

0165

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

SOUTHEAST ALASKA SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME II

TELECONFERENCE
October 6, 2021
9:05 a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Donald Hernandez, Chair
- Calvin Casipit
- Michael Douville
- Albert Howard
- Ian Johnson
- Harvey Kitka
- Cathy Needham
- Harold Robbins
- Robert Schroeder
- James Slater
- Frank Wright

Regional Council Coordinator, Katya Wessels (Acting)

Recorded and transcribed by:
Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
Anchorage, AK 99501
907-227-5312/sahile@gci.net

0166

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Teleconference - 10/6/2021)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, good morning everybody that's on the line. I just want to check and make sure that our line has been unmuted, which I think it has. This is Don Hernandez, Chairman. We'll get the meeting underway here very shortly. The first order of business is to check and make sure we have a quorum of Council members present and on the phone lines. In order to do that I'll ask if our Secretary Frank Wright is on the line yet.

(Teleconference interference - participants not muted)

MS. WESSELS: I would like to say whoever does not have their phone on mute, please mute your phone so we don't want to hear the background noise.

(Teleconference interference - participants not muted)

MS. WESSELS: Everyone who is not speaking please mute your phones.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, sounds like quiet in the background again. Frank Wright, are you on yet?

MR. WRIGHT: I'm here.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Oh, good morning, Frank. It's a little after 10:00 [sic]. Why don't you take a roll call and we'll see if we have a quorum present then we can get started.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ian Johnson.

(No comments)

MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.

0167

1

(No comments)

2

3

MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.

4

5

MR. CASIPIT: Here.

6

7

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Cal.

8

9

Michael Douville.

10

11

(No comments)

12

13

MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

14

15

MR. DOUVILLE: Michael Douville's here.

16

17

MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

18

19

James Slater.

20

21

MR. SLATER: Jim Slater's here.

22

23

MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you, Jim.

24

25

Bob Schroeder.

26

27

MR. SCHROEDER: Bob Schroeder's here.

28

29

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Bob.

30

31

Albert Howard.

32

33

MR. HOWARD: Albert's here.

34

35

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Albert.

36

37

Don Hernandez is here.

38

39

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'm here.

40

41

MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.

42

43

(No comments)

44

45

MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.

46

47

(No comments)

48

49

MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

50

0168

1 MR. KITKA: I'm here Frank.

2

3 MR. WRIGHT: All right, thanks, Harvey.

4

5 Larry Bemis.

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.

14

15 MS. NEEDHAM: I'm here.

16

17 MR. WRIGHT: Did I hear a yes?

18

19 MS. NEEDHAM: Yes.

20

21 MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you, Cathy.

22 Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
25 Frank. I see a message from Ian Johnson that he's on
26 the Teams website but he's having trouble making a
27 phone connection so hopefully we'll get Ian connected
28 soon.

29

30 MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

31

32 MR. JOHNSON: Good morning, Mr. Chair,
33 it's Ian. I am now on.

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Oh, very good.
36 Good morning, Ian. So we do have a quorum. So will
37 call the meeting back into session. I'll start, Katya,
38 do you have any announcements for the folks online
39 before we start the meeting, any information for us.

40

41 MS. WESSELS: Yes, thank you, Mr.
42 Chair. This is Katya Wessels with OSM. I would like
43 to ask all the participants of this meeting to be
44 considerate towards others and please mute your phones
45 when you're not speaking. Also please, when, you
46 receive another phone call, do not put this phone call
47 on hold because we will hear the elevator Muzak if you
48 put us on hold. If you need to answer the other call
49 on the same phone, please hang up and then you can call
50

0169

1 back into this teleconference meeting.

2

3

4 The other announcement that I would
5 like to make, again, is that this Council meeting is an
6 opportunity for public and tribes to provide oral and
7 written testimony and comments. There's several
8 opportunities throughout the meeting. At the beginning
9 of each day you have an opportunity to provide
10 testimony on non-agenda items and the Council Chair is
11 going to announce those opportunities. There's also an
12 opportunity to provide oral comments on the wildlife
13 proposals and closure reviews after the analyst
14 presents the proposal analysis. The order of receiving
15 the comments is outlined on the page -- let's see what
16 page is that, Page 27 of your meeting book. There's
17 also an opportunity for you to send written comments
18 during this meeting and if you want to do so, comments
19 on the proposals can be sent to email
20 subsistence@fws.gov. Please clearly indicate the
21 number of the proposal or closure review that you're
22 commenting on in the title of the email. The comments
23 will need to be emailed prior to the proposal you're
24 commenting on is presented to the Council. If you
25 emailed comments prior to the meeting, please resend
26 them to subsistence@fws.gov. If less than 10 comments
27 are received we will read them into the record, and if
28 more than 10 comments are received they'll be tallied
29 and the results will be presented to the Council prior
30 to their deliberation. We might need to take a small
31 break to tally the comments after we receive them on
32 the subsistence@fws.gov email.

32

33 Thank you.

34

35 (Teleconference interference -
36 participants not muted)

37

38 MS. WESSELS: This is all I have for
39 now.

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

42

43 MS. WESSELS: And, again, please mute
44 your phones if you are not speaking. Please mute your
45 phones. Thank you.

46

47 (Teleconference interference -
48 participants not muted)

49

50

0170

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you
2 for that Katya. And as Katya said we'll start our
3 meeting this morning with public.....

4
5 (Teleconference interference -
6 participants not muted)

7
8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:comments or
9 testimony.

10
11 REPORTER: Wait, excuse me, please.....

12
13 MS. WESSELS: Stop. Stop. Just a
14 second. Please mute your phones if you're not
15 speaking. Please mute your phones. Sorry, Don.

16
17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I think we
18 got it. So public testimony on non-agenda items is the
19 first item up this morning. It'd be good if I could
20 get an idea of how many people we might expect for this
21 this morning. I could take a list here of names or
22 organizations, any organizations that want to testify
23 for this opportunity as well. So I guess we'll just
24 have to ask for a shout out here from folks who want to
25 testify to try and get an idea what to expect and what
26 kind of order to go in here. So go ahead and unmute
27 your phone and let us know if you want to testify or
28 comment.

29
30 MR. WIRTA: Yeah, good morning. This
31 is Terry Wirta. I would like to testify please.

32
33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Terry, what
34 was your last name?

35
36 MR. WIRTA: Wirta, W-I-R-T-A. It's in
37 Pelican.

38
39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, Terry. Next
40 person or group.

41
42 MR. OLSON: Mr. Chair.

43
44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.

45
46 MR. OLSON: This is Fredrick Olson, Jr.
47 representing the Southeast Alaska Indigenous
48 Transboundary Commission calling from Sitka.

49
50

0171

1 (Teleconference interference -
2 participants not muted)

3

4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, gotcha,
5 thank you, Fred.

6

7 MR. CARSON: Yeah, this is Chris
8 Carson. Owner of property of Lisianski out of Pelican.

9

10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, got you
11 Chris. Chris Carson.

12

13 MS. WALKER: Good morning.

14

15 (Simultaneous people talking)

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

18

19 MS. WALKER: My name is Brianna Walker.
20 I'm calling in from Juneau, Alaska on behalf of Salmon
21 Beyond Borders and I'd like to give public comment this
22 morning as well. Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

25

26 MR. MANNIX: This is Jacob Mannix with
27 Backcountry Hunters and Anglers. I'd like to give
28 brief comment this morning. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
31 Jacob. Anybody else.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, not hearing
36 anybody else. Not a long list, I don't think we should
37 have to limit time of testimony so I'll just go down
38 the list in the order that -- well, maybe I'll let
39 individuals testify first and then we have a couple of
40 groups so it might take a little bit longer so I will
41 start with the individuals. And I think I have Terry
42 Wirta first, so Terry go.....

43

44 MR. WIRTA: Yeah, so good morning.

45

46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:ahead with
47 your.....

48

49 MR. WIRTA: Yeah, this is Terry Wirta.

50

0172

1 I'm a lifetime resident. I'm 65 years old. I've
2 hunted here forever. And what I'm finding here lately
3 is like last year I couldn't even find a damn -- excuse
4 me -- a deer in the inlet here. I was probably out in
5 my boat a dozen times and I don't know things sure
6 seemed to have slowed down around here. And all I hear
7 now days is a lot of hunters want to come in here and
8 it seems like the residents of Pelican should have that
9 priority on hunting around here, I'll tell you that
10 much. Yeah, I kind of live for deer and I haven't been
11 able to get any last year. So -- and I'm getting too
12 old to climb up to the top of the mountain so, you
13 know, I do rely -- well, I rely for them to be on the
14 beaches. Anyway last year I wasn't able to score any.
15 So I've been saying that the -- the population, I don't
16 know, it seems to be decreasing if you ask me and
17 there's more pressure on them all the time. So I'm
18 kind of like the (indiscernible) here, we'd like to
19 have the Inlet for ourselves but, you know, can't do
20 that, but I do realize what the situation is. But I do
21 know there seems to be a lot less deer than there has
22 been in the past. I mean I could go out when it was
23 snowing and see a couple hunters in the Inlet but last
24 year that wasn't the fact anymore. So I don't know
25 what's going on. But I'd like to put a binder on
26 things you know. So anyway that's pretty much what I
27 got to say.

28

29 Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Terry.
32 I usually ask people if they're open to taking
33 questions from the Council members, would you like to
34 answer any questions?

35

36 MR. WIRTA: Sure.

37

38 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They want to ask
39 you questions.

40

41 MR. WIRTA: Yeah, yeah, that's fine.

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. So any
44 Council members have a question for Mr. Wirta.

45

46 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

47

48 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair.

49

50

0173

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Somebody, go
2 ahead.

3
4 MR. JOHNSON: Terry, I was wondering,
5 do you know if there's other people who had the same
6 issue as you did, no deer, even after, you know, 12 or
7 10 trips?

8
9 MR. WIRTA: Yeah, I mean, yeah, the
10 residents around Pelican, they didn't (indiscernible)
11 year. I mean I suppose if they want to climb to the
12 top of the mountain, but I mean usually it's like if
13 you can, you know, people realize what you can find on
14 the beaches but there really wasn't much last year.
15 That's all I can tell you.

16
17 (Teleconference interference -
18 participants not muted)

19
20 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, Mike
21 Douville.

22
23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

24
25 MR. DOUVILLE: I have a question. What
26 kind of hunting are you doing in Lisianski, are you
27 cruising up and down the shoreline in your boat or are
28 you actually going up in the woods, in these 12
29 attempts, or what's the norm in Lisianski for hunting?

30
31 MR. WIRTA: Yeah. Well, yeah, I've,
32 you know, I've been up to the tree line there and --
33 and as you know in the fall when hunting -- when you're
34 up on top of the mountain that's one thing, but I can't
35 get up there anymore and going around the beach, that's
36 another thing. But in between there it's hard to hunt
37 up here. I mean I guess you got to be a little bit
38 smarter than them. But, no, I've (indiscernible -
39 muffled) at all. I mean I've been through there several
40 times, and -- but I do like to cruise up and down the
41 Inlet to find them on the beach like everybody else
42 does. But, you know, seriously, I just -- I don't know
43 if it's the pressure or what's going on but there sure
44 didn't seem to be any deer around last year. And this
45 year I haven't really seen much either. I mean I've
46 seen maybe two deer on the beach and that's about it
47 and usually you see them swimming across, and I don't
48 know, they just don't seem to be around if you ask me.

49
50

0174

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Anybody else on
2 the Council have a question.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I have one
7 question myself and I'm trying to get a sense from
8 people in Pelican so maybe I'll ask you Mr. Wirta, do
9 you fill out the Fish and Game hunter information
10 reports at the end of the season? You don't have to
11 answer that if you don't want to but I'm just kind of
12 curious, trying to get an idea?

13
14 MR. WIRTA: Yeah, I do. I mean, yeah, I
15 have no problem filling it out. You know, heck it's
16 two deer a person, you know, I mean if I get a couple
17 of deer that's all I need, you know, per year. But I
18 mean I could get four or six or whatever, but I don't
19 need that many and I don't even try to get that. But,
20 yeah, I do fill out the report, yes.

21
22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
23 Appreciate that. Any other questions from Council.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 (Teleconference interference -
28 participants not muted)

29
30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Not hearing any,
31 thank you, Mr. Wirta. Next we'll go to Chris Carson.

32
33 MR. CARSON: Yeah, thank you very much.
34 My name's Chris Carson. I was born and raised in
35 Juneau. I spent pretty much my whole life in Juneau.
36 Recently retired in 2015. I've got a cabin out south
37 of Lisianski Strait about three miles from Pelican.
38 You know, I don't agree with Terry's thought of no deer
39 in Lisianski Strait. I was out there for six weeks
40 last year. My son came out there and my grandchildren
41 came out there and I had a brother-in-law that was out
42 there with me and, you know, it was a cold, it was
43 cold, there wasn't much snow last year so if you wanted
44 to get deer you had to go into the woods. It's as
45 simple as that, it's called hunting. So, we, I
46 thought, were pretty successful. My son and my
47 grandkids, they took four deer home. My brother-in-
48 law, he took one because he's out-of-state so he bought
49 one deer tag and he had no problem filling that tag. I
50

0175

1 was out-of-state so I took my one deer. You know it
2 was cold. It snowed up high. It was crunchy. When
3 you did get into the woods and tried to walk around up
4 in there you were crunching through the little bit of
5 frozen snow that was there so they were -- but there
6 was a lot of sign. I mean I've hunted -- I've hunted
7 Admiralty and Chichagof, Baranof, you know, my whole
8 life and, you know, very seldom did we run the beaches.
9 I mean that's, to me, not really hunting but I
10 understand for folks who are a little older or got a
11 disability that's a method to do. But Lisianski's not
12 a great place to run beaches. I mean the mountains
13 come straight down, there's not really a lot of
14 beaches. In fact my cabin's got one of the better
15 beaches out in front it, the flatlands.

16

17 You know, I don't think there's an
18 issue with deer. I mean I've seen -- I saw more deer
19 sign out there last year than I've seen in most places
20 that I've hunted in Southeast Alaska.

21

22 There was a bit of bear problem last
23 year out there. There wasn't much fish in the creeks,
24 you know, we've got fish creek right on our property
25 there and there weren't too many fish in the creek and
26 we ran into a bunch of bears out there. Skinny bears.
27 And that could be the reason that, you know, they were
28 talking yesterday about not seeing very many bears out
29 there. I think there might have been a good winter
30 kill because there really weren't. So I think the
31 bears. We were blowing our call and had a couple of
32 them come up to our call so I think they were -- they
33 were hunting the deer too and they had them pretty
34 spooked. But as far as deer sign, there were plenty of
35 deer out there. In fact, not -- probably, you know,
36 some of the best deer hunting we've seen out there.

37

38 You know this whole proposal that was
39 proposed by Jim Slater, you know, I think is really
40 unfortunate. We had an incident out there where we --
41 my -- my property backs up to his property and we had
42 an issue with us walking across his property and he got
43 a little bent and pissed off about it and we were
44 trying to stay on the 50 foot right-of-way on the creek
45 up there, which is his property but it is a right-of-
46 way and we are allowed to go up that way. We got kind
47 of a nasty letter from him and then shortly after that
48 this proposal comes out. There's about five lots on
49 the point that he owns 90 percent of and none of the
50

1 people that have their lots there are Pelican
2 residents. They live in Juneau. They live in Canada.
3 And they live down South. And, you know, I kind of
4 just really feel in my heart that this is his attempt
5 to keep us from going to out to our properties, an
6 attempt for him -- you know if I have no reason to go
7 out there, you know, if I can't hunt, so I won't be out
8 there in the winter, what's next, you know, now I can't
9 fish out there, is that going to be the next proposal
10 that comes through that, you know, only the Pelican
11 people can fish. So, you know, what do I do. I'll
12 sell my land and then he can pick it up, you know, at a
13 cheap price and own the whole -- you know the whole
14 Peninsula, you know, as locals call it the National
15 Park of Slater is what they call it out there. And,
16 you know, I'm being quite frank because, you know, I'm
17 a little upset about this, you know. My aunt grew up
18 in Pelican. My aunt and uncle have had this cabin for
19 25 years, I inherited it when my aunt passed away a few
20 years ago. I've been going out there for 20-something
21 years, you know, to visit them. I plan on having my
22 children go out there and, you know, they'll inherit
23 after me and -- and, you know, his -- and my grandkids
24 after that.

25
26 You know they talk about, you know, the
27 population of Pelican, you know, 15 years ago was, you
28 know, 200-some people lived out there, you know, year-
29 round. And I think there's maybe now in the wintertime
30 maybe 40, 45 people out there. So I don't understand
31 where they think, you know, a few people from non-
32 residential areas -- or, you know, from Juneau and
33 Ketchikan, I guess, you know, are going to really
34 impact it. There's just no way. There's a lot of land
35 out there and there's a lot of deer out there. You
36 know, a statistic that Scott Carson identified
37 yesterday over the past 20 years there's been no more
38 hunters and the same amount of deer have been taken out
39 of there. But, you know, to restrict us from going out
40 there and hunting on our cabin that we've had for many,
41 many years because you don't want to get out of your
42 boat or can't get out of you boat and walking up into
43 the woods is ridiculous, you know. And then what
44 happens when you can't even get into your boat, you
45 know, what about your children who have moved to Juneau
46 to go to work for the mines or live somewhere else, you
47 know, back in the day you took care of your elders, you
48 know, now they're not even going to be able to come out
49 there and hunt for their parents or their grandparents
50

0177

1 so then what do they do, you know.

2

3

4 Back when my dad lived out there I've
5 seen pictures when they'd go out in the fishing boat
6 and, you know, they'd go get everybody's deer. They'd
7 subsistence fish -- or hunt, and proxy for the elders
8 and they'd take care of their elders. You know if this
9 passes that's not going to happen anymore. You're not
10 going to be able to take care of your elders because
11 you're not going to be allowed to hunt out there.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

So, you know, I think the Council should look at the numbers, they should look at the subsistence figures, they should look at the science, and not just, you know, listen to a few people who, you know, want to just run up and down the beaches and shoot deer from their boats. You know, to me that's not hunting, you know, we go up in the woods, we hike up in there, we see plenty of deer. There's no issues with it. So I would recommend the Council, you know, not approve this proposal. I don't believe it got to where it -- it shouldn't have even got to this Council, this far. As Scott Carson notified -- he sent some emails from Jim Slater had sent out to folks with letters and it was a sneaky attempt. And honestly I think it's an attempt for him to purchase the land around him. He's got a ton of money. Everybody in Pelican knows it. And I think this is his way of just increasing, you know, his little empire he's got there in owning everything.

So thanks a lot for your time.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Mr. Carson, are you open for questions?

MR. CARSON: Yes, I am open for questions.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: All right. Any questions from the Council members.

MR. WIRTA: Yeah, Chris, this is Terry Wirta. Yeah, you said that.....

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Hello, Terry, this is the opportunity.....

MR. WIRTA:you.....

0178

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:for.....

2

3 MR. CARSON: This is for the

4 Council.....

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:Council

7 members.

8

9 MR. CARSON:members, Terry.

10

11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah.

12

13 MR. CARSON: Sorry.

14

15 (Teleconference interference -
16 participants not muted)

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, not hearing
19 any questions, Chris, I have one question. A fair
20 number of, you know, land holders live in the Lisianski
21 area it sounds like, people that have cabins, are we
22 talking about lot size parcels of land, or are we
23 talking about, you know, acreage, significant amounts
24 of acreage that people own as private land for the most
25 part?

26

27 MR. CARSON: You know I think some are
28 small. Mine's four and a half acres. You know I want
29 to make one other comment.

30

31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

32

33 MR. CARSON: If this proposal by any
34 chance does pass, you know what's going to happen, I'm
35 still going to go out there, there's great duck hunting
36 out there too. My son and my grandkids, they just love
37 to duck hunt. But what it's going to do, is if we
38 can't hunt on Federal land it's going to force me to
39 run up and down the beaches because below median tide
40 is State land and I can legally hunt deer on the beach.
41 So, you know, they're saying they don't want us out
42 there because they don't want, you know, they want to
43 go up and down the beaches but all it's going to do is
44 for anybody that's out there, which I think you
45 probably have more people that have cabins outside of
46 Pelican than the people that live in Pelican, but what
47 it's going to do is just force me to just run up and
48 down the beaches like them and then they think they
49 don't see any deer on the beach now, wait until I go
50

0179

1 out there with my brother-in-law, and my grandson and
2 my son and we got two or three skiffs running around.
3 I mean there'll be, you know, nothing on the beach and
4 we don't care to hunt on the beach, that's not how we
5 like to hunt. We like to track deer, we like to call
6 them in, we like to get to get those bucks. So you
7 know they're just -- they say they're doing this
8 because they want less pressure but all it's going to
9 do is force people who go out there, and I know a lot
10 of people go out there for hunting who aren't residents
11 of Pelican, it's going to force them to just beach
12 hunt. So it just doesn't make sense, what they're
13 asking for. You know this is an open state, you know,
14 we're Alaskans, you know, and we should be able to hunt
15 anywhere in the state of Alaska that we want to hunt.

16

17 But to answer your question, most of
18 the lots are acreage out where I'm at.

19

20 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I was just
21 trying to get -- yeah, I'm aware, you know, the beach
22 hunting aspect. I was trying to get a sense of private
23 land out there.

24

25 MR. CARSON: Yeah, you know, there's
26 real big mountains on each side of it, it's a long
27 skinny inlet, straits, there's really not a whole lot
28 of beach and most of it comes straight down to rocks
29 unless you get out to the head of it and then it's, you
30 know, pretty flat there and there's a few Phonograph,
31 and Telephone Cove where there's some flat. One of
32 them's got a whole bunch of cabins along it, the other
33 one's pretty open, but really not a lot of beach land
34 there. At high tide, I mean it goes right up to the
35 tree line.

36

37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, okay.

38

39 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
40 Albert.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

43

44 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
45 know this is an agenda item. I mean we had a lot of
46 conversation about it yesterday and it appears as
47 though we're heading that way again today. To maintain
48 order we should address the Chair, just not have a
49 conversation. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

0180

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, thank you,
2 Albert. Keeping that in mind. Okay. I don't have any
3 other questions so thank you, Mr. Carson, for your
4 comment. Maybe now I'll go to.....

5
6 MR. CARSON: Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: the
9 organization and maybe -- it might be on the same topic
10 here I'll call for Jacob from Backcountry Hunters, I
11 believe. I can't remember Jacob's last name, but go
12 ahead you have the floor.

13
14 MR. MANNIX: Yes, Mr. Chair, can you
15 hear me?

16
17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.

18
19 MR. MANNIX: Perfect. Actually, no,
20 I'm -- well, yeah, I'll state my name and organization
21 for the record. Jacob Mannix. I'm the Alaska Chapter
22 Coordinator for Backcountry Hunters and Anglers. I am
23 going to not comment on those proposals right now just
24 because I do want to bring up agenda items currently.
25 This is just an opportunity for me to be able to, I
26 guess, be in the same room virtually with the entire
27 Southeast Subsistence Regional Advisory Council so it's
28 mainly an opportunity for me to introduce myself and
29 just kind of open a door for future communication
30 between my organization and the Southeast RAC, at least
31 that's what I'm hopeful can happen in the future.

32
33 On a different note, I listened
34 yesterday to a fair amount of the testimony given by
35 the Forest Service as long as the Southeast Alaska
36 Sustainability Strategy and progress towards Tongass
37 Roadless Rule, and getting that reinstated and I want
38 to say, you know, I'm really pleased to hear that
39 that's the direction that the Forest Service is going
40 and I wanted to thank the SRAC [sic] for their
41 continued work that they've done on that. I've spoken
42 with Ian Johnson in the past about some of the things
43 that the SRAC is working on as far as developing a
44 statement and I believe that he said you were working
45 on developing a statement towards young growth
46 management and some potential projects that might be in
47 the works for that.

48
49 So I'm happy to hear that the SRAC is
50

0181

1 taking a comprehensive look at some of these issues,
2 that stuff does tie in with deer management. It
3 absolutely ties into, you know, a lot of the work that
4 my organization has been doing as far as work in the
5 Tongass. And so I'm hoping that there's room for
6 collaboration and to kind of move forward in that
7 direction.

8

9

10 It's -- it's -- I won't get into the
11 proposals except for to say that we did submit comment
12 in opposition to two of your proposals. I'm hoping
13 that you all have had the opportunity to read those
14 comments and, if not, that you'll be able to get the
15 opportunity to at least review them during the analysis
16 of those proposals later today. I may or may not be
17 able to be on the line when those proposals are
18 discussed. If there are any questions, again, I did
19 forward my contact information to DeAnna Perry, and I
20 think she forwarded that on to Katya. So that contact
21 information is available for the SRAC if you guys have
22 questions.

22

23

24 That's really all I wanted to say. I
25 just wanted to get the opportunity to introduce myself
26 to you all and hopefully open, you know, open a door
27 for communication in the future. There's a lot of
28 comprehensive issues that are happening in Southeast
29 Alaska right now. I'm encouraged by some of it and
30 discouraged by, you know, some other things. You know,
31 I'm glad to hear that the deer working group is looking
32 to convene later this year. I'm hoping that some
33 productive things can come out of that. I've had
34 conversations with a couple members of that group and I
35 think that, you know, there's potential to make some
36 progress there. So, you know, in the interest of time
37 I'm going to wrap it up. I didn't have a formal
38 comment prepared but, you know, I will be open for any
39 questions if there are any, but otherwise I'm going to
40 have to jump off the line here shortly.

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
Mr. Mannix. And, yes, I did see your comments and read
them, appreciated them. So any questions from Council
members for Jacob Mannix of Backcountry Hunters.

(No comments)

0182

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, not hearing
2 any, thank you, Jacob. So let's move on to Fred Olson
3 from the Transboundary Commission, I believe.

4
5 MR. OLSON: Good morning, can you hear
6 me okay?

7
8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, got you loud
9 and clear, go ahead.

10
11 MR. OLSON: (In Haida) In the Haida
12 language my name is Place of One Zone. My name is
13 Fredrick Olson, Jr., and I'm the Executive Director of
14 the Southeast Alaska Indigenous Transboundary
15 Commission. We're a coalition of 15 of Southeast
16 Alaska's Federally-recognized tribes. As we meet right
17 now, Tulsequah (ph) Mine continues to pollute the Taku
18 River watershed since the late 1950s. And that's a
19 cautionary tale for the rest of what I'm going to be
20 talking about. Our group, we're working on establishing
21 transboundary watershed governments, and ecosystem wide
22 protections.

23
24 Something you might be interested in is
25 we just received our first Federal funding. We were
26 awarded a grant from the BIA, Bureau of Indian Affairs
27 for a fish consumption rate project with the
28 (Indiscernible-muffled) Cooperative Association, one of
29 our member tribes. It's a two year project and it's
30 for a fish consumption rate survey. It'd be the first
31 one in Southeast Alaska. And the fish consumption rate
32 is tied to water quality standards. In the United
33 States, the Federal rate is 22 grams per day and Alaska
34 still uses the old Federal rate of 6.5 grams a day and
35 that's a piece of fish really the size of a quarter,
36 but a little thicker. The importance of this is that
37 the water quality standards, the regulations are
38 established using a formula and the fish consumption
39 rate is used in that formula. And just by seeing this
40 you can see Alaska is behind the United States in the
41 fish consumption rate and Washington and Oregon, they
42 would remove theirs -- when the United States said 17.5
43 grams a day there was some tribes in Washington and
44 Oregon who started doing fish consumption surveys and
45 they were getting numbers in 200 and some, 400 grams a
46 day and with just a few tribes reporting, those two
47 states they just moved the decimal point over and they
48 went to 175 grams a day. What's interesting is the
49 state of Alaska encourages people to eat two meals a
50

1 day of fish of two ounces a day (indiscernible) deck of
2 cards, you should eat a piece of fish, the size of a
3 deck of cards, two of those a week [sic], but if you do
4 that you'd be eating 48 grams a day. So it's
5 interesting that the State encourages you to eat 48
6 grams a day but they are saying we're only eating 6.5
7 grams a day. And, again, this is important because
8 this ties into regulations, you know, if people didn't
9 eat fish at all you could pollute the rivers as much as
10 you wanted, you know, theoretically. And so this is
11 what I'm going to be talking about.

12

13 You know we're talking about the
14 transboundary mining issue and when we talk about that,
15 we're talking about large industrial scale mining
16 projects that are either operating or proposed in
17 British Columbia, just across the border. Many of
18 these are very close to the Alaska border.

19

20 A lot of you, of course, have heard of
21 Alaska and British Columbia have the memorandum of
22 understanding and the statement of cooperation. And
23 some people think, oh, this issue has been solved and,
24 oh, there's a plan for the Tulsequah Mine. But even
25 through there's a plan for the clean up of the
26 Tulsequah Mine and some money's been earmarked there's
27 been no work. And, again, right now, it's polluting
28 the Taku River watershed. This is a tiny little thing
29 compared to these other projects and this memorandum of
30 understanding, it's very -- it's nice, you know, it's
31 the knowledge of two -- in cities you have the
32 Neighborhood Watch and neighbors look out for each
33 other. But, of course, the Neighborhood Watch still
34 needs the police. And in our case the police is the
35 Federal Government, because our State isn't really
36 protecting us. And the State does not recognize its
37 over 200 Federally-recognized tribes and so -- and also
38 administrations interest in this issue comes and goes.
39 You know, way back in 2015 and there was a lot of work
40 done but during this last administration there's just
41 been a few meetings. And it was disturbing when the
42 bilateral working group, which is a part of this MOU
43 and statement of cooperation, they had a sampling
44 program, water quality sampling program, they spent two
45 years, they did a few samples and instead of, you know,
46 saying this is the beginning, how do we move forward,
47 that was declared the end. You know there's nothing to
48 see here, let's move on. But there's a lot to see
49 here.

50

1 You know, a lot of people -- you've
2 probably heard of the Mt. Polley disaster in British
3 Columbia. The Mt. Polley Mine, it had a tailings damn,
4 you know, a big wall of dirt holding back this big lake
5 of poison. The tailings damn there is 135 feet high
6 but the designers didn't account for this being built
7 on glacial silt and so one day, as an expert described,
8 a big section of this damn just slipped out like
9 slipping on a banana peel and that became the largest,
10 so far the biggest mining pollution disaster in
11 Canada's history. So (indiscernible) small little
12 thing, a small mine. The Red Chris Mine is operating
13 up stream of Wrangell in the Stikine River watershed,
14 it has a tailings damn that's 341 feet high, that's
15 over half as high as the Space Needle in Seattle. And
16 there's even bigger ones coming. The (Indiscernible -
17 muffled) the KSM it would have two of these facilities
18 and both of the tailings damns would be over 100 feet
19 taller than the Space Needle. And these sit out in the
20 quote/unquote middle of nowhere and they need to --
21 they need to hold back all these contaminants for
22 literally hundreds of years. The Mt. Polley Mine damn
23 was supposed to last forever, but it lasted fewer than
24 20 years. And there's statistics that show that
25 there's been two failures every 10 years and there's
26 more and more of these being built.

27
28 Interesting reference, the Pebble Mine,
29 which many people are familiar and Democratic
30 Presidents and Republican President Administrations
31 have been against -- the Pebble Mine, its wastewater,
32 waste management would have put it like five or six
33 times more than the current largest open pit mine in
34 North America, Bingham Canyon. But KSM is almost
35 double the water management of Pebble. And so when you
36 think of the Pebble Mine and how scary that is, we
37 really need to think about the KSM mine that's
38 threatening us down here in Southeast and the folks in
39 British Columbia. And that's why we're working on a
40 campaign this summer, Beyond Borders, we have a
41 resolution and one of the asks in it is to have a ban
42 on these tailings damns. And this is one of the
43 reasons we have a human right's petition with the
44 Native American Commission on Human Rights, that's part
45 of the organization of American States. And they took
46 our petition very seriously and it's in the
47 admissibility phase and back in April of this year we
48 were notified that they gave Canada four months to
49 reply. However, Canada didn't reply. And so much like
50

1 the United Nations, the Organization of American
2 States, doesn't have the teeth but they are an
3 important organization but they've given Canada four
4 more months to reply so we're hoping that Canada does
5 reply. And we're trying all the tools in the tool shed
6 in this issue and we've been trying to deal directly
7 government-to-government with the B.C. Government. And
8 this year we're in contact with the Ministry of Energy
9 Mines and Low Carbon Innovation, Administer Ralston and
10 we were asking him to enter into a -- for our group, to
11 enter into an agreement with them so we can begin
12 working government-to-government. You know, Canada had
13 passed the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of
14 Indigenous Peoples and B.C., had passed their own, they
15 call it the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous
16 Peoples Act, and they committed themselves to working
17 with First Nations and indigenous governments in their
18 system and so we are calling them on that, and Mr.
19 Ralston appreciated that. But he said it would take
20 time to work with us effectively and it would involve
21 several Ministries and they'd have to conduct internal
22 reviews. And so we asked them -- we brought this
23 letter to the B.C. Premier Horgan and brought him up to
24 speed on our communication and we asked that during
25 this time that the Ministries would have to get ready
26 to work with us, that there be a pause in their
27 permitting program and process, a pause in new permits,
28 amendments to existing permits and approval of new
29 mining projects in B.C., until they figured out a
30 mechanism of how they're going to work with us and our
31 ability to consult with them. And that's the second
32 thing we are asking for in this campaign. And we're
33 getting very close to having, later this month we will
34 be meeting with Ministry -- with representatives of the
35 Ministry of Energy Mines and Low Carbon Innovation and
36 the Ministry of Environment and Carbon -- and like
37 Climate Change Strategy. And so we're looking very
38 much forward to this. Hopefully this will begin a
39 mechanism of government-to-government work on this
40 issue because, again, we need consistent effort, we
41 don't need one or two years of passion and interest and
42 then 10, 20 years of nothing. Because this is a real,
43 very big threat to our region. Just the Red Chris
44 alone, if that was the only one that would be a lot to
45 look out for, but they're popping up all the time.

46
47 There's one right now coming back to
48 life, the Eskay Creek, that's E-S-K-A-Y Creek Mine,
49 they're now having a revitalization project and
50

0186

1 converting this underground mine into an open pit mine
2 and they're going to -- they're proposing a tailings
3 damn that's 70 meters high, which is just a little
4 under a hundred feet high. But this project has only
5 become reviewable because the Tahltan Central
6 Government, First Nation, requested that it come up for
7 review. If they had not done that, this would just
8 have been an administrative slam dunk and there'd be
9 another tailings damn out there with no comment from us
10 or anything. Instead, we've arranged -- we're having a
11 meeting this week with the B.C., Environmental
12 Assessment Office directly regarding this project and
13 our consultation going forward.

14

15 So we would ask for your support. I
16 don't know what questions you might have.

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
19 Mr. Olson, for your really important comments there.
20 There may be some questions from the Council. Council
21 members, questions for Mr. Olson.

22

23 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, this is
24 Ian.

25

26 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
27 Albert.

28

29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I hear two people.
30 Go ahead.....

31

32 MR. HOWARD: This is Albert, Mr.
33 Chairman.

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

36

37 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
38 Mr. Olson, Through all your years of dealing with the
39 mining industry, have you come across any concerns with
40 the food resource. I guess my question is based on the
41 amount of people having cancer in Angoon, and we're
42 wondering if it has to do with the food. It's got a
43 lot of people thinking about it and we're wondering if
44 our resources around Angoon is even healthy for us
45 because a lot of us, being 80 percent unemployed, un --
46 80 percent of the population here is unemployed so we
47 rely on the resources around Angoon to keep us going
48 and now we're wondering if that's a cancer causing
49 issue. So in any of your dealings, has that been a
50

0187

1 conversation and have you found anything related to
2 cancer that's being spilled into the systems.

3

4

5 MR. OLSON: Gunalcheesh, Haw'aa for the
6 question. I'm not sure specifically about cancer. I
7 know there's a lot of concern about selenium with a lot
8 of these mines. And, you know, Wrangell just tried to
9 have a salmon derby, they had several years without
10 salmon derbies and, you know, across the region fish
11 are smaller, and one of the problems is, though,
12 because you can't pinpoint, you know, all the fish
13 didn't die one day from one specific cause that
14 everybody can point to, then the cheerleaders that are
15 running the game just say, oh, there's no problem and
16 so, you know, that's what we refer to as the death by a
17 thousand cuts. You know the Tulsequah Mine has been
18 polluting for decades and because we still have fish
19 and people still are alive, so then it can't be that,
20 right. And, you know, just like that seal that was
21 caught along -- a few years ago, at Hawk Inlet, because
22 the seal only lived half its life there then you
23 couldn't say that the mine had anything to do with it.
24 And this is -- it's kind of hard to take sometimes when
25 you're a person, you know, you feel like you've been
26 patted on the head a little bit.

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
Albert.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: You got a follow-
up, Albert, go ahead.

MR. HOWARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I
guess I have a question. Because when we got into the
seal that was sickened from the mine and we also got
information, oh, by the way, you couldn't be eating so
much salmon, oh, and if you have women that are
pregnant they shouldn't be eating seal at all, and this
was information that we had never gotten before that.
Now, it's been said, well, we don't -- we don't hunt up
in Greens Creek, but the wonderful thing of the
internet is the travel migration patterns of seal, they
go 60 miles from their home range any direction. Now 60
miles from Greens Creek goes a little south past --
pretty close to Whitewater Bay, so, in fact, the food
does come around Angoon, I guess, from Greens Creek,
the travel patterns of our salmon go past Hawk Inlet.
I'm just trying to solve a problem in Angoon and figure
out why there's so much cancer happening here and it's

0188

1 having an impact on every home.

2

3

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4

5

6

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, thank you, Albert. Was there somebody else who had a question for Mr. Olson.

7

8

9

10

MR. OLSON: Mr. Chair, could I follow-up.

11

12

13

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Oh, okay, yeah, go ahead.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

MR. OLSON: Mr. Howard brings up a great point. You see that's the difficulty of the word, subsistence, because people hear that and that refers to eating. That refers to -- the way the State of Alaska uses that word, that's the caloric intake from natural food gathered or medicines or plants. But what we're talking about is not food, we're talking about a government-to-government relationship. This is not about race, this is not a racial preference, and this is not a food issue, directly, because this is about our cultures and in this case, though, it's a little bit about food and the food, if you will, is the canary in the coal mine. People are having trouble getting the resources or they might be getting sick from eating them.

30

31

32

Thank you.

33

34

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. Other Council members with a question.

35

36

37

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

38

39

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair.

40

41

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, thanks for the presentation. I guess I'm pretty familiar with the fish consumption stuff and just wanted to reiterate that, you know, it's a pretty good venture to look at. You know basically like Fredrick stated -- Fred stated, the fish consumption rates, the assumptions of it in Alaska are skewed, you know, like not correct, you know, basically they assume we eat much less fish than

0189

1 we do and by representing how much fish we eat here it
2 changes the acceptable levels of contaminants within
3 the meat itself. And so -- but my question, Fred, is
4 just is there a way to extend this to the other
5 subsistence resources we're looking at? I mean, you
6 know, basically this is more of an ocean-linked issue
7 especially on any animal that lives awhile, seals,
8 salmon and others, so like is this consumption rate
9 analysis that you're being funded for, can that be
10 extended to seal and other things or is that just -- or
11 would that not be helpful?

12

13 MR. OLSON: Technically the fish
14 consumption rate does include seafood. One thing I
15 didn't mention about the Federal rate, even though the
16 Federal rate is 22 grams a day, and what they call
17 subsistence areas they recommend over 140 grams a day,
18 which would be more in line with what Washington and
19 Oregon have now.

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Any other
22 follow-up Ian.

23

24 MR. JOHNSON: No. No, I just think
25 it's, you know, the more holistically we can think
26 about the impact of these contaminants on all marine
27 foods maybe the better. Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you.
30 Anybody else on the Council with a question for Mr.
31 Olson.

32

33 MR. KITKA: Don, this is Harvey Kitka.

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Harvey.

36

37 MR. KITKA: Yeah, I'm just realizing
38 that the Transboundary Commission is basically dealing
39 with the big streams on the mainland. I was wondering
40 if you could possibly name these streams that are going
41 to be affected by the mines that are taking place.
42 Also I'd like to know why some of the cleanup, like the
43 ones on West Chichagof, Klagg Bay and maybe some of the
44 exploratory mines that are going to happen, I
45 understand there might be one going in around Lisianski
46 someplace, some going in around Ketchikan. I know
47 there was a lot of talk about the Unuk and what effect
48 it had on the eulachon, I was wondering if you can
49 mention some of that.

50

0190

1 Thank you.

2

3

4 MR. OLSON: Gunalcheesh. Mr. Chair,
5 yeah, the main ones that we're talking about are the
6 Taku, the Stikine and the Unuk Rivers and the Alsek up
7 by Yakutat. And we are very concerned about the Unuk.
8 That's directly threatened by the KSM project. It's
9 already being influenced by the BruceJack Mine, you
10 know, there's a lot of diminishing eulachon returns,
11 king salmon. You know I was born in Ketchikan, the
12 salmon capital of the world. When I was a kid, if you
13 caught a 40 pound salmon, you debated whether to even
14 turn that in to the derby because you might not even
15 win a prize, you know, 72 pounds or 68 pounders would
16 win and dominate the fish ladder there, the rankings.
17 And now like I already said, a lot of towns don't even
18 have fish -- the salmon derbies have become a relic of
19 the past. We're very concerned about the Unuk.

19

20

21

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any follow-up,
Harvey.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. KITKA: Don. I was curious about
if there was any -- could be any ties between some of
the things that happened in Taku and maybe Greens
Creek, outside Chichagof and some concerns about the
ongoing exploration of mines that are going to take
place in Southeast.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

MR. OLSON: Yeah, Mr. Chair. We do
know that exploration is a very underrated part of
mining. You know a lot of the regulations have to do
with when they're operating and we're focused on that,
and at the end we call reclamation when things are
supposed to go back to nature. But just I brought up
the Eskay Creek revitalization project. Last year
alone the company spent \$55 million on exploration.
And Tahltan businesses made 47 percent of that. And so
that speaks to the Tahltans concern because even though
a lot of their businesses are benefitting from this
project they have concerns. And one of the concerns --
there's a concern outright for the individual project.
There's a concern for the individual project Red Chris.
There's a concern for the individual project KSM. But
when you consider these are all in the same place. The
Eskay Creek will even use the same road that the KSM
project would use. You know the cumulative effects of

0191

1 these mines is really not considered very well yet by
2 British Columbia. And that's a huge -- besides the
3 projects themselves, the number of them, and how close
4 together they are and how sensitive the areas are, you
5 know, they call this the Golden Triangle because these
6 are literally gold mines, but a lot of our people call
7 the same area the Sacred Headwaters. These are the
8 sacred headwaters of major crucial watersheds.

9

10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
11 Mr. Olson. I'd like to thank you for your very
12 important and informative testimony here this morning.
13 And I also would like to ask you if you have any
14 resolutions that you think the Council might like to
15 join on to or endorse then if you could send those
16 along maybe before the end of the meeting we could take
17 action on them. I don't know if you have anything like
18 that in mind.

19

20 MR. OLSON: Mr. Chair, yes, haw'aa. We
21 do have the -- I mentioned the campaign, we do have a
22 resolution that's going around to many of the
23 municipalities and tribes in our region and we could
24 send that on to you. Appreciate your time and interest
25 in this very important topic.

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Like I
28 say, if we receive that before the end of the meeting
29 we could put it up for consideration to the Council
30 there to sign on to. So, okay, thank you very much
31 again, a very important topic.

32

33 Now, maybe.....

34

35 MR. OLSON: Thank you.

36

37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep. Thank you.
38 And now maybe.....

39

40 MR. KITKA: Don, this is Harvey.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Harvey.

43

44 MR. KITKA: Yeah, I got to leave for
45 awhile for an appointment so I'm signing off.

46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Very good. I'm
48 glad you were here for this testimony. It sounded like
49 it was a lot of interest to you, Harvey. So we'll
50

0192

1 listen for you this afternoon.

2

3 MR. KITKA: Okay. All right.

4

5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: And now maybe move
6 onto Brianna Walker from Salmon Beyond Borders, I
7 believe.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Are you there
12 Brianna. Are you muted?

13

14 MS. WALKER: Hello. Good morning, can
15 you hear me?

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Good morning. We
18 hear you loud and clear.

19

20 MS. WALKER: Wonderful. Thank you so
21 much. Thank you for this opportunity to give public
22 comments. My name is Brianna Walker. I'm the Campaign
23 Coordinator for Salmon Beyond Borders and I am joining
24 you this morning from Aukwaan (In Native) the ancestral
25 and present homelands of the Ackwaan Tlingits peoples
26 in Juneau, Alaska.

27

28 You just heard quite extensively from
29 my friend and colleague, Fred, on the Transboundary
30 issue. So I'll keep my comments for you this morning
31 quite brief. As many of you likely know Salmon Beyond
32 Borders is a community driven campaign. We work
33 closely with commercial and sport fishermen, community
34 leaders, tourism, and recreation business owners and
35 concerned citizens in cooperation with tribes and First
36 Nations united across the Alaska/British Columbia
37 border to defend and sustain our Transboundary rivers,
38 jobs, and our salmon way of life. Fred spoke to the
39 Transboundary mining issue and our shared concerns over
40 the Taku, Stikine and Unuk quite well. I'm happy to
41 answer any other questions folks might have.

42

43 But what I would like to do this
44 morning is to thank this Council for its leadership and
45 action in defense of our shared Transboundary Salmon
46 Rivers in the past. And, specifically, I'd like to
47 reference a letter that this Council sent in 2013 to
48 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that we still
49 utilize and include in our advocacy efforts as we work
50

1 to elevate this issue to the highest levels of
2 government today. In this 2013 letter the Southeast
3 Council spoke to the potential impacts of large scale
4 mining and related activity in Canada along with Taku,
5 Stikine and Unuk Transboundary Rivers. And I quote
6 from the letter: Impacts for large scale mining have
7 the potential to have substantial direct negative
8 effects on subsistence resources and subsistence uses
9 on Federal public lands. This Council has a unique
10 opportunity to continue to advocate for subsistence,
11 traditional and customary users while encouraging the
12 Federal government to not only continue their work on
13 this issue but to advance it and to ensure that the
14 voices of this region are amplified so as to protect
15 our coastal communities and the sustainable resource
16 that salmon and seafood creates for our region and our
17 world.

18
19 As Fred spoke to, Salmon Beyond Borders
20 is working in partnership and collaboration with SCITC
21 (ph) on a new resolution. This new resolution of
22 support is currently being considered and passed by
23 tribes and municipalities in Southeast Alaska. And it
24 calls for a permanent ban on toxic mine waste dams, or
25 tailings dams, and for a temporary pause to new mining
26 activity in the mines along the Alaska/B.C.
27 Transboundary salmon rivers until the U.S./Canada
28 Boundary Waters Treaty and the United Nations
29 Declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples are
30 upheld and an international agreement on watershed
31 protection is in place.

32
33 As of September 27th, the following
34 tribes and municipalities have passed this resolution.

35
36 The Wrangell Cooperative Association;
37 the Sitka Tribe of Alaska; the Craig Tribal
38 Association; the Organized Village of Kake; the City
39 and Borough of Sitka; Tenakee City Council; Pelican
40 City Council; and the Saxman City Council.

41
42 Additionally, several dozen prominent
43 community members, businesses and organizations have
44 signed on to the community resolution of support and
45 over 100 individual Alaskans have signed on to a letter
46 to President Biden asking for this same temporary pause
47 and for the permanent bans on tailings dams along the
48 Taku, Stikine and Unuk Rivers.

49
50

1 I could go on and provide a bit more
2 detail about the resolution but I don't want to take up
3 any more of your valuable time. I'm happy to answer
4 questions. And I would just like to say that I did
5 send an email last night to Chairman Hernandez with
6 visuals from both Fred and myself that we normally use
7 in presentations. So some of -- much of what we spoke
8 to today is included in those visual PDFs and I also
9 attached a copy of the resolution that we both spoke to
10 that's being considered by municipalities and tribes.
11 So our ask of this Council today is that you consider
12 either passing a resolution or sending a new letter
13 echoing the asks that this resolution highlights and
14 building the momentum around these acts around
15 Southeast Alaska.

16
17 Thank you, again, so much for your
18 time. Your input truly does carry so much weight and
19 thank you for your leadership on this issue and your
20 consideration of our request.

21
22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
23 Brianna. Any further questions from the Council for
24 Ms. Walker.

25
26 MR. HOWARD: I have one, Mr. Chairman.

27
28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

29
30 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
31 Do you have anything in black and white that shows
32 large scale mining as having a negative impact on the
33 subsistence users and traditional food gathers?

34
35 MS. WALKER: Through the Chair. Thank
36 you for the question. While I don't have specifically,
37 in front of me, information about that, there is some
38 information around the Mt. Polley tailings damn failure
39 that my colleague Fred mentioned in his comments, and I
40 would be happy to send you some of the most recent
41 reports that have come from Mt. Polley Mine and the
42 concerns from Quinell Lake, the community on the ground
43 that was directly impacted. A study from the summer of
44 2020 showed that, you know, metals were basically being
45 recirculated up into the lake where the tailing's damn
46 failed and that was concerning because previously they
47 thought that the metals had settled at the bottom of
48 the lake, that the sediment and tailings had settled.
49 So that's something that I can sort of speak to. And
50

0195

1 then Fred also mentioned the concern of selenium. And
2 selenium is a toxicant that is, you know, would be --
3 potentially problematic for some of the proposed
4 projects like KSM, and others in the region.

5

6 And we can look to another border state
7 of British Columbia, Montana and Idaho have had some
8 very serious issues with selenium pollution from mines
9 in British Columbia at the headwaters of the Kootenay
10 watershed and I would be happy to share with the
11 council more information on that as well. And while
12 there's not necessarily specifically information around
13 subsistence impacts, there is information on how it's
14 impacted water quality and aquatic life in the region.
15 And I'd be happy to share some of the concerns from
16 tribes in Montana and Idaho with you as well.

17

18 I hope that answers your question and
19 thank you, again, for it, it was a great one.

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any follow-up,
22 Albert.

23

24 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman. Just a
25 comment. You know we've been hearing a lot of things
26 should be in black and white before we consider them so
27 I'm thinking, you know, if we're going to put a letter
28 together supporting this it would be nice to have
29 supporting documents to go along with the letter.

30

31 Thanks, Mr. Chair.

32

33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.
34 And, Brianna, I just wanted to add, I saw your email
35 last night and I might ask Katya, our Coordinator, to
36 jump in here and maybe she could give you the email
37 address for written public comments that would go to
38 the Council. If you send it to that address I think it
39 could be distributed better to the rest of the Council
40 before the end of the meeting.

41

42 Katya, could you give that email
43 address again.

44

45 MS. WESSELS: Yes, I can give the email
46 address, Don. But that email address is the comment --
47 for the comments on the proposals that the Council is,
48 you know, going to take today, later today and
49 tomorrow. That is not really for sending out other

50

0196

1 documents. What do you want to do with these documents
2 otherwise? You know I have to.....

3

4

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, it's some
5 information that can be relayed to the rest of the
6 Council during the course of the meeting. I don't know
7 if there's an email address for that type of
8 information.

9

10 MS. WESSELS: Let me think about it,
11 Don, and I'll get back to you on that. Thank you.

12

13

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
14 Yes, I mean this whole -- back to Brianna and the rest
15 of the Council, this whole hands down remining and
16 local mining as well, issue, is something of a lot of
17 interest to the Council. Something that's a lot of
18 interest to the Council is increasing the amount of
19 indigenous management here in the Southeast region. I
20 can certainly see the overlap on those two issues. It
21 sounds like we have a lot of engagement from some
22 tribal entities and groups on this issue. I see a lot
23 of opportunities for advancing that effort. At our
24 winter meeting, which will focus on fisheries, I
25 anticipate having a lot more time to maybe delve into
26 issues such as this. That would be a good time for a
27 lot of these issues to come back before the Council.
28 This being a wildlife meeting we don't have as much
29 time and we have a lot of proposals. But I certainly
30 will keep this in mind for our winter agenda.

31

32

33 So other than that are there any other
34 questions for Brianna Walker this morning from the
35 Council.

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I'm not
hearing any so thank you again, Brianna.

MS. WALKER: Thank you very much, Mr.
Chair, and members of the Council. I appreciate your
time this morning.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
That's all the people and groups I have on my list when
we opened the meeting this morning. So I'll just ask
again if there's anybody that called in that would like
to testify or make a public comment this morning.

0197

1 Please speak up.

2

3 MR. GALLEGOS: This is Tony Gallegos
4 from Ketchikan Indian Community, may I make a comment.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead,
7 Tony.

8

9 MR. GALLEGOS: Just wanted to, again,
10 thank you Salmon Beyond Borders and Southeast
11 Indigenous Transboundary Commission. KIC has been
12 working closely with them. We will be joining the
13 resolution. We had to postpone it until our meeting
14 here this next month. But the resolution that Fred
15 mentioned has already gone through committee and we are
16 supporting that effort and the other efforts of those
17 two organizations.

18

19 I'm going to have to leave just shortly
20 because we do have a meeting today with the other
21 Transboundary tribes in Montana and Washington as well
22 talking about this issue on a larger regional basis.
23 So I just wanted to make you aware of that.

24

25 But I think the main thing I wanted to
26 just touch on was the fact that KIC has just received a
27 grant for about \$600,000 to continue -- to enhance our
28 ability to work on the Unuk River studying eulachon and
29 salmon and water quality and we will be engaging in
30 some environmental DNA analysis to assess the
31 populations there and also try to collect some more
32 baseline water quality data before the Eskay Creek and
33 KSM Mines move forward. So excited we did receive that
34 funding, we're partnering with Fish and Game and U.S.
35 Forest Service to make that happen. It's similar to
36 some proposals we've submitted in the past through the
37 Fisheries Management Partnership Grant but we weren't
38 funded for, but we are happy we received some funding
39 to move forward with increasing our studies to do
40 indigenous management of the resources and science and
41 look at the water quality of the mining that's going to
42 affect our indigenous food supply.

43

44 So just wanted to share that because it
45 was related to some of the discussion that our
46 presenters mentioned earlier today.

47

48 Thank you.

49

50

0198

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
2 Gallegos. Appreciate that. Are there any questions
3 for Mr. Gallegos before he has to leave from the
4 Council.

5
6 (No comments)

7
8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
9 for your comments. So I think we can wrap up the
10 public comment section this morning and get ready to go
11 into wildlife proposals. And before we do that I think
12 I would like to once again draw people's attention to
13 Page -- the Council member's attention to Page 27 of
14 our meeting book which kind of outlines the procedure
15 and maybe for the public who's still listening I will
16 just kind of familiarize you with what that procedure
17 is so you'll be aware how we go about this.

18
19 So the first thing we do is each
20 proposal is introduced and presented by the Staff
21 analysis, which we have in our book. Then we hear a
22 report on any consultations with tribes or ANCSA
23 Corporations on the individual proposals. Then we hear
24 agency comments, and that would be the Alaska
25 Department of Fish and Game, any other Federal agency
26 that wanted to comment, or any tribe that wanted to
27 comment on that proposal. Then we would hear Advisory
28 Group comments and those would be any other subsistence
29 councils in the state who wanted to comment and, of
30 course, local Fish and Game Advisory Committee comments
31 would be presented at that time, or any comments from
32 Subsistence Resource Commissions in the state. Then we
33 hear the summary of written public comments. And those
34 would include any comments that were emailed specific
35 to these proposals during the course of the meeting.
36 And I think Katya said if there were less than 10 they
37 could be given verbatim, if there's too many they might
38 have to be summarized. And then we open the meeting up
39 to oral public testimony, if people want to call in and
40 testify. And then after all the testimony the proposal
41 is opened by a motion to be discussed. Our motion is
42 always made to adopt, we never make a negative motion.
43 And then we have the deliberation and discussion within
44 the Council members. And those discussions and
45 justification are centered around the important topics
46 of is the recommendation by the Council consistent with
47 established fish or wildlife management principles; is
48 the recommendation supported by substantial evidence
49 such as biological and traditional ecological
50

0199

1 knowledge; will the recommendation be beneficial or
2 detrimental to subsistence needs and uses. If a
3 closure is involved, is the closure necessary for the
4 conservation of healthy fish and wildlife populations,
5 or is the closure necessary to ensure continued
6 subsistence uses. Then we also discuss what other
7 relevant factors that are mentioned in the Office of
8 Subsistence Management Draft Staff analysis. And then
9 restate the motion and the Council votes. And, you
10 know, in the course of that discussion there could also
11 be amendments to proposals which we may have to
12 consider and vote on accordingly. And then it's also
13 important that people understand that a motion to adopt
14 by the Council or not adopt is only a recommendation.
15 It's not the final word. However, there is a procedure
16 within the -- the final decisions are made by the
17 Subsistence Board meeting in Anchorage in the late
18 winter or early spring and there is both a consensus
19 and a non-consensus agenda at the Subsistence Board.
20 If the Advisory Council and the State and the Office of
21 Subsistence Management are all in agreement, either
22 opposed or adopt for a proposal that proposal goes on
23 the consensus agenda and the Board adopts it by
24 consensus if all parties agree and they defer to the
25 Council's decision. If there's disagreement between
26 the Subsistence Management analysis, the State and the
27 Council then it goes on the non-consensus agenda. And
28 the non-consensus agenda proposals are deliberated on
29 by the Board and they make the final decision.

30

31 So that's the process.

32

33 Okay. We will be making
34 recommendations, not final actions. So if everybody
35 understands that then we'll move into the proposals in
36 the order that are listed in our meeting materials
37 book. If everybody's ready, Staff, our first proposal
38 is Wildlife Proposal 22-03, which is to modify the wolf
39 sealing requirements, and I believe we have a
40 presentation by Brian Ubelaker and Lisa Grediagin. I
41 believe that proposal begins on Page 28 of the meeting
42 book. So if the presenters are available we'll move to
43 Wildlife Proposal 22-03.

44

45 MR. UBELAKER: Yes, good morning, Mr.
46 Chair and Council members. My name is Brian Ubelaker.
47 I am ready to provide you a brief summary of the draft
48 Staff analysis if you are ready.

49

50

0200

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I think we
2 are ready. Go ahead, Brian.

3
4 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you very much.
5 Wildlife Proposal WP22-03 submitted by Alaska
6 Department of Fish and Game requests that all wolves
7 taken in Unit 2 be sequentially numbered or marked by
8 the hunter or trapper. That hunters and trappers shall
9 call the Department within seven days of harvest to
10 report the date and location of take for each wolf and
11 that all hides must be sealed within 15 days of
12 harvest.

13
14 The proponent states current Federal
15 sealing regulations no longer align with new State
16 sealing regulations designed to gather more precise
17 information from harvested wolves for use in ADF&G
18 annual population estimates. It was not understood in
19 2019 to what extent that changing the sealing
20 requirement from within 14 days of harvest to within 30
21 days after the season closes would have on data used
22 for population estimates. The purpose of this proposal
23 is to correct that error. Of note. Unit 2 wolves are
24 part of the Alexander Archipelago subspecies which
25 occupies Southern Alaska and Coastal British Columbia.

26
27 In 1997 the Federal Subsistence Board
28 and the State Board of Game adopted harvest guideline
29 levels to manage the Unit 2 wolf population which
30 established annual harvest quotas based on wolf
31 population estimates. These quotas meant seasons would
32 close early if they were expected to be met. Between
33 2013 and 2018 most seasons closed early with reported
34 harvest well exceeding quotas. In 2018 ADF&G submitted
35 Proposal 43 to the Board of Game to change the harvest
36 management strategy, present harvest management
37 guidelines to meeting population objectives. The Board
38 of Game adopted this change establishing the Unit 2
39 population objective range as 150 to 200 wolves. They
40 also extended the State trapping season at the same
41 time aligning Federal and State seasons. In 2020 the
42 Federal Subsistence Board approved WP20-16 and 17
43 extending the sealing permit from within 14 days of
44 harvest to within 30 days of the end of season. This
45 proposal also removed the harvest quota and introduced
46 a no limit harvest for wolf hunting in Unit 2. In
47 March of 2021 the Board of Game adopted Proposal 194 as
48 amended requiring all wolves taken in Unit 2 to be
49 sequentially numbered or marked by the hunter or
50

0201

1 trapper and required all hunters and trappers to call
2 ADF&G within seven days of harvest to report the date
3 and location of take for each wolf and that all hides
4 must be sealed within 15 days of take.

5

6 Before 2013 Unit 2 wolf abundance was
7 uncertain and based on assumptions from sealing records
8 and a 1994 population estimate. Since 2013, a method
9 identifying individual DNA from fur samples has been
10 used to generate population estimates, which between
11 2013 and 2020 have ranged from a low of 89 wolves in
12 2014 to a high of 316 in 2020. Human harvest accounts
13 from the vast majority of wolf mortality in Unit 2.
14 Wolves are very resilient to high harvest levels due to
15 their high reproductive potential and ability to
16 traverse long distances. However, past research
17 indicates a greater than 38 percent total annual
18 mortality is likely unsustainable. In Unit 2 wolf
19 abundance is closely linked with deer abundance, which
20 are their primary prey. Deer in the area are primarily
21 limited by habitat which is being negatively affected
22 by logging of old growth Forest in Unit 2. The same
23 logging operations construct roads, which provide easy
24 hunter and trapper access to previously remote areas.

25

26 The new harvest management strategy
27 consists of four zones as depicted in Figure 2 on Page
28 45 of the meeting book. Different plan zones
29 correspond to different population levels and season
30 lengths. Zone 3 is the desirable zone where the wolf
31 population is within the objective range of 150 to 200
32 wolves and a season of up to two months would be
33 announced. In 2020 the wolf population estimate was
34 170 wolves placing it in Zone 3 which resulted in a
35 2019/2020 season being open for two months from
36 November 15th to January 15th. The 2020/21 Federal
37 season was closed September 1st and reopened on October
38 31st to allow time to acquire the delayed 2019
39 population estimates.

40

41 While wolves are valued for their fur
42 and hides in Unit 2, they're also viewed as a direct
43 competitor of deer, which is an important subsistence
44 food source. Wolf harvest primarily occurs on non-
45 Federal lands by hunters and trappers using a
46 combination State hunting/trapping license. Typically
47 little harvest occurs before mid-November when only the
48 Federal hunting season is open. From 1997 to 2018 when
49 the harvest guideline levels was initiated annual
50

0202

1 reported harvest ranged from seven to 76 wolves,
2 averaging 50 and the annual harvest quota has been
3 exceeded five times. High unreported harvest rates of
4 38 to 47 percent have likely resulted in unsustainable
5 harvest in some years. Between 1997 and 2018 trappers
6 in Unit 2 averaged 14.5 per year, primarily from
7 Klawock and Craig and accounted for 89 percent of the
8 wolf harvest on average. During this time period,
9 catch per trapper averaged 3.4 wolves. However,
10 usually only two to three skilled trappers harvest the
11 majority of wolves. In 2019 the first year under the
12 new harvest management strategy without quotas 165
13 wolves were reported harvest which is the highest
14 number ever recorded in Unit 2. This may have resulted
15 from there being almost double the normal number of
16 trappers. In 2020 the reported harvest was 68 wolves.

17
18 Adopting WP22-03 would align Federal
19 and State regulations by requiring Federally-qualified
20 subsistence users to sequentially number or mark all
21 hides, call ADF&G within seven days of harvest to
22 report the date and location of take for each wolf, and
23 to seal all hides within 15 days of take. Effective
24 wolf management in Unit 2 depends on accuracy of
25 population estimates. These reporting changes will add
26 in ensuring ADF&G has the most precise data to base
27 their estimates on. The sealing requirement is shorter
28 than the current regulation but is only one day longer
29 than the sealing requirement prior to the previous
30 regulation change in 2020. While these reporting and
31 sealing requirements will be more burdensome to Federal
32 hunters and trappers it is essential to allow the
33 management agency to acquire the most precise data
34 possible to aide in estimating the wolf population and
35 safeguard them from becoming a listed species.

36
37 Therefore, OSM's preliminary conclusion
38 is to support WP22-03.

39
40 Thank you for your time. I will be
41 happy to answer any questions you might have.

42
43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
44 Mr. Ubelaker. Any questions from the Council.

45
46 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

47
48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mike.

49
50

0203

1 MR. DOUVILLE: This is Mike Douville. I
2 will have some questions but I'm not sure if right now
3 is the correct time, okay.

4
5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So you think you
6 might want to hold those questions for the State or do
7 you think we'll need Mr. Ubelaker to come back during
8 deliberations?

9
10 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, my
11 questions would be for the State.

12
13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, we'll be
14 hearing from them as well. So anybody else on the
15 Council with questions.

16
17 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

18
19 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal in
20 Gustavus.

21
22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

23
24 MR. CASIPIT: I'm not sure if this is
25 going to be for the State or the Federal Staff but it
26 appears in the Federal Staff analysis so I'm going to
27 ask the question and if it's not the right -- anyway
28 I'll just go.

29
30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

31
32 MR. CASIPIT: This issue of unreported
33 harvest of .45 percent, based on this person's study
34 from I think, if I was reading correct, was 2008 data
35 or something, so this unreported harvest is being
36 applied to all the -- this is where it gets maybe into
37 the State, but we're using this estimate of unreported
38 harvest for all the years including up to today, for
39 instance, and it's based on a study in 2008, or here it
40 says -- yeah, Person, Russell 2008; is that the only
41 study that you're relying on for this mortality
42 estimate or do you have information from more recent
43 years that corroborate that? I guess that's my
44 question.

45
46 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair.

47
48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mr.
49 Ubelaker.

50

0204

1 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
2 believe that is the only source we have the data from
3 unless Lisa is listening and can fill in more. It's
4 the only one I found in the analysis. And maybe when
5 the State does chime in, they can add a little bit more
6 to that. But, yeah, as far as I know that is the only
7 source we have that figure from.

8
9 Thank you.

10
11 MR. CASIPIT: And that 45 percent --
12 excuse me, Mr. Chair, follow-up. Sorry. And that 45
13 percent.....

14
15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

16
17 MR. CASIPIT: That 45 percent
18 unreported harvest is being applied to even this day?

19
20 MS. GREDIAGIN: Mr. Chair.

21
22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, who's
23 speaking?

24
25 MS. GREDIAGIN: This is Lisa Grediagin,
26 the Wildlife Division Supervisor with OSM. And I would
27 just invite, if Tom Schumacher's on the line perhaps he
28 could better answer the Council member's question
29 because a lot of the data we have on unreported harvest
30 -- or not a lot, but I mean we do cite Schumacher 2019
31 personal communication as a more recent estimate for
32 unreported harvest in the analysis, you know, that's
33 saying there's 38 percent, but, again, since OSM's
34 relying on some of the State's data and then also
35 perhaps they'd have the most up to date information on
36 that.

37
38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
39 But let's wait until the State presentation and they
40 can address that question at that time if that's okay.

41
42 So any other questions from Council to
43 OSM Staff.

44
45 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

46
47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

48
49 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

0205

1 For the OSM Staff on the analysis I have a question,
2 and if you can't answer it we can kick it to the State.
3 But when we look at sort of the regulatory history,
4 it's actually five pages. I had thought it was three
5 but I went back and looked and it's five pages of
6 regulatory history. And as recently as the last
7 regulatory cycle we extended the reporting period out
8 to 30 days and now we're looking at implementing a
9 proposal that would sort of kick it back to seven days,
10 which hasn't necessarily ever really been, at least in
11 the trapping regulations before, and so I'm wondering
12 -- like I get the analysis in terms of like population
13 of wolves, and I do understand that we want to have a
14 little bit early reporting, but I'm wondering how this
15 might affect subsistence users in terms of, well, just
16 being worn out from regulations changes all the time
17 and not understanding what they're supposed to be doing
18 when. I feel like it might be a hardship on
19 subsistence users for us to constantly being changing
20 regulations like this and I'm wondering if OSM
21 considered any of that in their analysis and
22 justification because if they did I didn't see it in
23 the work that I was reading.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. Yes,
28 that was taken into consideration and as I stated in my
29 analysis, that the new change of reporting this within
30 15 days of take will only be longer than the previous
31 reporting period of 14 days. And, yes, it is confusing
32 having regulations change throughout the years and
33 definitely within a quick succession of years. But I
34 think the downside of not reporting as rapidly, of the
35 State not having the information to have a very concise
36 population estimate, it may lead to more of -- leaning
37 more to the side of where the wolf may be listed
38 through the Endangered Species Act and then there won't
39 be any concern for anybody to worry about trapping or
40 reporting, there won't be any take of wolves if they
41 are listed.

42

43 So I guess I would say in summary, yes,
44 it was considered. It was taken into account and, yes,
45 regulation changes are never anybody's favorite thing
46 to hear but the down side of it, I think, is worse than
47 the medicine that we would have to take to cure the
48 problem.

49

50

0206

1 Thank you.

2

3 MS. NEEDHAM: Follow-up, Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

6

7 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
8 appreciate that answer. But I guess what I'm also
9 trying to get at is what we've seen with trappers on
10 Prince of Wales Island is that they're an extremely
11 tight-knit well-informed community of folks who really
12 have a beat on the ground and it seems like in the past
13 when we've taken regulatory actions, if they don't
14 agree with the actions that we take, they're still
15 communicative and they do kind of what they want to,
16 and I'm afraid that every time we change regulations
17 we're setting them up to essentially break the law
18 because we're implementing laws on them regulatory
19 cycle that's different from the last regulatory cycle.
20 And while I appreciate that, you know, what we're
21 trying to do is have better reporting in order to
22 address this ESA petition, I don't feel like we would
23 be at that point if we hadn't taken all these
24 cumbersome regulatory actions in the past. And so I
25 guess to extend my question, what I'm thinking about is
26 how much have you interacted with that trapping
27 community and have you gotten any sense for when the
28 Proposal 194 was put forth from their -- from
29 testimony, on whether or not this change in regulation
30 was supported by those folks on the ground, or
31 alternatively whether or not it was opposed, like what
32 that process looked like when it went before the Board
33 of Game, but then also any outreach that may have been
34 done in regard to this proposal with the trapping
35 community on Prince of Wales.

36

37 Thank you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: A response.

40

41 MR. UBELAKER: Yes, through the Chair.
42 I will kick the can on this one. I will let Tom
43 Schumacher or somebody from the State respond to
44 outreach they conducted on the State side. And then I
45 would also ask, Lisa, if she has any insight into your
46 question, Cathy.

47

48 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is
49 Lisa, can you hear me?

50

0207

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

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead.

MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, again, this is Lisa Grediagin. I understand -- I mean there's a lot of, yeah, regulatory changes for Unit 2 wolves the past several years, but basically the previous, you know, harvest guideline levels where a quota was set, those regulations were not working. We did have a special action back in -- it was around 2018/2019 before we had the permanent -- or codified regulation change and so we went and had a public hearing on Prince of Wales Island to collect public comments on that special action and we did hear from trappers from Prince of Wales at that meeting that the current regulations of that harvest guideline level, you know, they weren't working because they didn't know how long the season would be each year and it was really frustrating to get all your traps out there and set and then a week or, you know, two weeks later they're closing the season because they expect quotas to be met. And at that time they had the two week sealing requirement and trappers we talked to at that public meeting on Prince of Wales said that they would wait that full 14 days before reporting their wolves because the sooner the report the sooner they'd close the season.

And so also in the previous petition that was, you know, submitted in 2011 and they came out with the not warranted listing in 2016, that ESA petition was for the entire population of Alexander Archipelago wolves, not just Unit 2, and in that finding the species status assessment they conducted in 2016, they found the regulatory mechanisms on Unit 2 to be inadequate. And, again, that is a reason for listing under the ESA, but because the focus was on the entire population of wolves, you know, throughout British Columbia and all of Southeast Alaska, that that finding was not warranted. But if Unit 2 had been considered a distinct population segment, it may have been listed because the regulatory mechanisms were inadequate. So that really indicated something needed to change on the regulation side because the harvest quotas weren't working, they were being exceeded all the time, it was an unpredictable season and so that was really frustrating trappers who couldn't plan for their traps.

So there was a lot of effort to change the management strategy from quotas to this, you know,

0208

1 population objective. And that was -- I know the
2 State, once, again, as Brian said, you know, we'll let
3 them talk more specific on that but there was a lot of
4 outreach conducted in trying to get input from all
5 sides, all user groups on what that population
6 objective should be. And then having, you know, being
7 able to announce to season lengths and what wasn't --
8 you know, like with any new management strategy there's
9 going to be some bumps in the road to really refine it.
10 And there was concern when that management strategy was
11 adopted that we're not getting in-season timely
12 reporting and so that was pretty evident the first
13 year, the 2019/2020 trapping season when almost the
14 number -- the estimated population of wolves was
15 reported harvested and so that was pretty alarming to a
16 lot of people and precipitated this refinement of the
17 regulations and reporting.

18
19 And so, yeah, that's kind of a long-
20 winded answer, but I guess what I really want to come
21 across here is the previous regulations weren't working
22 and so something really needed to change. And while
23 this is an additional change it's -- it was kind of an
24 unforeseen or unanticipated change from the last -- or
25 I guess I should say refinement that, you know, like I
26 say with any new process, new strategy there's going to
27 be some things that come up once it's actually
28 implemented. So hopefully that kind of answers your
29 question. Yeah, and I don't know if there's any
30 further questions but, thank you.

31
32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Lisa.
33 Any follow-up to that Cathy.

34
35 MS. NEEDHAM: No, thank you, Mr. Chair.

36
37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy.
38 Any other questions from Council members to OSM Staff.
39 We're going to hold off on questions to the State until
40 it's their time to present, so any more questions for
41 OSM.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I'm not
46 hearing any. Thank you, Brian and Lisa, for your
47 presentation. So now let's see if we have any reports
48 on consultations with tribes and corporations.

49
50

0209

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Katya, do you have
4 anything.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I don't
9 think we have any report on consultations. So
10 we'll.....

11

12 MS. WESSELS: Sorry, Mr. Chair. My
13 mute button wasn't working. Yes, we did not receive
14 any comments from tribes or ANCSA Corporations on this
15 proposal. Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
18 Let's go to the agency comments now and that would be
19 an opportunity for Alaska Department of Fish and Game
20 to give their comments.

21

22 MR. SCHUMACHER: Hello, Mr. Chairman,
23 this is Tom Schumacher, can you hear me?

24

25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, good morning,
26 Tom, go ahead.

27

28 MR. SCHUMACHER: Good morning to you
29 and to the rest of the RAC members. You know we
30 covered this topic yesterday in my presentation and
31 then we just heard the Federal comments, which also
32 generally summarized the intent behind this proposal.

33

34 The primary issue is in 2019 when we
35 developed a proposal to alter the whole wolf management
36 strategy in Unit 2 I made a mistake and I proposed to
37 change the sealing to 30 days after the season rather
38 than having a shorter sealing period. The result of
39 that mistake is that we no longer got information, or
40 precise information on where or when wolves were
41 trapped. And it's not just a general like I caught a
42 wolf here, or I caught a wolf there. Population
43 estimates based on DNA and wolf individual require the
44 date and time of each individual -- the date and place
45 where each wolf was taken. So the purpose of our
46 original proposal to the Alaska Board of Game was
47 simply to shorten the sealing period so we could get
48 more precise information from trappers. The Board of
49 Game then refined that proposal and adopted the

50

0210

1 regulation that they did.

2

3 (Teleconference interference -
4 participants not muted)

5

6 MR. SCHUMACHER: There's a lot of
7 background noise. If someone doesn't have their phone
8 on mute can they please do that.

9

10 So the Board of Game developed the
11 current regulation, the current State regulation, which
12 is sealing within 15 days of take, reporting harvest by
13 phone, so that's not a burdensome requirement, it's
14 merely reporting harvest by phone within seven days and
15 then labeling each hide, and the purpose of labeling
16 each hide is to keep track of which hide was taken on
17 which day and at which place. We talked yesterday
18 about how having reasonably accurate estimates of when
19 and where those individual wolves were taken to the
20 benefit to the population estimate. I think that
21 everyone has an interest in accurate population
22 estimates. Unit 2 users are constantly asking how can
23 we help, this is a way they can help.

24

25 In the current environment, we're all
26 aware of the Endangered Species process that is
27 ongoing, accurate population estimates and the
28 appearance of doing everything we can to sustainably
29 manage those wolves is in everyone's interest and this
30 is the time for State and Federal regulators and
31 managers to work together.

32

33 I don't know if the Council members are
34 aware, but in addition to the ESA process, the State is
35 also being sued by Joel Bennett and the Alaska Wildlife
36 Alliance over the management of the Unit 2 wolves.
37 That suit has been ongoing for more than a year. The
38 State asked for summary judgment which would
39 essentially throw out the case but the judge denied
40 that and so he set a trial date for April. The outcome
41 of that trial is going to affect wolf management in
42 Unit 2. So there's not just the ESA process, there's
43 that lawsuit.

44

45 The changes that we've asked the
46 Council to make, just aligning State and Federal
47 regulations really aren't that burdensome, they're very
48 important for population estimates and I think they're
49 very important to give the impression that managers,
50

0211

1 users, regulators are all doing everything they can to
2 ensure management is sustainable.

3

4

5 I think, you know, I urge the Council
6 to carefully consider the situation that we're in and
7 weigh the consequences, particularly the consequences
8 for the people you represent because they are the ones
9 who will bear the brunt of it. So I strongly encourage
10 the Council to adopt this proposal.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
Tom. Does that conclude your presentation?

MR. SCHUMACHER: Yes, that's a summary
of our written comments.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
Let's see I don't know if you want to address at this
time -- did you take note of the questions that were
asked previously to the OSM Staff. I don't know if you
want to answer them now or if not we'll just open it up
to Council questions again.

MR. SCHUMACHER: I'm afraid I did not
record those questions so if Council members want to
reask them I'll be happy to do my best to answer them.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. So let's go
back, questions from the Council.

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, Mike
Douville.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mike.

MR. DOUVILLE: So what it looks like is
the State is asking these trappers and hunters to
report twice on the same wolf. You got to call in
within a week and give them the information and then
you're going to have to go get it sealed within 15 days
and you're going to have to give them the same
information. So I have some issue with that. I don't
have issue with reporting in 15 days, that's not a
problem, we could do that. But to call in and report
when, in reality, I don't think you're doing any
computing in real-time. It gives you a little window
into how fast the catch is going but I think you have a
lot of data on that already. So I think it is a
burden, and I think that we've -- everybody's worried

0212

1 about this Endangered Species, they're threatened, look
2 they're not threatened, they're not endangered. I'm
3 not fearful of it because I know how many wolves are
4 out there, it's just up to the State to come up with
5 the proper data to show that and they haven't been able
6 to do that yet. So using the same methods that they're
7 using, they started off several years ago when it was
8 only 89 and we disputed that number and we still
9 dispute it. And the reason that you caught 165 a
10 couple of years ago is because the population was at
11 least double what the Department's estimate was. You
12 can't catch more than 50 percent in a given year, you
13 know, we have more trappers but they're amateurs, but
14 they're getting better at it.

15

16 So reporting twice doesn't really -- I
17 don't think it's necessary because you're not computing
18 that data until after the DNA results are in and then
19 it's still being recorded, I mean without having to
20 make a telephone call, you're putting a tag on the wolf
21 and numbering it and where you go it so why would you
22 have to call in. That's just one of the questions I
23 have.

24

25 You know there's a lot of focus that
26 habitat is got an issue here of -- I think most of this
27 is focused around old growth logging and so on. Even
28 the young growth will become an issue at some point.
29 But is the State biologist doing anything in the
30 direction of trying to curb or make a statement or a
31 stand on what they think of old growth logging on
32 Federal lands as well as State land and private land, I
33 never seem to hear anything about biologists from the
34 State saying that, no, we shouldn't be doing this or,
35 you know, there's a limit on how much you can log on
36 here without affecting the wildlife and really a lot of
37 this petitioning, this isn't the first time we've been
38 down this road, and there's never been cause to list
39 these either threatened or otherwise.

40

41 There's one other thing I want to
42 mention is that, you know, this 45 percent. Person
43 wrote in one of his analysis that he thought that the
44 commercial, or the harvest was -- the illegal harvest
45 was equal to the legal harvest, so that being the case
46 I think there was some people that actually believed
47 that and it couldn't be farther from the truth. But
48 that would have meant that the trappers harvested 330
49 wolves instead of 165.

50

0213

1 But, anyway, I'll stop for now. Okay,
2 those are a couple of questions I do have.

3
4 I mean logging is the real culprit
5 here, geographically we've lost a lot, so is the State
6 actually addressing that issue?

7
8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
9 Mike. That sounded like three questions there to
10 respond to, Tom, can you do that, go ahead.

11
12 MR. SCHUMACHER: Through the Chair to
13 Member Douville. I may need some help remembering some
14 of the questions you asked about. But there are a
15 couple of things I'll be happy to address.

16
17 Yes, the current -- State's regulation
18 does involve reporting twice, once is a phone call
19 within seven days and the other is sealing within 15
20 days of take. I think the reason that the Board came
21 up with that is they wanted to make sure that they at
22 least -- you know, and I can't speak for the Board of
23 Game, the reasoning behind that but I believe part of
24 their reasoning was to give the appearance, and not
25 just the appearance, but that we could actually look at
26 harvest in-season. You know, we don't plan to manage
27 by harvest by a quota like we used to, we plan to
28 manage by season dates, but they thought it was
29 important to at least have that on the books. Whether
30 it needs to be done twice or not, that's up to this
31 Council to decide. The most important information for
32 a population estimate is that animals are tagged with a
33 sequential number and that the date and location they
34 were taken is recorded on that tag. Other than that,
35 it's just a matter of being over monitored -- or show
36 that we at least have tools to monitor harvest should
37 we need to.

38
39 Let's see, what else, you talked about
40 the State and our research regarding the effects of old
41 growth logging. Old growth logging has been going on
42 for a long, long time and a lot of research has been
43 done on the effects on deer. And, in general, that
44 research done by Department of Fish and Game,
45 University of Alaska-Fairbanks, University of Idaho and
46 others generally shows that following logging there's a
47 flush of productivity in young clear-cuts, that the
48 forage plants that were in the under story of the
49 Forest are exposed to sunlight and flourish, however,
50

0214

1 after 20 to 25 years trees, regenerating trees tend to
2 over top those forage plants and shade them out and
3 then Forest generally has -- recovering Forest has
4 little forage for deer for an extended period in
5 decades and decades as it slowly recovers and regains
6 forage production for deer. There's been ample
7 research on that topic and now it's been well
8 documented. The focus now is on whether anything can
9 be done about it. And while the Department is not
10 currently engaged in research on that question we are
11 involved with other researchers who are looking into
12 whether thinning, patch-cuts, or, you know, something
13 else can at least provide some improvement in
14 conditions for deer in a regenerating Forest.

15
16 You also asked about, I believe, the
17 unreported or illegal take of wolves and how that
18 compares to reported harvest. The Department of Fish
19 and Game recognizes that underreported take
20 underreported take can be anything from vehicular
21 collisions to animals that were shot at or trapped and
22 escaped and later died to animals that were taken
23 outside of seasons and bag limits. There is -- there
24 are some estimates based on mortality of radio-collared
25 animals on Unit 2, and that's -- that's what you're
26 talking about with Dave Person. We also data beyond --
27 more recent data from wolves collared between 2014 and
28 2017 that shows a similarly high rate of mortality. So
29 unreported human caused mortality is an issue. It does
30 happen. The current management strategy was proposed
31 to kind of turn things on their head because instead of
32 focusing on the number of wolves that die, legally,
33 illegal, through natural mortality, whatever, the new
34 strategy focuses on the number of wolves that are alive
35 in the population because that's really what everybody
36 cares about. Whether you're a deer hunter on Prince of
37 Wales or you're a conservationist in California, really
38 what everybody cares about is the number of live wolves
39 in the population. So that was the primary focus of
40 changing the management strategy so we asked the Alaska
41 Board of Game to set a population objective and then we
42 do our best to manage to meet that population
43 objective. The Board of Game established a fall
44 population objective and that's important, a fall
45 population objective, so it's after the reproductive
46 season, it's the number of wolves in the population
47 after the reproductive season, but they just have a
48 fall population objective that's 150 to 200 wolves.
49 We're not able to estimate populations quickly so we
50

0215

1 end up with a year lag in our population estimates but
2 we believe that we are able to manage to meet that
3 population objective.

4
5 So I think that's -- I hope that's a
6 complete answer to your questions.

7
8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
9 Any follow-up, Mike.

10
11 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12
13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mike.

14
15 MR. DOUVILLE: I have some -- just a
16 second here. Okay, you still got me?

17
18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.

19
20 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. I think that
21 we've been down this road before, but, anyway, the hair
22 board study that they do is all done.....

23
24 (Teleconference interference -
25 participants not muted)

26
27 MR. DOUVILLE: Say again.

28
29 (Teleconference interference -
30 participants not muted)

31
32 MR. DOUVILLE: I heard somebody. The
33 study is all done within like Central Prince of Wales
34 just off the road system, you don't see anybody out on
35 Kosciusko, or Heceta or Tuxican, or any on Dall Island
36 or Suqwan, you know, and not all these wolves roll on
37 these boards so you can get a good estimate of
38 population, but there should have been some opportunity
39 to do that in the results of the 2019 season -- that
40 should have been an opportunity to look at what the
41 real population might have been, using, you know,
42 methods where, you know, you have your known number,
43 you have your DNA number and you know how many were
44 caught and you know how many of those you had DNA on,
45 it should have gave you a good idea of percentages and
46 what the population really might have been.

47
48 So I don't know if that's a question or
49 a statement but anyway that's all I have.

50

0216

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thanks,
2 Mike. Any response to that Tom.

3

4 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yeah, I'd just like to
5 clarify that because there is a one year delay in our
6 population estimate, the population estimate prior to
7 the fall 2019 trapping season, so the population for
8 September 1st of 2019 was 316 wolves with a confidence
9 interval ranging from about 250 to 399. A harvest of
10 165 wolves from that was very high and it's sustainable
11 for one year. But I think that the effort and the
12 estimate link up pretty well.

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Well, I
15 think Mike was done so any other questions from the
16 Council.

17

18 MR. HOWARD: This is Albert, Mr.
19 Chairman.

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

22

23 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
24 have a couple of questions. I'll start with one
25 though. What is the number of undocumented or
26 unreported wolves killed in 2018 and 2019, that's the
27 first question.

28

29 MR. SCHUMACHER: Well, through the
30 Chair to Member Howard. We no longer try to estimate
31 number of wolves that could be -- died -- that died
32 through either natural mortality or unreported human
33 caused mortality. It's no longer the focus of our
34 management. The focus is on managing for a number of
35 live wolves in the population.

36

37 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, I'll give
38 just a comment or a suggestion.

39

40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

41

42 MR. HOWARD: Given the facts that we
43 have people that decide they want to sue the State over
44 wolves and we're putting this information out there
45 through our own resources, maybe that should be removed
46 because it isn't proven that that, in fact, is the
47 case. Hopefully they're not using a 45 percent in
48 their management plan anymore either but I don't think
49 we should have it in black and white in our documents

50

0217

1 since the last time we had any proof of it was in 2008.
2 It's just a thought and something for us to consider.

3

4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
7 Albert. Any other Council members with a question for
8 Tom Schumacher.

9

10 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

13

14 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
15 had a question that I posed to OSM and they said it
16 might be better answered by the State. In our analysis
17 on Page 38 it talks about the Board of Game Proposal
18 194 it looks like. At our last meeting -- it was
19 either our last meeting or the meeting before we had a
20 discussion about Proposal 194 and this Council opposed
21 the proposal and we wrote public comment for 194,
22 however, in that discussion we did discuss what I
23 thought at that time was what the State was going to
24 ask for with the Council, in terms of a regulatory
25 change in order to address this issue and the need for
26 more information. And at that time we did say that we
27 had concerns with like the seven day after harvest
28 sealing requirement, which I understand the new -- this
29 proposal that's before us is more of just a seven day
30 reporting harvest, but what we had recommended is that
31 we have, you know, just this seven day sealing
32 requirement at the end of the season. And so I think
33 at that point in time we -- the Council felt like we
34 came to a compromise and then the Board of Game, of
35 course their cycle is different than our cycle, so they
36 had, you know, they approved -- it sounds like they
37 modified Proposal 194 but they didn't necessarily sort
38 of listen to some of the work that the Council had done
39 with regard to that. So my question earlier to OSM is
40 sort of along this, I'm now thinking of it as like
41 regulatory change fatigue and maybe it's because I've
42 been sitting on this Council and it feels like we're
43 just constantly changing regulations. And when you
44 have harvest, like a majority of the users are
45 harvesting under subsistence regulations, and so we
46 provide opportunity for those users to provide us
47 comments and then we try to make our decisions based on
48 what we hear from our users, and so my question to OSM
49 and now to the Fish and Game, really, is how much

50

0218

1 interaction with users was given and what
2 considerations were given by the Board of Game in terms
3 of whether or not another change in regulation is going
4 to be potentially a hardship on users or -- I'm just
5 trying to get a feel for are we just setting the whole
6 system up to fail and we're going to come back to
7 another regulatory change because we can't get users to
8 keep up with what we're doing.

9

10 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11

12 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yeah, through the
13 Chair to Member Needham. Let's see, the Board of Game
14 doesn't really have, other than the -- the issue of
15 individual members, I don't know that they have a
16 particular way of contacting users in an area. They
17 tend to rely on the comments of Advisory Committees.
18 So there are three local Fish and Game Advisory
19 Committees on Prince of Wales Island, and then, you
20 know, there's one in Ketchikan as well and people in
21 Ketchikan tend to see that they have some interest over
22 in Unit 2. Prior to the spring Board of Game meeting
23 they had back in March, you know, those Advisory
24 Committees were polled and voted on the proposal. I
25 don't remember -- it was a mixed vote, some supported,
26 some didn't. I don't recall if it was two supported and
27 two didn't or one supported and three didn't. So that
28 is the, I guess, the public input that the Board of
29 Game gets before they deliberate on proposals.

30

31 As for constantly changing, yeah, the
32 Unit 2 wolf population is a controversial population.
33 And many of the changes we've made recently were at the
34 behest of Unit 2 users. You know, we changed the
35 management strategy because of complaints of Unit 2
36 users. That involved changes in State and Federal
37 regulations, nobody seemed to complain about that
38 change. However, you know, this change, which, you
39 know, does make reporting a little bit more burdensome,
40 but not unduly so, it's really intended to help avoid a
41 listing and avoid long-term consequences for users in
42 that area. So I believe it is in the interest of the
43 Council and the users in that area to support this
44 proposal.

45

46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

47

48 MS. NEEDHAM: Follow-up, Mr. Chair.

49

50

0219

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any follow-up. Go
2 ahead, Cathy.

3
4 MS. NEEDHAM: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
5 Chair. So the Board of Game's proposal has already
6 been adopted and then we're looking at this regulatory
7 proposal for our cycle to basically kind of come in
8 line with the new regulation. Is there going to be a
9 plan by the State and, I guess, also could go back to
10 maybe even the Forest Service, is there going to be a
11 plan to do some outreach and work with the users on the
12 ground to assure that they understand the regulatory
13 change and why it was put in place? I am just trying
14 to prevent us, you know, having three to four hour
15 public ANILCA meetings later when, if there's an
16 emergency closure, people are going to come back and
17 this is going to potentially bite us in the butt. So I
18 guess my question is whether or not there's -- if
19 there's going to be any outreach if this proposal is
20 passed to assure that we don't have regulatory fatigue
21 and help educate users so that we don't set them up to
22 be breaking regulations that we keep making.

23
24 Thank you.

25
26 MR. SCHUMACHER: Through the Chair to
27 Member Needham. Each year our area management
28 biologist in Ketchikan provides mailers to trappers
29 explaining, you know, what we're looking for in terms
30 of samples at sealing and regulatory changes so I
31 believe that users in Unit 2 will be well informed of
32 the regulatory changes. You know there was something
33 else I wanted to mention but I think I've lost that
34 train of thought. So, yes, we will make an effort to
35 reach out to trappers to make sure that they
36 understand. And it's also, I think, you know, despite
37 these changes the idea is to align State and Federal
38 regulations to eliminate confusion also. Different
39 sets of regulations on State versus Federal lands, that
40 can be confusing for people. Although over 70 percent
41 of Unit 2 is Federal-managed, a lot of wolf trapping
42 takes place on the beach which is State-managed. So I
43 think it would be advantageous for us to be on the same
44 page regulation-wise.

45
46 I think it's also important to keep in
47 mind, and I don't know of anyone who's ever been cited
48 for making a reasonable opportunity to comply with
49 regulations, even if they were unable to. So while
50

0220

1 those law enforcement decisions are always up to our
2 law enforcement people, I think they're reasonable.

3

4 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Cathy,
7 if I could jump in here. We've been kind of dancing
8 around a topic that kind of concerns me. So from what
9 I understand is, is seven day reporting is not a
10 regulatory requirement, or is not -- is not, I guess I
11 should say the purpose of it is not for regulation,
12 this is more of a research or information need. My
13 concern is that the folks that are out trapping will
14 see a within seven day reporting requirement within the
15 season as a possibility to have in-season management
16 whereas is the Department is seeing that maybe there's
17 a high wolf take occurring and they get nervous, you
18 know, there's going to be another high number of wolves
19 taken and maybe more than anticipated like we had in
20 the previous season a few years ago, that they may
21 initiate an emergency closure or something. That might
22 cause people to, you know, not report and violate the
23 regulation. You know at the start of this whole thing
24 it did seem like, you know, this Council and the State
25 kind of agreed on shortening the sealing period and
26 then this seven day reporting requirement was thrown in
27 by the Board. I'm worried about the, you know,
28 compliance factor here, you know, if the people who are
29 trapping are worried about the motivation behind this
30 regulation on the seven day reporting.

31

32 (Teleconference interference -
33 participants not muted)

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So I don't know,
36 what assurances would they have that this is not geared
37 towards in-season management but merely for information
38 purposes? Can you convince trappers and hunters that
39 that's the case?

40

41 MR. SCHUMACHER: Chair Hernandez. Our
42 Commissioner felt it was important to have that tool in
43 place to at least have some mechanism in place to
44 monitor harvest during season. However, we have no
45 intention of monitoring -- or of managing the season
46 based on in-season harvest management. It does not
47 work. Okay. It's just ineffective in managing
48 harvest. The State will continue to manage by season
49 length. So I can guarantee you that we will issue an
50

50

0221

1 emergency order this year but that emergency order will
2 be issued before the trapping season opens and it will
3 state the closure date for the trapping season and the
4 hunting season and we hope that the Forest Service will
5 also join us in issuing that same kind of order. But
6 we have no intention of managing by monitoring in-
7 season harvest and the emergency order that establishes
8 a season length should guarantee that.

9
10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
11 That's what people need to hear. So one other
12 question, I can see that there's, you know, still a
13 little hesitancy within the Council on approving this
14 seven day monitoring provision. Have you given any
15 thought what it would look like if in the Federal
16 regulation there was no seven day reporting requirement
17 and on the State regulation there was? I know it would
18 be a misalignment of regulations but what would that
19 really -- what would really be the consequence of that,
20 have you given any thought to that?

21
22 MR. SCHUMACHER: I think the primary
23 consequences that would appear that we cannot monitor
24 harvest as closely as under the State regulation. And
25 that's primarily for, you know, having a tool in place
26 should it be needed and say to, you know, be involved
27 with the Endangered Species process, petitioners,
28 lawsuits, say, look, we have this tool in place, we're
29 not using it right now but at least it is there. It
30 would provide less (ph) -- certainty to those groups
31 that we have tools in place to monitor harvest during
32 the season.

33
34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, that, to me,
35 implies that it could be used for management purposes
36 instead of information, that's the sticking point.

37
38 MR. SCHUMACHER: You know the
39 Department recognizes that, you know, harvest
40 reporting, you know, can -- it's difficult to enforce
41 and, you know, particularly if it's a phone call, we
42 have no intention of trying to manage by in-season
43 harvest. Our current Unit 2 management plan does not
44 talk about managing by in-season harvest, however, the
45 Commissioner and the Board felt it was important to
46 have that in there. In terms of how we plan to manage,
47 I don't know that that's going to have a big effect on
48 how we would manage.

49
50

0223

1 (indiscernible - muted - background noise - cutting
2 out). Getting back to Cal Casipit and Albert Howard's
3 note, we're still recycling this legal or non-legal
4 harvest on Prince of Wales, and, you know, is it
5 appropriate. It kind of implies an inherent business
6 of this rural (indiscernible - cutting out) on Prince
7 of Wales. Is this really warranted. Are Prince of
8 Wales indigenous people and rural residents singularly
9 unlawful, this doesn't seem very wise.

10

11 To get to a question, and I've asked
12 this question numerous times -- oh, let's see, the
13 background on the question is when we debated and
14 discussed with Mr. Schumacher some years ago the idea
15 of the movement to a population objective, noted in our
16 very extensive comments, that the wolf population
17 estimates are inherently a year off because of the
18 amount of time to process data and in that time the
19 wolf population, because wolves have incredible
20 fecundity, could be way higher than whatever the
21 population estimate was when samples were collected.
22 The Council strongly suggested developing and
23 implementing formal methods of including local
24 knowledge and traditional ecological knowledge
25 specifically to get around that. In other words, if
26 there were mechanisms in place, not a public meeting,
27 not a mailing, not receiving written comment, but
28 actual research methodologies to see what the experts
29 on Prince of Wales know about what's going on with the
30 wolf population, perhaps the State petition would be
31 very strong, but perhaps we have other data sources
32 that would indicate that, yes, there was a healthy
33 model population of wolves on Prince of Wales. So the
34 question would be to Tom, you know, is there any
35 intention of formal data gathering of traditional
36 ecological knowledge and local knowledge, and I mean
37 something beyond having a couple of public meetings,
38 which are really great to do but that's not research.
39 And I really believe we will be in this situation on a
40 yearly basis, meaning that we'll endlessly be fighting
41 about wolves on Prince of Wales because of the general
42 crusade against wolf harvest in general and certain
43 people (indiscernible - cutting out) rural subsistence
44 interests or with Native interests.

45

46 And I'd point out one other thing
47 that's very exciting about our meeting this time around
48 is that we'll be having significant discussion on
49 comanagement and tribal (indiscernible - cutting out)

50

0224

1 natural resources. And I'll just point out that what's
2 going on with Prince of Wales is hopefully in the other
3 direction, it's (indiscernible - cutting out)
4 comanagement, it's not acknowledging the possibility of
5 comanagement, or tribal management.

6
7 So in case my question was lost in
8 there, is there any intention of actually doing
9 scientific gathering of traditional ecological and
10 local knowledge with respect to wolves on Prince of
11 Wales or are we going to continue to do what has not
12 been very effective at best? So that's my question
13 Tom.

14
15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Bob.

16
17 MR. SCHUMACHER: Through the Chair to
18 Member Schroeder.

19
20 (Teleconference interference -
21 participants not muted)

22
23 MR. SCHUMACHER: I think as far as we
24 know the wolf population on Prince of Wales Island in
25 Unit 2 is being sustainably managed so I would argue
26 that the management has been ineffective. In terms of
27 involving traditional ecological knowledge, at this
28 point we do not have any plans to do that. That
29 doesn't mean that we won't in the future. But at this
30 point we do not have any plans to do that.

31
32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Tom.

33
34 MR. SCHROEDER: Just a follow-up, Mr.
35 Chair.

36
37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Bob.

38
39 MR. SCHROEDER: I think we'll basically
40 save discussion of that for our deliberative process
41 but I see that as a major weak point in management of
42 Prince of Wales because -- Prince of Wales wolves
43 because (indiscernible - cutting out) meaning the
44 Department as well as the subsistence users vulnerable
45 as to what I see as experius wolf hugger crusade
46 against wolf harvest ESA suits. That's not a question,
47 it was just a comment.

48
49 Thanks, that's it for me right now.

50

0225

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, thank you,
2 Bob. Yes, I think your comments there kind of fit into
3 a broader discussion that we are going to have, you
4 know, throughout later in this meeting and probably
5 subsequent meetings about just how do we bring into
6 bear more local and indigenous management
7 (indiscernible) this year.

8
9 (Teleconference interference -
10 participants not muted)

11
12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So thank you for
13 bringing that up. I would like to move on here with
14 the deliberation process if we could. We've had quite
15 a few questions and would like to move along. So
16 Katya, I'll turn to you and ask were there any other
17 comments from other Federal agencies or tribal entities
18 on this proposal.

19
20 MS. WESSELS: Well, we will -- Mr.
21 Chair, thank you, this is Katya Wessels. We will need
22 to ask the other Federal agencies if they have any
23 comments because those comments are not sent to us, if
24 there are any tribal agencies that have comments. You
25 know if there's any that are on the teleconference
26 right now please step up and provide your comments, any
27 Federal or tribal agencies.

28
29 (Teleconference interference -
30 participants not muted)

31
32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
33 Are there any.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Not hearing any,
38 how about Advisory Group comments, do we have any Fish
39 and Game Advisory Committees or other Regional Advisory
40 Councils or Resource Commission comments at this time.

41
42 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is
43 Katya Wessels. No other Regional Advisory Councils
44 took this proposal, it's your regional proposal and I
45 don't think it appeared on any other Council's agenda.
46 But your Council is the second Council to meet and
47 Kodiak/Aleutians definitely did not review this
48 proposal. That was the first Council to meet.

49
50

0226

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Receive any other
4 comments from Fish and Game Advisory Committees in
5 writing?

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Apparently not.
10 How about written public comments, do we have any of
11 those.

12

13 MS. HOWARD: Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.

16

17 (Teleconference interference -
18 participants not muted)

19

20 MS. HOWARD: Sorry, this is Amee
21 Howard. I would like to -- I was wrestling with my
22 star six, but I do have a written comment from the
23 Pelican ADF&G Fish and Game -- or ADF&G.....

24

25 (Teleconference interference -
26 participants not muted)

27

28 REPORTER: Wait. Wait, sorry, sorry to
29 interrupt but.....

30

31 MS. HOWARD:Advisory Committee
32 that we received in writing that I would like to read
33 into the record if you would allow me.

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Is this on the
36 wolf proposal?

37

38 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Don, and Mr.
39 Chair, it is not. I'm just ahead of where I need to
40 be, thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, well, we'll
43 look for that later.

44

45 MS. HOWARD: We'll look for that later
46 and I'll have it primed, my apologies.

47

48 (Teleconference interference -
49 participants not muted)

50

0227

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, no problem.
2 How about a summary of written public comments.

3
4 (Teleconference interference -
5 participants not muted)

6
7 REPORTER: Excuse me, I'm sorry to
8 interrupt, but somebody is typing, if you could mute
9 your line. Thank you.

10
11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you.
12 Okay, written public comments on.....

13
14 MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair.

15
16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:the -- go
17 ahead.

18
19 MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, Brian
20 Ubelaker, OSM. There were no written public comments
21 submitted by the timeline for this proposal.

22
23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Now it's
24 time for any public testimony and that would be anybody
25 who is called into the meeting who would like to
26 testify on this proposal, the wolf proposal, 22-03,
27 this proposal only.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, not hearing
32 any response there. So now it's time for Council
33 action and to initiate that we would need a motion to
34 put it on the floor.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, we need a
39 motion to adopt.....

40
41 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair.

42
43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead,
44 Cathy.

45
46 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair. I move to
47 adopt WP22-03.

48
49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy.

50

0228

1 Do we have a second.

2

3 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

4

5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, Mike.

6

7 MR. DOUVILLE: Mike Douville. Are we
8 going to put this on the floor, and then -- I have a
9 question first and then do lunch or does it matter, I'm
10 willing to second the motion.

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, let's get
13 the motion and a second and then, yeah, there's an
14 opportunity for questions and discussion.

15

16 MR. DOUVILLE: I'll second the motion.

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
19 Mike. We'll see how far we get here before the lunch
20 hour. But, okay, so it's been moved and seconded to
21 adopt Wildlife Proposal 22-03. So Council discussion.
22 Keep in mind the points of justification that we need
23 to consider and, yes, if we need to have another
24 question answered we can do that as well.

25

26 So, Mike, go ahead.

27

28 MR. DOUVILLE: Excuse me, I was muted.

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Go ahead.

31 Are you unmuted?

32

33 MR. DOUVILLE: I'm unmuted but I'm not
34 quite ready -- I'm considering offering a modification
35 to it so I'll have to think about it for a little bit,
36 thank you.

37

38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

39

40 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead.

43

44 MS. WESSELS: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is
45 Katya Wessels. I just want to make one procedural
46 correction. The Councils usually need to have a motion
47 to support proposals, not to adopt the proposal,
48 because it's the Board who adopts the proposal, the
49 Council just provides their support or opposition. So
50

0229

1 I would request that the Council corrects their motion
2 that it's a motion to support WP22-03, not to adopt 22-
3 03.

4

5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you for
6 that clarification Katya.

7

8 MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So I think I'll go
11 back to Cathy Needham, would you like to restate the
12 motion.

13

14 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair. I move to
15 support WP22-03.

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. And
18 you may have said that, I may have been the one that
19 restated it improperly but I can't remember.

20

21 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, I was just
22 reading off of our presentation procedure for proposals
23 and closure reviews, and No. 7 says Regional Council
24 recommendation, move to adopt, so I said move to adopt
25 but if it needs to be moved to support, then I move to
26 support WP22-03. Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
29 for pointing.....

30

31 MS. WESSELS: Yes, thank you. This
32 is.....

33

34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:that out.

35

36 MS. WESSELS:yeah, Katya Wessels.
37 Thank you for pointing this out, this is definitely a
38 typo in our procedure that will need to be corrected.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Duly noted.
43 Mike Douville, you seconded the original, do you second
44 again, the restated motion.

45

46 MR. DOUVILLE: Yes, I do.

47

48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, very good.
49 So it's on the floor, open for discussion. So Mike, it
50

0230

1 sounded like maybe you're contemplating an amendment.
2 If you need time to think about that we could break for
3 lunch now if you need more time, otherwise we'll
4 continue on, first, what do you think about that. We
5 still got a few minutes here, maybe I'll ask if there's
6 questions from other Council members on this -- or
7 comments, excuse me, comments from other Council
8 members on this proposal.

9
10 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal
11 from Gustavus.

12
13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

14
15 MR. CASIPIT: I guess I have just some
16 quick comments, observations, whatever on this. And I
17 guess to Mike's point, I think I might have a
18 modification as well. You know I really appreciated
19 Mr. Schumacher's presentation yesterday and today, you
20 know, I'm a fisheries biologist by training so I do
21 understand mark/recapture. He talked about fish
22 biologists coming up with it in the first place. But,
23 anyway I understand the mark and recapture, I
24 understand how his model works as far the spatial
25 distribution and needing to have that location, the
26 location information to improve the math, the model of
27 the whole thing, and I do understand the need for the
28 14 day sealing because, you know, apparently that --
29 they consider the trapping -- or the hunting -- or the
30 harvest of a wolf as a recapture event, it's a
31 potential recapture event. So I understand the need to
32 increase the recapture to improve the precision of your
33 model. So I totally understand that and I'm on board
34 with the 14 day sealing and the need for that and to,
35 you know, have a good population estimate in place to
36 deal with the inevitable petitions we will get and I
37 assume we will always get because I don't think this is
38 going away, it's just -- you know, we're still going to
39 get petitions, we're still going to get lawsuits but
40 our job is to do the best we can, provide for the
41 subsistence priority, do the best we can for
42 conservation, do the best we can for providing for the
43 subsistence priority and if we get sued or go to court
44 or whatever then, you know, the judge decides and we
45 find out if we're right or wrong. But the way ANILCA
46 is set up is we're supposed to take the first shot at
47 it and we have -- we're conducting these hearings,
48 we're talking to people, we're listening to people, you
49 know, we do our best to understand the data and the
50

0231

1 information presented to us and we come up with our
2 best shot. And I think this is good. It improves the
3 estimate, I'm on board with the 14 day sealing. It's
4 consistent with established fish and wildlife
5 principles. I don't see the problem with it.

6
7 The issue I have is the seven day
8 harvest reporting by phone. That seems kind of a
9 burden to be putting on subsistence users. And if that
10 seven day telephone reporting isn't necessary to
11 improve the population estimate based on the -- in the
12 model's population estimate then I don't -- I don't
13 really support that. That seems to me going a bridge
14 too far for subsistence users. If it's not really
15 needed for population estimates then I don't think we
16 should require it for our users.

17
18 But that's kind of where I'm at right
19 now and I'll be -- I'm done, I guess.

20
21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
22 Cal.

23
24 MR. CASIPIT: Oh, one more thing I did
25 want to point out. I guess I should have said this the
26 first time, but I do want to recognize that Hydaburg
27 Cooperative Association is running a bunch of these
28 hair boards, so I think that's good. I think that's
29 excellent getting the tribal governments involved in
30 conducting research, whether it's TEK, whether it's
31 population estimates, whether it's monitoring, I think
32 it's just a suburb idea and I commend Fish and Game and
33 HCA working together on this. I think that's a super
34 thing.

35
36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you,
37 Cal. I think a lot of us agree with that as well.
38 Anybody else on the Council with a comment on the
39 proposal.

40
41 MR. HOWARD: This is Albert, Mr.
42 Chairman.

43
44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

45
46 MR. HOWARD: A couple of things. I've
47 been listening to Cal and Mike. If it isn't being used
48 for regulatory, what's the purpose of the seven day
49 reporting, you have 15 days already, that seems to be
50

0232

1 sufficient enough. My concern is somebody's going to
2 interpret this as a law to enforce and penalize
3 trappers when all they're trying to do is support
4 themselves and be independent of handouts. Everything
5 I know about trappers, they're hard working people and
6 you never see them asking for anything because they're
7 out getting for themselves and I wouldn't like to see
8 them penalized because they didn't call in within seven
9 days. So I'm thinking about how trapping wolves down
10 here in the past in Angoon, was you take your troller
11 and you go into Tenakee Inlet and you stay there for a
12 month. So if they, in fact, do that on Prince of
13 Wales, where there's no phone signal, how are they
14 going to call in and are they going to get penalized
15 for not calling in. I mean if you're not going to use
16 this for the open/closure method then what's the
17 purpose.

18

19 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.
22 I think that's the question we all have in our minds
23 right now.

24

25 (Teleconference interference -
26 participants not muted)

27

28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: All right, anybody
29 else on the Council.

30

31 (Teleconference interference -
32 participants not muted)

33

34 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair, this is Jim
35 Slater from Pelican.

36

37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jim.

38

39 MR. SLATER: I've tried to study the
40 statistical methods that were used to estimate the
41 population and while I think it's a very good effort
42 and a lot of it is based on very solid methods, I think
43 there is some uncertainty with it and I would say with
44 regard to that I would defer to the local knowledge
45 there, I would support Mike in his estimate and what
46 the proper course of action is.

47

48 That's all I have, thank you.

49

50

0233

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
2 Jim.

3
4 MR. SCHROEDER: Can I follow on Jim's
5 comment there.

6
7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, I believe
8 that was Bob Schroeder. Go ahead, Bob.

9
10 MR. SCHROEDER: Well, I'm just
11 thinking, you know, I think unless we want to
12 completely shoot ourselves in the foot, the ESA
13 proposal and we're going to have to adopt something in
14 connection with -- to lessen the chance of the ESA
15 petition succeeding. However, I'd like to figure out
16 some way where we can more than strongly support, but
17 it could even be that our support for this is
18 contingent with there being some actual action to have
19 formal methods of collecting TEK local information and,
20 you know, we've been doing this every year for an
21 interminable number of years, and the polite answer
22 comes back; well, we certainly do, we're going to talk
23 to those trappers, we're going to have some meetings,
24 we're going to do this and that, and at the same time
25 hundreds of thousands of dollars is spent on DNA work
26 and we don't have anything, in an organized way of
27 collecting and organizing -- collecting and presenting
28 TEK and local knowledge. And as a former researcher in
29 this area it isn't that there aren't any techniques for
30 doing this. This is kind of like normal course of
31 affairs, probably, you know, if you actually wanted to
32 do it you would lean heavily on comanagement and tribal
33 management ideas, but I think we're not doing our duty
34 if we just kind of go along with it one more time where
35 we're going to kind of roll over on representing our
36 constituents in a formal way.

37
38 So I'm not exactly sure how we do that
39 because it would be a matter of adopting this proposal,
40 and I'll point out to Katya that we always adopt
41 proposals, that's what we've been doing for 20 years
42 and we have evidence supporting it, but if there's some
43 way that we can get in there that our support is
44 contingent on future funding and inclusion of formal
45 local knowledge and TEK methods I'd be a little more
46 comfortable.

47
48 Thank you.

49
50

0234

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Bob.
2 Any other Council members discussion at this point.

3
4 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, Mike
5 Douville.

6
7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mike.

8
9 MR. DOUVILLE: I concur with Cal's
10 comments. I think reporting twice is a bit too much
11 and I think that was added by the Board of Game and it
12 wasn't even requested, it appears, by the biologists,
13 but I have no issue with marking date and time and so
14 on on the wolf, but to have to call in is a bit too
15 much because, you know, sealing them within 15 days I
16 think is more than adequate to take care of reporting
17 needs. So I'm not -- you know if you try to pressure
18 too much you're going to get bad information anyway,
19 would be my guess. Just on a voluntary basis, there's
20 nothing wrong with that, you'd probably get better
21 information, but to try to force somebody to report
22 twice is not going to work so well I don't think. So I
23 think you'd have to look at the value of the
24 information you're getting.

25
26 So if my Council members could figure
27 out how to word that so we could make a modification
28 I'd be happy to support it.

29
30 Thank you.

31
32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
33 I think I agree with what you say there. Okay, here is
34 what I'm going to do.

35
36 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair.

37
38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: It's a little past
39 noon. Yes, one more, go ahead.

40
41 MS. NEEDHAM: Yeah, this is Cathy, Mr.
42 Chair. I have a quick question for Mr. Douville
43 because I was trying to craft the new language so if I
44 could ask that question that would be great.

45
46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

47
48 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you. Mike, it
49 sounds like you don't support keeping the seven day
50

0235

1 report after take, but what about the language shall
2 sequentially number, mark by the hunter or trapper,
3 odes that part still apply.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 MR. DOUVILLE: Well, I think in those
8 areas where they're doing mark/recapture, I think that
9 probably is important enough to leave there. I don't
10 have issue with that. If they log it or take a picture
11 of it, or whatever, to keep them in order. We don't
12 have that mark/recapture everywhere, but I think that
13 part of it's okay. So I mean there's nothing wrong
14 with jotting down what you're doing. But have to call
15 up Tom every time you catch a wolf would be too much,
16 okay.

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Good
19 consideration. So what I'm hearing is that several of
20 the Council members are considering making amendments
21 to this proposal. It might be a good idea if we recess
22 for lunch for one hour and give people, maybe a chance
23 to think through that, what they might propose and
24 we'll come back after lunch, if there is a suggested
25 amendment we'll take that up, if not, we'll proceed and
26 make the vote accordingly. So does that sit well with
27 everybody if we recess for lunch.

28

29 MR. DOUVILLE: I agree totally.

30

31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, sounds good,
32 we'll do that. It's a little after noon, let's recess
33 until 1:00 o'clock.

34

35 (Off record)

36

37 (On record)

38

39 (Teleconference interference -
40 participants not muted)

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Katya, can you run
43 through the roll and see if we have a quorum.

44

45 MS. WESSELS: Yes, Mr. Chair, thank
46 you. Ian Johnson.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50

0236

1

MS. WESSELS: Ian Johnson.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5

MS. WESSELS: Frank Wright.

6

7

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

8

9

MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

10

11

Calvin Casipit.

12

13

MR. CASIPIT: Here.

14

15

MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

16

17

Michael Douville.

18

19

MR. DOUVILLE: Michael Douville's here.

20

21

MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

22

23

James Slater.

24

25

MR. SLATER: Jim Slater is here.

26

27

MS. WESSELS: Robert Schroeder.

28

29

(No comments)

30

31

MS. WESSELS: Robert Schroeder.

32

33

MR. SCHROEDER: Present.

34

35

MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

36

37

Albert Howard.

38

39

MR. HOWARD: Albert Howard's here.

40

41

MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

42

43

Don Hernandez.

44

45

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'm here.

46

47

MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

48

49

Harvey Kitka.

50

0237

1 MR. KITKA: Here.

2

3 MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

4

5 Harold Robbins.

6

7 MR. ROBBINS: Here.

8

9 MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

10

11 Larry Bemis.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 MS. WESSELS: Larry Bemis.

16

17 Cathy Needham.

18

19 MS. NEEDHAM: Cathy's here.

20

21 MS. WESSELS: Thank you. Thank you,

22 Mr. Chair, we have a quorum.

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,

25 Katya.

26

27 (Teleconference interference -

28 participants not muted)

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So we can pick up
31 where we left off on the Wildlife Proposal 22-03,
32 changes to the wolf hunting and trapping regulations.
33 When we recessed we were contemplating an amendment to
34 the proposal. Hopefully the Council members had a
35 chance to think that over during the lunch break and
36 I'll ask to see if that's where we want to start. But
37 maybe before we do that I think I had another important
38 question that I wanted to ask somebody on the Staff. I
39 don't know if we have a Staff person available to maybe
40 answer a question.

41

42 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, Katya Wessels
43 is here. What is your question?

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, it is in
46 regard to what happens to the existing

47

48 (Teleconference interference -

49 participants not muted)

50

0238

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: trapping and
2 hunting season in five weeks.

3
4 MS. WESSELS: I'm sorry, I can't hear
5 you very well there's a lot of background noise. So
6 please mute your phones if you're not speaking. Please
7 mute your phones. Sorry, Don.

8
9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Well, it
10 occurred to me over the lunch break that it seems like
11 at present we have a State regulation that's in place
12 that's not in alignment with the Federal regulation.
13 We have five weeks until the start of the season.
14 We're talking about a proposal that presumably needs to
15 be acting on by the Board next spring. So when this
16 season opens, are we going to go into the season with
17 regulations that are unaligned or has there been some
18 talk about doing a special action for this year to
19 align the seasons on these reporting and tagging
20 requirements. It seems like an important question that
21 I didn't think to ask while we had the Staff before.

22
23 MS. WESSELS: Well, I would think that
24 the analyst for the proposal is online now and perhaps
25 Lisa Grediagin is online now. So Lisa or Brian if
26 you're online can you help me answer Don's question.

27
28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

29
30 MS. GREDIAGIN: This is Lisa Grediagin.
31 And currently, as you stated, Mr. Chair, the
32 regulations are misaligned. OSM has not received any
33 special action to change the Federal regulations to
34 align with the State regulations this season. So if
35 one was submitted tomorrow it would take us, you know,
36 probably two months to process that. So currently the
37 Forest Service has delegated authority to close and
38 reopen the seasons and make some adjustments but they
39 do not have a delegated authority to change the sealing
40 requirements and require the sequential numbering as
41 required in the current proposal. So basically, yes,
42 for this season the State and Federal regulations would
43 be misaligned.

44
45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Yeah,
46 that's interesting, something to keep in mind. Okay.
47 I guess, you know, I asked the question to Mr.
48 Schumacher about what things would look like if we were
49 out of alignment and I guess it didn't occur to him at
50

0239

1 that time that they would be out of alignment it
2 sounded like, so I guess we will find out. But anyhow
3 moving ahead, I guess, for what's going to affect
4 trappers most likely next season in this proposal, so
5 does anybody on the Council have a suggested amendment
6 they would like to put forward at this time and, if
7 not, we'll proceed with the proposal.

8
9 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

10
11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

12
13 MR. JOHNSON: I'm making a note that I
14 barely missed roll call but I am now here and making
15 that on record. Thank you.

16
17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Very good.
18 Appreciate that, thank you.

19
20 (Teleconference interference -
21 participants not muted)

22
23 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

24
25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

26
27 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
28 I'm prepared to propose an amendment but I had a
29 question. In my motion do I have to state what the new
30 language would read or do I make a motion for us to
31 amendment and do that during the discussion.

32
33 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

34
35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: That sounds like a
36 procedural question, maybe I'll defer it to Katya,
37 could you answer that, please.

38
39 MS. WESSELS: Yes, thank you, Mr.
40 Chair. So Cathy you are asking -- can you repeat your
41 question because, again, there's noise in the
42 background and I couldn't hear every word what you
43 said.

44
45 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you. Through the
46 Chair. My question is, I'm prepared to make a
47 suggested amendment to the proposal. Do I need to
48 actually read what the new proposal language is in my
49 motion?

50

0240

1 MS. WESSELS: Yes. In your motion you
2 need to suggest a modification. Yes, to the original
3 proposal. And then after the Council votes on your
4 motion to modify, then they will vote on the original
5 motion as amended. So you will need to give the
6 Council the language that you propose to modify in your
7 motion.

8
9 Thank you.

10
11 (Teleconference interference -
12 participants not muted)

13
14 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you.

15
16 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

17
18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Is that Albert?

19
20 MR. DOUVILLE: No, it's Mike.

21
22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Oh, hi, Mike,
23 yeah, go ahead.

24
25 MR. DOUVILLE: I'll have a further
26 question like one of these changes would be for wolf
27 hunting, the other would be for wolf trapping, however,
28 they.....

29
30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right.

31
32 MR. DOUVILLE:read the same, what
33 procedure would you use to do them both at the same
34 time or one at a time. Thank you. If there was an
35 amendment offered, okay, thanks.

36
37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

38
39 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, Katya Wessels.

40
41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead,
42 Katya.

43
44 MS. WESSELS: I don't think that needs
45 to be two separate motions. I think it can be done in
46 one motion unless the proponent of this motion, if they
47 think that it would be more clear to have two motions,
48 if it will make it clearer for the.....

49
50

0241

1 (Teleconference interference -
2 participants not muted)

3

4 MS. WESSELS:Council that -- then
5 they should have two motions to amend. But I think it
6 can be done in one.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Well, maybe
11 go back to Cathy. Cathy, are you prepared to make a
12 motion. And I guess my suggestion would be if you
13 wanted both the wording to be the same for both hunting
14 and the trapping regulation you probably could just
15 address that in one motion. If for any reason they
16 were going to be different you'd probably have to make
17 two motions.

18

19 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
20 think I'm prepared, it's going to be a long one.

21

22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

23

24 MS. NEEDHAM: All right. I move to
25 amend.....

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Just a second, is
28 somebody prepared to, you know, have this all written
29 down so it could be restated accurately?

30

31 (Teleconference interference -
32 participants not muted)

33

34 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya.
35 I'm going to try to record all of this on paper while
36 Cathy's speaking. Thank you.

37

38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Very good. Okay,
39 go ahead, Cathy.

40

41 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
42 also have it written down so I can read it back if
43 there's confusion later.

44

45 I move to amend the proposed regulation
46 of Wildlife Proposal 22-03 to now read: Any wolf taken
47 in Unit 2 shall be sequentially numbered, marked with
48 the date and location recorded by the hunter or trapper
49 for each wolf and all hides must be sealed within 15

50

0242

1 days of take.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, well, that
4 sounds pretty straightforward.

5

6 MR. CASIPIT: This is Cal, I'll second.

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
9 Cal. So the amendment is now open for discussion.

10

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any discussion
15 from Council.

16

17 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

18

19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

20

21 MS. NEEDHAM: I would provide support
22 for the amendment based on the discussion that we've
23 had thus far regarding this proposal.

24

25 (Teleconference interference -
26 participants not muted)

27

28 MS. NEEDHAM: The amended language is
29 pretty much the same that has been in the proposed
30 regulation, however, it just takes out the.....

31

32 REPORTER: I'm sorry to interrupt. I'm
33 sorry to interrupt. But the record is not clear
34 because.....

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Someone needs to
37 maybe.....

38

39 REPORTER: Yes, thank you. This is the
40 court reporter. I just need somebody to mute their
41 line, whoever was making all the noise.

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. It sounds
44 quite. Go ahead and start over Cathy, I missed a lot
45 of that.

46

47 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
48 would provide support for this amendment. It pretty
49 much follows the proposed regulation change that the

50

0243

1 Department of Fish and Game suggested for Wildlife
2 Proposal 22-03, with the exception that we are removing
3 the requirement to call the Department within seven
4 days of take.

5

6 (Teleconference interference -
7 participants not muted - rustling papers overpowering
8 speaker)

9

10 MS. NEEDHAM: I think that we've heard,
11 at least from another Council member that that
12 additional -- having double reporting can be confusing
13 for subsistence users so we're just removing -- and the
14 new language is just removing the calling the
15 Department of seven days. Hunters and trappers would
16 still be required to number and mark the wolves and
17 record the date and location of where those wolves are
18 taken and report within 15 days of take which should
19 help address the need for collecting information.....

20

21 (Teleconference interference -
22 participants not muted - rustling papers overpowering
23 speaker)

24

25 MS. NEEDHAM:in order to have
26 good information for the population assessment.

27

28 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
31 Cathy.

32

33 (Teleconference interference -
34 participants not muted - rustling papers overpowering
35 speaker)

36

37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: There's still
38 somebody rustling.....

39

40 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:a lot of
43 paper in the back -- yeah, go ahead, Katya.

44

45 MS. WESSELS: Yes, that's exactly what
46 I was going to say, Mr. Chair, thank you. Please put
47 yourself on mute if you're not speaking. When you are
48 shuffling your papers we can hear the rustling sound
49 because it's right next to your microphone on your
50

0244

1 phone. It's very distracting and no one can really
2 understand what the speaker is saying when you're doing
3 this.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
8 Katya. And I think I did catch what you said that
9 time. So I do have one discussion topic I'd like to
10 clarify. And I think maybe Mike Douville might be able
11 to answer this, you know, if not we'll have to get
12 somebody from the Staff. But the way it is now, I
13 think it's my understanding that when you -- under the
14 sealing requirements there's no real specific
15 information on location and time that's associated with
16 the sealing requirement. Right now it's just kind of
17 more general information. I know you've gone through
18 this process a lot, Mike, is my understanding correct?

19

20 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman. Mike
21 Douville here.

22

23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

24

25 MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah, it is correct.
26 The forms that have been used, you know, to date, only
27 go by month, they don't go by individual days so -- you
28 know, and then there's a place in there to record where
29 a wolf was taken and it's pretty much by month but
30 maybe they'll change their forms and it'll be more
31 specific but you are right.

32

33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
34 So this proposal says they shall be sequentially
35 numbered and marked by the hunter or trapper. So that,
36 to me, indicates that at least the time of when they
37 were taken would be more closely recorded, and I guess
38 that would be kind of reflected in the sealing, when
39 the hide actually gets sealed. Location, exact
40 location, maybe not so much, so I don't know how
41 important that is. You have a comment on that, Mike.

42

43 MR. DOUVILLE: You know, I would look
44 at this regulation as, you know, when you got home at
45 the end of the day, you know, you have a wolf or two
46 and you could jot down the information at that time.
47 You know if you're out in a boat in adverse weather or
48 whatever it's just not practical. And I think general
49 information in this case is, you know, okay. If you

50

0245

1 want to ask the exact location, go ahead and ask, but,
2 you know, that sometimes is kind of classified, even
3 amongst trappers so, you know, if you got it off
4 SanFernando Island, it's SanFernando Island, you know,
5 if you want to be more specific than that there
6 wouldn't be any rationale as to why.

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah.

9

10 MR. DOUVILLE: Anyway.

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you for
13 that. I understand that. Okay. Any other questions
14 from any other Council members, that's all I had.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, perhaps not.
19 So I guess the proper procedure would be that we would
20 now have a vote on the amendment, whether to approve
21 the amendment.

22

23 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chair. I call.....

24

25 MS. WESSELS: That is correct.

26

27 MR. HOWARD:for the question on
28 the amendment.

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I heard a
31 call for the question on the amendment. So go ahead,
32 anybody else.

33

34 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair.

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mike.

37

38 MR. DOUVILLE: Just a clarification.

39 Does this.....

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

42

43 MR. DOUVILLE:include both wolf
44 trapping and wolf hunting?

45

46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Correct. So we
47 have a call for the question, Cathy could you reread
48 your amended proposal for us once again.

49

50

0246

1 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
2 moved to amend the proposed regulation for Wildlife
3 Proposal 22-03 to change the language for both wolf
4 hunting and wolf trapping to now read: Any wolf taken
5 in Unit 2 shall be sequentially numbered, marked with
6 the date and location recorded by the hunter or trapper
7 for each wolf and all hides must be sealed within 15
8 days of take.

9
10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Sounds very
11 clear. So are we ready for the roll call vote on this
12 one, if you would, please, Frank.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Frank, are you
17 there, unmuted.

18
19 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, I'm here, Mr. Chair.

20
21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Are you
22 ready to do a roll call vote, Frank.

23
24 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, okay.

25
26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

27
28 MR. WRIGHT: I'll start off with Cathy
29 Needham.

30
31 MS. NEEDHAM: Yes.

32
33 MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

42
43 MR. KITKA: Yes.

44
45 MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.

46
47 MR. ROBBINS: Yes.

48
49 MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

50

0247

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

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Bob Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Jim Slater.

MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.

MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Frank Wright votes yes.

Ian Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. The amendment passed.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you, Frank, that's unanimous. Okay, now the proper procedure would be to -- I guess we need to make another motion to adopt the amended proposal; is that correct procedure?

MR. WRIGHT: Go to the main.....

MS. WESSELS: No, you go.....

MR. WRIGHT:motion, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Or back to the.....

MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya Wessels. You just need to vote on the original motion as amended, which the amendment will be include the

0248

1 language that Cathy proposed.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. So we need
4 a new motion to adopt the main motion as amended; is
5 that the correct wording?

6

7 MS. WESSELS: No. No. You're just
8 voting on the original motion as amended. That's all
9 you need to say because you voted -- it's -- I think,
10 you know, it's in the direction that were sent to you
11 -- let me just find this very quickly.

12

13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I just want to get
14 the procedure right here.

15

16 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
17 Albert.

18

19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

20

21 MR. HOWARD: I call for the question
22 on.....

23

24 MS. WESSELS: Yes, so you just, you
25 know.....

26

27 MR. HOWARD: Call for the question on
28 the main motion as amended.

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: There you go.
31 Main motion as amended. Okay.

32

33 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair.

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.

36

37 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

38

39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

40

41 MS. NEEDHAM: Before -- I know the
42 question's been called and you are probably going to go
43 to the main motion to vote with the main motion.....

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right.

46

47 MS. NEEDHAM:of course being to
48 support Wildlife Proposal 22-03 but I think we still
49 need to provide a justification for the record for the
50

0249

1 main motion. I know we had some discussion but I don't
2 think we went through all of our discussion and
3 justification yet.

4
5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: That sounds
6 correct. So Albert if we could just hold off on the
7 vote, Cathy, if you want to add something now would be
8 the time.

9
10 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11
12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

13
14 MS. NEEDHAM: I would support the main
15 motion and in order to document some of the
16 justification of why I would support the main motion is
17 that I believe that this -- while it will be somewhat
18 cumbersome for subsistence users because of all of the
19 regulatory fatigue we may have created in the more
20 recent years, I do believe that the information that
21 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is trying to get
22 at from bringing this proposal to us is to provide
23 better reporting for a population estimate so that we
24 can better manage under a management strategy that this
25 Council has supported in the past to come together with
26 the State in a dual management system.

27
28 This proposal does not include closure
29 -- I think it is also helping to address assuring that
30 we can manage wolf populations within Unit 2 so that
31 our -- so that there's not a positive finding in the
32 ESA petition. I don't think that it limits -- because
33 it's not a closure I don't think that it -- I still
34 think it allows for the continued use of wildlife
35 population, and I think that is good.

36
37 So again I would support the proposal.

38
39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
40 Cathy. Sounds like pretty good justification to me.
41 Would anybody like to add anything, do so now.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you very
46 much. I'll call for the question for the vote on the
47 main motion as amended for Wildlife Proposal 22-03. I
48 think.....

49
50

0250

1 MR. KITKA: Call for the main motion as
2 amended.

3
4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: This vote is for
5 the main motion as amended, yes, that's correct.

6
7 MR. KITKA: Question.

8
9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any questions.
10 Have a question or are you calling for the question?

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any more
15 questions.

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I believe the
20 vote's been called for. I think on this one I can do a
21 voice vote. So all in favor of adopting Wildlife
22 Proposal 22-03 as amended signify by saying aye.

23
24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25
26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Anybody opposed to
27 adopting 22-03 as amended say nay.

28
29 (No opposing votes)

30
31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Hearing none,
32 motion passes unanimous. Okay, thank you very much.
33 We got through a difficult proposal there. So we can
34 move on. Next one up is two proposals kind of dealt
35 with as one topic and those would be Wildlife Proposal
36 22-04, 22-05 has to deal with elk hunting and do we
37 have a presenter up for those two proposals, and it's
38 Page -- the analysis for that starts on Page 56 in the
39 Council books. Do we have a presenter.

40
41 MR. CROSS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My
42 name is Robert Cross and I'm a fish and wildlife
43 Biologist with the U.S. Forest Service and I'll be
44 presenting on WP22-04 and 05. Mr. Chair. I'm hoping
45 to present on the two separately. They were combined
46 because there's a lot of shared background information
47 but I think it would be simpler if I presented on them
48 separately.

49
50

0251

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, sounds good,
2 go ahead.

3
4 MR. CROSS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
5 executive summary for Proposal WP22-04 is on Page 56 of
6 your meeting materials and the analysis begins on Page
7 58. WP22-04 submitted by the Southeast Alaska
8 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council requests the
9 establishment of a year-round Federal elk hunt in Units
10 1, 2, 3 and 4, except on Etolin, Zarembo, Bushy,
11 Shrubby and Kashevarof Islands in Unit 3, with a
12 harvest limit of one elk by Federal registration
13 permit. The proponent requests that a Federal general
14 season be established to aid in the control of non-
15 Native elk and to provide a meaningful subsistence
16 hunting opportunity. The proponent cites the previous
17 State general elk season that encompassed the proposed
18 area and was closed in November of 2018.

19
20 Elk were transplanted to Etolin Island
21 in 1987 and became established on both Etolin and
22 Zarembo Islands. An elk hunting season began in 1997
23 and remains open on Etolin Island through draw and
24 registration hunts. Elk hunting on Zarembo Island was
25 closed after the 2005 draw hunt and remains closed due
26 to conservation concerns. In 2001 ADF&G attempted to
27 limit the dispersal of elk outside of the Zarembo and
28 Etolin Islands populations by instituting a general elk
29 season for Units 1, 2 and the remainder of Unit 3. Six
30 elk were harvested in the general season from 2004 to
31 2005 and they were all cows taken from the neighboring
32 Bushy and Shrubby Islands. In 2012 Bushy, Shrubby and
33 Kashevarof Islands were added to the restricted area
34 due to concerns of false reporting and illegal harvest
35 of Zarembo Island elk. In 2018 the State issued an
36 emergency order to discontinue the general elk hunt due
37 to concerns that one or more of the elk harvested
38 during the general season had been harvested illegally
39 from Zarembo or Etolin Islands. Since the State was
40 not able to harvest locations of elk taken during the
41 general season and believed that hunters may have been
42 killing elk in the closed or managed areas and then
43 submitting or false reports or not reporting.

44
45 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
46 support WP22-04. There's no conservation concern for
47 elk outside of the Unit 3 elk management area. A
48 Federal general elk season may provide limited
49 subsistence opportunity to residents of the area while
50

0252

1 helping to maintain the spread of elk.

2

3

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4

5

6

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Rob. Any questions for Rob Cross on this proposal from the Council.

7

8

9

MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

10

11

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

12

13

14

15

16

17

MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a couple of clarifying questions and I'm hoping to be able to just ask them all at once. They're on a couple of the tables that were provided in the analysis.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

So Rob, for Table 2, it looks like this is a table that shows the permits that were issued for Unit 3, and I guess my question is, is this for all of Unit 3 or just the management area, and then also is it only one type of permit. I was a little bit confused about in the -- yeah, I guess I'll just leave it at that, I was a little bit confused. Is there more than one type of permit, or is elk combined.

27

28

Thank you.

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

MR. CROSS: Yeah, through the Chair. Member Needham. Yeah, so for Table 2, those are all permits issued for Unit 3 and those are all displayed down in Figure 1 as well. So it would be the draw hunt, DE318, DE321, DE323 and then the registration hunt RE325.

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Rob. And then my next question is on Table 4 where it talks about like I guess there's a total of 925 permits issued, were those all to non-Federally-qualified users or were there also -- or how many of them were non-Federally-qualified users and then -- because I think that relates to another question that I had for the next proposal where you talk about like how many permits are issued to Ketchikan which is not in this table, so my understanding is the table is for Federally-qualified subsistence users, but how many permits are issued to non-Federally-qualified subsistence users and how many might be issued to non-

0253

1 Alaska residents.

2

3

4 MR. CROSS: Yeah, through the Chair.
5 Member Needham. So for Table 4 that's all Federally-
6 qualified subsistence users, the 925. And then Table 3
7 shows the elk harvest by residency. I don't presently
8 have the number of permits issued to non-Federally-
9 qualified users and out of state users, but I do have
10 the harvest numbers by those parties are in Table 3.
11 And for Ketchikan specifically it's about 25 percent of
12 the harvest.

12

13

14 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Rob. 25
15 percent of the harvest comes from Ketchikan but do they
16 also get 25 percent of the issued permits, do you know
17 that?

17

18

19 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. Member
20 Needham. I don't have that number off the top of my
21 head. I'm searching through the document really quick.
22 I do know that 46 percent of the permits go to
23 Federally-qualified users, I don't have the breakdown
24 of the remaining percentage.

24

25

26 MS. NEEDHAM: Okay, thank you. Mr.

26

27

28 Chair.

27

28

29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thanks,

29

30 Cathy. Any other questions from Council members.

30

31

32 (No comments)

31

32

33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I do have

33

34 one question. Rob, when -- I think when we originally

34

35 talked about putting in this proposal as a Council, I

35

36 don't recall asking for a permitted hunt. Was that

36

37 added later as some kind of a more administrative act

37

38 to try and keep track of the harvest or why the permit

38

39 hunt on this because the State has it as just an open

39

40 hunt when they were managing it.

40

41

42 MR. CROSS: Mr. Chair. I will have to

42

43 go back and look at the original language. It's my

43

44 understanding, it's a permitted hunt but the permits

44

45 are available to any Federally-qualified user from Unit

45

46 1 through 5 so you're not required to apply for a draw

46

47 hunt or anything like that, it's an open permitted

47

48 hunt.

48

49

50

0254

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. And it is
2 a year-round season, I see, which is what we intended.
3 So that would mean that a person who thought they might
4 encounter an elk and.....

5
6 (Teleconference interference -
7 participants not muted)

8
9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:
10(indiscernible) the permit in hand, because, you
11 know, with the subsistence hunters it would not like we
12 would be going on an elk hunt, that's not the
13 intention. The intention is, you know, while we were
14 out hunting or doing some other activity, if we
15 encountered an elk and wanted to take it and could, so
16 I guess a person would have to think ahead and have a
17 permit in hand if they felt they might want to take an
18 elk. And then, of course, there's a reporting
19 requirement attached to that. I guess that's the
20 intention, is to be able to track what's taken, is that
21 why that would be in there?

22
23 MR. CROSS: Mr. Chair. So I have the
24 original proposal and it is for a Federal -- it's for
25 one elk by Federal registration permit and then I
26 believe it was the Council's wishes to have successful
27 hunters send a photo of their elk antlers to ADF&G and
28 a five inch section of the lower jaw with front teeth.
29 I believe that that was just to match the reporting
30 requirements of the State. I'm not sure about the
31 registration permit.

32
33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Yeah, so it
34 sounds like it probably reflects what the State
35 requires for their -- whatever purposes they want that
36 information for. So, okay, that's fine. Thank you.

37
38 Any other questions from the Council.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. We'll move
43 ahead then and ask for any reports on tribal
44 consultation on this proposal.

45
46 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47 Katya Wessels. We received no tribal or ANCSA
48 Corporation comments on the proposal WP22-04.

49
50

0255

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.

4 Do we have comments from the Department of Fish and
5 Game. Are they here to provide us comments.

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Anybody from the
10 Department of Fish and Game who wants to comment on
11 this.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Apparently not.

16

17 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yes, Chairman
18 Hernandez. This is Tom Schumacher with the Department
19 of Fish and Game.

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
22 Tom, go ahead.

23

24 MR. SCHUMACHER: Okay, thank you. I
25 think the Federal analysis did a, you know, a good job
26 of summarizing the management history. However, we
27 reached a different conclusion. The Federal analysis
28 reached the conclusion that, well, there's really no
29 harm in having an elk hunt if there really aren't any
30 elk there, however, given the history or what we
31 believe to be the history of the State hunt, and the
32 fact that there have been no verified sightings of elk
33 outside the designated Zarembo, Etolin, Shrubby and
34 Brushy Island hunt area, we think that opening a hunt
35 like this could, again, facilitate poaching from the
36 Zarembo and Etolin Island population. Considering
37 there is no verified harvest and no verified sightings,
38 you know, outside the current elk management area,
39 there really is no meaningful harvest opportunity here.
40 And I think the short story for us is that we believe
41 opening this hunt will just open another avenue for
42 poaching and, therefore, you know, the Department
43 opposes this proposal.

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
46 I guess are there any questions from Council members
47 for the State, Mr. Schumacher.

48

49 (No comments)

50

0256

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I'm not
2 hearing any questions. But let's see I think we saw in
3 the analysis that there was some reported harvest in
4 your previous State hunt and I guess maybe the question
5 is whether that was potentially reported from a wrong
6 location but I thought there was some reported harvest.
7 Am I incorrect on that?

8
9 MR. SCHUMACHER: Chairman Hernandez.
10 No, there was reported harvest and it was correctly
11 summarized by the Forest Service, it's that the harvest
12 locations couldn't be verified, therefore, whether the
13 reporting was accurate remains in question. And
14 generally remains in question because there really have
15 been no verified sightings of elk outside the current
16 management area. You know elk are big animals, they
17 tend to travel in groups, they dig deep ruts when they
18 walk around on wet ground, and they shed antlers. If
19 they were there people would see them, or see sign of
20 them and hopefully report it to the Department. But
21 that has not happened, therefore, we don't believe
22 there are any elk outside the current management area.

23
24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I guess I
25 would dispute that. I don't know I've flown with pilots
26 that fly around the country quite a bit who seem pretty
27 familiar with what they see and, you know, they tell
28 me, oh, yeah, they've seen bands of elk in various
29 places, Kupreanof Island and Prince of Wales Island and
30 I don't know I've been out there hunting, I could swear
31 I've heard an elk bugle (indiscernible) and I'm pretty
32 sure I've seen tracks. So I guess that's kind of the
33 rationale for asking for this, is if people do seem to
34 believe that there's elk that are migrating to other
35 islands, and whether or not they're confirmed sightings
36 or not, I guess, is an open question. So maybe we'll
37 just have to leave it at that, I don't know.

38
39 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, this is
40 Frank.

41
42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Frank.

43
44 MR. WRIGHT: I have to leave for an
45 hour.

46
47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Oh, okay, Frank.

48
49 MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you, Mr.

50

0257

1 Chair.

2

3

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Frank.

4

5

MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal.

6

I have a quick follow-up on your question if you don't

7

mind.

8

9

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead,

10 Cal.

11

12

13

MR. CASIPIT: Along the lines of harvest during this general elk season in the mid-2000s, Page 64 of the analysis talks about a cow harvested in '04 and five more cows in '05, and then nothing reported in 2010 and then there was -- there was some -- I can't find it, I'm still looking for it, but there was some words about, like Mr. Schumacher said, that somehow that those reported elk weren't actually being harvested outside that core area, or whatever. I'm just curious as to, was there -- obviously that would have been unlawful under State regs, was -- you know, I'm sure there was -- I don't know, maybe a law enforcement investigation, you know, whatever, was there any kind of documentation for it, you know. You know, what -- what -- I mean other than just saying, oh, it's probably just this or that, I'm more -- I'm kind of like the Chair, I'm more interested in local knowledge and folks on the ground who have seen these things. And I've heard kind of the same things that the Chair has heard, you know, I have a friend in Kake who said he swears he's seen and heard elk on Kuiu, the same -- on Kupreanof, just like the Chair has said, so -- and I've heard the same stories about North Prince of Wales, so I'm -- I'm not -- my first reaction is not to doubt the local users and the people on the ground who have been there a very long time just because it doesn't seem -- I'm inclined to pay attention to local knowledge and the local people who are there all the time.

41

42

So anyways that's all I have to say.

43

44

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,

45

Cal. Any other Council questions for Department of

46

Fish and Game, Mr. Schumacher.

47

48

(No comments)

49

50

0258

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
2 Tom. I think we'll move on. Comments from any other
3 Federal agencies or tribes on this proposal.

4
5 (No comments)

6
7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Don't hear any.
8 Were there comments submitted by any Fish and Game
9 Advisory Committees or other Advisory Committees on
10 this proposal, Katya.

11
12 MS. WESSELS: To my knowledge, no,
13 there wasn't. Thank you.

14
15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Also to
16 you, Katya, are there any written public comments that
17 were submitted on this proposal.

18
19 MS. WESSELS: The written public
20 comments, if they were submitted, will be presented by
21 the proposal analyst. Thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So we do have some
24 written comments?

25
26 MR. CROSS: Mr. Chair, this is Rob
27 Cross. I don't have any written comments as the
28 analyst.

29
30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
31 Is there anybody that is on the phone from the public
32 who would like to testify.....

33
34 (Teleconference interference -
35 participants not muted)

36
37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:on this
38 proposal, and this proposal only.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Not hearing
43 anybody. Time for the Council to take action, do we
44 wish to put forward a motion.

45
46 MR. CASIPIT: This is Cal. I'll make
47 the motion, I move to -- I guess we're not supposed to
48 use adopt.

49
50

0259

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Let's just do it
2 as we usually do the proposal.

3

4 MR. CASIPIT: I move to approve WP22-04
5 as written under proposed regulation on Page 56.

6

7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

8

9 MS. NEEDHAM: This is Cathy.....

10

11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Do we have a
12 second.

13

14 MS. NEEDHAM:I'll second.

15

16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy.
17 Cathy seconds. Okay, it's now under discussion and we
18 should be thinking about our justification either for
19 or against on this proposal. So it's open to the
20 Council, does anybody want to talk about this proposal.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, well.....

25

26 MR. CASIPIT: Excuse me, I was just
27 looking here for a second. I will support this motion.
28 I think it's consistent with.....

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Is this Cal
31 Casipit for the record, this is Cal -- go ahead, Cal.

32

33 MR. CASIPIT: Oh, I'm sorry, the one
34 time I didn't introduce myself, sorry. Okay. I plan
35 to support this motion, my motion. It is consistent
36 with established with fish and wildlife principles. I
37 mean I'm -- I have a concern about elk out competing
38 deer especially on Prince of Wales and other places, so
39 to the extent that we can keep them confined to where
40 they're supposed to be I'm all for it. It's almost
41 like a conservation concern for deer. I think it's
42 supported by substantial local knowledge that there are
43 elk in these areas that we're talking about under this
44 proposal and it would be beneficial to subsistence
45 users if they can take those elk that are wandering
46 off. There's no closure involved here. And I think
47 it's -- I think it's the right thing to do for
48 subsistence users. It just gives them a little more
49 opportunity and it serves a conservation purpose at the
50

0260

1 same time. I think it's a win-win.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.

4

5 MR. SCHROEDER: Don, could I

6 (indiscernible - cutting out)

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.

9 Somebody else.

10

11 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Don, just a short

12 addition.

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Bob.

15

16 MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I think Cal
17 covered the justifications really well. I'd just
18 mention that the Council spent a great deal of effort
19 in aligning our customary and traditional use approach
20 some years ago to cover all the resources in Southeast
21 Alaska and this would be in line with that because we
22 would, in fact, have a Federal subsistence season for
23 elk in this area and, you know, as Cal said that would
24 provide subsistence opportunity.

25

26 That's all I've got, thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Very good, thank
29 you, Bob. Any other Council members want to add
30 anything or differ with anything.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
35 And I also want to add my support to this and Cal did a
36 really good job of summarizing why this would be
37 beneficial to subsistence users with no impact to non-
38 subsistence users or conservation concerns.

39

40 So are we ready to vote.

41

42 (Teleconference interference -
43 participants not muted)

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any other Council
46 members want to weigh in or are we ready.

47

48 MS. NEEDHAM: Call for the question.

49

50

0261

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Cathy.

2

3 MS. NEEDHAM: This is Cathy, I'll call
4 for the question.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Cathy -- the
7 question has been called for. Katya, Frank, our
8 Secretary has stepped away, maybe you could do a roll
9 call vote on this one.

10

11 MS. WESSELS: Sure, Mr. Chair. All
12 right.

13

14 Ian Johnson.

15

16 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

17

18 MS. WESSELS: Frank Wright.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 MS. WESSELS: Calvin Casipit.

23

24 MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

25

26 MS. WESSELS: Mike Douville.

27

28 MR. DOUVILLE: Mike Douville votes yes.

29

30 MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

31

32 James Slater.

33

34 MR. CASIPIT: Jim Slater votes yes.

35

36 MS. WESSELS: Robert Schroeder.

37

38 MR. SCHROEDER: Bob Schroeder votes

39 yes.

40

41 MS. WESSELS: Albert Howard.

42

43 MR. HOWARD: Albert Howard votes yes.

44

45 MS. WESSELS: Don Hernandez.

46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.

48

49 MS. WESSELS: Harold Robbins.

50

0262

1 MR. ROBBINS: Harold Robbins votes yes.

2

3 MS. WESSELS: Harvey Kitka.

4

5 MR. KITKA: Yes. I vote yes.

6

7 MS. WESSELS: Larry Bemis.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 MS. WESSELS: Cathy Needham.

12

13 MS. NEEDHAM: Cathy votes yes.

14

15 MS. WESSELS: Thank you. The motion
16 passes on a unanimous vote.

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
19 Katya. Rob Cross, are you available to do the analysis
20 on 22-05.

21

22 MR. CROSS: Yes, I am, Mr. Chair.

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, go ahead.

25

26 MR. CROSS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
27 Again, for the record my name is Robert Cross and I'm a
28 Biologist with the U.S. Forest Service. The executive
29 summary for Proposal WP22-05 is on Page 56 of your
30 meeting materials and the analysis begins on Page 58.

31

32 WP22-05 submitted by the Southeast
33 Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council requests
34 the establishment of a draw permit hunt for elk in the
35 Etolin Island area of Unit 3 with one permit issued per
36 household. The proponent requests that 25 percent of
37 the State's annual permit quota be allocated to a
38 Federal draw system. Federally-qualified subsistence
39 users will be limited to one permit per household. If
40 one or more members of a household receives a State
41 draw permit they will not -- or I'm sorry, they will be
42 ineligible for a Federal draw permit.

43

44 The proponent states this proposal
45 would provide a meaningful subsistence priority by
46 reducing competition with non-Federally-qualified users
47 resulting in increased harvest by Federally-qualified
48 subsistence users. The proponent states the annual
49 harvest quota prevents any conservation concerns.

50

0263

1 The State issued an average of 181 elk
2 permits per year from 2010 to 2020 for Etolin Island.
3 A summary of harvest by year in Table 2 on Page 64 of
4 your meeting materials shows an average of six elk
5 harvested per year for a total harvest of 71 elk from
6 2010 to 2020. When harvest was summarized by hunter
7 residency in Table 3 on Page 65 and 66, 58 percent of
8 elk were harvested by Federally-qualified residents of
9 Units 1 through 5, and 35 percent were harvested by
10 non-Federally-qualified residents of Units 1 through 5.
11 In 2020 only six percent of the 2,015 draw applicants
12 received a permit, however, harvesters who do not draw
13 a permit may receive a late season State registration
14 permit.

15
16 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
17 oppose WP22-05. Federally-qualified users harvest an
18 average of 58 percent of Unit 3 elk. Roughly 52
19 percent of the permits issued to Federally-qualified
20 residents in the past 11 years were not used likely due
21 to the low success rate, remoteness and difficult
22 terrain of the hunt. The large percentage of unused
23 permits and the availability of a State registration
24 permit suggests that the restriction of non-Federally-
25 qualified users is not necessary to continue
26 subsistence uses of the Unit 3 elk population.
27 Enforcement of the Federal draw permit household
28 restriction would be difficult for both State and
29 Federal managers since it may require sharing
30 permitholder information.

31
32 Thank you.Mr. Chair.

33
34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Rob. Do
35 we have any questions for Rob Cross on this proposal.

36
37 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

38
39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

40
41 MR. JOHNSON: I mean it seems like the
42 percentage numbers lined out in regards to the
43 percentage of permits awarded to Federal and non-
44 qualified -- and non-Federally-qualified is pretty
45 insightful. I guess my question would be, is there any
46 -- do we know what the composition of the draw pool, is
47 it weighted towards non-Federally -- or Federally-
48 qualified subsistence users or is it about a 50 percent
49 match? I guess what I'm trying to figure out is if
50

0264

1 it's just a fluke, you know, if it's just statistically
2 a fluke that a majority -- or a high percentage of
3 Federally-qualified users are being drawn or is it just
4 because they're weighted heavily in the pool?

5

6 (Teleconference interference -
7 participants not muted)

8

9 MR. CROSS: Member Johnson. Through
10 the Chair. I would have to defer to the State for that
11 information. I don't actually have the applicant
12 information.

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I presume
15 we're going to have the State present on this proposal
16 as well so, Ian, if you can reserve that question for
17 them. Any other Council members with questions for Rob
18 Cross.

19

20 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

21

22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

23

24 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
25 guess I'll just trying to phrase my question in a
26 different way. I'm trying to get a handle on the --
27 how many permits are issued to non-Federally-qualified
28 users, I think that that also is kind of in line with
29 what Ian's question is in terms of weighted, but I
30 don't want us to also -- are elk hunted by out of state
31 residents as well, on top of this, is there a mechanism
32 for out of state elk hunts.

33

34 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. Member
35 Needham. Yeah, so non-resident elk harvest was roughly
36 one percent. And to clarify your earlier question,
37 Ketchikan receives approximately 20 percent of the
38 permits but I do not presently have that number for
39 non-residents. I can just tell you that the elk
40 harvest for non-residents of Alaska is roughly one
41 percent.

42

43 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
44 guess we'll see if the State has better numbers or if
45 somebody can dig those up. I've just been trying to --
46 like I look at these tables and the one table, Table 4
47 is for all Federally-qualified users and I look at like
48 permits issued and I see 320 permits for Wrangell,
49 which is a Federally-qualified community and it makes
50

0265

1 me wonder if, you know, Ketchikan is -- if there's
2 somewhere else in the analysis that says that Ketchikan
3 is the -- residents of Ketchikan have historically
4 received the largest proportion of permits so I'm
5 wondering how -- over the past 10 years, or during the
6 same reporting timeframe, if Wrangell's getting 320,
7 how many permits are being issued in Ketchikan, and
8 then along those lines how many are getting issued to
9 other non-Federally-qualified communities or out of
10 state residents. So that's what I'm just trying to get
11 at.

12

13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

16

17 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. Member
18 Needham. So Ketchikan, during that same time period
19 has received 397 permits. They're the largest single,
20 or the largest single community that re -- the
21 community that receives that largest proportion of
22 permits out of all the communities. And then to your
23 earlier question, non-residents during that period have
24 received 51 permits.

25

26 MS. NEEDHAM: Great, thank you.

27

28 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, can I have a
29 follow-up to Cathy's question.

30

31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead, is
32 this Cal.

33

34 MR. CASIPIT: So I think what Cathy was
35 asking for was for a line for Ketchikan in that Table
36 4, and you gave the first number, which was 900 and
37 what?

38

39 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair, 397
40 total permits issued for that time period.

41

42 MR. CASIPIT: 397. And then how many
43 of those permits were hunted and how many elk were
44 harvested, just fill out that line for me?

45

46 MR. CROSS: That would be 187 permits
47 hunted and -- sorry, through the Chair. That would be
48 187 permits hunted and 18 elk harvested during that
49 time period.

50

0266

1 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, that's really
2 helpful. Thank you.

3
4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
5 Cal. Any other questions from Council members.

6
7 (No comments)

8
9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I'm not
10 hearing any other questions. So Katya was there any
11 report from tribal consultations on this proposal.

12
13 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. No,
14 we did not receive any comments from tribes or ANCSA
15 Corporations on WP22-05. Thank you.

16
17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
18 Department of Fish and Game, do they want to comment on
19 this proposal.

20
21 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yes, this is Tom
22 Schumacher for the Department of Fish and Game.

23
24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
25 Tom, go ahead.

26
27 MR. SCHUMACHER: I think the Federal
28 analysis talked about -- did a good job describing
29 permits offered, where permits were distributed and
30 harvest. I think one of the important things to keep
31 in mind is that there are currently three drawing
32 permits available in the Etolin Island hunt area.
33 There's a month long archery season in September.
34 There are two rifle seasons first 15 days of October
35 and the second 15 days of October, all of those hunts
36 offer 50 permits. Beyond that, there's a two week,
37 actually 216 day registration permit season in late
38 November, virtually all use in late November is by
39 local users. Permit distribution is not weighted in
40 any way. In the big picture, wherever the most people
41 apply for them that tends to be where the most permits
42 get awarded. That's just how random chance works.
43 It's been roughly 50/50 in terms of Federally-qualified
44 and non-Federally-qualified users being awarded
45 permits. The hunt is not terribly popular with non-
46 residents, simply because it's a remote area, the elk
47 are in wilderness, there are no lodges, no cabins, no
48 guides, and actually very few places to anchor a boat.
49 So really the hunt favors local residents.

50

1 The other key thing is that most of the
2 harvest is by local residents, be they in Ketchikan or
3 in Federally-qualified communities. That hunt is -- or
4 that harvest is generally very low. The average is, I
5 think seven animals over the last 10 years. It tends
6 to be a very difficult hunt because of the challenging
7 terrain and the remote nature of the area and sometimes
8 elk are hard to find. Something else to keep in mind
9 is that there's an awful lot of opportunity left on the
10 table every year. Roughly 40 percent of permits are
11 hunted and that's by Federally-qualified and non-
12 Federally-qualified users. So even a lot of Federally-
13 qualified users who are issued permits don't hunt. So
14 there appears to be a surplus of hunting opportunity
15 right now.

16
17 So at this point the Department opposes
18 establishing a second hunt. We don't think there's a
19 need for it. There's adequate opportunity provided
20 under State hunts. And the proposal would deprive non-
21 Federally-qualified users of hunting opportunity when
22 there's no conservation concern for the population,
23 and, you know, that's supported by the fact that we
24 have a 16 day registration permit with an unlimited
25 number of permits available to anybody who wants them.
26 There also is no harvest cap on that, harvest has been
27 self-regulating just because of the difficulty of the
28 hunt. So at this point the State offers plenty of
29 opportunity. The proposal would deprive non-Federally-
30 qualified users of opportunity and we don't see a need
31 to further complicate the hunt structure by adding a
32 second Federal permit that we don't know how it would
33 be administered.

34
35 Thanks, that concludes my comments on
36 that one.

37
38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
39 Tom. Any questions from Council members to Mr.
40 Schumacher.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I think all
45 of our questions may have gotten answered earlier, so,
46 thank you, Tom. Let's see any other agency comments on
47 this proposal, Federal or tribal.

48
49 (No comments)

0268

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Katya, do we have
2 any comments from Fish and Game Advisory Committees or
3 other Advisory Committees on this proposal.

4
5 MS. WESSELS: Well, I don't know any --
6 about Fish and Game Advisory Committees but to my
7 knowledge other Regional Advisory Councils did not take
8 the proposal up because there's only just one Council
9 who's met and it's your original proposal as well.

10
11 Thank you.

12
13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Bob, were there
14 written public comments submitted for this proposal.

15
16 MR. CROSS: Mr. Chair, this is.....

17
18 MS. WESSELS: There were no written
19 public comments submitted for WP22-05. Thank you.

20
21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Is that Bob Cross.

22
23 MR. CROSS: That was, Mr. Chair. I was
24 just going to say the same thing as Katya.

25
26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, no written
27 comments. Anybody from the public on the phone line
28 who would like to testify on this proposal, 22-05.

29
30 MR. BEASON: Hi, Mr. Chair, I would
31 like to give a comment.

32
33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
34 State your name and go ahead.

35
36 MR. BEASON: I am Ryan Beason, I am
37 with the Territorial Sportsmen in Juneau. We agree
38 with ADF&G's opposition to Wildlife Proposal 22-05. I
39 have personally done this hunt twice and it's one of
40 the toughest hunts in Alaska and typical success rates
41 are less than 10 percent. This is mainly due to the
42 terrain and the timing of the hunt as rifle season
43 doesn't open until October. As you know these elk were
44 transplanted to give everyone access to hunt and there
45 should be no limits put on non-Federally-qualified
46 users. I mean everyone should have equal opportunity.
47 There are numerous other hunts with much higher success
48 rates that Federally-qualified users can hunt in order
49 to meet their subsistence needs. This hunt is a
50

0269

1 challenge to hunters and by no means should be relied
2 upon for subsistence needs due to the low success rate.

3
4 In conclusion, we as Territorial
5 Sportsmen oppose this proposal and respectfully ask it
6 not be adopted. Thank you for your time.

7
8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
9 for your testimony. Are there any questions from the
10 Council.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, not hearing
15 any, thank you once again. Time for the Council to
16 take action on this proposal. Do we have a motion.

17
18 MR. SCHROEDER: I'd move to adopt or
19 support, whatever the correct language is.

20
21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Is
22 that Bob Schroeder.

23
24 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, it is.

25
26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Bob.

27
28 MR. JOHNSON: This is Ian, I second.

29
30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
31 Ian. Okay, time for the Council to discuss and justify
32 their actions on this proposal. So any Council member
33 care to do that.

34
35 MR. SCHROEDER: Could I start out, Don.

36
37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Bob.

38
39 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes. There may be some
40 other Council members who are way more familiar with
41 this. I think in the regulatory realm, what we have
42 before the Council is the idea that if we are talking
43 about areas that are virtually all Federal public land
44 where the ANILCA protections provide, in our earlier
45 actions when we exhaustively went through Southeast
46 Alaska and did customary and traditional use
47 designations and updated those, that was a really good
48 piece of work. Perhaps if we're consistent with that
49 there should be Federal seasons for all the people may
50

0270

1 have harvest for subsistence in Southeast Alaska.
2 Simply because the permit structure would be a little
3 bit cumbersome or difficult isn't a rationale for not
4 having a Federal permit hunt.

5
6 I'll leave it up to other Council
7 members who are a little closer to the ground on this
8 one about whether we're talking about a drawing hunt or
9 an open permit hunt. But the Council may consider
10 whether we should have Federal hunts for basically all
11 the subsistence creatures that are used by Southeast
12 Alaska Federally-qualified subsistence users. So I
13 think that's a question in my mind and I think it tilts
14 towards the idea that that's something that we may wish
15 to do.

16
17 Thank you.

18
19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
20 Bob. Any other Council members, discussion on this
21 proposal.

22
23 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

24
25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

26
27 MR. JOHNSON: I'm having a hard time
28 dissecting this one and the need, I guess, a little
29 bit. I mean it sounds like it we're not necessarily
30 talking about creating more opportunity for subsistence
31 necessarily, I think the argument laid out, kind of
32 demonstrates that opportunity already exists there.
33 You know, maybe like what Bob was saying essentially --
34 that a 25 percent allocation would essentially enshrine
35 this as an opportunity within the subsistence and maybe
36 that has merit. I do wonder -- to Tom's point earlier
37 about how these hunts are divided up, essentially
38 there's these four opportunities and perhaps a way to
39 make this more subsistence oriented would be to not --
40 have a subsistence permit be directly put inside those
41 windows, it would create some flexibility for
42 subsistence hunters to access the area but I don't know
43 if that's within this process that we're talking --
44 like if that's too far outside of the scope of like an
45 amendment or if that's something that could be
46 entertained.

47
48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

49
50

0271

1 MS. GREDIAGIN: Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
4 Ian. Who is that?

5

6 MS. GREDIAGIN: Thanks. This is Lisa
7 Grediagin and I have a comment if that's okay.

8

9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Sure, we can allow
10 that if it might answer a question somebody had.

11

12 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, first of all I
13 just wanted to alert the Council that some of the
14 requirements in the proposal as submitted are actually
15 illegal, specifically Federal regulations cannot
16 prohibit participation by an individual in the State
17 hunt. So in addition to just some of the enforcement
18 issues being difficult, you just can't have those sorts
19 of requirements that if you receive a Federal permit
20 you can't hunt under regulations. So I just wanted to
21 make the Council aware that that requirements actually
22 illegal as it's written in the proposed regulation.
23 And in the analysis there is another alternative
24 considered that, is to having a draw permit, it would
25 just be a Federal registration permit, so that would
26 still provide a Federal season and opportunity for
27 Federally-qualified users without all the issues
28 associated with allocation of draw permits and
29 households and to have, you know, you could have a
30 Federal permit and a State draw permit but just report
31 -- you know, just harvest one animal. But I just
32 wanted to alert the Council because there was a
33 question about whether that's within the scope, that
34 that was considered in the OSM analysis and other
35 alternatives to considered to have a Federal
36 registration permit hunt.

37

38 Thank you.

39

40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
41 Lisa. That might have been a question that was on some
42 of our minds as far as permit management there and how
43 that would all work. Anybody else on the Council want
44 to weigh in on this proposal.

45

46 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal.

47

48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

49

50

1 MR. CASIPIT: Just picking up on a
2 thought from Bob and listening to Ian, you know, I --
3 my -- the thing that I'm kind of focused on is trying
4 to ensure that there's a meaningful priority for
5 Federally-qualified subsistence users for harvest of
6 wild and renewable resources on Federal public lands.
7 I think somebody said it pretty good that basically all
8 the land we're talking about here is pretty much
9 Federal public and I'm looking to see what the
10 meaningful priority is beyond the State regulations.
11 And the whole reason we submitted this was to try to
12 figure out what meaningful priority is. I think this
13 Council is the first step in determining what that
14 meaningful priority is. Sure, eventually through
15 litigation and appeals and RFRs and all that stuff,
16 ultimately a judge will determine what actually a
17 meaningful priority is but to start off ANILCA
18 basically leaves it to us to tell the Board what we
19 think a meaningful priority is. And if getting that
20 meaningful priority is a registration permit at a
21 different timing than these October and November dates
22 maybe we should -- can we consider that or do we have
23 to wait for another cycle to think about that.

24
25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.
26 If I may, my thoughts on that are and thinking along
27 that same line just like you have, through the course
28 -- I know one of our purposes in putting in these
29 proposals is to get a good analysis so we can, you
30 know, make good decisions and try and determine what
31 exactly you're bringing out, what would be a meaningful
32 priority. I think what I am hearing in the course of
33 this discussion is that perhaps this proposal may not
34 be the best proposal to address that. And so then my
35 other consideration is, well, is this one amendable to
36 do that. And what I'm thinking is that the ideas that
37 we may have to institute that priority are probably
38 beyond the scope of what this analysis is and maybe it
39 would take a different proposal. So, yes, it may take
40 another attempt, maybe a couple of years to address
41 this issue but in my mind I'm thinking that this
42 proposal with its permit complexities and implications
43 may not be the right vehicle to do that. You know
44 something that I'm questioning is, you know, the fact
45 that there is a bow hunting season in September, well,
46 you know, I don't know why there's a bow hunting season
47 and not a rifle season but if there was a rifle season
48 in September would there be a better success rate for
49 hunters and would more Federally-qualified people take
50

0273

1 an elk if the hunting was earlier. But that's out of
2 the scope of what this analysis is so I wouldn't offer
3 that as an amendment.

4

5 So my inclination is to vote against
6 this proposal. I don't see any pressing need to
7 address any subsistence concerns, you know, this cycle.
8 If we revisit it in another cycle and come up with
9 different ideas I think that's perfectly adequate. So
10 that's my feeling on this proposal. So anybody else on
11 the Council.

12

13 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Mike Douville, go
16 ahead.

17

18 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
19 agree with you. And interesting listening to Cal.
20 But, you know, a meaningful priority would be an
21 earlier season in September when the weather's good.
22 Tom Schumacher pointed out that, yeah, there's a
23 registration hunt but it's the 15th to the 30th of
24 November and we that live around here don't want to be
25 running across the Strait or fooling around with the
26 weather that time of the year, I mean there's probably
27 not many people go because it's just plain too nasty.
28 So, you know, after the middle of October it's a pretty
29 hard sale. I've done this hunt before, I know what
30 it's like, but a priority in September some time would
31 be meaningful and probably your success rate would be
32 okay, too.

33

34 Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.

37

38 MR. SCHROEDER: Can I get in here
39 again, Mr. Chairman.

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Sure, go ahead,
42 Bob.

43

44 MR. SCHROEDER: I appreciate Cal's
45 point about meaningful priority and I think it's
46 something that the Council supports. A step back from
47 that is, you know, say, we as the Council believe, and
48 the Federal Program, that there should be some way for
49 someone to hunt under Federal regulations on Federal
50

0274

1 public lands. And if we had a registration permit, a
2 Federal registration permit that would establish that,
3 yes, someone's going to be hunting Federal regulations
4 for elk in this unit. I agree that with Mike and Don
5 on how we may be a little bit beyond the scope of the
6 proposal as written and the analysis to basically be
7 creating a meaningful priority at this point.

8

9

That's it.

10

11

12

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Bob.
anybody else on the Council.

13

14

MR. CASIPIT: Well, this is Cal again.

15

16

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. CASIPIT: I would like -- you know,
I don't know, you know, like the Chair said we might be
treading on thin ice if we're trying to change the
season too because we didn't ask for that change, but a
regis -- I would be all in favor of a registration hunt
say, you know, in September as Mike was suggesting when
the weather's a bit better and the light conditions are
better and I don't know maybe it makes sense to match
up with, yeah, an existing deer season or something.
But, you know, no, I guess there there wouldn't be much
deer. But, anyway, I am thinking of a different season
and I am thinking of a registration permit but I'm
wondering, like the Chair suggests, that might be too
much in terms of modifying this one. Can we get an
interpretation of Staff on that.

33

34

35

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'll open it up to
Staff if they want to comment.

36

37

38

MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this
is Lisa Grediagin.

39

40

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Lisa.

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, the short answer
is the Council's able to make whatever recommendation
they want to the Board. So if the Council wants to
change the season dates that's up to them. I mean as
far as OSM's concerned that would be beyond the scope
for OSM to change the season dates but the Council, you
know, could make whatever recommendation they want.
But it definitely would be within the scope of the

0275

1 proposal if you just -- instead of the drawing permit
2 you changed it to a registration permit and maintained
3 the season dates in the proposed regulation, so that's
4 the October 1st, October 31st.

5

6

7 So, again, you know, the Council can
8 make whatever recommendations they want to the Board
9 and the Board can take it from there. But certainly
10 from OSM's standpoint, OSM would consider it within the
11 scope to just change it to a registration permit but
12 not to change the dates that were proposed.

12

13

Thank you.

14

15

16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
17 for that, Lisa.

17

18

19 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
20 Albert.

20

21

22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead,
23 Albert.

23

24

25 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
26 This kind of seems familiar to me because it seems as
27 though we have done this Berner's Bay where a Gustavus
28 resident asked for an opportunity to hunt moose in
29 Berner's Bay based on a subsistence priority and we did
30 the same thing where we actually did set something up
31 that gave them an opportunity to hunt in Berner's Bay.

31

32

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

33

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.
36 You're correct, we do have a similar management
37 approach there for the Berner's Bay moose. And, yes,
38 actually that was Cal Casipit who first put that in to
39 the Council before he was on the Council so I know
40 Cal's pretty familiar with that. I guess I don't --
41 trying to see the differences between this hunt and the
42 Berner's Bay hunt or this elk hunt and the Berner's Bay
43 hunt, this one does have a little more complicated
44 permitting structure already in existence with
45 different hunts at different times. So I don't know
46 how to deal with that. But thank you for bringing that
47 up.

47

48

49 So any other discussion from Council
50 members or are we ready to vote, I don't know.

50

0276

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

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I think everybody's kind of scratching their heads like I am here.

(Pause)

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, Mike Douville.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead. Go ahead, Mike.

MR. DOUVILLE: It would be difficult to try to do the justification for this one. I know -- so I'm not sure how to proceed from here. I do not support the -- I do not support it in its present form. I think I would support something similar in a better format down the road.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. That actually sounds like a reasonable justification. I guess we would say that in order to resolve this meaningful priority question we would need more substantial evidence to judge our rationale on.

MR. KITKA: Don, this is Harvey Kitka.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Harvey.

MR. KITKA: Yeah, Don, I'm just sitting here listening to all this on this proposal, it sounds to me like a lot of us -- I know I won't vote it as it is now but I was wondering if we vote -- if we don't support this, what would happen if we came back with a different one or if we just put it as no action.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Harvey. That is another option. We could vote to take no action and revisit it at the next cycle. That's an option.

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, has there been a motion made and seconded on this proposal or are we there yet? Or are we just under discussion yet?

0277

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: No, we had the
2 motion to adopt.

3
4 MR. DOUVILLE: Well, then we'd have to
5 vote on that motion, we can't make another motion to
6 take no action, so that was my question anyway.

7
8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I think you're
9 correct there, Mike, actually, yeah.

10
11 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

12
13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead,
14 Cathy.

15
16 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
17 think that you actually provided pretty justification
18 in terms of your opposition to this proposal and I
19 would support and reiterate what you have already put
20 on to the record as well as Mr. Douville put on the
21 record. I'd also remind this Council that we have
22 provided some additional subsistence opportunity for
23 elk when we supported Wildlife Proposal 22-04. So if
24 no other Council members had anything else to add I
25 would call for the question.

26
27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
28 Cathy. And, yes, I think Mike brought out the point
29 that taking no action is probably not an option, we did
30 have a motion to support so we should probably vote on
31 that motion. So Cathy called for the question. We'll
32 take the vote, a roll call vote and, Katya, I think we
33 need you to do that roll call.

34
35 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

36
37 Ian Johnson.

38
39 MR. JOHNSON: Ian votes no.

40
41 MS. WESSELS: Frank Wright.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 MS. WESSELS: Calvin Casipit.

46
47 MR. CASIPIT: No.

48
49 MS. WESSELS: Mike Douville.

50

0278

1 MR. DOUVILLE: Mike Douville votes no.

2

3 MS. WESSELS: James Slater.

4

5 MR. CASIPIT: Jim Slater votes no.

6

7 MS. WESSELS: Robert Schroeder.

8

9 MR. SCHROEDER: Robert Schroeder votes
10 no.

11

12 MS. WESSELS: Albert Howard.

13

14 MR. HOWARD: Albert votes no.

15

16 MS. WESSELS: Donald Hernandez.

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I vote no.

19

20 MS. WESSELS: Harold Robbins.

21

22 MR. ROBBINS: Harold votes no.

23

24 MS. WESSELS: Harvey Kitka.

25

26 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes no.

27

28 MS. WESSELS: Larry Bemis.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 MS. WESSELS: Cathy Needham.

33

34 MS. NEEDHAM: Cathy votes no.

35

36 MS. WESSELS: Thank you. The motion
37 fails on the unanimous vote.

38

39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
40 Katya. Okay, that was a difficult proposal. So now
41 let's move on to Wildlife Proposal 22-06.

42

43 (Teleconference interference -
44 participants not muted)

45

46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I believe that
47 analysis begins on Page 71. And, once, again, I
48 believe we have Rob Cross.

49

50

0279

1 MR. CROSS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For
2 the record my name is Rob Cross and I'm a Biologist
3 with the U.S. Forest Service. The executive summary
4 for Proposal WP22-06 is on Page 71 of your meeting
5 materials and the analysis begins on Page 72.

6
7 WP22-06 submitted by the Southeast
8 Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council requests
9 the establishment of a Federal draw permit moose hunt
10 with an any bull harvest limit and a harvest limit of
11 20 bulls on Kupreanof and Kuiu Islands in Unit 3.

12
13 The proponent states that it is
14 becoming more challenging for Federally-qualified
15 subsistence harvesters to harvest a sufficient number
16 of moose under the State's antler restriction hunt and
17 that a Federal draw permit hunt allowing the harvest of
18 any.....

19
20 (Teleconference interference -
21 participants not muted)

22
23 MR. CROSS:bull would provide
24 additional subsistence opportunity.

25
26 I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, I'm getting a lot
27 of feedback, I'm not sure if you can hear me.

28
29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I am hearing you
30 but there is a lot of feedback, I don't know where that
31 would be coming from.

32
33 (Teleconference interference -
34 participants not muted)

35
36 MR. CROSS: The current Unit 3 moose
37 hunt allows for the taking of one bull moose with
38 spike-fork greater than 50 inch spread, three or more
39 brow tines on either antler or two brow tines on both
40 antlers by State registration permit. The proposed
41 Federal draw hunt would allow a permit holder, one per
42 household to harvest one bull moose on Kupreanof or
43 Kuiu Islands without antler restriction. Aerial moose
44 surveys do not provide accurate population estimates in
45 Unit 3 due to dense vegetation and remote habitat.
46 Harvest reports indicate a low to moderate moose
47 population that is expanding. The summary of moose
48 harvest on Table 1 on Page 79 shows that harvest
49 throughout the unit has steadily increased since 2010
50

0280

1 and has been at or above the 11 year average of 67
2 moose for the last six years. The expansion of the
3 population is likely facilitated by the creation of
4 moose habitat resulting from past timber harvest
5 activity, however, clear-cuts only provide productive
6 habitat for the first 20 to 25 years of the 100 to 150
7 year commercial harvest rotation. The apparent
8 reliance of moose on recent timber harvest in Unit 3
9 leads to uncertainty to the long-term stability of the
10 population.

11
12 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
13 oppose WP22-06. Harvest outside of a State management
14 plan has the potential for long-term adverse effects to
15 the moose populations on Kuiu and Kupreanof Islands.
16 The population may be susceptible to over harvest due
17 to hunter access, both to and on the islands, and
18 reduction in brows as a result of ongoing clear-cut
19 succession. The draw hunt would provide greater
20 subsistence opportunity for up to 20 households while
21 potentially reducing subsistence opportunity for the
22 remainder of the Federal harvesters in Unit 3. Roughly
23 75 percent of the Unit 3 moose are harvested by
24 residents of Kake, Wrangell, and Petersburg, which
25 receives an average of 81 percent of the Unit 3 moose
26 permits. Allowing for the harvest of up to 20
27 additional bulls from the road system near these
28 communities may limit future harvest opportunities for
29 local residents.

30
31 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

32
33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
34 Rob. Time for questions from Council members.

35
36 (Teleconference interference -
37 participants not muted)

38
39 MR. SCHROEDER: This is Bob Schroeder.
40 Rob, an idea of local residents is (indiscernible -
41 cutting out) I'm wondering why this says local
42 residents as opposed to Federally-qualified subsistence
43 users, and if you could clarify that because I think
44 all Federally-qualified users should be included, we
45 don't (indiscernible - cuts out) local residents.

46
47 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. Mr.
48 Schroeder. It's presented that way, local residents,
49 it was collected that way by the State, it is also
50

0281

1 available by residency in generally. But I think it
2 was just to show that primarily the users of this
3 permit and the recipients of moose in this area are
4 primarily, directly from the immediate area.

5
6 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, just a follow-up.
7 We're really concerned with implementing ANILCA and so
8 it would be way more useful if all qualified
9 subsistence users were there when presented.

10
11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Any other
12 Council members with a question on this proposal.

13
14 MR. HOWARD: I have one, Mr. Chairman.

15
16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

17
18 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19 Did this proposal include antlerless moose?

20
21 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. Member
22 Howard. I'm not sure what you mean by that question.
23 All of the harvest included here is antler -- it falls
24 under the antler restriction, so that would only be
25 antlered moose but the proposal is for any bulls, which
26 would include bulls with no antlers I suppose.

27
28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any follow-up,
29 Albert.

30
31 MR. HOWARD: So this includes bulls
32 with no antlers, I guess.

33
34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, any other
35 questions from Council.

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Not hearing any,
40 so we can move on with.....

41
42 MR. CASIPIT: No, sorry, I was trying
43 to hit the unmute button. Sorry, this is for Staff.

44
45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

46
47 MR. CASIPIT: So I guess one of the
48 issues of why the preliminary conclusion to oppose is
49 because of the difficulty in managing for the State
50

1 management plan? Can you -- or some words to that
2 effect, it was part of your oral presentation. Can you
3 explain that a little bit more. I mean if -- if
4 there's a set amount of bulls that we want for a
5 Federal priority, that is, any antlered bull, and, in
6 fact we'll talk about that, one bull moose is a little
7 -- you brought it out with unantlered bull, we could
8 fix that, but if we know that we want Federally-
9 qualified users to be able to harvest any antlered bull
10 as to provide for a meaningful priority on these two
11 islands, and the State knows about it ahead of time,
12 can't that 20 moose harvest be just incorporated into
13 their management system and just deal with it? Because
14 we're talking about meaningful priority for Federally-
15 qualified users here on Federal public land. I'm
16 trying to search for a way for us to provide that
17 meaningful priority.

18

19 (Pause)

20

21 MR. CASIPIT: I don't know maybe that's
22 more of a statement than a question. But it seems to
23 me that if we knew ahead of time that 20 were going to
24 be reserved for that, I don't see what the problem with
25 the management plan is.

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Maybe, Cal, that's
28 something to bring up in our deliberations so we can
29 discuss unless you want to ask that question to the
30 State, that might be a question for them.

31

32 MR. CROSS: Mr. Chair, this is Rob
33 Cross. I have an answer as far as my oral statement if
34 that's okay.

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Sure, go ahead.

37

38 MR. CROSS: So basically I say harvest
39 outside of the State management plan has the potential
40 for long-term adverse effects to the moose population
41 in that area, and that's because the State doesn't use
42 a harvest quota, they use the antler restrictions in
43 Unit 3 as a fail safe to protect females and a subset
44 of the breeding population of males. And so this would
45 protect -- or it ensures recruitment, allows for
46 maximum harvester participation by not limiting the
47 number of permits that are available and it maximizes
48 sustainable harvest by avoiding a harvest quota. So it
49 allows anyone who would like to go hunt for them to
50

0283

1 hunt for them and there is no quota, so it just allows
2 maximum harvest and maximum hunter participation.

3

4 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, follow-up.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

7

8 MR. CASIPIT: I'm totally familiar with
9 the spike-fork brow tine antler restrictions and their
10 purposes and their needs and how they're used and why
11 they're used. I live in Gustavus and we have one of
12 those systems for hunting here. Yeah, I know exactly
13 what's going on there. But even in Gustavus, maybe
14 it's just the level of information they have on the
15 population out here but we had a quota this year, we
16 had 10. So our quota is 10 animals, and we hunt spike-
17 fork 50 three brow tine and when we get to 10 animals
18 the season is cut off, or if we don't get to 10 animals
19 we go to the 15th of October. So I'm wondering, yeah,
20 I know.

21

22 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman.

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, I think
25 that's Albert.

26

27 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
28 I had a conversation with Joel Jackson and he'd like to
29 weigh in if that's possible. He's the president of the
30 Organized Village of Kake.

31

32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Tell Mr.
33 Jackson he can have that opportunity very shortly, if
34 he could standby. We have a designated time for tribal
35 comments.

36

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

38

39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Any
40 other questions for Mr. Cross from the Council.

41

42 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

43

44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

45

46 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47 Rob, in the OSM justification it does state that the
48 draw hunt would provide greater subsistence opportunity
49 for up to 20 households while potentially reducing

50

0284

1 subsistence opportunity for the remainder of the
2 Federal harvesters in Unit 3. So can you clarify, this
3 goes back to a question that I heard earlier about
4 local -- like providing an opportunity for local
5 Federally-qualified subsistence users, however, there
6 are other Federally-qualified subsistence harvesters in
7 Unit 3 and it sounds like implementation of this
8 proposal, while it would provide a meaningful
9 opportunity for local residents like Kake, it would
10 take away from other Federally-qualified. Can you
11 clarify that please.

12
13 MR. CROSS: Yes, through the Chair.
14 Member Needham. So this would be available to all
15 residents -- or all qualified residents of Unit 1
16 through 5. I guess the point of that statement was
17 that 75 percent, or roughly 75 percent of the harvest
18 occurs from members of this community -- or these
19 communities on the two islands in question and so
20 allowing harvesters from Units 1 through 5 to harvest
21 any bull potentially off the road system near Kake
22 would potentially be to the detriment of those local
23 residents trying to harvest in that same area.

24
25 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Rob.

26
27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any follow-up,
28 Cathy.

29
30 MS. NEEDHAM: No, Mr. Chair. Thank
31 you.

32
33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Any
34 other questions from the Council on the proposal for
35 Mr. Cross.

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, Rob, I think
40 we're done with your presentation so we'll move on and
41 that would be any reports on tribal or corporation
42 consultation with regard to this proposal.

43
44 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
45 This is Katya Wessels. We did not have any tribal or
46 ANCSA Corporation comments on WP22-06. Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
49 So we'll move on to agency comments and the Department
50

0285

1 of Fish and Game, do you have a comment on this
2 proposal.

3

4 MR. SCHUMACHER: Hello, this is Tom
5 Schumacher with the Department of Fish and Game. I
6 think the Federal analysis did a good job summarizing
7 the harvest and permit allocation and things like that.

8

9 I'd like to start off with the
10 justification offered for this proposal, it says the
11 Federally-qualified users are having a more difficult
12 time harvesting sufficient moose under the current
13 State system. The harvest data provided to us by
14 people who live in the area shows that harvest grows
15 every year and this year it appears like it's going to
16 be another exception to that harvest as it continues to
17 rise. Hunter success rate continues to go up. It was
18 as low as 11 percent and now it's up to 17 percent and
19 climbing. So roughly one in five hunters is
20 successful. And hunter efficiency, you know the length
21 of time you have to hunt to harvest a moose is
22 declining. So based on the data we have I don't see a
23 lot of support for the justification offered.

24

25 Talk a little bit about the State
26 management because there seems to be some question
27 about how the State manages this hunt. As Mr. Cross
28 noted, we cannot survey moose in Unit 3. It's a
29 Forested environment and you cannot reliably fly over
30 and see moose. So there's no way to survey, the number
31 of moose, look at bull/cow ratios, look at calf
32 production, so we're a little bit handcuffed in that
33 area and flying a little bit blind. And when you're a
34 manager in that situation, you know, we want to offer
35 as much opportunity as possible but we also need to
36 worry about the population and the potential for over
37 harvest. So the way we manage this population is
38 through an antlered restricted registration hunt. A
39 registration hunt is open to everyone, there's no limit
40 on the number of permits, and there's no harvest
41 limits, that's because the number of moose that are
42 harvested are limited by the number of moose meeting
43 the antler restrictions and in this area we have the
44 most lenient antler restrictions in the state. Hunters
45 can harvest a spike or fork moose, a moose with two
46 brow tines on both side, a moose with three brow tines
47 on one side or a 50 inch antler spread. So that is by
48 far the most liberal antler restriction in the state,
49 it provides the most opportunity of any antler
50

0286

1 restricted hunt in the state. And the harvest seems to
2 reflect that, it's growing and growing and most of
3 those moose are taken by residents -- Federally-
4 qualified residents, you know, 75 percent of them. So
5 there's a lot of opportunity and a lot of success in
6 harvest.

7

8 A proposal to add another 20 any bull
9 permits, I think, you know, does have the potential to
10 limit harvest opportunity in the future. Right now,
11 you know, moose are hunted where there's access.
12 They're big heavy animals, you can't carry them very
13 far so they're hunted along road systems and boat
14 accessible beaches. So they're hunted in a relatively
15 small area. The middle of Kupreanof Island has no
16 roads, therefore, it's not accessible, therefore people
17 don't hunt there, so it's really only the moose that
18 are in areas where people can hunt that are affected by
19 this by hunting. So if you take another 20 any bulls
20 out of there, I think there is the potential for over
21 harvesting bulls in those areas and depleting both
22 reproduction and future harvest of bulls for anybody,
23 be they Federally-qualified or non-Federally-qualified.
24 So this proposal has the potential to affect harvest
25 opportunity for everyone in the future.

26

27 Something else to consider is that the
28 proposal says that the Petersburg District Ranger in
29 consultation with the Department of Fish and Game will
30 establish a quota. The Department of Fish and Game
31 does not support this proposal and we may not support
32 any additional harvest quota and so I'm wondering how
33 that would work.

34

35 Essentially we just don't support this
36 proposal because we see some real potential for
37 problems and the current system has allowed the moose
38 population to expand throughout Unit 3 and grow and
39 provide greater harvest opportunity and we think this
40 proposal has the potential to damage that trend.

41

42 And I think that will conclude my
43 comments.

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Tom.
46 Any questions for Mr. Schumacher.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So I do have a
2 question. Tom, you said that this herd is expanding, I
3 know it's expanding in area, that's obvious.
4 Essentially the moose population's migrated out of the
5 mainland, moved to the islands. Initially Mitkof
6 Island, Wrangell Island started seeing good populations
7 of moose and then they showed up on Kupreanof Island
8 and started having good populations there. Very
9 recently in the last recent years they've moved to Kuiu
10 Island now they seem to be doing quite well on Kuiu
11 Island. I noticed a fair amount of the take this year
12 came from Kuiu Island. But my question is, it appears
13 to me that the areas where the moose initially migrated
14 to, the hunter success on those areas like Mitkof,
15 Thomas Bay, Wrangell Island have decreased, so I don't
16 know if you have an assessment, is the moose population
17 expanding in size or is it just moving out of areas to
18 new areas and I don't know what happens when they run
19 out of area, are they depleting their resources in
20 areas where they initially had high populations and are
21 moving on or what do you think is going on with this
22 population.

23
24 MR. SCHUMACHER: Well, through the
25 Chair. Chair Hernandez. We have difficulty surveying
26 this population even in relatively open areas like the
27 Stikine River Valley, which is part of the same
28 registration hunt, or Thomas Bay, which is also part of
29 the same registration hunt, you know, we just don't get
30 workable survey conditions, particularly early in the
31 winter when moose still have their antlers. So it's
32 hard to say what the trend of the population is. We
33 don't know that -- harvest hunter may also be related
34 to hunter effort, we haven't analyzed that, and maybe
35 that fewer people are hunting on Thomas Bay or Stikine
36 or Mitkof Island because hunting has been better out on
37 the other islands. So that is something we haven't
38 looked at. We also have not looked at browse
39 conditions, habitat conditions, but moose that are
40 harvested appear to be in good condition so that
41 doesn't appear to be a limiting factor at this time.

42
43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
44 So it sounds to me like your opposition to this
45 proposal is it won't create a conservation concern,
46 that your concern that an additional number of moose
47 that do not meet the existing antler requirement would
48 cause a reduction in the herd size and, therefore,
49 would ultimately lead to less opportunity for
50

0288

1 subsistence users rather than greater opportunity; is
2 that the crux of your opposition?

3

4

5 MR. SCHUMACHER: We believe that is a
6 realistic possibility, yes. And it's not just for
7 subsistence users, it would be for all users. You
8 know, as I talked about, the hunting opportunity is
9 where access is, that's only a portion of the area that
10 we're talking about here and, you know, if you just
11 continue to re -- you know, our current management
12 strategy leaves some bulls, the bulls that don't meet
13 the antler restrictions, if you start taking more of
14 those bulls in the small area where people can hunt,
15 you know, I think there's a real possibility of running
16 very low on bulls, particularly legal bulls that are
17 available during the State hunt.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. So in your
opinion this fairly large area that is not effectively
hunted, if there's a -- if that maintains a good
population of adult bull moose, that, I guess I'm
hearing that it's your opinion that those moose that
are outside of those easily hunted areas would not
necessarily migrate into areas that are presently
hunted and wouldn't fill that void that's created by
taking what's now sublegal moose out of the herd; is
that your -- would that be your opinion?

MR. SCHUMACHER: No doubt some of that
would happen but moose are (indiscernible) travelers so
it's hard to say to what degree animals from unhunted
areas would repopulate areas where they've been hunted.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Just some
questions I have in my mind in attempt to create more
opportunity for subsistence hunters, I guess, is the --
is the focus of this proposal so I will weigh all those
opinions, so thank you very much. Any other Council
members with a question for Mr. Schumacher.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. Yeah, I can't
remember the basis on which 20 animals was chosen for
this proposal and so I'm wondering if Mr. Schumacher
would have a recommendation for a number that maybe
would be more amenable to the management plan.

0289

1 MR. SCHUMACHER: Through the Chair. At
2 this point, because the Department does not support the
3 proposal I don't know that we could recommend a number.

4

5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
6 Anybody else on the Council with a question.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I think
11 we're done with ADF&G comments. Any other agency
12 comments, tribal comments, and do we have somebody from
13 the Organized Village of Kake that wishes to comment on
14 this, Mr. Jackson.

15

16 MR. JACKSON: Yes, could you hear me?

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, we hear you
19 fine, go ahead.

20

21 MR. JACKSON: Okay. Through the Chair.
22 My name is Joel Jackson, I'm the President of the
23 Organized Village of Kake. I've been listening, I
24 wasn't too sure I was hearing things right, and this is
25 the first time I'm actually calling in to one of your
26 meetings. But my question is, was the additional 20
27 moose that you were talking about, and I probably heard
28 it wrong but I'll ask the question anyway. Was it --
29 what I thought I heard, and you can correct me, was
30 that there wouldn't be any antler restrictions on these
31 20 moose; that's my first question. Is that -- did I
32 hear that correctly or did I not understand it.

33

34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, the proposal
35 is for up to 20 bull moose so it would not include, you
36 know, cow moose obviously but.....

37

38 MR. JACKSON: Yeah. Yeah, I under.....

39

40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:it would be
41 -- right, it would be for any bull moose of any
42 antlered configuration yes.

43

44 MR. JACKSON: Okay.

45

46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So there would not
47 be an antler restriction, that would go away.

48

49 MR. JACKSON: Okay. Well, knowing that

50

0290

1 now, one of my concerns is because we've been following
2 the State regulations here in our community on
3 Kupreanof Island, and this was a big discussion a
4 couple of years ago, is the kind of a weird antler
5 configuration on these moose we have around us, and
6 consequently a number of moose are taken -- are deemed
7 illegal because of the configuration of the antlers on
8 them. So -- and there is a lot of them, say you look
9 at them and they're pretty weird the way they're -- I
10 don't know what causes it -- they thought maybe when
11 they were developing their antlers that they hit it
12 against something and it messes it up but, yeah, we're
13 seeing a lot of that. And I know Fish and Game had
14 talked about it and I can't remember what they -- they
15 changed a few regulations trying to accommodate it but
16 we had one here and I had our resource person contact
17 Fish and Game out of Petersburg about it, this young
18 man, he's still in high school he got his first moose,
19 and everybody looked at it said, oh, wow, yeah, it's a
20 legal one, and then we had a couple Fish and Game guys
21 from Prince of Wales, and Ketchikan, or something like
22 that, but they were down to enforce -- and they came in
23 to look at it and they deemed it wasn't legal because
24 the tip of the antlers were broken -- one side was
25 broken off, the very tip of it, and after talking with
26 a number of hunters they said nothing will form that
27 far up on the antler, the tip of it, so there's no
28 possibility of another, you know, growth coming out of
29 there, to form something else, because it's at the very
30 tip of that antler, so it was a fork -- fork torn moose
31 and, yeah, we have a bunch of those around here. And
32 if these 20 moose doesn't require them -- our hunters
33 to look for, you know, a certain configuration like the
34 spike-form, you know, three brow tine, two brow tine,
35 whatever it is, and the 50 inch spread I would say yes.

36
37 But, you know, I'd have to go with Fish
38 and Game on their analysis, which, you know, doesn't
39 seem like they actually know the number of moose in our
40 area because we're so heavily Forested. So I'd rather
41 try to be conservative on taking the moose because we
42 are feeling a lot more pressure from outside hunters
43 that are coming from Petersburg, Wrangell, Ketchikan,
44 some from Juneau, so that kind of, really, has put
45 pressure on the local guys here to try to get a moose.

46
47 Most of the moose that you see, the
48 increase like from 11 to 17 percent increase every year
49 is mostly outsiders, they're -- of course, when they
50

0291

1 say local they include Petersburg, Wrangell and
2 Ketchikan, so that's deemed local, it's not the number
3 of moose taken by the residents of Kake.

4
5 So anyway that's just my thoughts on
6 there, I'm rambling now, so thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. There
9 might be some questions from the Council members if you
10 want to standby. Any Council members have a question
11 for Mr. Jackson.

12
13 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is
14 Cal in Gustavus, I have a question for Mr. Jackson.

15
16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

17
18 MR. CASIPIT: Yes, Mr. Jackson, thank
19 you for your testimony. I really appreciate when local
20 traditional users come in and give us testimony. And
21 based on your comments, I gather that you're okay with
22 Fish and Game's position of not wanting to include, you
23 know, these protected moose in our harvest, and not
24 have 20 any antlered bull. I can appreciate that and I
25 understand that. But I would like to provide a way to
26 provide some sort of meaningful priority to Federally-
27 qualified users and I wanted to ask you, if you thought
28 we -- if we started a Federal season, say a week
29 earlier than the State season, we still use the State
30 registration permit and we use the State antler
31 restriction, we go by what the State is doing with
32 their permit and everything and reporting, but we just
33 start the Federal season a week early, do you think
34 that would be helpful for residents of Kake and other
35 Federally-qualified users?

36
37 MR. JACKSON: I would think so. We've
38 been asking that question with the Alaska Fish and
39 Game. I know there's one community, I believe, I'm not
40 too sure, how their situated, but they open their
41 season like ahead of time and we've discussed this and
42 that would be great, you know, if it was just for
43 locals in our community that would be great. That
44 would give us a little more time to try to find a moose
45 before everybody floods into our community to go moose
46 hunting so, yes, I would support that.

47
48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
49 Does anybody else have a question for Mr. Jackson.

50

0292

1 MR. KITKA: Don Hernandez, this is
2 Harvey.

3
4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Harvey.

5
6 MR. KITKA: The question I had was for
7 Mr. Jackson is I'm not too sure how close you are to
8 putting that road all the way to Petersburg and if that
9 would cause some problems with that. What's your
10 analysis on that with Federally-qualified users in your
11 area, would that be a problem, because knowing that the
12 ferry system from Juneau to Ketchikan and all the other
13 places would be able to stop by and get across through
14 the road system and it's going to really open up an
15 area that might be some problems. I was wondering if
16 there was any thoughts on that.

17
18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any thoughts, Mr.
19 Jackson.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Are you still
24 there, Mr. Jackson?

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: We may have lost
29 contact there.

30
31 MR. JACKSON: I'm still here, my phone
32 dropped the call, sorry.

33
34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Oh, okay. We can
35 hear you now, go ahead.

36
37 MR. JACKSON: Yeah, like I was saying I
38 fully support trying to get the season one week before
39 the regular season for community members. I would
40 totally support that, so, yeah.

41
42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any comments on
43 the.....

44
45 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

46
47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:new
48 Petersburg road system, how that may affect local
49 hunting, that was part of the question.

50

0293

1 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

4

5 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
6 have a question for President Jackson. I understand
7 that you -- as you mentioned, you would support having
8 a week additional time on the front end of the hunting
9 season and I see what Cal's trying to do in terms of
10 trying to provide what he's defining as a meaningful
11 subsistence priority but I don't think that that --
12 what he's suggested in terms of a one week in front
13 would apply just to Kake, it would be for all
14 Federally-qualified users, so, President Jackson,
15 knowing that, would you -- is that still something that
16 you would support?

17

18 MR. JACKSON: Yeah, I don't think I
19 would support that because it would be just the same as
20 what we're doing now, you know, that wouldn't give us
21 -- you know those people would just come in another
22 week early so that isn't giving us any more time as a
23 community to hunt for our share of the moose.

24

25 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, President
26 Jackson.

27

28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any other question
29 -- you got a follow-up, Cathy.

30

31 MS. NEEDHAM: No, Mr. Chair. I was
32 just thanking President Jackson for his response.

33

34 (Teleconference interference -
35 participants not muted)

36

37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Anybody else on
38 the Council with a question.

39

40 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
41 Albert.

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

44

45 MR. HOWARD: I guess it's more of a
46 comment or a thought to go along with Cal's idea of
47 subsistence priority. I know Kake has petitioned the
48 Federal government to allow them to hunt moose when it
49 was closed during the State's season and they were

50

1 awarded that. And I guess what I'd like to see going
2 forward is if all subsistence users in a community be
3 allowed access to resource when there's a pandemic.
4 Especially here in Angoon without having to give a
5 report later and explain why, and I don't know if Mr.
6 Jackson has any ideas on how to get there.

7
8 MR. JACKSON: Through the Chair. It
9 was quite a process to get that. It went all the way
10 up to the Federal Subsistence Board and to the
11 Department of Interior, it took a total of like three
12 weeks to get it in place but, yeah, we're starting to
13 see the affects of shortages in our community again due
14 to the Covid down South. I'm sure some of you guys are
15 experiencing different things not being on the shelves
16 again and we're thankful this time we're in the middle
17 of the moose and deer season here. But, yeah, going
18 forward we don't know what's going to happen and, yeah,
19 I would petition the Federal Subsistence Board to, in
20 times of pandemic, to allow out of season moose and
21 deer hunting through the tribes because it's very
22 important that we, as tribes, provide for our tribal
23 citizens and make sure they have what they need to stay
24 healthy and to be able to survive this pandemic. So,
25 yeah, I would start by asking the State like I did and,
26 of course the Fish and Game said absolutely not, so I
27 went to the Forest Service in Petersburg and he said he
28 didn't have the -- the District Ranger over there, he
29 didn't have the authority, I went to the Regional
30 Forester in Juneau and he said he would work with us on
31 a permit on Federal lands and the next day I got a call
32 from the Forest Service subsistence guy in Anchorage
33 and he's the one that told me he'd pass it on to the
34 Federal Subsistence Board and after about five days
35 they finally decided, yes, they'll grant our special
36 action request to get moose and deer out of season.
37 And it passed on to the Department of Interior and they
38 shot it back down to the District Ranger in Petersburg
39 since we're in his district, and then of course he had
40 to ask the (Indiscernible) Unit, I'm not too sure if
41 that's the name of it but it's put together at times
42 of, like we're going through now, and they said they'd
43 tried to reach people in Kake and I reached out to all
44 the organizations in Kake and nobody got a call from
45 them and they -- they said that we couldn't have that
46 moose hunt and, you know, of course the District Ranger
47 had to send it back up to the Federal Subsistence Board
48 and after a little conversation with them they voted
49 us, you know, they voted to grant our special action
50

0295

1 request and it went back down to the Petersburg
2 District Ranger and it was -- we set up a number of
3 moose we could take, which was two, and five deer to
4 start with, I told them, you know, so we didn't impact
5 the moose or deer population around us, and that fed
6 our community through two rounds of meat to each
7 household, which is 160 households. And thankfully the
8 deer season opened up about almost a month later or two
9 -- yeah, about there, and we didn't need to do our
10 second hunt. So, you know, we're trying to be very
11 conservative on it, but that's the process I went
12 through.

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
15 Mr. Jackson. Any other Council members, questions, I
16 don't want to get too far out of the scope of this
17 proposal here so any other questions.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
22 again Mr. Jackson for your comments.

23

24 MR. JACKSON: Could I have one more
25 comment please.

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

28

29 MR. JACKSON: A quick one.

30

31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.

32

33 MR. JACKSON: What I'd like to request
34 of your committee there is that you guys look at trying
35 to find a way for us to like have a week jump on the
36 regular moose season, just Kake residents, that would
37 be very helpful. Very helpful indeed before the moose
38 feel the full impact of the hunting season.

39

40 All right, thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
43 Mr. Jackson. Let me see, I think suggestions like that
44 are a little too far out of this proposal to take them
45 up to an amendment to a proposal such as this. So
46 those are the kind of things we'll have to probably
47 revisit at another time but it's something we can keep
48 in mind, I guess, but I don't think we could address
49 that here at this meeting, too far out of the proposals
50

0296

1 that we have in front of us.

2

3 Well, let's see any other Federal
4 agencies with comments.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Other Regional
9 Advisory Councils or local Fish and Game Advisory
10 Committees like to comment.

11

12 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya
13 Wessels. There are no comments from other Regional
14 Advisory Councils. And, I'd like to correct my earlier
15 statement, when you ask for tribal or ANCSA Corporation
16 reports, I missed one and there was comments from
17 Sealaska Corporation in.....

18

19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

20

21 MS. WESSELS:support of WP24-06.
22 So that's the only one that there was a result of the
23 tribal consultation, they spoke in support of this
24 proposal.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, that's good
29 to have that on record. Thank you. Do we have written
30 public comments on this proposal.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any written public
35 comment.....

36

37 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is.....

38

39 MR. CROSS: Mr. Chair, this is.....

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Is that Rob.

42

43 MR. CROSS: Excuse me, Katya.

44

45 MS. WESSELS: No, you go ahead, I
46 wasn't sure that you were on, go ahead.

47

48 MR. CROSS: Mr. Chair, this is Rob
49 Cross. I have no written comments on this proposal.

50

0297

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
2 Public testimony. If there's anybody standing by on
3 the phones who would like to testify on this proposal
4 please come forward.

5
6 (No comments)

7
8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Apparently not.
9 Time for the Council's recommendation.

10
11 (No comments)

12
13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'll just kind of
14 remind the Council, this would either be -- a motion to
15 support or if you wanted to take another action such as
16 table or take no action, I guess that would be
17 appropriate, so one of those motions.

18
19 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, Mike
20 Douville.

21
22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I heard Mike
23 Douville.

24
25 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair. I move to
26 adopt WP22-06.

27
28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
29 Do we have a second.

30
31 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian, I
32 second.

33
34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
35 Ian. Okay, this proposal is now open for discussion
36 amongst the Council, what are your thoughts.

37
38 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

39
40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mike.

41
42 MR. DOUVILLE: I intend to support this
43 proposal. I think it can be done without harming the
44 overall population. It's a pretty big area and I
45 believe the proposal reads up to 20, it doesn't have to
46 be 20, it could be 10 or 15. But I think that it would
47 offer a rural priority in a small fashion and that's
48 our job. So looking at the charts, you know, like 25
49 percent of these go to non-qualified people so I'm sure
50

0298

1 that those concerns with the Department could make some
2 adjustments to take care of whatever this rural
3 priority takes in, which shouldn't be difficult or it
4 won't be that much. But it is going to provide a rural
5 priority on Federal land. So that's how I feel about
6 it.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
11 Mike. Anybody else on the Council.

12

13 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal.

14

15 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I hear Cal, go
18 ahead, Cal.

19

20 MR. CASIPIT: Well, I heard Cathy too,
21 but I'll go ahead, sorry Cathy. I am going to support
22 this as well much for the same reasons that Mike
23 outlined. You know, I was considering, you know, the
24 reason I asked the question about season dates is I was
25 trying to figure out, you know, what a meaningful
26 priority might look like if we weren't going to have
27 the 20 antlered bulls -- or 20 antlered moose thing in
28 there. So I'm in support of this. Let me get my list
29 here. I think this will be beneficial to subsistence
30 users. It was supported by Mr. Jackson of the
31 Organized Village of Kake. So for those reasons I'm
32 going to support it. I think there's -- I think the
33 issue of trying to account for the 20 moose in the
34 overall harvest in Unit 3, I think we can deal with
35 that. Like Mike said, it's up to 20, I mean we can
36 adjust that. The in-season I imagine would adjust that
37 as needed for providing for a healthy population. So
38 this provides a priority. I don't know if folks will
39 say it's meaningful but it's at least a little bit of a
40 priority like Mike said.

41

42 Thank you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.
45 And, Cathy, you wanted to weigh in as well.

46

47 MS. NEEDHAM: Yes, thank you, Mr.
48 Chair. I'm having a hard time with the proposal. At
49 this point in time I'm inclined not to support it. Not
50

0299

1 because I don't feel like the residents of Kake should
2 have a little more access to moose as a resource but I
3 feel like this has -- passing this would have an
4 unintended consequence of creating more competition
5 amongst Federally-qualified users. So I know what
6 we're trying to get at is potentially doing something
7 to support local residents on Kupreanof but I don't
8 think that this proposal does exactly what that
9 intention is and I don't think that it would create an
10 unnecessary competition with other Federally-qualified
11 users. I also think that the fact that it is any bull
12 and in the analysis and sort of what we've heard from
13 biologists today that there could be -- this could also
14 have potential deleterious effects to the breeding
15 population, mainly because the difference between
16 what's going on in Kupreanof and how moose are
17 harvested in places like Gustavus is that the
18 biologists don't have a good way, or a way to count the
19 moose population in this unit and so by opening up, or
20 shifting to an any bull, we could be taking breeders
21 out of a population that we just don't know much about.
22 And I think that, in my mind, kind of starts to get to
23 this question about it would be putting a conservation
24 concern on moose in the unit. I guess the other reason
25 I -- I feel like Federally-qualified subsistence
26 harvesters have a lot of opportunity for moose in this
27 area. If we look at the data that was provided,
28 Federally-qualified users definitely have the lion's
29 share of the harvest for moose. And I know we try to
30 provide a meaningful subsistence priority and we are
31 attempting to do that by regulations but I don't feel
32 like Federally-qualified subsistence users are at a
33 loss for opportunity for moose in this.

34
35 So I don't know, personally, I think I
36 am going to oppose the proposal for those reasons.

37
38 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

39
40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
41 Cathy. Any other Council members want to weigh in.

42
43 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman.

44
45 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair.

46
47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I hear Albert and
48 I think somebody else, so Albert you go first.

49
50

0300

1 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
2 think supporting this isn't really going to hurt the
3 resource unless the State can show cause that it
4 actually will. Part of the report said that 80 percent
5 of these tags were given to residents in Petersburg and
6 that is really no comparison between the residents of
7 Petersburg and the residents of Kake. Kake is similar
8 to Angoon as far as employment goes and the cost of
9 living. So when you see 80 percent of the permits go
10 to Petersburg that leaves 20 percent for the Kake
11 residents, so I'll support just based on that. Hoping
12 that it gives them an opportunity to take care of
13 themselves. We could almost look at this proposal and
14 change the September 15th to, I don't know, September
15 1st and September 7th and give the Federal draw a week
16 or two head start.

17
18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
19 Albert. I think there was somebody else also that
20 wanted to comment.

21
22 MR. SLATER: Yeah, hi, Mr. Chair, this
23 is Jim. I have a question and I guess it's.....

24
25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jim.

26
27 MR. SLATER: Thank you. The question I
28 think would be about the interpretation of Mr.
29 Jackson's feelings on this. Based on Cathy's comment
30 or question to him previously, if he is aware that this
31 proposal would enable all Federally-qualified
32 subsistence hunters to access these moose rather than
33 just the community members of Kake. And hopefully he's
34 on and he can address that.

35
36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, if Mr.
37 Jackson is still on the phone line he can address that
38 question if he's still listening in, that'd be fine.

39
40 MR. JACKSON: Yes, through the Chair.
41 I guess this person missed what I said earlier. I
42 wouldn't be in support if it's not just Kake residents
43 that were able to partake in this earlier hunt.

44
45 MR. SLATER: Yeah.

46
47 MR. JACKSON: So, you know, that's the
48 way I understood it.

49
50

0301

1 MR. SLATER: I understand now, thank
2 you. Yeah, I believe the question originally was for
3 if you would support it for a week earlier, and you
4 said no. This is for the whole proposal as written for
5 the relief of the antler restriction.

6
7 (No comments)

8
9 MR. SLATER: Are you there?

10
11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think you lost
12 your connection.

13
14 MR. SLATER: Did I lose my connection?

15
16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: We still hear you,
17 Jim.

18
19 MR. SLATER: Okay, so I couldn't hear
20 anyone for awhile. I'm sorry, did Mr. Jackson comment
21 on that?

22
23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I don't know if
24 his call got dropped, I'm not hearing him.

25
26 MR. SLATER: Okay. Okay. That's what
27 I was just wondering because a lot of this is the
28 thought in supporting Mr. Jackson and the community of
29 Kake and it seems as though he may or may not support
30 this if it's clear that it's for all Federally-
31 qualified subsistence hunters.

32
33 (Teleconference interference -
34 participants not muted)

35
36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, I could
37 weigh in a little bit on that. The proposal states
38 for, you know, the moose that -- the (indiscernible) of
39 moose hunting that takes place on Kupreanof and Kuiu
40 Islands where, you know, right now the moose population
41 is probably strongest on Kupreanof and Kuiu than it is
42 on the other Unit 3 areas like, you know, Mitkof,
43 Thomas Bay -- excuse me, Thomas Bay's on the mainland,
44 not Unit 3, but Mitkof and Wrangell Islands and the
45 other associated small islands, now Kake may be the
46 only community on Kupreanof Island but there are a lot
47 of other hunters that do hunt Kupreanof and Kuiu
48 Island. You know there's a lot of access for people
49 with boats and ferry access from Petersburg that hunt
50

0302

1 there that I know of. There's also a fair number of
2 people that are starting to come from Prince of Wales
3 Island running boats up from Craig, Klawock, putting
4 boats in from Thorne Bay, and places like Coffman Cove,
5 Wale Pass, Point Baker, Port Protection, they're all
6 headed up Rocky Pass and hunting Kupreanof and Kuiu
7 Island so to say that just because, you know, Kake is
8 the only community on Kupreanof does not necessarily
9 mean that those people from Kake would have the most
10 benefit, it would be pretty spread out. I think people
11 from Wrangell even go out and hunt, travel to Kupreanof
12 and Kuiu Island. So I think that would be a
13 misrepresentation.

14
15 So I mean the question is would
16 allowing a liberalized antler requirement for, you
17 know, up to 20 moose, would that benefit subsistence
18 hunters in general from all of these communities. I
19 think that's the main question there. I don't think we
20 should just be talking about Kake here.

21
22 MR. SLATER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23
24 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

25
26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

27
28 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
29 think in my justification and why I am in opposition.
30 My understanding is that if we pass this proposal then
31 there will be up to 20 permits for antlerless bulls for
32 Federally-qualified users. So our hope is that Kake
33 would get them, however, if you were a Federally-
34 qualified user in Sitka, if you were a Federally-
35 qualified user in Point Baker, what permit would you
36 hope to hunt moose on Kupreanof, you would most likely
37 try to put in for a permit that's for an antlerless
38 bull, thus taking away the opportunity because now
39 you've quote/unquote sucked up that permit, you've
40 taken that opportunity away from Kake, which is sort of
41 the sub-Federally-qualified user group that we had
42 hoped to benefit with this proposal. And so I don't
43 think this proposal gets at the intent. And, largely,
44 you know, because all rural residents in Southeast
45 Alaska have a customary and traditional use
46 determination for moose and so that's going to create
47 an undue competition amongst Federally-qualified users,
48 and I just don't think it meets the intent of what the
49 Council was trying to do when we put this proposal
50

0303

1 forward.

2

3 So, again, I'm still going to oppose
4 this proposal.

5

6 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
9 Cathy. Any other Council members want to weigh in on
10 discussion on this.

11

12 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

15

16 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, my thinking is in
17 line with Cathy. And it maybe goes back to the initial
18 discussion about where these animals would come -- you
19 know, presume -- well, these extra 20 animals could
20 cause a potential conservation concern down the road
21 but would also be considered within the pool of animals
22 that would be taken by Kupreanof residents, so I think
23 that might compound the effect of what Cathy is
24 discussing anyway. I mean the only reason that I could
25 -- that I think that I could support this is because
26 there's still that up to 20 clause control in there so
27 this isn't like a hard and fast rule and maybe that
28 clause makes it justifiable, it could like limit the
29 effect -- the possible negative effects that we're
30 discussing here but I still will tend to not support
31 this proposal.

32

33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
34 Ian. Anybody else.

35

36 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
37 Albert.

38

39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

40

41 MR. HOWARD: It seems like some of this
42 is all people's assumptions of what could possibly
43 happen when, in fact, being so close to Kake we respect
44 what's theirs and they respect what's ours. So we're
45 not going to go in and ask for a moose tag to say we
46 get -- say get more than we do, so basing your vote on
47 something you're assuming is going to happen and
48 probably won't. You know you also got to keep in mind
49 you got to go into the community and hunt the way they
50

0304

1 do. If anything, this proposal sets aside 20 moose for
2 Federally-qualified subsistence users so this also
3 gives a priority in the future should there be a
4 conservation concern, you have this 20 in place
5 already. If we kick this can down the road and when
6 there actually is a conservation concern we're going to
7 have to go through this process and wait another two or
8 three years before this process is implemented or vote
9 for this now and then the 20 Federal draw permits will
10 be in place should there be a conservation concern.

11

12 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
15 Albert. Anybody else on the Council want to weigh in
16 on this proposal.

17

18 MR. ROBBINS: Mr. Chair, this is
19 Harold.

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Harold.

22

23 MR. ROBBINS: Yeah, the moose hunt that
24 we have here in Yakutat species local area of residents
25 for the first two weeks of the hunt have priority and
26 nobody else can hunt that so perhaps that could be
27 applied in this situation for the village of Kake and
28 modify things so that it would work out that way. Just
29 a thought.

30

31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
32 Harold. Any other Council member's thoughts on this.

33

34 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, Mike
35 Douville.

36

37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mike.

38

39 MR. DOUVILLE: There is no conservation
40 concern. The State perceives one, or could be, maybe,
41 almost, who knows, but right not there is none. I
42 don't think it would be harmful to the resource. And
43 it may benefit rural users perhaps in Coffman Cove or
44 somewhere where logistically it doesn't -- it's
45 difficult to go and compete with other hunters for a
46 week or two trying to get a moose when you have a
47 registration hunt that says you can shoot any bull
48 would be quite beneficial and of course you would go.
49 But to worry about somebody in Sitka or elsewhere,
50

0305

1 Juneau -- or not Juneau, but other places where they're
2 Federally-qualified that are a distance away, it's
3 still logistically difficult to do this hunt so, you
4 know, it's not something that's going to cause a flood
5 of competition, I don't think at all. And there's lots
6 of talk about an earlier hunt, that might work if --
7 that might work, maybe but, you know, the moose aren't
8 moving that well earlier, like right now is probably a
9 prime time. But, anyway, there's no conservation
10 concern and it would provide some opportunity, some
11 rural priority and I still support it.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
16 Mike. I guess I would like to express my support for
17 this proposal. I've really was on the fence on this
18 one, kind of been a hard decision of trying to
19 analyzing all this discussion. In my view this is a
20 proposal that would increase opportunity for
21 subsistence users. If the purpose of the proposal was
22 to institute more of a meaningful priority I don't
23 think this would be the proposal that I would put
24 forward, however, I think it does create opportunity
25 for subsistence users. My feeling is that this moose
26 population is healthy. I think the Fish and Game's
27 management plan with their spike-fork 50 inch, three
28 brow tine, whatever, moose antler restriction has been
29 very successful. I think it's probably built up the
30 moose population to where some additional harvest can
31 be sustained. The provision in this proposal that
32 calls for a flexible number that can be decided pre-
33 season up to 20, I think could add enough flexibility
34 that if there were some indications that it were
35 causing a decline in the moose harvest it could be
36 adjusted. I think, you know, a lot of the factors
37 people have talked about, I know this antler
38 restriction, it is kind of an impediment to some folks
39 who do have to travel, or do wish to travel longer
40 distances to take a moose. Part of the consideration
41 is that, yeah, they might have a difficult time finding
42 a moose that meets the antler restriction, however, if
43 they could take any bull, I think that would really
44 change their calculation on whether or not they wanted
45 to go on this hunt or not. I know there's already a
46 factor of moose that are taken, like Mr. Jackson
47 pointed out, it's not uncommon for somebody take a
48 moose and then have it not meet the antler requirement
49 and that can be a very fine level of examination on
50

0306

1 whether that moose is legal or not. If somebody were
2 to have any moose, any antler permit in their
3 possession, it'd certainly eliminate that factor,
4 although I realize that there will probably still be
5 moose taken that don't meet the antler requirement that
6 would be confiscated by people that don't have a permit
7 for any bull moose.

8
9 But, I don't know, just a lot of
10 considerations here but all in all I'm going to come
11 down on the side that it would be beneficial to
12 subsistence users to increase opportunity on a
13 population of moose that is not experiencing
14 conservation concerns at this time. So I'm going to be
15 in support.

16
17 Anybody else want to add anything.

18
19 MR. SCHROEDER: This is Bob and I go
20 with Mr. Jackson's opinion that this really wouldn't
21 assist Kake in their moose hunting and I think we could
22 probably work something out for this moose hunt that
23 may be more effective at providing a subsistence
24 priority.

25
26 Thank you.

27
28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Does that mean
29 you're in opposition to the proposal, Bob?

30
31 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, I am. Thank you.

32
33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
34 Anybody else.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Are we ready for
39 the question.

40
41 MR. CASIPIT: Question.

42
43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Was that a call
44 for the question or did somebody else want to add
45 something?

46
47 MR. CASIPIT: That was me asking for
48 the question.

49
50

0307

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, question's
2 been called for. I don't know if Frank is back with
3 us, Frank are you available to take a roll call vote.

4
5 MR. WRIGHT: I'm here, Mr. Chair.

6
7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Oh, very good,
8 thank you Frank. Would you do a roll call vote on
9 this, I'd appreciate it.

10
11 MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you, Mr.
12 Chair.

13
14 Albert Howard.

15
16 MR. HOWARD: Yes.

17
18 MR. WRIGHT: Bob Schroeder.

19
20 MR. SCHROEDER: No.

21
22 MR. WRIGHT: James -- Jim Slater.

23
24 MR. SLATER: Yes.

25
26 MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

27
28 MR. DOUVILLE: Michael Douville votes
29 yes.

30
31 MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.

32
33 MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

34
35 MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.

36
37 MR. JOHNSON: Ian votes no.

38
39 MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

40
41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I vote yes.

42
43 MR. WRIGHT: Pardon me, I didn't get
44 it, yes, no?

45
46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.

47
48 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.

49
50

0308

1 MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.

2

3 MR. ROBBINS: Harold votes no.

4

5 MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.

14

15 MS. NEEDHAM: Cathy votes no.

16

17 MR. WRIGHT: Don, I didn't hear what
18 you said.

19

20 MS. NEEDHAM: Cathy votes no.

21

22 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, I heard that, but I
23 was asking about Don -- Donald Hernandez.

24

25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Oh, I vote yes.

26

27 MR. WRIGHT: Frank votes yes. So I've
28 got one, two, three, four -- four no's, and the rest
29 yes so motion carries.

30

31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Motion carries,
32 okay. Thank you, Frank. Split vote. Okay, so the
33 question, I don't know, we've got about an hour here
34 before I'd like to recess so do we need to take a break
35 or should we move ahead.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'm willing to
40 move ahead unless I hear otherwise so.

41

42 MS. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, this is Amee
43 Howard.

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, Amee, go
46 ahead.

47

48 MS. HOWARD: I would request us to take
49 a short break. Our Council Coordinator, Katya, is

50

0309

1 having some phone difficulties and got dropped from the
2 call and is trying to get back in.

3

4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. That's a
5 good reason for a break.

6

7 MS. HOWARD: Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Let's take 10
10 minutes and we'll be back at 4:20.

11

12 (Off record)

13

14 (On record)

15

16 MS. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, this is Amee
17 Howard.

18

19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead,
20 Amee.

21

22 MS. HOWARD: I believe Katya's still
23 having technical difficulties, if it is okay with you
24 and the Council I'm happy to step in for her while she
25 gets those resolved and we can continue in the agenda.

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I think we
28 ought to do that. I'd like to get a bit further here
29 this afternoon. So, Frank, you better check to make
30 sure we've got all the Council back, could you do a
31 quick roll call.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Are you unmuted,
36 Frank.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: We may not have
41 Frank or Katya.

42

43 MS. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, this is Amee.

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Amee.

46

47 MS. HOWARD: I'm happy to do the roll
48 call for you if you would like.

49

50

0310

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, if you could
2 do that please, that'd be great.

3
4 MS. HOWARD: Certainly.

5
6 Ian Johnson.

7
8 MR. JOHNSON: Ian is here.

9
10 MS. HOWARD: Calvin Casipit.

11
12 MR. CASIPIT: Cal is here.

13
14 MS. HOWARD: Michael Douville.

15
16 MR. DOUVILLE: Mike Douville's here.

17
18 MR. WRIGHT: Frank's here.

19
20 MS. HOWARD: Frank, would you like to
21 take over the roll call?

22
23 MR. WRIGHT: You're doing fine, thank
24 you.

25
26 MS. HOWARD: All right, thank you.

27
28 Jim Slater.

29
30 MR. SLATER: Jim Slater is here.

31
32 MS. HOWARD: Thank you.

33
34 Bob Schroeder.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 MS. HOWARD: Bob Schroeder.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 MS. HOWARD: Albert Howard.

43
44 MR. HOWARD: Albert's here.

45
46 MS. HOWARD: Don Hernandez.

47
48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Don Hernandez is

49
50

0311

1 here.

2

3

MS. HOWARD: Harold Robbins.

4

5

MR. ROBBINS: Harold is here.

6

7

MS. HOWARD: Harvey Kitka.

8

9

MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka's here.

10

11

12

MS. HOWARD: Larry Bemis.

13

14

(No comments)

15

16

MS. HOWARD: Larry Bemis.

17

18

(No comments)

19

20

MS. HOWARD: Cathy Needham.

21

22

MS. NEEDHAM: Cathy's here.

23

24

MS. HOWARD: Thank you. Mr. Chair, it appears you have a quorum.

25

26

27

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you, Ameer. The next proposal up is Proposal WP22-07. This is a closure to non-Federally-qualified users on Admiralty Island, and do we have a presenter for this proposal ready to go.

28

29

30

31

32

33

MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yes, Mr. Chair.

34

35

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Tell us who you are and proceed.

36

37

38

MR. MUSSLEWHITE: For the record my name is Jake Musslewhite and I'm a Fisheries Biologist for the Forest Service in Juneau and I'm here to give you a quick summary of the Staff analysis of WP22-07.

39

40

41

42

43

Wildlife Proposal 22-07 requests the that Federal public lands of Admiralty Island draining into Chatham Strait between Port Marsden and Point Gardner in Unit 4 be closed to deer hunting September 15 through November 30th except to Federally-qualified users. It was submitted by the Southeast Regional Advisory Council, and the Staff analysis of the

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

0312

1 proposal begins on Page 84 of your meeting book.

2

3

4 The proponent states that it's become
5 more challenging for subsistence hunters in Angoon to
6 harvest sufficient deer to meet their subsistence needs
7 due to increased hunting pressure from non-Federally-
8 qualified users. They state that regulatory change is
9 needed to protect the deer population from further
10 depletion and increase opportunity for Federally-
11 qualified subsistence users.

11

12

13 The portion of Unit 4 covered by the
14 proposal consists of the majority of the west coast of
15 Admiralty Island. The area is primarily Federal public
16 lands within the Admiralty Island National Monument and
17 the Kootznoowoo Wilderness with the exception of lands
18 surrounding Angoon proper and a strip along the
19 shoreline of Mitchell Bay. Rural residents of Units 1
20 through 5, customary and traditional use determination
21 for deer in Unit 4.

21

22

23 The current Federal season for deer in
24 Unit 4 is August 1st to January 31st with a limit of
25 six deer. Antlerless deer may only be taken after
26 September 15th. The State general season runs from
27 August 1st to December 31st and also allows antlerless
28 deer to be taken after September 15th. In 2019 the
29 State bag limit was increased from four to six deer.

29

30

31 Based on the available data, deer
32 populations in Unit 4 and the proposal area appear to
33 be healthy. To assess the deer population, ADF&G uses
34 pellet count transects and aerial surveys. While no
35 pellet counts have been done in the proposal area
36 recently, counts in adjacent areas have shown an
37 increase in trend and population. Data from aerial
38 surveys also indicate an increasing trend in deer
39 populations with Admiralty Island having the highest
40 aerial survey counts within Unit 4.

40

41

42 We used data from ADF&G harvest reports
43 between 2000 and 2019 to assess the patterns of deer
44 harvest within the proposal area. Harvest and effort
45 data were grouped by wildlife analysis areas, or WAAs
46 which roughly correspond to major watersheds or other
47 distinct geographical areas. So there's a map of the
48 six WAAs used on Page 92 of your meeting book.

48

49

50

The amount of deer hunting effort

1 within the proposal area was measured using both the
2 number of hunters and the number of hunter days.
3 Graphs of the hunting effort data are on Page 95. The
4 amount of effort has been relatively stable over that
5 time period. The majority effort is by non-Federally-
6 qualified users, most of which reside in Juneau and
7 most of the Federally-qualified hunters using the area
8 reside in Angoon.

9
10 The success rate and harvest was
11 measured using the number of days hunted for deer
12 harvested and the number of deer harvested per hunter.
13 And graphs for those measures are on Page 96. The days
14 per deer has been variable to stable with Federally-
15 qualified hunters consistently taking less time to
16 harvest a deer. The number of deer per Federally-
17 qualified hunter has declined somewhat over the early
18 2000s but has been stable for the last decade and is
19 roughly comparable to the non-Federally rate.

20
21 Overall the number of deer harvested
22 within the proposal area has been fairly stable over
23 recent years as shown in Figure 10 on Page 97. There
24 appears to be a decline in the total harvest by
25 Federally-qualified users since the early 2000s but
26 that's largely as a result of Angoon users shifting
27 efforts out of the proposal area and into other areas
28 as shown in Figure 11. Timing-wise, the majority of
29 harvest in Unit 4 as a whole occurs during the proposed
30 closure period. Nearly half occurs during November and
31 two-thirds occurs from September to November. Since
32 the data were compiled on a monthly basis we couldn't
33 calculate how many were harvested before and after that
34 September 15th, beginning of the proposed closure
35 period.

36
37 This proposal would restrict non-
38 Federally-qualified users hunting deer on portions of
39 Admiralty Island during the month of peak effort and
40 harvest. Currently non-Federally-qualified users
41 represent roughly 60 to 70 percent of the hunting
42 effort and harvest in the proposal area, which is
43 compromised almost entirely of Federal public lands.
44 The proposed September 15th to November 30th closure
45 for non-Federally-qualified users would likely
46 eliminate over half of the hunter effort and harvest of
47 deer in the proposal area. Non-Federally-qualified
48 users would likely shift their effort to other areas of
49 Unit 4 leading to increased competition with hunters in
50

0315

1 participants not muted)

2

3 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, and so I'd be
4 happy to take any questions.

5

6 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
7 Albert.

8

9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you,
10 Jake. Go ahead, Albert, with questions.

11

12 MR. HOWARD: It's tough to sit here and
13 listen to someone who is looking at data that was given
14 to them and not actually living in Angoon and sees it
15 for himself or lives the life the people who live here
16 in Angoon and then ask for this to be opposed by the
17 Council.

18

19 On the one hand he says there's enough
20 deer here to not warrant a conservation concern, on the
21 other hand his data shows him that we have to go hunt
22 somewhere else. Does that data say why we have to go
23 hunt somewhere else, is it possible we're hunting
24 somewhere else because there's so much competition on
25 this side of the island that we have to go hunt
26 somewhere else. Does the data show that. Traditional
27 knowledge needs to be implemented at some point. I'd
28 like to see the data that shows that all this deer
29 that's supposed to be here is here and where that
30 information comes from. And the only time I see any
31 Fish and Game around here is to give us a ticket. So
32 are they collecting data during that time, I don't
33 know. I fly back and forth from Juneau, I don't see
34 what the aerial surveys are telling them.

35

36 This whole thing gives the appearance
37 that OSM is working for the State now just based on
38 everything he explained.

39

40 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.
43 I don't know if you had a question there but if Jake
44 wants to respond to anything.

45

46 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, Mr. Chair, if I
47 may. I did -- Mr. Howard, I did point out that there
48 was a shift in Angoon hunting patterns out of that sort
49 of proposal area on Admiralty over to the Chichagof

50

0316

1 side, Peril Straits sort of area, so I did actually
2 talk to some folks that I know in Angoon and said, oh,
3 you know, what's going on with that because that did
4 seem to be kind of a trend, but I didn't really get any
5 satisfying answers out of that other than, you know,
6 there was just maybe better opportunities over there,
7 you know, something like that. So I appreciate that
8 you bring up that shift in effort because I definitely
9 picked up on that but I attempted to kind of pick that
10 apart and I didn't come to really any conclusions after
11 that.

12

13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Jake.
16 Anybody else on the Council with a question for Mr.
17 Musslewhite.

18

19 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Cathy, go ahead.

22

23 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
24 have a couple of different, unrelated questions
25 regarding the analysis as I read it. On the tables and
26 graphs, starting on Page -- well, on most of the table
27 and graphs.....

28

29 (Teleconference interference -
30 participants not muted)

31

32 MS. NEEDHAM:it basically
33 presents data for Federally-qualified and non-
34 Federally-qualified users. I'm wondering in this
35 information that we have that are in your analysis, if
36 non-Federally-qualified users include out of state
37 harvest or if that information is just not in this
38 analysis at all in terms of your hunting by out of
39 state residents.

40

41 (Teleconference interference -
42 participants not muted)

43

44 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Through the Chair.
45 Yeah, the non-resident effort and harvest was very
46 small in the proposal area, it was like less than two
47 percent. So it's basically almost all folks from
48 either Juneau or Angoon with just a smattering of folks
49 from places like Sitka and (indiscernible-cutting) and
50

0317

1 stuff like that, so non-resident hunters aren't really
2 too much of a piece of the puzzle. Does that satisfy
3 -- answer your question?

4
5 MS. NEEDHAM: Yes, thank you, Mr.
6 Chair. Another question that I had for the analysis
7 area, is there any information regarding the average
8 number of deer that are taken by non-Federally-
9 qualified users?

10
11 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: No. So this is --
12 I'm kind of glad you brought this up because this is a
13 major caveat with these data, they're all grouped by
14 those wildlife analysis areas, those six separate
15 spots. So I did not have the data to track individual
16 hunters to see like, you know, how many deer throughout
17 a total season, throughout that whole area people would
18 end up with. So for instance, you know, if one hunter
19 hunted in four separate areas that would show up as
20 looking like four hunters, or if one hunter hunted
21 for.....

22
23 (Teleconference interference -
24 participants not muted)

25
26 MR. MUSSLEWHITE:four days in the
27 same area, that'd be one hunter for four days. So
28 that's why I used both.....

29
30 REPORTER: Excuse me, I'm sorry to
31 interrupt here, but real quick -- I'm sorry, sir. I'm
32 sorry, sir.....

33
34 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yes.

35
36 REPORTER: Yes, I'm having a really
37 hard time getting a clear record so if everybody could
38 mute their lines unless you're speaking. Go ahead.

39
40 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Okay, I hope you
41 managed to hear that. Did that make sense? So, yeah,
42 that's an important kind of thing to look at when
43 looking at these data is that they're -- you know, we
44 can't -- we don't have the ability to track individual
45 hunters to figure out how many deer for the total for
46 the season that people are, you know, ending up with.

47
48 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
49 Albert.

50

0318

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Just a second,
2 Albert. Cathy, do you have any follow-up to that?

3
4 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, I have several
5 questions. I don't have a follow-up specifically to
6 that answer. If you want somebody else to jump in, I
7 can always get your attention in a minute.

8
9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Albert, why
10 don't you go ahead.

11
12 MR. HOWARD: She can finish up, Mr.
13 Chair, that's fine.

14
15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Cathy, so did you
16 have a question.

17
18 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, thank you.
19 Thank you, Albert. My other question is kind of -- we
20 have a couple of other wildlife proposals that we do
21 have that I noticed that there was a reference Sill and
22 Koster in the Hoonah report, and this goes back to when
23 they do the household harvest surveys, in a couple of
24 other proposals -- in actually the Hoonah proposal it
25 stated that during household surveys Hoonah residents
26 did actually report that there were user conflicts and
27 so I'm wondering if there has been documented user
28 conflicts in household harvest surveys that have been
29 done for Angoon in the past and if this analysis had
30 looked at any other things like our transcripts in the
31 past to get an idea of the amount of user conflicts
32 that we're seeing in the analysis area.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, through the
37 Chair. Yeah, thank you for that question. I did use
38 that Sill and Koster and looked through that, you know,
39 to sort of get basic background information about where
40 Angoon folks and everything traditionally hunted, like
41 I think I included a map in there, which lined up
42 pretty well with our harvest data. Unfortunately I
43 don't remember encountering anything about reported
44 user conflicts or anything like that. So I would -- as
45 I'm a fishery biologist and not an anthropologist I
46 would, you know, definitely admit that, you know,
47 probably not enough of that anthropological type
48 information, you know, as much as we could have in this
49 analysis, for sure.

50

0319

1 MS. NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. I
2 think that concludes my questions for now, Mr. Chair.
3 Thank you.

4
5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy.
6 And I'd just like to throw out there we're going to
7 have comments from the State, hopefully on this, and I
8 was kind of hoping during their presentation that -- I
9 was hoping that Lauren Sill from the Subsistence
10 Division could be available to take questions as well.
11 She would be the one best to address questions like the
12 one you just asked so I'll just say if somebody on the
13 State is listening we are hoping that Lauren Sill is
14 available when your time comes to present.

15
16 MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I have a question
17 for the Federal.....

18
19 (Teleconference interference -
20 participants not muted)

21
22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So let's -- yeah,
23 another Council member, go ahead.

24
25 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, this is Bob
26 Schroeder. And, you know, I've been associated with
27 this Council for quite awhile and I -- my personal
28 preference would be for another (indiscernible -
29 cutting out) management resources on Federal public
30 land. We are, however, constrained by ANILCA. We
31 operate under ANILCA. I'm wondering whether the
32 Federal Staff could give us the definition of what's
33 needed, or what the criteria are to restrict non-
34 Federal subsistence users from harvesting. I've got
35 ANILCA opened here but we used to all have our copy of
36 ANILCA that we carry as Regional Advisory Councils and
37 we no longer have that, so if you could just remind
38 everyone of what the criteria are in ANILCA for
39 restricting non-Federally-qualified users, that would
40 be probably useful at this moment.

41
42 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yes, through the
43 Chair. Mr. Schroeder, was that question directed at me
44 then or other Federal Staff.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Bob.

49
50

0320

1 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

4

5 (Teleconference interference -
6 participants not muted)

7

8 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair. I'm seeing on
9 the Teams chat as well as getting several texts at this
10 point in time that there are a number of several Staff
11 as well as State Staff that cannot get back on to the
12 call. And I've also heard that our Council Coordinator
13 is still not back on the call. And I'm not sure that
14 there's anything I can do about it but makes me wonder
15 if we should be proceeding if we can't have the State,
16 who is going to go next on our call. We're missing
17 some other Federal folks and public testimony, we won't
18 have access to any of those folks either. It sounds
19 like there's a phone carrier that might be down.

20

21 MS. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, this is Amee
22 Howard.

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Amee.

25

26 MS. HOWARD: I want to thank Cathy,
27 yes, we seem to be having a service-wide outage or
28 something of that nature with the teleconference
29 carrier. And, unfortunately, at this time there are
30 several people who have been dropped from the Southeast
31 Regional Advisory Council meeting and the Yukon
32 Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council meeting and
33 they're unable to call back in. My recommendation is
34 that in order to proceed and have everyone here that we
35 need to have.....

36

37 (Teleconference interference -
38 participants not muted)

39

40 MS. HOWARD:here, it might be a
41 good idea to adjourn or recess for the evening so that
42 we can figure out what's going on and get all the
43 services back up and running.

44

45 Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you
46 Cathy.

47

48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
49 Amee. Yeah, I hadn't been looking at the chat, I'm

50

0321

1 just now seeing all this back and forth here so, yeah,
2 I guess we're within shooting distance of coming to our
3 recess time for this evening so that's probably a good
4 idea. Okay. We'll recess until 9:00 o'clock tomorrow
5 morning. We still have a lot to get through. I was
6 prepared to maybe go a little bit later this evening
7 but I guess that can't happen so we'll just see what we
8 can do tomorrow.

9

10 Okay, meeting recessed until 9:00
11 o'clock tomorrow morning. Sorry about that.

12

13 (Off record)

14

15 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

