```
    KODIAK/ALEUTIANS SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
            PUBLIC MEETING
                    VOLUME I
Cold Bay Community Center
        Cold Bay, Alaska
    September 26, 2017
            9:00 a.m.
```

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Della Trumble, Chair
Melissa Berns
Coral Chernoff
Patrick Holmes - (Telephonic)
Richard Koso - (Telephonic)
Samuel Rohrer
Thomas Schwantes
Antone Shelikoff
Rebecca Skinner

Regional Council Coordinator, Karen Deatherage

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

1
P R O C E E D I N G S
(Cold Bay, Alaska - 9/26/2017)
(On record)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Good morning. As our Chair, Mitch Simeonoff, isn't available, I am the co-Chair, so I will do this meeting today. I'd like to welcome everybody to Cold Bay. I need more coffee, I forget how quiet it is over here and I slept so hard I still don't feel like my eyes are open. But, yes, it's nice and the weather's been beautiful. It's nice to be back in Cold Bay, it's been quite a number of years, I think, at least, five, that we've been here.
So with that, those of you that are on the teleconference, welcome. Public comments are for each agenda item, or regional concerns that are not included on the agenda, the Council appreciates hearing concerns and your knowledge, so please, like I say if you'd like to testify fill out a blue card.
With that, I'd like to maybe call the meeting to order and is anybody willing to do the invocation.
Tom.
If you'd stand, please, we're not the NFL.
Okay, go ahead.
MR. SCHWANTES: (Invocation)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Tom. And we'll go into roll call. Melissa.
MS. BERNS: Antone Shelikoff.
MR. SHELIKOFF: Yeah.
MS. BERNS: Patrick Holmes.
MR. HOLMES: Here.
MS. BERNS: Richard Koso.
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. ROHRER: Sam Rohrer, Kodiak. |
| 2 |  |
| 3 | MR. SCHWANTES: Tom Schwantes, Kodiak. |
| 4 |  |
| 5 | MS. DEATHERAGE: Karen Deatherage, |
| 6 | Office of Subsistence Management in Anchorage. |
| 7 |  |
| 8 | MR. DOOLITTLE: Tom Doolittle, Deputy |
| 9 | Assistant Regional Director for OSM, Anchorage. |
| 10 |  |
| 11 | MR. KOSO: Rick Koso from Adak. |
| 12 |  |
| 13 | REPORTER: Okay, so the people on line, |
| 14 | could you please identify yourselves. |
| 15 |  |
| 16 | Thanks. |
| 17 |  |
| 18 | MR. KOSO: Yeah, Rick Koso from Adak. |
| 19 |  |
| 20 | MR. HOLMES: Pat Holmes, Kodiak. |
| 21 |  |
| 22 | REPORTER: I got you and Pat, Rick, |
| 23 | thanks. Are there others, please identify yourself. |
| 24 |  |
| 25 | MS. WITTA: Amy Witta, Division of |
| 26 | Subsistence, Fish and Game, Anchorage. |
| 27 |  |
| 28 | MR. BURCH: Mark Burch, Division of |
| 29 | Wildlife Conservation in Palmer. |
| 30 |  |
| 31 | MR. WITTEVEEN: Mark Witteveen and Lisa |
| 32 | Fox, Alaska Department of Fish and Game in Kodiak. |
| 33 |  |
| 34 | MS. PETERSON: Chris Peterson, Alaska |
| 35 | Fish and Game in King Salmon. |
| 36 |  |
| 37 | MR. PYLE: Bill Pyle and Mike Brady, |
| 38 | Kodiak National Wildife Refuge. |
| 39 |  |
| 40 | MR. LIND: Orville Lind, Office of |
| 41 | Subsistence Management. Cami, good morning. |
| 42 |  |
| 43 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. And |
| 44 | we'll go ahead and do the public.... |
| 45 |  |
| 46 | MS. DAMBERG: Carol Damberg. Sorry, |
| 47 | Carol Damberg, regional subsistence coordinator, |
| 48 | Anchorage. |
| 49 |  |
| 50 |  |
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MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Do we have anyone else on line.
(No comments)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. And we'll move on to the public in the building here.
MR. LIPKA: This is Colton Lipka, Department of Fish and Game, Kodiak/Cold Bay.
MR. EVANS: Good morning everybody. I'm Tom Evans. I'm a wildlife biologist with OSM.
DR. CHEN: Aloha Council members. My name is Glenn Chen with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
(Laughter)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes, come on up here.
(Laughter)
MS. SIMPSON: Angela Simpson, City of Cold Bay.
MR. ARKLEY: John Arkley, Cold Bay.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, thank you everyone and, again, welcome. We will move on to review and adopt the agenda.
Before I start I'm going to have Karen explain some of the agenda items that she has made changes to and then we will add any agenda items the Council would like to add.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
At the last meeting there were several items that the Council requested to be on the agenda. One was a report on sea otters, largely in the Kodiak region. And I did call Rebecca Skinner about that. And I think it was determined that it would be best to have that discussion and those representatives in Kodiak because we would have more individuals from the public as well that could contribute to that
conversation versus having that here in Cold Bay.
The second item is, if you'll recall, the Council put forth a wildlife special action request for the Southern Alaska Peninsula Herd to change from one bull to one caribou. That wildlife special action request was not forwarded on to the Board, and the reason why is because it didn't meet, quote/unquote, the emergency measures because people could still hunt any caribou under the State registration permit. With that said, the proposal under the regulatory cycle to change from one bull to one caribou for that herd is part of this meeting discussion and the Council will deliberate on that proposal.
Tom Schwantes, Member Schwantes also recommended that we do intermittent reviews of the State regulations and the Federal regulations to look for consistency or more liberalized hunting opportunities under State that were not under Federal subsistence. Our biologist, Tom Evans, reviewed those, as well as myself, and we did not find, other than the Southern Alaska Peninsula Herd issue any, at this time, that are more liberal than the subsistence regulations.
And that's it for me.
Thank you, Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Karen. Any other additions to the agenda.
MR. SCHWANTES: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, under new business, I would like to add some discussion on the Kodiak -- or the Unimak Caribou Herd.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Under new business, wildlife proposals, I think we could add that after the regional proposals and after the Unit 9D caribou. We would like just to have a discussion at this point.
MR. SCHWANTES: Uh-huh.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair. As far
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as the Unit 9D.....
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Unit 10. Unit 10.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Unit 10 , for the Unimak Herd?
MR. SCHWANTES: Yes.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Yes, Ma'am, you can certainly add that to the agenda.
There are several people on the line for Fish and Game. I tried to get a hold of the biologist who could speak to that but I wasn't able to hear back from them but perhaps somebody at Fish and Game could also give us an update on the status of the Unimak Herd.
Thank you.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Chris Peterson is on line and I think she would be able to do that.
MS. PETERSON: Yes, this is Chris, Madame Chair. The question is simply to go over the status of the Unimak Caribou Herd at the moment; is that correct?
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Not particularly at this time but at some point in the meeting we're going to add it for discussion after we look at what the survey numbers are, the last survey that was done, and that's basically where we're at because we didn't see the information in the packet, at least up to this point.
MS. PETERSON: Okay, yes, that would be fine. I'd be glad to get that information for you. Just let me know when to present it. I did not ever know that it was required for this meeting, so.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair. There is a report in the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge that does have some updates on the herd and you can also, if you choose to have that discussion, when Izembek, as well as ADF\&G report, under agency reports later in the meeting.
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Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. We did have two more additions to, if you would like to come forward and introduce yourself. The microphone's here.
MR. RISDAHL: Thank you, Council members. My name is Greg Risdahl. I'm the manager at Izembek National Wildlife Refuge. Glad to be here. Sorry we're a few minutes late. We have about 16 people at the Refuge, extra, starting today and yesterday. So, thank you.
MS. MELENDEZ: Good morning, Council. My name is Leticia Melendez, and I'm the Deputy Refuge Manager for Izembek National Wildlife Refuge.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, thank you. So if I understand this correctly under Item No. 5 on your agenda we will be moving the sea otter to the winter meeting and add the Board of Game proposals, if requested, by Council; is that correct.
Item No. 8, Tom Doolittle will -- it says bio's provided, so I guess, on service awards.
Under No. 11, wildlife proposal, Tom Evans will be doing that report.
Under 11B, under 2018 Fisheries Resource Monitoring will be Robbin LaVine.
Under Item C, that will be done by Karen Deatherage.
Under the USGS, this is an addition; is that correct, under ANSEP?
MS. DEATHERAGE: Yes, Ma'am, it is. And that will be presented by telephone.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. And then I believe that adding the caribou under Unit 10 is probably going to come up a couple of times in this meeting, to be honest with you. We'd like to see the report, not only from Izembek, but from the State on Unit 10 caribou, and then most likely later in the agenda we would like to try to create a proposal, if
the numbers look like they can sustain a possible subsistence harvest. That's where we're.....

MS. SKINNER: Madame.....
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: .....headed with
this.....
MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.....
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: .....just so you
know.
MS. SKINNER: .....I have a question.
Madame Chair, a question.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes.
MS. SKINNER: Thank you. Can you clarify where two of the items you've talked about have been added to the agenda, one, the Fish and Game Board of Game proposals, what item number -- where will that appear on the agenda?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: It's under -Karen added it under No. 5.

MS. SKINNER: Okay. Well, it seems like it would go under new business. I'll propose to add that under new business, which is Item 11, as Item 11D.

And then I propose to add the Unit 10 caribou discussion as 11E, mainly so that the people who are presenting information on that know when they need to be on line and ready to go.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: All right, thank you.

Do we have a motion to approve the agenda as amended.

MS. BERNS: Move to approve the agenda.
MR. SCHWANTES: Second.
MR. KOSO: Second.



Okay. We'll probably move on to the Council member reports. Rick, you're leaving, I think you said at 10:00, do you want to go ahead and start with the report for Adak?

MR. KOSO: Okay, thank you, Madame Chair.

Yeah, Adak, this past year has been doing well on subsistence $I$ guess it's probably due to the fact that we have a small population, there's plenty of fish in the ocean for everybody there, nobody's having any problems getting their subsistence.

The caribou herd as far as I understand is doing well. We've been still getting quite a few hunters coming in on the planes but not as much as last year. Caribou are getting a little harder to get on the north side, but we still have a fair amount of caribou on the south side. I'd still like to see a survey done here so we could see what's been going on here, we've been having a lot of hunters come out there this past couple years.

And I don't know if this is the right time to bring it up but this Proposal 128 on the caribou, Adak, to open it up to shoot all different caribou. I think the population in Adak is -- 99 percent of them are in favor of that. We don't have too many guides in Adak, none that I'm aware of, most of the guides are from outside. So as far as the local people go, they're more meat hunters than head hunters and they would like to have it either way.

So that's my report for Adak.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Rick.
Pat, would you like to give a report.
MR. HOLMES: Yes, Ma'am. How do you
copy?
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Sounds -- we can hear you good, Pat, go ahead.

MR. HOLMES: Okay. I was playing

1 around with my hearing aide and my cell phone is not 2 happy at times so I just wanted to check. I was going
to make a comment, Rick, that the local tribal folks there in the city might want to have a chat with the air station in Kodiak and see if -- of course everybody's budget's tight but maybe if the Coast Guard has a cutter out there with a machine, you might ask them to have a -- borrow it for a few hours and have them do a count on the caribou there and if you could get a State or Federal person that'd be good but I think Rick can count as good as any critter person. That might be one way to get some idea of what's happening on the south end.

As far as myself and Kodiak, folks did really good on subsistence. They opened up the Buskin, the run came in early, a lot of fish, had it opened to the mouth until the end of June. And, of course, being a hard-headed Scandinavian, I spent most of that time trying to get my skiff running so ended up having to go to Pasagshak but did get my minimum for our canning and enough to give away to lots of other folks. And so that went pretty well.

I think the deer population is up from the cold winters but down from the previous year because it was pretty frosty last year. So I think all in all, from what I've heard, things are doing pretty fair for folks on the north end of the island.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat.
We'll move on.
Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Thank you, Madame Chair.

Yeah, along with what Pat said we did have an extremely hard winter last year, not because of snow but because of the lack of snow and the extremely cold temperatures, that had a pretty negative effect on the deer population.

Had, as Pat mentioned, good returns of salmon to the Buskin and also to Pasagshak. From


I'll just reiterate on the deer. It was a rough winter. The north and west side got hit pretty hard. From what I've heard, though, I think the south side certainly is in a lot better shape, and the east side's in somewhat better shape. We'll know in the next month or so as folks really start to get deer hunting though. This is still a little bit early in the season for people to have a real good feel but it certainly seems as that there was quite a bit of winter kill.

The other thing to mention, with Emperors. I haven't heard of anyone who participated in the Emperor hunt for the spring season. Certainly some might have, but $I$ haven't heard anyone talking about that and I think $I$ probably -- well, at least if there was any around town I think I probably would have heard about that.

I know folks are excited about the fall season. Although, last $I$ checked with Fish and Game not that many permits had been picked up. So it's going to be real interesting. There's been some complaints from folks about the limit, the couple hundred feet limit off the road system. I know people aren't happy about that, but it'll just be interesting to see what that participation is.

So that's all I have.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Sam.
Melissa.
MS. BERNS: So from Old Harbor, we've had a great salmon return.....
(Teleconference interruption participant phones not muted)

MS. BERNS: ......wonderful sockeye harvest this spring and late king run in June and July that a lot of people participated in.

We had a late pink run and a lot of people were a little bit concerned but the fish did end up showing up and we saw that people were fishing much later into August and into September.

We have a really good silver run right now and a lot of people are busy harvesting and smoking and filling their freezers. Bright new silvers are still being caught in the saltwater and in the fresh water.

We're also seeing a lot of the bears harvesting and, you know, plumping up for the winter and this is really good because they're staying out of the village and away from the village, unlike last year when we had seen a lot more bear activity throughout the community with the lack of fish in the creeks.

Let's see, we did have a slow berry year but some people were able to find them, you just really had to work hard to get them. So we're hopeful that our winter will be a little bit more mild and we can partake in the berry harvesting next year.

A lot of sea otters have been seen coming further on the southeast side of the island and people have been harvesting them basically on the spot or come into the community and, you know, let people that harvest know exactly where they're seen so that we can take care of them so that we don't have a lack of shellfish like they're seeing in other areas of the island.

The seal and sea lion populations are in abundance and people continue to harvest them. And it's really nice to see that a lot more people are harvesting and using the hides for handicraft. And then the people that harvest only for the meat source have been contacting our non-profit agency so that we can get the hides and process them for cultural activities within the community so it's been a nice relationship between the hunters and our coordinators, our cultural coordinators.

Lots of migratory birds have been coming into the Old Harbor area and filling up our estuary. Lots of geese. And we're also seeing more swans than usual.

We had a great culture camp this summer on Sitkalidak Island and we focused on responsible harvesting practices with the youth and also plants as food and medicine. It was very well received. That was held in late July. And then through the salmon
project, when $I$ return from this meeting, I'll be going back to Old Harbor and holding a salmon camp for a week and at the salmon camp we'll be catching fish and then processing them, salting, smoking, pickling and drying and canning fish and at the end we'll hold a community potluck and we're going to be gifting the fish that we processed to the elders within the community that can't harvests for themselves.

So a lot of positive things going on and we're really looking forward to a good fall and I hope -- we do have a good healthy deer population around the community. I know people are looking forward to the deer harvest as well as harvesting goats, that people have been partaking in more so in recent years.

That's it.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Melissa.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Excuse me, Madame Chair. I'd just like to ask the people on the phone to make sure that you're muting your phone unless you're speaking to the Council because we're getting a lot of feedback here.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you,
Karen.

## Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: Thank you. On the -- I want to give a quick update on something more relevant to the commercial fishing side. But Senator Dan Sullivan hosted a field hearing for the MagnusonStevens Act Reauthorization this August in Soldotna and I think that this is something that is useful for this Council to kind of keep in mind or keep an eye on that that Act is going through the reauthorization process and it probably will have some significant changes as Congress works on that.

I'll echo the comments about the bad salmonberry year in Kodiak. I think I may have seen 10 berries total, so we had a pretty bad salmonberry year.

With the Emperor geese, I want to note that we're excited about the season being open for subsistence spring hunt. And over the last six months or so I've been involved in discussions and have submitted comment about the road closures on the Kodiak road system, so that's not specific to Emperor geese but it does relate to Emperor geese. And I think we might -- maybe we'll have more discussion on that later in the meeting today.

And the last thing I wanted to note is that I did call into the tribal and Native Corporation consultation that occurred the first week in September and I will note that participation was pretty sparse. They did combine different regions on to one call so there wasn't a call that was just Kodiak/Aleutians, we were combined with several of the other regions, but there were very few tribes and very few ANCSA Corporations that called in to participate. And then a lot of the discussion on the phone ended up being more about the process of the consultation and how people could get involved. So it seemed like there was a general lack of knowledge about how the tribes and the corporations could be involved and give comment, so that may be something we want to look at improving.

Thanks.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you,
Rebecca.
Coral.
MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you. Coral
Chernoff.
So I guess fish has already been covered, it was plentiful.

My experience with deer and hearing about people talking about deer is our usual fall trip that we see, we didn't see a lot of deer. I've seen a lot of does with double fawns around town but other than that, out on the other side of the island I haven't seen a whole lot. And I've heard of people walking in areas and seeing 20 to 40 deer carcasses. So it sounds like the number of deer that have died this winter is quite large.

That was from the cold winter, which also produced a big berry -- salmonberry die-off so in the spring you could just see large swaths up the mountains of dead berry bushes but all the -- all the new growth seems to be large, tall and healthy looking so hopefully next year and the following years we'll have more good salmonberries.

Clams, there's not too much clam digging going on in Kodiak. There's been a lot of public outreach about PSP. And Sun'aq is working with an organization and they're doing clam testing for PSP so I went on one of the digs this winter and we talked a lot about how that process was happening with people who didn't really dig clams and they weren't really digging in areas where people dug clams. Also they test the whole clam, which I felt like -- so there was this discussion on why they're not going where people really get clams and testing just the parts that people eat and it kind of isn't their, that's not a part of their study. But we did -- she -- I did go back to the lab, I showed her how I would clean my clam, which parts I would eat, which parts I would throw away and she kept those parts separate and was testing them separately so -- and I haven't seen the results on that but hopefully more of that could happen in the future. They did publicly post their results for several of the months and they've all been -- they've all tested hot for PSP, too high of levels for people, what they suggest people should be eating.

Spring subsistence harvest opened for Emperors. I did not go Emperor hunting and I haven't heard of anyone that did. We have an issue of during our spring hunt, we can't hunt on the road system, we have to be 500 feet off shore so that kind of limits -well, it does limit anyone who wants to hunt to have to have a boat to hunt. So that's a barrier that with AMBCC, we're working to get that -- the 500 foot off shore regulation removed. We do have a fall hunt and we can hunt migratory ducks and snipes and a few other birds, we can hunt on the road system. So there's already hunting on the road system, but we're not allowed for the spring subsistence harvest.

This year -- I go to the other side of the island from where I'm from, I go to the west side for a little bit in the fall and then part of the winter to do hunting and some fishing activities. And

1 the last couple -- we always set crab pots, and the
2 last couple of years we have not caught a single king crab. This year we tried a little bit harder. We had actually three spots and then we kind of moved our pots around so $I$ don't know if the king crab have just sort of moved out of that bay area, I don't know all over the island, I -- I don't know if the king crab population is just moving or if it's -- the population's going down again and I don't know that there's any studies that are addressing that anymore.

We did find plenty of dungeness and a few tanners. Lots and lots and lots of dungees, so we ate dungees.

There's lots of reports of bird die-off up north. And we had the murre die-off, the large murre die-off last year, but we don't seem to have any of that die-off this year, so it seems to be just in the northern areas.

And then Sun'aq, lastly, there's been crayfish for several years. Quite a few years people have been asking about the crayfish in Buskin and so Sun'aq finally got -- they went out and got a few last year and then they applied for a grant and so they, I think, have a three or four year study that they're gathering crayfish and they -- when we had heard reports, too, Fish and Game would get, I think the last year -- year before last it was up to like seven reports of crayfish that people had -- were reporting and then Sun'aq, the first time they went out, I think they got like 120 crayfish and then I had my step-son and his friend, the friends went out, there was four of them, they went out, and within a half hour they had 45 of them. So I got to eat some of those crayfish. But hopefully they'll study them and we'll find out -that's such a big subsistence river for us, the Buskin, they seem to be up in the lakes mostly, so I think with this grant they were going to see how many they find down stream. And they did find crayfish with big.....

TELEPHONE: (Indiscernible) crayfish
out there.
(Laughter)
MS. CHERNOFF: They did find female crayfish with big egg.....
TELEPHONE: And then they do a fish composition of crayfish.
(Laughter)
MS. DEATHERAGE: Hello, this is Karen Deatherage with Office of Subsistence Management. Can you hold your comments until we invite public comment on this issue. We appreciate it, thank you.
MS. PETERSON: I think some phones are not on mute.
(Laughter)
MS. CHERNOFF: So that is the end of my report. Thank you, Ms. Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Coral.
Antone.
MR. SHELIKOFF: Emperor goose has been -- this year because people just found out and they're kind of skeptical, they think it's only one bird but they're probably have their other birds, they can have two. But there's no Emperor goose taken.
Humpies, finding them, because there was a lack of fresh water, humpies were finally getting up this creek and up to the creek spawning, just this last week. I know this because there's a run of humpies right in the village, right by the school and it's kind of like a science project started by a teacher a few years ago. He started a humpy run run by the school so it's kind of like a science project.
But there's no clam harvest or mussel harvest because of Trident Seafoods. I believe they're -- they put their wastewater in the bay and it just becomes -- or all the way -- they flow with the water and they -- well, they might be -- they may be poisoned but no one's tried them for the past 20 years, I believe.
There was a person doing a research project and she did a subsistence survey but there's some information that should have been -- but we can

1 send that data in to the website that would -- they
would use the data and put in their system.
Berry harvest.
Blueberries did good this year but no -- no salmonberries at all. I mean you were lucky to get a couple but there's no salmonberries.

And I kind of did a written report but I somehow forgot it so I'll print it up and send it to Tom or Karen but that's all I had.

Thanks.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Antone. I'll do a brief report for King Cove.

Lisa Scaroborogh and Kate (indiscernible) did do some of their work that they intended to do on subsistence uses in Sand Point. I believe that was in February. And then Lisa and her team were in King Cove in April, however, Kate was not able to make it at the time. Her schedule is to come in the spring, I think, to continue with that study.

The caribou, Greg was in King Cove, the Refuge manager, and met with members of the community and spent over a day there and what Greg and I brought was the subsistence permits for caribou that had been done by Fish and Wildlife in the past and so I've been doing them out of the King Cove corporation office and I do believe I had -- I think it was nine -- eight or nine permits and two designated hunter permits that I didn't grab before I came over but $I$ was asking people to go ahead and call and report that, and bring those in and I'd bring them over -- send them all over to you when the season was done. So just so you know, Greg.

MR. RISDAHL: Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Also in talking caribou, I've been working with Rod Schuh this past year on caribou and his hunters that have harvested a caribou, they had processed the meat and brought it in and Rod actually flew two caribou over to King Cove the day before yesterday and -- Sunday morning to be exact, and I picked that up and was able to -- it was processed very well, packed and I was able to give 13
elders caribou and they were really pleased and so I thank Rod very much for that and people were really happy because some of these elders have not had caribou for many years. So very good -- good deal.
(Applause)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Cold Bay.

Thank you, Rod.
Then -- and some of the hunters, of course, have been also with the birds, sending them over so that's also -- so it's a good relationship working with the communities. There's quite a large number of people in King Cove that do live off of these, or subsist off of these species.

As everybody else has said there has been no snow this winter. In King Cove it was -- we'll usually get a week of cold weather, two weeks max, we had three months of straight cold weather. In all my life living out here I've never seen it like that in my life. So it was an interesting winter. And, of course, you know, the elders always say that basically if you don't have a snow-pak you're not getting any berries and that's -- that snow insulates the roots in those berry bushes. So that was definitely a result, we did not have many -- hardly any salmonberries. Very little moss berries. Blueberries were good, I think like Akutan and Unalaska and King Cove, blueberries were good, and I'm hearing also here.

We did have a moose and a calf spend a good part of the summer up at the end of the road in King Cove and then another moose, which is very -- they were there, watch the bears -- some residents said chase the -- chase them but they had gotten -- they had survived the last time I heard so I'm not sure where they're at now.

Salmon for the community was very good and it was really encouraging to see how well the fishermen did. It's been quite a number of years that they were able to get a season like they did. So we're thankful, very thankful for that.

So other than that, I think I covered
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what I wanted to.
Oh, culture camp, we did have two Staff members from Izembek over at the culture camp and I'm sorry I can't remember their names, but they participated in that this summer in August and so that was really good also.

With that, I guess, if anybody has any questions directly for any of the Council members and their reports, I think it would be a good time to do that now, if you just want to let me know here.

Melissa.
MS. BERNS: I don't know how I forgot this in my report, but one positive thing that we have done within Old Harbor and were successful in doing is purchasing a bison herd and moving it to Sitkalidak Island. And the purpose of the herd,there were 40 animals -- 40 animals in the herd that we purchased from a local family that needed to get the animals off of their leased land from the State, and the purpose is to provide an alternative meat source for community members and so when we have a hard year with deer or what not, we're able to provide for the community. When the herd hits a substantial size that's outlined within our management plan, we'll be able to do draw hunts for members of the community to go out and harvest.

And so we're looking forward to that.
The herd, when we did move them in May, they swam across the straits to greener pastures. We were surprised that they're very good swimmers, we've learned. And we have 20 of them located on the Akaluta Bay (ph) side on Native allotments. We're working with the land owners there and they're -- you know they've pretty much been staying in the same area. We have 20 over in -- on Bush Point, which is right next to the community and across the straits from Sitkalidak Island. Many people see them and part of our community outreach is that we ask people, when they do observe them, is to report back to myself and my office, how many are seen in the herd, and the location of them and if there's any -- you know, if people are out hiking and maybe if they run across a carcass or that type of thing, to report those mortalities to us as well so we
can keep a good track on them.
We are going to be making efforts this next coming week and a half to hike the herd that's over in Akluda Bay back over the pass to Bush Point and we had purchased a lot of corral material from the Ninilchik Fairground so we'll be able to build our corral system, feed them and then hoping to have the landing craft come in and relocate them to the southeast side of Sitkalidak Island where we have identified greater pasture areas. And we're working closely with NRCS at this time and their range land planners and so they're actually coming out to Old Harbor the week of October 11th to hold a community meeting and to help us finalize our management plan and so we're really happy for that. We're also members of the InterTribal Bison Cooperative and so tapping into their resources, they've been able to provide a lot of technical support and guidance as we've worked through this process. I always joke that that was my first rodeo, I've never herd any cattle or anything of the sort, I'm more of a chicken person so it's been quite the experience, and we're really looking forward to having that herd grow on Sitkalidak Island and to be able to provide for our community.

So that's what I have.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Melissa. That was interesting.

It's interesting to watch Melissa. I have her on FaceBook. She's fattening up these turkeys and she harvests them. Then she's fattening up these hens and these chickens and she's harvesting them. And then next she's like ranging bison and I'm like, this girl is really busy.

But other than that, I did hear, I think, some comments when Coral was making her report and was there any questions on line from people for any of the Council members.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, this is Pat.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Pat.
MR. HOLMES: I forgot a couple of
things.

As far as compliments go. I think Sun'aq Tribe has worked really well with the other folks in Kodiak and particularly on the AMBCC things.

And I think Coral Chernoff also deserves a salute for her role in getting acceptability of using migratory bird parts for art. I think that's going to be a really good thing.

And I think Sun'aq's research on crayfish, that's got some real potential there because crayfish in other areas have been documented on reducing salmon populations and, of course, the Buskin being our region's (indiscernible) sockeye subsistence source is really good.

And I also wanted to give Melissa an atta'girl for that seal meat she gave me when we got back from visiting the grandkids in February. I kind of had my normal Swedish blues there and I made up a pot of soup while Patty was out and that really made me feel good.

And lastly I wanted to thank Antone and Rick for sharing that fine Aleutian summer with the folks in Kodiak. I think it was the wettest, greyest August and September I've ever seen and my potato -- I usually have really good (indiscernible) but it got so wet that I probably got a third of the spuds so thanks Rick and Antone for letting us have some Aleutian summer.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat.
And I think there's one other thing I can add because I'm wondering if anybody else or any of the other places -- this summer there has been so many pink salmon and humpies that it's -- I saw Tom yesterday at the airport and he showed me pictures of False Pass, I mean you could walk on fish and that was the same thing in King Cove. And so the concern, I think, like up by Barney's Creek was that the fish that were getting up later, that were able to, that they're loosening up the eggs from the fish that already have come up and it's coming back down. So I don't know what kind of affect that will have but there's just way too many fish. It's interesting to see how much fish, it was like raindrops in the bay this summer.
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MR. HOLMES: Della, I think you're spot on. I worked with the Department. In '82 and '92 were fantastic runs like that and the following returning years dropped way off. That's a very good observation.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. Did you have a comment, please state your name.
MR. EVANS: Hi, this is Tom Evans, I'm a wildlife biologist.
Last year you guys mentioned, or I think it was mentioned that ptarmigan may be declining and I haven't heard any real reports about what the status of the ptarmigan are so I'd kind of like to hear if that's continuing or what's going on with them.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Do you guys want to comment.
(No comments)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Well, I guess we're not seeing them there's no comment.
(Laughter)
MR. HOLMES: The last chat -- this is Pat, the last chat I had with Ronnie Lind over at Karluk, he said that it didn't look like things had improved much.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Melissa.
Thank you, Pat.
MS. BERNS: Yeah, I know that this was talked about at our migratory bird meeting and there was concern about the ptarmigan. I know that the folks from Akhiok, in particular, said that they used to be able to harvest pretty close to the community. They said that they -- when the wind would blow a certain direction they would come over from Sitkalidak and they said that they haven't seen ptarmigan very much in the south side of the island as much as they had in years past and they're also -- one of their concerns was the increase in the eagle population and they're wondering if the eagles are playing a part in that decline in the population.
It's been awhile since I've been up hiking in the high country and that's where we generally see the ptarmigan around Old Harbor so I don't have any experience from my area, in particular, but I know that there was a concern for the south side of the island.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Melissa. Any other comments.

## Antone.

MR. SHELIKOFF: Thanks, Della. Yeah, I can't speak for Cold Bay hunters, but there was some local person, I won't mention his name, but he was saying that the sportfishermen, sport hunters were shooting off the ptarmigan and trying to give the ptarmigan to the local people and the locals will not take ptarmigan because it was -- the meat was like cheese and I don't blame the local person for not taking them but -- and I think they should have some kind of restriction of closing that hunt to the sport fishermen until the ptarmigan can rebound, or rebuild.
Thanks.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Antone.
All right, we'll move on to the Chair's report. I don't -- do we have -- Karen -- Mitch isn't here so.....
MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair, there's no Chair report from Mitch.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. We'll move on to service awards.
We had this on our agenda and Tom Doolittle will be providing this.
MR. DOOLITTLE: I get to wear my glasses and a tie for this for sure.
I think this is the fun part about being the Deputy Assistant Regional Director for OSM,
and that is to recognize people in service.
And every time I look at wildlife regulations or the Federal subsistence regulations, or I look at the proposed regulations, I think of all the RACs and all the people and really how unique a system we really have. It's a bottom up system and it's one that really comes from the people to the Regional Advisory Councils for decisionmakers and the Federal Board. And there's no other wildlife and fishery management system like it in the world. And I think it's the leadership from here, and my sincerest thanks to yourselves and getting to know you last night was one of my great honors of -- and, really, in my career. Because I get the opportunity to, you know, work with people to solve problems and you guys are it, you're the point on that.

We always bring up in ANILCA and about subsistence, we bring about a couple of things, we talk about conservation concern is number 1, and, of course, that makes all the sense in the world. Conservation, because certainly we have to have a resource or subsistence doesn't exist. But in ANILCA there's -it's not an and, it's for the continued use of -continued subsistence uses. And it really reflects on our lives and lifestyles. It's about getting together with family, friends, the preparation of food, our communities as we talk about our elders and the importance of caribou, is that really hunting, fishing and subsistence is our being, it's a way that people generally live. And keeping that in perspective, I think, is very, very important and one of the great decisions that RACs also make, is to maintain our lifestyles. And many times when we look at regulations, you're not just looking at the resource but how this affects people and the way they live and how this would affect their culture.

So I kind of want everybody to think about the two sides of ANILCA and it's purposes as a land swath, is that, it is a conservation-minded piece of legislation but also it's legislation for people and the maintenance of our communities and way of life.

And with that in mind, one of the -Melissa you've served for five years on this committee, and the Federal Program would like to recognize you and the communities. And there's this little two

1 paragraphs that were put together, in part, by your peers, and so I'll read this.

It says:
Ms. Berns, grew up in the village of Old Harbor on Kodiak Island, except for the time she attended college in Anchorage. She was raised in the traditional Alutiiq lifestyle and grew up harvesting subsistence foods in the area. She uses marine mammals, seals, sea otters, sea lions, birds, cormorants, mallards, pintails, Canada geese, seagull eggs, fish and all five species of Pacific salmon, halibut, rockfish, herring, shellfish, tanner and dungeness, and king crab, razor clams and octopus and berries, salmonberries, blueberries, high bush cranberries and mossberries.

She learned from going out with her parents and community members, mostly extended family. She learned marine mammals etiquette from her maternal uncle. Ms. Berns learned from her parents and extended family in Old Harbor how to prepare the various foods in the tradition methods.

She is asked to do presentations on cooking traditionally for local organizations and schools, including information on diet and nutrition, all parts of the animal, fish or plant are utilized and what wasn't eaten was made into art, tools, or crafts. She has learned to butcher in a traditional manner and is called upon to instruct others, particular young people.

Ms. Berns is involved in her community and is comfortable speaking to groups and teaching young people. She has been the vice-president of the Alutiiq Tribe of Old Harbor for the past 10 years.
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She has been actively involved in the tribal youth program and has been the program lead for the last three years. She has been a board member for Cape Barnabas Incorporated and community quota entity for Old Harbor halibut fisheries for six years. She is an alternate representative for Old Harbor area for the State Fish and Game Advisory Committee for the Kodiak area. Ms. Berns is on the Mountain Goat Advisory Committee. She has been involved for 13 years with users as she does harvest activities.
She interacts with other tribes and non-profits on a regular basis. She has also been involved in the Rural Roundtable Group, which consists of local tribes, Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act Corporations and local government representatives, which meets three times a year.
She maintains a networking pool through email, shares pertinent information with people who prefer that type of communication.
Holy smokes, that's unbelievable.
Melissa, this is for you from the Federal Subsistence Board, a certificate of appreciation for your five years with us.
MS. BERNS: Thank you very much.
(Applause)
MS. DEATHERAGE: You must have started
at birth.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Well, I hate to always
speak that there are elders on the Regional Advisory Committee and when you really think about long-term service is that we have a subsistence Regional Advisory Council member, Della Trumble, who has been on this Council for 20 years. That's just amazing to me.
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(Applause)
MR. DOOLITTLE: This is like a real holy smokes.
(Laughter)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I took a break.
MR. DOOLITTLE: So, Ms. Trumble, is a long-time incumbent to the Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory Council.
She was born and raised in King Cove. Her family has harvested resources from the land and commercial fisheries for generations. She was taught the way to do things by her family and continues to pass down that knowledge to family and anyone who wants to learn.
Ms. Trumble is very actively involved in fish and wildlife issues and well aware of subsistence issues in the whole area.
She is a point of contact and works directly with user groups and with ADF\&G and Staff from Izembek National Wildlife Refuge toward resolving fish and wildlife issues.
Ms. Trumble understands what the concerns of the people are in her area and is familiar with Kodiak as she went to high school there.
She has also been on the
Kodiak/Aleutians Subsistence Regional Advisory Council since its inception with only brief intermissions during her appointments and at times serving as Chair person to the Council.
Ms. Trumble would like to see communication continue to improve with Izembek National Wildlife Refuge as well as with Alaska Peninsula and Alaska Maritime National Wildlife

Refuges with the users and interested stakeholders. Educating the user groups is a concern for her because people do not understand what they can and cannot do. She would like to see the designated hunter program align with the State and caribou remains a high priority in her view.

Ms. Trumble's references described her as very active and knowledgeable, since about the 1970s in boards and councils and everything to do with fish and wildlife issues, noting she is concerned about protecting the resource as well as keeping people informed. She is described as an excellent communicator and leader and they all highly recommend her to serve on the Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. One noted she is recognized by her senators and representatives from the walks of government.

So, Della, I would like to present this to you, which I think, we really thought, as a Staff, what would be most meaningful to you and youth.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Oh, I love this, this is perfect.
(Applause)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Oh, Dale should have been here.
(Applause)
MS. DEATHERAGE: That artwork was done by -- what's her first name?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: The artwork's by Nichole Gould, and Dale was going to come this morning and I wish he had to see this.

But I'd like to say thank you very much. It's been my pleasure to serve the people in the region and working with Kodiak. And I'll have to say I remember being the Chair the first time and going to a
statewide meeting and having to fight for subsistence king crab in Womens Bay, I didn't have a clue, on what in the world did I get myself into, but we got on the phone and talked to people and, you know, I got my direction and we got it, you know, and that is -- I'm very appreciative. It's been my pleasure. It's so important to our communities.

Melissa, I have to say this, I went to high school with her mom and dad in Kodiak, they're close friends of mine, and it's just a pleasure sitting here and listening to her getting recognized for all that she's doing because, you know, I'm looking at Jada here, she's with me, and I'm hoping she steps in my shoes one of these days. But we work closely with our kids to be able to see how important it is to communicate, speak up and fight for what you believe in and working together, you can usually come to a good resolution somewhere down the line.

And I think with that I'm really proud of the ladies on this Council, so, guys, you have to step up to the plate.
(Laughter)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: But thank you very much, I appreciate that. And I think if we can, I'd like to take a break.

Thank you. We'll take 10 minutes.
(Off record)
(On record)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, everybody, we'll call the meeting back to order.

The next item on our agenda is public and tribal comment on non-agenda items. We do have a gentleman that has filled out a blue form, so if John Arkley, if you'd like to come to the mic and introduce yourself and make your comments.

Thank you.
MR. ARKLEY: Okay, we ready.
REPORTER: Yes.
MR. ARKLEY: Okay. I'm not very good at speaking in public but it's -- I've always got questions about this sort of thing, about the subsistence. And a couple of them are, why is Unit 9D the only unit that swans -- that tundra swans aren't allowed to be subsistence hunted?
And let's see here, is there any possibility of the Unimak Caribou Herd to be subsistence hunting? Is there any idea when it might be opened again? And what are the populations? Because I don't believe a count was done of the caribou herds, and if so why not?
And, then, of course, always, laws, subsistence, I think is a good thing. I think it would be much better if laws were enforced that are in place because I've never seen an enforcement officer down here actually check or do anything like that, and that would be good. And just overall, checking, even on the Refuge.
So, anyway, just a few things.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, John.
For those of you that will be making reports, maybe you can answer John's questions. John, are you available to be here all day today or are you....•
MR. ARKLEY: Yes.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Then, if we can, we'll have the various agencies maybe respond to your questions and comments in their reports.
Do we have any other public comments.
(No comments)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Any tribes or organizations on line at this time.
(No comments)

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. I guess we will move on but if anybody would like to make any public comments, during the course of the meeting we do leave that open, just fill out a blue form in the back of the room.

Moving on to old business.
Karen, I think we have any at this
time.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair. There are no items, policy items from OSM. It seems like all of the old business has been completed, with the exception of the MOU between the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Office of Subsistence Management, that draft document is still being worked on and will be presented to the Council the next go around.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you,
Karen.

Moving on to new business, we have Item A, wildlife proposals. OSM wildlife anthropology.

Tom Evans.
MR. EVANS: Good morning, Madame Chair. Members of the Council -- Acting Chair, I guess.

I will do a presentation here on Proposal WP18-20. It was submitted by the Kodiak/Aleutians Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

It was requested that the harvest limit be changed from one bull to one caribou and that the fall harvest season be extended from August 10th to September 20th to August 1st to September 30th in Unit 9D. The proponent stated that the Federal caribou regulations in Unit 9 D are more restrictive than the State regulations and that currently most Federallyqualified subsistence users in the area are hunting under State regulations.

The Southern Alaska Peninsula Herd is genetically distinct from the Unimak Caribou Herd and managed separately now. In 2015 the minimum population

1 count was 1,568 animals. The State's management
2 objectives for this population is 3,000 to 4,000
animals. The cow/calf ratios have averaged 31 calves per 100 cows since 2011. And under normal conditions 25 calves per 100 cows is needed to to kind of offset adult mortality. Bull/cow ratios have averaged 45 bulls per 100 cows since 2011 which, again, is above the State management goals of 35 bulls per 100 cows.

The State also has, I guess it's part of their management scheme, is that there's no harvest if the bull/cow ratio falls below 20 bulls per 100 cows, or if the population is below the 1,000 animals and in decline.

Oh, if you're looking for the proposal, it's in your supplemental material. Yeah, so it's not in the book.
(Pause)
MR. EVANS: Go ahead, Karen.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair. It's in the book in the back behind the supplemental materials tab.

Thank you.
And for the public there are copies back on the back table.

MR. EVANS: So removal of the restrictions for Federally-qualified subsistence users allows the same opportunity as provided under State regulations. And, once, again, currently most of the Federally-qualified subsistence users are harvesting caribou under the State regulations because they are more liberal, the Southern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd is able to sustain the current harvest and there's no indication that removal of the restrictions for the Federally-qualified subsistence user is going to substantially increase the harvest. Increasing population trend and a bull/cow ratio since 2013 suggests that the Southern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd could sustain a potential increase in the harvest as a result of the changes to the Federal regulations.

```
In the past -- there is some concern in
```

the past that this herd has experienced wide population fluctuations and currently the population is only about 50 percent of the recommended lower threshold recommended by the State, so there's still some concern and need for some conservative management schemes.

The Izembek National Wildlife Refuge manager has delegated authority to determine and announce harvest quotas and any needed closures. Thus, they have the regulatory flexibility to adjust the harvest if needed based on fluctuations of the population. So it seems like there's kind of guidelines already in place that would allow the herd to be -- the season to be closed, if necessary.

OSM's preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal WP18-20 with the modification to remove the unit specific regulation referencing quotas and closures and delegate the authority to the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge to announce the quotas and any needed closures via delegation of authority letter.

That concludes my presentation on that one.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Tom.
Karen, can you refresh my memory on this, at this particular time all the Councils listed, in their meetings, to make comments on this proposal; is that correct?

MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair. I'm not sure $I$ understand your question. All the Council members?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: We have the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Southcentral, Kodiak/Aleutians, that's listed all on here, is that what the process is, or what exactly -- or what is the process we're following right now?

MR. EVANS: So when we do these, this is just an artifact for statewide proposals, we would -- all the Councils could participate -- or in areas where they overlap with customary and traditional use. These are listed here, but they don't need to be listed here in the executive summary that we have here, so
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1 basically it'll just be -- this is just primarily for 2 Kodiak/Aleutians. You'll notice there's no comments
there, so it's not a statewide proposal either, so it's not -- it doesn't fall under that category.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair, I have a question whenever it's appropriate.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead,
Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: And I'm not sure who this question is directed to. So from this meeting, is an appropriate action to accept the proposed amendment or proposed changes?

MR. EVANS: That's up to the RAC here, they can make a recommendation to support it, to oppose it, or to support it with a modification.

MS. SKINNER: Okay. But I guess my question is, you need some sort of feedback from us on the suggested changes?

MR. EVANS: Correct.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: If I may, I think -- now that I've got this, this is what we're following at this time, so if we look at this, we just had the introduction by Tom and the presentation of analysis, so the next item would be report on Board consultation by tribes and ANCSA corporations. Have there been any of that available?

MR. EVANS: So we did have tribal consultation on this proposal and we got no comments on this proposal.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, thank you. And then agency comments, we'll start with ADF\&G.
(No comments)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Do we have someone from ADF\&G on line.

MS. PETERSON: This is Chris Peterson in King Salmon and I was called out of the office for a minute so I would kind of need to be updated on what it
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1 is that we are currently addressing?
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: At this time it's WP18 on the changing the regulations -- to align the regulations of Federal and State for caribou in Unit 9D.
(No comments)
(Pause)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Karen.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame Chair. Generally this portion is where there have been formal comments submitted by the agencies, which had a comment deadline and to my knowledge we did not receive any written comments from ADF\&G on this proposal, nor have we received any comments from Federal or tribal entities.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Advisory group comments and other Regional Councils, were there any comments received in that, that's on the list.
MR. EVANS: No, there were not.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. Okay, we figured it out.
Summary of written comments.
MR. BURCH: Well, this is Mark Burch from the Department of Fish and Game. I apologize that we haven't gotten written comments into the Regional Advisory Council, but I would ask that Chris be allowed to give some perspective on the proposal.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes, that would be great, thank you. Chris, you want to go ahead.
MS. PETERSON: Well, thank you, Madame Chair. And if I'm understanding correctly, we're addressing the WP18-20, 2-0?
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: That is correct.
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MS. PETERSON: Is that correct?
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes.
MS. PETERSON: Okay, thank you. I'm sorry, I did get called out of the office there momentarily and at apparently the wrong point in time.
So this proposal is the one that would change the bag limit of the Federal caribou registration hunt in 9D from one bull caribou to one caribou and would change the fall harvest season dates from August 10th to September 20th, to -- which is currently, that would be changed to August 1st to September 30th. If that's correct then, yes, we support the proposal, in that, we have no comments that would be negative against this.
The bag limit currently for the State is one caribou and I believe originally it was set at one bull for the Refuge but that was back when we were very limited in the numbers in the population and so we have no problem with increasing that to be just one caribou.
The season, the harvest has been very low compared to what we would like -- what's available, and so we have no problem with implementing this proposal.
The herd is to be maintained between somewhere 1,000 to 3,000 . Once it starts getting up above 3,000 we need to have greater numbers harvested and it cannot be limited to just bulls. So just -- so we have no problems with implementing this proposal.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. Does anybody have any comments for Chris.
Greg.
MR. RISDAHL: Madame Chair. Members of the Council. I kind of suggested this happen at the last meeting. And the other thing that I had mentioned, and I have been in conversation with the folks at ADF\&G about the herd, it is growing and continues to grow and we have actually discussed the
possibility of providing a two caribou limit. And I would like to make that offer to the Council.

We only harvested seven bulls through the Federal subsistence harvest season last year and a total of 89 caribou by sporthunting on the State license. As the population grows we're just simply not going to be able to catch it. Our biggest problem here, of course, is whether or not caribou are available. There's a lot of caribou in Unit 9D but most of them are up around Black Hill and Trader Mountain. We don't have a lot down here. I passed up three small bulls on the Isthmus here in the last few weeks but until we get a big snow or something to push them here, it makes it difficult for people to get those caribou. But nonetheless the opportunity should be there in case the caribou come.

That would be my recommendation to the Council.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Greg, for bringing that up. Because I also noted in the report, Tom, when you gave it, you used the 1,560, which was the numbers from 2016 and the 2017 reflect 2,200 caribou. And, so, I know, Greg, we talked about changing that to two. And so my question at this time would be, to the State, what their comments would be if we amended this proposal to change that to two.

Chris.
MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair, this is Chris.

His comments are right on mark. The herd is growing rapidly, and in addition to that they all look very healthy. The pregnancy rate is high. The bull/cow ratio has been high for several years, certainly above the minimums that are necessary in the management plan. And we have no problem with increasing the bag limit as long as the population stays where it is now, which is somewhere above 2,000 .

We have, currently, a proposal in to the State Board of Game to base increasing the bag limit -- to base on the harvestable surplus that is available each year. So once the harvestable surplus would be, say, greater than 150 then the bag limit
would be increased to two animals. The harvestable surplus would be greater than 250 then the bag limit could be increased to three animals. If the harvestable surplus was greater than 450 then the bag limit would be increased to four animals. And if the harvestable surplus was greater than 550 then the bag limit could be increased to five.

And that is something that is very dependent on getting more surveys done and being able to access that country and, you know, be able to count the animals and see what we have. The last few years it's gone pretty well. There was only one year in the last five years where we were not able to access that area due to the weather. In those years it's very helpful if the Izembek Refuge is able to get out and do their winter count. So we very much appreciate those numbers when they're able to do that. But we will keep -- this proposal to increase the bag limit will be based on what is available each year and we hope that that's something that will pass the Board of Game and we'll be able to use that in our management.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I think at this time we have Regional Council comments or questions and it has motion to adopt but I think the Council needs to have the -- Greg, I might ask that you go ahead and stay up here so that the Council members have a time to discuss this with you and Chris.

Sam.
MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair, thank you.

In 2016 there was -- well, in 2015 there was three permits issued, in 2016 there were 75 permits issued, why the big jump in permit issue, in the amount of permits issued. Do you.....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: They went from, I think, seven per community to 15 per community. They were available to issue, remember, for subsistence.

MR. ROHRER: Yeah, thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom.
MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, this is Pat.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Pat, and then I'll go to Tom, and then Rebecca.

So, Pat.
MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. Having worked out there -- my first trip westward was 1963 and then a lot of time off and on in the '70s, '80s and '90s until I left the Department, I did work out there on salmon, but $I$ think it would be good for Council and the long-term discussion of this to have Fish and Game send Karen a copy of Lem Butler's report from 2009 so they can understand a little more on the dynamics of the population.

Myself, I'm comfortable with leaving the judgment to discussion on harvest numbers up to the professional biologists. I would ask people to think in terms of caution, though, is snowfall is a variable that determines the distribution of caribou on the Peninsula in my mind and from talking to folks, and I would suggest Ms. Peterson get a hold of Steve Harvey in Anchorage, he was a pilot out there for like 45 years and worked his last 25 with the Department, but he was also in the commercial -- anyway just to get a broader perspective, because I can recall when the herd was small and then when it peaked at 10,000 , as the population is bigger than the critters, in my mind, distributed themselves over broader areas, in my mind if we wanted to have a greater harvest availability for folks west of Nelson Lagoon and back down to King Cove and folks from Sand Point going across, then you need to probably see the population increase towards the higher end and so I would, myself, be cautious in increasing the harvest level based on a model that's a best guess, but I still would allow -- and that's your folks business.

I think the key point that was left out in this discussion was Lem Butler's small experiment there for three years on removing wolves that came on the calving grounds and I believe over three years it was 36 wolves in total. I forget the actual number. And 25 the first year, and my numbers might be off, six cubs that they couldn't find, but just that small selective removal, and I know there's a lot of passion and differences of philosophy between agencies and between different public folks on predator control, but I think his small experiment on selective removals on
only 40 percent of the calving grounds, in my mind, that has been a direct result of the increase in the population and $I$ would also remind folks that the 60 percent of Federal lands that was not allowed on.
So we need to look at this cautiously and take it a step at a time, but $I$ would trust the agencies to talk amongst themselves on a gradual increase but I would suggest caution.
And I think that beings our Council has discussed this issue, I think that it would be really good to have this alignment between the State and the Federal agencies on the harvest.
So, thank you very much and anyway that's it for me for now.
Thank you, Ma'am.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat.
MS. PETERSON: Madame.....
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame.....
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Oh, I'm sorry, is....
MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair, Chris
here.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: .....that you
Chris?
MS. PETERSON: Yes. If I could just say a little bit.
Just to clarify because it sounded from Pat's comment, it sounded like perhaps I didn't make something clear there and I want to make sure that it is very clear.
The numbers that are in the proposal from the State to increase the bag limits will be based on the population and what is available as surplus in that population. And the reason that it will be based

1 on that is so that we can be very cautious, but we have to be cautious in two different ways.

We need to make sure that we do not overharvest on this herd, but because it is such a small herd we also -- and it is prone to reaching its upper limits very rapidly, which can lead to problems with forage, over utilizing the range and various other problems with the herd, so we also need to be cautious to make sure that we don't let it, the herd, reach excessive population numbers. We need to be able to manage it within that window between, say 2,000 and 4,000, with 4,000 being a very high number. So once we reach the 3,000 mark we do need to get in there and get the harvest accomplished that we need.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.
MS. PETERSON: So based on that, why this proposal has been put forth to increase the bag limit based on the available surplus. Mr. Homes is 100 percent correct in that we need to have caution in this but we need to also be able to increase the harvest quickly and in some cases, if the population suddenly starts increasing very quickly we need to not have to take a year or two to be able to raise our bag limit and get the harvest as needed. So there is no intent in this proposal to overharvest the herd, it is to be able to keep the herd down in the limits that the range is able to support and that the herd in its limited geography there is able to support.

We also did have kind of an idea that it would be perhaps beneficial for the Federal folks to issue -- rather than issue a separate Federal permit, just simply require your subsistence hunters to hunt on the State permit. That would kind of simplify the reporting process and the acquisition of the data from the hunt would all be going to one source, which would simplify the management issues. It's just a recommendation from us, it would be something that might be beneficial.

Thank you.
MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, this is Pat.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, I agree with you 100 percent. I was just reflecting on a lot of time hunting and hiking out there in terms of your goals. And I understand and accept those but you also need to still be able to look at population density in terms of distribution over the entire area and if you go out now in the southwestern portion and the blueberries are now up to your chin, the brush and the forage and odds and ends -- lost -- (telephone breaking up)....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, I'm sorry, I got lost there. These silly flip-phones, I need a 12 year old to help me with it.

I was just saying that $I$ agree with the Fish and Game biologist on all the points they made and I was merely, you know, referencing the reasons why things have changed. I agree with the need to be conservative but you need to also keep in mind the distribution of that population over the area and so I would just -- that would be my caution. And in terms of looking at the habitat, I haven't been all over the area in quite some time, but with our meetings at Cold Bay I've noticed a -- I can't remember when -- when the herd was -- it was probably over 10,000 where they'd take a truck out to get the caribou off the runway and all their forage items would be four to six inches high and now they're five to six feet high and all the caribou are far to the north.

And I certainly trust you folks but I would just suggest that you keep an eye on the distribution in relation to the population numbers that you folks have set because caribou, I acknowledge, are a tricky critter to manage.

Anyway, my hat's off to you for your efforts. Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat.

Tom.

MR. SCHWANTES: I'm ready to make a motion but I'll hold off if anybody else has some other discussion.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: All right, I have three questions.

The first, $I$ just want to clarify the information we have in front of us. So in the, I'm going to call it the OSM Staff report, on Page 12, there's a chart that shows the number of harvest permits and it says that 75 permits were issued in 2016. I'm comparing that to Page 2 of the Izembek Staff report where there's a chart that indicates 31 permits were issued, I think in 2016 , but $I$ just want to know, are these two different sets of information that don't cover the same thing or is there a conflict in data?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Greg, can
you.....

MS. SKINNER: And then can both of you -- like both of you see what I'm comparing?

MR. RISDAHL: Yeah, we see it, that's a good catch. To be honest I'm not really sure -- I only put the current harvest for this past year in so without having the previous years I'm wondering if we're just one year -- that could have -- that doesn't make sense at all actually.

MS. SKINNER: Well, it strikes me that maybe the 75 was permits allocated, not permits actually issued.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: That's what it was, remember, we talked about the 15 permits per community and getting all the proper paperwork in to issue those permits, that's the difference.

MR. RISDAHL: Yes, Madame Chair. Members of the Council.

I was looking at State harvest tickets on Page 12 that you're referring to, yes, so for some reason on 2016 the data isn't in this table but it was -- there were 75 total permits, but I do not believe that that's the total number that were issued for that year. We had 31 permits issued, it was just 75 permits available.
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MS. SKINNER: Okay.
MR. EVANS: Yeah, that's correct. Based -- we wrote these reports earlier on before we had this updated information so.....

MS. SKINNER: Okay. All right.
MR. EVANS: .....that's.....
MS. SKINNER: All right.
MR. EVANS: .....so that is correct.
MS. SKINNER: Okay, thank you for clarifying.

So in 2016 there were 31 permits issued and the community-specific details for that can be found on Page 2 of the Izembek Staff report, great.

Second question. With the winter counts, the Izembek Staff report notes that there wasn't a winter count, 2016 winter, because we're not to 2017 winter yet, because there wasn't enough Staff. Do you expect going forward that there would be enough Staff, or is this a long-term, just budget cut, there won't be enough Staff in the future?

MR. RISDAHL: Madame Chair. Members of the Council. I wish I knew the answer to that.

I did speak with my boss yesterday and he assured me out of the Refuge managers, and the refuges he supervises, $I$ am one of eight, he said the biologist at Izembek is the number 1 priority because -- I wrote the report this year because I didn't have a biologist to do it so we really do need a biologist. If we have a biologist, if funding's available, if the Federal hiring freeze within Fish and Wildlife Service is lifted, I have already done the paperwork for that position, I am waiting for the go ahead to be able to send in the waiver to hire to fill that position so our goal is to have a biologist here, it's just a matter of, things happen, you know, we -- Stacy left during the shuffle before the new administration came into office, which was going on all over the country, and then Chris decided to leave and we gave him an opportunity, to help him out, it was sort of a hardship
case, so he's down in Washington and that's working out. But as a result we've been relying on our partners to help us on a lot of our biological surveys, and I'm the report writer.

But we hope to get somebody in that position and be able to continue doing those surveys.

But with the State as our number 1 partner out here, they did do their surveys. They classified from this year 1,400 animals and gave us some good numbers on the bull/cow ratio and cow/calf ratio, which I have included in this report on Page 3 for the 9D herd. It was 49 bulls per 100 cows, 38 calves per 100 cows. And, likewise, they also did a survey on Unimak Island. So we're still getting good information because Fish and Game is helping us out on that.

MS. SKINNER: All right, thank you. So making some assumptions and drawing some conclusions from that, I would assume it's possible you probably wouldn't have a biologist for the 2017 winter count and that's me saying that, not you, but that if things work out you do plan to have another biologist and in which case you would plan to do the winter surveys.

Okay.
And then my third question, and you don't have to answer this, but do you have thoughts on the State's suggestion to require State permits rather than having a separate Federal permit?

MR. RISDAHL: Madame Chair. Members of the Council.

Actually, you know, $I$ don't really mind the idea too much. There is one exception to that, and that is our designated hunter permits under the Federal system make it a lot easier for a hunter to harvest game for other people. The State does have a program also but it is more stringent. So that really is the main thing for us. IT makes sense to have one agency keeping track of the harvest, but the one thing that we have is the designated hunter permit that really does -- can benefit some individuals in a community. Because one guy can go out who's a really excellent
hunter and harvest caribou for any number of people.
So that would be my only thought on
that.
MS. SKINNER: All right, and thank you for those comments. The designated hunter option or program is very important so it's helpful that you clarified that.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you.
Coral.
MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you. That was my question, is about the designated hunter. So in the regulation it states that -- you said a designated hunter could hunt for two or three or however many people and in the regulation it says you can have no more than two harvest limits in possession at one time. So I'm wondering, as we're proposing to get more caribou and getting more caribou to more people, if we can't change that number, so that a designated hunter or maybe two hunters -- because it is difficult to go hunt and to expect someone to be a designated hunter, go and get someone's hunt, come back, go get someone's hunt come back, rather maybe two people could go and get 10 caribou as designated hunters. And it's sort of more in line with a traditional style hunt also.

And I'm wondering if we could address the increase in take for these places with something like that and how we would go about that, and what are your thoughts on that.

MR. RISDAHL: Well, I'll give you my thoughts on that.

You know some guys are really great at hunting, you know we call them super hunters basically and that's what they live to do, and those are the guys that are going to provide food for the tribe. The only issue, I think, and I don't know how that all came about, when those regulations were -- when those sideboards were put into place, but like when I go moose hunting, I like to have at least one other guy, if not two guys with me, because one moose by myself is

1 a lot to handle. In the case of caribou, if I shoot 2 caribou, that's probably more than I'm going to want to handle in a day anyway, and it varies with where you go. So in Cold Bay, it's not a big deal to shoot a couple caribou, nobody camps out here. You go out and you hunt caribou, you shoot a couple caribou, you'd be home by that night, and that's probably all you'd want to handle. Now if you were -- if you happened upon a big herd and you could shoot more, you'd probably want to call somebody and say, hey I need some help butchering these caribou or something. So, you know, whether or not we need to change that, you know, I guess that's kind of a judgment call. I personally don't have any strong feelings.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: If I can maybe respond to some of that. If you look at the designated hunter permit, it has quite a number of lines on there so you could actually hunt for more than one person. You may not have to -- maybe in one day have two in possession, but you could go the next day and probably hunt two for two more people. Because if you look at that form, it does have a number of lines on it. And you can correct me if I'm wrong but that's what I recall.

MR. RISDAHL: Madame Chair, that is correct. It doesn't mean that you're limited to taking two caribou or something for other individuals, it's just that you're allowed two a day. You know, so in other words, your possession limit, then you bring it home, then you go back out the next day and you can harvest a couple of more. And you can continue to do that throughout the season. And if there was actually any reason behind that, you know, because two caribou is more than enough for one person to handle, I don't know. But that is -- you can certainly harvest more than two per, whatever, possession limit, it's just daily, it's a daily possession limit.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, my experience is that -- I believe if we would increase it we will find more waste and so my opinion is we leave it as it is. If I want to go out as a designated hunter, I could take my caribou and a caribou for Sam and that's all I'm going to be able to handle. And if I shoot more it's going to get wasted, you know, either the bears

|  | Page 53 |
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| 1 | are going to get it or something's going to happen to |
| 2 | it before I can get it out of the field. |
| 3 |  |
| 4 | So I, for one, would say leave it as it |
| 5 | is. |
| 6 |  |
| 7 | Thank you. |
| 8 |  |
| 9 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: All right. Any |
| 10 | other comments, discussion. |
| 11 |  |
| 12 | Rick, I believe, is not on line right |
| 13 | now so -- Tom. |
| 14 |  |
| 15 | MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, this is Pat. |
| 16 |  |
| 17 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat. |
| 18 |  |
| 19 | MR. HOLMES: I agree with Tom. Thank |
| 20 | you, Madame Chair. |
| 21 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom, do you have |
| 23 | a comment. |
| 24 |  |
| 25 | MR. SCHWANTES: A motion. |
| 26 |  |
| 27 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Tom. |
| 28 |  |
| 29 | MR. SCHWANTES: Regarding Proposal |
| 30 | WP18-20. |
| 31 |  |
| 32 | I would make a motion that we approve |
| 33 | this proposal with a couple of changes. |
| 34 |  |
| 35 | Under proposed regulation, Unit 9D |
| 36 | caribou, allow two caribou by Federal registration |
| 37 | permit and then with the modification under the support |
| 38 | there, with that modification, so to allow the Refuge |
| 39 | to close the season if necessary. |
| 40 |  |
| 41 | So that would be my proposal. |
| 42 |  |
| 43 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Melissa. |
| 44 |  |
| 45 | MS. BERNS: I was going to second it. |
| 46 |  |
| 47 | MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair. Members |
| 48 | of the Council. I apologize for the confusion. We |
| 49 | have also an invite for any public testimony, not just |
| 50 |  |

agency testimony that should be done prior to a motion by the Council. So an invitation for that.

Secondly, I apologize for earlier saying that the agencies couldn't orally comment, I was referring to written comments and there are none, and we have the agencies comments, which I think is great. But the next step on the card is to invite public testimony and if there is not, then the Council can proceed to make a motion.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Karen, I thought we had done that but I'll ask again. Is there anybody in the public that would like to make a comment in regard to this proposal.

Leticia.
MS. MELENDEZ: Madame Chair and Regional Council. I just wanted to add, as we talked about the Subsistence Federal caribou hunt at Izembek National Wildlife Refuge, there has been a process that was introduced when we send out the permits when we started the program and it has a unique code for each of the permits. And I don't know if you all've noticed it, Della, if you've noticed it, but it's a unique code at the very bottom of the permits in addition to a website. Now, the hunter, once they've harvested their caribou can actually access that website and enter that unique code and it identifies who they are and then brings up questions about how they obtained their harvest. They can enter that information into the database, into the subsistence database and it actually counts the harvest and that's how they keep up with the harvest reports.

It has been a program that's been available since we started the subsistence hunt but has had some glitches but is now up and running and so I just want to make sure that we're aware that that unique code can now be a way to record the harvests that are being taken throughout the different communities that hold these permits. So I wanted to make sure that we're all aware of that.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you.

Go ahead, Sam.
MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. Just a question. What's the participation in that, what are you seeing, for people actually following through with that after the hunt?

MS. MELENDEZ: I haven't been able to actually see what the successful rate of that entry is but it seems to be pretty helpful for the communities to be able to get on the internet and actually plug that in rather than save that harvest report that's attached to the permit and make sure that they hold and have it and then mail it to us. So it just depends upon the user, if they are willing to get on the internet and it's easy for them to input that information then it still gets recorded, if they'd rather not, they can still out that harvest report and just throw it in the mail and we can get it. But I do not have a success rate of either one, I just know that we do get our permits out and our harvest report in, but it's another way to record your harvest reports.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And then, Sam, one of the things I've been doing because I've been doing these in King Cove. When I worked at the tribe I used to do them out of that office but I started doing them out of the King Cove Corporation office, but I've been just kind of asking everybody if you're more comfortable, drop these back off to me, I'll get all the information to Fish and Wildlife when this is all done and that way I'm finding sometimes it's easier for people to just say, here, Della, you take this and I'm happy to do it, perfect, and that way at least we get something.

MS. MELENDEZ: That sounds like a great idea.

## MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom.

MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, that would be my only concern, that it's an either or, so either I can mail the permit in or $I$ can go on line, but I don't have to go on line.

MS. MELENDEZ: That's correct. And I think if it's communicated, when we have the POC, i.e., Della Trumble for King Cove, she can talk to her folks
1 and say this is an option, but either way you can give 2 it to me and I can mail it off to Izembek or you can get on to the computer yourself and enter the information, it's really up to them as long as it's communicated and we get the record of it, that's what's the goal.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And to be honest with you, I plan to call all the people that $I$ have all the copies of just to follow through in case they haven't taken the time to do that, because that's sometimes the other issue, people just don't take the time to do it.
MS. MELENDEZ: Yeah, people are busy, I understand.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay.
MS. MELENDEZ: Thank you, that's all I had.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Angela.
MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: One moment, Pat, please, we have someone in the audience.
Angela.
MS. SIMPSON: Madame Chair and Members, thank you for listening to me. I just really want to show some caution about that these are estimated models. Right here it says that this is an estimated population simulation, and without the Staffing of a possible biologist position here to really get those counts for this next winter, I really want to make sure this is -- you know, models are portrayed a lot, but I really want to make sure that we're taking this in the best interest and making sure that we're not increasing these limits, that are going to harm the herd for future years. You know,you can open up special hunts later, but until we really have those hard numbers, I think that's really a cautionary item that really needs to be considered.
Thank you.
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1
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Angela.
And, Greg, can you respond to that. Did you not make the comment that you had numbers from the State.
MR. RISDAHL: Yes, Madame Chair. What Angela's referring to is $I$ have an asterisk on the 2016/2017 composition survey information on Page 3. The only part of that table there that was actually modeled was the estimated population. The actual classification was of a sample size of 1,442 caribou and the Fish and Game Department, in doing that survey, came up with a population count of 49 bulls per 100 cows and 39 calves per 100 cows, and those are from actual numbers that were observed in the field. So those are actual numbers and a survey -- a sample survey of 1,400 animals for that herd is actually an excellent survey because, you know, that's approximately three-quarters of the total herd, so it's a pretty darn good sample size.
But the total count is just an estimate and that's what was modeled, that number 2,200 is the only modeled number, the rest of them are actual numbers. And, yes, as Tom was saying that is totally standard Fish and Game survey information, that's the way it's been done -- it's done all over the United States, all over the world for that matter.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. And, Tom, did you have one more comment.
MR. SCHWANTES: No.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, hearing none, we do have a motion.....
MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: .....on the floor -- oh, I'm sorry, Pat, go ahead.
MR. HOLMES: I think Angela's point was what I was trying to get at and I didn't hear anything definitive of the reason to increase to two. I think the harvest we should be dealing with the proposal that we have at hand of one and that we -- you know, that it

1 would be recognized that if the biologist, the game 2 biologist with the State and the Feds, felt that something occurred with the herd, they got this State model and then if they felt an increase was appropriate, because when you increase the number then you also have the sporthunt, you got, you know, the State subsistence -- we're talking about the Federal subsistence and trying to get the Federal subsistence aligned with the State and so that's a sticky issue. And so I would like, in terms of clarification, of why the two, and also in terms of the discussion on Page 1, OSM preliminary conclusion, they drop that the quota -needed closures will be announced by the Izembek Refuge manager after consultation with ADF\&G, and I think our discussions we've had over the years has shown that you need to have both agencies working together and that they need to consult and so I would have some reservations about deleting that sentence in the OSM recommendation and $I$ would like to hear some discussions definitively that two is necessary at this point. You could say up to two, or you could have some verbiage saying after consultation and meeting the necessary model, whichever one you're going to use, I can't give you quite the verbiage but I don't know that we're -- I'm not comfortable with saying going for two and deleting that last sentence.

## Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat.
I want maybe a clarification.
Number 1, you mentioned a special action to increase it. Well, it's every two years on wildlife and we tried to do a special action just to change this and we were told we can't because there's not a harvest issue, our problem, so we -- as far as caribou are on -- on 9D we're on a two year cycle, so kind of keep that in mind. I think we need to be reminded of that.

And, yeah, just kind of keep that in mind. So what we're doing now is setting something starting in 2018 that's going to be going on to 2020. If I think there's an issue of having to do an emergency closure, both the Fish and Wildlife and the State have that ability to make that decision jointly; am I correct? Go ahead, Tom.
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MR. EVANS: This is Tom Evans.
So in the delegation of authority letter it does state that Federal managers are expected to work with managers of the State, the Council Chair and the appropriate Council members to minimize disruption to the subsistence resource. So it's expected that when someone has delegation of authority they consult the parties, and it specifically mentions the State in this case.
So that, I think, covers what your issue is with taking the language out of the regulations and putting it into the delegation of authority, Pat.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Sam.
MR. HOLMES: Thank you.
MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. I wanted to comment on that and then $I$ was waiting to comment on the increase to two until we had that modified language on the table actually because I do have some comments on that.
But, yeah, just to agree with what Tom said about the delegated authority, my understanding is the Refuge manager has that for all of the subsistence regulations so, again, there's no reason to put that language specifically into this one, when they already do that for all of the hunting regulations, is my understanding, so it's just redundant.
MR. EVANS: Yeah, all the Refuges don't have delegated authority for all species and stuff, so we have delegation of authority kind of goes by species and by location and units, so but by taking it out of the regulations it makes sense to not have it in regulation and have the Refuge manager -- it allows more.....
(Teleconference interference participant phones not muted)
MR. EVANS: .....flexibility for them to change the regulations on a more timely basis, because without the delegation of -- if it stays in regulations, then as Della mentioned, then if you
wanted to change the regulations out of the sequence, you know, in the in between year then you would have to do a special action, which takes more time and it's not as -- it's a more cumbersome process basically.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.
MS. SKINNER: I'm not sure if this is a comment or a question.

So I think I understood Pat's question/concern about why are we going up to two caribou. I thought that Chris from Fish and Game said that they put forward a proposal to the Board of Game to change the bag limit for this caribou and I think that is Proposal 126, so we're going to be discussing that proposal shortly and we'll have an opportunity to submit comment to the Board of Game. I guess my question, or throwing this out as an idea, do we want to table the action we're currently working on until we've discussed Proposal 126 under, I think it ended up under Item D of new business, if people are concerned about increasing the bag limit.

My understanding was, from past Council discussion, there was a desire to not have subsistence hunting be more restricted than the State hunting and so to me it's logical that if the State is going to increase the bag limit to two, that if we don't increase it now, we're just going to be coming back in two years and increasing it. But I understand the cautionary note as well.

So I guess a question $I$ do have, if we change the language to say up to two, is that something then the Refuge manager could make it one or make it two, or how does that work in practice?

I'm seeing nods of heads.
MR. EVANS: No, I just had to think about this. This is Tom from OSM, Fish and Wildlife.

If the manager has delegated authority to set the quotas, yes, they could change it from one to two, they could do that. So I have to look at the delegation of authority to see if it says that they can
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MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair.....
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Is that you, Chris, go ahead.

MS. PETERSON: It is, I'm sorry. I just wanted to verify that, yes it is Proposal 126 that addresses this for the State and that's why I mentioned this earlier was to clarify that the State is basing their bag limit -- if this proposal is accepted this year through the Board of Game, we will be basing our bag limit on the population each year. So that kind of simplifies the management in terms of, well, if the herd is really rapidly growing and it takes a year or two to change a bag limit in the regs, if we base it and say that if the population exceeds -- or if the harvestable surplus exceeds a certain number then we automatically are ready to legally able to change our bag limits to match that and that is why I recommended that, rather than saying that you have a bag limit of one or two, say that your bag limit is based on harvestable surplus, then you don't need to worry about the time lapse from seeing what the population is doing to making the change in the limit.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom.
MR. EVANS: So, Chris, this is Tom.....
MS. PETERSON: Does that make sense.
MR. EVANS: .....again. So that would -- going along with the lines of what you just said, that would change the bag limit from like -- like to a range of like one to five, or something like that?

MS. PETERSON: Yes, you just -- all we have implemented -- it actually says in the regulation that if the surplus exceeds 250, then we -- we are able to up our limit -- bag limit to three caribou and so each year we are able to look at the data that we have and make the changes accordingly and we don't need to run this past the Board of Game or get a new regulation in place.

Currently we're at a bag limit of one, but if our harvestable surplus gets to exceed -- I want
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1 to say the right numbers here -- if the harvestable bag limit up to two caribou and we don't need to go through the legal process to do that because it's already been done, and so we're not limited to just one.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Chris.

## Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: So I know we have a motion on the floor but I'd really like to table this until we've had a chance to look at Proposal 126 or 56 or whatever it is I just said, because I don't have that in front of me right now. I would like to see what the proposed -- the State's proposed language says because that will make it much more clearer to me. And I think, depending on what that language says, it may be appropriate to use similar language in our proposal.

But in any case I think these two are so closely tied, I don't feel comfortable voting on this one until we actually talk about and review the Board of Game proposal.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Rebecca.

Tom.
MR. EVANS: Thank you. So the Board of Game, their comment deadline is February 2nd, the meeting will be February 16th to the 23rd, to give you sort of a timeline of when that will happen.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And our window basically closes because we're doing wildlife now; is that correct?

MR. EVANS: We're doing wildlife now but we have -- the Board will not meet until April of next year so there is time for us to modify in the meantime. The one thing, if we do the changes now,
this will be -- other people won't have seen that, you know, if we make a change at this point, but we can do that, you know, that all the people that have gone through reviews now have not seen the changes that we might make but.....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. Tom, you had the motion on the floor and then Rebecca had as a suggestion to table this to Item E, under 11 , which would also include Unimak, which you have also added to the agenda, what is the process here, to withdraw to your resolution or just.....

MR. SCHWANTES: I'd like to withdraw that motion until after we've looked at the proposal.

MS. SKINNER: Does the second concur.
MS. BERNS: Yes, second concurs.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, I think we're good. We'll just go ahead and move that.

A lot to think about. I guess maybe a comment, you know, it's encouraging, I think, from those of us living in 9D, to be able to look at possibly increasing the harvest limit but, you know, I hear from people that depend on the subsistence also to be careful so, you know, it would be nice to have more -- the numbers sooner than later but, yeah, I just -I'm also concerned about us getting the caribou not being the -- the environment not being able to sustain the herd also so we've got a lot to think about as we move forward.

Tom.
MR. EVANS: So just to clarify. So the recommendation of the Council would be to defer the proposal until after the recommendation has been made under the Board of Game?

MS. SKINNER: No.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: No. I thought it was after the State's report today.

MR. EVANS: Oh, okay.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Is that correct?
MS. SKINNER: Yeah. So my intent was to not take action on this proposal until we've had discussion on the proposal that's going in front of the Board of Game, which is coming up in like two agenda items. So I expect that discussion would occur today and then we would come back and take action on our proposal.

MR. EVANS: Okay.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, everyone. Good discussion.

We will move on to statewide proposals WP18-51, modifying the definition of bait. And do we have a page number, is it in our booklet?

MR. EVANS: This is also a
supplemental.
MS. DEATHERAGE: It's in the back after the caribou portion.

MR. EVANS: Okay. So this proposal is brought up because it is sort of a -- could affect statewide areas, so this could affect your area. So this proposal is being addressed just because your -this RAC might have comments on this proposal. It will go to many different -- this proposal was -- Proposal 18-51 was submitted by the Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. And it requests that the Federal statewide bear baiting restrictions be aligned with State regulations specifically for the use of biodegradable materials.

The proponent states that the Federal -- that the current Federal bear baiting restrictions are much more restrictive than the States and do not provide a Federal subsistence priority.

The proponent proposes to align Federal and State bear baiting restrictions in order to reduce regulatory complexity, reduce user confusion and allow baiting with items, for example dog food, popcorn, baked goods, grease, syrup, et cetera, that have been traditionally used as bear bait by Federally-qualified subsistence users and are currently allowed under State
1 regulations.

Currently black bears may be taken at bait stations under Federal regulations in all units except Units 1C, 4, 8, 9, 10, 14, 18, 22, 23 and 26. Brown bear may be taken at bait stations in Units 11, 12 and 25D.

In 2012 the National Park Service published the Final Rule 36 CFR 13.42, subsection G, paragraph 10 prohibiting the take of brown and black bears over bait in National Park Prese -- National Preserves under State regulations.

In 2017 the National Park Service published Final Rule 36 CFR 13.480 limiting types of bait that may be used for taking bears under Federal subsistence regulations to native fish or wildlife remains from natural mortality or parts not required to be salvaged from a legal harvest. An exception to the Final Rule allows the superintendent of the WrangellSt. Elias State National Park and Preserve to issue a permit to all the use -- to all, the use of human produced foods as long as they're incompatible -- wait, let me go back to that. An exception to the Final Rule allows the superintendent of the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park to issue a permit to all -- to use the human produced foods as long as it's incomapt -- as long as it's compatible with Park purposes and values and the applicant does not have access to natural materials for bait. And this is based on some documented history of bear baiting in Wrangell-St. Elias areas.

Some of the cultural knowledge. The use of bait stations is controversial. Those that support bear baiting state that it allows hunters to be selective, it allows them to select sex and allow for the identification of sows with cubs and a humane way of taking of bears, especially those bears with limited mobility to participate in a hunt, so if you're shooting with an arrow and stuff, it's considered a humane way of getting the bear that you need. Those that oppose often cite safety concerns and food conditioning.

Other alternatives considered for this proposal were that if this is adopted, this proposal would permit the use of scent lures on Federal public

1 lands administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service, 2 BLM and the US Forest Service, which are currently not defined under Federal regulations. If scent lures are not defined, any material of chemical -- any material, including chemicals, including toxic and bionondegradable materials could be used.

So if this proposal is adopted it would provide more opportunity for Federally-qualified subsistence users on most Federal public lands and would align State and Federal baiting restrictions.

The requested changes are already permitted under State regulations, it's not expected that there would be any differences in the bear harvest population subsistence uses or habituation of bears to human foods with this proposal.

OSM's preliminary conclusion for this is to support Proposal WP18-51 with the modification to establish the definition for scent lure and clarify the regulatory language. And the regulatory language would read as follows:

Under 25(a) under the definitions, the following definitions apply to all regulations contained in this part.

A scent lure (this is the new part) in reference to bear baiting means any biodegradable material to which
biodegradable scent is applied or infused.

The next section, for Section 26.
You may use only biodegradable materials for bait if fish and wildlife is used for bait, that would be new, only the head, bones and viscera or skin of legally harvested fish and wildlife, the skin carcasses of furbearers and unclassified wildlife may be used, except that in Unit 7 and 15, fish or fish parts may not be used as bait. Scent lures may be used at registered bait stations.

So, that concludes -- any questions.
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MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I think as the process, we do the introduction and presentation analysis and then we ask for the report on Board consultation from tribes, ANCSA Corporations.
MS. SKINNER: Can we ask questions of what he just said to clarify?
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Rebecca.
MS. SKINNER: So as I read the -- the current regulation, or the new regulation, $I$ don't understand how the proposed regulation is less restrictive, can you cover that again, what is less restrictive about it?
MR. EVANS: So the existing.....
REPORTER: Tom, mic please.
MR. EVANS: Yes. So the existing Federal regulations right now, for that Section 26, which was the second section I read about, states, prohibitive methods and means, except for special provisions found in paragraph 1 (ph) through 26 of this section, the following methods and means of taking wildlife for subsistence users are prohibited.
Using bait for taking ungulates, bear, wolf or wolverine, except you may use bait to take wolves and wolverine with a trapping license and you may use bait to take black bears and brown bears with a hunting license as authorized in unit specific regulations, which it lists the sections. Baiting of black bears and brown bears is subject to the following restrictions. You may use only biodegradable materials for bait. You may only use the head, bones, viscera or skin of legally harvested fish and wildlife for bait.
So this new regulation would allow you to use -- would allow you to use fish and -- fish and game so.....
MS. SKINNER: So as I read it, it appears actually to be more restrictive because it gives more specificity to what you're allowed to use whereas the current regulation just says you can use fish and wildlife, head, bones, viscera and skin of
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1 legally harvested fish. So I'm trying to understand,
is there something I'm missing in the language because
I really don't see the proposed language as less
restrictive so I'm assuming there's something else that
I'm not picking up on, why this is needed to be less
restrictive.

MS. DEATHERAGE: This is actually expanding it.

MR. EVANS: Well, I thought it was expanding it too but.....
(Pause)
MR. EVANS: Yes, okay, so that is correct. So we are using -- so you can use other biodegradable materials including, and then it gives you a definition if you do use fish and game for bait then it gives you those restrictions. So it's allowing them to increase, and it also defines the use of a scent lure so.

MS. SKINNER: Okay. So it uses -you're allowed to use biodegradable materials that are not fish and wildlife derived?

MR. EVANS: Yes.
MS. SKINNER: Okay, thank you.
MR. EVANS: Yes.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom, can you answer why it says except that in Units 7 and 15, fish and fish parts may not be used?

MR. EVANS: Yes, I can answer that. That's because that's usually on the Kenai, in that area there, and they have lots of -- there's lots of fishing and they don't want to -- they want to attract bears into areas -- to the bear baiting stations, so that's why they restrict the use of fish in those areas.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Report from -- any reports, consultation from tribes and ANCSA Corporations at this time.
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Karen.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame Chair. Is Orville Lind still on the telephone.
(No comment)
MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair. I have not heard of any responses from the tribes or ANCSA Corporations under consultation for this proposal.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Karen. Advisory -- agency comments, ADF\&G.
MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair, this is Chris Peterson in King Salmon, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay.
MS. PETERSON: As we look at this proposal, the Department comments are simply that this seems to expand the definition of what may be used as bait for bears and would align the State and Federal regulations. And we do not believe that, if it was adopted, there would be no significant impacts on other users. So it would expand it to the use of lures, scent lures, and it would simply simplify the enforcement.
So the Department does support this proposal because it does reduce regulatory complexity and user confusion by allowing Federally-qualified users to bait bears with additional attractants that are not necessarily related to wildlife and fish. So the Department does support this proposal.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Chris.
Federal comments.
MR. RISDAHL: Madame Chair. Members of the Council.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I think I see three letters of opposition.
(Pause)
MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair, you are correct in there are three letters of opposition to this proposal. Those letters largely cite the food conditioning of bears, human food conditioning to be specific, and the potential dangers of habituation bears and causing conflict with residents
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.
MS. SKINNER: I have a question on the scent lure. Is it defined or is it understood that the scent lure is supposed to smell like food or can the scent lure smell like, whatever, like during mating season, when, whatever, you understand my question?
MR. EVANS: I do understand your question. And it could be anything that they want.
In the Federal regulations we had no definition of scent lures so there was no definition at all before so that's why we're trying to clarify that with this proposal.
MS. SKINNER: So I'll just make a comment to that.
I guess the idea of using -- I have some concerns about the idea of using scent lure. I understand that there are technological advances, I don't have a problem with people using more technologically advanced sorts of things to do what they've traditionally done, however, I guess, to me, using the scent lure could cover such a broad range of things, I'm -- that's -- I feel like that's getting beyond what, I guess, what I'm comfortable with. But, I guess I'm still thinking about this one but $I$ do have concerns with it.
Thanks.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you,
Rebecca.
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Public testimony.
(No comments)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Regional Council. Anybody have comments.
Sam.
MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. Sam Rohrer, here. Yeah, a couple of comments.
Just for clarification, while this is a statewide proposal for bear baiting restrictions, it's still only actually applies to unit specific areas where bear baiting is allowed so in no area in Unit 8 or Unit 9D or Unit 10 is bear baiting allowed and we've always taken a pretty strong stance against it just because traditionally it's never been done in these areas.
Often times on these kind of proposals that don't affect us at all, but they do affect other areas that participate, we just don't comment, and that's probably appropriate to do in this instance.
I don't have a.....
MS. SKINNER: I second that.
(Laughter)
MR. ROHRER: Yeah. I don't have any strong concerns with the proposal. Generally, I support trying to bring into line the Federal and State regulations just to make things easier for the folks in the field, that makes good sense to me generally. But in this instance it doesn't affect us. The folks on the other Councils -- the other Council who submitted it, they have the expertise in this area, we don't. I'd just as soon we don't comment on it.
Thank you.
MS. SKINNER: Second.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Is that a motion, Sam, it's been seconded.



1 upload. I mean black computers with black usb ports,
in the dark. Can you do this.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes.
(Pause)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, go ahead, Karen.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Good afternoon members of the Council, Madame Chair. What we have here is I've done a quick PowerPoint on the Board of Game proposals that affect statewide regulations as well as Units 8, 9 and 10.

As you will see on the PowerPoint right now the comments on statewide proposals are due October $27 t h$ and the regional comments are due February 2nd. Both of these timeframes are before your winter cycle meeting in Kodiak.

The first proposal that the Council may want to address is they are changing the definition of edible meat for cranes, geese and swan to include breast; and these are the new things; back, wings, gizzard and heart. And those are the new items that are being added to the definition. And the meat of the femur and legs and thighs for fall migratory and winter migratory bird hunting. And the reason why this proposal was put forth by the Native....
(Teleconference interference participant phones not muted)

MS. DEATHERAGE: .....caucus of the AMBCC was to make it more consistent with the spring/summer subsistence migratory bird harvest regulations and to prevent waste.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can you mention the proposal number.

MS. DEATHERAGE: I'm sorry, the proposal is No. 4, it is a statewide proposal.

Madame Chair, we also do not have to follow the process for the Federal regulatory changes. The Board may or may not wish to comment on this and I
can submit those comments on behalf of this Council but we don't have to take public testimony or any of the other protocols listed on the back unless you wish to.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So I guess my question is, at this time, specifically on Proposal 4, do the Council members have any comments or questions.
Melissa.
MS. BERNS: I just would like to say that I was a part of this process and I'm in favor of this proposal for the purpose of decreasing waste.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I have a question, maybe, because it's something that kind of came up during lunch.
For 9D or 10, there is not a swan, I think for swans on a hunt, and if that's the case, can someone explain why that is?
MS. DEATHERAGE: I stared at Tom.
MR. EVANS: Just because.
(Laughter)
MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair, this is Chris at Fish and Game.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Chris.
MS. PETERSON: Since no one else is saying anything. From my years down there in Cold Bay, I recall being told that the reason swans were not included in hunting down there was because the population in that area is considered to be a separate population and does not migrate and so they were being much more careful in permitting hunting.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So if that's the case then does Fish and Wildlife have the ability to set a limit for purposes of hunting if it's not considered part of the migratory birds?
MR. RISDAHL: Madame Chair.
MS. PETERSON: I don't know.
MS. DEATHERAGE: For the Federal Subsistence Program with the Board, they -- the management of migratory birds are not under the jurisdiction of the Board, but they are under the jurisdiction of Fish and Wildlife Service. This proposal is for Fish and Game.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: That's true it's for Fish and Game, but the question that came up is where I was getting at. Because the birds in our area are not considered migratory, why is there not a hunt, or even a subsistence hunt, and then if that's -- if they're not migratory, then who is the powers to be that says you can have a subsistence hunt; is that Fish and Wildlife, that's the question.
MR. RISDAHL: Madame Chair and Council members, this is Greg Risdahl from Izembek.
The management of swans is still under Federal jurisdiction and the Migratory Bird Division makes those recommendations and regulations. So like Chris Peterson was saying, I was on my way up here but I was tripping over the cord back here, and she is correct, from what I understand that because this population is considered sort of isolated and unique they decided not to have a season on it. That doesn't mean that somebody couldn't make that suggestion, but that would go through the Federal Migratory Bird process.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, thank you. Then maybe we could look at that at some point in time.
Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: I'd like to invite John from the audience to come up and comment on this.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: John.
MR. ARKLEY: John Arkley from Cold Bay. Hey, my question is, in this proposal, would it be statewide obviously, and it would be for all resident hunters and out of state hunters and everybody? Does anybody know?
MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you. My assumption would be, and maybe Fish and Game could clarify this, is it would be dependent on the eligibility of hunters in particular regions, whether non-resident or resident hunters were allowed to hunt these particular birds in their game unit.
And so let's say that you couldn't hunt cranes in Unit 16, then obviously this proposal would not be applicable for cranes in that unit.
MR. ARKLEY: Yes, I understand that. It says the back, wings, gizzard and heart, and so in other words, keep basically the whole bird in tact; is that what you're saying?
MS. DEATHERAGE: That's what the proposal is saying, to add those as part of the definition of what's required to use when you take the bird, which is currently what's required under Federal regulation for migratory birds.
MS. CHERNOFF: For subsistence.
MR. ARKLEY: For subsistence, not for State?
MS. CHERNOFF: No, I missed that question.
MR. ARKLEY: Okay.
MS. CHERNOFF: I mean I missed that part, that comment. This is for the State fall hunt.
MR. ARKLEY: Subsistence.
MS. CHERNOFF: No.
MR. ARKLEY: Overall.
MS. CHERNOFF: Spring is -- so currently in the State hunt they -- I think it's defined the edible meat, I believe, is just defined as the breast.....
MR. ARKLEY: Right.
MS. CHERNOFF: .....of the bird.


put forth by the Native caucus from AMBCC who deal with a lot of birds up north which are -- there's a lot more people hunting a lot more large birds and they're getting a lot of waste, and so it was to address that waste for the fall hunting season and to align it more with the spring.....
MR. ARKLEY: Could we add the word.....
REPORTER: So could you.....
MR. ARKLEY: .....subsistence to that.
MS. SKINNER: Your microphone.
REPORTER: Turn the microphone on.
MR. ARKLEY: Could we add subsistence, just subsistence to that to kind of let us old guys not have to carry the whole carcass sometimes.
MS. CHERNOFF: It's their proposal so we can just comment on it.
MR. SCHWANTES: John, sit back down
there.
(Laughter)
MS. DEATHERAGE: I think that what you could do and what any public member could do and this Council could do, is in your comments to the Board of Game regarding this proposal, you could certainly ask for anything you would like amended and give your justification for why you would like that to happen.
As far as actually changing the proposal, that is not under the purview of anybody at this point, but you can comment and ask the Board to change it.
Does that make sense?
MR. ARKLEY: I guess. I'm not very good at this sort of process.
It's -- I understand it and I agree with it to a point but it's -- to require every person to do that, there's -- we're going to make everybody
criminals because not all of us are going to use the heart and gizzard and certainly not the wings.

MR. SCHWANTES: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Maybe when you're done talking if you could just turn that mic off so it doesn't interfere with the other ones, thank you.

Tom.

MR. SCHWANTES: So, John, I apologize for putting you on the spot but I wanted to hear your comment and from what I understand you are opposed to this proposal, this change in the regulation.

MR. ARKLEY: I would be, yes.
MR. SCHWANTES: Okay, thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Wait, wait, John, I got one question.

And for me to understand the reason you're opposed to it is because the amount of the bird that you'd be having to pack out; is that correct?

MR. ARKLEY: Yes. Sometimes we hunt five or six miles away and to carry the gizzard and the heart as part of a regulation, the legs and thighs are already part of the regulation, so we must carry those out, just in the state of Alaska, not anywhere else in the United States, in the migratory waterfowl, so it's just adding more -- it would be tougher, a lot harder. We can certainly try and do it but it would just -you'd have to carry a couple extra bags and everything else with you if you want to basically reduce the weight you're going to carry.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair, I have a question.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca, go ahead.

MS. SKINNER: Can you -- I guess I'm not familiar with how big the gizzards and the hearts are of these larger birds and I think I heard someone
snicker earlier when you said, oh, that'll be too much to carry, can you describe or tell us or show us how big are the hearts and the gizzards from each bird so we can have a sense of what we're talking about.

MR. ARKLEY: It's -- we're not talking about very much weight here, but it's I'm an old guy and I don't -- sometimes five or six miles is hard to get to. The gizzard, what would you say, Della, is about the half size of my fist, very dense, very, very dense. And the course, of course, is a standard heart size, not very big. It's just the carrying and the -to keep them clean and separate would be difficult. It would just add one more element and more garbage, more plastic bags and so forth. It could be done. The wings of a waterfowl are not very big, they're not like a chicken, so to even pluck the wings are going to be almost impossible, and I don't know how else you'd do it, maybe you could skin them but I don't know how.

So.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom, go ahead.
John, maybe if you could just stay just for a few more minutes and make sure everybody's.....

MR. SCHWANTES: I guess another question. You just mentioned skinning the wings, but isn't there another regulation that requires you to leave at least one of the wings feathered for identification?

MR. ARKLEY: You can also leave the head. The head or a wing for identification.

MR. SCHWANTES: Oh, okay. Okay.
MR. ARKLEY: But that is correct, yes.
MR. SCHWANTES: And so one more question, how many birds are you talking about packing out from wherever.

MR. ARKLEY: It's -- if you really pound them good you get six geese, or eight ducks and three brant so that turns out to be a pretty good load. That's if you're really lucky and shoot a lot better than me.
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(Laughter)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Does anybody have any more questions for John.
(No comments)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you.
MR. KOSO: Hey, Della, this is Rick here. I'd like to catch up a little bit of where you're at.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, Rick, what we're doing and you probably don't have it available, is we're going over the State Board of Game proposals, and this one is Proposal No. 4. I don't know if you have access to the internet and can go on line to the State proposals, but that's basically where we're at right now.
MR. KOSO: Yeah, I got the proposals, is that Proposal 4 you're on?
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: That's correct.
MR. KOSO: Okay, yeah, I got those.
MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.
MS. SKINNER: Karen, can you -- I think earlier you said the dates that public comment for these would be due so if there's members of the audience that do have opinions about these proposals they can submit comments to the Board of Game by a certain date; can you repeat what that date was.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Member Skinner, through the Chair, yes, that date is October 27th for the statewide proposals and you can submit those comments in writing, by mail, or by email, or on line, so there's several ways to do that.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Greg.

MR. RISDAHL: Madame Chair. Council members. I do have one comment regarding this proposal.

I don't have a problem carrying the meat out but $I$ will agree with John that there would probably be a lot more violations. Just down on the beach below my house, I was walking there yesterday afternoon and people are tossing their carcasses off the end of the pier and they immediately float over to the beach right there and there's not a single goose or duck carcass that has had their thighs removed. All they do is breast them out. So people are not taking all the meat. And, you know, I don't know what to do about it. I did talk to our -- we do have a law enforcement officer here right now and she is working on that as well as other things. You know, it's actually a nationwide regulation and, yet, people aren't even following that rule. It's just one of those things. You got to catch people and it's a change of culture, is what it is, it's to get people to recognize the value of those parts and to take them out but most people don't want to do it.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Greg.
On the chance of being controversial, which, hey, I've been there many, many times, but as representing people in King Cove, for example, you know, I have to be honest, people are concerned of what birds are left, you know, and set aside and in all due respect, you know, we don't have anything against sporthunting or anything, but from people that will eat pretty much the whole bird, you know, a good 90 percent of it, it's hard for us to see what we look at as waste. So I'm just going to add that in there. But I mean this is one of those tough subjects, I think, that, you know, being honest and responsible together that hopefully we can try to come up with some sort of -- I'm not sure what the answer is.

Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, Madame Chair, when I look at this I -- if I were to compare it to the big game regulations, there's no requirement in the big game regulations to bring out the heart and the liver. So -- but now we're going to say, we expect you to bring it out if you're killing a goose when the volume
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1 of waste, per se, per animal is -- it would be
significantly more in a big game animal then what you'd have in a waterfowl.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead.
MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Sam.

MR. ROHRER: Well, I'm wondering about the aspect of the wings. You know, there's people that, for generations, have traveled all over the US collecting ducks to display, to show people, to have in museums, to have in schools, the airports, all that, how exactly are you salvaging the meat for birds that are going to be mounted from the wings? And I don't know because we don't have any big birds in Kodiak that I've gotten to hunt until this fall, maybe I'll know this fall.

MS. CHERNOFF: Can I.....
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.

MS. CHERNOFF: I'll say this first. So as far as subsistence and subsistence goes, I believe in absolutely saving and using all these parts and eating all these edible parts but $I$ also realize that the sporthunting the fall is -- it's a completely different thing. Different people hunt for different reasons. There's all kinds of taxidermy game, people do it for hunt, they do it for -- you know, they want to mount every single bird they can get their hands on, it's a different kind of a hunt. So I guess I would feel okay, you know, if we wanted to act as a Board, I would prefer to not act on this because it is a suggested proposal for a State hunt, fall hunt, and we are a subsistence board addressing spring migratory -I do believe in saving everything and using everything, but, I mean I would prefer not to act on this at all because it is a fall State hunt for residents and nonresidents and not just subsistence users.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom.

MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, I would agree
with Coral. I would not be interested in supporting this. Just from my standpoint it's just because of the disparity between what this regulation would require and what the big game regulations require, or don't require.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.
MS. SKINNER: So I'll move that we.....
MS. KOSO: Yeah, hey, Della.....
MS. SKINNER: .....take no action on this.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rick, do you have a comment.
MR. KOSO: Yeah, you know, I agree that there's been a lot of breast cutting out and throwing the rest of the bird away, but my train of thought is at least they save the legs and the thighs. But, you know, as far as being on a Subsistence Board and Game Board, they're totally two different entities, so I would go along with the rest of the group, saying we have no action on that.
MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, this is Pat.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And can.....
MS. SKINNER: We have a motion, I guess, can we see if there's a second or if it dies for a lack of a second that's fine but.....
MR. ROHRER: Second.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: We have a motion made and seconded, call for question or discussion. I think, Rick, did you.....
MR. HOLMES: I have a comment.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: .....have a comment before -- I know you're on line and I thought I heard that you -- or Pat.
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MR. HOLMES: Yes, I.....
MR. KOSO: Yeah, Della, I said I wouldn't get involved with the game birds, on their changing of stuff, of the edible meat there, it would be an awful hard one to, you know, for the enforcement to act on. I think we should maybe just stick to our subsistence so I will be voting to just have no action on that.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Rick. And, I think, Pat, you had a comment.

MR. HOLMES: Yes, Madame Chair. I guess I can go along with not taking any action but my experience with waterfowl is, whether it's a duck, goose or a swan, back when I used to do that sort of thing.....
(Telephone cutting in and out)
MR. HOLMES: .....man I could take anything, a ptarmigan, or a swan or whatever, of course, swan's a little more tougher (phone cutting in and out) and in less than five minutes I can have all that meat they require in a bag and all you do is stand on the wings and you give it a jerk under the breast, the breast and the wings come -- or stand on the feet, that comes off, you reach down and grab the thighs and snip them off and you can do it in just a whiz. I understand -- to me -- I think -- oh, thank you (phone cutting in and out) having listened in on the comanagement thing, I think it has a lot of merit but I can just let it go. But most of the folks that $I$ know, traditional ones, the whole bloody thing goes in a pot and if it's a goose it goes in a big pressure cooker and you cook the whole puppy up and make soup out of it and the guides that I know on the west side of Kodiak that do trophies, they take all the meat and bring it in and give it to the folks in Larsen Bay or wherever they happen to be and so -- but I can see that our Council is just not -- has mixed feelings on it so I'd say just let it go.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat.
The proposal -- the proponent on this proposal is the Native caucus of the Migratory Bird Council. So we do have a motion made and second, call
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MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Why do I think this had already passed at some point in time and it was in a book.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was from
Bethel.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're thinking of Federal.
MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Rebecca.
MS. SKINNER: Do we have any information on data collection so $I$ could see how data can somewhat be tracked by looking at the number of State permits that are issued. And I guess I'll throw this out as a question, does anybody know if during discussions on this proposal, data tracking, data acquisition, anything like that has been discussed and do we feel like there's a robust data collection system in place?
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Does anybody have an answer for Rebecca.
MS. CHERNOFF: I just have a question on what kind of data you're looking for, like how many stamps are issued, survey -- household use surveys?
MS. SKINNER: I am asking if the issue of data was discussed and, if so, what was the nature of the discussion?
MS. CHERNOFF: I guess -- I was at the AMBCC meeting this past week and I guess there wasn't any discussion of data of any sort. They did talk about these proposals and that it was a hardship and even though there's a separate subsistence season and State season in the rural areas, well, for one, there's not a lot of jobs, not a lot of money, the money might be a hardship. Last year in the subsistence season we did away with the Federal stamp -- the requirement to have a Federal stamp went away so they were trying to just kind of be consistent with the State stamp and

1 just let them have their sort of customary and
2 traditional hunt where they didn't have to check in with anybody, they didn't have to report what they did, they didn't need stamps, they didn't need money to buy, just what it cost to go hunting, it's quite costly to go hunting. But there was not any kind of data that $I$ recall them talking about.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Coral.

> Tom.

MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, I might be wrong here but I think the State of Alaska just changed their license requirements for anybody under 18 is no longer required to have a hunting license or a fishing license, so $I$ suspect this is already covered.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Sam.
MR. ROHRER: Yeah, through the Chair. So the new requirements are if you're under 18 you don't need to purchase a State duck stamp. If you're over 60 you don't have to purchase a duck stamp. And if you are low income you don't have to purchase a duck stamp. So as it sits right now, people with jobs who can afford to buy a duck stamp have to buy a duck stamp, the rest don't.

Frankly, I wasn't very happy when the State reduced from -- or increased it from 16 to 18, the exemption. When I turned 16 it was like a moment of honor to get to go to Max Sportshop and buy my first hunting license. It's something good to train your kids to teach them the importance of management, of accurate recordkeeping, of responsibility. I think going in the direction of not reporting things, of not having to get stamps, I don't think it helps -- I don't think it's a good thing. It takes away a great training opportunity for us with our kids, plus it's money that goes back into managing those resources. So it should be money that's used for matching -- to get matching grants as well. I would assume that money would be used for Pittman-Robertson funds which gets triple basically coming back to money for the State to be used for management, so specifically management for waterfowl. So I certainly wouldn't support the proposal.

|  | Page 93 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | And, again, this might be another |
| 2 | example where we just don't comment on it. But, anyways, though, but I certainly, personally don't support it. |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |
| 6 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Sam. |
| 7 |  |
| 8 | Tom. |
| 9 |  |
| 10 | MR. SCHWANTES: I could make a motion |
| 11 | that we take no action on this proposal |
| 12 |  |
| 13 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: The motion's |
| 14 | hear a second. |
| 15 |  |
| 16 | MS. CHERNOFF: Second. |
| 17 |  |
| 18 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Second by Coral. |
| 19 |  |
| 20 | Discussion or question. |
| 21 |  |
| 22 | MR. KOSO: Question. |
| 23 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Question's beencalled. All in favor signify by saying aye. |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
| 26 |  |
| 27 | IN UNISON: Aye. |
| 28 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Opposed, same |
| 29 |  |
| 30 | sign. |
| 31 |  |
| 32 | (No opposing votes) |
| 33 |  |
| 34 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, Karen, |
| 35 | moving on. |
| 36 |  |
| 37 | MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame |
| 38 | Chair. This is Karen Deatherage, OSM. We are on the |
| 39 | final statewide proposal, which is Proposal No. 43. |
| 40 |  |
| 41 | The proposal asks to allow the taking |
| 42 | of emperor geese by proxy hunting. The justification |
| 43 | for the proposal is current State regulations do not |
| 44 | provide for individuals that are incapable of hunting |
| 45 | geese because of age or physical disability. |
| 46 |  |
| 47 | There is a side note that says current |
| 48 | regulations do allow gifting of geese but that gifter |
| 49 | must forfeit their goose if they do gift it to somebody |
| 50 |  |

    else.
    The proponent, again, is the Native caucus of the AMBCC.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral, I keep hating putting you on the spot but since you're on the Migratory Birds, do you have any more information in regards to this?
MS. DEATHERAGE: I need to separate you two.
(Laughter)
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, I think one of the reasons that we've pushed so hard over the years to get the emperor season open is so that the elders could have access to the birds. And, I, for one, would
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certainly support this proposal. I would like to see a stipulation in there that any birds taken by a proxy hunter have to be delivered to the individual that they're taking it for the same day they're taken.
MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair, I have a question.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Rebecca.
MS. SKINNER: Does anybody know if proxy hunts are allowed for other large birds or comparable birds to the emperor geese -- so I guess I'm seeing shaking of the heads, so this might be something new that hasn't been proposed before -- I'm -- that's what I'm trying to get a handle on -- I see nodding of heads there, okay, thanks.
(Laughter)
MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Pat.
MR. HOLMES: My brain is foggy but it seems to me sometime in the last 20 years there might have been this discussion before on larger waterfowl but I think it got bumped back to the AMBCC or whatever, but $I$ honestly don't remember. To me, I think that that proposal has -- I agree with Tom, it has good merit and I think we should endorse it because if it ends up that we can get a season (telephone cutting in and out) so folks in the Aleutians and Kodiak can get back to emperor geese like their grandparents did I think it would have merit because that's going to be the only way to get the emperor goose to some of these folks before they die.
Thank you.
MR. KOSO: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Rick.
MR. KOSO: Yeah, on this proxy -- I'm certainly not against having this proxy, I guess my question would be are we too late for this season to implement this or is this something that's going to be
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | done right away? |
| 2 |  |
| 3 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I'm thinking the next cycle, is that correct, I'm almost positive. |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |
| 6 | to pass the regulation would go into effect, I believe, July of 2018. |
| 7 |  |
| 8 |  |
| 9 | July of 2018. |
| 10 | Thank you. |
| 11 |  |
| 12 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom. |
| 13 |  |
| 14 | to approve the proposal with the stipulation that the |
| 15 |  |
| 16 | bird taken by the proxy hunter has to be delivered to |
| 17 | the individual they're hunting for the same day it's |
| 18 |  |
| 19 | taken. |
| 20 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Is there a second on the motion. |
| 21 |  |
| 22 | MR. KOSO: Madame Chair. |
| 23 |  |
| 24 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, is |
| 25 |  |
| 26 | that you Rick. |
| 27 |  |
| 28 | MR. KOSO: Yeah, I have to disagree a |
| 29 | little bit with Tom on that timeframe because a lot of |
| 30 | the elders in King Cove, most of these hunters, they're hunted over night and back, or out in some other area |
| 31 |  |
| 32 | and there's no way that they can get it back to the |
| 33 | individual that same day in a lot of instances. |
| 34 |  |
| 35 | I am all for the proxy but I'm against the time that Tom's requiring. |
| 36 |  |
| 37 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Rick. |
| 38 |  |
| 39 |  |
| 40 | Tom. |
| 41 | MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, how much time do |
| 42 |  |
| 43 | we need Rick. |
| 44 |  |
| 45 | MR. KOSO: Well, you know, I think |
| 46 | they're going to take it back and like I say I don't |
| 47 | think we need to put a time on there, I think it needs to be -- you know, enforcement could be really tough on |
| 48 |  |
| 49 | something like that. I think we need to try it and see |
| 50 |  |

Page 97
1 how it works. I don't think people are going to abuse
2 it. If they get a proxy from somebody, somebody's
going to give them their proxy and they're going to
hunt their bird, if they don't get their bird through
the proxy and they know the guy got it then they'll
probably call the Feds themselves.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: I'll amend the proposal, that we support this with -- that we just support the proposal.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Is there a
second.
MR. KOSO: I'll second that as Tom stated it.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And, Karen, you had.....
MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame Chair. I'm not sure if this is appropriate or not and I'll get a memo if it's not, but would this proxy help in any way -- if you recall some of the concerns that were brought up in Kodiak about the road restriction. In other words, if somebody like John Reft, who is an elder does not have the capacity to go 500 feet off the road in a boat, would he be able to use this proxy hunting regulation during the fall hunt to get a bird?
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, I think the answer to that would be yes because he could use the -you know, he could get Sam to go kill a bird for him. But my thought behind this is the reason we've been pushing this thing so hard for so long was to be able to get the birds to the elders. And a lot of those elders can't go get them for themselves so to me the proxy thing is just the common sense way to get a bird to the elders.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: All right,

regional based proposal, so comments on this proposal are due February 2nd. This is the proposal that was earlier discussed by Fish and Game regarding the Southern Alask -- Peninsula -- Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd.

The proposal requests that there is an increase in bag limits for the SAP Caribou Herd in Unit 9D. I'm going to go ahead and read once again the harvestable surplus issues that the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is proposing.

For residents and non-residents, two caribou if the harvestable surplus is greater than 150 animals.

Resident and non-resident, three caribou, if harvestable surplus is greater than 250 animals.

Resident and non-resident, four caribou, if harvestable surplus is greater than 450 animals.

And No. 4; resident and non-resident, five caribou, if harvestable surplus is greater than 550 animals.

The justification for this listed is that the Southern Alaska Peninsula Herd has likely exceeded 2,200 caribou, has high bull to cow ratio and low reported harvest. And, again, this proposal was put forth by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you,
Karen. Discussion, Greg, comments.
MR. RISDAHL: Yeah, I do have one comment on this.

MR. KOSO: Yes, Della, I have comment.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Hold on, Rick, I'll get to you here, hold on.

MR. KOSO: Okay.

MR. RISDAHL: And, generally, I agree with the concept, however, from the standpoint of subsistence if we're allowing both resident and nonresident hunters the same bag limit, that honestly takes away from the local people's opportunities. And I know that for a fact, in Cold Bay, for instance, we do get non-resident hunters who come here that do hunt from the road system. We have about 50 miles of roads here and if you rent a truck, you can drive around and hunt caribou. Well, if non-resident hunters are able to come -- or non-local hunters even to come and take caribou to this extent, I mean for example if we did have a harvestable surplus of say even three caribou per person, it is still going to limit what the subsistence users can get because they will be effectively in competition with the non-local, nonresident, whatever, kind of hunter.

So from just looking at the small communities that we have around here, I think it would make a lot better sense if the subsistence users had the opportunity to take more, at least within their local area and somehow limit those hunters that are flying in. You know, if they want to fly out to Trader Mountain and hunt five caribou, I think that's fine, but if you have people coming in and taking five caribou apiece or even two caribou apiece right around Cold Bay that will affect the subsistence users. Likewise in King Cove, you have people coming from out of the area, that is actually taking away from the subsistence user's opportunities because it is difficult to get around out here, there's not a lot of infrastructure and people don't have the financial means and the equipment oftentimes to go out and hunt so they need to hunt locally, they need to hunt close by.

Do you understand what I'm saying?
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: That's correct. And just more clarification is the residents in this particular case is the residents of the five or six communities within the Aleutians east, or residents of 9D, can you define residents, or, are residents of the state of Alaska.

MR. RISDAHL: Yeah, in this case it does mean -- resident does mean residents of the state of Alaska, whereas non-residents means people that live

1 in other states or elsewhere, so that does make it difficult, and I don't know that you can -- yeah, you can't divide out people from Anchorage versus Cold Bay or whatever.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And then from the Federal standpoint your residents are defined as residents of these five or six communities.

I just wanted to make sure everybody ---- we all kind of understood that in our mind when we're looking at this.

There's been a lot of discussion and -is this the last proposal Karen?

MS. DEATHERAGE: No.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair. No, there's one more proposal, actually two more proposals after this but this is the more complex of the proposals.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. And the reason I asked that is if we could turn the lights on.
(Laughter)
MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: I also just wanted to point to the copy of the actual proposal because it does, in the proposal itself, show the additional dates for resident hunters and I don't think those dates are reflected on the PowerPoint slide. So resident hunters have additional opportunity between November $15 t h$ and March 31st of each year that non-resident hunters don't have.

MR. KOSO: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Rick.
MR. KOSO: Yes, when we get into a
position where we're able to harvest caribou on a regular basis, does that actually limit our subsistence hunting then or do the subsistence hunt that we always is going to still maintain the stature that we're doing now, I guess I'm confused on when -- when they get enough caribou and they open up the regular hunt, is that more or less exclude the subsistence?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: No, because the subsistence regs are to be able to hunt on Federal lands only. So they have a separate.....

MR. KOSO: A separate time.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: .....time to.....

MR. KOSO: A separate quota and a separate time, right?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Well, no, well, the -- one of the proposals in the booklet, Rick, is to align the Federal one with the State, so the dates match and then the -- and change it, instead from one bull to just -- or to caribou, that's basically what the State's regulation is now. However, both the Federal -- the Federal is to change it right now to match the State's, to align that, but to also consider -- if we look at changing it to two caribou, however, the State's proposal now, is what I'm to understand, is changing that to possibly resident hunter up to the 150 caribou and including non-resident to two caribou, that's -- and then it goes on to 250, you know, three caribou for residents, Alaska residents, and three caribou for non-residents, which is out of state.

So the -- there's quite a bit of -- you know, there's quite a bit of information here and I think having to make some really good suggestions or recommendations because, you know, what I'm hearing also, since this morning from a number of people, is the concern, the impacts some of this might have basically on this herd. So I will leave that discussion open to anybody at this point.

Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, I think the one thing that we need to point out, too, is that there is

1 an extended season for residents, that non-residents 2 are not allowed to participate in. So residents are allowed to participate in that hunt from November 15th through March 31st.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, I'll bite the bullet.

MR. RINALDI: This is Tom Rinaldi with the Department of Fish and Game. I'm the regional management coordinator for Region 4, which encompasses Units 9 and 10. I guess I'd just like to clarify, I thought Chris did a good job of explaining it this morning, but through the Chair, if I could take a moment to elaborate on some of it.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes, go ahead, please.

MR. RINALDI: So the intent of this proposal is really to -- not only to provide additional harvest opportunity for rural residents and residents of Alaska, but it's mostly focused on attempt to control the trajectory of the herd.

We have a lot of evidence that suggests that when the herd gets to a certain level if we don't get the level of harvest necessary, the herd will get away from us and then we'll have issues like we had in the past and we're really sensitive to habitat issues. And so this structure that was developed by Region 4 and the area biologist, Chris and Dave in the King Salmon office, is an adaptive approach to attempt to gain the necessary harvest as the population continues to grow. Like I mentioned before, in the past we haven't been able to get the quote/unquote, local harvest to be significant enough to control that expansion, and so that's really the intent of this adaptive structure.

MS. PETERSON: This is Chris, Madame Chair. Chris from King Salmon.

I'd like to add to what Todd just said and he indicated this is aimed at a herd that is increasing so that we can contain that growth so that it does not over do what habitat is available, but also to encourage, if we have that growth, to encourage hunters to get out there and harvest some animals.

1 Currently the harvest is not even coming close to meeting what is available, and it's been open for several years now. And we need, at certain times, that it becomes very important that we have increased harvest. Some people may just not be interested in going out and hunting or if they do they may only be interested in one animal. But other people, if they knew that the bag limit was greater, that it had increased, they might go out and harvest whatever that bag limit was at that time, three to four or even five if it reached those levels and once it gets to those levels it becomes even more important that we get those numbers down on the herd so that it does not increase past the limits so that it can be sustained.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.
MS. PETERSON: And then vice versa, if the population then does turn around and it starts decreasing, then the bag limit falls off. The bag limit does not remain up at those high levels, that's only if the herd is increasing and has exceeded those particular population numbers. And at the same time, and we may be forgetting this, we still have to be maintaining for three years or more, have had the really good bull to cow ratios and the calf to cow ratios. So we're not excluding any of those things. They're still part of the management.

So.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you,
Chris.
Rebecca. Tom. And I may put John Arkley back on the hot seat again for a couple of comments.
(Laughter)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: But if I can get Rebecca first and then Tom, first, John.

MS. SKINNER: Okay. I think this question is for Chris. Chris, can you define, or explain the definition of harvestable surplus and then depending on what your answer is, explain how you come up with the number for harvestable surplus.

MS. PETERSON: Yes, certainly. Harvestable surplus, as the population grows and increases there are a certain number of animals each year that are going to die through natural causes, or be removed through other natural means. Those are not -- by -- come spring they are going to be gone and they are not necessary for the growth of the herd or for that population. So once we -- and we do look at the overall numbers that we get on our surveys and the proportion of cows to -- or calves to cows and of bulls to cows and there are certain limits that we know are necessary for growth in a herd, for good health and growth. So once we have exceeded those particular levels and then we have a certain number of -- or percentage of the herd that's going to die each year, that's considered, you know, a certain percent of that is considered excess and those are -- there's benefit to harvesting those and then it's not a loss, a waste, if you will, some people would call, and they're available to be harvested via human means, through firearms or (indiscernible), archery, so that's what we're talking about here. So as the herd grows as those different proportions, the calf/cow ratios and the bull/cow ratios, those can change each year and you can have a herd that is actually growing but for some particular reason, perhaps the calf/cow ratio is.....
(Teleconference interference participant phones not muted)

MS. PETERSON: ......becoming more negative and we look at that in addition to the population.....
(Teleconference interference participant phones not muted)

MS. PETERSON: .....to see whether or not that herd is going to be growing in a few years and so we can make projections from looking at those different numbers.

I do not believe that we would implement, even if we had a herd that was growing, if it had begun to slow down in that growth and the calf/cow ratio was declining rapidly, even if the numbers were high, we would be very conservative in having an increase in bag limits until we saw those numbers turn around.
But if it's -- also at the same time if it's reached a really high population growth, level, then it's going to be exceeding its habitat and we need to get those numbers down quickly.
And so all of those different numbers have a part in whether or not that bag limit would go up or down.
MS. SKINNER: Thank you. And.....
MS. PETERSON: Hopefully that answers it.
MS. SKINNER: And have you come up with a harvestable surplus for the herd currently?
MS. PETERSON: Yes. Currently it's -it's not a.....
MS. SKINNER: I'm just trying to get a sense for what it is if I were trying to apply the proposed numbers in Proposal 126.
MS. PETERSON: Okay, currently we are somewhere around the 150 to 200 animals that we would consider surplus.
MS. SKINNER: Okay, thank you.
MS. PETERSON: And, certainly we don't want to remove all of those and so the bag limit stays well under what the harvestable surplus might be.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Madame Chair. I was ahead of myself, so I'll just sit and listen for a bit.
(Laughter)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris, I'm going to ask John to come up. I talked a little bit with him during lunch. But, you know, I guess what I want to ask him is what he's seen and where and this is probably going to follow on to kind of Greg, too, and the gentleman that works for the State, who's sitting here, is right now -- you know, the issue in the last couple of years has been the harvest limits have been
low, you know, and when you're doing your surveys, you know, where are these caribou, number 1, and, you know, John you can tell me when you're out in the field what -- what do you see as far as caribou in area 9D.

MR. ARKLEY: John Arkley from Cold Bay. I spent about 10 days really hunting caribou hard this year and I never saw a caribou. Chris, I saw one caribou way at Frosty, oh, about -- I saw one caribou calf, she was collared with a little tiny baby calf and that's the only caribou that I've seen for months and months. I don't know where they are but they're certainly not where we can find them, I guess, so my question.....

MS. PETERSON: Well, that's a really good point and.....

MR. ARKLEY: .....is.....
MS. PETERSON: .....that's partially why we have a winter hunt is to give more opportunity. This year you are not the only hunter on the Peninsula who is wondering where the caribou are. They're out there because we've seen them and we've counted them and we'll be out in about, I guess right about a month from now we'll do our fall count. And the last couple of years we've had difficulty finding them as well, but once we do the numbers are there. The caribou just have not read the textbook as to where they're supposed to be at a given time and they're not cooperating but our counts are still really good. So if you find them, I'm sure there are a lot of other people who would like to know.

MR. ARKLEY: No doubt about it, can you tell us where you are finding them?
(Laughter)
MS. PETERSON: I wish I could.
MR. ARKLEY: Another question that I would have is if the carrying capacity is around 4,000 and we're only at 2,200 animals, but, yet we want to kill off twice as many caribou; is that right?

MS. PETERSON: Oh, not yet. We do want to increase -- we want to increase the harvest because

1 it's not currently meeting what we need. But that 2 doesn't mean we want to double it. By increasing the
bag limit at some point would not automatically suggest that we would actually have that many animals harvested, there's only -- there's usually somewhere, 30 to 50 percent of hunters will actually be successful so there can actually be an increased bag limit that will not result in a highly increased harvest.

So -- and at the same time, I do need to throw in here that we need to remember that what we're discussing here is a proposal we've put forth and it's based on the data that we've been getting through the last -- well, for a lot of years, for 20 or 30 years, that doesn't mean that the proposal will be accepted. But it is based on the data we have and we look at the history of the herd, the different trends and what has happened and one of those things is that when the herd exceeds, let's say 2,500 animals and that's not a firm number, but in that area, once the herd exceeds and continues on that trend to increase, and it exceeds that 2,500 animals, the growth of the herd can be very, very rapid. And so within a couple of years it can exceed the total number that is supported by the range down there. So once it reaches those upper levels, it's like the growth is much faster and we need to have a control, a way to keep it from exploding across that -- because then once it exceeds the range then we have all kinds of other problems and then it's too late. So we'd like to be able to forestall those problems.

Yes.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris, this is Della, I've got a couple questions maybe.

The first being, initially, with the harvestable portion greater than 150 and the resident hunter is for two caribou and then if the Federal aligns there with the State that's going to be two caribou. I mean I -- personally, for non-resident hunters on the increase, if we had over 450 caribou as an allowable harvestable portion, maybe then allow the non-resident hunters, but $I$ think just even increasing it to two and seeing what happens, you know, my biggest fear, too, is if we get a lot of snow this winter and those caribou come down they are going to be harvested. So, you know, there's some things to look at here,
yeah, and I think there's a lot to kind of really take into consideration.

Does anybody else have any thoughts in regard to this.

MR. KOSO: I got a question.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Rick.
MR. KOSO: Yeah, I got a question, and it looks like you guys are putting in some, you know, safeguards and you also got another fall survey you're going to do, this proposal is probably not going to get acted on until next year, would your fall -- say that they don't come out like the 2,200 like you have now, and they're less than that, then would you reconsider this proposal?

MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair, this is Chris. I think I can answer that.

This proposal is based on the survey results that we get. So even if this proposal was to be passed immediately, say that happens, and we go out in a month and our numbers show that the herd has suffered from a decrease and it's way low, we no longer have the numbers that can have an increased bag limit, well, then we no longer have the numbers that would justify that bag limit and this proposal supports not implementing increased bag limits. This proposal gives us the flexibility to look at the numbers on a more current basis and adjust bag limits accordingly. So we would not be tied into increasing the bag limit, no. We can do what needs to be done by what we see with the herd.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: One of the comments that was made, I think, that came up was if you said up to, if it said up to two caribou for resident hunters, and then looking at the Federal, when we had our discussion, that was part of our discussion this morning, and the State and the Feds decide that they make their allocations the same, and the ability to have that discussion to make whatever determination, if it's going to be one or two caribou, the concern that was also voiced was -- and I like to tell -- we throw stuff on the table so we're not hiding anything -- and the concern was basically that the Feds and the

State can get together and make a reasonable decision that -- they'll say, okay, we're going to align our regulations this year, we're going to allow for two caribou under the Federal and we're going to allow for two caribou under the State; do you see that as a problem?

MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair, no, I -- I -- I don't see any problem there and as long as somebody is -- one agency or the other is not tied into an increase, that as long as it's based on the data, of what we've seen, then I think it would be done correctly, so I have no problem with that.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair. Madame Chair, can I get.....

MS. PETERSON: We always seem to be able to find Izembek.....

MS. SKINNER: .....a question in
after.....
MS. PETERSON: .....when we go down there so I think it would work well.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Tom.
Okay, Tom, and then Rebecca.
MR. EVANS: Chris, how do you know the population's going to increase when it reaches 2,500 at that same rate, because the population increased last time probably due to the predation control on wolves and also partly to a moratorium on some of the hunting at the same time, so unless those same things happen, will the population -- how do you know the population's going to increase at that high rate when it reaches like 2,500 like you said?

MS. PETERSON: Oh, well, we don't necessarily know that nor do we expect that, other than the different surveys that we do through the year. And so perhaps this is a good point to -- at which to explain a little bit about how we monitor the herd.

In the fall, like I said, in about a month, we'll be going out and doing our composition survey. And for this we fly in, we have to have a

1 certain percentage of the herd that we are able to 2 observe for this survey in order for it to be -- for us
to have much confidence in it, but we go out, we rank what we see as far as the size of the bulls and how many cows and we get ideas from this survey, we can kind of tell the health of the herd as well by the condition they're in, this is visually. It gives us the percentage of bulls to cows. And we get a general sense of the numbers as well as to -- for where they are.

Then in the spring we also have a different survey and it's called a partrician* survey, we fly in once more and we rank all of the animals again, but in -- more specifically we are looking at cows and whether or not they are pregnant or if they have a calf. And that gives us the pregnancy rate for the herd, which tells us whether or not the herd is growing. I mean if all those cows that we saw that were pregnant have calves then that gives us an idea of how rapidly the growth is going to be taking place that year. Then, again, when we come back to that fall survey we can examine how many of those calves that were born have actually survived. And so we get not only a growth rate but we can look at the survival of the calves, which tells us what the trend in that growth rate is actually going to be for that year.

The additional thing that is a part of both of those surveys is that we have our -- currently we have about 50 -- I believe it's 50 radio collared animals scattered throughout the entire herd and so in both surveys, it's like you have two different surveys in each of those surveys. We do count all of the animals that we see, whether or not they have a collar, but we also use the collars in a subset survey and we use those collared animals to help us find all of the animals that we possibly can for the overall survey.

So we have quite a few things that we're picking up and looking at each year. As we conduct both of those surveys we have -- we do put some -- we have quite a bit of interest in informal counts of how many predators we do see across the landscape as we conduct those surveys and we kind of keep track of those. They aren't -- they aren't formal surveys, they're not like that, but it does give us a sense of how many bears are perhaps hanging around where the caribou are calving or how many wolves we're seeing,
you know, in the vicinity of caribou in the fall and it does help us have a picture of the herd.

So there's quite a few things that we're looking at when we look at that number of 2,500 animals to say whether or not it's growing or decreasing. And there may be one year where it suddenly looks like, oh, well, it's 2,500 but it -- we think it's going to decrease and there would be some other -- you know, there'd be something else that we would see during those surveys that might suggest that.

Does that answer your question.
(No comment)
MS. PETERSON: Hello. Is anyone there?
MR. EVANS: Yes, I'm here, I just had to get back to the mic.
(Laughter)
MS. PETERSON: Oh, okay, I'm sorry.
MR. EVANS: Yeah, it's -- yeah, that's pretty standard, what you just said, how you conduct your surveys, the composition surveys and the population surveys, you still can't predict though what's going to happen. We could have a bad winter this winter and knock off a ton of caribou. So it's -I think it's fine to have a system but I think we should be conservative, given that this population has undergone big fluctuations before. We should be, you know, somewhat conservative, and I think Della was trying to express some of that, too, that if we're going to go, we shouldn't go in big steps, we should go maybe in smaller steps.

But, anyhow, it's just a thought, you know, I mean you're recommendation of changing the harvest depending on the harvestable surplus, obviously if you have counts that increase, but I guess I get a little bit concerned when we're not quite at the 3,000 mark, you know, like at what point we need to do this more drastic measures in increasing the harvest to control the population. I think we just need to look at it on a year by year basis and then figure out what the population's doing and then we can kind of do -- so

1 if we make any steps, $I$ would suggest that we go, you 2 know, in small steps at this point. But that's just my personal opinion.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Tom.
Rebecca.
MS. PETERSON: Well, thank you, and I -- you have a very valid opinion and I do, however, think that your opinion is built into this proposal. So one thing that I really like about this proposal is that the steps are already in -- they're already in place and so we don't have to go through this process. If we have to -- if we ended up with a sudden decrease, I mean we go out on our surveys and we've had -- we also keep track of harvest and so say the summer, the August harvest is extremely low, or maybe it could be high, but let's say it's low and we go out on our surveys and we should be able to detect decreases, if there's been sudden decreases. If we look at that and we come up with -- you know, we determine that we don't want to have the bag limits -- we don't want the harvest to reflect the current high bag limit that we have then we have the option through emergency order to take steps to reverse that.

So we do have the ability to do that.
But by having the bag limits already in place we don't have to wait a long time to get the bag limit increased, because by then, if the herd suddenly does have a huge increase we've at least had some chance to affect it before it exceeds its ability.

We're not saying that -- and we would never do this in management, it -- it is based on numbers but we're very conservative, as we said a few minutes ago, if the bag limit is high -- say, for some strange reason it actually got up to the four animals per hunter, how many -- generally there's only a third to maybe half of the hunters who will even be successful in getting one caribou. They are not all going to go out there and get four caribou but -- I don't believe that has ever happened, it could conceivably. But when we implement these bag limits we do look at, well, what is the possible maximum that

1 could be taken and we are very cautious and careful about setting those bag limits up. We don't want to over do that. That's fundamental to our management, is we're not going to get the maximum harvest possible. So it's always going to be less because of the luck that hunters have.

MR. EVANS: Thank you.
MS. PETERSON: So I do think this is conservative and support what you just explained in your opinion, I -- I think it's in there. So.

MR. EVANS: Thank you. Thank you, Chris.

MS. PETERSON: Certainly.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca and then Sam. And then I'm going to recommend after -- and then Greg, we'll take a little bit of a break. We'll give people a few minutes to kind of catch their breath, everybody wants to talk a little bit so let's do that and then take a break.

So Rebecca. Sam. Greg.
MS. SKINNER: Yeah, it's always good to hear some healthy debate between our Federal and State management. But I had a question about the harvest levels and perhaps I should have asked this when Tom was at the table. But on Page 11 of the OSM report, it says that a majority of the harvest from the SAPCH, which occurs primarily during the months of September, November and December are currently being taken by residents from Cold Bay and King Cove under the more liberal State regulations. Do we have that actual data by month to show the number of animals harvested in each month and then whether it was resident and nonresident?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair.....
MS. SKINNER: Is it in the -- do you know if we have it in here or can we be provided the data at some point?


Chair. A couple comments.
First on the State proposal. I have a couple thoughts on it. The non-resident numbers seem a little bit high. It's not necessary to have the nonresident numbers equal the resident numbers, certainly if resident hunters can take five animals then the nonresident number should be higher than one animal, for example, five seems a little excessive. But the other factor to throw in there, is remember a non-resident has to pay $\$ 650$ for a tag. You -- I would just be shocked if you would have very many non-residents show up and participate with more than two caribou. It's just too expensive. They're not going to buy the tags. They're just not going to be interested in doing that. So you're not going to see a lot of harvest there probably.

## It seems to me that there are

 safeguards built into this. The State is obviously concerned at what the upper level of the herd is and so they want to make sure they're covered to try to keep it from getting too high. Those safeguards are built in here as best as you can, you just keep liberalizing the season, liberalizing the season. If, in turn, the population goes down, the safeguards are built in there, you just reduce the season. So I don't -- I mean it seems like we're debating this a whole bunch and everyone's saying the same thing, well, we need safeguards, well we have safeguards.So, personally, I would have no problem with supporting Proposal 126. We could add an amendment to it to reduce the non-resident portion of it some. I'd be fine with that as well.

The other thing to remember is the Board of Game's going to kick this thing around a bunch and they're ultimately the ones who are going to make a decision on it. We could just not comment on it, is our other option. I would prefer to comment on it and say we support it or we support it with some modification if we think the upper end needs to be brought down a little bit.

I'm ready for us to make a decision on it here pretty quick because $I$ think we've said most all that needs to be said.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. I'm going to go with Tom and then Greg, and then we have Angela. I guess we're just going to have to let everybody say their peace, $I$ mean this is a decision that affects us all and it's been a tough decision that we have to make for many years and are happy to be able to harvest caribou so whatever decision we make $I$ hope it's the right one that we're going to live with -- we have to live with it.

Tom.

MR. SCHWANTES: I'll defer to Greg because $I$ 'm ready to make a motion.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Greg.
MR. RISDAHL: Madame Chairman and Council. A couple things.

You know, we Federal, government, agency folk totally agree with what the State has laid out here, they're using sound wildlife management principles, they're using adaptive management, it allows us the flexibility to change our regulations. If there's a change in the population, whether it goes up or down, we can change it.

Sam does make a couple of good points. One of them is, non-residents are probably not going to want to shoot more than two caribou. I think a lot of them will shoot two, but probably not three or four. But this is done in other places. Unit 25 , I was just looking in the residents. Residents are allowed to shoot 10 caribou, non-residents two. So, you know, there is a precedent for that.

So my only question, and that really is -- and this is to the State, Chris, Dave or whomever, is there a tool that the state uses to in any way provide a little more opportunity for subsistence by the community. So like I see there's these community subsistence harvest permits and from what I've noticed is usually they just make the season a little bit longer than for the rest of the residents. Is there anything that the state can do to provide a little more opportunity for the local people living in these remote communities, other than, you know, for instance, already we have the -- the non-resident hunt is August,

September, there's no non-resident hunting from November through March but the residents can and for instance -- the reason why $I$ bring this up is I've only been here a short period of time but I can tell you -I mean I would bet my life that the bulk of the harvest in Cold Bay was by folks coming in with the Coast Guard. Those young guys were out there every day and they were bringing back caribou day in and day out and I don't have a problem with that, but it makes it a lot more difficult for the local folk to get those caribou. And I have been out a couple times and I have seen some caribou, I just decided they were too far to carry back to my ATV.

So my question is, does the State have a tool that somehow we could make it a little bit easier for the local people to access those animals versus even other residents of the State?

MS. PETERSON: Excuse me, I just had another question presented to me.

I believe that that is an issue that's called allocation and $I$ can do some checking into that and get back with you about it but at the moment I believe it's an allocation issue and we don't have anything that we can do about that.

But, yeah, if you -- if you give me just a few minutes here, if you had that, I could check into that and find out fairly quickly, but it is something that I have never heard that they have anything to do with so -- so I don't know if you have a minute that you could spare here but I could go....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris, I think what we'll do at this time, there is a lot of information, and some new information and things to think about it, if we could just take a 15 minute break, that'll give you time, I think, to look for what you're looking at and give some time for these guys to throw things around and what they'd like to recommend, hopefully, from when we get back from a break. Is that acceptable to everyone?
(Council nods affirmatively)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Angela, did you want to make a comment before we do that.
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MS. SIMPSON: Thank you, Madame Chair and the Board. And as I listen to all of you talk, is there a way to get a clear definition of what a resident is, and non-resident. I mean the State has so many different definitions of what residency is. I think that first needs to fully be defined before anybody can make any decision on this, in honesty.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Angela. Okay, with that we're going to take a break guys. 3:00 we'll be back and hopefully we can resolve this.
(Off record)
(On record)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Just kind of a point of order, it has been brought to my attention, you know this issue is very important to the people in this region and statewide for that matter, so everybody, you know, wanted to say something, so as a Council we need to be sure to raise your hand so I can allow you to talk and that we all have some constructive discussion and allow the people that are speaking, especially the ones on line, for people to hear. So our hands have duly been slapped.

I'd like to go ahead and move on.
Part of the reason I wanted to have the break there, there was a lot of information starting to clash together and I think everybody constructively was on the right track and I believe that maybe have been the result and so I'm going to ask Tom, and/or Sam to maybe speak at this time.

MR. SCHWANTES: Madame Chair. I'd like to make a motion....

REPORTER: Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Oh, yes. Madame Chair. I'd like to make a motion that we support Proposal No. 126 with the following modifications.

If the harvestable proportion is
1 greater than 150 caribou, residents two caribou, non-
residents one caribou.
If the harvestable proportion is greater than 250 caribou, residents three caribou, nonresidents one caribou.
If the harvestable proportion is greater than 450 caribou, residents four caribou, nonresidents two caribou.
And if we get to where we have a harvestable portion greater than that, we need to be at the table talking.
MR. ROHRER: And I'll second that.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: A motion's been made and seconded. Pat and Rick, were you able to hear that.
MR. KOSO: Yes, Della. It's 150, two and one, then did it go to 260, then three animals.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: That is correct, Rick. And then if it goes to 450, it would be four resident and two non-resident. And if it goes beyond the 550 or 550 and beyond, then everybody needs to be at the table to discuss the future of this herd.
MR. KOSO: Okay.
MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Pat.
MR. HOLMES: This is Pat, copy.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Pat.
MR. HOLMES: Yeah, I agree with that. And that's where my thinking was going along that line and my apologies to Chris, because the Department does do allocative things with Tier II and all sorts of different creative things. I think that the proposal that Tom is making is an excellent one because it gets it up on the table for discussion. I would like to see the anthropology people, both State and Federal go back and look at the old subsistence surveys for the

Peninsula and see how much caribou meat people usually took and then take a look at that and compare it to non-residents harvest and I think it'll probably come up -- from just my recollection over 40/50 years is that it's going to come pretty close to what you're proposing there. So I think there's probably some pretty solid data behind it so go for it.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Council.
Rebecca.
MS. SKINNER: I think that the structure of this proposal goes in the right direction and that it provides more flexibility to the managers that, where they can make changes on a more immediate basis without going through an extended, you know, 12 or 24 month regulatory change process. So I will be supporting the motion.

I do want to say after the discussion today, I am concerned with the -- the harvestable surplus, so if the harvestable surplus today is 150 to 200, that means if you applied these numbers you would immediately have a two caribou bag limit. It doesn't necessarily make sense to me that you would double the bag limit, when the size of the herd isn't even at the minimum herd size that you want. However, I think -yeah, I do defer to some extent to the Fish and Game biologist who are actually managing this herd, and I think they do want a healthy herd, but I can say that from my perspective, listening to everything, not all of the dots were connecting. But $I$ am comfortable with the motion and I do plan to support it.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral.
MS. CHERNOFF: No.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Sam, any
comments.
MR. ROHRER: Just that I support the proposal. I think it's a bit of a compromise -- well, maybe not compromise but I think it goes to address some of the concerns that we heard from some of the local folks about, you know, concern about too many


The next proposal is Proposal 128. This is a proposal that is requesting to allow the harvest of any caribou in Unit 10 on Adak Island.

Essentially it's requesting no limit, no harvest ticket, no closed season.

The reason why the proponent has put forth the proposal is because it removes a bull restriction which unnecessarily restricts meat hunters who may harvest younger animals that are harder to determine sex. The proponent is John Bush.

Thank you, very much.
MR. KOSO: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, Madame Chair. I'm definitely going to oppose this proposal. I think we don't have enough information on that Unimak herd to make a valid decision as far as -- but certainly, I mentioned earlier that $I$ wanted to speak to the Unimak herd and I'm certainly interested in hearing more about that herd and where we're at with numbers and I'm certainly interested in looking at providing a subsistence hunt for the locals, but I'm definitely not in favor of opening this up to anybody for any animal basically.

Thank you.
MR. KOSO: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: We've got Rick on there, this says Unit 10, Adak Island.

MR. SCHWANTES: I'm sorry.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yeah, so Rick, go ahead.

MR. KOSO: This is up in Adak, it's in Unit 10 also, but it's from Adak. (Phone cutting in and out)

MS. DEATHERAGE: Rick, could you speak a little maybe closer to the phone, we're having a

that there's no limit at all on this herd but you can't take more than two bulls. And you can't take any bulls between January 1st and August 9th.

MS. SKINNER: Okay. So you can't take more than two bulls but then you can take the rest as cows.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Yes.
MS. SKINNER: Okay, thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rick, is that
you?
MR. KOSO: Can you hear me now?
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes, we.....
MR. KOSO: Can you hear me now?
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes, we can hear you, go ahead.

MR. KOSO: Okay. Yeah, just a clarification, I guess, for Tom, maybe there, that Unit 10 also includes Adak Island, and I think we're speaking on behalf of Adak Island on this proposal.

So as far as Adak community is concerned, they would like to support this motion. I know they put in the Board of Game, put in a proposal to cut it to two males -- yeah, males in order for the heads to grow bigger for the head hunters. 99 percent of the locals are not head hunters, they're for meat. So I support the locals on this one. I don't think it's going to affect the larger bulls.

And I guess I'm a little bit nervous on this whole deal because we've never had a survey in awhile and I'd certainly like to see a survey of Adak, you know, but $I$ don't think it's going to hurt the population to keep it as is and the way it is now.

So I'm going to support 128.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Rick. Is there any more discussion.
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MR. ROHRER: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Sam.
MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair.
MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. I was just going to ask if the state had comments, I would like to hear what the State says.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Chris.
MS. PETERSON: Thank you. One idea that has not been yet presented here is that part of the purpose for restricting the take of bulls is to increase the taking of cows. The problem down on Adak is that the herd continually exceeds its capacity and we need to have more cows taken to keep the herd from growing as much as it does. So it is not entirely aimed at people who want to take bulls and get trophy bulls, it's aimed at keeping the herd within the bounds that can sustain it.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. Any other questions or discussion.
Antone.
MR. SHELIKOFF: Antone. Thanks, Della. I support this proposal because a few years ago the Federal funding for the -- they wanted to cull the caribou or get the number down so I support this.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Antone. Anybody want to make a motion.
MR. KOSO: Yeah, I'd make a motion Della that we support Proposal 128.
MR. SHELIKOFF: Second.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: We've got a motion on the floor made by Richard Koso seconded by Antone Shelikoff.

Discussion.
Sam.
MR. ROHRER: Harvest tickets are currently required so there's reporting and we should have some idea of the harvest but under this proposal there would be no harvest tickets, which I would take that to mean no reporting so we wouldn't know what -there wouldn't be any recordkeeping, wouldn't know how many animals are killed. That doesn't seem like a good idea, to not have any kind of reporting, to me.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris, can you answer that.

MR. KOSO: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Rick.
MR. KOSO: Madame Chair. As I read this proposal, $I$ don't see where it's going to change having harvest tickets, this is just harvesting caribou but I don't see the change in the regulation.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, the way I'm reading this it says no limit, no harvest tickets, no closed season, so that tells me we're not going to have any recordkeeping at all and I'm not comfortable with that. I would support this if we had a no limit on caribou but harvest tickets required. Well, I'm not sure how that'd work either. That wouldn't work really.

MR. KOSO: Madame Chair, this is Rick here. I guess I'm reading something a little different here, I must not have the full proposal in front of me here so I may be doing something I might not be -probably shouldn't be doing if I don't see the full proposal. So with that, I guess I'll withdraw my proposal since I didn't get a second anyway until I can see what the whole proposal is.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rick, if you can hold on a second. There was a second. Chris, are you on line, can you address what was just discussed.


MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame Chair. Members of the Council.

This is Proposal No. 53, and I'm glad we do have the Department of Fish and Game on the phone because it was a little difficult to understand. The proposal requests a reevaluation of the C\&T use finding for migratory game birds statewide, so it is another statewide proposal. The Alaska Board of Game requested that ADF\&G look at determining C\&T findings for the amount necessary for subsistence for ducks, geese, swan, snipe and cranes. Positive C\&T findings currently exist for Canada and Emperor geese. ADF\&G does not recommend that the Board of Game pursue an amount necessary for subsistence for migratory birds due to the broad scale of C\&T findings.

The proponent is the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. So I know it sounds confusing but my sense is that the Department is responding to a request from the Board of Game that C\&T findings be reevaluated. They're responding by putting forth a proposal but they're not recommending that there be any changes.

Correct me if I'm wrong, any representative from ADF\&G.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris, would you like to address that.
(No comment)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris, are you
still there?
(No comment)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Is there anybody else on line that can address this Proposal 53?

MR. KOSO: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Is that you Pat?
MR. KOSO: No, this is Rick here, Della. I would say until we get more information I'd like to


MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: So do I understand this correctly, that the only $C \& T$ right now are for Canada and Emperor geese or are there other C\&T findings for other ducks, geese, swans, snipes and cranes? So I guess I'm asking is it that there are many C\&T in addition to Canada and Emperor geese that will need to be reevaluated or is it, there's Canada and Emperor geese C\&T and what the Board of Game is asking for is that more be developed for more species of birds.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Karen.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Member Skinner, through the Chair. My understanding is there are only two positive findings for C\&T and that would be for Canada and Emperor geese, and the Emperor goose C\&T finding was recent, more recent and so this is asking to reevaluate other species of birds.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I have a question or maybe somebody could help me with this.

When I worked with the Aleutian Marine Mammal Commission, part of that process is somebody came in and I worked with them doing household surveys on birds and it had this big poster full of pictures of all these birds and so it seems to me -- and I did it like three times over a five year period, or two times over a five year period, so somebody has information from these communities on it because the six communities in the Aleutians East, we did these surveys. I'd actually gone to Sand Point and did it. So I'm not -- but I can't recall though is who we were doing the survey for because we did some State surveys on fish and households too.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair. And Fish and Game can.....

MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair.
MS. DEATHERAGE: .....hopefully verify

1 this. Doing the surveys would be just part of that process but it would only collect the data that are necessary to make a determination so you may have actually done surveys but it appears that no C\&T determination has been made based on some of that other data other than those two species of birds.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris, did I hear you on line.

MS. PETERSON: Yes, Madame Chair, thank you. As far as -- as I read this and discussed it with my co-workers here, this is more or less just a procedural proposal. The C\&T has only been made for two species and there are other additional species that the Board of Game would like to have a C\&T
determination made for those other species. It's not a proposal to change management in any way or allocation or anything like that. It's simply to get those numbers determined for those other species. And I cannot answer why there were only two original species done. But this is to maybe alleviate some of those gaps there that needed to be filled.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Does anybody have any other questions or comments.

MS. WITA: Madame Chair, this is Amy.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Amy. MS. WITA: I have Brian Davis here as well.

MR. DAVIS: Hello.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Hi Brian, go ahead.

MR. DAVIS: Della.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yeah, go ahead.
MR. DAVIS: Just looking at the Fish
and Game Staff comments are describing this Proposal

1 No. 53 and these are published on the meeting website now, the Board of Game meeting. This proposal is kind of a -- it's not housekeeping, but it's a follow up to the C\&T findings that the Board of Game made last year for migratory birds in certain units. They found customary and traditional use for migratory birds in Units 18, 22, 23, 26A and then they found C\&T for Emperor geese throughout the Alaska Range and this proposal would extend C\&T findings for migratory birds in other regions of Alaska.

So what the Subsistence Division will have to do is to write up a description of the customary and traditional use pattern for migratory birds in Units 18, 22, 23 the Arctic Western Region and in additional units, you know, other than what was covered last time, it's going to extend the C\&T to all the units where these birds range.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom, and then Rebecca.

MR. SCHWANTES: Madame Chair. I'm going to make a motion that we take no action on this proposal.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Got a motion on the floor. Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: Are you going to look for a second or should I go ahead with my question or....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I think we'll go ahead with your question first and then....

MS. SKINNER: All right, thank you.
To our Fish and Game representatives on the phone, can anyone explain why the sentence I'm looking at which you don't have because it's on a PowerPoint, but it says ADF\&G does not recommend that the Board of Game pursue an ANS for subsistence for migratory birds due to the broad scale of C\&T findings.

So does this mean that Fish and Game supports developing C\&T but not ANS, or do these two things go hand in hand, and what exactly does Fish and

Game not support in regards to this proposal and why don't they support it?

MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair, this is Chris in King Salmon. I cannot answer part of that statement, but the document I'm looking at, in front of me, it has the Department comments, it simply says that the Department submitted and supports this proposal. So why there would be a difference between ANS, I don't -- I can't answer that.

MS. SKINNER: Okay, thank you.
MR. DAVIS: This is Brian from Fish and Game. I think I might be able to shed some light on that.

## MS. SKINNER: Okay.

MR. DAVIS: The C\&T finding is a real general finding that says -- that says these bird -- in this case, bird stocks, are used by Alaska in a customary and traditional way. It doesn't go so far as to say the numbers of birds that are necessary for subsistence, the ANS does that. And so the Board would first consider a C\&T finding for a fish or a game population, or a bird population, and then they would go on to say, okay, we know that there is a C\&T finding for this population, now how many -- how many animals or pounds or whatever are necessary for subsistence, and that's the amount necessary for subsistence, and that's usually a numerical range. So it might say, you know, harvest of -- harvest of swans are -- is a customary and traditional use and the harvest of swans in this or that, you know, 400 to 2,000, you know, just hypothetically; that's what an ANS would do.

The proposal that's on the book that the Board of Game will be reviewing does not have any mention of ANS at all, they're simply dealing with the C\&T finding at this point. I think someone's pointing out language that was written in the draft version of the proposal and that was struck. So all the description of ANS and the Department recommendation, either for or against ANS, that's no longer in the proposal and -- and the Board of Game may ask for that to -- you know, for comment on that and for some perspective on that, but as of now, again, it's not in the proposal.

|  | Page 135 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, Tom, you |
| 2 | had a motion on | the floor, I think in regard to what |
| 3 | was on the wall here on Proposal 53, what would you |  |
| 4 |  |  |
| 5 | like to do. |  |
| 6 | motion. MR. ROHRER: I'd like to second his |  |
| 7 |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |
| 9 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, Sam. Amotion made by Tom and seconded by Sam. |  |
| 10 |  |  |
| 11 | motion made by Tom and seconded by Sam. |  |
| 12 | Discussion. |  |
| 13 | action? MS. CHERNOFF: What was it for, take no |  |
| 14 |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |
| 17 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Take no action. |  |
| 18 |  |  |
| 19 | MR. Koso: Call for the question. |  |
| 20 |  |  |
| 21 | got one comment hadame chair trumble: Discussion. We |  |
| 22 |  |  |
| 23 | got one comment here, hold on. |  |
| 24 |  | MS. Chernoff: I would just like to say |
| 25 | I would like to see this supported. As a subsistence |  |
| 26 | board, I think it's important to have C\&T findings, and so I would be in favor of supporting this. |  |
| 27 |  |  |
| 28 | Thank you. |  |
| 29 |  |  |
| 30 |  |  |
| 31 | MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, |  |
| 32 | Coral. The way I understand this, positive C\&T |  |
| 33 | findings currently exist for Canada and Emperor geese and then where it says ADF\&G does not recommend the |  |
| 34 |  |  |
| 35 | Board pursue an ANS, that whole sentence is no longer |  |
| 36 |  |  |
| 37 | MR. DAVIS: Yes, this is Brian Davis, |  |
| 38 |  |  |
| 39 | that is correct. |  |
| 40 | MS. DEATHERAGE: Hello, Brian, this is |  |
| 41 |  |  |
| 42 | Karen Deatherage from OSM. And I guess you had a draft one in the book because we do have the proposal book |  |
| 43 |  |  |
| 44 | here and that statement is in the proposal book underthis proposal. |  |
| 45 |  |  |
| 46 | Thank you. |  |
| 47 |  |  |
| 48 |  |  |
| 49 | MR. DAVIS: Okay, Karen, this is Brian. |  |
| 50 |  |  |

I want to apologize, I think I may have made a mistake in my statement there. I think I'm looking at the actual proposal book now and I'm sorry I wasn't prepared to speak but I'm trying to catch up here.

I think the take home message is kind of what $I$ was saying before, that the C\&T is the first step in kind of a longer process, where a stock is, you know, established as a subsistence stock and then, you know, there's quite a bit of work that goes into determine the ANS for each stock in each unit.

So, again, I do apologize for my mistake before, the comment is in there about an ANS finding. My understanding is that the Department's recommendation that ANS not be established at this time is simply a matter of the fact that a lot more work is required and that the C\&T finding that's proposed here is the first step.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. So we have a motion on the floor to not approve this proposal, or not support this proposal -- or not take any action and a second. I did hear a call for the question so I'm going to go ahead and ask for this to go to a vote.

So all in favor at this point of the motion say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Opposed, same sign.

MS. CHERNOFF: Aye.
MS. SKINNER: Aye.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat, are you still on line.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah. I had my mute on and I didn't have it switched quick enough. I'll go with the flow.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So I believe the ayes have it.
(Laughter)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: All right. Karen, moving on.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair. I regret to inform you that there are no more proposals. Thank you all for your patience.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: All right, thank you. Now, we are to -- is it the WP18....

MS. BERNS: No, we're down here or no, wait.....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Karen.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair and Council. I believe at this time you should return to Proposal 18-20 because you were waiting for the discussion on these proposals prior to making your decision.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes, thank you. That is correct. So now we are down to the WP18-20, align Federal caribou hunting regulations with State regulations in Unit 9D.

Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Madame Chair. I'd make a motion to approve this proposal with the modifications to remove the unit specific regulations referencing quotas and closures and delegate the authority to announce quota and needed closures via delegation of authority letter, only, and that the Unit 9D caribou season be a -- limit be one to four animals based on conservation concerns and harvestable surplus with the seasons from August 1st to September 30th and for residents only from November 15th to March 31st.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I see Karen shaking her head.

MS. DEATHERAGE: I apologize, I'm trying to get my computer up over here. Tom, I did not get that motion and so if you could repeat it once I
get this system set up, just give me a minute.
Thank you.
(Pause)
MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame Chair. Member Schwantes, I'm ready for you to repeat that motion.

MR. SCHWANTES: Okay. Madame Chair.
The motion would be to support Proposal WP18-20 with modification to remove the unit specific regulation referencing quotas and closures and delegate authority to announce quotas and any needed closures via a delegation of authority letter only. Unit 9D caribou would be a limit of one to four based on conservation concerns and harvestable surplus with seasons August 1st through September 30th and November 15th through March 31st.

MS. SKINNER: Second.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: We've got a motion made by Tom and second.

Discussion.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat and Rick, are you good.

MR. KOSO: Madame Chair. I don't have the regulations book in front of me there, just a quick question on those dates. Were those dates in there by the Feds or were they by the State and are you changing them to coincide with which one.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom.
MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair, this is Sam. Those are to coincide with the State dates.

MR. KOSO: Thanks, Sam.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat, are you on line, do you have any questions or discussion.

MR. HOLMES: No, I'm fine with it.

MS. BERNS: Question.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. We have a motion made to approve WP18-20 and amended by Tom, question's been called. Okay, go ahead, Tom.

MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, I need to add one thing into that, that should be by Federal registration permit only.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, Tom amended his motion, is the second still good?

MS. SKINNER: Yes.
MR. KOSO: Madame Chair, one more quick question, please.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, Rebecca seconded and.....

MS. BERNS: Tom motioned.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I know that, okay, and you called the question.

MR. KOSO: I just had a real question.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, Rick, go ahead.

MR. KOSO: I guess on the number of the caribou, one through four season, I guess I'm maybe just a little bit confused on this proposal that we discussed, that Proposal 126, where we proposed two and one, 150, that kind of stuff, so where does that correlate with that?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Tom.

MR. SCHWANTES: Rick, this is strictly a Federal subsistence permit. It's a Federal registration permit only.

MR. KOSO: Oh, okay, thanks Tom.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I think, Rick, it's just giving the Refuge manager the leeway if the State says two caribou in 2018, the Refuge manager can
match that for subsistence for two caribou. That's basically an easy way to say what this proposal would do.

MR. KOSO: All right, thank you for that.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. A motion's been made, seconded and the question's been called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Opposed, same sign.
(No opposing votes)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Good job.
Let's see the next item on our agenda will be 2018 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, Robbin.

I've got a request to take a five to 10 minute break so everybody can just get some fresh air while Robbin is getting set up so we'll do that.
(Off record)
(On record)
MR. HOLMES: Hello.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: We are on line getting ready to do the 2018 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program.

## Robbin.

MS. LAVINE: Good afternoon, Madame Chair. Members of the Council. My name is Robbin LaVine and I'm an anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence Management in Anchorage. My regions are typically Bristol Bay and Southcentral but since the retirement of my associate, Palma Ingles, I am -- I have the great honor and luck of coming out here on such a gorgeous day, as well. So I flew out today, it
was clear almost all the way up and it was a stunning flight, so thank you for having me here today.

So my goal today is to present you with a brief overview of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program and its accomplishments to date. I'll review the funding process, your regional overview, and finish up by requesting Council comments and input on the proposed 2018 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program in the Southwest Alaska region. No motion is necessary.

The Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program materials begin on Page 20 of your Council book. There's an updated handout that I've just passed to you that is specifically for your region, the Southwest Alaska region overview.

The Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program is a multi-disciplinary collaborative effort that enhances subsistence fisheries research and provides necessary information.....

MR. HOLMES: I don't know if anybody's interested about the lady spider out here in the web, it's nailed a fly and.....
(Teleconference interference participant phones not muted)

MS. LAVINE: .....for the.....
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat, could you mute your phone, please.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, pardon me, the biologist watching other critters while I'm doing this, sorry.
(Laughter)

MS. LAVINE: Okay. The Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program is a multi-disciplinary collaborative effort that enhances subsistence fisheries research and provides necessary information for the management of subsistence fisheries on Federal public lands in Alaska. We encourage partnerships between tribes, rural organizations, universities and Federal and State agencies. In addition, we encourage inter-disciplinary approaches to conducting research
and addressing issues.
The Monitoring Program is administered through the Office of Subsistence Management in order to advance projects of strategic importance to the Federal Subsistence Management Program. It also coordinates communications and information sharing of ongoing and new subsistence research efforts.

The monitoring -- since its inception in 2000, the monitoring program has funded 452 projects statewide, with the total allocation of close to $\$ 117$ million. The following figures demonstrate both the allocation of funds and the number of projects funded through the Monitoring Program by the organization of the principal investigator. It should be noted that as we encourage partnerships that much of the -- the pie might be divvied up a little differently. Some of these funds have been used by the principal investigator or organizations to subcontract with research partners like communities, tribes and other research organizations.

This slide demonstrates the allocation of funds by region. Budget guidelines provide an initial target for planning, however they are not final and are often adjusted as needed to ensure that we fund quality projects rather than just ensuring that a specific dollar amount goes to each region.

The state is divided into six regions that approximately correspond to Federal subsistence fishing areas and to stock, harvest and community issues that those regions hold in common.

For each of the six regions, Office of Subsistence Management Staff works with Regional Advisory Councils and Federal and State fishery and land managers to ensure the Monitoring Program focuses on the highest priority subsistence fishing information needs. Input and guidance from Councils are used to develop priority information needs by identifying issues of local concern and knowledge gaps related to subsistence fisheries. Ideally principal investigators will work closely with Councils in order to develop strong proposals that are responsive to those needs.

The Office of Subsistence Management provides technical assistance as needed.

The Program requests new projects every two years. Submissions must be complete, on time and address five criteria outlined in the notice of funding opportunity in order to be competitive. Those criteria are strategic priority, technical scientific merit, investigator ability and resources, partnership and capacity building and the cost benefit of each project. You can find a more detailed description of the five criteria in your Council book on Page 25.

Once submitted, a Technical Review Committee evaluates and rates each proposed project. The Technical Review Committee is a standing interagency committee of senior technical experts brought together to ensure program transparency. It is the responsibility of the Technical Review Committee to develop the strongest possible Monitoring Program for your region and across the state based on high quality, cost effective projects that address critical subsistence questions.

During the proposal evaluation process, the Technical Review Committee adheres to specific guidelines in order to assess how well a project addresses the five criteria. While some agencies may have more than one senior expert on the committee, like a social scientist, or a fisheries biologist, each agency only provides one, single, consolidated review and will not score their own proposals. The final score for each proposal is based on an assessment of the five criteria.

Once a draft monitoring program is developed, it is brought -- actually Draft Monitoring Plan is developed, it is brought before the Regional Advisory Councils for their input and comments. This is where we are at in the current cycle and will come back to it in a moment.

Additional comments on the process and draft Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program in the Southwest Alaska region are provided by the InterAgency Staff Committee and these, along with those developed by the Councils, are then forwarded on to the Federal Subsistence Board. The Board takes into consideration comments and concerns generated by the process and endorses the funding plan. Final approval of the funding plan is made by the Assistant Regional Director of the Office of Subsistence Management.

Okay. So the Southwest Alaska region overview, and this is relating to your handout.

In Southwest Alaska 55 projects have been undertaken for approximately $\$ 10$ million in funding. Project leads were predominately held by the State of Alaska or the Department of the Interior, but remember most of those projects also included other agencies and Alaska rural organizations as research partners. If you're wondering, the other category generally includes universities, non-profit organizations, independent contractors and other nongovernmental organizations.

So this is what your draft Monitoring Program looks like for 2018.

There is an anticipated one to \$1.5 million available for new projects statewide and up to $\$ 1.6$ million for ongoing already funded projects. Please note that the available funding for 2018 is budgeted for each project's first year, not the total project request. You will notice that the total project request adds up to over $\$ 1.6$ million just for this region alone. But the $\$ 1.5$ or approximately $\$ 1.5$ that is available, again, is only divvied up between the first year's funding request for each project.

So for the Southwest region, five projects were submitted -- yep. The projects are listed in order by the strength of their Technical Review Committee scores. Justification for your projects begin in your Council book on Page 32 and they're followed by project abstracts. So if you want more detail about each project, you can read further.

And at this point, we're back to step four. Once, again, we are seeking your input and comments on the Draft Monitoring Plan for your region, no motion is necessary and I'm ready to take your comments and questions.

## Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom, go ahead.
MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, I just have one quick question. I believe you said when these projects are submitted, a group of high tech experts took them
up and took a look at them. Who are these high tech experts?
(Laughter)
MS. LAVINE: Those folks with specific expertise on subsistence fisheries across the state would be representatives of the State, we have folks from Fish and Game, commercial fish, sportfish. We have technical experts from the Office of Subsistence Management that Chairs the committee. We have people from US Fish and Wildlife Service. The Forest Service. And a number of others. So these are folks that are actually on the ground implementing subsistence management across the state.

MR. SCHWANTES: Thank you.
MS. LAVINE: Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Any other comments or questions.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.
MS. SKINNER: So the list of projects that we've been provided is the entire list of projects for the FRMP Southwest region?

MS. LAVINE: Madame Chair, through the Chair. Correct.

MS. SKINNER: Okay. So Bristol Bay didn't have any projects?

MS. LAVINE: Actually, I believe there is another project that is multi-regional and you'll notice that -- and I think it kind of -- it straddles both the Bristol Bay region and the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Karen.
MS. DEATHERAGE: I apologize for the interruption, Madame Chair. I just received a text from OSM and the multi-regional is in the meeting book.

MS. LAVINE: Okay, yes.
MS. DEATHERAGE: So it's different than -- so it shows the proposals in the meeting book but it doesn't show the multi-regional proposals in the updated handout that she gave you.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I guess is that like on Page 49.

MS. KENNER: This is Pippa Kenner at OSM. And the multi-regional proposals are listed on Page 45 of your meeting book.

MR. SCHWANTES: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: I guess, we had a number of meetings throughout the fall and winter concerning these projects with Bristol Bay. We met with Bristol Bay a couple of different times. So I guess my question is, when we're looking at funding for these projects, are the Bristol Bay projects, because we're all part of the Southwest region, are the Bristol Bay projects thrown into this as well so when we're talking about these programs, for instance, the Buskin River sockeye salmon stock program and then I noticed that Bristol Bay has the Togiak River harvest there, so are what we commenting on today -- are we trying to determine where we want to fit each one of these six different projects in the list? I mean there's five of them on our list, actually seven, there's two on theirs, so are we just discussing ours and not worrying about Bristol Bays, even though they're part of our region?

MS. LAVINE: Tom these are -- the five that we have on Page 31 were all the projects that we are considering for the Southwest region. So these include any projects that were submitted -- that could have been submitted to Bristol Bay. I believe these are the only ones that were reviewed and submitted and are under consideration.

The other two on Page 45 came under multi -- let's see, multi-regional projects so they're
not actually even Bristol Bay specific.
MR. SCHWANTES: Thank you for that clarification.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Is there any other questions or discussion.
(No comments)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Basically what are you asking us to do at this point?

MS. LAVINE: We're asking you to provide comments. When we leave here today, this is -this is the preliminary Monitoring Plan for the Southwest region. These are the projects that we're looking at. We have potentially about $\$ 1.5$ million that are going to go statewide. And we are looking at those projects that are going to address important needs for your region and others across the state.

So having your comments to accompany this lineup when we submit this to the TRC for their final review and then the Board for their review and approval, just adds more information to consider.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. And when we went through this process before, and as Tom said we had meetings with Bristol Bay, so this list -- your proposal, this list doesn't include anything from Bristol Bay but they're part of the Southwest region.

MS. LAVINE: Madame Chair, yes. These were the projects that were submitted to the entire Southwest region -- from the entire Southwest region. These were the projects that were submitted to address the priority information needs that a working group that was -- that you put together between the Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory Council and the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council, you guys worked together and developed a list of priority information needs for our 2018 call and these five here are the proposals that were submitted to address those priority information needs. So there's no more that you will -you will not be considering a different list, this is going to be the same projects that will be presented to the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council for their comments.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Any comments.
MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.
MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, this is Pat.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead, Pat, and then Rebecca.
MR. HOLMES: I think in clarification on this, Page 30 has the priorities needs list that we developed with the folks from Bristol Bay. And so there's quite a few of them that were in there and obviously a lot of -- some of them weren't -- or no proposals were submitted for them and so folks might want to take a quick look at Page 30 and then look over to 31 for the ones that evidently this committee has approved for funding.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat.
Rebecca.
Okay, go ahead.
MS. LAVINE: Madame Chair. Just to clarify these projects have not been approved for funding, they're -- they have been -- they have been assessed by the TRC. They have been scored and the -based on the five criteria. And approval for funding won't occur until all statewide proposals are considered by the Board and then the ARD of OSM.
Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: So I guess what we should -- I think what I'm understanding is that you should come away from this meeting with an idea of what our priority are for these five projects; is that what you're looking for?
MS. LAVINE: Well, we're really
interested in if there's -- they have been ranked on
quality, they've been ranked on -- based on the -- or they have been scored based on the five criteria, and they're strong projects in this particular order. We would like to know your comments, if there is anything of interest, if priority information needs may -- your information needs may have changed, if there's something that maybe even those don't addressed, and this might be a good place to even start thinking about any potential information lacuna in the future. Now is a good time to start.

We might be looking for you -- from you, let's say these proposal alignments with your priority information needs, the score order, what you think about the abstracts. You can also provide information or comments just on your thoughts on the overall process.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead.
MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you. Thank you for this presentation. And I am very excited to see Buskin River sockeye salmon right there at the top of the list because, of course, we're a little selfish about our projects, where we're from. So that's good to see.

And I am really excited that Unalaska, you know, we had our meeting out there last August and we were able -- since we went to the area and talked to locals and went to a local meeting we had a pretty good grasp on some of their issues that were going on, so I'm really happy to see a couple of their projects on the list.

And then I have a question.
So all five of these projects, so
they're rated, do we know how much money is available yet? Will likely all five of these be funded or maybe only two or three or we just really have no idea yet?

Thank you.
MS. LAVINE: Madame Chair. Through the Chair. Yeah, we have -- right now we're not too sure about the money that we have available for first year project funding but considering all of the projects statewide, not all of these projects will be funded.

But it's really hard to say just now. Because of the scoring process and because of our efforts to ensure that the projects that are forwarded -- or that are eventually approved for final funding are strong projects, they could be excellent ideas, they could be fantastic expert -- have great expertise, wonderful partnerships, but they may not be drafted in a way that ensures success, we don't know what the entire line up looks like for this year and that's also why I said when we look at kind of where our general allocation for each region might potentially go each year, it's going to change. That funding will go to some of the strongest projects, the ones that are most -- that meet the priority information needs that you've laid out that are strongly designed, that have great partnerships and that have a good structure that ensures the success of the project.

So until we have the whole plan together before the Board, we're not too sure where our funds are going to go. Like I said, it's a smaller -it's a smaller amount this year than in years previous. We're looking at about $\$ 1$ to $\$ 1.5$ million dollars statewide.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Tom Doolittle, Deputy Assistant Regional Director, OSM.

When you look at this type of funding and that we're in a cycle at the very beginning of four years of funding and that we're still paying for previous cycles of funding coming through, where we hit the shortage this year is if we would receive, let's say, $\$ 5$ million, for instance, and we commit $\$ 1.2$, we still would have to be paying these other projects from the past that we've committed funding already to.

And as we go through a fiscal year -and as we go through a fiscal year, we have to be able to essentially -- if we see extra monies that would be available and we see savings, we try to add those monies in. But we can't pre-commit what we don't have.

Yep.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: We understand that.

And, given all that, I'm going to throw something out there for those representatives from Kodiak, when you look at the Buskin River sockeye salmon stock assessment, and the subsistence harvest trends of salmon and non-salmon fish in four southern island communities, basically those two have tied. Now,is it possible if you took a priority in one of those two, can you and move up the Unalaska fish harvest practices. I just feel strongly that that is important based on all the public testimony we had when we were in Unalaska last year, and whether that's something that can be considered. I know I would appreciate it, and I'm sure Unalaska would.

But I'm throwing that out there.
Karen.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame Chair. I think you're exactly on the right track. I just want to back up a little bit because this is always so confusing.

If you'll recall, a working committee was developed of several Council members from this Council as well as Bristol Bay to establish priority information needs so that you all would not feel like you're competing with one another, but rather complimenting one another if possible, and at least recognizing the needs for each unit within this Southwest region. And what has happened here is pretty remarkable. Because the Southwest region, the Kodiak region, Kodiak/Aleutian region have some very impressive proposals that meet those priority information needs.

And so what this is about is to present to you where they are currently ranked and how you feel about where they are. Like Della just said, should we consider commenting that we believe perhaps the Unalaska surveys might be more important for this Council than the Buskin River weir. That doesn't mean it's going to happen, but certainly this is what, I think, is being asked of the Council right now. Is to look at what has happened as a result of your work in establishing those priority information needs, what projects came in and what comments you have on how they're being presented.

Thank you.
MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Rebecca and then Tom.

MS. SKINNER: I guess I want to give our RAC a pat on the back for the work we did over the last few years in going through and setting our priorities. I think we had -- well, I shouldn't speak for the group, but I'm going to.
(Laughter)
MS. SKINNER: I mean I think we had a realization that it really starts with identifying -doing a really good job identifying and documenting the priorities, letting the, you know, people or entities that will write the proposals, letting them know what those priorities are and then getting through the process so that the proposals actually get written and submitted. And I assume that that's what happened here.

I'm surprised and it sounds like there's other Council members that are surprised that there aren't Bristol Bay projects on this list. I remember the first year when $I$ looked through the project list it was -- I think it was primarily Bristol Bay projects and it was a lot more projects, I think it was like I don't know 20 projects. So I think that's why you had several people ask several times where's the Bristol Bay projects, are you sure, you know, this is the whole list, because it looks very different from what we've seen in the past.

So those are my comments on the progress we've made and the overall process.

Specifically in regards to the projects, you know, I would like to see some money go out to Unalaska. I do think that's important. Although from being out there, I do think the issues that they really want help with just can't be funded because the projects, the waters aren't Federal, they're not Federal fisheries, from being out there and talking to the community. But I do think that -- you know, I'd like to see some money go out there.

That being said, I think that the Buskin weir project, the sockeye salmon stock assessment and monitoring is -- it's very important for Kodiak. It is, I think, the largest subsistence fishery in Kodiak and the value of having that consistent year over year data from the weir in managing that stock and allowing ongoing subsistence harvest is really important.

So I did want to get that in the record.

And I think that's all I have, thanks.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, I have to say I was surprised to see this list and not a whole lot from Bristol Bay because I worked on that committee as well and it seemed to me like they had some really good projects.

I tend to agree with what Rebecca has said. There's no question the Buskin River sockeye stock assessment is extremely important to Kodiak. It is probably our number 1 subsistence fishery in the area. Although looking back at that we've had funding for that project for several years now and I would certainly not be opposed to giving that up to see, at least temporarily, to see some of these other projects from the Dutch Harbor area be moved up on the list.

That would be my comment.
MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, this is Pat.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Pat.
MR. HOLMES: Well, Tom and I are old geezers and argue all the time. I would not like to see the Buskin funding go away. I do feel, however, the evaluation in reading these points from the committee, there are some in here, when it tied, the subsistence -- number 451, it weighs in there that only the proposal -- the proposal only minimally addresses information needs for comparative ecological evaluation of sockeye rearing habitats of Olga and Akalura Lake watersheds. And a little further down, does not effectively address priority information needs as a

1 research effort. You know we do need to have
2 information on the south end, but $I$ feel that there needs to be -- that Unalaska, particularly, there are subsistence surveys -- there hasn't been one out there for many years. One of the topics that I'm surprised didn't get any proposals, or maybe it did, was Dan Dunaway, or the Bristol Bay group and myself tossed out the idea of having a -- trying to build capacity and doing some test studies where you could train local communities, such as that one proposal for King Cove and Sand Point, to where the communities could be participating more vigorously in the harvest surveys. That didn't make it.

But that item 18-451 is important. But the systems there that are being discussed, I think you needed to have a bit of input from the Fish and Game Staff there because Olga Lakes and Akalura Lakes, that's all part of a fishery in Moser/Olga Bay and there are five different runs there, early and late, but at one time they were able to manage it, Fish and Game, because there was a program, that honestly I got started in '85 for stock separation, where they could manage for weaker stocks. They haven't had that money in years, all they can do is manage that whole south end based on the strongest run and that's the Frazer, and then whatever happens is strictly what happens. And even if you had information on those lakes, which would be great to have, when you compare that to the study -- and I'm going to bat a bit for Bristol Bay, but I think Unalaska is our second important area, but that proposal that was in for quality escapements, I remember, Becky spoke to that, as well as other folks, and I'm just surprised that, you know, that that didn't make the cut.

451 is good, but I'd rather see things bump up and maybe something else there because your technical review is a technical review, but it doesn't include -- I mean you come to the Councils for one bit of information on what is important but some of that seems to get lost, and I'm sorry you make the grade precisely but some of the real meat is lost.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat.
MR. KOSO: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Rick.
MR. KOSO: Yeah, I guess you guys harped on that pretty hard there so I guess you covered most everything. But I'm kind of in favor with Della and a couple of the others that we should maybe look at Unalaska. I know during our meeting in August of last year there, it was one of their main subjects. So if we could direct funding to that and get that running then that would really be a big plug for us $I$ think in this whole deal.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead,
Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: I forgot to make a comment on one of the proposals.

Proposal 18-401, the Southwest Kodiak Ecological Assessment and the priority need addressed by that project was the Olga Lakes and Akalura Lake watersheds and the final sentence in that project description really caught my eye, that the investigators missed an opportunity to involve local residents on this project. And I guess I was surprised at that and disappointed, because I'm pretty sure that the Olga Lakes and Akalura Lakes are something that Mitch has discussed almost every single meeting. Mitch being from Akhiok and Akhiok being referenced in the description.

And so I'm making this comment now hoping that somehow this does get back to the people who wrote the project and the importance of -- I mean I can't imagine that they didn't reach out to Akhiok but the importance of documenting that and really doing a good job of presenting that in their proposal. Because I do think, subject-wise, this proposal was a good one and I know that Mitch, again, he's talked about the need for this, so it is concerning or disappointing that the component of really involving the community or involving Akhiok didn't -- apparently it didn't come together.

And then my other comment: I do agree with Pat that $I$ don't think this is the time to, like I would not agree with pulling the Buskin River
monitoring off of the list. I don't think -- my concern is that I don't think the State is in a good place to step up and take over that monitoring and that without any monitoring subsistence in Kodiak is going to take a big hit and so I am very concerned about the risk of that.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Robbin.
MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Madame Chair. And I just wanted to remind the Council that your priority information needs here will remain here and, again, during the next -- between now and our next fall meeting when you will be developing those priority information needs again, those that remain unaddressed this cycle, in addition to -- will go forward into the next call. And there may be other priority information needs that arise both here in the Kodiak/Aleutian region and in the Bristol Bay region that will be added to this list, but those that did not get addressed this round have the opportunity to get addressed the next call.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. And, again, when we talk about Southwest region we're talking in reality three regions, Bristol Bay, Aleutians and Kodiak. And when we're put in this bag, and it's a big bag, trust me, you know, $I$ think we also got to recognize over the years where a lot of this funding has gone and to be able to address the needs in other regions.

And to be honest with you, what I was asking if you're top two are tied and they are Kodiak projects, can you move one of those top two to maybe number 3 and move Unalaska to number 2. Chances are, and hopefully they all get funded, that would be ideal, but if you're given a budget that God only knows what that's going to be just because of, you know, right now where things are at, but that's what I was asking.

Thank you.
MS. LAVINE: Madame Chair. I can't change the scores as they were presented but I can

1 forward your comments, your recommendations, your concerns, any input that you may have, I can forward those on to the Board.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. All right, thank you.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, this is Pat.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat, go ahead.
MR. HOLMES: A question to the lady, forward them on to the Board, the Subsistence Board makes the decision or the Technical Committee?

MS. LAVINE: Through the Chair. The plan is reviewed by -- let's see, actually I have it -let me just go back to my notes to be sure.

So the Technical Review Committee does the initial scoring based on the five criteria. We come to you, the Councils, for your input. We also go to the Inter-Agency Staff Committee, which really is the support Staff to the Federal Subsistence Board members for their review, their comments. And then the whole package goes before the Board, and the Board approves a funding plan based on, at that moment, what our funds are, the strength of each project from one region to the next and, you know, we have to look at them, not just in a region, but across the state as a whole, and once the Board approves a funding plan, the final -- the final funding plan is made by the Assistant Regional Director of OSM.

MR. HOLMES: Through the Chair, thank you for that clarification.

And I have another question, I think back when I joined when Della was chairing, did we -there was a part of this whole evaluation program, is that there was one member from each Council that participated in the Technical Review Committee and that disappeared several years ago and I was wondering why because I think most of us felt that that provided a little bit of, not necessarily technical part, but a little bit of on the ground reality for each region.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead.
MS. LAVINE: Through the Chair. I'm sorry, but that arrangement occurred before my time here and I don't know if there's anyone on line who's listening that might be able to provide some background on that but unfortunately $I$ can't answer your question, I'm sorry.

MR. HOLMES: Well, if you could look into that and get it back through Karen, because I personally feel that that would have a considerable bit of merit. And I know some of those folks are retired and they're still hanging around Anchorage, but anyway I think it would merit some thought on doing that again.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay, thank you. I think our comments are on the record at this point. And hearing nothing else we will thank you.

I'll just throw this out there, team, we didn't talk about -- we talked about Unit 10 as in Adak but we didn't talk about Unit 10 caribou. We did have it on this list. So I don't know if it's something we can take care of, I think, before we leave or do you want to leave that for tomorrow and do the identifying -- the identifying issues for 2017.

Karen.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame Chair. I think we talked about maybe having the Council hear from both Izembek and the ADF\&G representative on Unimak and then the Council could discuss some of the issues that they have. I think that was what was discussed earlier.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. So we
will leave Unit 10 Unimak for tomorrow. And then if we can, I think, go ahead and take care of the identifying issues for 2017 annual report.

Karen.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame Chair. As you know the annual report to the Board is a report on generally non-regulatory related issues that concern the Council.

In the past you've talked about sea otters, you've talked about the Emperor goose issue, the CAG Alaska issue caribou with caribou. So what we are -- what the Council needs to be doing at this meeting is to identify issues for a draft annual report and what we will do at OSM is draft that annual report for you for review at your winter meeting where it will be finalized and sent to the Board for reply.

And as a side note your annual report is in your -- your fiscal year 2016 annual report is in the meeting book and there are responses to the issues that you had from the Board. And so that's where we are right now.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And that is on Page 52; is that correct?

MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame Chair. Yes, that is correct. And you can also take a few minutes, if you'd like to read through the responses because if you feel like you need to bring this issue forth or have a different question, based on the responses, then you could certainly add that to the fiscal year '17 report.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Would it maybe be advisable at this point for letting everyone take this home for their homework tonight and marking up so we can actually come back in the morning and go through this.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead,
Rebecca.
MS. SKINNER: Yeah, I agree with taking it home and thinking about it.

I did want to note in regards to our annual report that we submitted last year and the responses, $I$ wasn't at the February meeting last year, so the -- some of this might have been discussed at the February meeting, but I really appreciated the responses we got on the rural determination process and I felt like the information that came back was really responsive to some of the concerns that we had and some of the questions, for example, what baseline are you starting with when you're determining if a community has changed and the concerns that some communities might face year after year of request to change their rural status. And while much of that writing could probably just be considered advisory in nature, it's not binding, I did think it went into a lot of very helpful detail and did seem very responsive to concerns that this Council brought as well as the written comments that other Councils submitted as part of the rulemaking process.

So I did want to, I guess, commend, the Federal Subsistence Board and everyone, all of the Staff that worked on those responses because I think rural determination is a -- it's a big deal for communities that have had to grapple with that and Kodiak is one of them. And having as much clarity and consistency in the process as possible is really important.

So that was one thing that $I$ definitely noticed in the responses to our annual report.

Thank you.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you,
Rebecca.
Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: Yeah, Madame Chair. Just a recommendation, if we're going to hold off on this until tomorrow, I would not be opposed to hearing from the Izembek Refuge manager and then possibly Fish and Game, if we can, so that we can get into that Unimak.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Are you ready to do your report, I'm fine, our dinner is not until 6:00.

## (Laughter)

MR. RISDAHL: Well, I was actually hoping to have a little more than five minutes.
(Laughter)
MR. RISDAHL: But my goal was to summarize, simplify my report that $I$ gave you guys. It is a longer, I think, than has been done in the past. Partly that was because, you know, I'm new, and I'm sort of an over achiever and I wanted to make sure I knew what was going on on my own Refuge.

First, I want to mention that there is one typo. When I came back from my moose hunt, I looked over this again and I said oh that number is wrong, so on Page 11, it has to do with bear survey information, second paragraph.....

MS. SKINNER: I'm sorry can I -- I'm sorry to interrupt, can $I$ ask a clarifying question. Did you mean about caribou or did you mean the whole Izembek report?

MR. SCHWANTES: Well, we might as well do the whole report.

MS. SKINNER: Oh, okay, thanks.
MR. SCHWANTES: I mean I don't care, we can just do the Unimak or....

MR. RISDAHL: Okay, you want to just do the....

MS. SKINNER: Okay. I didn't know what you meant when you asked.....

MR. RISDAHL: Oh, I'm fine there, too.
MS. SKINNER: Thanks.
MR. RISDAHL: Whichever you'd prefer to do, Madame Chair.

MR. SCHWANTES: Do we have Fish and Game on line so that if we just do the Unimak, can we get into Fish and Game then or are they not on line.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris.
(No comment)
MR. SCHWANTES: If not, then we might as well.....
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris, are....
MR. SCHWANTES: .....do his whole report.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris, are you still on line at this point, did you hear what Tom was saying?
(No comment)
MR. SCHWANTES: Since Fish and Game is not on, why don't we just go ahead and do his whole report and then -- I mean if.....
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral.
MS. CHERNOFF: I guess I would like to recommend, since it's so late, that we just take this up tomorrow, so that he's not feeling rushed, we have time to comment and ask questions and then more people -- people who are not on the phone now also have an opportunity to listen in.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I agree.
(Laughter)
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I think if we can look at the annual report issues tonight, take the time when our minds are fresh in the morning. With that, I know Matt is bringing in some issues that he wanted me to read into the record and I would like everybody here when $I$ do that and I think some of it ties into some of the decisions that we make tomorrow, plus our annual report, to add to that.
So with that I think -- Rebecca.
MS. SKINNER: Sorry. I had a question. In regards to the agenda and the Unit 10 caribou, are we still doing that as a separate agenda item so that
both Fish and Wildlife and Fish and Game can be ready at the same time and are we doing that first thing in the morning -- no.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: No, I think we would like to listen to the -- I would prefer to listen to the reports and what they have to say before, I think, we go get into that, would be my recommendation.

Tom.
MR. SCHWANTES: I didn't hear
everything you said, but $I$ think you said we're going to take both reports before we take up Unimak.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes.
MS. SKINNER: So then would we expect to discuss the Unimak issue at the end of all of the Staff reports or just after whichever Staff report is last on the list, just so that both Fish and Game and Fish and Wildlife are prepared to discuss the caribou issue when we're ready to discuss it.

MR. SCHWANTES: Madame Chair. Maybe we can rearrange them so that we have the other
organizations testify first and then we can get Izembek and Fish and Game to testify -- or give their reports at the end and then we can take up the Unimak issue.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. So what your thoughts are at this time is tomorrow when we come in we're going to go back to the identifying issues, the annual report. We will do agency reports, which is tribal governments, Native organizations. And then go ahead and move maybe to the Kodiak Maritime -- or Kodiak Refuge and then Alaska Maritime and then maybe go to the Izembek and then move on to the State of Alaska, ADF\&G, I guess, and then maybe we can do Buskin River and then do Izembek and then tie up with the State for this portion of the region and then we can do caribou. So caribou is going to end up coming up prior to OSM reports tomorrow; doses that sound right.

Karen.
MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame Chair. And there's also the report from ANSEP on the -- that we added to the agenda regarding the Monitoring

Program. And the presenter has requested, you know, that if there's a way we can figure out a time that might work for him so he has an idea when that might occur and I'm waiting to hear back from him to see what might work for him so I can keep you apprised of that for tomorrow.

Thanks.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I would say maybe -- let's try this. On identifying issues, maybe we can go ahead and move that toward the end when we're getting ready to wrap up, yeah. And let's do all these reports. So I'd say maybe 10:00 would be pretty fair.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame Chair. To request that he do his presentation at 10:00?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes. Let's just go ahead and have him do his report and then we can go in the order we were talking about on the other ones.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Okay, I will do that, thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay.
MR. KOSO: Madame Chair.
MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes, go ahead.
MR. KOSO: Yeah, hey, Della, this is Rick here. I had a question, a couple of guys asked me here and I forgot to ask it on the Emperor goose there, are they allowed to mount those or is this just food only type thing on those.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral, do you have any idea on that.

MS. CHERNOFF: Yes, it's subsistence only for the spring hunt and you're allowed regular -if you want to mount your one, that you get in the fall, you're allowed to do that.

MR. KOSO: Okay. That was presented to me a couple of different times in the last couple of days. Okay, so thank you I wanted to get back to them
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