had a little glare on the
41 windscreen, so there was some hillsides that I couldn't
42 count because the glare was so bad. I don't want to
43 crash the plane.

44
45 But throughout the years that area is
46 extremely low and it's probably a 90 percent reduction
47 from what I saw back in the '70s and '80s and I don't
48 know why that subunit area would be much lower than the
49 rest, but it just seems to be that way. It can't be
50 hunting harvest because only a few have been harvested,

1 just like the rest of the area. It's so low now it's
2 not worth hunting there. I gave it up. Of course I'm
3 getting older too. Anyway, that's my comment.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any more questions.
6 Have you got any more information for us at this point
7 in time.

8

9 MR. EVANS: So I think that brings up a
10 good example of how there are a lot of sub populations
11 in the area and some of them are doing good and some of
12 them may not be doing good. And then to kind of answer
13 your question, Ralph, you're still a little confused
14 about the rams and the study, I think, that was going
15 to go on.

16

17 The idea was that if you remove the
18 large rams more of the juveniles participate in the
19 rut, so it involves more harassment of the ewes, less
20 tending of the ewes, prolonged mating seasons and that
21 basically ends up being more energy expenditure by both
22 the ewes and the rams. Then if there's overwinter
23 survival it's thought to be a little bit lower. That
24 was one of the thoughts as to why maybe some of these
25 populations may have contributed to the populations
26 declining in the past. So I just wanted to clarify
27 that.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. That was
30 my idea too. That's why I couldn't see increasing the
31 rams to 3/4 curl or better would help that out because
32 you'd be taking more of the mature rams out. If I had
33 my way, being an old person, I would say that what
34 you'd have to do with this is you'd have to say that
35 locals could take a ram 3/4's of a curl or less and
36 save your big rams because that would solve the wearing
37 out of the young sheep and the breeding population and
38 everything else. And that's what we brought out is
39 that even the locals that are hunting under -- and
40 that's what I'd like to find out.

41

42 I don't know if we have anything in
43 place that says a subsistence hunter has to register as
44 a subsistence hunter and what they got because they're
45 the only ones that are allowed to take something under
46 full curl. It would be interesting is if you have a
47 subsistence permit you should have to report on that
48 subsistence permit what you took, whether it's full
49 curl or not, and it's possible that what we should have
50 for our -- of course they could always hunt under a

1 State permit, that's true. There's no way to limit a
2 subsistence hunter not to take a full curl ram.

3
4 But it's interesting to me that with
5 what you've got written there that they would want to
6 limit it to 3/4 curl or better because they'd be much
7 better off if everybody took a sub-legal, in other
8 words took a half curl or less.

9
10 MS. PUTERA: In our research, you know
11 11 is a big place and people hunt some areas more than
12 others, so I think what we're going to have to do is
13 just really look at the situation and pick areas for
14 our study that mimic those conditions that are talked
15 about under the theoretical and hopefully we'll be able
16 to do that.

17
18 I also wanted to say that Tom Lohuis
19 has been under that any ram area in Unit 13D conducting
20 research on the ewe component of that population, so
21 we'll have that kind of data for the ewe component
22 under that any ram scenario.

23
24 Then I also believe, and maybe Frank
25 can correct me if I'm wrong, but in 14 he's been
26 putting collars on rams, so beginning to look at the
27 ram population as well as the ewe population. I think
28 in the past the focus has been on researching ewes, but
29 there hasn't been a lot of research on the ram
30 component.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So if I understood
33 correct before, OSM -- it says here to support, but OSM
34 actually would prefer to be deferred?

35
36 MR. EVANS: No. OSM's preliminary
37 recommendation is to support the proposal as written,
38 but the alternative would be possibly to reduce it to
39 -- for the research, to allow the researchers to
40 conduct their studies, would be to reduce it to one
41 ram, any ram, versus a ram with 3/4 curl. And then
42 Judy mentioned defer, but that would be another option
43 that you could do too.

44
45 Thank you.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

48
49 Gloria.

50

1 MS. STICKWAN: And that was because --
2 it was written that way because they didn't have the
3 information that we have now, so that's probably why
4 the justification is written that way.

5
6 MR. EVANS: We made our preliminary
7 recommendation based on -- because the proponent didn't
8 want -- thought that protection of lambs and -- well,
9 ewes and young rams that often stay together, to
10 prevent the disturbance of that, and that was sort of
11 why the original proposal was submitted, to protect
12 that. That's why it went from any sheep to a ram with
13 3/4 curl or larger. That was the reasoning initially.

14
15
16 So in line with that OSM recommended
17 that we thought that if we reduced it to any ram to do
18 the research, there would be some disturbance to ewes
19 and young rams that sometimes associate together
20 because any ram means a small ram. That being said,
21 most of the rams being taken out of the population are
22 larger rams.

23
24 So it's a decision for you guys to
25 decide where you would like this proposal to go in
26 terms of -- I think it's pretty straightforward that it
27 be a ram. Now the question is a ram 3/4 curl or larger
28 or any ram. It's kind of your decision at this point
29 to decide what you think is best.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you.
32 With that, we go to Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

33
34 Are you there, Drew.

35
36 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is
37 Drew Crawford with the Alaska Department of Fish and
38 Game in Anchorage. The Department's preliminary
39 recommendation is to support WP16-20. While State
40 regulations that restrict harvest to older mature males
41 with a full curl or larger better ensure harvest are
42 not negatively impacting the population, reducing the
43 Federal subsistence from any sheep to one ram with 3/4
44 curl or larger would help the population by reducing
45 hunting pressure on ewes and young rams.

46
47 Also I would like to let you know that
48 in 2015 the Alaska Board of Game is establishing a
49 sheep working group in response to repeated proposals
50 and expressed concerns by the Department and the public

1 of general sheep abundance and user group conflicts.
2 Planning meetings have been held and plans for
3 stakeholder invitations to the working groups have been
4 made. I believe I heard when you were modifying your
5 agenda that either Donald Mike or George Pappas is
6 going to be discussing the recent letter that was sent
7 to OSM by the Board of Game about this working group.

8

9 Over.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mr.
12 Crawford. I think you're correct on the letter if I
13 remember right. We look forward to looking at that.
14 Thank you for your input.

15

16 Do we have any Federal agencies,
17 Native, tribal, village or Interagency Staff Committee
18 testimony.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Other Regional
23 Councils, Fish and Game Advisory Committees or
24 Subsistence Resource Commissions. This proposal is
25 submitted by the Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence
26 Regional Advisory Council.

27

28 Gloria.

29

30 MS. STICKWAN: The Wrangell-St. Elias
31 National Park Subsistence Resource Commission supported
32 and amended a version of WP16-20. Specifically, the
33 SRC recommends amending the proposal to restrict the
34 harvest of Dall sheep in Unit 11 to any ram. Given
35 stable to increased populations in our area, a 3/4 curl
36 or larger restriction for subsistence users is not
37 needed at this time to grow the sheep population. Any
38 ram harvest would preserve subsistence opportunity with
39 minimal impact on the sheep population. Once the
40 results of the upcoming sheep study are available,
41 there will be an opportunity to use the results of that
42 study to help make further decisions about sheep
43 harvest regulations.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Gloria.
46 And that brings us to written public comments. Have we
47 got any, Donald.

48

49 MR. MIKE: Yes, Mr. Chair. We received
50 one written public comment that begins on Page 160 of

1 your meeting materials. It's from the AHTNA Committee.
2 They oppose 16-20 Unit 11 sheep proposal to change the
3 harvest limit from one sheep to rams with 3/4 curl horn
4 or larger. Sheep populations in Unit 11 are stable. A
5 regulatory change of ram horn size at this time isn't
6 necessary. Changing Unit 11 sheep regulations will
7 restrict Federally qualified subsistence users to hunt
8 only for larger rams. They continue to say if the
9 proponent has a concern on the populations of sheep in
10 Unit 11, a proposal to the Alaska Board of Game could
11 address the issue.

12

13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. Do
16 we have any public testimony cards.

17

18 MR. MIKE: None.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, a motion to
21 accept WP16-20 is in order. Do I hear such a motion.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If we don't get a
26 motion, it dies.

27

28 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'm going to make that
29 motion so we can debate it.

30

31 MR. ADLER: Second.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
34 seconded to put WP16-20 on the table. Greg, you made
35 the motion. Would you start the debate.

36

37 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, my debate is I
38 was listening to Gloria and I kind of like this one
39 ram. I'm looking at it all sides and from what I hear
40 that might just be the best thing for now. There's no
41 real conservation any other way, so it won't hurt to
42 use.

43

44 You know, what we see too is at some
45 point we've got to quit taking all the old fellas too
46 because it's happening with moose too, you know.
47 Taking out the larger stock. I think this wouldn't
48 affect the subsistence use. I would be fine with just
49 one ram. I'm no expert on this stuff though.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other comments.
2
3 MR. ADLER: I would agree with that. I
4 would just leave it at one ram no matter what size and
5 eliminate ewes and lambs. That way I don't think that
6 would affect the subsistence hunters hardly at all, but
7 it would definitely help. That's my comment.
8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.
10
11 MS. STICKWAN: Initially I thought
12 maybe I would oppose this, but when I listened to the
13 discussion at Wrangell-St. Elias and the report that
14 was given, and I know the Alaska Board of Game is
15 working on a Dall sheep committee to address issues,
16 and this research that's going to be done will give us
17 more data. So I would go along with the any ram
18 because under the sheep elder hunt we could still take
19 any sheep, so that allows additional opportunity for
20 people in our area that are 60 years or older and youth
21 to take a sheep. So I would go along with any ram.
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other comments.
24 Judy.
25
26 MS. CAMINER: So, Mr. Chair, we need an
27 amendment then to get to where we're talking about?
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, we would need an
30 amendment at that point in time. Can I make a comment
31 first?
32
33 MS. CAMINER: Sure.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm going to say right
36 now from my own standpoint I don't see any reason to do
37 anything with this proposal simply because when you're
38 taking one ewe every two years, I really don't think
39 you're affecting the sheep population.
40
41 From a subsistence standpoint, I'm
42 going to talk from a subsistence standpoint because
43 when we went out to the Crystalline Hills, moved out to
44 that area back in the late '60s and there was no road
45 access, there was no neighbors, there was no other
46 food. I would say that probably my brother and I lived
47 a fairly subsistence lifestyle out there. We ate
48 grouse most of the fall and when it came time that we
49 got tired of just eating grouse we went down to the
50 Crystalline Hills. We could have shot a big full curl

1 ram, but we knew that we had neighbors who guided and
2 that full curl ram was worth a lot of money to them.
3 We could have shot a ewe, but ewes produce sheep. We
4 chose to take a lamb for subsistence purposes, so we
5 did that for two years. Simply because that had the
6 lowest impact on the population that was there and we
7 had no other meat.

8

9 From a subsistence standpoint, I see no
10 reason -- if this is a subsistence proposal, I see no
11 reason to take the ewes and lambs out when none of them
12 to speak of are being taken on some years and one of
13 them is being taken out of the whole area on other
14 years. The mean for the number of years that we have
15 is two. I've seen coyotes take down more than two
16 lambs with no problem at all. If there's somebody out
17 there actually doing subsistence, they're probably
18 trapping and I know for a fact that -- you know, we
19 took up to 20 coyotes in a year while we were out there
20 and those 20 coyotes saved more than the one or two
21 lambs that we ate in 20 years out there.

22

23 So, from that standpoint, I'm going to
24 argue from a subsistence standpoint that this proposal
25 does not even need to be made.

26

27 Yes.

28

29 MS. PUTERA: Mr. Chair. I did want to
30 bring up data that's not presented in the table and
31 this is just -- I'm not bringing it up with any feeling
32 one way or the other. It's just sort of more of a kind
33 of a question. In the '90s, there were quite a few
34 ewes taken every year, quite a few, and I'm just
35 curious as to what you think -- why you think that
36 folks over the years have kind of stopped taking ewes
37 like they did in the '90s. If we did leave the ewe
38 component in, would that increase again at some point
39 in time where a lot of ewes would be taken? That's
40 just a question I have.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You want my answer to
43 that?

44

45 MS. PUTERA: Yes, please.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Costco.

48

49 (Laughter)

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: My answer to that is
2 there are not -- you know, in order to take a ewe or a
3 lamb, it's kind of against -- you know, you're not a
4 hunter then, you're a subsistence-taker. The only
5 reason you would take a ewe or a lamb is if you needed
6 some meat to eat because you're sure not going to go
7 brag about it, you're sure not going to show it to
8 anybody. We called them short-haired goats just so
9 that we wouldn't offend some of our neighbors.

10
11 The average person today that's
12 hunting, even under subsistence regulations for sheep
13 out there, they're going to bring the sheep home and
14 they're going to show it to somebody and that's why you
15 have one ewe taken every two years or something like
16 that. So, consequently, that's why I don't think that
17 if you leave the ewes in, if you look at the last five
18 years or even the last seven years, I don't see where
19 you're going to have a big increase in ewes taken.

20
21 The other thing is, I'll say the
22 hunting ethics have changed. You know, even the road
23 out to McCarthy. I can leave my home in Kenny Lake and
24 I can be in McCarthy in two hours. We used to have to
25 fly in there or take snowmachines or dogs or something
26 like that. Those kinds of places don't exist very much
27 anymore, especially in sheep country.

28
29 So, to me, the answer is Costco. I
30 mean everybody has access to alternative meat and the
31 sheep that are being taken are part of the culture, not
32 because somebody is hungry. So I don't see a big
33 increase in the taking of ewes and lambs. I'm all for
34 -- if Council wants to make it any ram, that's fine. I
35 don't think the proposal is necessary. That's my own
36 personal opinion.

37
38 Andy.

39
40 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I would concur with
41 that same thing. Twenty years ago, not under Federal
42 but under sport, I was hunting Unit 11 and it was any
43 sheep and I thought, wow, this is great because I'm
44 going to -- maybe the last two days of my trip if I
45 haven't gotten a ram I could get a ewe and have my meat
46 because truly it wasn't sport, it was subsistence for
47 me, but I was under my State thing in the Preserve.
48 Consecutive years I got full curl rams every time and
49 then it switched to any ram, then it switched to 3/4
50 curl ram and now it's full curl only and I don't hunt

1 there anymore.

2

3 I just can't see closing a subsistence
4 opportunity for people that need the meat if they
5 wanted that option of getting a ewe. From what I heard
6 from the report, it's not that much of a conservation
7 concern, you know, the numbers are stable. So that's
8 where I'm at on this. I don't think it needs to switch
9 to one ram because it's just making things more
10 restrictive for the subsistence user and then in the
11 future that probably never gets rescinded and now it's
12 just even harder for them to get their meat.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Andy. I'd
15 like to add one other thing. A lot of people would
16 have trouble telling an immature ram or an immature ram
17 lamb from an immature ewe or an immature ewe lamb or
18 even from a ewe. If you go to any ram, you've
19 increased the likelihood of a violation. If there's
20 anything I don't like to do is to put something on the
21 book that increases the likelihood of an unintentional
22 violation and that's what I see with this any ram.

23

24 Greg.

25

26 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I think you made
27 a very good point and I agree with you. I wanted to
28 get it on there and debate it, so I was going to go for
29 anything, but this is a great debate. I do disagree
30 with you on the Costco because I would drive all the
31 way to here and further to get the wild meat, but
32 that's me.

33

34 (Laughter)

35

36 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Anyway, yeah,
37 absolutely. If it's not broken, it don't need fixing.
38 If subsistence has more opportunity to get a ewe, get
39 some meat, more power to it, so I would support that.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll add one other
42 thing. This can come before us again after we have
43 more information and if we see a detrimental effect.
44 At this point, your information does not show any
45 conservational detrimental effect as far as I can see.
46 I'm not telling anybody else what to do, but that's why
47 I'm supporting voting this proposal down and that's
48 going to be my vote.

49

50 Gloria.

1 MS. STICKWAN: I don't know if I could
2 ask a question.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, you sure can.
5 You're on the Council.

6
7 MS. STICKWAN: My understanding from
8 reading reports is that this population number is based
9 on -- it was changed over the years. The high numbers
10 in the '90s, as Lee Adler was saying, there was a new
11 number created based on the lows on the population
12 before the numbers were based higher because of higher
13 population. Is that true? That's what I've heard and
14 that's what I've read in the report. They've changed
15 the way they look at the numbers. It's now considered
16 stable based on the low populations. Am I not
17 understanding what I read and heard?

18
19 MS. PUTERA: Yeah, so what I think I
20 hear you saying is that right now we're saying they're
21 stable and, yeah, I think we're basing that stability
22 probably on the last 10 years or so. I think there
23 might be some debate when we go back further in the
24 record. For example in Table 1 on Page 155 -- and I'm
25 not saying one way or the other what the magnitude of
26 the decline is. I agree there has been a decline from
27 those very early years when we started getting numbers.

28
29
30 For example, in Table 1, the first
31 three -- it says WRST 1990, 1991, and then I think it
32 says 1993, which should actually be 1992, and you can
33 see the first two years those numbers were pretty
34 consistent, 25,000, 27,000, and then that third year it
35 says 17,000 sheep. Those three years in a row that was
36 like almost exactly the same survey that they tried to
37 do to estimate the total population three years in a
38 row. You know, when you look from '91 to '92, you've
39 got to ask yourself how can a sheep population drop
40 10,000 sheep in a year. It doesn't quite seem right.

41
42 Basically what happened is, you know,
43 you have essentially -- you do this method to look at a
44 sheep population and they did nearly the same exact
45 method three years in a row. I think that third year
46 they used a little bit of a different method to sample.
47 Again, these aren't complete counts. They basically
48 surveyed a portion of the range, they did some double
49 sampling to determine how many sheep they were missing
50 and then adjusted their counts and then they

1 extrapolated to the entire range and that's how they
2 would come up with these numbers. But that third year
3 they used exactly the same method a little bit
4 different in the way they selected the units or sample,
5 but they came up with 17,000 sheep.

6
7 So I guess -- and then also, just to
8 back up, which isn't on this table, there was some
9 quite extensive surveys done in 1983-84 where they
10 actually did a total count in most of the units. They
11 ended up extrapolating to a couple of the units they
12 weren't able to survey and then they applied a
13 correction factor that they kind of came up. That
14 population estimate in '83-'84 was 15,723.

15
16 So I guess -- what am I trying to say.
17 I guess I'm trying to say I'm not super confident in
18 those Park-wide numbers early on because they do seem
19 to fluctuate even though they're done back to back, so
20 I'm not sure the method was exactly -- you know, gave
21 us a good number I guess what I'm saying. I believe
22 there has been a decline. I'm just not sure what the
23 magnitude was and I guess I kind of think, yeah, we've
24 been tending to look at say the past 10 to 15 years to
25 look and see where the population is now versus where
26 it was in the '80s or '90s or '70s.

27
28 I don't know if I answered your
29 question, Gloria.

30
31 MS. STICKWAN: Can I ask a question to
32 Frank Robbins because I think I read that in the Fish
33 and Game -- I think it was in some report that the
34 numbers of the population have changed from the highs
35 to the lows. There used to be -- do you understand
36 what I'm asking? There used to be a high -- Lee Adler
37 said there used to be a high -- the population was high
38 in Unit 11 for sheep and then it dropped, so the
39 population count was changed to reflect those low
40 numbers, is what I'm understanding. What I've heard,
41 but I don't know if I'm understanding right.

42
43 MR. ROBBINS: Through the Chair, Member
44 Stickwan. I think what I would comment would support
45 what Judy said. There's some difference. Our agency,
46 the Fish and Game Glennallen office, our survey efforts
47 are trend counts, so we have count areas. When we fly
48 those count areas, we try to fly them the same way. We
49 count rams, we try to assess full curl, 3/4 curl, ewes
50 and lambs and that's all we do with the data. We don't

1 try to find a sightability correction factor. We just
2 have those numbers.

3
4 Over time we can hopefully look at
5 those numbers and if the data is good, the conditions
6 are right when we conducted the survey, we might be
7 able to identify trends over time. There's no doubt
8 that these trend counts, the numbers of sheep observed
9 in these trend counts has changed. We're counting
10 fewer sheep than we counted in the '90s and the '80s.
11 In some cases, significantly fewer sheep.

12
13 I have heard recent language that would
14 apply to the last decade or so that the sheep
15 populations have stabilized at a new low. So, in other
16 words, we're acknowledging the fact that there's fewer
17 sheep than there were in the '80s, but our counts seem
18 to have stabilized. We don't see a continuing decline,
19 so we've sort of stabilized at this new low. If that
20 helps or if that makes sense to you.

21
22 MS. STICKWAN: To me that sounds like
23 you're changing your count to the new low instead of
24 the high that you had before. That's the way I
25 understand it.

26
27 MR. ROBBINS: I think it's honest to
28 say that when we reference the recent stable numbers it
29 is reflective of the last decade. So when we say
30 stable, we seem to be observing the same numbers of
31 sheep that we have in the recent years, but not
32 reflective of what was counted in the '80s.

33
34 MS. STICKWAN: I'm not understanding.
35 I just don't know how to ask the question, I guess.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria, did you get
38 what you needed there?

39
40 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah. So Lee Adler was
41 right about the count. I mean you know that too. I
42 mean a lot of people know that there was a lot of sheep
43 over there and it has declined.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There aren't as many
46 sheep as there used to be, but they're not going
47 downhill. If anything, they're staying stable or going
48 uphill. If we want to go into that, those of us that
49 were here long enough to talk to some of the real
50 old-timers, if you wanted the highest sheep population

1 the Wrangells ever had, it was after the market
2 hunting. Because every market hunter carried a bottle
3 of strychnine with him and every gut pile was poisoned
4 and there were no Golden Eagles to knock the lambs off
5 the hills and there were no coyotes running around or
6 wolverines up in the top of the mountains or anything
7 like that and that's when the highest sheep population
8 was.

9
10 In the late '50s -- and I had a lot of
11 friends that hunted the Wrangells in the late '50s. In
12 the late '50s, the sheep population was still
13 reflecting that. I mean they talked about flying into
14 McCarthy or flying into any of the airstrips here and
15 everybody went back -- you can go to Cordova and see
16 everybody went back with a full curl ram. I mean it
17 was like going and hunting deer on Hawkins Island.

18
19 When I came, which was the late '60s,
20 there still was an effect of that, but it was going
21 downhill. Possibly part of the downhill part was the
22 fact that they were overpopulated and used up their
23 food resources or damaged them or something like that.
24 And it's gone downhill until recently and now recently
25 it seems to have stabled. Like I said, we've been
26 counting more sheep on the Crystalline Hills in the
27 last two years than we counted before, but not what we
28 counted 30 years ago or 40 years ago.

29
30 Like I said, when I first came in '67,
31 the first thing I did is I got a -- one guy gave me a
32 flight just up to the pass above Long Lake on the
33 Crystalline Hills and there's 11 full curl rams up
34 there, but he didn't want to land and hunt because
35 there was only 11 full curl rams and we could go
36 someplace better. I mean that's what it was like back
37 then.

38
39 So Gloria is right, we're not at that
40 level. What we are is we're at, like you said, a new
41 -- the last 10 years we don't see the precipitous
42 decline going anymore. It's kind of leveling out and
43 possibly going up, but we won't know for 20 years. To
44 me, that's why I don't see any need to change at least
45 unless we get a whole lot of more information.

46
47 But thanks, Gloria, for bringing that
48 up. Lee.

49
50 MR. ADLER: I concur. I have no

1 problem with just leaving things as they are because
2 it's not going to hurt the sheep population and if it
3 helps subsistence I go along with it.

4
5 I would like to point out something on
6 this chart on Page 155 though. The lowest overall
7 population was in 1993 according to this and I found
8 just the opposite. I've hunted since 1970 around
9 Tanada Lake and into the Nabesna and there was always a
10 lot of sheep there, but the very best year that I ever
11 saw was 1993. The place was just alive with sheep and
12 alive with say one or two big rams. They were all over
13 the place. I did get to go that year for various
14 reasons. But at the same time they were very numerous
15 in the front range there from the Klawasi on down to
16 Long Glacier. Dixie Pass you could see 20 or 30 sheep
17 and now I don't see any.

18
19 I can't figure out why you came up with
20 like here, south, 55,280 in '93 south and WRST you had
21 13,500 about. That's not what I saw. I saw lots of
22 sheep in '93, the most I've ever seen.
23 So, anyway, that kind of confuses me.

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Lee. Which
25 could bring up the fact that they do make their counts
26 in the same place and I wonder if sheep don't move from
27 one place to the other. These counts are counts and
28 then estimates on the counts. They're not actual
29 numbers of sheep. All they had to do is miss one area
30 and it would change the count. Anyhow, we know that
31 right at the moment we seem to be dealing with a stable
32 population. We have a proposal on the table before us.

33
34 Mary Ann.

35
36 MS. MILLS: Yes, I'd like to call for
37 the question.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
40 called on WP16-20, requests that the harvest limit for
41 sheep in Unit 11 be modified from one sheep to one ram
42 with 3/4 curl horn or larger. We have no amendments on
43 it. A yea vote is in favor of this modification, a nay
44 vote leaves things as they are. All in favor signify
45 by saying yea or aye or yes.

46
47 (No affirmative votes)

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
50 saying nay.

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion fails. Okay.
4 Next one.
5
6 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair.
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donald.
9
10 MR. MIKE: May I interrupt. We have
11 Council Member Encelewski leaving at lunchtime and we
12 have the Kenai Refuge Staff to present to the Council
13 on their agency report, so if we can accommodate that
14 schedule, Mr. Chair.
15
16 Thank you.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald, for
19 the reminder. With that, we're going to differ from
20 our agenda. We're going to have the Kenai Refuge
21 manager give a report because one of our Council
22 members needs to leave. Do we have the Kenai Refuge
23 manager ready with his report.
24
25 MR. ENCELEWSKI: He's always ready.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: He's always ready?
28 That's a good compliment.
29
30 MR. LORANGER: Good morning, Mr. Chair
31 and members of the Council. My name is Andy Loranger.
32 I'm the Refuge Manager at the Kenai National Wildlife
33 Refuge. What I'd like to do here briefly this morning,
34 those of you might recall that at last March's meeting
35 in Anchorage I provided an overview of some proposed
36 regulatory changes the Fish and Wildlife Service is
37 considering in relationship to sport
38 hunting/recreational hunting on National Wildlife
39 Refuges in Alaska. What I'd like to do today is just
40 kind of refresh your memory about that and also to
41 update you on where we are at in the process.
42
43 So the proposed regulations we're
44 considering can be broken into three main components
45 with the first component pertaining to clarification of
46 predator control, predator management within the
47 context of our legal mandates and responsibilities on
48 National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska. So predator
49 control is only allowed on Refuges in Alaska if it is
50 determined to be necessary to meet Refuge purposes,

1 Federal laws, policy and is consistent with our
2 mandates to manage for natural and biological
3 diversity, biological integrity and environmental
4 health. The need for predator control must be based on
5 sound science, in response to a significant
6 conservation concern and demands for more wildlife to
7 harvest cannot be the sole or primary basis for
8 predator control on Refuges in Alaska.

9
10 The second component of the proposed
11 regulatory changes pertain to the prohibition of some
12 particularly effective methods and means for, again,
13 non-subsistence or recreational take of predators on
14 Refuges in Alaska due to their potential for cumulative
15 effects to predator populations and the environment
16 that are inconsistent with our mandates to conserve
17 natural and biological diversity, biological integrity
18 and environmental health.

19
20 Specifically the following methods and
21 means for predator harvest would be prohibited on
22 refuges in Alaska again under sport hunting
23 regulations. Take of brown bears over bait, take of
24 bears using traps or snares, take of wolves and coyotes
25 during the denning season from May 1st to August 9th,
26 take of bears from an aircraft on the same day air
27 travel has occurred, and take of bear cubs or sows with
28 cubs. Exceptions under this regulation would allow for
29 resident hunters to take black bears and cubs and sows
30 with cubs under customary and traditional use
31 activities at a den site in some specific game
32 management areas where it's allowed under State law.

33
34 The third component of our regulatory
35 changes that we were proposing would be to update our
36 public participation and closure procedures on Alaska
37 Refuges. This part of the regulation applies to the
38 closing or restricting of recreational activities on
39 Refuges or in areas within Refuges such as general
40 sport hunting and fishing, camping, recreational trail
41 use, et cetera. The proposed regulatory changes would
42 not apply to the taking of fish and wildlife under
43 Federal subsistence regulations or the use and
44 transportation methods traditionally employed by rural
45 residents engaged in subsistence activities.

46
47 We're proposing these changes to be
48 consistent with other Federal regulations and to more
49 effectively engage the public. Some of the updates
50 we're considering under this part, including the

1 conservation of natural and biological diversity,
2 integrity and environmental health to the list of the
3 criteria we consider when considering a closure or
4 restriction, increase the possible duration of an
5 emergency closure from 30 to 60 days, and this is
6 consistent with the timeframe for emergency special
7 actions under Federal subsistence regulations.

8

9 Update the temporary closure duration.
10 We would retain language that clearly states temporary
11 closures may only remain in place as long as reasonably
12 necessary. And for closures pertaining to the
13 recreational take of fish and wildlife we would remove
14 the 12-month limit but require mandatory review at a
15 minimum of every three years consistent with, again,
16 the Federal Subsistence Board process for considering
17 temporary closures. We also added in a requirement for
18 the review to include a formal finding in writing
19 justifying the decision to reopen or keep the closure
20 in place.

21

22 Our proposed regulations would require
23 the publication of an annual list of Refuge closures,
24 including contact information for the person in the
25 lead for the Fish and Wildlife Service for public
26 review and input. Our proposed regulation would
27 require consultation with the State of Alaska and
28 affected tribes and Native corporations on temporary
29 and permanent closures on any temporary or permanent
30 closure.

31

32 Based on feedback we've received thus
33 far through scoping, we've decided to retain a
34 requirement for a public hearing as opposed to just a
35 public meeting in the affected area prior to
36 implementation of any temporary or permanent closure.
37 Lastly, we would expand the methods of public notice.
38 Right now it just talks about newspapers and radio, et
39 cetera, and we would expand that to add the use of the
40 internet or other available methods in addition to the
41 more traditional methods I mentioned.

42

43 So why are we proposing these changes.
44 Again, it's aimed at ensuring that the overarching
45 establishment purpose as defined under ANILCA for
46 Alaska Refuges and that is conserving all fish and
47 wildlife and their habitats in their natural diversity
48 on Refuges met. Fish and Wildlife Service also has a
49 legal responsibility under our organic legislation, the
50 National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act, to maintain

1 biological integrity, biological diversity and
2 environmental health. Those mandates speak to the
3 broader ecological context in terms of not only fish
4 and wildlife populations but the natural ecological
5 processes that occur within these large ecological
6 systems.

7
8 The changes that we're considering deal
9 primarily with recent allowances under State of Alaska
10 regulations that we, again, believe are in conflict
11 because they have the potential to depress or manage
12 predator populations at levels inconsistent with the
13 mandates I just mentioned. Especially as we consider
14 those impacts within the context of being cumulative
15 and long term and especially from the standpoint of
16 these mandates relative to how complex these systems
17 are and the level of uncertainty that we have.

18
19 Even with the best biological and
20 scientific information we're able to generate, there's
21 still a lot of uncertainty about the effects of
22 manipulating these system. So we want to ensure that
23 we're managing sport hunting, fishing, all recreational
24 uses on Refuges consistent with what our primary
25 mandates are.

26
27 Lastly, again, specific to the changes
28 we're proposing for our public participation
29 regulations, it's to more effectively engage the public
30 by updating these procedures, broadening our
31 notification and outreach, ensuring consultation with
32 tribes in the state and providing increased
33 transparency in our decision making, and lastly to
34 allow for additional public input.

35
36 Who do these proposed regulations apply
37 to? They apply to only State-regulated intensive
38 management activities and general sport hunting and
39 trapping, which is open to all Alaska residents as well
40 as people from the lower 48 on Alaska Refuges. The
41 proposed regulations would not apply to Federally
42 qualified subsistence users hunting or trapping under
43 Federal subsistence regulations.

44
45 Where would these regulations apply?
46 They would apply to the National Wildlife Refuges.
47 There are 16 Refuges in Alaska. Within the area under
48 the purview of this Council, the Refuge involved would
49 be the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge on the Kenai
50 Peninsula.

1 Lastly, an update on where we are in
2 terms of the process. Over the last year we spent a
3 lot of time with scoping, tribal consultations, a
4 number of meetings in rural Alaska communities,
5 including meetings with the various RACs. We're
6 continuing that today. Sometime in November right now
7 is the tentative schedule where we'd actually publish
8 the proposed rule as a draft rulemaking and that would
9 initiate a public comment period.

10

11 This slide mentions a tentative
12 scheduling of a public meeting in Soldotna on December
13 8. I just learned yesterday that the earliest that
14 meeting would occur would be the second week in January
15 because things are pushing back. Following the
16 publication of the proposed rule and its opening for
17 public comment, those comments would be analyzed and
18 we'd update and finalize the proposed rule sometime
19 next spring.

20

21 Right now a tentative timeframe of
22 February to April 2016 is what we're looking at and
23 publication of the final rule sometime late in the
24 spring. Again, the timeframe has been pushed forward
25 since this little presentation was put together, so
26 maybe a little later than what's on this.

27

28 That's all I have. Again, I appreciate
29 the opportunity to provide this update and I'd be happy
30 to answer whatever questions I can that the Council may
31 have.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody on the Council
34 -- Andy.

35

36 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, through the
37 Chair. Sport hunting only is what we're talking about
38 and is black bear baiting still allowed?

39

40 MR. LORANGER: The proposed regulations
41 would not affect the allowance of black bear baiting on
42 Refuges.

43

44 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: So what would be the
45 biological reason as to why a certain color of a bear
46 or species of a bear -- how come black would be allowed
47 but brown isn't? Is it something that society is
48 accepting as a color thing? I'm trying to wrap my head
49 around this.

50

1 MR. LORANGER: Biologically speaking, I
2 think the main concern with the species is the biology.
3 The reproductive potential of brown bears is
4 significantly different than black bears. Brown bears
5 have the lowest reproductive potential of any North
6 American mammal. What we're concerned about relative
7 to allowance of harvest of brown bears over bait is
8 that it more likely will have biological impacts on
9 brown bear populations than black bear and that's why
10 the proposal is to not allow it for brown bear.

11
12 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: One more question. Do
13 you see all baiting of bears as predator control and
14 not just a sport hunt? Is it feasible in your mind
15 that if somebody is hunting over bait, shoots a bear,
16 it's predator control automatically?

17
18 MR. LORANGER: Certainly the record --
19 as some of these methods and means have been recently
20 adopted by the State, the record indicates that the
21 intention was to reduce some of these predator
22 populations with the adoption of those regulations. So
23 there is the potential for that intent, but our looking
24 at it is really from the standpoint of our concern for
25 biological impacts dealing with a species with very low
26 reproductive potential in the context of a lot of
27 uncertainty.

28
29 It's very difficult to monitor brown
30 bear populations adequately. Considering those things
31 in that context is why we're looking at this
32 prohibition on take of brown bears over bait. Again,
33 looking at it from the standpoint of cumulative impacts
34 locally at a broader geographic scale as well as over a
35 longer time scale, we have that concern about taking
36 brown bears over bait.

37
38 We also share some of the concerns that
39 have been mentioned earlier today about the increased
40 potential for food conditioning bears and that issue
41 exists with both black and brown bears, but there is a
42 difference. There is an elevated level of concern with
43 food conditioning of brown bears from a public safety
44 standpoint.

45
46 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: One follow-up
47 question. Could you estimate approximate numbers of
48 brown bears versus black bears on the Kenai?

49
50 MR. LORANGER: The most -- maybe Todd

1 has this off the top of his head here and I'll defer to
2 him, but I think it's about an 8 or 9 to 1 ratio based
3 on the information that we had back in the '80s.

4

5 MR. ESKELIN: Yeah, it was back in the
6 '80s and the best estimate they could come up with was
7 around 3,000 black bears. That was 1980. It caused a
8 tremendous amount of money for the Refuge to produce
9 the brown bear population estimate. You know, as much
10 debate as there is about the quality of that number is
11 still to date the only true number as opposed to taking
12 a population estimate from one area and applying it to
13 a land mass in another area with what you would
14 consider suitable habitat.

15

16 If you look at population densities
17 from Kodiak bears to Interior -- you know, I'm talking
18 about brown bears specifically, it's a broad spectrum
19 of population densities. So taking the brown bear
20 population from the Wrangells and applying that to the
21 Kenai Peninsula, that's pretty hit and miss whether you
22 actually selected the right density for available brown
23 bear habitat on the Kenai Peninsula.

24

25 So the actual study that we did with
26 the hair sampling is the best number we have. You
27 know, it's tremendously expensive and a slightly
28 different method would be needed to get a black bear
29 population estimate. Because of the density of black
30 bears, sites would have to be closer together and would
31 actually probably be more expensive to come up with a
32 fairly tight confidence interval on a hair sampling
33 study of black bears on the Kenai.

34

35 MR. LORANGER: A lot of uncertainty in
36 regards to black bear population numbers on the Kenai.
37 We think we have a healthy black bear population.

38

39 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you. I could
40 comment that I used to hunt 15A and a lot of friends,
41 almost like family-type friends, still hunt there and
42 there's a lot more brown bears now than there used to
43 be.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

46

47 MS. MILLS: You know, that was one
48 discussion that was pretty long and laborious with this
49 Council when Doug Blossom was on here. He was out in
50 the woods on the Kenai Peninsula and he felt, as do I,

1 that there's a lot more brown bear on the Kenai than
2 what is reported. I think we see the population just
3 increasing yearly. Since the last count was in the
4 1980s, that's quite a few years span between then and
5 now. It's too bad we don't have a more accurate
6 number. Maybe the community could help with that.

7

8 MR. LORANGER: Through the Chair, Ms.
9 Mills. We generated an estimate of the brown bear
10 population on the Kenai Peninsula in 2010, a
11 cooperative study with the U.S. Forest Service, that
12 generated an estimate of just under 600 brown bears on
13 the Kenai.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's interesting to me
16 that I think about what's going on in the sport hunting
17 world and with friends of mine that are into it also
18 with our trail cameras, computers and being able to
19 radio it right to your home to look at it or a phone to
20 look at it, that more use of that isn't used to
21 estimate something like brown bear populations because
22 that's what was a real shock to a lot of my neighbors
23 when they decided to go after brown bears and put out a
24 bait station for them and put a trail camera on. They
25 thought, oh, my gosh, we've been living around this
26 many of them and we never know they're there because
27 the ones that survive are the ones that don't let
28 people know they're there for lack of a better way of
29 putting it.

30

31 It would seem like that would be a
32 comparatively inexpensive way to get some pretty fair
33 estimates. I mean what's really interesting to me is
34 when I look at what's happening in the rest of the
35 United States and documentation of wolverines in
36 Minnesota and Michigan and cougars in New York and all
37 this all because people have trail cameras out. That
38 animal is not even supposed to be here, you know. It
39 seems like we could sure use some of that.

40

41 MR. ESKELIN: Through the Chair.
42 Actually that ultimately is the basis of the study that
43 was done. Bait stations were set up over the entire
44 Kenai Peninsula with barbed wire fence to collect hair
45 and that hair -- you know, each individual bear has a
46 genetic component that was identifiable. The number of
47 stations that were 5, 10, 20 kilometers apart, every
48 week we would check the barbed wire fence. Individual
49 bears are traveling to stations a lot further away than
50 you with your trail cam would have ever believed.

1 That, in essence, is kind of the basis of that study.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They did a hair study
4 out where we lived at Long Lake. I know they asked us
5 to locate bear trees for them to go get hair off of.
6 To me, it was interesting how many individual bears
7 there actually were on one tree, so I can understand
8 the study and I think that would be pretty accurate as
9 long as the bear -- you know, it's just like looking at
10 them.

11

12 Gloria.

13

14 MS. STICKWAN: I know this is going to
15 affect the Tetlin. When is the Tetlin hearing going to
16 be?

17

18 MR. LORANGER: Through the Chair,
19 Member Stickwan. None of the public hearings have
20 occurred yet. I don't have the schedule for when that
21 might occur for the Tetlin area, but I can get that
22 information and make sure that you have it.

23

24 MS. STICKWAN: Because that would
25 affect our area, so it would be good to have. The
26 other thing is -- I think this doesn't apply to the
27 Federal subsistence, but it does affect what happens to
28 subsistence users even though there's no regulations
29 there. There are too many bears. It's going to take
30 out calves of moose and caribou and that's going to
31 affect us.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Gloria. Do
34 you have an answer.

35

36 MR. LORANGER: Through the Chair,
37 Member Stickwan. Those are viable comments and we
38 encourage you to provide those. I will bring those
39 forward from the standpoint of the comments from this
40 RAC and I would encourage you to bring those forward
41 through the public process and those public meetings as
42 well as formal commenting when the proposed rule is
43 published.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Do we have
46 any more questions on these proposed rule changes.

47

48 Greg.

49

50 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Andy. Just

1 a couple comments and a question too. You know, the
2 bear, the moose, the biological diversity, we realize
3 that's a huge issue and a huge change. Also on the
4 Kenai the National Wildlife interfaces with the State
5 and those bears move back and forth. So there's a
6 concern how that whole thing is managed because they're
7 back and forth.

8

9 Just making another comment, the
10 biological diversity of our moose and taking the big
11 moose all the time, what I'm seeing is a tremendous
12 increase in the mid-size moose. I'm not so sure if
13 we're going to study this biological diversity. We
14 need to take a broader picture of what's happening to
15 the whole system. Anyway, I'm glad it doesn't affect
16 subsistence right now.

17

18 I'm not going to get into the technical
19 stuff, but I do have questions I'd like to get one-on-
20 one with some of this consultation and the review
21 process and all that stuff because that's important to
22 us.

23

24 Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Shall we
27 go.....

28

29 MR. LORANGER: Mr. Chair. Just for the
30 record, because there was one statement or one thing
31 that I didn't mention but I did want to mention in the
32 presentation and that is that hunting is -- by law and
33 policy for National Wildlife Refuges, hunting is one of
34 our priority uses. We strongly support and will
35 continue to support hunting on National Wildlife
36 Refuges. Obviously on Refuges in Alaska we strongly
37 support and are committed to our mandates for providing
38 subsistence opportunities.

39

40 The vast majority of State regulations
41 apply to hunting on National Wildlife Refuges. We have
42 some concern about some of these new allowances that
43 have either been put in place under State regulations
44 or have been considered and their effects on our
45 ability to meet our mandates on National Wildlife
46 Refuges and that's why we're moving with this proposed
47 rule.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Now can we
50 go on to the moose harvest report?

1 MR. LORANGER: If I could add one more
2 thing. I just wanted to say thank you, Chairman Lohse,
3 for your service on this Council.

4
5 MR. ESKELIN: Thank you. Todd Eskelin,
6 Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. I track the issued
7 permits for moose hunting for Federal subsistence hunt
8 FM15-05. So far this year we've had the early season
9 that's been completed. There's two sides to this and a
10 lot of you will look at those numbers of permits issued
11 and go, man, the Refuge can't even add up these
12 numbers. There's 95 total permits and 88 on the back
13 side.

14
15 The subsistence database was down for a
16 while, so I produced those numbers based on the first
17 hunt alone. Then the second hunt opened up on October
18 20th. So what I did was I -- as soon as the database
19 came up I provided the current number of 95 permits
20 issued to date, but in the early season we only had
21 issued 88 at that point.

22
23 There's a lot of discussion over moose
24 harvest in 15B and C. You'll see on the back side that
25 the bulk of our harvest this early season came from
26 15C. We had three moose harvested total in 15B and
27 five in 15C. That fits right in probably with what we
28 would expect compared to last year. There were no cows
29 harvested this year. It's the second year of the cow
30 hunt. We had three last year and none this year. So
31 October 20th to November 10th is the late season.
32 Obviously I don't have any results for you on that hunt
33 yet.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Over the years, has
36 the late season had a tendency to have more take than
37 the early season?

38
39 MR. ESKELIN: Surprisingly not. There
40 are a lot of people that get permits for the late
41 season and very few people that actually put the effort
42 in. Most of the long-term resident hunters who hunt
43 hard get their moose in the early season and don't have
44 a reason to go out during the late season. Trying to
45 analyze those -- you can talk to the community members
46 and you can look at the hunter harvest cards and I
47 don't know how accurate they are. I mean you fill one
48 out every year. You can tell me how accurate you are.

49
50 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Absolutely accurate.

1 (Laughter)

2

3 MR. ESKELIN: All right. But, you
4 know, most of the time the late season -- I'm seeing
5 hunter effort of one, two, three days during the late
6 season. As with most of the hunts, about half of the
7 people that get a permit don't actually hunt. So the
8 people who put the effort in get their moose.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: When you were talking
11 about accuracy, you weren't talking about accuracy in
12 the amount of moose taken, mostly accuracy how much
13 effort was put in.

14

15 MR. ESKELIN: Yeah, effort and area,
16 you know. Sometime the flaw of them is they're not --
17 they're set up with drop-down menus and maybe you have
18 somebody who hunts both 15B and C and that option is
19 not available. There's a lot of little things, but
20 remembering -- if you only hunted one day, it's pretty
21 easy to remember that, but if you hunted 15 or 20 days
22 spread out over a two-month period, who knows how
23 accurate effort numbers are.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the accuracy is in
26 the effort, not in the take.

27

28 MR. ESKELIN: I certainly hope so.

29

30 (Laughter)

31

32 MR. ESKELIN: I mean we would certainly
33 hope that all the moose are being reported because
34 that's the numbers that the Council is using to
35 evaluate these hunts. So I should hope that all the
36 numbers are accurate.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They seem pretty
39 consistent.

40

41 MR. ESKELIN: Yeah. If you're
42 satisfied with the numbers, the other issue that I do
43 want to bring up is that, as you're aware, the Board of
44 Game changed the sport hunting season last spring for
45 this fall and at some point either one of your members
46 or the Council should look at addressing the
47 discrepancy in the seasons.

48

49 It was founded on increasingly warm
50 fall temperatures and in talking to the hunters this

1 year a lot of -- especially the guys who harvested did
2 not go out at least the first week or longer because it
3 was 70 degrees. Too hard to keep game if they did get
4 one down.

5
6 So probably next spring, once we have
7 the late season numbers, I'll actually put together a
8 chronology for you to show you the dates of harvest,
9 but I think there's probably an adjustment of season
10 that will not only extend the season a little bit
11 longer, but probably shorten it in the beginning
12 because there's no effort. I think this year there was
13 possibly one moose harvested before August 20th.

14
15 That's something to consider in the
16 future is if we continue with these warm temperatures,
17 a lot of guys are finding it pointless to go out. Now
18 we have a State season that extends longer than the
19 early season.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Judy.

22
23 MS. CAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
24 Based on that, I guess the Council would appreciate
25 advice whether we need to consider a new proposal or
26 whether you have the flexibility in terms of opening
27 and closing seasons to make those adjustments.

28
29 MR. ESKELIN: A, I'm not sure what
30 flexibility we have. I certainly doubt that we could
31 extend the season. I think our flexibility is in
32 shortening. B, I think we've all been in agreement we
33 like to see stuff in regulation. I would look to your
34 guys's advice as to whether there should be a proposal
35 put in in the future. Conceptually, the idea being
36 that right now the State season is open five days
37 longer. They shortened it by 12 days.

38
39 So I could easily see a situation
40 where, as before, the archery season starts on August
41 -- did start on August 10th, which is the same day as
42 the Federal subsistence early season. It was moved to
43 August 22nd. So there's a sacrifice of a few days
44 there of hunting, but there's also the addition of five
45 days during more -- conceptually when more moose are
46 available because of rut and stuff. I think the State
47 was trying to balance not having overharvest, so, in
48 essence, it shortened the season by a little bit, but
49 shifted it later. I could see the Council considering
50 something like that.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Do you
2 have a comment, Greg.

3
4 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I'd just like to
5 comment to that. We'll probably come back to you guys
6 with some proposal or maybe to this Council. First of
7 all, I'll just tell you, I mean they took away 12 days,
8 extended you five. You net lost six or seven days. It
9 doesn't make sense. It doesn't take a rocket scientist
10 to figure out we lost opportunity for hunting. So, to
11 me, it wasn't a great deal on the State's part, but,
12 yeah, the weather does change and it may get cold again
13 next year. I don't know. I don't like to take away
14 the hunting time or the opportunity.

15
16 I think some of the reason you saw some
17 of the change from what I heard there's more people --
18 there was a few bulls taken this year and there was
19 quite a bit on State land taken, so they didn't need
20 the Federal hunt. I know myself, if we're fortunate
21 enough to get a moose and we don't, I might have to go
22 to this late hunt now though just so you know. I have
23 to go get my permit first, right?

24
25 MR. ESKELIN: I was going to ask. I
26 didn't remember seeing that you had a permit.

27
28 (Laughter)

29
30 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I guess I better get
31 that first. Okay. But, anyway, yeah, it's a good
32 debatable question. I'm not, for one, for necessarily
33 aligning these things because I hate to see us fall
34 into that trap. We've got to align everything with the
35 State. We lose opportunity for the Federal subsistence
36 users. I don't think it's good.

37
38 And those cow things, I'm real
39 surprised they didn't use more of that because we
40 advertised that pretty good and everyone was really
41 excited about that. I have heard in the community
42 there's people groaning that they can't afford to hunt
43 much anymore. I argue that you can't afford not to. I
44 mean it may cost you gas and everything, but so be it.

45
46 MR. ESKELIN: Anecdotally, you know, a
47 lot of folks did say they saw cows and they were having
48 difficulty finding cows that didn't have calves.....

49
50 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Exactly.

1 MR. ESKELIN:in 15C. I guess a
2 person has to ask where's all the brown bears and
3 wolves that are eating the calves, right.
4
5 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, we could testify
6 that we did get a potlatch moose out of it for the
7 community and we had a hell of a time finding one with
8 a calf.
9
10 MR. ESKELIN: Yeah. So that's a good
11 thing. I mean that is a good thing.
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any other
14 questions for them. Can we go on to the fisheries one
15 right now?
16
17 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Sure.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How much time have we
20 got before lunch?
21
22 MS. CAMINER: Until they're done.
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And you've got time to
25 stay for the whole thing.
26
27 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I'll stay for
28 this and then I'll have to go.
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you,
31 guys.
32
33 MR. ANDERSON: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
34 RAC members. My name is Jeff Anderson. I'm the field
35 supervisor for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
36 Kenai Fish and Wildlife Field Office. In that
37 capacity, I have been delegated authority through the
38 Federal Subsistence Board as in-season manager for Cook
39 Inlet Fisheries, Federal subsistence fisheries in Cook
40 Inlet.
41
42 My report I've actually provided on
43 Page 253 of your booklet is the summary of Federal
44 subsistence fisheries through September 9th. I have a
45 little bit more updated information. We're going to
46 continue to receive harvest reports through the middle
47 of January. January 15th is when they're due for the
48 year.
49
50 Overall it was a similar year to others

1 for numbers of permits issued and the harvest reported
2 to date with the exception of the new experimental
3 community gillnet fishery on the Kasilof River. It's
4 my understanding that the Ninilchik Traditional Council
5 provided some information about that fishery yesterday,
6 so I'm not going to spend a lot of time on those
7 details other than to say I think we likely issued
8 double the number of Kasilof River permits to Ninilchik
9 residents this year compared to last and it's likely
10 because of the gillnet fishery, the existence of the
11 fishery. I think we went from 16 permits issued last
12 year to 33 permits for Ninilchik households this year.
13 Again, I think the harvest was likely reported
14 yesterday of 223 sockeye salmon in that fishery.

15
16 My summary for the fisheries to date
17 through September 9th indicates a harvest of 1,400
18 sockeye salmon at the Russian River Falls dipnet
19 fishery. That number, as of a couple days ago, has
20 increased to 1,515 fish. The rod and reel fishery
21 numbers, the harvest reported so far to date has
22 increased to 70 fish. Those numbers will continue to
23 increase a little bit between now and when all the
24 harvest reports are turned in the middle of January.

25
26 For the management summary for the
27 year, I did issue an emergency special action to close
28 the Federal subsistence fishery for chinook salmon in
29 the Kenai River downstream from the outlet of Skilak
30 Lake from Thursday, June 18, through Saturday, August
31 15th and it prohibited all subsistence fishing for
32 chinook salmon, including dipnet, rod and reel and
33 community gillnet fisheries. The special action
34 followed an emergency order issued by the Alaska
35 Department of Fish and Game on May 1st to close the
36 sport fishery for early run chinook salmon throughout
37 the river and to close the Kenai River above Slikok
38 Creek to sport fishing through 31 July. Federal waters
39 of the Kenai River below Skilak Lake were closed to
40 fishing for Chinook Salmon for all users
41 through August 15.

42
43 That's my summary report and I'm happy
44 to take any questions.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now the Russian River
47 Falls report, that was subsistence take, right?

48
49 MR. ANDERSON: Correct. That's the
50 dipnet fishery at Russian River Falls.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's the Federal
2 subsistence one.
3
4 MR. ANDERSON: Correct.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There's a State dipnet
7 fishery there too, isn't there?
8
9 MR. ANDERSON: That's not correct.
10 There's a personal use dipnet fishery at the mouth of
11 the Kenai River.
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. But not up at
14 the Falls.
15
16 MR. ANDERSON: Correct.
17
18 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.
19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.
21
22 MS. CAMINER: Thanks, Jeff, for coming
23 here today and I know we kind of corresponded on this,
24 but maybe you can explain again. So all the waters in
25 the upper river were closed to subsistence fishing, but
26 just on the other side of the boundary a lot of people
27 were fishing. I know you're concerned about the
28 spawning areas, but maybe you could explain that a
29 little bit more to us, please.
30
31 MR. ANDERSON: Through the Chair,
32 Member Caminer. Yes, there are two distinct runs of
33 chinook salmon that enter and spawn in the Kenai River
34 and its tributaries. The early run chinook salmon is
35 managed under a separate management plan even within
36 the state. Those fish enter the Kenai River starting
37 in early May and continue to arrive until the end of
38 June. On June 30th and July 1st is when the management
39 plan transitions from early run chinook salmon to late
40 run chinook salmon.
41
42 Early run chinook in Kenai River spawn
43 primarily in tributary streams such as the Keely River,
44 the Funny River, Quartz Creek, Juneau Creek, Granite
45 Creek, in the headwaters, they spawn in the Russian
46 River. There also is a portion of the early run that
47 spawns in the mainstem Kenai River above Skilak Lake
48 and also in the mainstem river below Skilak Lake on
49 Federal waters.
50

1 Starting on July 1st the late run
2 management begins for chinook salmon on the Kenai
3 River. Late run fish primarily spawn in the mainstem
4 Kenai River from below Skilak Lake all the way down to
5 the saltwater, the brackish water around Pillars boat
6 launch, Eagle Rock, in that area.

7
8 The fishery for the early run was
9 closed to all users, not just on Federal waters but in
10 the lower river as well. On July 1st, the sport
11 fishery for late run chinook salmon opened while the
12 early run fish were present in the river upstream of
13 the regulatory closure markers and were spawning or
14 transitioning to spawning areas. The sport fishery and
15 also commercial fisheries harvested late run chinook
16 salmon off the mouth of the Kenai River as well.

17
18 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. I think what
19 we are all struggling with is the mandates for
20 subsistence priority. And I guess my understanding is
21 escapement was achieved this year, so I guess why
22 couldn't there be a little subsistence fishing? There
23 have been allocations for it. Why was this not the
24 year to open it up?

25
26 MR. ANDERSON: Through the Chair,
27 Member Caminer. Yes, the escapement goal for early run
28 chinook salmon in the Kenai River was achieved. It was
29 the first time since I believe 2012 that that number
30 was achieved. It was still, however, the fourth lowest
31 return on record for the early run. It's still just --
32 meeting the lower bound of the escapement goal does not
33 alleviate our concerns for the stock at this time.

34
35 The Federal waters of the Kenai River
36 where the Federal subsistence fishery could occur are
37 estimates for numbers of early run chinook salmon that
38 might have been present when a fishery could have
39 occurred this year was about 150 fish. We don't think
40 any of those represent a harvestable surplus in this
41 day and age. Erring on the side of conservation is
42 where I landed this year. I think the State of Alaska
43 kept their closures in place as well to protect the
44 early run.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Andy.

47
48 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Through the Chair. I
49 didn't quite catch it. Was there a timing in the late
50 run, not early run, in the late run where sport fishing

1 was allowed but subsistence wasn't?

2

3 MR. ANDERSON: Not on Federal waters.
4 Actually on Federal waters of the Kenai River my
5 emergency special action expired on August 15th and at
6 that time subsistence users could have harvested late
7 run chinook salmon in Federal waters, but there was not
8 a time when Federal waters were open to any user groups
9 to target chinook salmon this year.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Jeff, can I ask a
12 question. I was just wondering does Fish and Game
13 operate their gillnet during the time when early run
14 chinook are coming up the river or do they only operate
15 their gillnet for test purposes after early run chinook
16 are gone?

17

18 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chair. I'd defer
19 questions of Fish and Game's operation of their sonar
20 assessment project directly to Fish and Game, but it's
21 my understanding that, yes, they run their assessment
22 program through both runs, the early run and the late
23 run.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we have no
26 information as to what their incidental catch rate of
27 early run chinook was or what their survival rate was
28 in releasing them?

29

30 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chair. Those would
31 be questions directly for the State.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So I just meant we
34 have no information on that. Okay. Any other
35 questions. Judy.

36

37 MS. CAMINER: Go ahead, Lee.

38

39 MR. ADLER: For Andy, what are the
40 effects of the Funny River fire? Have you analyzed
41 that on wildlife?

42

43 MR. LORANGER: The Funny River fire,
44 this was the first growing season. Actually maybe the
45 second because it occurred early in May of 2014. So it
46 was an early season fire that was carried by dead
47 Canada blue joint grass and black spruce primarily. It
48 was not a deep burn in terms of a lot of the organic
49 layer being consumed. There are areas where it did
50 burn fairly severely and actually overwintered and

1 popped back up this past spring. But overall it was
2 not that kind of -- what we call a mineral soil burn.

3
4 What we're seeing is some fairly
5 significant root sprouting of species like birch and
6 aspen as well as some willow. We expect that will be
7 positive from the standpoint of winter moose browse.
8 Effects on wildlife populations in terms of things like
9 moose populations are going to be somewhere down the
10 road as opposed to this quickly.

11
12 MR. ADLER: How many total acres?

13
14 MR. LORANGER: The perimeter of the
15 fire was roughly 200,000 acres. There's a lot of
16 unburned inclusions within that, so we're still mapping
17 fire severity. It's something less than 200,000 acres
18 that actually was consumed.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any more questions for
21 Jeff. Judy.

22
23 MS. CAMINER: One more, I guess. Well,
24 harvestable surplus is kind of maybe a State term
25 that's kind of migrated over to the Federal program,
26 yet I think maybe we think of it more as subsistence
27 resources available to subsistence users. To me, it
28 seems clear we have an allocation problem, challenge on
29 the Kenai Peninsula and I understand it's a difficult
30 problem, but are there talks underway with Fish and
31 Game to try to save the allocation for the first
32 priority users rather than have people downstream catch
33 everything up until escapement.

34
35 MR. ANDERSON: Through the Chair,
36 Member Caminer. That's a good question and I don't
37 necessarily have probably a great answer for you today.
38 I do know part of the challenge with managing this
39 fishery and these fisheries is geography and where the
40 Federal waters actually lie in relation to the rest of
41 where fisheries occur on the Kenai River and also out
42 in Cook Inlet. I think there's about seven miles of
43 river below Skilak Lake that are actually Federal
44 waters and a good chunk of those represent spawning
45 areas for chinook salmon and other species.

46
47 So my delegated authority actually lies
48 within those Federal waters. That's the only place I
49 can effectively manage use, whether by -- I have no
50 authority to manage or restrict State fisheries outside

1 of the Federal waters where a lot of the other sport
2 fishing and commercial fisheries occur. So it's a
3 challenge of geography, it's a challenge of my
4 delegated authority as well what I can do and what
5 options there are.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy, is that.....

8

9 MS. CAMINER: And we understand that
10 and certainly many of us are familiar with that. I
11 mean the Copper River is another example and the upper
12 reaches that go into the Park or to BLM areas. The
13 Yukon is certainly the famous checkerboard management
14 there. There needs to be some better system put in
15 place so that Title VIII is upheld. I guess I'll just
16 leave it at that.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

19

20 MS. MILLS: The Cook Inlet is included
21 in the law of the sea, so what impact does this have
22 with the Federal management of Cook Inlet?

23

24 MR. ANDERSON: Through the Chair,
25 Member Mills. I think that's a question of authority
26 and it's beyond my authority as delegated through the
27 Federal Subsistence Board. I'm probably not the person
28 to answer the question or provide the best answer. I
29 know it's extraterritorial jurisdiction. The
30 management there lies with the Secretaries of Interior
31 and Agriculture if I'm not mistaken. It's beyond my
32 authority within Federal waters or the Federal
33 conservation units in Cook Inlet.

34

35 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I was going to stay
36 out of this fight, but I have a question. Jeff, I'm
37 going to stay out of this and you know why, but I do
38 want to ask you a question. I want to ask you where
39 all those fish come from.

40

41 I kind of have an analogy and you have
42 it too, we all do, but I don't think a lot of these
43 people with us here understand what really goes on down
44 there coming up the Cook Inlet. If I could paint a
45 word picture for you, I would say that starting out
46 down south you start with the guides and there's
47 hundreds of boats of those fishing and they're taking a
48 lot of kings.

49

50 As you come up the system, you're

1 seeing them hook and line off of Ninilchik, Deep Creek,
2 all the way to the Kasilof, up toward the Kenai.
3 Pretty soon you have dippers and then you have
4 drifters, you've got drift boats all over. You've got
5 setnetters. There's a few of those around too and
6 they're out there. You've got early run nets going in
7 for the State on the 16th of June.

8
9 I'm not going to get too into it, but
10 we know where I'm going. We've got all these fish are
11 being intercepted that are heading to Federal waters.
12 A lot of those are coming from Federal waters and you
13 stated you don't have control of that, but anything
14 three miles out in the Cook Inlet it's my understanding
15 it's Federal waters.

16
17 I really think that this whole issue
18 needs some real scrutiny and some work. I know we
19 can't have a surplus of fish and overescaped rivers.
20 Everyone in the country, we got more kings this year
21 than any of them, and everyone knows that, in all
22 systems and all catches down there. Big surpluses,
23 overescapement on the Kenai. My understanding is close
24 to half a million reds overescaped. I just want that
25 to be noted.

26
27 Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Greg.
30 Thank you, Jeff. Have you got anything else you'd like
31 to share with us. I would think you've got a pretty
32 hard job myself. It's hard for me -- what I can't
33 figure out is what we can do when you have all these
34 other fisheries that we're talking about that you have
35 to manage on a terminal fishery and you can't take into
36 effect even what the other ones are doing below.

37
38 I mean it's almost like psychologically
39 I'd want to say if they can take some, we can take
40 some. I mean that would be the attitude I'm sure that
41 Greg would have and yet I don't know how -- you know,
42 you can't put that into your thinking as a manager
43 because the end result is how many do we have sitting
44 here. I'm glad I don't have your job.

45
46 With that, unless somebody has some
47 further questions, I think we need to break for lunch.
48 Ivan.

49
50 MR. I. ENCELEWSKI: Can I make a

1 comment?

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You can make a
4 comment. You have to come to the mic.

5

6 MR. I. ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Mr.
7 Chairman. For the record, my name is Ivan Encelewski.
8 I ask your indulgence to make a comment and I do so out
9 of noting the agenda where it says public and tribal
10 comment on non-agenda items available each morning and
11 I didn't notice that this morning, so I'd like the
12 opportunity to make a couple comments.

13

14 And I'm not going to belabor the issue
15 or get into this back and forth, but I want to
16 reiterate a couple things on this fishery. First of
17 all, remember that the escapement goals were met. I
18 think it was over by six or eight hundred. So when
19 we're talking about escapement goals being met, one of
20 the issues that we brought up is here we are when we
21 talk about State and Federal, and we talk about
22 subsistence being the priority.

23

24 Well, the State sets the optimum
25 escapement goal, but yet the Feds have a higher
26 escapement goal for subsistence users apparently
27 because when you meet the State escapement goal, the
28 Feds believe that's not still a conservation concern.
29 So we have Federal subsistence users who have a higher
30 burden of conservation than even the State has and
31 that's not the way that this Federal subsistence system
32 was designed.

33

34 We argue about whether Federal
35 fisheries are occurring, no other fisheries are
36 occurring in Federal waters. Well, it's semantics
37 because right here at an imaginary line there's state
38 waters and Federal waters and there's all kinds of
39 things going on in those waters right up to that point.
40 You know, when you talk about the numbers from the
41 State, and I'm not going to speak for the State, but
42 you can go online any time and you can get the daily
43 count numbers of the test fishery.

44

45 They start the net test fishery, I
46 believe, in June. It runs all of June. They have
47 daily counts of kings, actually chinook harvested or
48 caught in the net. I believe from June 1st to June
49 30th it's in the range of between 80, 90-ish. What it
50 was this year. Like I said, you just pop it up online

1 and it's right there, numbers by day.

2

3 So if you take into account the U.S.
4 Fish and Wildlife has testified previously that they
5 believe the net harvest or the mortality rate for nets
6 is in the 30-some percent, maybe 40. I don't know what
7 it is. Somewhere in that range. I'm not justifying
8 that. I think it's lower. You can see how many early
9 run kings the State killed in their net test fishery in
10 the Kenai, okay, but we weren't even allowed to have an
11 opportunity at this imaginary line a few miles up the
12 river.

13

14 So somehow all of a sudden it's such a
15 huge concern. The State can sit there and do it. It's
16 just like your comments just a second ago, you know.
17 The burden of proof and the burden of conservation has
18 been shifted entirely to the subsistence user. So when
19 you take the hundreds and hundreds of guides that are
20 fishing in the Cook Inlet where all those fish come up
21 the inlet, all those kings, every one of them, then you
22 take the sport fisherman, you take the hundreds and
23 hundreds of setnetters and setnets, buoys, and they're
24 starting to fish in late June now, earlier. Sometimes
25 on the 19th, 20th.

26

27 So they're getting into that early run
28 timeframe where all those setnetters, all the drifters,
29 and then you start getting into when you have
30 dipnetters and sport fishermen and yet the escapement
31 goal is being met, the Federal managers have a higher
32 burden on subsistence users than the State, so all of a
33 sudden we're taking all the brunt of the conservation
34 when the conservation actually doesn't exist.

35

36 Lastly, I want to say just in regards
37 to -- you know, we've testified on the record before
38 about -- I want to make clear that the other fisheries
39 -- and just a little history on this is that we
40 proposed nets years and years ago, 10, 15 years ago,
41 and of course that didn't go anywhere, so they gave us
42 the fishwheel, they gave us the extra bait, the extra
43 worm. So those were not meaningful preferences for us.
44 We told them time and time again we're not bait
45 fishermen with sport fishing and all that. They told
46 us they would teach us how to sport fish and all that.
47 It absolutely was not a preference under this program.

48

49 So through this whole process we
50 finally got to where we got these nets, a single net,

1 and all these conservation measures that go with it.
2 Operational plan and mesh size and area and 24-hour
3 reporting. The 72-hour reporting in the regulation was
4 dropped to 24-hour reporting in our Kasilof net
5 operational plan, so we're talking about literally
6 every day you have to report or you could be shut down.

7
8

9 So I want to make clear that when we
10 testified or we did the presentation on how the fishery
11 went, you could see that -- I think Darrel testified
12 about three of the permits were completely filled out
13 of the 11 or 12. So even with this most aggressive
14 method and means of catching fish in the Kasilof we
15 didn't even come close to being able to meet the needs
16 of the subsistence users.

17

18 So when you look at lower harvest
19 numbers like in the report here, you'll see lower
20 harvest numbers for Ninilchik. It's not because we
21 don't have the need, it's because it's not a meaningful
22 preference. So you can see all of a sudden we jumped
23 up to 200-some-odd fish caught in the Kasilof gillnet.
24 That will increase if we're allowed to get the
25 operational plan approved in the beginning of July to
26 fish the earlier portion. So you're going to see that
27 increase there. But low numbers don't mean not a need,
28 they mean no meaningful preference in the past.

29

30 So we want to make sure that these
31 other fisheries, like the extra worm and the extra
32 hook, they don't provide for the meaningful preference
33 under ANILCA. So we just want to make that clear for
34 the record. We've always testified that -- part of the
35 reason and the rationale for our proposals is to find a
36 meaningful preference for our people and to say that we
37 have -- I heard this come up in this body in the last
38 day or two.

39

40 Sometimes you hear, well, we want to
41 align things with the State and we want this, but we
42 need a real preference under the law. That's what it
43 mandates and that's what it's for. When you have
44 higher thresholds of escapement goals, higher
45 conservation measures put on subsistence users, faster
46 reporting times. The onus on the subsistence user is
47 more than would ever be applied to a State user. It's
48 absolutely patently ridiculous and it's not
49 implementing the intent of ANILCA.

50

1 I don't want to belabor any more, but I
2 want to make clear that this loss of opportunity in the
3 Kenai caused a great burden to our people because that
4 would have been an area where we could have actually
5 fulfilled some of our fish needs.

6
7 Thank you.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Ivan. Any
10 questions or comments.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ivan, you know that
15 down through the years that I've been here one of the
16 things I have supported is reporting, but I've also
17 fought the fact that we have requirements for reporting
18 on subsistence fisheries, especially on the Kenai
19 Peninsula, greater than any State fishery.

20
21 I can remember when we did it on the
22 rainbow trout and they wanted 24-hour reporting and
23 that was a late meeting and we didn't even know how
24 many subsistence fish were taken on the Copper at that
25 time. It's just interesting to me that there's no
26 reporting requirements on all the dipnets that are out
27 there. It would be real interesting to find out what
28 the actual take is and where the actual take goes, but
29 I don't think we're going to change that.

30
31 MR. I. ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Mr.
32 Chairman. Yeah, it's an interesting dynamic. I don't
33 think there's any question that the Kenai is very
34 political. There's things that go on in the Kenai that
35 are more restrictive and more problematic when they
36 don't need to be just because of that issue.

37
38 A good example of that is we've been
39 here in this area a few times for these meetings. We
40 go down there to the fishwheels in Chitina and we were
41 kind of laughing because you see an old engine block
42 used as an anchor on the side of the bank. Can you
43 imagine if we brought an old engine block and set it up
44 in the Kenai? We can't even walk on the bank, you
45 know, because we're going to kill off the fish and
46 that's in history in our proposal. We can't have a
47 dipnet fishery because we're going to kill off the fish
48 if we walk on the bank let alone if we put an old
49 engine block as an anchor, but they can do it here. I
50 don't know.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's because you
2 live on the Kenai. Well, thank you. And thank you,
3 Jeff, for your report. With that, I think -- Gloria.

4
5 MS. STICKWAN: I heard yesterday they
6 had to buy insurance for their operational -- as part
7 of their plan. I wanted to hear from them.

8
9 MR. I. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chairman. Ms.
10 Stickwan. Yeah, we have to have a certificate of
11 insurance as part of the special Refuge permit. It's a
12 two-tier process. For the gillnet fishery specifically
13 and the fishwheel, we actually have to have an
14 operational plan approved and that gets approved
15 through the in-season manager. Separate to that is a
16 special Refuge permit that is approved by Andy and that
17 lays out the certain conditions and requirements of use
18 of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. So there are
19 two requirements. One is not in regulation and one is
20 just, I believe -- and I don't want to speak for them,
21 so if there's anything I'm misquoting, please, Jeff or
22 Andy. But that's one of the requirements that they
23 have in their permitting process for the special Refuge
24 permit is an insurance requirement. So that's why we
25 have to get with our insurance company and provide
26 insurance.

27
28 MS. STICKWAN: To me that doesn't sound
29 like subsistence. It's kind of sad that you have to
30 buy insurance. I hope that isn't adopted statewide.
31 There sure would be a lot of unhappy people. I'd like
32 to hear what his response is about the insurance. Is
33 that in regulation or is that something you guys put
34 into the operational plan requirement?

35
36 MR. LORANGER: It's not in the
37 operational plan as a requirement, but having a special
38 use permit -- and the issue from the standpoint of
39 liability insurance is just related to the level of use
40 that occurs in these river systems and just to insure
41 -- because there is the potential for conflict amongst
42 users, a potential for safety issues and that's what
43 that is about. It is really a matter of just insuring
44 that we're addressing the liability issues associated
45 with a structure in a waterway that receives a lot of
46 boating and other recreational use in addition to --
47 for this subsistence fisheries purposes. That was the
48 basis for the requirement for insurance for the
49 fishwheel and it just carried over to this requirement.

50

1 MS. STICKWAN: So it was a requirement
2 for the fishwheel too?

3
4 MR. LORANGER: It was in the original
5 permit.

6
7 MS. STICKWAN: How is a fishwheel going
8 to move up and down river. I don't know. It doesn't
9 make sense to me.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

12
13 MS. MILLS: Mary Ann Mills. Are other
14 governments or other entities required to have
15 insurance as well on the Kenai?

16
17 MR. LORANGER: Through the Chair,
18 Member Mills. As an example, all of the guiding
19 operations that get special use permits for providing
20 commercial visitor services on the Kenai National
21 Wildlife Refuge are required to provide a certificate
22 of insurance as part of getting that permit. It's a
23 requirement for them as well. There are a number of
24 other examples of that requirement as well.

25
26 MS. MILLS: Mr. Loranger, guiding is a
27 commercial industry, but subsistence is not. So it
28 seems to me like kind of a stretch to require insurance
29 of the subsistence on the Kenai when it is not required
30 to my knowledge with any of the subsistence endeavors
31 throughout the state on Federal land. If you could
32 explain why the Kenai is in this different category.

33
34 MR. LORANGER: Through the Chair,
35 Member Mills. I am certain that the uniqueness of the
36 Kenai and the level and intensity of use and the number
37 of users that are involved in the close vicinity is the
38 reason that the need for liability insurance when the
39 fishwheel was first established as an experimental
40 fishery was put into place. That's the best answer
41 that I have. It's the uniqueness of the Kenai in
42 dealing with the amount of people and the intensity of
43 use that occurs there and trying to address that from
44 the standpoint of a structure on the river that hasn't
45 been there in the past, et cetera.

46
47 MS. MILLS: So would it be correct to
48 say it's a penalty imposed on those on the Kenai?

49
50 MR. LORANGER: Certainly the intent was

1 never to penalize.

2

3 MS. MILLS: Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions or
6 comments before we break for lunch.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Andy.

11

12 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Before we head out to
13 lunch, I just want to tell other Council members here
14 I've got to head out, but I sure respect Ralph and I
15 appreciate everything you've done for us. I'm going to
16 miss you. I wish I was here this afternoon, but I've
17 been gone from work all week and I need to get back.
18 Hopefully I'll get the reports.

19

20 (Off record)

21

22 (On record)

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just for the sake of
25 the Council, the next two proposals both deal with Unit
26 12 and in the past it's been our policy as a Council to
27 defer to the home region. Both of these are Eastern
28 Interior proposals. They deal with lynx and they deal
29 with beaver trapping and lynx trapping in Unit 12 and
30 20. Is it the wish of the Council just to defer these
31 to the home region and then we don't have to take
32 action on them. Can somebody make a motion to that
33 effect.

34

35 MS. MILLS: Yes, Mr. Chair, I have no
36 problem with that. I don't know about the other
37 Council.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you're making a
40 motion that we defer WP16-67 and 68 to the home region,
41 which is Eastern Interior.

42

43 MS. MILLS: Yes.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I have a second.

46

47 MS. STICKWAN: I'll second for
48 discussion.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. It's been

1 seconded. Gloria, discussion.

2

3 MS. STICKWAN: Since these two
4 proposals are non-controversial and they will probably
5 pass the way we want them to, I'd say no, but I think
6 our policy in the past hasn't been a good one. We need
7 to address these proposals that are cross-overs.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just defer them to the
10 region that.....

11

12 MS. STICKWAN: No, we need to address
13 them, but for these two I don't think we need to.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Donald.

16

17 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
18 just want it clear on the record that I was approached
19 by Member Stickwan about the comments that was provided
20 by AHTNA Committee and she wishes to withdraw that. If
21 you can state on the record that you wish to withdraw
22 those comments from.....

23

24 MS. STICKWAN: I just wanted to
25 withdraw the comments on the lynx proposal.

26

27 MR. MIKE: On the lynx, yes. I'll make
28 sure the Eastern Interior Council knows that.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you,
31 Gloria. With that, we have a motion on the table. If
32 there's no further discussion, we are deferring WP16-67
33 and 68 to the home region, which is Eastern Interior.
34 Question.

35

36 MS. CAMINER: Question.

37

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

40

41 IN UNISON: Aye.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
44 saying nay.

45

46 (No opposing votes)

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. With
49 that, I have two requests. I have a request from
50 Gloria to present something on the membership on the

1 SRC and I have a request from Robbin to bring something
2 to our attention and then we'll go on to the FRMP.
3 Gloria.

4
5 MS. STICKWAN: Earlier I had requested
6 that we allow AHTNA to make their presentation of the
7 moose browse after lunch because they have to leave at
8 3:00 and it shouldn't take that long to do theirs. For
9 the Denali, I'd like to do the Denali now if that's
10 okay.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

13
14 MS. STICKWAN: I wanted to nominate or
15 select Eleanor to be our representative on the Denali
16 SRC and we want to keep Marie Gore on.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Am I understanding
19 right, Gloria, as a Council we need to appoint one of
20 our members to the Denali SRC, right?

21
22 MS. STICKWAN: Yes. And we want -- I
23 may be getting confused. Can we get help?

24
25 MR. SUMMERS: Certainly. Mr. Chairman,
26 Council members. If you appoint two members to the
27 Denali SRC. I believe Jeff Burney is a member and his
28 term has expired and Marie Gore is another member and
29 she's up for reappointment. So I'll stop with that and
30 let Gloria continue.

31
32 MS. STICKWAN: Well, my understanding,
33 I thought we could appoint Eleanor in Burney's seat and
34 we wanted to keep Marie Gore on.

35
36 MR. SUMMERS: Mr. Chairman. Yes,
37 that's.....

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have a vacancy.

40
41 MR. SUMMERS: You have a vacancy and
42 you have a re-appointment, so.....

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That this Council
45 needs to make.

46
47 MR. SUMMERS: Correct. And it sounds
48 like Gloria is making a recommendation that Eleanor
49 take Mr. Burney's seat, be appointed to take his seat,
50 and I think Gloria wants to reappoint Marie Gore, who

1 is a representative from Cantwell. Mr. Burney is a
2 representative from Cantwell also.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So what we would need,
5 Gloria, is a motion on your part and a second because
6 we have a vacant seat that we need to appoint somebody
7 to. So you could make a motion to appoint Eleanor to
8 the vacant seat and to retain Marie if you would so
9 like to do.

10

11 MS. STICKWAN: I make a motion to
12 appoint Eleanor Dementi to be our representative on the
13 Denali SRC and to report back to us and to keep Marie
14 Gore on the Denali SRC.

15

16 MS. MILLS: I second.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
19 seconded. Any discussion by Council members.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, the
24 question is in order.

25

26 MS. CAMINER: Question.

27

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

30

31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32

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

35

36 (No opposing votes)

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. You
39 now have a full SRC.

40

41 MS. DEMENTI: Thank you.

42

43 MS. CAMINER: Thank you.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you for being
46 willing to go on it and to report back to us.

47

48 MS. STICKWAN: I just wanted to remind
49 you that earlier we talked about allowing AHTNA to give
50 their presentation after lunch.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. So what we'll
2 do now is we're going to have Robbin give us a short
3 thing on what we did before and this is just a piece of
4 information. It takes no action on our part.

5
6 MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, members of the
7 Council. I wanted to clarify in regards to Wildlife
8 Proposal 16-19 just so that we have it on the record.
9 The culture camps are now no longer authorized through
10 unit-specific regulations. They are authorized under
11 the Cultural and Educational Permit Program and that's
12 found at 100.25(g). A bit of regulation that was
13 passed with unanimous support by all Regional Advisory
14 Councils statewide. So these are now authorized under
15 that general provision.

16
17 The Board can vote to leave the AHTNA
18 Culture Camp in unit-specific regulations as forwarded
19 by this Council. However, the regulation will still be
20 processed or the culture camp permit will still be
21 processed based on the regulations under 100.25(g) and
22 it's the same exact process whether the camp gets left
23 in the unit-specific regulations or not. There will be
24 a delegated letter of authority. There has been a
25 delegated letter of authority. It can't be done
26 without. The difference being that your camp will be
27 as amended in regulations or you're forwarding your
28 recommendation to the Board. We can't say what the
29 Board will do, but that it would be in regulations as
30 amended and those regulations would then specify the
31 process under 100.25(g).

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But basically what we
34 did still stands.

35
36 MS. LAVINE: Yes. We don't need to
37 take any further motion. I just wanted to clarify.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Robbin.
40 And at this point I do have a request from a Council
41 member to allow a group to speak because some of them
42 have to leave. If it's okay with the rest of the
43 Council, I would like to allow at this point in time
44 AHTNA to speak because some of them have to leave.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, AHTNA, you're
49 welcome to come and make your presentation.

50

1 MS. LINNELL: Good afternoon. I'm
2 Karen Linnell. I'm the executive director for the
3 Copper River-AHTNA Inter-Tribal Resource Conservation
4 District. It's quite a mouthful, but we also go by
5 CRITR. Before I get too far I want to introduce
6 myself. I'm from Chistochina. My parents are Lemmie
7 and Edna Charley of the Nelchina Clan. I grew up in
8 the Basin here since I was about 12 years old, but
9 there hasn't been a time that I haven't eaten food from
10 this valley.

11
12 My parents moved away for work and so
13 what you folks are doing is real important to me and to
14 my grandchildren who now live in Valdez because they
15 and my girls have all, from the day they were born,
16 since they could eat food, have eaten from here. So I
17 appreciate all your hard work and what you're doing to
18 protect our subsistence way of life.

19
20 I want to introduce Bruce Cain. He's
21 our special projects person with AHTNA and he provides
22 technical support to the Conservation District. And we
23 have Dr. William Wall, who is a forester and consultant
24 to us on moose habitat. So I'll turn it over to them
25 for now.

26
27 MR. CAIN: Thank you, Karen. Mr.
28 Chair, members of the board. I'm Bruce Cain. I work
29 for AHTNA, Incorporated. I'm also working with the
30 Copper River-AHTNA Inter-Tribal Resource Conservation
31 District. My parents are John and Trudy Cain. They
32 live in Anchorage and I was adopted in the Nelchina
33 Clan by Christine Craig and her parents were Walter and
34 Mamie Charley.

35
36 I'm going to run through briefly a
37 little bit of an overview of what we're doing with the
38 Tribal Conservation District and it's purpose, mission,
39 goals and some of our initiatives and then
40 Dr. Wall will go through a few of our projects and
41 we'll try to be brief. Thank you very much for
42 allowing us the opportunity to share with you some of
43 the work we're doing because I think it will provide a
44 tool for some management issues that we deal with.

45
46 So this is who we are. This is a map
47 of the AHTNA Traditional Use Area, that red line that
48 goes east to the Canadian border and then around to the
49 Cantwell area. If you look at the checkerboard red
50 areas, those are AHTNA, Inc. patented lands with ANCSA.

1 There's about 700,000 acres of land within the
2 Wrangell-St. Elias Park Service boundary, so it's about
3 8 percent of the Park Service land mass and then as
4 well as other places as well. It's about a 30 million
5 acre territory.

6
7 Then why we formed. Maybe some of you
8 heard of the Fairbanks Four. Well, this is some of the
9 Copper River Four. This is back in the '70s. We were
10 having to have -- you've seen this, we have to have a
11 lawyer and a surveyor to go hunting and we kind of
12 whine a little bit about it, but after listening to the
13 Kenai and some of the things they've got to do for
14 their fishing permit, maybe we're not as thankful as we
15 should be.

16
17 Anyway, this is Pete and Annie Ewan
18 there on the right of that picture. This is maybe a
19 little history lesson. This was in the late '70s and
20 after ANCSA was passed and there was a promise to
21 protect subsistence for Alaska Natives, they had a bad
22 run of salmon on the Copper River and they closed
23 fishwheels. Fish and Game came down and put a padlock
24 on this fishwheel and Annie there, who is Faye Ewan's
25 parents, maybe some of you know Faye, she went down
26 with a 30.06 and shot the lock off while the troopers
27 were there. She asked them if they had any problem
28 with that and they didn't.

29
30 (Laughter)

31
32 But it became very apparent that ANCSA
33 had not addressed the subsistence needs of Alaska
34 Natives and this was kind of an event here that -- not
35 the only one. There were others, but this was one of
36 the big events that pushed Congress into developing
37 ANILCA. So what we're doing here today is really
38 directly related to this event here. Maybe some of you
39 know Kenny Johns. He's the younger fellow there the
40 second from the right and that's Tennis Jack and then
41 Frank Stickwan is there behind Annie.

42
43 MS. STICKWAN: No, no, no, he's not
44 there.

45
46 MR. CAIN: That's not Frank?

47
48 MS. STICKWAN: No.

49
50 MS. LINNELL: That's Morrie, Jim and

1 Morrie.

2

3 MR. CAIN: Jim and Morrie, okay.
4 Second chief. I'm sorry. And then, of course, down in
5 the corner there is Nellie and Nathan Ewan.

6

7 This is a little bit about our
8 organization. It's a regional coordinating body for
9 subsistence. Its core purpose is traditional resource
10 stewardship and our mission statement is with self-
11 determination we will conserve and develop and use our
12 resources for the maximum sustained benefit of our
13 people. It's a little bit different than the
14 biodiversity purpose that we heard about a little
15 earlier in the meeting.

16

17 This is our goals. Manage our own
18 resources on our own homelands. Grow our own
19 professionals to manage resources and for all people to
20 be supportive.

21

22 This is our organization. We have
23 eight tribes in the AHTNA region. Cantwell, Mentasta,
24 Cheesh'na, Gakona, Gulkana, Tazlina, Kluti-Kaah and
25 Chitina. Then we have two ANCSA corporations, AHTNA,
26 Incorporated and Chitina Native Corporation that are
27 members. So it's a partnership between Federally
28 recognized tribes and the landowning ANCSA
29 corporations. It's very unique. Kind of when ANCSA
30 tore apart the governing bodies and the landownership,
31 we kind of put it back together a little bit. We have
32 an MOA with the Secretary of Agriculture on a
33 government-to-government basis and we've been working
34 with other organizations as well.

35

36 This is kind of a picture of it. The
37 boxes are each of our tribes, appoints a
38 representative, and then we have the MOAs up there at
39 the top and the work we do and the programs are below.
40 We're just kind of getting started.

41

42 These are our initiatives as a tribal
43 wildlife management. Moose habitat planning, moose
44 habitat enhancement. We've got a biomass pellet mill
45 going in in Gulkana. A conservation innovation grant.
46 You'll hear that acronym is CIG. Bill will talk about
47 that. And then a water quality and Copper River
48 salmon.

49

50 This is some numbers. Just getting

1 kind of going from FY11 is when we incorporated and we
2 had our first year in FY12 we had 25,000 and up to this
3 year FY15 we've got 938,000 in projects we're
4 operating. We have \$737,000 for FY16 that have been
5 awarded so far. So we're growing and taking on some
6 responsibility and some programs.

7
8 This is the pellet mill in Gulkana
9 that's being built. We're planning on using this to
10 work with -- well, we're doing moose browse projects,
11 thinning out some of the old growth forest and getting
12 willows to come back and working on fuel brakes that
13 will go through this mill to make biomass for
14 affordable heating.

15
16 That was a visit we had from the NRCS
17 office. For the Department of Interior people, that's
18 the Natural Resource Conservation Service with USDA and
19 that's Leonard Jordan, one of his associate chief there
20 visited us this summer.

21
22 So I'm going to turn it over to Dr.
23 Wall here and he'll talk a little bit about our
24 wildlife program and our community-based natural
25 resource management and maybe try to tie it into how it
26 affects our subsistence programs. Go ahead, Bill.

27
28 DR. WALL: Thank you, Bruce. Thank
29 you, Karen. Mr. Chair and Council members. It's an
30 honor for me to be sitting before you right now and a
31 privilege. Just to give a little bit of my background,
32 I've had the privilege of working with indigenous
33 peoples in various places in the world and I'm going to
34 go through just very briefly a little of that. And
35 talk about how we might have an innovative solution to
36 engaging tribes, private landowners and resource
37 management, specifically subsistence resource
38 management and generally the approach that we're
39 taking.

40
41 I'm kind of a hybrid guy. I actually
42 am a wildlife biologist who got his degree in a
43 forestry school, so I know some forestry as well. Just
44 a little bit anyway.

45
46 This is based on NRCS innovation grant,
47 which was the first big grant that really got us going,
48 so we want to recognize them as a primary partner. The
49 outline here is to review the program basis, goals of
50 CRITR that I'm dealing with specifically, review some

1 of the current projects, review our proposed projects
2 and the direction that we're headed, talk a little bit
3 about the conservation innovation grant and what it's
4 doing for us right now and the idea of a landscape
5 collaborative or landscape partnership in working
6 between tribes, private landowners and the agencies.

7
8 The premise of community-based wildlife
9 management. This is something that's going on around
10 the world engaging indigenous peoples in managing of
11 the resources. So the idea here is it engages resource
12 users, tribes, Native landowners, et cetera and
13 resource management. It creates partnerships that
14 brings capacity to that resource management and even
15 more capacity. One of the things we always say is what
16 are the numbers and it's very difficult many times with
17 budget crunches, et cetera, for agencies to get the
18 numbers that we need. There's some opportunities here
19 for that kind of collaboration.

20
21 It brings a collaborative process where
22 we work together on some of these issues, it empowers
23 tribes and landowners and creates ownership in the
24 management process while recognizing responsibilities.
25 Responsibilities for sustainability, of course. And it
26 can help balance sport hunting and subsistence issues.

27
28 I'm going to jump you all the way out
29 of this Basin and go to Zambia. This is a workshop
30 being held by World Wildlife Fund and the Zambia
31 Wildlife Authority, which is their Fish and Game agency
32 essentially. What these guys are doing is working with
33 communal people that are sitting in the audience and
34 they're setting quotas. They're setting harvest quotas
35 for the communal lands in which they live and which
36 they subsist.

37
38 You look at the left side of that and
39 you'll see the complications in the species that
40 they're dealing with. The point is they're fully
41 empowered and part of the process. So you can see
42 elephant to eland over there on the left.

43
44 Now I'm going to jump you to Mexico.
45 In Mexico they have something called the UMA system.
46 The ijidos are communities. This particular community
47 is a forestry community. This was a project working
48 with those local people in the conservation of jaguar.
49 Just to let you know, on the bottom right, that's not a
50 dead jaguar, that's a drugged jaguar that got darted by

1 a hunter. Some of the funds that he paid for the
2 privilege of doing that went to the research project as
3 well as to the community.

4
5 So that's kind of the background of
6 bringing in why are we talking about this. When you
7 look at CRITR goals as far as what I'm dealing with,
8 it's to develop the internal capacity for a strong
9 cultural and scientific approach to engagement in
10 sustainable subsistence resource management on AHTNA
11 lands and within the traditional use area that you saw
12 that Bruce described. And to develop strong
13 partnerships and working relationships with agencies
14 and others in that traditional use landscape.

15
16 Once again this is it and you can see
17 the amount of land that's over in the park as well as
18 the other areas and the ownership pattern that exists
19 here. One of the issues is being able to work across
20 boundaries.

21
22 So some of the major ongoing projects
23 right now is to develop initial management plans and
24 set goals for setting goals and priorities. We're
25 developing the structure of CRITR. We're looking at a
26 moose habitat plan in the Tazlina Planning Area and
27 I'll show that briefly in a moment. A general overview
28 of how CRITR wants to approach and engage in wildlife
29 management and to set goal for harvest, et cetera, for
30 moose. Working again, understanding that this is a
31 cooperative process.

32
33 In the Tazlina wildlife grant, which
34 was a tribal wildlife grant through U.S. Fish and
35 Wildlife Service, the objectives were to conduct a
36 vegetation analysis and develop a moose habitat
37 management plan for that area of AHTNA lands. But we
38 connected it to the conservation innovation grant,
39 which I'll go through in detail in a few moments. The
40 conservation innovation grant is giving us the ability
41 to create GIS, geographic information service, and
42 you'll see that we're developing an ecosystem approach
43 to how all this fits into an overall ecosystem.

44
45 I'm going to run through a series of
46 maps very quickly just to demonstrate what's being
47 developed. By the way, this is not being developed
48 strictly on our own. This is with partners. The Park
49 Service has been really big in this. We've gotten
50 information from BLM, Fish and Game and others. I'll

1 show you some of that in a few moments.

2

3 So land ownership, wetland types,
4 permafrost layer -- and all this is around Glennallen
5 just to orient you a little bit. There's actually an
6 old soil survey that was done in this area and wherever
7 you see it going off gray that's where the end of the
8 information is. So we're taking all this information
9 and blending it together and doing the very best with
10 the best information that's available. Then in the
11 future, as we have opportunities, you'll see we'll be
12 filling that in.

13

14 This is timber size classes. This is
15 from DNR. This is cover type, again from DNR. Now
16 this is an interesting map because you'll see the line
17 on the left and that's the green. This is actually a
18 vegetation typing map and the Park Service has done a
19 really good job because on the right side, of course,
20 is where the Park is. That's the Copper River going
21 down through there. It's done a really good job of
22 mapping the vegetation and it goes all the way out over
23 AHTNA lands to where you see that green line is. That
24 green line is where we're pulling information off.
25 That is not as robust or as good. So, once again,
26 we've got ground source surveys on the right and this
27 other is mapping from satellite imagery.

28

29 Now the brown is where there's soil
30 surveys. That's really a big deal. That gives us a
31 tremendous amount of ecological information to
32 understand the landscape. You'll see a little bit of
33 brown right there in Glennallen where we do have a soil
34 survey done historically. Now the nice thing about
35 this process is that NRCS recognized the value of soil
36 surveys and recognized that this process was going
37 forward and they went back to D.C. and requested
38 additional funds to do soil surveys. So all of AHTNA
39 lands are going to have a soil survey done for them
40 over the next two to four years.

41

42 Now you see sort of a seamless map.
43 What we've done is fill that in and brought that
44 information together. This allows us to take an
45 ecological diversity -- sets up an ecological diversity
46 matrix, allows us to understand the vegetation and then
47 when we go out and try to treat things for creating
48 habitat, et cetera, we've got the information to be
49 able to do it. Just background to show you that all
50 that's mapped, it's categorized, there's a lot of

1 information associated with it.

2

3 In addition, one of the things that
4 we're doing is looking at caribou habitat suitability
5 indices and moose habitat suitability indices. In
6 other words, what's the quality of habitat out there
7 for caribou and for moose. Can we pin that down
8 directly? No. This is a very rough sketch. But what
9 it does allow us to do is understand where caribou are
10 and where they're not, where suitable habitat is and
11 where it isn't because if we go out and start looking
12 at the opportunities of creating moose habitat, we
13 don't want to destroy caribou habitat while we're
14 creating moose habitat. So the idea here is to get a
15 better understanding again at a landscape scale and
16 understanding what's going on. That's it mapped across
17 the entire area.

18

19 Now down to some very practical
20 management. That's some of the science basis,
21 ecosystem basis that's going on behind this so that you
22 have at least a recognition that we're not just out
23 there doing things.

24

25 Essentially there's three ways to make
26 moose habitat; fire with lead burn, safe prescribed
27 fire, logging for biomass or mechanical treatment.
28 Right now we've done some mechanical treatment, but the
29 best way to do this is to integrate all three. Produce
30 biomass for enhanced village fire safety and create
31 moose habitat simultaneously.

32

33 So just as an example, this is the
34 Klutina-Tazlina fire line. Most of you guys are
35 familiar with this. In talking with DNR and sitting
36 down with those guys and discussing fire and fire
37 behavior here because I have to say I'm not a local
38 expert. I'm learning as I go, but we're bringing the
39 capacity to put all this together and utilize that
40 local knowledge both from tribal members as well as
41 from agencies. He told me it would take about 20
42 seconds for a fire to jump that fire line if the wind
43 is the right way and it's the right intensity. So
44 although it's a great anchor point, it doesn't
45 necessarily solve your problem.

46

47 So we got to talking about how would we
48 solve a problem like that and how can we make something
49 like that better with the same idea; habitat, biomass,
50 fire protection. The line that you see above the

1 yellow line, which is AHTNA's boundary line, is the
2 north fire line in Glennallen. The areas that you see
3 in pink are potential areas that we might treat. The
4 idea is to get the biomass off, create an earlier
5 successional habitat there where we have willow growth
6 coming back.

7

8 What this does is break up that
9 continuous forest and then if a fire comes you have a
10 much greater opportunity of dealing with the fire.
11 Once again this is directly from the fire folks, so
12 it's meeting all those objectives simultaneously and
13 that's the way we're trying to think, is to integrate
14 this kind of a process.

15

16 This is some of the treatment that
17 we've tried. We've had good success, but we also have
18 a lot of lessons learned in how to do it a lot better
19 than we have in the past. The roller chopper back
20 there takes down small black spruce and helps us
21 regenerate willows.

22

23 Just to give you a prescription,
24 there's places where this works and places where it
25 doesn't work. The best time to do it is when the
26 ground is frozen. We've got 18 inches or less of snow.
27 The black spruce is less than 5-inch DBH and we've got
28 a strong willow understory or in an old burn or in a
29 riparian willow zone.

30

31 So this is some actual work that was
32 going on down in Klutina, off the Klutina Road. You've
33 got to keep that thing really sharp if you want it to
34 do its job.

35

36 Now this is up in Tok and we've been
37 working with the forester up in Tok who's been really
38 good at utilizing both grants and certain types of
39 funding to do some of this kind of work and this is an
40 old burn up there in Tok from the '90s, I believe, so
41 you can see all the sticks there. This is before and
42 that's after. The idea is that you create all that new
43 regeneration, you've broken it up a little bit and it
44 creates an opportunity for some really, really good
45 moose habitat to be created.

46

47 One of the things we've had to keep
48 training him on is to make his patches a little smaller
49 and keep a lot of edge there, which is one of the
50 things we're all trying to do while we do this.

1 This is a little area over here in
2 Tazlina. This is kind of a before picture. You'll see
3 there's a good willow component underneath those black
4 spruce and that's what it looks like a year after. You
5 can see the willow growth regeneration.

6
7 Now just to dig on lessons learned,
8 this doesn't scarify the soil so that we still have
9 that moss component out there, so all that old growth
10 willow, if you will, regenerates, but we don't get any
11 new willow in there because we still have that
12 scarification that we've got to do, so that's part of
13 our learning process, is understanding how to get all
14 that done.

15
16 You see that stuff they're dragging
17 behind. That was a contractor's attempt to scarify
18 because we talked about scarifying, being able to get
19 some new willow growth in there and it's got to hit
20 mineral soil in order to do that. It was a mixed
21 success, but it wasn't really, really good.

22
23 That's one of the enhancement areas
24 right there. You can see our attempt with the buffers
25 there.

26
27 Now here's projects in the works and
28 I'm going to go through them real quick. We're
29 developing another tribal wildlife grant and the
30 purpose of that is for data capture and analysis in the
31 field, meaning being able to do population surveys,
32 working with Fish and Game as well as the Park Service.
33 One of the examples that I like to use is the Park
34 Service counts one way and they count every three
35 years. Fish and Game counts a different way and they
36 count when they have the funds to do it and nobody is
37 counting on AHTNA land and the strip in between the
38 Park and where Fish and Game counts.

39
40 So there's a real opportunity for CRITR
41 to step up and engage in a partnership to where we have
42 better numbers and a better understanding of what's
43 going on out there. So that's the tribal wildlife
44 grant that we're going to be submitting.

45
46 We've submitted a partnership grant
47 with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for capacity and a
48 social scientist in developing the Partners Program.
49 We'll hear if we were successful I hope in a little
50 while.

1 We are going after community wildfire
2 protection plans, so the idea is the WUI, the Wildland
3 Urban Interface. So a whole bunch of AHTNA villages
4 and some non-AHTNA villages in this region do not have
5 community wildfire protection plans. So if we could
6 get those plans, put those communities in the
7 landscape, start looking at how we create moose
8 habitat, biomass and safety around those villages, then
9 in the future, if we work together in this region, we
10 can look at the opportunity of allowing more fires to
11 burn occasionally when it's safe and when everybody is
12 comfortable with being able to do that.

13

14 Then Bruce is working on the Chitina
15 volunteer check station. If you want to say anything
16 about that, Bruce.

17

18 MR. CAIN: That's just a program I've
19 been working on years to get a check station in
20 Chitina. We've made a little progress on that. We do
21 have some private funding from the Cordova Fishermen
22 that we'll be setting up a check station next summer.
23 We also have a FRMP application in for that as well
24 that we haven't heard on whether we're successful with
25 that yet, but we are moving ahead with it.

26

27 DR. WALL: So you heard the CIG and the
28 TWG were working together, but the SIG was a really big
29 deal. Here's a little bit of background of what's
30 happening. I think it's important for folks like you
31 to understand what's happened with USDA NRCS.

32

33 In the last 10 years, NRCS has
34 recognized Native corporation lands and private lands
35 as agricultural lands. That's huge. What that means
36 is that land is recognized as farms under subsistence.
37 That doesn't mean farming moose. It just means that
38 they're recognized under this program. So subsistence
39 use and management is considered agriculture.

40

41 It also created historically
42 underserved and beginning farmers. That's also huge
43 because in their programs they typically partner with a
44 farmer with 50 percent dollars, contract dollars to do
45 conservation practices. In Alaska, they contract at 90
46 percent of the total contract because everybody is
47 considered an underserved and beginning farmer.

48

49 In addition, the conservation district
50 like we're talking about here is being done across the

1 state. There's a lot of different ones going on. I
2 don't have that information in front of me, but 10-plus
3 at this point.

4
5 NRCS is working very, very hard to
6 adapt all those conservation programs that grew up in
7 Iowa on corn farms to black spruce, the Interior, the
8 Southeast, et cetera. So it's a big challenge for that
9 organization, but they have really, really been working
10 with Native corporations in the last little while.

11
12 Let me make one more point really well
13 about what CRITR is because it is so powerful and
14 there's just such a great opportunity here. With the
15 private lands, you've got NRCS, funding, conservation
16 practices, et cetera, that come through USDA to private
17 lands. That's non-tribal. That has to be to private
18 lands. Then you've got all eight tribes working
19 together. For instance, the Tribal Wildlife
20 Conservation Grant is tribal. So you've got the
21 ability to take both of those, put them together and
22 they're working together very well. That's huge and
23 that's a huge opportunity.

24
25 So the purpose of the SIG. We got one.
26 We had to compete nationally. Was to stimulate the
27 development and adoption of innovative conservation
28 practices and approaches and technologies.

29
30 So just real quick the objectives here
31 was to develop an ecologically-based resource
32 assessment. That's what that GIS is doing. On AHTNA
33 and CNC ownerships on the traditional used lands. So
34 we've got two levels of focus. One is to understand
35 what's going on on AHTNA and Chitina corporation lands
36 and the other is to understand what's going on in the
37 region.

38
39 It's to develop ecological sites, which
40 is just simply, if you're a forester, it's site index.
41 It's the idea that there's more than just what the
42 vegetation is, there's the potential. If you put a
43 fire through an area, certain areas will regenerate
44 certain ways. Other areas will regenerate different
45 ways. So it's creating that understanding. It's to
46 understand where moose and caribou habitat was. I
47 showed you that a few moments ago.

48
49 We're working with Fish and Game on
50 that. We're going to be working with the Park Service

1 as well to bring that information together. And we're
2 going to be developing a 10-year management plan for
3 AHTNA on this 1.7 million acres of land.

4

5 Here's the really big one as far as
6 dealing with these issues. We've already had two
7 meetings and the idea was to create a landscape
8 partnership. This isn't formalized in some way where
9 everybody has to sign an MOU or anything else, but
10 we've met twice, we've been keeping all the agencies
11 informed. We're beginning to work and develop
12 partnerships that have been ongoing but developing them
13 under this process into the future.

14

15 Like I said, we've had a tremendous
16 amount of information coming in. We started with
17 vegetation. We'll next start looking at wildlife
18 populations and issues and understand where the data
19 gaps are and start helping to try to fill those gaps.

20

21 It helps us develop specific EQUIP
22 treatments. EQUIP is the Environmental Quality
23 Incentive Program. We're going to be training local
24 technicians in our work. We've already been doing
25 these presentations and talking about this with the
26 other tribal conservation districts. We do this with
27 our tribes and, of course, we're doing it with the
28 agencies in the region as well.

29

30 So just some of the ideas that we're
31 looking at into the future. Creating a landscape fire
32 strategy for safety and habitat enhancement. In other
33 words, as we progress in developing safer communities,
34 where should we allow fire to burn, where should we not
35 allow fire to burn, where are our opportunities and can
36 we work at a landscape scale with all the agencies to
37 understand how we might do that.

38

39 Habitat population monitoring, we
40 mentioned that. We've got an agreement with Fish and
41 Game for this next spring. They're going to be
42 training us and their methodology for doing moose
43 browse surveys so we can understand how our moose are
44 impacting habitat. There are times when you have more
45 moose than good habitat. There's other times when
46 you've got a lot of habitat and no moose, which we feel
47 like we've got right now. Bison enhancement
48 potentially. GIS data sharing. And perhaps even
49 developing sustainable subsistence management plans.

50

1 Questions. These two will answer.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 DR. WALL: Thank you. Thank you very
6 much.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you for your
9 presentation. I do have a couple questions just off
10 the top of my head. I see that you already have done
11 some of the habitat work in the field. A lot of it
12 reminded me of something I just saw up at Delta when I
13 went up on the panoramic fields that the State had for
14 bison habitat. Is that the same kind of equipment
15 basically used? You know, because black spruce has
16 been changed over to willows and the soil broke up and
17 things like that.

18

19 DR. WALL: Very similar. Although I
20 think in their cases they were targeting specifically
21 old burns, which makes it much much more effective
22 because the old burn goes in and takes the moss off,
23 creates mineral soil, gets a lot more willows going,
24 and then you come back with a crushing and it doesn't
25 matter how you crush it. You just bring the
26 successional stage back down and get that regenerated
27 growth in there and it also just kind of cleans up.

28

29 So the difference is we haven't gotten
30 to the point where we can get some of that moss layer
31 off to where we get the mineral soil and we can really
32 regenerate willows that way. So we're looking at some
33 more innovative ways of trying to get to that point.
34 The nice thing again is, once again, fire is the best
35 way to do it, not mechanical.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. It was
38 interesting to me because they were using the big discs
39 and stuff like that to break the soil up, but that was
40 because they were already down to mineral soil then.

41

42 DR. WALL: Correct. By the way, when I
43 say innovative, that's one of the things we're looking
44 at is getting a forestry disc and a skinner and being
45 able to try some of that in certain places as well.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The other question I
48 had is how are you coming along on your pellet stove
49 biomass pellet making?

50

1 MR. CAIN: Ralph, I'll talk about that.
2 The Gulkana Village Council is actually the entity
3 that's building it and we're just acting as a flow-
4 through on some of the funding. The Tribal
5 Conservation District has seemed to be a pretty
6 attractive vehicle for some agencies to work with.
7 They used us as the grant management and the entity to
8 handle -- I think we did 250,000 on that, but they've
9 got several grants on that and they're building it.

10
11 Their schedule to be completed was
12 November 15th and they're close. I don't think it's
13 going to be open on November 15th. I was just talking
14 with them about their revised schedule. It will
15 probably push back another 30 to 60 days, but by
16 January they're going to be operating. They've got a
17 pile of wood there to start with and then we're working
18 on a plan to get wood to that mill. This is part of
19 it. We'll hopefully be able to use some of the
20 material off of our moose browse sites to go into that
21 mill. We're trying to put together biomass, moose
22 browse, fire safety and jobs all into one program.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now is that going to
25 be basically a big enough mill for pellets for the
26 larger community? For the area, not just for Gakona.

27
28 MS. LINNELL: The school district has
29 their wood chip boiler. Chistochina just installed a
30 pellet boiler system. So they're looking to market.
31 One of the things I think through all of this, just
32 doing our moose browse alone isn't going to be
33 successful. Just doing moose counts and monitoring
34 isn't going to be successful. And just doing pellets
35 and trying to do biomass alone isn't going to be
36 successful. But pulling all this together in a program
37 that meshes all of those things together will make it
38 be successful..

39
40 The other thing with this CIG grant I
41 think that's real important. He kind of cruised
42 through those maps and things, but getting information
43 from the National Park Service, getting information
44 from the Bureau of Land Management, the caribou
45 migration patterns and stuff like that from ADF&G,
46 animal counts and all of that into one place for
47 information I think is huge.

48
49 When you look behind Eureka where they
50 opened it up for recreational cabins and things like

1 that and then that was caribou calving area. At the
2 time when they did it, the population objective was
3 85,000 caribou. Now they've cut that back to less than
4 40,000 and it's because they're not crossing there at
5 Eureka anymore. There's so much traffic and so much
6 going on.

7

8 For me and my concerns, the departments
9 aren't talking to each other or paying attention to
10 each other in those kinds of things. We heard from
11 other folks just this week talking about herring roe
12 and things like that and the permitting process that
13 they go through to get their herring in Southeast where
14 they issue those permits for commercial use, but are
15 they really talking to the fisheries managers who are
16 trying to keep the population up. So those two
17 departments aren't really talking together. One is all
18 about the money and one is about trying to keep the
19 stock going.

20

21 We've seen that more recently when DNR
22 talked about developing around Northway more recreation
23 area right where the moose winter and then they're
24 there in the spring for calving and where the Northway
25 people go to hunt. So there's no talking to each other
26 on what's really there on the ground between those
27 departments. So if we can pull all this information
28 together, we can plan better for our resources.

29

30 One of the things with this, and Mark
31 said it yesterday too about having to be a surveyor
32 when you're out hunting and things like that, and we've
33 been fighting over that last moose, that last caribou.
34 Well, we don't want to do that. We want to take this
35 and see what we can do to help the population be
36 healthy and strong so we can manage for abundance
37 rather than managing how many people get the harvest.
38 So that's kind of what our board has been driving us to
39 do. A pretty good board I have. Very supportive.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Karen.
42 Thank you for your presentation. Does anybody else
43 have any questions or comments. Lee.

44

45 MR. ADLER: I think it's a great idea
46 what you're doing. I'm really happy to see this. As a
47 retired biologist and 46-year resident, I've been
48 looking at this for years. What you're doing is
49 exactly what I've always wanted to do. There's going
50 to be some tough questions as you go though about what

1 to crush and what not to crush. The reason it's black
2 spruce is because the soil conditions aren't good
3 enough to make it white spruce, so you don't always get
4 what you want back there again.

5
6 There's so much country out there.
7 Even the birds have changed. I never saw a rough
8 grouse here until 2005 and now they're not thick, but
9 they're all over the valley. So if we can increase the
10 aspen or leave the young aspen alone for the rough
11 grouse, it would be nice.

12
13 But I'd just like to say in conclusion,
14 I'm semi-retired and any time I can help, give me a
15 jingle. I'll be glad to offer any help I can.

16
17 DR. WALL: If I could comment, Mr.
18 Chair, Council members. You're on our list already.

19
20 (Laughter)

21
22 DR. WALL: The other thing is as this
23 comes together, the next objectives, when we were
24 talking about the tribal wildlife grant and developing
25 the capacity to gather information, step one is to
26 gather local and traditional knowledge. So not only
27 elders, et cetera, and do it from the cultural side,
28 but also people who fly hunters, old biologists, all of
29 that is going to be critical to come together to help
30 us understand how to make this process work most
31 effectively.

32
33 MR. ADLER: I wish you the best of
34 luck.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

37
38 MR. CAIN: Thank you. And that's 3,500
39 tons per year to answer your question.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, pellets?

42
43 MR. CAIN: Yeah. That's their
44 capacity.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'd have a couple more
47 questions on it, but I'll ask them later.

48
49 MR. CAIN: You've got business to do.
50 Thank you very much.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's why I said I'd
2 ask them later. Okay. With that the next thing on our
3 agenda is Fishery Resource Management Program, but.....

4
5 MR. BURCHAM: You missed one. Cordova
6 District Ranger.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, the Cordova
9 District Range. We did miss that. Is he important?

10
11 (Laughter)

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Go ahead. I'm sorry,
14 Milo.

15
16 MR. BURCHAM: Do you want to take that
17 in order or do you want to.....

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think we were
20 talking about taking -- are you going to be here for a
21 little while?

22
23 MR. BURCHAM: Until it's over.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, okay. What I mean
26 is I was under the impression that some of the ones
27 from the Fisheries Resource Management Program had
28 places to go. Oh. Then we'll take them in order.
29 You're next. I just missed you, Milo. Not on purpose.

30
31 MR. BURCHAM: That's what I thought.

32
33 MR. EVANS: So I'll just introduce this
34 and let Milo finish up on the issue that we're going to
35 discuss at the meeting. Basically we had two wildlife
36 special actions last year that dealt with black bear
37 seasons in Unit 6D. The first one dealt with trying to
38 -- this was WSA15-09 which dealt with the State closed
39 the season on May 27th and the question was after that
40 whether there would be a Federal season that would
41 follow up after that. So that proposal went through
42 and basically the decision by the Board was not to
43 shorten the Federal season like was requested, but to
44 require a Federal registration permit.

45
46 Later on there was another -- these
47 were kind of submitted at the same time. WSA15-10
48 requested that a Federal registration permit be
49 required for the entire season of the black bear season
50 and that was approved. As part of that, the proponent

1 also requested that black bears be added to the letter
2 of delegation of authority for the Cordova Ranger
3 District of the U.S. Forest Service. That was deferred
4 until this meeting so the Council could have a chance
5 to weigh in on it and make a decision. So that's what
6 we're going to discuss right now and Milo will kind of
7 head this up.

8

9 MR. BURCHAM: I'd like to think this
10 will be short and to the point, but I know the
11 delegation of authority issues in front of this Council
12 aren't always that way. In a nutshell, what this
13 request is is to add black bears to the delegation of
14 authority for the Cordova District Ranger and this was
15 prompted by a request by the State to shorten the black
16 bear season in Federal regulation like was done in
17 State regulation to get the registration permit and
18 then to add this added flexibility to the district
19 ranger for in-season management.

20

21 We did not go along with shortening of
22 the season because there are so few Federal users. The
23 Federal take of black bears or the take of black bears
24 by rural residents in Unit 6D is so small it wasn't
25 seemed as significant. A registration permit was seen
26 as a good idea and it filled the gap that was created
27 when the State did not allow their registration permit
28 to be used for the entire season. Then this Council at
29 this meeting passed a proposal to permanently fix that.

30

31 Then the third part is to add the
32 delegated authority to the Cordova District Ranger's
33 delegations of authority. The point I want to make and
34 the reason for it is -- you know, you guys have been
35 very careful about what authorities you've given to the
36 Cordova District Ranger or in Southcentral in general.
37 What you have allowed is for the species that are most
38 actively managed. For the Cordova District Ranger it's
39 moose and deer that are on there right now. We had
40 asked for all wildlife, but we narrowed it down to just
41 that.

42

43 I think we're entering a new era in
44 management of black bears in Prince William Sound with
45 conservation concerns. There's very poor data out
46 there, but harvest has dropped precipitously from
47 several years ago, over 500 bears a year were taken, to
48 300 bears to less than 200 bears and this season 90
49 bears were taken. There's probably many factors at
50 stake.

1 Overhunting in State regulation is
2 probably the largest one, but severe winters. When
3 bears have come out of hibernation, they've had little
4 to eat after our snowpocalypse and then a late winter
5 just after that in combination with two very mild
6 winters in which bears did not have insulation over
7 their dens. We're guessing at the causes, but these
8 are all factors that could have contributed to this.

9
10 The point I want to make is that we're
11 entering a period with some severe conservation
12 concerns for black bears in Prince William Sound. As
13 we've asked for deer and moose, species we actively
14 manage, we think we're entering a period where it would
15 be a useful tool for the ranger to be able to make in-
16 season management decisions on black bears.

17
18 I guess I'd like you to bear in mind
19 our record of how responsibly we've used this
20 delegation in the past. Speaking just for how you've
21 seen the Forest Service, the Chugach National Forest
22 use these delegations.

23
24 I'll open it up to discussion or be
25 happy to take any questions.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

28
29 MS. MILLS: How long do you estimate or
30 how long would you want this delegated authority?
31 Would you want it renewed every year?

32
33 MR. BURCHAM: The delegations of
34 authority as they've been issued are indefinite, but
35 they can be rescinded by actions from the Council, it
36 could be initiated by actions to the Council or request
37 to the Federal Subsistence Board. So I guess I'd like
38 this added to that letter that at this point in time is
39 indefinite.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Milo. I
42 understood that they were there until we took them
43 away. So far, like you've said, we've had fairly --
44 don't you also have delegation of authority for goats?

45
46 MR. BURCHAM: No. Well, I'll correct
47 that. In Federal regulation the Cordova District
48 Ranger closes the goat season when specified quotas in
49 regulation are met. So, in my mind, it's not active
50 management.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. It's reactive.
2
3 MR. BURCHAM: It's reactive and it's
4 set in Federal regulation, not in the delegation of
5 authority.
6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Okay. Because
8 I knew you had the responsibility or the ability to
9 close the season. Any questions. Personally, I have
10 to agree with you that we've had a good record so far.
11 I have concerns about the black bear because just from
12 what we've seen. As far as black bears having hard
13 winters, my son has brought me a nice cub that was
14 basically starved to death. I mean you could see. You
15 could count the bones sticking out of it. And that was
16 in June, so that kind of goes along with not having
17 enough feed in spring.
18
19 MR. BURCHAM: Who was that? I'd like
20 to ask him about that.
21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's Tyee. That was
23 a couple winters ago.
24
25 MR. BURCHAM: The local State biologist
26 Charlotte might be interested in that anecdotal report.
27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Obviously it starved.
29 As the only Cordova one here, but I'd have to ask Andy
30 because he's from Prince William Sound, what do you
31 think about delegation of authority on black bears.
32
33 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: One question here. So
34 we had the 20 Federal subsistence tags, right?
35
36 MR. BURCHAM: Well, let me clarify that
37 because in the notes or the write-up that I saw it
38 wasn't exactly right. There's a quota of 20 black
39 bears in Federal regulation for the extended baiting
40 season only. There's not a quota on Federal black
41 bears.
42
43 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: The way it's written,
44 June 11th.....
45
46 MR. BURCHAM: June 16th through June
47 30th.
48
49 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Okay, 30th.
50

1 MR. BURCHAM: Yeah. So that's the
2 only period of time and that's just for black bears
3 taken over bait during that time.

4
5 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: So beyond just the
6 baiting, how many on an annual basis Federal
7 subsistence black bears are utilized?

8
9 MR. BURCHAM: Well, the registration
10 permit -- you know, Federal subsistence proper take of
11 black bears is only just begun. You're the only one
12 I've issued permits to and you didn't take any. Rural
13 residents that qualify for this have taken up to around
14 eight black bears in a year. If you look at qualified
15 rural residents take very small numbers and that was
16 recognized in the lack of a need to close the Federal
17 season when the State closed theirs on May 27th this
18 year.

19
20 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: So comparing Federal
21 subsistence harvest of bears, which has been nothing
22 non record, to many years ago 600 bears in a season to
23 270 at some point here pretty recently, so the way
24 these numbers have been changing but still Federal
25 subsistence is so tiny I don't really find it
26 warranted. Is this the time for discussion on this?

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

29
30 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I don't find it that
31 warranted with such a tiny number of Federal
32 subsistence bears being utilized as to why a delegation
33 of authority would be needed because I remember the
34 deer thing and the moose thing and you were like, oh,
35 time is of the essence because I want to be able to
36 make this decision about the deer population dropping
37 off quickly without having to contact OSM and fill out
38 the paperwork accordingly, so we did that delegation of
39 authority.

40
41 I still have a little bad taste in my
42 mouth about how that didn't have a sunset clause.
43 After you talked to me about this right after lunch I
44 looked at my old notes and I was like, oh, wow, okay,
45 back here October of 2014 we spoke at length about
46 this.

47
48 MR. BURCHAM: Can I respond or do you
49 want to finish?

50

1 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: No, go ahead.

2

3 MR. BURCHAM: I think you're lumping
4 together two separate things. We asked for wildlife
5 delegated authority and that ended up in the delegation
6 for moose and deer and did not include the sunset
7 clause that you had asked for when the Board delegated
8 that authority to the Cordova District Ranger. That
9 was separate from the decision to close the deer season
10 in Federal regulation. It sounded to me like you were
11 putting those two together.

12

13 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Switching gears
14 to black bears then. This past season when the State
15 did the 27th closure and you and I consulted regularly
16 on the phone and I was like what's this gray area here
17 -- that we just kind of solved with this other thing we
18 just passed. I'm kind of in the mindset that worked.
19 I didn't find a time is of the essence issue there. I
20 was kind of stuck with something that Mr. Encelewski
21 had said about it, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. So
22 I'm just speaking my mind and that's where I'm at with
23 this delegation of authority. I'm not ready to -- you
24 know.

25

26 MR. EVANS: Mr. Chair. One thing it
27 might do, it might reduce having to have a lot of
28 special actions because I think we're going to have a
29 lot of special actions with the black bear season
30 because there is a season and if there are not enough
31 bears or quotas are met, then a special action is going
32 to have to be continually done year after year. If
33 they had a delegation of authority, it might lessen the
34 burden of having to do those special actions time after
35 time because they take a lot of work and time, so
36 that's just one benefit of having the delegation of
37 authority.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Milo.

40

41 MR. BURCHAM: And the other half of it,
42 through delegations of authority you can close or
43 shorten Federal seasons, but you can also close Federal
44 public lands to all users. If we thought the State was
45 mismanaging this resource or we saw some imminent need
46 to close Federal public lands to all hunting or a
47 portion of the Sound, it would leave that tool. That
48 seems pretty drastic, but it's the sort of thing that
49 could happen if we needed to react quickly to a
50 resource concern.

1 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair. So, in my
2 opinion, if you're talking about the State, then the
3 State is almost the one who is allowed all this
4 overharvest via the sport and Federal subsistence rural
5 users of the bear resource aren't the ones that are at
6 fault for this decline in the numbers, so it just kind
7 of makes me avoid it.

8
9 MR. BURCHAM: But at this point in time
10 we have a serious resource concern.....

11
12 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Oh, I agree.

13
14 MR. BURCHAM:and we want to do
15 what.....

16
17 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I did not harvest a
18 bear when I could have.

19
20 MR. BURCHAM: Exactly.

21
22 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I wanted to badly.

23
24 MR. BURCHAM: But, anyway, we have to
25 do what it takes and it might take some from both
26 sides, but it will hopefully mostly come from the State
27 side to fix the problem. And they're working that way.
28 By shortening their season this spring, I was
29 encouraged seeing a step in that direction.

30
31 I'll also add we're trying to engage
32 with the State to start some black bear monitoring in
33 the Sound. There's so little data on what's actually
34 happened with the bears in the Sound. We have funding
35 in the subsistence program to do monitoring to C&T to
36 subsistence species and this year almost certain you're
37 going to see a start for some black bear research in
38 the Sound to start getting at the bottom of what's
39 going on.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

42
43 Lee.

44
45 MR. ADLER: I have quite a few friends
46 that bear bait. I've never baited bears. They're
47 seeing more grizzlies than blacks. That hasn't always
48 been the case. Any black bear that shows up around
49 town gets shot. It sounds like you could be reaching
50 the critical stage on black bear population. I do know

1 another thing. If there's a lot of grizzlies, the
2 grizzlies do prey on black bears and kill them. Of
3 course, if the black bear gets to be an endangered
4 species, it probably won't get that far, but then it
5 would affect subsistence too because a black bear is
6 much more edible than a grizzly bear.

7

8 So I think it's a good idea to have
9 another layer of protection for the black bears because
10 we don't want them to get to the point where they're
11 critical and low population.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Milo.

14

15 MR. BURCHAM: Mr. Adler, through the
16 Chair. Thank you for the support, but I just want to
17 make sure it's for the right reasons. Most of the
18 Sound where the -- the western Sound, where the highest
19 densities of black bears occur, there really are not
20 brown bears, so I don't think that fear would take
21 place.

22

23 Another good portion of the Sound, the
24 large islands, Hawkins, Hinchinbrook and Montague, are
25 only brown bears and then there's a portion of the
26 Sound, eastern mainland, has both and maybe a few other
27 areas. Anyway, I just wanted to make sure you
28 understood the exact set-up there.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Milo, it's kind of
31 interesting because Andy brought up some things that I
32 probably didn't think about before, but it also brought
33 up another thing and you brought it up, the ability of
34 the Federal manager to have -- I'll say the ability of
35 the Federal manager to manage the Federal land even if
36 it's contradictory to Fish and Game current
37 regulations, is one thing that I haven't put in my
38 thought process.

39

40 I'm like Andy, I really can't see where
41 the black bears are going to get in bad enough shape
42 that with the subsistence take being anywhere near what
43 its averaged that anything has to be done about the
44 subsistence take. Simply because, number one, most
45 subsistence take is opportunistic and if there's aren't
46 very many black bears around, the opportunisticness
47 goes down immensely. Even if they weren't even at the
48 highest population, the subsistence take or the local
49 user take still was not very high.

50

1 But the ability to close Federal lands
2 to -- and I'll say I'm sure it would be very
3 controversial, but to close Federal lands to State
4 hunters if you thought black bears were in trouble
5 would be -- without having to go through the whole
6 special action process, I could see where that could
7 come in play sometime. From that standpoint I would
8 actually like to see that in place, but I'll leave it
9 up to the rest of the Council. I don't have any fear
10 of delegation of authority because if bad comes to
11 worse, it can't last more than two years because we can
12 sure initiate things to take that delegation away.

13

14 Judy.

15

16 MS. CAMINER: Well, I'm glad you came
17 back too because I wanted to ask Tom about his point
18 about special actions. You said having delegated
19 authority kind of gets us out of that route of special
20 actions. So maybe you could just do a brief review of
21 who, for example, would be requesting a special action.
22 Do you mean, for example, Forest Service or OSM and how
23 this would save time on our end.

24

25 MR. EVANS: Anybody can request a
26 special action, so that can be a Council, that can be a
27 RAC, it can be an individual. If they request a
28 special action, if it has merit, we have to follow
29 through with it. By this delegation of authority --
30 let's say the State puts in a restriction or we want to
31 close some Federal lands because we think there's too
32 many bears being harvested but we want to leave it open
33 for rural residents to be able to harvest bears, then
34 the way it's set up now we'd have to have a special
35 from somebody who wishes that to happen.

36

37 Whereas now, if we have delegated
38 authority, that would allow the Cordova Ranger
39 District, if they had the authority, could perhaps
40 close a section of the forest, maybe Unit 6D or
41 something like that, to State residents while leaving
42 it open to Federal subsistence users. That's just an
43 example of how that might work.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

46

47 MS. CAMINER: Again, for our
48 information, can you give an example of how much time
49 it takes between the time somebody submits a special
50 action and the decision perhaps versus the delegated

1 authority situation.

2

3 MR. EVANS: Yeah. For special actions,
4 they can take -- sometimes we get special actions and
5 they request an action to happen within a week and we
6 do the best we can to turn them around as fast as
7 possible, but that often means there's not a lot of
8 consultation involved because there's not enough time
9 to do that.

10

11 Once we get a special action we have to
12 write up an analysis and then that goes through a bunch
13 of reviews and that basically has to go to the -- if
14 it's agreed to by the ISC and everybody agrees to the
15 ISC, that takes time and then we can kind of do it in
16 house. If not, then it has to go to the Board, so then
17 that special action has to go to the Board. So it can
18 take up to a couple months to follow through and it
19 sort of depends on work load and staff time and the
20 complexity of the special action. So delegation of
21 authority can be fairly quick. A much quicker process.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Andy.

24

25 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair. Do you
26 think a couple months is that vital in the Federal
27 subsistence take?

28

29 MR. EVANS: It really depends on when
30 the seasons are opening and what the special action is
31 requesting. If the season is opening in a week and we
32 want to get it done and it takes a couple months, then
33 the regulations stay in place until that special action
34 gets through. If the special action is not requesting
35 something for two or three months, probably not because
36 we could get it done before the season opens or like
37 that. So it's variable.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

40

41 MS. MILLS: Well, I know we had a
42 problem with the delegation of authority not having a
43 sunset clause. Some of the problems that I know as a
44 Council member myself it's our responsibility to also
45 know and to participate on behalf of the subsistence
46 users. If we don't know what the conditions are, we're
47 kind of in the blind.

48

49 Also the oversight process. I didn't
50 hear where the oversight process would be with the

1 managers if you have your delegation of authority
2 indefinitely. So I mean there's several things that
3 concern me. And you said the actions could be done
4 sooner, but you could also have like a sunset clause if
5 you feel that there will be a huge impact on the bears
6 there.

7
8 I could see that, but for a year at a
9 time. That way it would give this Council time to
10 review all of the research and time to make a decision
11 without having all of the information so we can
12 represent the subsistence users to the best of our
13 ability as well.

14
15 So delegated authority indefinitely
16 kind of scares me and I would think that if something
17 was so drastic that you would be contacting other
18 people, but in this process you wouldn't have to.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, that's not
21 totally correct, but go ahead, Milo.

22
23 MR. BURCHAM: Through the Chair. Even
24 an emergency special action taken by an in-season
25 manager through the delegation of authority still
26 requires consultation. At a minimum, it's usually
27 effected members of the Regional Council, the State and
28 sometimes even greater users.

29
30 If he was here, Greg, I think, would
31 agree that that's been used wisely. Ralph and Andy,
32 you've seen me -- I've consulted both of you in actions
33 that we've taken and it's not taken lightly. These
34 emergency special actions aren't taken without it. So
35 there is review that takes place even with these
36 emergency special actions with the delegated authority.

37
38 MS. MILLS: Thank you. That makes me
39 feel better. I was under the impression that once that
40 was in it was.....

41
42 MR. BURCHAM: I would like to add one
43 more thing and that is the Federal Subsistence Board
44 can add these delegations of authority. When they saw
45 this black bear request, they knew this Council's
46 sensitivity on this issue and OSM and everybody
47 involved knew we wanted to bring it to the Regional
48 Council and put it before you guys and get your opinion
49 on it before taking action on it. It was an extra
50 step, but it was seen as important given the history.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Milo. That
2 brings up a point. We've gone past the point of
3 presentation and we've actually been going into
4 discussion. In order to do that, we should have had a
5 motion on the table. If there's no motion on the
6 table, the whole idea can die. So I'm going to ask my
7 Council if somebody wants to make a motion to allow the
8 Cordova District Ranger to have delegation of authority
9 over black bears in the Chugach National Forest in Unit
10 6D.

11
12 If nobody makes a motion, you'll have
13 to go through other channels. In that case.....

14
15 MS. CAMINER: I'll make the motion.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You'll make the
18 motion. We have a motion. Do we have a second.

19
20 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Second.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we have a motion
23 and a second. Now we've been doing discussion on it.
24 Do we need further discussion. Andy, do you have some
25 things you'd like to say.

26
27 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I'll try to make it
28 fast here. Page 203 in this letter about delegation of
29 authority, there's a section there on number 4, the
30 effective period. This delegation of authority is
31 effective from the date of this letter and it continues
32 until superseded or rescinded.

33
34 So it's defined for effective period,
35 which leads me to, hey, why didn't that sunset clause
36 get put in there if that's a section in the letter, you
37 know. So I just don't trust sunset clauses anymore.
38 It's kind of like once bitten, twice shy. It's not
39 something I would support.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

42
43 MS. CAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
44 Andy, to answer your question, I believe the Board
45 declined to do that. So that's why they're not in
46 there.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And, if I remember
49 right, the reason they declined to do that, and I may
50 be corrected on this, but the reason they declined to

1 do that is because a request to rescind it can be put
2 in by the Council or somebody else at any time. So a
3 sunset clause, basically all it does is gives a time
4 for review, which we're supposed to do every year
5 anyhow. If he makes a special action and brings it to
6 our attention next year and we disagree with it, we can
7 ask that this special action be removed. Now whether
8 the Board will grant it or not, that's a different
9 question.

10
11 So we have a motion on the table. Any
12 further discussion on it.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 MS. MILLS: Call for the question.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're calling for the
19 question. All in favor of giving the Cordova District
20 Ranger a delegation of authority to cover black bear in
21 Prince William Sound in Unit 6D signify by saying aye.

22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
26 saying nay.

27
28 IN UNISON: Nay.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. In that case
31 we're going to have to have our first roll call vote
32 because I couldn't tell.

33
34 MS. CAMINER: Eleanor.

35
36 MS. DEMENTI: Aye.

37
38 MS. CAMINER: Mary Ann.

39
40 MS. MILLS: Nay.

41
42 MS. CAMINER: Lee.

43
44 MR. ADLER: Yeah.

45
46 MS. CAMINER: Gloria.

47
48 MS. STICKWAN: I don't know.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are you abstaining?

1 MS. STICKWAN: I'll abstain.
2
3 MS. CAMINER: James.
4
5 MR. SHOWALTER: I'll have to vote aye.
6
7 MS. CAMINER: Michael.
8
9 MR. OPHEIM: Nay.
10
11 MS. CAMINER: Andy.
12
13 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Nay.
14
15 MS. CAMINER: I voted yes. Ralph, do
16 you want to vote.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't need to vote.
19 It's not a tie at this point in time.
20
21 MS. CAMINER: Four ayes, three nays.
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Four to three, so ayes
24 have it.
25
26 MS. CAMINER: Unless you want to make
27 it a tie.
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If I voted, I would
30 vote an aye too. I normally don't vote unless it's a
31 tie. That's just my own personal. I don't know if
32 that's a requirement, but that's what I've always done.
33 So we have a 4 to 3 vote, it passes. That's just a
34 recommendation to the Board.
35
36 So thank you, Milo. We need to move on
37 now. I was surprised, but I wasn't surprised. Okay.
38 2016 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program.
39
40 MR. COGSWELL: Mr. Chair. Members of
41 the Council. My name is Stewart Cogswell. I'm the
42 Fisheries Division Chief for the Office of Subsistence
43 Management with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
44 Since it's my first time presenting to this board, I
45 just want to introduce myself.
46
47 I'm a fish biologist. I've been
48 employed by the Fish and Wildlife Service for 24 years.
49 I grew up in the midwest. I was born in Michigan. I
50 lived most of my life in Wisconsin and I've worked for

1 the Fish and Wildlife Service in Green Bay, Wisconsin.
2 So that's where I spent most of my 24 years in the
3 Service. I came up to Alaska in 2013 to do a detail at
4 Yukon-Delta National Wildlife Refuge. Sort of fell in
5 love with the resource and the issues and somehow I
6 convinced my wife to move up here, so I'm here now.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Convinced her? How
9 could she stay away?

10

11 (Laughter)

12

13 MR. COGSWELL: I was going to start off
14 by saying -- you know, I've been bumped so many times
15 today I was going to start off with does anybody else
16 want to go ahead of me again.

17

18 (Laughter)

19

20 MR. COGSWELL: I'd gladly sit down
21 again, but here I am. I know it's getting late, so
22 I'll try to be brief.

23

24 This is the Fisheries Resource
25 Monitoring Program. I talked to some of the Council
26 members and I just want to define what the mission of
27 this program is. The mission of the Monitoring Program
28 is to identify and provide information needed to
29 sustain subsistence fisheries on Federal public lands
30 for rural Alaskans through a multidisciplinary
31 collaborative program. It's a fund to help with
32 subsistence, both fisheries science and anthropologic
33 science.

34

35 Before I get going, this is a big
36 program and it takes a lot of time, so I just want to
37 thank the people on the record that have helped out
38 with this. It's the Fisheries staff, myself, Kay
39 Larson-Blair, Don Rivard and Karen Hyer, and the
40 Anthropology Division, which is Robbin LaVine, Pippa
41 Kenner, Palmer Ingles, Jennifer Hardin and Jeff Brooks.
42 We did have Ken Gates help out this year too.

43

44 We do have a Technical Review
45 Committee, which is made up of ADF&G employees, senior
46 scientist level folks, U.S. Forest Service, National
47 Park Service, the BLM. The BIA, we do have one TRC
48 member here today. Thanks, Pat. Fish and Wildlife
49 Service and there's two of us from OSM. So it's a lot
50 of work to put this together, so I just wanted to say

1 thanks to those folks.

2

3 So I will start. If you want to follow
4 along in your book, The FRMP overview starts on Page
5 205. I'm not going to go through everything. There's
6 a lot of information there. We wanted to make it
7 simpler, visual, so people could see it and identify a
8 few things in here very quickly.

9

10 On Page 207 it shows -- I wanted the
11 history of the program. This is the subsistence
12 community's money and they wanted to show them where
13 it's going. Since the inception, it's been a little
14 less than \$104 million that have gone out to
15 subsistence issues and I think there's 431 projects.
16 Those two graphs just show you where the money has
17 gone. The pie graph shows who has received it and the
18 bar graph shows the number of projects.

19

20 I'll move on to the next slide. This
21 is on Page 208 in your book. This shows the allocation
22 guideline. It's not met exactly every year, but it's
23 kind of a guideline to go on. So we have the guideline
24 on the left and then it shows what actually happened on
25 the right. You can see the green is the Kuskokwim. In
26 actuality they got 25 percent of the funds and they've
27 been targeted for 29. Your region, Southcentral,
28 you're targeted for 5 for DOI funds, Department of
29 Interior, and you received 13 percent, \$14 million. So
30 it's a little higher, so you guys are doing a little
31 better than what the guidelines are set forth there.

32

33 Okay. I just want to go over the
34 policies and guidelines. This is on Page 212 of your
35 book. It's a four-year program, up to four years. It
36 can be less. We don't want to duplicate existing
37 projects. We'd like the majority to be dedicated to
38 non-Federal agencies. Long-term projects are going to
39 be considered on a case-by-case basis. Number 5, it
40 just lists -- you know, this is for studies, it's not
41 for habitat protection, hatcheries, contaminant
42 assessment or if the only goal of the project is
43 outreach or science camp or education. I think we
44 received 45 projects and only one of those was deemed
45 not eligible. It was for habitat work.

46

47 So for those of you that have been here
48 for a while it's a little bit different process. We
49 use the same criteria, but it's a little bit different
50 process. This is step one. Step one is proposal

1 development and I think that's a big step. This is
2 where the Councils need to be really involved in this
3 process.

4
5 Number one is priority needs and
6 they're very important. I think in the next meeting in
7 March, the all-Council meeting, we will have a session
8 to assist with that, to develop and work out those
9 priority needs.

10
11 Number two is we're going to work --
12 you know, a lot of times in these grant programs people
13 put in projects, they get the announcement and then
14 they scurry around to get the project in. That's not
15 really good for you guys not to know what's going in or
16 not. I'm hoping to get the investigators working with
17 the Councils to develop projects over time, not just
18 last minute, so you have a big voice in what's going in
19 and how they're developed.

20
21 To that end, in December, the Fisheries
22 Division and Anthropology Division of OSM is going to
23 be working with Southeast, the Forest Service, their
24 subsistence folks, to develop a letter or a card in
25 December to encourage that. So we want people to start
26 working on this ahead of time.

27
28 Step two is the actual submission. A
29 complete project package needs to be submitted on time.
30 What's in bold and underlined there is you have to
31 follow the notice. It used to be called a notice of
32 funding availability. I think it's going to be called
33 a NOFO, notice of funding opportunity in the future.
34 But you've got to follow the directions. If anything
35 is not on time, we won't be accepting it anymore.

36
37 The five criteria, four of those are
38 the same for many years, the first four, strategic
39 priority needs. Are you meeting the priority needs of
40 the Councils. Technical-scientific merit.
41 Investigator ability and resources. Partnership-
42 capacity building.

43
44 Since I'm here I'm really stressing
45 partnership and capacity building. Partnerships
46 because in a limited funding -- you know, funding
47 levels aren't going up, so you need to work with
48 partners. We want to encourage partnerships, but the
49 capacity -- capacity building is sometimes tough, but
50 if you don't try, you're never going to get anywhere,

1 so I really want to push that and really hold people
2 accountable for addressing that in their projects.

3
4 The new one this year is cost benefit.
5 That's the only thing that's changed. For one year
6 what it would cost us for all the projects we got this
7 year, for 44 projects, is \$4.8 million. We only have
8 around \$2 million. So it's very important to fund only
9 those projects that are ready to go. If you have a
10 project that meets a priority need but the technical
11 merit isn't there, the cost is way too high or too low
12 and the TRC thinks it's not ready to go, it probably
13 won't get funded.

14
15 Step three is the evaluation process.
16 We want to be transparent. We want people to know how
17 -- we don't want to be sort of like the projects go in
18 and no one knows how they're getting ranked and how
19 they're coming out. We really want to identify high-
20 quality projects and maximize funding opportunities.
21 That means partnerships in this limited funding
22 climate.

23
24 When I got here a year ago, I had a lot
25 of suggestions and I took some of those and
26 incorporated them. One is we made specific criteria
27 within each one of those criteria to specifically score
28 a project. We wanted them to be more objective than
29 subjective. I think in the past they were ranked high,
30 medium and low. This time we have an actual score that
31 they have to meet thresholds within each of those
32 criteria. So it's more objective.

33
34 The next thing we did was -- for each
35 project there was -- for the entire process, if an
36 agency -- each agency -- I'm not talking very well.
37 Each agency only gets one vote. In the past a single
38 agency had multiple agencies. Like OSM, we had two
39 people and we got two votes for the projects. Not
40 anymore. OSM gets one vote, ADF&G gets one vote, the
41 Park Service gets one vote even though there's multiple
42 people on the TRC.

43
44 The next thing we did was if your
45 agency submitted a project, you did not get to rank
46 your project anymore. Most granting programs, if you
47 submit a project, you don't get to rank your own
48 projects. It interjects some potential bias or
49 perceived bias. So I eliminated that.

50

1 Step four, the Technical Review
2 Committee. They develop the draft monitoring plan for
3 each region. So that means they score all the projects
4 and there's a rank. We'll get to your rank for
5 Southcentral in a second. They're based on those five
6 criteria and then the final score determines the rank.

7
8 This is the next really huge step, step
9 five, for RAC involvement, is today. There's two parts
10 to it. The TRC rankings. They are what they are.
11 There's also your comments. Each of those are equally
12 important and they both need to go forward to the ISC
13 and to the Board and ultimately to OSM to determine the
14 final monitoring plan.

15
16 So each part of that is very important.
17 So comments that we're looking for today are do the
18 proposals that you see in front of you, I think there's
19 six of them, do they align with your priority needs.
20 Are they meeting the questions that you have for the
21 subsistence program. You can comment on the proposal
22 rankings, proposal summaries or the process. Those
23 comments are very important to go forward to the Board.

24
25 The last step is just the reviews.
26 Your comments will be forwarded to the ISC and the
27 Board for recommendations. The Board will take those,
28 they'll synthesize the comments, look at them and
29 provide final recommendations for the monitoring plan.
30 Then OSM receives that and the assistant regional
31 director of OSM will sign off on the final proposals
32 that are funded.

33
34 So that's the six steps. The RACs
35 definitely need to be involved in the project
36 development and the comments once the projects are here
37 at the RAC meeting.

38
39 Okay. I just want to give you a quick
40 overview. This is on Page 214 in your books. Your
41 slice of the pie in that first slide, this is what it
42 actually looks like. The total funds received I think
43 there's 13 or 14 million, 13 percent of the total FRMP
44 program over the history of it. This is just a summary
45 of that and who received the money.

46
47 I'm going to go on to the proposal
48 rankings. These are the proposals in your book on Page
49 216. I'll just read through the projects in order.
50 The first project is 16-551, Subsistence Users

1 Attitudes and Perceptions in the Russian River Dip Net
2 Fishery. The second proposal is 16-503, Ibeck Creek
3 Coho Salmon Escapement and Harvest Monitoring Program.
4 Number three project is 16-552, Chitina Check Station
5 (Copper River in-season data on Chinook and Sockeye
6 Salmon Harvest). The fourth one is 16-501, Abundance,
7 run timing, and age, sex and length compositions of
8 Chinook Salmon in the Killey and Funny rivers, Kenai
9 Peninsula, Alaska. The fifth one is 16-505, Stock
10 Assessment of Late Run Kasilof River Chinook Salmon.
11 The last one is 16-502, Age, sex, length, run time,
12 spawning site fidelity and distribution of Chinook
13 Salmon within Federal waters of the mainstem Kenai
14 River, Kenai Peninsula, Alaska.

15

16 So those are the TRC rankings. Your
17 comments will go to the Board on these proposals. I'm
18 done with my presentation. I'm looking for comments.
19 Your comments can be in the form of a motion that goes
20 to the Board or the Council Coordinator or Robbin.
21 Your comments, one way or the other, will be forwarded
22 to the Board and it's up to you on how you would like
23 to do that.

24 So thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

27

28 MS. CAMINER: Thanks very much for an
29 excellent presentation and kind of welcome to the
30 program. I appreciate some of the adjustments you've
31 made to the process. That sounds like it would make
32 things a little more equitable, let's say.

33

34 Just a little bit of history here too.
35 I've said this for the last several years. When this
36 program first began, the Monitoring Program, the Kenai
37 Peninsula was not part of fisheries management, so
38 originally allocations were made by regions if you will
39 within the State, not corresponding to RACs. So I've
40 been suggesting over the years that our area, including
41 the Kenai Peninsula, receive more of that piece of the
42 pie you were talking about. I can't, to tell you the
43 truth, really tell if that's happened now in the last
44 year or two or not, so I would encourage you to take a
45 look at that as well.

46

47 I guess my first question would be on
48 Page 215, the notice of funding opportunity identified
49 these priority information needs. Some of these I
50 recognize either from our last meeting or our meeting

1 before that where we identified needs specific to our
2 region based on our membership here. So, to be honest,
3 I don't remember the last two points that you have
4 here, Ibeck Creek and Russian River dipnet fishery.
5 Not to say we didn't say that.

6
7 Jumping then to the rankings by the TRC
8 and I understand some of the proposals may not have
9 been complete or maybe you were questioning or others
10 were questioning the budget aspects of them.
11 Personally, and you heard it all yesterday and today, I
12 don't see where our number one need is on the dipnet
13 fishery. Others can chime in.

14
15 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair, Judy.
16 Those are the comments we want. If you feel like the
17 top-ranked project is not a good one or you don't think
18 it's as important as some of the other ones, that's a
19 perfect comment to go through to the Board. So that's
20 exactly the kind of comments we're looking for. So
21 thank you.

22
23 MR. ADLER: Who is actually going to
24 run this Chitina check station?

25
26 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair. I
27 didn't go through the rest of it, but to answer your
28 question if you go on Page 217. We tried to lay this
29 out so it was very simple and you can get a quick
30 explanation of all the projects. On Page 217 it has it
31 in ranked order. It has the project summary and then a
32 quick justification. So it's just a quick way to
33 really quickly see the projects in order.

34
35 Then on Page 224, this is the executive
36 summary from the principal investigator. This is their
37 words. We didn't change anything. This is a little
38 bit more information if you want to dig a little
39 deeper. Project 16-552 is on Page 237. The principal
40 investigator is CRITR. I think the previous
41 presentation talked about submitting this proposal.

42
43 The last thing I'll say as long as
44 we're here, Appendix B on Page 239, that's the history
45 of all the projects ever funded in Southcentral through
46 the FRMP.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask you a
49 question. Is the ranking the order that the TRC puts
50 them in? So number one is more important than number

1 two, number two is more important than number three or
2 are these just the five top-ranked projects that the
3 TRC had?

4

5 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair.
6 These are all the projects received for Southcentral.
7 They're in ranked order of how they scored.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. They're in
10 ranked order of how they scored. Wow.

11

12 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

15

16 MS. CAMINER: Are the applicants past
17 the point of revising their proposals to satisfy some
18 of the missing requirements that you identified?

19

20 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair. Yes.
21 The proposals, on the submission date, they need to be
22 complete. You know, we have 44 projects and there's a
23 lot of work. These proposals are very thick documents,
24 each one of them, and there's a lot of people that read
25 each and every one of these. So it's actually a huge
26 job. The TRC, I don't believe it's their job to pick
27 and choose and look at different -- you know, there
28 used to be fund with modifications. We're not doing
29 that anymore. The projects need to be complete. We
30 can't pick and choose different parts of them. We have
31 to evaluate the project on how it is submitted.

32

33 MS. STICKWAN: So the first five are
34 going to be approved? I don't understand.

35

36 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair.
37 That's an excellent question, Gloria. In general, if
38 your project ranked higher on the list, it has a better
39 chance of being funded than if it's on the bottom. So
40 I don't know how many projects will be funded in each
41 region. Again, we're only going to fund projects that
42 are ready to go. So if some of these projects aren't
43 ready to go even if they're higher or in the middle, it
44 all depends on where they're at on the list and the
45 funding levels.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So there's no
48 guarantee that these five projects are ready to go.

49

50 MS. CAMINER: They're not.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or am I wrong. I
2 thought these were ranked already because they are
3 ready to go. Are these not all ready to go?

4
5 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair.
6 Yes, they're not all ready. They're just in order of
7 how they scored. So there could be five points between
8 them all, there could be 30, 40, 50 points between them
9 all. The ones on the bottom may not be ready to go.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

12
13 MS. CAMINER: A follow up on that. I
14 haven't worked my way backwards yet, but it looked like
15 ranking number six, number five, there's not enough
16 budget justification and maybe even four. I guess
17 maybe can we ask which of these are viable projects.
18 Maybe only two or three met all the criteria.

19
20 MR. COGSWELL: I have the scores for
21 all of them and we haven't released that. No one knows
22 what projects in the Monitoring Program are going to be
23 funded at this point. I don't know that offhand.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the TRC ranking
26 isn't dependent on their scores.

27
28 MR. COGSWELL: It is.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So we know that
31 TRC ranked number one has the highest score.

32
33 MR. COGSWELL: Yes.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But does that score
36 then include whether TRC number one is ready to go?

37
38 MR. COGSWELL: No, it does not.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I see that TRC
41 number three doesn't even have a cost on it.

42
43 MR. COGSWELL: Yeah. I have it here.
44 That was omitted in the publication. If you go to Page
45 216, the third ranked project, the Chena check station,
46 the total matching funds are \$160,000, the total
47 project request is \$200,000 and the average annual
48 request is \$50,000.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask a question

1 then.

2

3 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair. Can
4 I make one more correction before we move on?

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sure.

7

8 MR. COGSWELL: On project number two,
9 the Ibeck Creek, there's a correction there too. The
10 middle budget column, total project request, it is
11 actually \$789,151 and that would make the average
12 annual request \$197,287. So I apologize for those
13 mistakes and omissions.

14

15 MS. MILLS: What was the annual
16 request?

17

18 MR. COGSWELL: \$197,287.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And when it says
21 matching funds, that means how much they're getting
22 from somebody else, right?

23

24 MR. COGSWELL: Correct. Or in kind
25 services, yeah.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically on
28 project number three, if they're getting \$160,000 in
29 matching funds, are they still asking \$200,000 from
30 this funding at a \$50,000 a year funding level?

31

32 MR. COGSWELL: That is correct.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the project
35 actually costs \$360,000.

36

37 MR. COGSWELL: Correct.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Then I see what
40 you mean when you say \$173,544 in matching funds, it's
41 still \$197,287 from this funding source every year.

42

43 MR. COGSWELL: Correct.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And these are all
46 three-year projects -- four-year projects.

47

48 MR. COGSWELL: Most of them are four-
49 year. There's a couple three-year.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Okay.

2

3 MS. DEMENTI: Just a question. I was
4 wondering how many of these projects are going to be
5 funded or just one or two or what?

6

7 MR. COGSWELL: I'm working on the
8 budget right now. Our end of year just happened, so
9 we're getting final budgets and putting all the costs
10 together. We have around \$2 million and if you look at
11 your slice of the pie is allocated at 5 percent. At
12 \$2 million, that's \$100,000. So you don't get very far
13 down that list with \$100,000. In actuality, you've
14 been getting 13 percent, so it will be double that or
15 it could be double that. That's one way to look at it.
16 I don't know. Again, if you're higher on the list,
17 your project probably scored higher, you have a better
18 chance of being funded.

19

20 Through the Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

23

24 MR. COGSWELL: I want to clarify that,
25 Eleanor. The average annual request, that is the hit
26 the program takes each year. Again, we had \$4.8
27 million. If you added up all these proposal rankings
28 for all the regions, that would come up to \$4.8 million
29 and we have \$2 million, a hair over, for projects for
30 this year.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically then from
33 what I understand is that just looking at our average
34 for our area we have somewhere around \$200,000 that's
35 going to get spent in our area right here, which
36 basically means any one of these big projects would
37 take our \$200,000 approximately. We could get two
38 projects if we cut them out of the middle, but there's
39 no way we could get three projects at \$200,000.

40

41 So basically what we need to do, if I
42 understand correctly, is we could as a Council rank
43 these in the order of priority we think they should be
44 done and that would then aid in the ranking of which
45 one would end up getting funded because it doesn't look
46 to me like at \$200,000 too many of them are going to
47 get funded.

48

49 MR. COGSWELL: The TRC ranked the
50 projects based on those five criteria, so you don't

1 have all the information. Some of that is personal
2 information we can't give out. So you have the bare
3 minimum. You could say that these projects are more
4 important to you, absolutely.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I mean.
7 We could rank these in the order of importance and we
8 could do this as a Council or we could do this as
9 individuals on the Council and then that would end up
10 giving some guidance as to which ones we think would be
11 most important to do. That's the only way I can see to
12 do it because with only one of these projects possibly
13 being funded, possibly two, there's no way we could sit
14 down as a Council -- and even if we voted as to which
15 ones we wanted, that doesn't mean a thing because we
16 don't know which ones are currently ready to go, we
17 don't know what the total ranking is. We know what the
18 order of ranking is.

19
20 So for the information that you want
21 from us is what we think are the most important. Am I
22 correct on that?

23
24 MR. COGSWELL: Yes. We want to know
25 your comments.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Andy.

28
29 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Through the Chair. I
30 was looking at these five criteria that you guys are
31 using to rank these things and I'm thinking, well, the
32 number of households that benefit from that resource or
33 something would be something that you'd use, not just
34 technical merit or education or capacity. The number
35 of subsistence users that benefit from that resource
36 seems to be like it should be weighed into that as to
37 what's important and how a rank happens.

38
39 Thank you.

40
41 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair.
42 That's an excellent comment. We'll forward that. This
43 is a process. It's going to be worked out and we want
44 it to be the best process it can be to rank projects
45 and to have the best projects move forward and to met
46 the priority needs.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

49
50 MS. CAMINER: I don't know how

1 difficult this would be to dig out and, again, I'm
2 sorry, my memory isn't serving me on this, but I think
3 for the Council to be consistent what would be really
4 helpful is to see the list of priority needs we said
5 most recently and then we could evaluate these in
6 priority order.

7

8 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair. I'm
9 looking up the priority needs that I have, and I'm
10 assuming they're accurate, are on Page 215. I'm going
11 to go back to slide five here real quick. These are
12 the comments that we're looking for. Judy, you're
13 hitting on that. Do the proposals align with the
14 priority needs. That's really important.

15

16 MS. CAMINER: Excuse me. So, like I
17 said, either at our last meeting or the one before we
18 were asked just for Southcentral what are your priority
19 needs. So are you saying these five dots were the ones
20 we identified on Page 215?

21

22 MR. COGSWELL: I believe most of those
23 are. A couple may have been put in after the fact. I
24 believe the last one was put in after the Council
25 meeting.

26

27 MS. CAMINER: So I think between our
28 recollections I would say we identified the first four
29 and that's why the fifth one looked a little odd to me.
30 Okay. So that's helpful to us to say here's what you
31 said last time just so we can then look at these.
32 Thanks. Okay. Got it.

33

34 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair. At
35 some of the other RAC meetings they've handled it
36 differently. Some have put comments forward. At the
37 last RAC meeting I was at, Yukon-Kuskokwim, they had
38 specific comments on projects. They didn't make a
39 motion, but those comments were forwarded to the Board
40 on specific projects. They thought some projects
41 should be funded or not funded and they weren't
42 important. So just to let you know what other Councils
43 have done.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, that's what I'm
46 trying to think of as to what we've done in the past.
47 Of course, we didn't have the same funding. We had
48 better funding, so we could be a little bit broader
49 than this time.

50

1 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair. The
2 project allocations piece of the pie, that is just a
3 guideline, so some regions may get more than that. You
4 might get a little less. That's just a guide. We want
5 to fund the best projects. If the other regions we
6 can't get those projects that are ready to go to
7 actually answer a subsistence question well, we'll move
8 to other regions and spread that money around.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, that's why I see
11 that somehow or another we as a Council, either as a
12 complete Council or as individuals on the Council, need
13 to come up with a ranking of these in order of
14 importance or how we feel that they meet the priority
15 information needs or the needs of our area.

16
17 Personally, I think it would take a
18 long time for us to go through these individually and
19 I'm just wondering whether it wouldn't be acceptable to
20 the rest of the Council if on our next break we each
21 took a piece of paper and didn't put a name on top of
22 it and ranked these in importance and basically we
23 would be taking a vote on the importance of them as
24 each of us as individuals see them and then we could
25 give you a ranking of how this Council sees the
26 importance of them. If that would be acceptable to the
27 rest of the Council, that would give everybody a voice
28 in it.

29
30 Judy.

31
32 MS. CAMINER: I think that's a great
33 idea, but my frustration is if really two or three of
34 these had been eliminated because they're not complete,
35 it's kind of a waste -- I mean it's somewhat a waste of
36 our time. I mean how is our vote going to be counted
37 when they've already been eliminated but we don't know
38 that.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, the thing is,
41 what I could see if we did that, what we would do is we
42 would get a ranking and that way if one was not
43 complete, then the next one down in the ranking would
44 be -- you know, we can rank the importance, but we
45 can't rank whether they're ready to go or anything like
46 that.

47
48 So we have six proposals here and we
49 could just put the numbers down in the order that we
50 think they're more important. Do you have something,

1 Gloria. And then Robbin has something. But if the
2 rest of the Council doesn't agree to that, we can try
3 to do it a different way. Gloria.

4
5 MS. STICKWAN: Well, if we are going to
6 do it that way, I just wanted to speak to the Chitina
7 proposal before we start ranking if that's what we're
8 going to do.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We could let
11 Council members speak to the ones that they see is
12 important before we, as individuals, take a vote on it.
13 Robbin.

14
15 MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, thank you.
16 Members of the Council. I wanted to clarify. When we
17 are asking for your comments, on number A, do proposals
18 align with priority needs, we recognize that priority
19 information needs and your priority needs for your
20 regions shift from year to year, from month to month.
21 What you voted on a year ago may have shifted somewhat,
22 so you bringing a current contemporary today's version
23 of what your priority information need is also very
24 useful.

25
26 So you don't need to feel confined by
27 the list that was developed here. They may continue to
28 meet the needs -- address the priority information
29 needs as developed through the call, but sometimes
30 something happens and this Council may feel that to
31 address that, whatever it is, a shift in population, a
32 shift in user needs, your comments on that also is
33 really important and we will forward to the Board.

34
35 Thank you.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria, you wish to
38 share something.

39
40 MS. STICKWAN: The way I understand
41 this, this Chitina -- I didn't write this, so my
42 understanding is this Chitina check station is to get
43 people that use dipnets to count the catch. To set up
44 a place where we'd have them voluntarily give us their
45 fish to be counted and somebody would be down there,
46 probably the NRTs, counting the fish that are caught.

47
48 The reason we saw that is because we've
49 been threatened for two years now -- or it's been
50 discussed that our Copper River chinook is on the

1 decline. It's been on the decline for five years, but
2 we've been hearing rumors that we're going to have to
3 do something to restrict subsistence fisheries. So we
4 want to be able to protect our chinook fishery and
5 continue to be able to harvest chinook. It didn't
6 happen, but there's rumors going around.

7
8 We know the chinook is on the decline
9 and eventually they're going to restrict us to having a
10 live box. We're going to have to put in a live box or
11 we're going to have to stand at our fishwheel 10 hours
12 a day and watch it continuously to take the chinook out
13 of the box. So we have a concern about that. Plus
14 just the amount of salmon that leaves our area that's
15 not being counted is a concern to us by the dipnetters.

16
17
18 So we met with Cordova and we talked to
19 people down there and they gave us monies because they
20 see that as a concern as well. So they gave us some
21 money to do this project, so what we planned to do is
22 combine some of AHTNA's in kind to do this. It sounds
23 like it's not planned, but we do have a plan.

24
25 MR. MIKE: Excuse me. People on the
26 line hit your mute button or hit *6 to mute. We're
27 hearing background music.

28
29 Thank you.

30
31 (Radio station continuing to play)

32
33 MS. STICKWAN: So if there are any
34 question, I'll answer them.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Gloria.
37 The only question I have, I know you put that proposal
38 in.....

39
40 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. If I could
41 interrupt. Apparently nobody is minding their phone.
42 The only option we have is to disconnect the phone
43 lines and redial.

44
45 REPORTER: Maybe. Even if I redial
46 he'll still be on the phone line.

47
48 MR. MIKE: Is anybody online today for
49 the rest of the meeting, please say so.

50

1 (No comments)
2
3 MR. MIKE: If nobody is online, we're
4 going to disconnect the phone. We're having background
5 interference in the meeting.
6
7 Thank you.
8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Gloria.
10
11 MS. STICKWAN: The only thing I was
12 going to say is we have capacity building working with
13 the tribes as well.
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Gloria. I
16 think that was a good presentation. The only question
17 I have on it is the fact that it's voluntary. I don't
18 mean voluntary from your standpoint. I mean it's
19 voluntary from the people who come by, so I'm not sure
20 what kind of compliance we'd get, but it's something
21 that I know you've put in to the Board of Fish and it's
22 something I know we've supported in the past and I've
23 supported in the past. I'd sure like to see it happen.
24
25 MS. STICKWAN: We own land down there,
26 so that might make a difference.
27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. From that
29 standpoint, that's something for us as a Council to
30 think about when we rank these proposals. I can't
31 think of any other way to do it very quickly. I think
32 what we'll do at this point in time just to give you
33 guys a heads up, I don't know if we've got any -- does
34 anybody have any comments. You've heard comments from
35 Gloria on the Chitina check station. Has anybody got
36 any comments on the rest of these proposals that they'd
37 like to go in under comments even before we vote on
38 them.
39
40 MS. CAMINER: Yes, Mr. Chair. It's
41 unfortunate Greg isn't here because number 4, 5 and 6
42 are in his area. Number 6 might speak to some of the
43 concerns that have been expressed about having a net in
44 the water in the Kenai. Again, reading this write-up,
45 it didn't look like the study was very well put
46 together or meet all the criteria. So in terms of data
47 needs, I think we identified them last time and
48 included those in there.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, that's what I

1 was going to say. I know out of the data needs, 5 and
2 6 and 2 meet data needs that we expressed directly last
3 time. I'm not going to make any comments on what I
4 thought of them, but it's interesting to me that -- the
5 Funny River and the Killey River, they're nice on the
6 Kenai Peninsula, but they don't have much effect on any
7 subsistence users at this point in time. That would be
8 my only comment. I don't know how well thought up
9 those are. It would be nice information to have, but
10 it doesn't directly affect the concerns we have with
11 subsistence users at this point in time.

12
13 Ibeck Creek has a direct effect on
14 subsistence users because it's developing into a large
15 sport fishery and it's in the development stage. The
16 Chitina check station has a real effect on subsistence
17 users because it effects subsistence users upriver from
18 Chitina also. Again, this is personal opinion. Like I
19 said, the two stock assessment ones at the end are ones
20 that we directly said that we're going to need in the
21 future.

22
23 Those would be my comments. If anybody
24 else has comments that they would like to make at this
25 point in time. We'll make comments and then we'll vote
26 on it and we'll give you the results of our vote as far
27 as importance.

28
29 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair.
30 Those are excellent comments. Those are what we're
31 looking for, are comments like that. I would just
32 direct you to Page 217 when you're going to be voting
33 on them. All the project summaries and justification.
34 It will give you a quick idea. If you have more
35 questions, you'll have to go back to Appendix B. From
36 Page 217 to 223 are all the project summaries and a
37 brief justification, so that should help you.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think most of us
40 have glanced at them or read them at this point in
41 time. The other thing I would like to point out to all
42 Council members, if you have individual comments that
43 you would like to make, all you have to do is write
44 them down and give them to Donald and Donald will make
45 sure that they get them. Am I correct on that, Donald?
46 And that would be one way that we as individual Council
47 members can put comments in. At this point in time I
48 think it would be pretty hard for us to get a consensus
49 on these with a limited amount of time that we have,
50 but we can at least give you an overall consensus and

1 then make it open for individuals to put comments
2 through Donald directly to you unless a person wants to
3 make their comments right now.

4
5 Does that satisfy the rest of the
6 Council.

7
8 (Council nods affirmatively)

9
10 MS. STICKWAN: I already made my
11 comments and I wanted that to be on record.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Your comments are on
14 record and they heard it. With that, everyone take one
15 clean piece of paper out of your notebook. Don't put a
16 name on it, don't do anything on it. You take these six
17 and put them in the order that you would like them,
18 whichever way that you would rank these proposals. We
19 will give these to Donald and Donald will add them up
20 and we'll present them to you.

21
22 Donald, I don't like making too much
23 work for you, but I know you can count.

24
25 MR. MIKE: I work for you guys.

26
27 (Off record)

28
29 (On record)

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We need to get
32 back in session to get going with what we were doing.
33 Donald, did you end up coming up with a ranking.

34
35 MR. MIKE: Yes, Mr. Chair. I had to
36 hire a social scientist to analyze the final vote.

37
38 (Laughter)

39
40 MR. MIKE: For that I'll ask Pat to
41 help us out on the results of how each Council member
42 ranked each project.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you.

45
46 MS. PETRIVELLI: This is Pat
47 Petrivelli. All I did was just tally them. I forgot
48 to bring my SPSS software.

49
50 (Laughter)

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: For ranking of number
2 one, six people voted project number three as number
3 one.
4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Number
6 three.....
7
8 MS. PETRIVELLI: Got six votes for
9 number one. Project number six got two votes as number
10 one.
11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, okay. I see what
13 we're doing now.
14
15 MS. PETRIVELLI: We're not averaging,
16 we're just reporting.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Project number
19 what had.....
20
21 MS. PETRIVELLI: Project number three
22 had six votes for number one. Project six had two
23 votes as number one. In the number two spot, it was
24 more diverse. Four projects were voted number two.
25 And then it was a tie, but three people voted project
26 six as a second priority. Three voted for project five
27 as a second priority. Then two people voted project
28 three as a second priority. Two people voted project
29 two as a second priority.
30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And for the third
32 priority.
33
34 MS. PETRIVELLI: There were three
35 projects that were voted for.
36
37 MS. STICKWAN: This is confusing.
38
39 MS. PETRIVELLI: It is confusing.
40 Three different projects were voted and two people
41 voted for each of these projects and it was one, three
42 and five as third priority. Do you want to hear the
43 other votes?
44
45 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah.
46
47 MS. PETRIVELLI: Okay. People voted in
48 the fourth list. Three people voted for project four
49 and I guess we could just finish with each of the
50 projects. Project four got ranked fourth by three

1 people and it also got ranked last by two people. Then
2 we're through with the voting for project four.

3
4 For project one, one person voted it as
5 fourth. Two people voted it as last also. That's
6 project one.

7
8 For project two, three people voted
9 that as a fifth priority. There's only two rankings
10 left.

11
12 For project five, one person said it
13 should be ranked fourth and two people said it should
14 be ranked fifth.

15
16 The very last one for project six, one
17 person ranked it fourth and one person ranked it sixth.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I got kind of
20 mixed up on that.

21
22 MS. STICKWAN: Me too.

23
24 MS. CAMINER: You kind of switched the
25 way you said it.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You switched gears
28 right there. So let's just take.....

29
30 MS. PETRIVELLI: One, two and three?
31 How do you want to look at it?

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I would have just
34 looked at each one with the -- that's true, we ranked
35 them in six different positions and not just gave them
36 a one vote. That makes things hard.

37
38 MS. PETRIVELLI: Because there's six
39 projects and you ranked them in -- and not everybody
40 ranked all six.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Hmm.

43
44 MS. PETRIVELLI: Do you want to just
45 hear the top three over again?

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Let's here the
48 top three.

49
50 MS. PETRIVELLI: Okay. For the top

1 three rankings, it was project three got six votes and
2 project six got two votes.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, they were ranked
5 number one by people on their card.

6

7 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. That's what it
8 means.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

11

12 MS. PETRIVELLI: For the number two
13 ranking, there were four different projects voted for
14 as number two. Three people each voted for five and
15 six as number two. Two people each voted two and three
16 as number two. For project two and project three, two
17 different people made them their second priority. Oh,
18 I could just.....

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And then for third it
21 was two for one, two for three and two for five, right?

22

23 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes, one, three and
24 five, correct.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now the question is --
27 I guess we can just give this to them and let them
28 figure out what it says.

29

30 (Laughter)

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Basically what it says
33 to me is -- I don't know.

34

35 (Laughter)

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But it looks to me
38 like six people voted for number two as number one,
39 right?

40

41 MS. PETRIVELLI: No, number three.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, I got that one
44 reversed.

45

46 MS. STICKWAN: So does it sound like
47 Chitina got number one?

48

49 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes, it sounds like
50 Chitina got number one.

1 It was ranked top by six people.

2

3 MS. STICKWAN: And then what does it
4 sound like for the second one?

5

6 MS. PETRIVELLI: It was pretty balanced
7 -- well, kind of. Five and six got an equal amount of
8 votes, which would be three and three. Then two and
9 three each got two votes, so I don't know what that
10 means.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Out of the top two,
13 six definitely came out in second because six came out
14 with five votes. Three came out with six votes. And
15 then I guess you'd have to say that five would have
16 been third because five came out with three votes.

17

18 MS. PETRIVELLI: Three votes, yeah.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And then from there on
21 down.

22

23 MS. PETRIVELLI: You could have number
24 two as the fourth vote because it was ranked as second
25 priority. That could be fourth. So you could have
26 that one, two.....

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think if we just
29 give -- I think that they can figure that out from the
30 numbers. Like I said, any Council member who would
31 like to make comments on any one of these projects,
32 write your comments down, give them to Donald Mike and
33 Donald Mike will make sure that they get them.

34

35 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair. I'm
36 going to trust Pat that she took good notes on that.

37

38 MS. PETRIVELLI: I just heard what
39 Ralph said. I think Ralph said that project three came
40 out number one. Project six came out number two
41 because it got five votes for either one or two.
42 Project five came out as number three because three
43 people voted for it as the second priority. Two people
44 voted for it as a third priority. Oh, and then after
45 that it would be project two as number four because it
46 was ranked two by two people. I guess after that it
47 would be project one that would be five. And project
48 four would be six. Because they got ranked all in the
49 lower, in the fourth, fifth and sixth by everybody.

50

1 MR. COGSWELL: So, Pat, you have the
2 official record of the ranking. I just want to briefly
3 state that the ranking -- that's good what you just
4 did. You have a ranked list. In my mind, the
5 individual comments like Gloria had on that project is
6 going to carry a lot of weight because the rank list --
7 you know, you're going off a title and not much in
8 depth, but those individual comments that people have
9 on the process or individual projects that's really
10 important and that's going to carry a lot of weight.
11 If there's any other comments that need to be made, I
12 can try to address those. I just have a closing
13 comment when we're all done.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. With
16 that.....

17
18 MS. CAMINER: He's got one more
19 comment.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: One more comment.

22
23 MR. COGSWELL: I know this is a new
24 process and a little confusing. Anybody can call me
25 any time. I'll be willing to stay after as late as
26 possible to tell anybody exactly what's happening. I
27 appreciate your comments.

28
29 Andy, you had a great comment on the
30 subsistence issue and the TRC is going to be meeting
31 not just once every two years to rank these projects,
32 but that will be something definitely forwarded to TRC
33 to take into consideration, you know, specifically how
34 many subsistence users and we'll try to work that in
35 somehow. That's a comment in process, so I really
36 appreciate that.

37
38 This is your process. We're trying to
39 make it easy and open and fair, consistent across all
40 regions. So any comments we have will be taken. So
41 thank you.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now we need to
44 go on. Identify issues for 2015 annual report. Oh,
45 that's right. We need to take care of something that
46 Gloria brought to our attention and that is the fact
47 that we need to reassess our vote for the SRC because
48 one of the persons involved -- we backwards it.
49 Gloria, do you want to make the motion.

50

1 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah. Based upon new
2 information we got from Cantwell, we want to change
3 what we said earlier. We want Eleanor to take Marie
4 Gore's place and we want Jeff Burney to stay on.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We had reversed it
7 last time. Do I hear a second.

8
9 MS. CAMINER: Second.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This is a motion to
12 replace an action that we've already done with lack of
13 information. We got new information from Cantwell. So
14 instead of replacing Jeff, Eleanor would be replacing
15 Marie. Both of their terms, if I remember right --
16 would you speak to it, please.

17
18 MR. SUMMERS: Clarence Summers,
19 National Park Service. I'll say that Jeff is a member
20 of the local advisory committee. He's an active member
21 at the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission and he
22 wants to continue. I know I've talked to him
23 personally. Let's see, Marie Gore was an active member.
24 She's missed a number of meetings unfortunately and I
25 can only say that to serve on the commission I know the
26 charter requires you to attend meetings and if you miss
27 so many, there's a cause for removal. We're not doing
28 that. She's served a number of years in good standing.

29
30
31 But we have an opportunity now to
32 select a new person because that term has ended for
33 Marie Gore. So we have Eleanor Dementi on your
34 Regional Council, which is a great thing to have if
35 you're a Subsistence Resource Commission because you've
36 got a person on our Subsistence Resource Commission
37 reporting back to the Council, getting all the
38 additional training that's offered through this
39 program. In this scenario, Eleanor will replace Marie
40 Gore with your permission.

41
42 Thank you.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. We had a
45 motion and a second. If there's no further discussion
46 we can call the question.

47
48 MS. CAMINER: Question.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been

1 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

2

3 IN UNISON: Aye.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Those opposed signify
6 by saying nay.

7

8 (No opposing votes)

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Eleanor will replace
11 Marie on the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission.
12 With that we have the annual report. Issues for our
13 annual report and a bunch of them have been brought up
14 over the course of this meeting. I think Judy has kept
15 track of some of them. If somebody would like to run
16 through them and if anybody on the Council finds an
17 objection to them, we can object to them. Otherwise we
18 will give that information to Donald Mike to submit in
19 our annual report.

20

21 Judy, some of the ones that you've kept
22 track of as our secretary.

23

24 MS. CAMINER: Thank you. Please,
25 everybody, add in here or edit as you wish. So, in no
26 particular order I just wrote down the idea that I hope
27 the Federal Subsistence Board sees the presentation we
28 did by Ninilchik as to their efforts toward having a
29 net in the Kasilof.

30

31 Do we want to talk about each one
32 or.....

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We don't need to talk
35 about it. Just tell us what.....

36

37 MS. CAMINER: Okay. I'll run through
38 them.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just run through what
41 they are. If anybody wants them expanded, we can
42 expand it, but otherwise, as the secretary, you'll work
43 with Donald Mike to complete them.

44

45 MS. CAMINER: Okay. While we passed a
46 motion supporting Ninilchik working with the in-season
47 manager -- I said that wrong. We passed a motion that
48 supports that the Federal Manager should be working
49 with Ninilchik, but we could also mention this in our
50 annual report as well and this is focused really on the

1 Kenai net as well as perhaps making things a little
2 easier on the Kasilof next year.

3
4 It was mentioned this morning by the
5 Kenai National Wildlife Refuge that the State season
6 right now is a little bit longer than the Federal
7 season at the end. This was for moose. So it just
8 kind of triggered for me that maybe we ant to make a
9 comment on that that either special actions might have
10 to take place next year or that proposal be prepared.

11
12 We also heard this morning that we
13 don't know a lot about brown bear populations in Unit
14 11, so we may want to support a monitoring effort
15 there.

16
17 One thing that came up yesterday is
18 that the State deer tags don't include the date that
19 the animal was taken. We mentioned maybe the Federal
20 permit could. That might be helpful in harvest
21 information.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Wait a second. The
24 State deer tags do have it on. It's the harvest
25 report.

26
27 MS. CAMINER: Okay, sorry. All right.
28 But maybe there's a way through the Federal system that
29 can be accommodated.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We don't have Federal
32 deer tags. Milo.

33 MR. BURCHAM: Milo Burcham, Chugach
34 Forest. I think where we were getting with that was
35 that somebody said that it would be nice to know how
36 many bucks get taken in this new season and we assumed
37 that the State harvest report would do that. I think I
38 made the comment that it probably doesn't. I don't
39 know that for sure, but I'm trying to think of the
40 harvest report. I think it tells you -- asks you how
41 many days you hunted in which unit, but it doesn't ask
42 you what days you got deer. I don't think it's that
43 specific.

44
45 MS. CAMINER: Someone did check it
46 yesterday and verified it does not. If the Council
47 wants to, is it a suggestion that through any permitted
48 Federal hunt, for example, if you might have a longer
49 season than the State or something, would agencies be
50 able to require.....

1 MR. BURCHAM: If a Federal registration
2 permit is involved in this hunt -- did we ask for that?
3 We were talking about just using a State harvest
4 ticket. So if we just used a State harvest ticket and
5 it relies on the State harvest report, we might not get
6 that information.

7
8 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair, Judy. I guess my
9 recommendation would be to let Milo double check
10 because I think all the other species have the day that
11 the animals were harvested on them, on the harvest
12 report. Deer may, but let's ask if Milo can check on
13 that before you pursue that.

14
15 MS. CAMINER: Okay.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What we could put in
18 our report is that it would be advantageous to have a
19 report that told when the deer were taken and whether
20 they were taken under subsistence. It doesn't mean
21 they're going to get around to doing it right away, but
22 that would be advantageous to us.

23
24 Andy.

25
26 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Through the Chair. I
27 find it ironic that there is that little portion that
28 you rip off that when you do harvest your animal you
29 have to notch that little day of what day it is.

30
31 MR. BURCHAM: That's only to transport
32 the animal out of the field and get it home.

33
34 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. So you do have
35 to record it, but then the data goes nowhere.

36
37 MR. BURCHAM: Well, it's not meant to
38 be data. It's to make sure that you don't harvest.....

39
40 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: It's an enforcement.

41
42 MR. BURCHAM:additional animals.
43 That shows that you've used that tag on that day and
44 can't re-use it on another date. It invalidates it
45 when you punch out the dates.

46
47 MR. KRON: I guess my comment was I
48 believe for all the other species when you file a
49 report, you put in the day that you harvest it. If
50 Milo can double check.....

1 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: For moose, I do
2 believe I had to write the date of when the moose.....
3
4 MR. KRON: Yeah. Again, I think the
5 deer process, the deer data is new, so I don't know.
6 But if Milo could check that before you pursue that,
7 that would be great.
8
9 MR. BURCHAM: I'll give you a call next
10 week.
11
12 MS. CAMINER: Okay. Just a couple more
13 points. We heard about the safety hazards around the
14 Paxson area. If we wanted to ask the Board to write a
15 letter to the Department of Transportation, put up
16 signs or more parking areas, something like that.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The Department of
19 Transportation and Department of -- what do they call
20 it?
21
22 MS. CAMINER: Public Safety.
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Public Safety to
25 have.....
26
27 MS. CAMINER: I mean or to both of
28 them, yeah.
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: To put additional
31 effort into keeping the hunt safe on the road.
32
33 MS. CAMINER: Okay. And lastly, but
34 this is my own personal thought, I thought normally we
35 have reports from the Interagency Staff Committee as
36 we're doing our deliberations. So I don't know if the
37 schedule changed or something.
38
39 MS. PETRIVELLI: Do you want me to.....
40
41 MS. CAMINER: I think it would be
42 helpful if we had them.
43
44 MS. PETRIVELLI: Mr. Chair.
45
46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.
48
49 MS. PETRIVELLI: I sat in for Glenn
50 Chen this year because he was on a detail, but the

1 Interagency Staff Committee did meet and review all the
2 proposals before the RAC meeting and they only make
3 comments when the staff analysis is incomplete or if
4 not incomplete, if there's a concern that they feel the
5 Interagency Staff Committee needs to address. It would
6 be something the Board would find useful to help make a
7 decision, but there was no issues and that's why they
8 didn't make any comments.

9
10 So they did meet and they did review
11 all the proposals. It's just that they didn't have any
12 comments because there were no issues that they felt
13 needed further clarification or anything that they
14 needed to ask the Council about that they thought the
15 Board would need to make a decision.

16
17 MS. CAMINER: Okay. Thank you.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Anybody
20 else.

21
22 Andy, have you got any.

23
24 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Most of those --
25 actually the safety on the road system suggestion. Not
26 just Unit 11 for the brown bears, but also the Kenai
27 and Unit 12. And go along with Ralph's suggestion
28 there, perhaps utilizing this modern technology of
29 trail cameras. If they've already done the hair thing
30 or something over there in Kenai, why not use some
31 trail cams and then they're really going to know what
32 they've got.

33
34 I don't know if it's relevant or not,
35 but just curious why Kenai, the Ninilchik subsistence
36 user group is required to have insurance when there's
37 no other user group that is required to have insurance
38 other than commercial guides.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No other non-
41 commercial. I think that's a good one to put in there.

42
43 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: And then just a
44 comment that I'm highly concerned about the lack of
45 progress on the Kenai dipnet thing -- or gillnet thing.
46 I'd like to see some progress moving towards making
47 that happen for them.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody else have
50 anything. Mary Ann.

1 MS. MILLS: Yes, I also wanted to
2 address the issues that have been addressed. Also I
3 would like to bring something to the attention of this
4 Council and it's the United States Attorney General
5 Advisory Committee on American Indian/Alaska Native
6 Children Exposed to Violence. It is chaired by Senator
7 Dorgan, I believe. On Page 29, 5.5 states the
8 Department of Interior and the State of Alaska should
9 empower tribes to manage their own subsistence hunting
10 and fishing rights, remove the current barriers, and
11 provide Alaska Tribes with the resources needed to
12 effectively manage their own subsistence hunting and
13 fishing.

14
15 Regulations that limit the ability of
16 Alaska Natives to conduct traditional subsistence
17 hunting and fishing are directly connected to violence
18 in Alaska Tribes and the exposure of Alaska Native
19 children to that violence. Violence is essentially
20 nonexistent during the times in which the communities
21 are engaging in traditional subsistence hunting and
22 fishing activities, and violence spikes during times
23 when Alaska Natives are unable to provide for their
24 families.

25
26 Beyond providing basic food,
27 subsistence fishing and hunting has been essential to
28 Alaska Native families way of life for generations.
29 Like language and cultural traditions, it has been
30 passed down from one generation to the next and is an
31 important means of reinforcing tribal values and
32 traditions and binding families together in common
33 spirit and activity. Interfering with these traditions
34 erodes culture, family, a sense of purpose and ability
35 to provide for one's own, and a sense of pride.

36
37 The reason I wanted to bring this to
38 the Council's attention is some of it, with today, we
39 have seen Ninilchik struggle for a long time trying to
40 get their subsistence net. And also the tribes are the
41 only government left out of the Federal subsistence
42 process. We have to stay involved. Well, there are
43 three recognized sovereigns in the United States; the
44 U.S. government, the state governments and the tribal
45 governments. Alaska has fallen so far behind.

46
47 What I would like is this Council to
48 endorse the Attorney General's Advisory Committee's
49 recommendations that's in this book and have it be part
50 of the conversation of the Federal Subsistence Board.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was by the
2 Attorney General?
3
4 MS. MILLS: It's the Attorney General's
5 Advisory Committee. It came out of their committee.
6 This was one of the recommendations. They have a whole
7 list on Alaska, but this one was the recommendation
8 regarding subsistence.
9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What page was that on?
11
12 MS. MILLS: That is on Page 29. You
13 know, with the recent Tribal Law and Order Commission
14 report, that really states there's huge problems in
15 Alaska with regard to Alaska Natives and their tribes.
16 The commissioner referred to it as a national disgrace.
17 There's so much data and information that was contained
18 in this report that we wouldn't have enough time to
19 address it.
20
21 This is one of the reasons for this
22 additional advisory committee. So there's a lot of
23 information and a lot of things that I think would be
24 important for the Alaska Native people, particularly
25 with subsistence. This is one of the reasons is in
26 this book.
27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann, would you
29 suggest that we quote the Attorney General's Advisory
30 Committee's recommendation on Page 29 and just quote it
31 in our annual report?
32
33 MS. MILLS: Yes.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that would be
36 acceptable, wouldn't it? Just quote that paragraph
37 directly in our annual report.
38
39 MS. MILLS: Right. And then right here
40 the Attorney General's Advisory Committee. I would
41 also suggest this first page because it shows all the
42 commissioners that wrote this report.
43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, but if we just
45 include that paragraph and what book it came from, they
46 have it, I'm sure.
47
48 MS. MILLS: Oh, yes.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And they'll go back to

1 it. Otherwise we're going to have -- that's going to
2 be our whole.....

3

4 MS. MILLS: They could look it up, yes.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:annual report,
7 but if we just quote that paragraph and where it's from
8 and who made it.

9

10 MS. MILLS: And Valerie Davidson is one
11 of the people also on this commission and she is from
12 Alaska and she's the governor's commissioner for Health
13 and Social Services.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think just letting
16 them have that quote from them isn't going to hurt a
17 thing. Anything else to include in our annual report.

18

19

20 MR. OPHEIM: I didn't hear if you had
21 said climate change already.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We haven't put
24 anything in our annual report.

25

26 MR. OPHEIM: We've heard them even
27 suggest that seasons are not happening like they should
28 because of the warmer temperatures.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just to comment on the
31 fact that climate change can be affecting seasons and
32 bag limits. Okay. If we have no further things we'd
33 like to put in the annual report and if everybody is in
34 agreement that these are good things to put in, we can
35 just go on from here, right, Donald. Because this is
36 not an action item, this is just a direction to you.

37

38 MR. MIKE: Yes, that is correct. If
39 it's the wish of the Council, I can develop the annual
40 report, draft it up and send it to all the Council
41 members for their review and then we can just go
42 forward with that unless you want to review that at the
43 winter meeting. To speed up the process, I'd like to
44 have the Council members review it and approve it and
45 that way we can just go ahead and submit it to the
46 Board.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes. Okay. Judy.

49

50 MS. CAMINER: Well, I'll just mention

1 that the response to our last year's annual report 2014
2 I thought, whoever the author was, had a much more
3 positive attitude in responding to our requests and I
4 really appreciated that perspective.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I thought so too.
7 Thank you, Mary Ann, for reading that children's
8 violence thing. That was the next thing on my agenda.
9 So by including that in our annual report, that covers
10 that. We have ADF&G on our agenda, but I don't see any
11 ADF&G. Donald.

12
13 MR. MIKE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.
14 The Alaska Department of Fish and Game sent out a
15 letter to the Regional Advisory Councils addressed to
16 Mr. Carl Johnson, our Regional Council Coordinator
17 Division Chief, and I provided a copy of the letter to
18 each one of the Council members and I placed it behind
19 your meeting materials in the supplemental materials.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

22
23 MR. MIKE: In a nutshell, the Board is
24 requesting each Council to select one individual to
25 participate throughout the process -- I'm sorry, this
26 is the Board of Game Committee on Dall Sheep Management
27 is establishing a working group to explore issues and
28 make recommendations concerning future Dall Sheep
29 management in Alaska including research aspects. The
30 Board Committee requests each Council to select one
31 individual to participate throughout the process. The
32 representative should be familiar with the Dall sheep
33 issues, be able to explore new ideas and concepts, have
34 a willingness to work towards solutions and have a
35 commitment to participate in two to three weekend-long
36 meetings this winter with potentially more meetings to
37 follow. The first meeting has been tentatively
38 scheduled for December 5 and 6 in Anchorage.

39
40 So, Mr. Chair, this is the Council's
41 opportunity to select a participant from this Council
42 to sit on a working group on Dall sheep.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Did everybody
45 hear that? This Council has been invited to have a
46 member sit on the Dall Sheep Working Committee and they
47 should have knowledge of Dall sheep and come from an
48 area that has Dall sheep. That doesn't leave very many
49 of us. Cooper Landing has Dall sheep. There's a
50 pretty big commitment involved in it. I'd like to know

1 what Lee thinks of the whole thing.
2
3 MR. ADLER: Well, if it was one
4 weekend, I think I could do it, but two or three trips
5 in the winter I don't know if I'd want to go that many
6 times, but I could go to the first one on December 5th
7 if I'm not somewhere else.
8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria and Eleanor
10 both live where there's Dall sheep.
11
12 MS. DEMENTI: Yeah, but there's hardly
13 any around the area.
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There's hardly any
16 left there.
17
18 MS. DEMENTI: Yeah. I ate them all.
19
20 (Laughter)
21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Boy, remind me to come
23 to your house to eat.
24
25 MS. DEMENTI: No, we haven't seen any
26 lately. I decline.
27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You decline?
29
30 MS. DEMENTI: Yes.
31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.
33
34 MS. STICKWAN: I could take his place
35 if he doesn't -- can't go, I could go.
36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As an alternate?
38
39 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah.
40
41 MR. ADLER: I'll go to the first one
42 and if I'm excited enough, I might go again, but we'll
43 see.
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think between you
46 and Gloria that would be our only choices for people
47 with knowledge of Dall sheep and having dealt with it.
48 You have the ability to drop out and ask us to appoint
49 somebody else. If you're willing to go, we'll appoint
50 you.

1 MR. ADLER: Okay.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we need a motion to
4 that effect.
5
6 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I so move.
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved.....
9
10 MS. CAMINER: Second.
11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:to appoint Lee
13 Adler as our representative to the Board of Game's Dall
14 Sheep Working Committee. It's been moved and seconded.
15 All in favor.
16
17 IN UNISON: Aye.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed.
20
21 (No opposing votes)
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're it.
24
25 MS. CAMINER: Thank you.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you for going
28 for us. I know that you can take some information
29 about Dall sheep to them from long experience that
30 would be good for them to have.
31
32 MR. ADLER: I'd probably have something
33 to say.
34
35 (Laughter)
36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, you probably
38 would have something to say.
39
40 MR. MIKE: So, Mr. Chair, does this
41 mean that Gloria will sit as an alternate or it's
42 just.....
43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria will sit as an
45 alternate. That was correct, wasn't it, Gloria?
46
47 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.
48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now, with that,
50 do we have another thing that needs to go right here or

1 can we go on to agency reports.

2

3 MR. MIKE: Agency reports.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Agency reports, okay.
6 At this point in time the Native Village of Eyak would
7 be next. This is a synopsis of the Copper River salmon
8 information that you gathered this summer.

9

10 MR. PICHE: Correct. Hi. My name is
11 Matt Piche. I am the Partners fish biologist and the
12 natural resources coordinator for the Native Village of
13 Eyak in Cordova. I'm here today to present our
14 fisheries results for our 2015 research. Also I'd just
15 like to mention that my position, me being able to be
16 here today and all this data that I'm presenting, is
17 made possible because of the Partners for Fisheries
18 Monitoring Program and the Fisheries Resource
19 Monitoring Program through U.S. Fish and Wildlife
20 Service. Without these programs none of this data
21 would be able to be collected and I wouldn't be here
22 today.

23

24 So our longest running project, the
25 Copper River chinook salmon escapement monitoring
26 program, began with a two-year feasibility study in
27 2001 and since 2003 has provided accurate and
28 defensible in-river chinook abundance past the
29 commercial fisheries. Since 2003 this data has been
30 used by ADF&G to determine if the annual system-wide
31 sustainable escapement goal of 24,000 or more chinook
32 salmon was met. This project has been forward-funded
33 through 2017 by the FRMP.

34

35 We had a very successful season and an
36 excellent, hard-working field crew this year. The
37 river somewhat behaved compared to the past few years.
38 Roughly 2,600 chinook salmon were tagged at Baird
39 Canyon and over 2,100 were captured at Canyon Creek.
40 At this time I still have data QC checks and an
41 analysis to complete and, therefore, cannot present a
42 preliminary number, but I can present a preliminary
43 range of where we expect that number to be.

44

45 In 2015, we expect between 32,000 and
46 40,000 chinook salmon migrated past the commercial
47 fisheries and into the lower Copper River. This value
48 does not include upriver harvest, which has a five-year
49 average of 4,800 chinook salmon and a 10-year average
50 of 7,500 chinook salmon.

1 So how does this range stack up against
2 previous years. 32,000 to 40,000 fish will put us at
3 or near the 10-year average. This is excellent news
4 because last year we failed to meet the escapement goal
5 after the in-river take was applied to the abundance
6 value. So we expect it to be quite high and close to
7 that 10-year average, which we're very happy about.

8
9 In addition, NVE this year concluded
10 its multi-year feasibility study on the suitability of
11 streambed RFID readers. So basically by using an
12 antenna mounted in the Gulkana River streambed each one
13 of our tagged chinook salmon that passed over that
14 antenna ray could be detected. This provided data on
15 run timing and migration timing.

16
17 The feasibility study successfully
18 tested the detection efficiency and durability of the
19 system. As antenna rays continue to advance and
20 improve the detection range and the durability of these
21 systems, they should become more suitable for
22 deployment into the major glacial tributaries of the
23 Copper River. NVE plans on continuing studies using
24 similar technology and we feel this technology offers
25 the most promising avenue for affordable long-term
26 monitoring of distribution between spawning tributaries
27 in the Copper River system.

28
29 Within the next 10 to 20 years we would
30 like to have this technology installed in every major
31 Copper River tributary resulting in the first
32 individual stock management of Copper River salmon.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

37
38 MR. PICHE: Any questions.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Out of the 2,600
41 captured and released king salmon how many did you put
42 radio tags in?

43
44 MR. PICHE: So we used external TBA
45 tags, the RFID tags. Every single chinook that we
46 capture at our Baird Canyon camp gets tagged. The only
47 reason it wouldn't get tagged is if we get a fish
48 that's injured or has a big seal bite or we don't think
49 it can handle the tagging process, we just immediately
50 let that go. Generally that's less than 50 fish a

1 year. This year I think it was probably closer to 10
2 to 20 fish that we actually just released without
3 tagging, but all the 2,600 that we captured that
4 physically look okay we tag.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So do you feel the
7 streambed monitor in the Gulkana River read all of the
8 ones that went up to Gulkana?

9
10 MR. PICHE: Good question and, no, I
11 don't. So for this feasibility study we picked the
12 Gulkana River not because it has the largest, most
13 impressive run or because there's a data gap, we picked
14 it because you can see in the water. So what we wanted
15 to look at was our visual tag detection versus
16 detection of the actual reader and the durability of
17 the system. We weren't actually trying to get a full
18 dataset out of this. This was just kind of a
19 preliminary feasibility study.

20
21 So as you can see in the picture in the
22 middle all the way to the bottom the antenna ray
23 doesn't extend across the entire river. It's only a
24 partial coverage. This is actually located on the
25 island immediately above the ADF&G counting towers. So
26 there's actually another channel on the other side of
27 the island as well that was not covered. Having this
28 placement met the scope of our project and it answered
29 all the questions we needed to answer, but we didn't
30 have full coverage of the river. So, no, it did not
31 collect every chinook that passed over.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any other
34 RFID readers that those salmon go through, antennas on
35 the bridge or anything like that?

36
37 MR. PICHE: We do not. Not at this
38 time. So this is one of those kind of really exciting
39 things that technology is starting to advance quite
40 quickly and that's one of the avenues we're thinking
41 about taking is bridge installments and whatnot. The
42 durability of these systems kind of has to catch up.
43 As the technology increases, the detection range
44 hopefully will increase. So then we can maybe just
45 mount readers to bridge pilings and whatnot, which
46 would drastically reduce the cost of these systems.

47
48 So that's kind of why we had that big
49 10 to 20-year plan. We're not sure how long it's going
50 to take for the technology to get there, but at this

1 stage of the game we're ahead of the game and we're
2 really keeping up with this technology and as soon as
3 it's there we're going to be looking to get these
4 installed.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: One other question.
7 Does the RFID reader only transmit signals through
8 water or does it go through the water and into the air?

9
10 MR. PICHE: Right now the detection
11 range wouldn't allow it to go through the water column
12 and into the air. It's a matter of feet. But if that
13 detection range improved, then it could theoretically
14 allow that.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what my
17 question was. Thank you. Any other questions.

18
19 MR. ADLER: I probably missed it, but
20 how many king salmon actually go up the Gulkana out of
21 the 40,000?

22
23 MR. PICHE: I'm not sure where the
24 40,000 number came from.

25
26 MR. ADLER: I thought you said
27 approximately 40,000 entered the Copper.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, a range.

30
31 MR. ADLER: 32 to 40.

32
33 MR. PICHE: Oh, 32 to 40. Oh, so what
34 percentage of those do we think are going up the
35 Gulkana? Is that what you're asking?

36
37 MR. ADLER: Yes. What percentage of
38 those and what number approximately go up the Gulkana?

39
40 MR. PICHE: So because we don't have
41 full coverage of the stream and this was just a
42 feasibility study to see if the thing lasted.....

43
44 MR. ADLER: You don't extrapolate.

45
46 MR. PICHE:we haven't figured
47 that out. You know, we're not ready to extrapolate at
48 this time.

49
50 MR. ADLER: How many are you counting?

1 MR. PICHE: We've been getting anywhere
2 between 30 and 60 detections each season. Now remember
3 we're only tagging a portion of the fish migrating
4 through the river. So out of the 30 to 40,000 fish
5 that migrated through we only tagged 2,600 of them. So
6 it's all relative.

7
8 But where the promise for using this in
9 the whole system is is that if you can get these
10 readers into major tributaries, you get them into the
11 Klutina, you get them in the Gulkana, you start
12 covering all these tributaries, you immediately have
13 distribution data. Then, once you have the whole
14 tributary covered, you know that, okay, this year 12
15 percent of the run went up the Gulkana, 14 percent went
16 up the Klutina and you can start to track those changes
17 from a year-to-year basis and start managing on an
18 individual stock basis. Again, we're probably 10 to 20
19 years out on something like that.

20
21 MR. ADLER: Some go up the Tazlina,
22 some go up the Slana.

23
24 MR. PICHE: Exactly, exactly. So, you
25 know, it's -- we're heading in the right direction. At
26 NVE we're constantly trying to improve our knowledge
27 base for the Copper River salmon.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the count of the
30 fish that go up the Gulkana, that's done by the Alaska
31 Department of Fish and Game at the counting towers if I
32 remember right.

33
34 MR. PICHE: That's correct.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that number will be
37 available, but it's not available from the Native
38 Village of Eyak.

39
40 MR. PICHE: Correct.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

43
44 MS. STICKWAN: Can we get a copy of
45 your final report.

46
47 MR. PICHE: You certainly can. Our
48 final report is due to the office of subsistence
49 management in April, so we usually finish up that
50 report January, February. At that time, once we

1 finalize it, I can send it off to the RAC Council,
2 certainly.

3

4 MS. STICKWAN: You can send it to
5 Donald Mike and Donald would give it to us or.....

6

7 MR. PICHE: Yeah, I can do that.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Thank you. Any
10 other questions.

11

12 Mike.

13

14 MR. OPHEIM: One of the things we
15 talked about a little bit earlier in the meeting was
16 the fish coming back small. Was that something that
17 you noticed in your season this year?

18

19 MR. PICHE: Again, we're still cranking
20 through the data, so I don't have the full dataset
21 complete to compare the year to year sizes, but just
22 general experience from me being out there this summer
23 we didn't -- there wasn't any obvious detection of the
24 smaller fish in our fishwheels that we noticed. Again,
25 this is speculation. I would actually have to go
26 through and perform the data analysis to do that and
27 that's something I can easily perform once we have the
28 dataset finalized and I can send that off to you or off
29 to Donald and he can distribute it.

30

31 MR. OPHEIM: All right. Thanks. It
32 will probably take more years' data to find something
33 like that too.

34

35 MR. PICHE: Well, we actually have data
36 -- we have size dating all the way back to 2001, so we
37 have 15 years worth of size data. So I can certainly
38 provide that if that's something you would like to see.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That would be an
41 interesting piece of data to have.

42

43 MR. PICHE: One other thing. There was
44 a lot of concern this year over the hatchery chinook
45 salmon that were being captured in the commercial
46 fishery out on the flats. ADF&G they do sampling at
47 the canneries and they're detecting quite a few
48 hatchery fish out in front of the Copper River this
49 year. Because of that, and always Native Village of
50 Eyak on our fishwheels, we look for hatchery fish.

1 We're looking for those adipose clips, we're looking
2 for marks. Fortunately this year we did not see a
3 single one of those hatchery fish. So it looks like
4 they're not -- or it appears as if they're not entering
5 the river. Instead they're just traveling along the
6 coast and feeding and some of them are getting
7 intercepted by the fleet.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Andy.

10

11 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Just curious what
12 hatchery that is, that you assume those are.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Vancouver, Berkeley
15 Sound.

16

17 MR. PICHE: I'm not sure. I would
18 imagine ADF&G will probably publish those results. I
19 think they're certainly probably looking into that.

20

21 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Do they check code?

22

23 MR. PICHE: Yeah, I'm not sure exactly
24 if the hatcheries are using coded wire tags or anything
25 like that. If you were to call the Cordova ADF&G
26 office.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

29

30 MR. PICHE: Thank you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We now go all
33 the way to the Chugach National Forest Plan by Milo.

34

35 MR. BURCHAM: Milo Burcham, Chugach
36 National Forest. The word plan I think was left in
37 there from a previous agenda. This isn't about the
38 Chugach National Forest Plan, it's just an agency
39 report. Given how late we are in the meeting, I'm
40 going to keep this really short. I had at the front
41 table and Donald is passing it out now and I've given
42 him a copy for the record, just a quick subsistence
43 summary from the Chugach Forest and you guys can have
44 this for a little bit more detail.

45

46 Basically I'll just take this
47 opportunity to introduce David Pearson, who I
48 introduced earlier. He'll be Kenai subsistence
49 representative for the Chugach Forest and we'll be able
50 to work closely with the communities of Hope and Cooper

1 Landing, issue permits, get involved in monitoring
2 projects if they're funded and also come over to the
3 Cordova District to help with monitoring efforts like
4 deer transects and things like that. So, anyway, it's
5 great to have him here.

6
7 And we're continuing to fund monitoring
8 efforts with Alaska Department of Fish and Game. We're
9 contributing to the surveys of moose, mountain goats
10 and caribou on the Chugach. We have a cost share
11 agreement with Fish and Game. We're also drafting a
12 study plan to look at black bears in Prince William
13 Sound like I said earlier.

14
15 Then just in a nutshell, the deer herd
16 is continuing to increase as measured by deer pellet
17 transects that we do with Alaska Department of Fish and
18 Game. We may not be out of the woods yet. It's a
19 relative pellet density estimate that comes from these.
20 It doesn't tell you how many deer are out there. It
21 still shows it's below the pre-big winter estimates.
22 Anyway, it's rebounding nicely and we've had perfect
23 conditions for it.

24
25 The other big subsistence hunt we have
26 in Cordova is Unit 6C moose and that population is at
27 an all-time high, over 600 animals. We're giving out
28 71 subsistence permits through a random drawing. Over
29 1,000 people put in. It was the most we'd ever had put
30 in for that drawing. Anyway, there's nearly 100
31 percent success on that hunt and that situation is
32 going real well right now.

33
34 So real quickly, for Cordova, the only
35 other thing I'll talk about is the freshwater fishing
36 permits. We issued over 100 of them this year. That's
37 also a record number of these freshwater fishing
38 permits and they're not for the Copper River. They're
39 for freshwater systems on the Copper River delta.
40 Mostly coho are caught in that fishery and this year's
41 results are not in yet, but it's the most permits we've
42 issued and it was a big coho run this year. And I just
43 told you about the moose permits.

44
45 So, with that, I'll pass it to David
46 just to report on the Kenai subsistence activities.

47
48 MR. PEARSON: David Pearson, Chugach
49 National Forest. For Cooper Landing we issued 87
50 dipnet permit, 18 moose permits and 14 caribou permits.

1 They caught two moose in the Federal season. For Hope,
2 we issued 32 Russian River dipnet permits, 15 moose
3 permits and 12 caribou permits and they caught one
4 caribou. Total fish, as discussed earlier in the
5 Russian River dipnet was 1,515 and that number is going
6 to climb.

7

8 Thank you for having me.

9

10 MR. BURCHAM: That's all. We'll keep
11 it short. Any questions.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you muchly and
14 thank you for all your help on the other things that we
15 had.

16

17 MR. BURCHAM: And I'll say it, as some
18 of the others have, it's been a pleasure working with
19 you for 14 years on this Council, Ralph, and I know
20 I'll see you outside of this. Anyway, thanks for your
21 contribution.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're welcome. Okay.
24 Next we have National Park Service, Wrangell-St. Elias
25 National Park, Barbara, and you're taking her place?

26

27 MS. MCCORMICK: I think we're the last
28 ones standing here.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, I think there's
31 still some BLM after you.

32

33 MS. MCCORMICK: From the Park Service.
34 Mr. Chairman and members of the Council, my name is
35 Molly McCormick. I'm a fisheries biologist at
36 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. I'm going to present
37 what Barbara would be presenting, then a fish report
38 and then there is actually some data that Judy Putera,
39 our wildlife biologist, has put in the packet. You
40 should have a handout that has a pink page in the front
41 and a blue page on the back and that's what I'm going
42 to be talking about. And then Nyssa Landres will say a
43 bit about our Backcountry and Wilderness Stewardship
44 Plan.

45

46 Forgive me because I might not be
47 really good at interpreting some of this because I
48 wasn't really prepared to be talking about it, but as
49 far as Barbara's report goes, which is the pink page
50 you have in the front, she's got a report on the

1 Chisana Caribou Herd harvest. I'm not going to go into
2 a lot of detail about this hunt because I think you
3 guys probably know about it already, it's history.
4 It's only been going since 2012. It looks like in 2015,
5 this current year, there were 18 permits available, 11
6 of those permits have been issued and as of right now
7 no animals have been harvested out of that hunt.

8

9 The harvest assessments in Park-
10 affiliated communities. We are in cooperation with
11 ADF&G. We're working on projects to provide updated
12 information about harvests. Several of them have
13 already been done and they are available electronically
14 from the ADF&G website that's listed on the top of page
15 2 in Barbara's report. Right now the Park is working
16 with ADF&G to conduct this same survey in the Upper
17 Tanana community of Northway. It should be available
18 in 2016.

19

20 The Yakutat Tlingit Ethnographic
21 Overview and Assessment. This was conducted by
22 researchers from Portland State University in
23 cooperation with the NPS staff. I believe this
24 happened this summer, maybe last summer, and this
25 information will be provided in a final report that
26 looks like it already is available on the National Park
27 Service web page.

28

29 We did add some new interviews to the
30 Wrangell-St. Elias Project Jukebox. These new
31 interviews have come from the Upper Tanana region,
32 including Healy Lake, Dot Lake, Tanacross, Tok, Tetlin
33 and Northway. Again, this interview collection can be
34 accessed online. There's a website provided for that.

35

36 Federal subsistence hunting permits.
37 During the fall of 2015 our staff issued 213 Federal
38 registration permits for caribou, goat, moose and sheep
39 in Units 11 and 12. Then there's a table on the
40 following page summarizing permit numbers for these
41 units.

42

43 Unless you really would like me to, I'm
44 not going to read out the entire table. I don't know
45 if you have any questions on Barbara's report. I may
46 or may not be able to answer them.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions from any
49 of the Council members.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none.

4

5 MS. MCCORMICK: Thank you, Mr.

6 Chairman. Okay. So now the fisheries report, which I
7 know a little bit more about. We had projects going on
8 at two different weirs in the Park, at the Tanada Creek
9 weir and the Long Lake weir. Both of these projects
10 are funded by OSM, the Fisheries Program at OSM. We
11 just finished up year two of four-year funding for both
12 of these projects.

13

14 At Tanada Creek, it was really dry this
15 summer, so the creek itself was totally dry for about
16 six weeks at the early part of the season. The first
17 fish that we saw was around the middle of July towards
18 the end of the middle of July, which is about maybe
19 four weeks later than we would normally see the first
20 fish going through that weir. Occasionally this creek
21 floods. This year it didn't. It was just dry all
22 summer long.

23

24 We did count 9,271 sockeye going up
25 Tanada Creek. There were no chinook that we counted
26 this year. It's usually a fairly low number of
27 chinook. Possibly we had none this year just because
28 it was dry at the early part of the season and they
29 couldn't get up the creek. Possibly we had none
30 because there weren't going to be any anyway. We don't
31 have any way to know that.

32

33 At the Long Lake weir, we've counted
34 9,701 sockeye and 120 coho that had come through by the
35 time we took the weir down. This is a late run and we
36 usually don't see fish showing up there until maybe
37 very late July or early August. These fish continue to
38 run into September and sometimes into October. There
39 were just a few coming through when we took the weir
40 down on October 12th, I believe the day was that we
41 took the weir down.

42

43 Then I've got a few pictures. We do
44 collect otoliths for aging both in Tanada Lake and in
45 Long Lake and I've got some pictures of otolith
46 collection if you're interested in looking at those.
47 We collect them from carcasses, so we go around the
48 lake and get whatever carcasses we can find and then
49 take the otoliths out of them and then we send those
50 otoliths to the commercial fisheries down in Cordova

1 for aging.

2

3 There's some data from the Miles Lake
4 sonar. It was a record year for sockeye coming up past
5 the Miles Lake sonar; 1,341,545 fish were counted
6 through that sonar.

7

8 Another project that we have been kind
9 of doing off and on for the last several years is
10 looking at burbot in Grizzly Lake. We started with a
11 burbot population assessment back in 2011. Within a
12 couple of years after we did that assessment it was a
13 lake that had a very high number of burbot. Word got
14 out somehow and then we actually heard reports of a lot
15 of people going up and fishing burbot in that lake. So
16 we went back again in 2014 and then again in 2015 to
17 look at the numbers of burbot that are in that lake.

18

19 I did want to let you know that because
20 of that, because of the work that we've been doing
21 there, we have some conservation concerns about the
22 burbot population in Grizzly Lake and we have put in a
23 proposal to the Alaska Board of Fish. What the
24 proposal is asking is to prohibit the use of set lines
25 for sport fishing in Grizzly Lake and in Jack Lake,
26 which is a lake that is very close to Grizzly Lake. So
27 that will go before the Board of Fish in January, that
28 proposal will.

29

30 Those lakes are in the Tanana drainage,
31 so they're not in the Copper River drainage, so they
32 aren't really something in Southcentral, so they won't
33 come up before the Board of Fish that includes the
34 Southcentral area, but they will come up before the
35 Board of Fish that includes the Arctic drainage and
36 Yukon drainage.

37

38 Continuing on with my report. So we
39 have been kind of doing a subsistence contaminant
40 analysis for four lakes in the Park. These were
41 Tanada, Copper, Summit and Grizzly Lakes. This is
42 Summit Lake in the Tebay drainage, not the Summit Lake
43 that's up the road. We almost have all the final
44 results in. We did put out a consumption guide when we
45 first started seeing that there might be contaminant
46 issues in some of the lakes in the Park. I did do an
47 updated version, which is the very last page of the
48 fisheries report.

49

50 In this updated version, we had added

1 burbot, a couple of different sizes, to the consumption
2 guide that you should be aware that maybe you shouldn't
3 be eating quite as many. These are only in Tanada Lake.
4 That's the only lake that we actually found problems
5 with mercury in long-lived large fish. So both in lake
6 trout and in burbot in that lake.

7

8 I think that's kind of it for the
9 fisheries report. Then the only other thing that it
10 looks like you have in the handout was some information
11 from Judy and I'm not going to try to explain any of
12 this because I would not do a good job about doing so.
13 It looks like she's giving some information on Unit 12
14 Dall sheep and then also Dall sheep on Tumergan (ph)
15 Lake and Nikonda Creek, Cross Creek and then some
16 Chisana Caribou Herd population trends on the very
17 back.

18

19 That's all I have.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

22

23 MS. LANDRES: Nyssa Landres, National
24 Park Service. I'm here today to talk a little bit
25 about the Backcountry and Wilderness Stewardship Plan
26 that the Park is undertaking. I'm going to be super
27 brief because of the time. There's a handout in your
28 guys's packet on Page 255 that has more information on
29 the plan. It is going to cover all of the designated
30 wilderness in the Park, so about 9.5 million acres as
31 well as some large, inaccessible areas, backcountry
32 areas, about 1.5 million acres of those.

33

34 It's not a wilderness study. It's not
35 going to address acres of eligible wilderness or
36 anything like that. We are currently in the initial
37 stages of the plan with public scoping, so there's
38 going to be a lot more opportunities for public comment
39 to come. So we're in the public scoping right now and
40 then there will be three more major opportunities for
41 public comment when we release the proposed action, the
42 draft alternatives as well as the draft plan, whether
43 it's MEA or an EIS.

44

45 So we've been holding public meetings
46 and that will be wrapping up soon.

47

48 Thank you very much for your time.

49

50 Any questions.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
2 questions.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The information is in
7 our book.
8
9 MS. LANDRES: Yes.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you muchly.
12 Okay. With that, we have something about Subsistence
13 Resource Commission membership. Was there somebody to
14 speak to that?
15
16 MS. CAMINER: We did it.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was that one.
19
20 MR. SUMMERS: We covered it. You're
21 current with Wrangell. It's Gloria. You've got a
22 great situation. A member on the Wrangells and a
23 member on Denali.
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you
26 muchly. Okay, BLM.
27
28 MR. TEITZEL: Good afternoon. Dennis
29 Teitzel, field manager, Glennallen Field Office. You
30 should have been handed a handout. Our harvest this
31 year on the moose, we issued 1,330 permits, 635 hunters
32 attempted to hunt with 85 successful hunters. One down
33 from last year, but up from our yearly average. That's
34 about a 13.4 percent success rate on the moose harvest
35 this year.
36
37 Caribou. It's been a good year. 2,941
38 permits issues, 623 attempted so far that have been
39 reported. We won't have that final number until April.
40 Bulls harvested so far 407, cows harvested 136. We
41 also have four that were reported as harvested, they
42 just didn't select cow or bull, so we have a total of
43 547 that were harvested so far this year. So a very
44 good year so far.
45
46 We are still within the -- it's not the
47 highest year in the last 10 years. 2007 was actually a
48 higher year so far. We'll probably exceed it depending
49 upon what the winter hunt is like. Total permits we've
50 issued so far this year 4,271. That was as of

1 yesterday. There were people in this morning pulling
2 permits still. We'll get another run of permits after
3 the first of the year. We typically do.

4
5 Sara, our wildlife biologist, left last
6 May. We have hired a new one. He's due to report here
7 the 1st of December, so he'll be here on board soon and
8 be here for the next meeting. We'll start to break him
9 in and get him used to life in Alaska.

10
11 That is all I have. Any questions.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I just have one
14 question. The winter season so far, did ADF&G come up
15 with a request that we limit that to cows only yet at
16 this time or have they not?

17
18 MR. TEITZEL: Actually, no, they
19 haven't. Frank, the local biologist, and I, we spoke
20 last week and they actually ended up increasing their
21 quota by 300 cows and 300 bulls each, so they were not
22 going to ask us to limit our hunt this year. They said
23 the herd started at a size of about 48,000 this year.
24 Even the initial proposed take was only 2,600 and their
25 objective is 40,000, so there's still plenty of room.

26
27 The one concern he did have of an
28 overtake of bulls because we do have such a high bull
29 take it still isn't enough to be a major concern yet to
30 limit even just taking cows only.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So now did the State
33 say anything about having their winter season?

34
35 MR. TEITZEL: It's open.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It is open.

38
39 MR. TEITZEL: They're going to keep it
40 open. Like I said, they increased their quota by 300
41 cows and 300 bulls for the winter season.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And there was
44 no request for us to limit ours.

45
46 MR. TEITZEL: No, and I don't
47 anticipate one in all my conversations with him.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

50

1 Gloria.

2

3 MS. STICKWAN: I was looking at this
4 number of cows for caribou and bulls. Do you have any
5 idea how many were harvested from the area they're
6 talking about as dangerous?

7

8 MR. TEITZEL: You know, I don't have
9 that specific data yet. We could pull that and look at
10 that. Anecdotally, having been up there and seen and
11 understanding how the migration went, I don't believe
12 that that was a high percentage of the harvest because
13 they were up there for a few days and everything moved
14 south down south of Meyers Lake in the Haggard Creek
15 area shortly after that and I believe that's probably
16 where a bulk of that late run take came from. That's
17 just anecdotally and where we got reports where hunters
18 were and things like that. There were a few up there
19 on the north end, but most of them once they came south
20 most people didn't go north. They stayed on the south
21 end and hunted.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I saw the
24 last three days that I was up there. Very few people
25 went past the north end of Meyers Lake or past that
26 first place where you run into non-Federal land and
27 then they turned around. There seemed to be a fair
28 amount of caribou. The biggest bunch of caribou I saw
29 taken was by a boat on Paxson Lake.

30

31 MR. TEITZEL: Right.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that seemed to
34 be.....

35

36 MR. TEITZEL: And there were quite a
37 few taken on Paxson Lake and then even at the south end
38 up along the pipeline at the south end of Paxson Lake.
39 There were quite a few taken there also.

40

41 MS. STICKWAN: Can we get that
42 information later?

43

44 MR. TEITZEL: We can, yes. We can get
45 that and we'll get that to you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
48 questions.

49

50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

2

3 MR. TEITZEL: Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: OSM.

6

7 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. Members of the
8 Council. I will try to be really brief. It's 6:00
9 o'clock and I know everybody wants to be done and
10 you've got more things on your agenda.

11

12 The written OSM report begins on Page
13 257. There's three pages there. Again, I'm not going
14 to go through that given the time. Everybody can look
15 at it.

16

17 I would like to touch on some other
18 things though. I'm sure that people here heard about
19 this, but following the fisheries cycle we received
20 more than 700 requests for reconsideration. Ms.
21 Caminer is flinching a little bit because she knows.
22 Basically requests for reconsideration, the
23 abbreviation is RFR, so if you hear RFR, that's what
24 we're talking about.

25

26 Basically there were requests for
27 reconsideration for Kenai, Kasilof and Makhnati Island
28 down in Southeast Alaska. Again, no decision has been
29 made on any of these yet. The Anthropology Division
30 staff at OSM are working through all of them. The
31 intent is to basically -- there will be an assessment
32 based on the claims that were made for the Kenai, there
33 will be a separate assessment made for the claims on
34 the Kasilof and there will be a separate assessment
35 made for the claims of Makhnati. We're not going to do
36 more than 700 analyses. There will be three analyses
37 for all those.

38

39 The Anthropology Division staff are
40 working through that right now. Given the volume, we
41 don't know when they're going to be done, but they're
42 working on it.

43

44 The other thing I wanted to touch on
45 again real briefly, we talked about it earlier, is the
46 rural process. Basically the information I wanted to
47 make sure people saw is on Page 12, the second
48 paragraph, and again people can read it. I'm not going
49 to go over it again. There are documents in
50 Washington, D.C. in the Secretary's Office right now

1 and we are expecting a decision probably in the next
2 week.

3
4 The OSM staff and the Staff Committee
5 are going to be working together to kind of develop a
6 plan for where we go from here. They're going to talk
7 to the Board about it in January. Again, we don't know
8 for sure. It probably won't be at the winter meeting,
9 but probably next fall would be my guess from what I'm
10 hearing. They'll come back and we'll be asking for all
11 10 Councils to weigh in to provide their
12 recommendations on. So all the Councils will get a
13 chance to weight in again.

14
15 Again, those are the issues I just
16 wanted to make sure that we talked to you about.

17
18 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

21
22 MR. KRON: And thank you for your years
23 of service.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy has a question to
26 ask you.

27
28 MR. KRON: Okay.

29
30 MS. CAMINER: Going back to the request
31 for reconsideration, just for clarification to this
32 Council, when you say the Kasilof and the Kenai, you
33 mean that the Board approved a net.

34
35 MR. KRON: Right. These were actions
36 that the Board approved and then under regulations
37 people can submit a request for reconsideration if
38 there's new information or they think that things
39 weren't analyzed correctly, but there's a set of
40 criteria. Again, we've got a lot of people who have
41 submitted requests for reconsideration of those
42 decisions.

43
44 MS. CAMINER: Again, just to follow up.
45 So there are three criteria and it doesn't mean at that
46 meeting that the Board will re-tool the existing
47 regulations. It means they need to -- and I hope
48 people will keep them focused on this at the meeting,
49 only look at those three criteria. If they decide to
50 accept any requests for reconsideration, then there's

1 the possibility of remaking the regulation.

2

3 MR. KRON: Absolutely correct. I know
4 that you were involved in a number of these kinds of
5 decisions at the Board level. Again, thank you.
6 Appreciate that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

9

10 Thank you for your patience with us.

11

12 Okay. Future meeting dates.

13

14 Winter 2016 all-Council meeting update.
15 That's on Page 260 and Donald will give us a little
16 update on that.

17

18 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If
19 you turn to Page 260 and 261. The all-Council meeting
20 is tentatively scheduled for March 7th to 11th, 2016 in
21 Anchorage. The meeting venue, I think we're still
22 working on the meeting venue right now. Once that is
23 finalized that will be announced.

24

25 So if you look at the March 7th, 2015,
26 that's the joint session of all the Council meetings
27 and that will be held. On it we identified keynote
28 speakers and we're still working on the keynote
29 speakers. If you look at the concurrent section, that
30 is where each Council will meet in separate rooms to
31 address the specific Regional Advisory Council meeting
32 topics.

33

34 Throughout the week we'll have training
35 that includes Title VIII of ANILCA, Robert's Rules,
36 Federal Indian law, cross-cultural communication, C&T
37 vs. 804 and regulatory process with the State and
38 Federal. Also we'll have concurrent sessions of
39 reports and panels. You'll see on the bottom of Page
40 260 all the various issues that will be brought forward
41 to the all-Council meeting. If you turn to Page 261,
42 that's the meeting agenda for the joint session on the
43 first day of the meeting.

44

45 That's all I have on the update, Mr.
46 Chair. This meeting in March will serve as the winter
47 meeting for all 10 regions in the state. Thank you,
48 Mr. Chair.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Now we

1 need to set a date for -- we don't need to set a date
2 for the winter meeting.....

3

4 MR. MIKE: Right.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:because that's
7 been taken care of, but we do need to select a fall
8 meeting date and location. You'll find that on Page
9 265. The rest of the Council has to figure that one
10 out because I'm not going to be there.

11

12 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. I have an
13 updated fall meeting schedule if the Council wants to
14 take a minute to look at it and select their meeting
15 dates and location.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I guess I can look at
18 it too.

19

20 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. Maybe it
21 would be good to get some suggestions for locations.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody have any
24 suggestions for locations for the fall meeting. Any
25 place that people would have a preference for or
26 suggest that you go.

27

28 MS. CAMINER: My thought would be since
29 we once again had a -- I mean it seems like our focus
30 is really Copper River area as well as Kenai Peninsula,
31 so we did meet in Kenai last year. I don't know if
32 there's a meeting place in Soldotna, if that would be
33 okay.

34

35 MR. ADLER: That's fine.

36

37 MS. STICKWAN: We could have it before
38 the SRC meeting. The SRC meeting is scheduled maybe
39 the 19th or 20th, so before that.

40

41 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, Gloria.
42 Wouldn't it be good to have the SRC meeting first so
43 you can provide information?

44

45 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah. I'm a bit
46 confused. I'm just tired.

47

48 MS. CAMINER: Oh, okay. So you're
49 saying the 19th and 20th is your SRC meeting?

50

1 MS. STICKWAN: That's what they
2 tentatively scheduled it for.
3
4 MS. CAMINER: So I think Andy was
5 suggesting the following week then would not interfere
6 with AFN too.
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the suggestion at
9 this point in time then is following the AFN in
10 Fairbanks, so it would be sometime the week of October
11 24th through the 28th. Is that what you're thinking?
12
13 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's after caribou
16 season -- after early caribou season, right after the
17 late caribou season opens.
18
19 MR. ADLER: How about October 11th
20 through 14th.
21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You've got Bethel at
23 the same time, but that doesn't make any difference,
24 does it.
25
26 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. The SRC is
27 trying to meet the week of October 18th, prior to AFN,
28 is that correct?
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is it October 18th?
31
32 MS. STICKWAN: No. It's September 18th
33 and 19th, somewhere in that week.
34
35 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. Just for
36 clarity, again, we don't want to have more than one --
37 more than two Council meetings at the same time in a
38 given week, for example, so you've got lots of options
39 here. I think AFN people probably want to avoid that
40 time period, but the other dates -- if you want to
41 select dates over the top of another Council meeting,
42 you can still do that.
43
44 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.
47
48 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. I have a
49 conflict the 11th and 12th. My only comment about
50 later in October is road conditions, but I guess, you

1 know, we could have another late fall again too. I
2 would support the next to last week in October if that
3 works for most of the hunters.

4
5 MR. ADLER: How about October 3rd to
6 7th, that week? Better road conditions.

7
8 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, I'd rather have it
9 earlier in October than later.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Will somebody pick a
12 date. Make a motion.

13
14 MS. CAMINER: Okay. Well, Andy, how
15 does that look to you, 5th or 6th or 7th?

16
17 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, it's getting
18 close to the other personal leave that I use for my
19 hunting and closer to September, so there's a
20 possibility I can't make it, but I'll work with
21 whatever people want.

22
23 MS. CAMINER: Could I suggest October 5
24 and 6 because -- not that I think it will happen, but
25 there's always the fiscal year and will the government
26 be funded and give a few days breathing room there.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mike.

29
30 MR. OPHEIM: I kind of prefer towards
31 the end, the 24th to 28th. I'm usually closing out my
32 end of year in September. So staying away from that
33 area is always good. I just prefer the 24th to 28, I
34 guess.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Somebody make a
37 motion. You always can get voted down or get opened in
38 discussion. Anybody down at that end of the table have
39 some dates that they would like to pick.

40
41 MS. STICKWAN: I just said I'd like it
42 earlier in October because I don't like driving in the
43 snow and dark.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You'd prefer not to
46 have it in October.

47
48 MS. STICKWAN: Not the end of October.
49 There's too much snow to go through and it's a long way
50 to drive.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's true.
2
3 MS. CAMINER: What would the Council
4 think of the week of October 17th and then people can
5 still get to AFN in Fairbanks if they want to toward
6 the end of the week.
7
8 MS. MILLS: That would be good.
9
10 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Can we make a motion
11 for October 17th to -- or what would be better, 18th
12 and 19th?
13
14 MS. CAMINER: 18 and 19.
15
16 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I make a motion for
17 October 18 and 19.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Eleanor.
20
21 MS. DEMENTI: I would have to drive all
22 the way from Anchorage to Fairbanks and I don't like
23 that.
24
25 MS. MILLS: You know, I don't know what
26 our budget looks like, but for those who don't want to
27 drive you could always fly in to Kenai if that makes it
28 easier, but I don't know what our budget looks like.
29
30 MS. STICKWAN: She said she'd be
31 willing to fly if she could. Anchorage is kind of the
32 in-between point for Kenai and Copper River.
33
34 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: How about that motion
35 just include it be in Anchorage the 18th and 19th.
36
37 MS. MILLS: That's good.
38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we have a motion on
40 the table for October 18th and 19th in Anchorage. Do I
41 hear a second.
42
43 MR. ADLER: I'll second.
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
46 seconded the 18th and 19th in Anchorage. Discussion.
47 Does anybody have a conflict with that or a reason not
48 to do it.
49
50 (No comments)

1 MS. MILLS: I call for the question.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
4 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.
5
6 IN UNISON: Aye.
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
9 saying nay.
10
11 (No opposing votes)
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. At
14 this point in time we have an opportunity for closing
15 comments by anybody on the Council. Does anybody on
16 the Council have any closing comments.
17
18 MS. MILLS: Well, I would just like to
19 thank you again, Ralph, for everything you've done and
20 to let you know that you are always welcome. It's been
21 very educational for me being on this Council and I
22 want to thank you for your leadership. I learned a lot
23 from you and from all of the Council.
24
25 Thank you.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mary Ann.
28
29 MR. ADLER: Ralph, we have one more
30 gift for you. A hunting knife. That knife is 60 years
31 old.
32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I recognized that when
34 I saw that.
35
36 MR. ADLER: I made the sheath, but it's
37 a 60-year-old knife.
38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. A Marvel, is it
40 Marvel?
41
42 MR. ADLER: No, it's Western.
43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Western? Yep. They
45 don't make knives like this anymore. This has actually
46 got real carbon steel in it that sharpens. It's
47 interesting because I don't have one like this, but my
48 96-year-old friend that died a couple years ago gave me
49 one almost exactly like this to give to my kids. So
50 one of my kids has one of these, but I don't.

1 MR. ADLER: The only caveat is that you
2 use it and someday donate it to a younger hunter.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, it will get
5 donated to a younger hunter. I'll guarantee you that.

6
7 (Laughter)

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, this is -- yeah,
10 thank you much.

11
12 MR. ADLER: You can sharpen that. That
13 will sharpen.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, this sharpens.
16 These kind of knives sharpen when this other kind --
17 anyhow, let's not talk about how old-fashioned we are.
18 That's why I wear wool and that's why I want to thank
19 this Council for this shirt that I'm wearing. It's
20 probably the first new Pendleton shirt I've had in 15
21 years. But, you know something, a 15-year-old
22 Pendleton shirt still looks like almost the day that
23 you bought it unless you go out and tear the elbows
24 out, which I've done on a few of them.

25
26 But I do want to thank all of you. I
27 want to thank all of you for the comments, the support,
28 what I've learned from all of you, the opportunity
29 you've given me to learn and -- I don't know. It's
30 hard to quit this because this has been -- it's been 23
31 years and I have enjoyed and learned so much from this
32 that I hope some of the rest of you stay just as long
33 because there's so much to be gained that it's amazing.

34
35 Like I said, it's hard to quit because
36 there's still so much that needs to be done. I wish
37 you guys good meetings and good times with each other
38 and that you can all be a blessing to the community
39 around you because it's needed. And thanks for your
40 votes of confidence, thanks for your gifts and just
41 thanks. I'll never be the same after having done this.
42 I'll guarantee it.

43
44 (Applause)

45
46 MR. MIKE: Ralph, I really appreciate
47 and I admire and I look up to you for the years you've
48 served. It's been a pleasure working with you all
49 these years. I've made a lot of friends throughout my
50 lifetime and I'm still looking at you, Mr. Lohse. I'm

1 figuring he's got to have a Yup'ik name and it's still
2 waiting to come out and when it does, I promise you
3 I'll drive to Kenny Lake and christen you with a Yup'ik
4 name.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But then what will my
7 AHTNA friends say?

8
9 (Laughter)

10
11 MR. MIKE: Well, the AHTNA and the
12 Yup'ik, you know, we're brothers and sisters, so they
13 probably wouldn't mind.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's one of the
16 things that has come out of this. I feel like I have
17 gained some understanding, I've gained some -- I'll say
18 brothers and sisters, at least brothers and sisters in
19 attitudes as to what we like, what we use and how we
20 look at things should be taken care of and that.

21
22 I've transplanted some of that I hope
23 into my own children and I'm hoping that all of you
24 make it a priority to transplant that into your
25 children because the whole thing depends on the next
26 generation and the generation after that. It's pretty
27 tremendous what we have up here. I was born in
28 Michigan, raised in Wisconsin, Minnesota and Nebraska.
29 I came up here -- almost came up here in '64.

30
31 I put an application in to come and
32 teach school in '64 and I didn't hear from them and I
33 didn't hear from them and I didn't hear from them and
34 my dad was a schoolteacher and he said we have a
35 mission school in British Columbia that needs a
36 teacher, would you go there, so I said yes and I went
37 to British Columbia. Of course, I no sooner told them
38 that I would go to school in British Columbia then I
39 got a call from the Department of Education in Alaska
40 offering me a job and I had to tell them no because I'd
41 already committed.

42
43 They said what are they paying you and
44 I said \$180 a month and they said what? We can only
45 offer you \$6,100 for the season, for the year. At that
46 time my dad had been a teacher for 25 years, a little
47 bit over 25 years and he was making \$5,500 for the year
48 and they just offered me \$600 more than he was getting
49 and I said no. I said, well, if you ever need somebody
50 in the future, give me a call.

1 Well, I went to Canada, I taught school
2 for a year, I went prospecting, I almost bought a
3 trapline in Canada, but winter got -- I was living in a
4 tent. The snow got deep. I was working in a sawmill,
5 working on the Green Chain. If any of you have been on
6 the Green Chain, you know what I'm talking about. I
7 decided to go back to Minnesota.

8
9 I went back to Minnesota, went back to
10 3M, worked in the research department, but the tallest
11 place around was the Foshay Towers, which was a
12 building, and you could see half of Minnesota for that
13 and there was no mountains anyplace. So I made sure
14 and wrote to the State of Alaska and told them if you
15 need a teacher, let me know.

16
17 Well, I'm telling some stories here and
18 you don't have to stay for them. But come late August
19 I got a call from Alaska offering me a teaching job out
20 at Ivanof Bay on the Aleutian Peninsula. The problem
21 was they didn't have a school there and they didn't
22 have any books and they didn't have anything else, but
23 they needed somebody that would go out there and start
24 a school because a group of people from Perryville had
25 moved there and they had enough kids that at that time
26 Alaska was required to have a school for them.

27
28 Being the kind of person I am, I
29 thought that sounded pretty much like fun, so I said
30 yes. They gave me six days to tell 3M that I wasn't
31 working for them anymore, to pack my stuff and head for
32 Alaska. So four days later I'm on the train to Seattle.
33 I stop at Eddie Bauer and I buy what I considered the
34 stuff I needed to come to Alaska; a sleeping bag, pack,
35 stuff like that. I brought -- now this tells you what
36 days this was.

37
38 This was back in the days when in my
39 pack on the airplane on Alaska Airlines -- I don't
40 remember if it's Cordova Airlines or Alaska at that
41 time -- I'm coming up and I have a .44 Magnum, a 12-
42 gauge shotgun, a 30.06 and a .22, I got two-gallon cans
43 of 4831 reloading powder, I've got about 4,000 primers
44 for my rifle and a complete hand reloading kit. My
45 shotgun I had those old-fashioned brass shotgun shells
46 for that you could load yourself, so I had four cans of
47 shotgun powder, and I'm getting on the airplane in
48 Seattle with all this stuff.

49
50 MR. KRON: And no security check.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No security check and
2 no disagreement with the backpack. In fact, I said I
3 didn't want to leave it out of my sight and they let me
4 sit it in front of me. So I flew up here with all that
5 stuff and headed out to Ivanof Bay. That was an
6 experience of a lifetime for somebody like me.

7
8 I got out there and in the first week I
9 decided to go for books to the next school and I tried
10 to get somebody from the village to hike with me
11 because it was just a matter -- Perryville was only
12 seven miles over the pass and down the other side and
13 across the river that comes out of Mt. Veniaminof and
14 that didn't look too bad to me, but there was too many
15 bears. Heck, in Canada, I chased bears up trees and
16 all this kind of stuff. I ran into 21 brownies in an
17 hour and a half. I had as high as nine of them within
18 100 yards at one time.

19
20 Then finally, you know, what happens is
21 after you've passed that many you get kind of cocky.
22 You quit taking big detours around them and the alders
23 come down and there's a little layer of grass and then
24 there's a creek and I just split the difference, you
25 know, and finally I'm -- well, to make the story short,
26 I spent the night sleeping about 100 yards from the
27 salmon stream. It sounded like I was sleeping next to
28 a hog trough.

29
30 (Laughter)

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean it was just --
33 and this was after I had made the mistake of trying to
34 pass a sow grizzly with four two-year-olds. And I was
35 going to pack books back, so I didn't take anything. I
36 didn't take a flashlight. I took a sandwich -- because
37 the neighboring teachers would feed me. I took a
38 sandwich, I took a can of peaches, I took a sleeping
39 bag and I took five rounds for my rifle. Well,
40 needless to say this big bear that walked out and
41 walked in front of me made my 30.06 feel like a Daisy
42 BB-gun.

43
44 (Laughter)

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But he walked by and
47 walked right on by me. Boy, after that I didn't --
48 these things were just as tame as I'd heard. Mama
49 brownie didn't agree with the rest of them. I ended up
50 shooting her at 22 feet. Then having four two-year-

1 olds follow along behind me as I tried to truck my way
2 over the mountain, whining and crying, and I'm thinking
3 all they're waiting for is dark to get even for mama.

4

5 (Laughter)

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But finally it got
8 dark, I made a fire and curled up against the bank and
9 sat there holding my rifle and they're sitting outside
10 my fire (sniffing) and then there's this big woof and
11 crash, crash, crash, crash and everything got
12 quiet. Well, I took for granted a big bear smelled me
13 and took off running and they followed it. My friends
14 at Ivanof Bay informed me the next day, no, a big bear
15 heard them crying and came and went after one of them
16 for supper and that's exactly what had happened.

17

18 So I slept there for the night, I got
19 up in the morning, the bank was about that high and in
20 the top of the bank was one of these nice trails that
21 all these people made around there. You know, they're
22 about 15 inches wide, about six inches deep in the soil
23 and they just parallel all these creeks and rivers, you
24 know. In the tracks of that trail there were bear
25 tracks that my size 12 hip boots didn't fit. I mean I
26 turned around and went back to the village. I didn't
27 get any books until the Northstar came on the 20th of
28 October.

29

30 This is no joke. I had as high as
31 seven brown bears on my schoolhouse porch at one time
32 because my schoolhouse went right down, so all that was
33 there was a strip of beach between the schoolhouse and
34 the ocean. But the best thing was it was -- Teacher,
35 Teacher, the ducks just landed and Teacher would take a
36 shotgun out and shoot the ducks.

37

38 (Laughter)

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or Teacher, Teacher,
41 there's a seal out there. The teacher would go in the
42 back room and get his rifle and go out and shoot a
43 seal. Can you imagine what would happen to a teacher
44 -- the kids would come to my house at night and they
45 wouldn't leave and they wouldn't leave. Then I'd say
46 do you want me to walk you home. That was fine.
47 Finally I caught on to what was the problem. They
48 didn't like to walk home without a gun along because of
49 all the bears. So I said -- you know, I had eight
50 grades and the oldest one was 16 and the youngest one

1 was five and I'd say do you want to borrow my shotgun
2 and, oh, sure, Teacher, and then the kids would go on
3 home, borrowing my shotgun. You want to borrow my
4 rifle? The kids would go on home. Borrow my .22, the
5 kids would go on home. Borrow my .44, the kids would
6 go on home. Then the next day I'd go around the
7 village and collect all my guns so I'd have something
8 to send them home the next week.

9

(Laughter)

10

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Could you imagine what
13 would happen to a teacher today. They'd get hung.

14

15

(Applause)

16

17

18 MS. MILLS: I'd like to make a motion
19 to adjourn.

19

20

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

21

22

The motion passes.

23

24

(Off record)

25

26

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

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

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 181 through 366 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING taken electronically on the 22nd day of October 2015;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 6th day of November 2015.

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