

0001

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

SOUTHCENTRAL SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
PUBLIC MEETING
VOLUME I
TELECONFERENCE
October 13, 2021
9:00 a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Greg Encelewski, Chairman
- Judy Caminer
- Donna Claus
- Ed Holston
- Andrew McLaughlin
- Michael Opheim
- Diane Selanoff
- Gloria Stickwan
- Angela Totemoff
- John Whissel
- Dennis Zadra

Regional Council Coordinator, DeAnna Perry

Recorded and transcribed by:

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

0002

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

(Telephonic - 10/13/2021)

(On record)

(Invocation)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I'm going to go ahead and call the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council to order. We have October 13th, 2021, I got about 9:00 o'clock or just a minute there after. Gloria gave us the invocation and we're officially called to order and so you could do the roll call.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, again, if everybody is on mute, I'll just have you do a star six to come off mute to answer the answer the roll call. We'll start with Ed Holston.

MR. HOLSTON: Yes, I'm here.

MS. PERRY: Michael Opheim.

MR. OPHEIM: I'm here.

MS. PERRY: Thanks, Michael.

Chair Greg Encelewski, I just heard you.

Diane Selanoff.

MS. SELANOFF: Here.

MS. PERRY: Thanks, Diane.

Dennis Zadra.

MR. ZADRA: I'm here.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Dennis.

Gloria Stickwan, we just heard you the invocation, thank you for that.

Angela Totemoff.

MS. TOTEMOFF: Good morning, present.

0003

1 MS. PERRY: Good morning.

2

3 Donna Claus.

4

5 MS. CLAUS: I'm here.

6

7 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Donna.

8

9 Andy McLaughlin.

10

11 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Good morning, I'm
12 here.

13

14 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Andy.

15

16 Judy Caminer.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 MS. PERRY: Oh, Judy, I didn't hear you
21 on the phone but I can see you on Teams.

22

23 MS. CAMINER: I'm here.

24

25 MS. PERRY: Still not hearing you.

26

27 MS. CAMINER: I hit star six and it
28 says mute is off but.....

29

30 MS. PERRY: Now I hear you.

31

32 MS. CAMINER: Okay, thanks, good
33 morning.

34

35 MS. PERRY: Maybe there was just a
36 delay.

37

38 MS. CAMINER: Thank you.

39

40 MS. PERRY: Aaron Bloomquist.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair and Council.
45 Aaron was on a hunt, he had hoped he could be back
46 before the meeting but I checked in yesterday and it
47 looks like he is not going to be able to attend.

48

49 John Whissel.

50

0004

1 MR. WHISSEL: I'm here.

2

3 MS. PERRY: Thanks, John.

4

5 Paula Nicklie.

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 MS. PERRY: And, Paula, did she say she
10 would probably not be able to join us before 4:30 this
11 afternoon, she is working today. So hopefully we will
12 be able to hear her later today.

13

14 Okay, Mr. Chair, that's 11 of your
15 seated members are presented and you have a quorum.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, thank
18 you, DeAnna, that's great. Okay, I want to welcome
19 everyone. There's a whole slew of people here, when I
20 picked up the phone I heard like 35 and I'd imagine
21 there's 40. There's a couple things, I welcome
22 everyone and I hope we could stay on task today. We
23 will, we've got a couple days and we'll have plenty of
24 time for everyone to do testimony at their designated
25 time. There's a couple of other things I do want to
26 say before we get started too far into our meeting.

27

28 I would like to -- I found out
29 yesterday that our previous Chairman, Ralph Lohse,
30 passed, and I was very saddened to hear that, and he
31 was a very strong advocate of subsistence, he lived a
32 good subsistence life and he's truly going to be missed
33 and so our condolences to his family and I'd just take
34 one minute here and give him a moment of silence and
35 thought.

36

37 Thank you.

38

39 (Moment of Silence)

40

41 (Teleconference interference -
42 participants not muted)

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
45 Obviously that was somebody listening but not muted.

46

47 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, are you still
48 there.

49

50

0005

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, DeAnna.

2

3 MS. PERRY: Okay, you're coming up a
4 little broken up and I lost you for a minute.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I don't
7 know, this isn't the greatest so we're going to all
8 have to be patient with these, it's kind of a tough way
9 to do a meeting with that many people but we'll do our
10 best.

11

12 Yeah, I just wanted to finish the
13 welcome and we're going to do the introductions. So
14 you did call the roll. I'm not sure how you want to do
15 introductions, DeAnna, if you want to go through
16 everyone who called in, or how you'd like to do that
17 but let's go ahead, I welcome everyone, and let's go
18 ahead and do all the introductions.

19

20 (Teleconference interference -
21 participants not muted - several - lots of
22 interference)

23

24 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Let
25 me go ahead and take a little bit of a roll call with
26 Staff perhaps, first, and then we'll go to the lines
27 for anyone else who's on. Again, it's a virtual
28 meeting and we all know these are quite challenging so
29 unfortunately that means I get to talk a lot more than
30 I normally do, but hopefully that makes a good clear
31 record and we're able to capture attendants and who's
32 participated.

33

34 (Teleconference interference -
35 participants not muted - several - lots of
36 interference)

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: So I'll first
39 start out with roll call with Staff that may be on and
40 that might help instead of just saying who's on and 50
41 people talk at once. So let me start with.....

42

43 REPORTER: Hey, DeAnna, this is the
44 court reporter. Can we please remind everybody to mute
45 their phone.

46

47 (Teleconference interference -
48 participants not muted - several - lots of
49 interference)

50

0006

1 MS. PERRY: Again, for those who are
2 just joining us, please make sure that your phone is
3 muted by either a mute button or star six. If you are
4 joining us on Teams you should be muted already, if
5 not, please go up to the top and hit the little
6 microphone until it has a slash through it. Again, we
7 have to have a dedicated phone line for court reporting
8 purposes, it's one of our requirements under FACA. So
9 we realize this is a little cumbersome but that's how
10 we can work around that. So, again, trying to mitigate
11 any of the feedback, please keep yourself on mute until
12 you're ready to speak and always keep yourself muted on
13 Teams and we'll try to keep on top of the Teams mute as
14 well, so, thank you.

15
16 All right, so Ameer Howard, are you with
17 us this morning.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 MS. PERRY: Barbara Cellarius.

22
23 MS. CELLARIUS: Good morning, Barbara's
24 here.

25
26 MS. PERRY: Good morning.

27
28 Ben Mulligan.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 MS. PERRY: Ben, are you with us, I see
33 you on Teams but I don't hear your audio.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 MS. PERRY: Okay, maybe he had to step
38 away. Brie Darr.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 MS. PERRY: Brian Ubelaker.

43
44 MR. UBELAKER: Good morning, DeAnna,
45 this is Brian.

46
47 MS. PERRY: Good morning.

48
49 Brent Vickers.

50

0007

1 MR. VICKERS: Good morning, this is
2 Brent. Hello everyone, looking forward to a good
3 meeting.

4
5 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Brent. And
6 Brent is our leadership team lead for our meeting.

7
8 Brett Christianson.

9
10 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Good morning, this
11 is Brett.

12
13 MS. PERRY: Good morning.

14
15 Caroline Ketron.

16
17 MS. KETRON: Hi, this is Caroline.

18
19 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Caroline.

20
21 Chris McKee.

22
23 MR. MCKEE: Good morning, this is
24 Chris.

25
26 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Chris.

27
28 Dave Sarafin.

29
30 MR. SARAFIN: Yes, good morning. This
31 is Dave Sarafin, the Fisheries Biologist at Wrangell-
32 St. Elias.

33
34 MS. PERRY: Good morning, thanks, Dave.

35
36 Dana Kuhns.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 MS. PERRY: Francisco Sanchez.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 MS. PERRY: How about George Pappas.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 MS. PERRY: Glenn Chen.

49
50

0008

1 (No comments)

2

3 MS. PERRY: Greg Risdahl.

4

5 MR. RISDAHL: Good morning, DeAnna,
6 this is Greg. I'm here.

7

8 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Greg. And I
9 do realize you have to step out here in about an hour
10 or so for a little bit.

11

12 Hannah Voorhees.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 MS. PERRY: Heather Sam.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 MS. PERRY: Jarred Stone.

21

22 MR. STONE: Good morning, DeAnna.
23 Fisheries Biologist with Office of Subsistence
24 Management.

25

26 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Jarred.

27

28 Jill Klein.

29

30 MS. KLEIN: Good morning, DeAnna. This
31 is Jill. And just for everybody, I'm the new Regional
32 Subsistence Coordinator for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
33 Service. Good morning.

34

35 MS. PERRY: Thanks for sharing that
36 Jill.
37 Yeah, and as we go through this list I assumed you'd
38 all go ahead and mention your titles as well so please
39 do that.

40

41 John Kinsler.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 MS. PERRY: Jordan Reimer.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 MS. PERRY: Judy Putera.

50

0009

1 (No comments)

2

3 MS. PERRY: Katya Wessels.

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 MS. PERRY: Ken Gates.

8

9 MR. GATES: Yeah, good morning, DeAnna.

10 This is Ken Gates with the Kenai Fish and Wildlife

11 Conservation Office in Soldotna, Alaska.

12

13 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Ken.

14

15 Kendra Holman.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 MS. PERRY: Kim Yochum.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 MS. PERRY: Lisa Grediagin.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 MS. PERRY: Mark Burch.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 MS. PERRY: Mark Miller.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 MS. PERRY: Marney Graham.

36

37 MR. BURCH: Oh, good morning, this is

38 Mark Burch. I had hit the wrong button, sorry about

39 that.

40

41 MS. PERRY: Good to hear you, Mark,

42 thank you. Let's see Milo Burcham.

43

44 MR. BURCHAM: Yes, Milo Burcham,

45 Chugach National Forest, I'm here.

46

47 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Milo.

48

49 Pat Petrivelli.

50

0010

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: Good morning. This is
2 Pat Petrivelli, BIA, Anthropologist out of Anchorage.

3
4 MS. PERRY: Good morning.

5
6 Pippa Kenner.

7
8 MS. KENNER: Hi DeAnna.

9
10 MS. PERRY: Good morning.

11
12 Robbin LaVine.

13
14 MS. LAVINE: Good morning, DeAnna.
15 This is Robbin LaVine, the new Subsistence Policy
16 Coordinator at OSM. Glad to be with you all, good
17 morning.

18
19 MS. PERRY: Good morning. And I see
20 your bright shiny smiling face. All right, Rosalie
21 Debenham.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 MS. PERRY: Stephanie Latimer.

26
27 MS. LATIMER: Hi, DeAnna, this is
28 Stephanie.

29
30 (Teleconference interference -
31 participants not muted)

32
33 MS. PERRY: And for those of you who
34 might remember the name, Stephanie helped us out, I
35 call her the Teams Guru, she's the person behind the
36 curtain making everything work on Teams so that I can
37 fully focus on the facilitator stuff. So thank you to
38 Stephanie and to the Chugach Supervisory Office that
39 let her come be with us for a couple days, appreciate
40 that.

41
42 Steve Namitz.

43
44 MR. NAMITZ: Yeah, good morning. Steve
45 Namitz, U.S. Forest Service, District Ranger here out
46 of Cordova.

47
48 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Steve.

49
50

0011

1 Sue Detwiler.

2

3 (Teleconference interference -
4 participants not muted)

5

6 MS. PERRY: I'm sorry, Sue, was that
7 you.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 MS. PERRY: Oh, I think that was
12 feedback.

13

14 Todd Eskelin.

15

16 MR. ESKELIN: Good morning, DeAnna.
17 Todd Eskelin, Biologist, Kenai National Wildlife
18 Refuge.

19

20 MS. PERRY: Good to see your smiling
21 face as well Todd.

22

23 Tom Plank.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 MS. PERRY: Valerie Lenhartzen.

28

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 MS. PERRY: And Victoria Florey.

33

34 MS. FLOREY: Good morning. This is
35 Victoria, National Park Service Subsistence Program.

36

37 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Victoria.

38

39 And those are the folks that I have on
40 my list who possibly might be here. And I just want to
41 make sure that I haven't missed anyone. So is there
42 anyone from an agency or in a Staff role that I haven't
43 called, so I can make sure I jot down your name as
44 being at the meeting.

45

46 MR. LIND: Camai. Camai DeAnna. Good
47 morning, this is Orville Lind, Native Liaison. Looking
48 forward to a very respectful and effective meeting
49 today and days to come. Good morning everybody.

50

0012

1 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Orville. And I
2 think there was also someone else.

3
4 MS. HATCHER: This is Heidi Hatcher.
5 The Glennallen area Wildlife Biologist for the Alaska
6 Department of Fish and Game.

7
8 MS. PERRY: And Heidi, I'm sorry, I
9 didn't get -- I got the ADF&G part, but did you say
10 Glennallen.

11
12 MS. HATCHER: Heidi Hatcher, correct,
13 Glennallen wildlife.

14
15 MS. PERRY: I can type much faster than
16 I can longhand write. Thank you, Heidi. Anyone else.

17
18 SEVERAL PEOPLE: (Indiscernible)

19
20 MS. KEATING: Jackie Keating, Division
21 of Subsistence with the Alaska Department of Fish and
22 Game.

23
24 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Jackie.

25
26 MS. WESTING: This is Charlotte
27 Westing. I'm the Wildlife Biologist in Cordova, Alaska
28 with Fish and Game.

29
30 MS. PERRY: All right. Anyone else.

31
32 (Teleconference interference -
33 participants not muted)

34
35 MS. MCDONALD: Yeah, this is Leanne
36 McDonald out of Bureau of Land Management, Wildlife
37 Biologist in Glennallen.

38
39 MS. PERRY: Okay, thank you, Leanne.

40
41 MR. MILLER: Odin Miller,
42 Anthropologist Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission.

43
44 MS. PERRY: I'm sorry, I didn't get the
45 full name. Could I ask you to repeat that for me.

46
47 MR. MILLER: Odin, O-D-I-N Miller, M-I-
48 L-L-E-R.

49
50

0013

1 MS. PERRY: Odin, okay. Sorry, I think
2 I'm not getting the best reception and I didn't get
3 your name. All right, thanks, Odin, glad you're here.

4
5 MR. MILLER: Hello.

6
7 MR. HERREMAN: Jason Herreman, Alaska
8 Department of Fish and Game, Wildlife Biologist in
9 (indiscernible - cuts out)

10
11 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Jason.

12
13 MR. FOWLER: And Nick Fowler, Kenai area
14 Wildlife Biologist based in Soldotna.

15
16 MS. PERRY: Good to see you, Nick.

17
18 MS. SAM: This is Heather Sam with the
19 Chugach National Forest with the Subsistence Program.

20
21 MS. PERRY: Hi, Heather.

22
23 MR. RINALDI: Hi, this is Todd Rinaldi.
24 I'm the Regional Management Coordinator for Division of
25 Wildlife Conservation out of Region 4.

26
27 MS. PERRY: Great, Todd, thank you.
28 Any other Staff.

29
30 MR. MORRIS: Good morning. This is Andy
31 Morris with Forest Service Law Enforcement, Cordova
32 Ranger District.

33
34 MS. PERRY: Great, thank you, Andy.

35
36 MR. BRENDLY: This is John Brendly
37 (ph). Patrol Captain on the Chugach National Forest,
38 Law Enforcement Program.

39
40 MS. PERRY: Great, welcome. Anybody
41 else on Staff from an agency that we haven't called
42 yet.

43
44 MR. SIMON: Good morning, DeAnna. Jim
45 Simon with the Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission.

46
47 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Jim.

48
49 Okay. We have everyone on Staff, if we
50

0014

1 have we'll move on to the public but I just want to
2 make sure that we've received everybody on Staff.

3

4

(No comments)

5

6

7 MS. PERRY: Okay. So I know that many
8 Staff, including ADF&G and other agencies are covering
9 three RAC meetings this week so we're going to have to
10 do the best we can. I'll do my part to try to give
11 folks a head's up, I know a lot of these folks will be
12 pinging in and out of all the meetings so we appreciate
13 your time and your flexibility with that. This kind of
14 came about because we thought we would be having a
15 joint meeting with Eastern Interior on a fish proposal
16 and so the resources would be combined for that one day
17 and it would be like only having one RAC meeting. And
18 then when we found out how many wildlife proposals we
19 had we decided to move the fish proposal to the winter
20 meeting so we can make sure that it gets all the
21 attention it deserves and so that, unfortunately, made
22 it three RAC meetings in a week which we hardly ever
23 do. So apologies to Staff, we know we've got you
24 running but thank you for being flexible for that.

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

I would now like to ask if we have other participants, folks from the public who are online, and so that we don't have everybody speaking all at once I'll kind of try to do this in little alphabetical groups. I'd like for each of you to state and spell your name so that we could capture that for the transcript, any agency or group or community you represent or live in. And then, if you would, please let me know if you plan on speaking to a proposal or providing any testimony during the meeting. Normally, when we're all in person we ask everyone to fill out a little blue card and that tells us that we have people who want to do testimony, in the virtual world it's not that visual. So if we can get a head's up that really helps us make sure that when we get to that proposal nothing falls through the cracks.

So, again, if you could identify yourself when I kind of call out your group, let us know what community or what group you represent and if you'd like to make testimony on any proposal.

So let's start out if your last name starts with A through G. Why don't we start with that group, go ahead and identify yourself. Again, if your

0015

1 last name starts A through G.

2

3 MR. DOCKEN: Yeah, this is Nick Docken,
4 that's D-O-C-K-E-N. I'm going to speak on the Wildlife
5 Proposal 22-14 increasing black bear harvest limit.

6

7 MS. PERRY: Okay, Nick, and I've got
8 you down for testimony.

9

10 MS. BRUMMER: This is Christine
11 Brummer. My last name is B as in Boy, R-U-M as in
12 Michael, M as in Mary, E-R, and I'm just a public
13 member and I'm not planning on talking today. Thank
14 you.

15

16 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Christine.
17 Welcome. Any other public online with the last name A
18 through G.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 MS. PERRY: All right, how about anyone
23 who's last name starts H through O.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 MS. PERRY: Any public or tribal
28 members with the last name H through O who would like
29 to identify themselves.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 MS. PERRY: Okay. How about anyone
34 with a last name P, that's in P as in Paul through T, T
35 as in Tom. I your last name starts with P through T,
36 please identify yourselves at this time.

37

38 MR. SCHMALZER: This is Dan Schmalzer
39 from Cordova. I'll be speaking on Wildlife Proposal
40 22-14. My last name is spelled S-C-H-M-A-L-Z-E-R.

41

42 MS. PERRY: Great, thank you very much,
43 Dan, appreciate the spelling there. And anyone else P
44 through T, your last name starts P through T.

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 MS. PERRY: And how about anyone else
49 that we haven't gotten to yet so that would be if your
50

0016

1 last name starts with U through Z, or if I've missed
2 you earlier. Anyone else online from the public to
3 identify themselves.

4

5 MR. WILLIAMS: Hi, DeAnna, this is
6 Darrel Williams from Ninilchik Traditional Council, D-
7 A-R-R-E-L W-I-L-L-I-A-M-S. I'll be giving a fisheries
8 report for the tribe and I'll be speaking to several
9 proposals that are associated with Unit 15.

10

11 MS. PERRY: Okay, thanks, Darrel. Unit
12 15 proposals and agency report on fish when we get to
13 those for Ninilchik. All right, and I believe there
14 was someone else that was speaking also.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 MS. PERRY: Okay. So just a reminder
19 about the public testimony. Public testimony will be
20 solicited through the meeting and, of course, the Chair
21 will announce all those times that they're available.
22 Usually, again, we have those sign-in sheets so I will
23 have this list and help the Chair call on you when we
24 get to those proposals but if someone joins us later
25 just make sure that you speak clearly, and identify
26 yourself so that the Chair can recognize you.
27 Sometimes it's really hard to hear on the phone but
28 we'll do our best to keep listening and we do have
29 Staff listening as well that can shoot us a text if
30 we're not hearing someone.

31

32 Okay. Mr. Chair, with your indulgence
33 I'll just go over some housekeeping items and we'll get
34 those out of the way so we can get underway with our
35 meeting.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, DeAnna,
38 thank you.

39

40 MS. PERRY: Okay. Again, for those
41 just joining this is the Southcentral Subsistence
42 Regional Advisory Council meeting. The agenda and the
43 meeting materials can be found online on the Federal
44 Subsistence Program website and that address is
45 www.doi.gov/subsistence and then hit the regions tab
46 and then go into Southcentral.....

47

48 (Teleconference interference -
49 participants not muted)

50

0017

1 MS. PERRY:region and one of those
2 boxes will say meeting materials.

3
4 All audio for our administrative record
5 is being taken by teleconference. For those of you,
6 again, that's just joined us on the videoconference
7 platform, you'll need to still call the teleconference
8 number displayed earlier 1-866-617-1530 and the
9 passcode's 63629472.

10
11 Our meetings are conducted by Robert's
12 Rules and it's challenging to hold these public
13 meetings in a virtual world, and as the designated
14 Federal official for these meetings it's extremely
15 challenging for me so I'll remind everybody of a few of
16 the guidelines for these public meetings so that we can
17 strive for a successful mood meeting. All
18 participants, Council, Staff and public members should
19 be courteous and respectful in all of our interactions.
20 Please wait to speak until you're recognized by the
21 Chair. Again, so we don't have a lot of crosstalk so
22 that the transcriptionist can make sure that she is
23 adequately recording who said what. It's sometimes,
24 again, hard to hear, just keep trying and all Staff
25 will try to help us keep on top of that as well. Make
26 sure that you reflect your name as soon as you speak,
27 and the spelling of your name, again, for the
28 transcription. While you're on the conference call,
29 and this is really, really important, please put your
30 phone and your microphone on the videoconference on
31 mute. If your telephone does not have a mute button
32 hit star six and that will automatically mute you, and
33 when you're ready to speak just hit star six again and
34 then say your name and try to get the Chair's
35 attention. But that's really important in the virtual
36 world with so many participants so that there's not a
37 lot of crosstalk again, because we do have the burden
38 of making sure our administrative record, our
39 transcript is all accurate, and that helps with that.
40 Remember, also, that these proceedings are being
41 recorded. Sometimes I think in the virtual world,
42 we're hanging out on the phone for eight hours and we
43 have a comment that maybe we didn't want everyone to
44 hear and we certainly didn't want it to go into an
45 administrative record so just keep that in mind, star
46 six, make sure you're on mute and that's for everybody,
47 not just the public, but agencies, you know, sometimes
48 we're sitting in our offices and somebody comes in and
49 the next thing you know the entire Council is hearing
50

0018

1 about what your dog did yesterday and, although, that
2 might be entertaining that does interrupt the meeting.
3 So we'll ask you to be cognizant of that. Also please
4 don't place us on hold, especially if you're with an
5 agency because as we know we have that really lovely
6 Muzak that comes on when you place us on hold and that
7 will pretty much shut down our meeting. We will not be
8 able to have the meeting if someone has placed us on
9 hold and there's some Muzak going. So, again, I just
10 wanted to give a couple of those teleconference and
11 videoconference basics just to remind us all of some of
12 the etiquettes that hopefully will allow for a smoother
13 meeting.

14
15 There is an announcement for the
16 opportunity of written public comments, which I'll make
17 now. At the beginning of each day there's an
18 opportunity to provide testimony on non-agenda items.
19 The Council Chair will announce these opportunities.
20 And, again, this is for non-agenda items, this isn't
21 for testimony on proposals or agency reports, we really
22 try to limit it to non-agenda items and then receive
23 testimony on proposals or agency report information
24 where it falls naturally in the agenda, especially
25 comments on proposals, because they'll be fresh in the
26 mind of the Council when they start their
27 deliberations.

28
29 That being said, there's an opportunity
30 to provide oral comments on wildlife proposals and
31 closure reviews during the time that the analyst
32 presents proposal analysis. The order of receiving
33 comment is outlined on Page 24 of your meeting book and
34 the Council Chair will be calling for the public oral
35 testimony when we get to, I believe it's No. 5 or 6, so
36 for those of you who have access to our book, you can
37 follow along that way. And I know from our meeting
38 book that there are several written public comments
39 submitted on these proposals so we're anticipating
40 there will be a fair amount of public testimony as well
41 and so depending on that, the Chair and Council may
42 need to limit public testimony just to make sure
43 everybody has a fair chance of making a comment. We do
44 only have two days for our meeting and we have over, I
45 think, 30 wildlife proposals in addition to other
46 business. So I will try to help keep us going.

47
48 And then the last thing about public
49 comments is an opportunity to submit written public
50

0019

1 comments on these proposals. The first time is when
2 the proposal book first came out and then that closed,
3 I believe it was July 19th. Now, we're in the second
4 opportunity to provide public comment. And so if you
5 have a written public comment, you can email it to
6 subsistence@fws.gov. So that's subsistence@ Frank
7 Whiskey Sam.gov. fws.gov. And please clearly indicate
8 the number of the proposal or closure review you are
9 commenting on in the title of the email. These
10 comments need to be emailed prior to the proposal
11 you're commenting on. And at the time that the analyst
12 brings up that particular proposal no more written
13 public comments will be received. IF we have less than
14 10 written comments received, we'll read those into the
15 record, if more than 10 written comments are received
16 they'll be tallied and we'll do a quick summary and
17 present that to the Council prior to their
18 deliberations.

19

20 I know that was a lot of talking but,
21 again, a lot of these reminders are good to set the
22 stage and get us off on a nice efficient foot.

23

24 So, Mr. Chair, thank you for indulging
25 all my announcements and I will hand it over to you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, DeAnna,
28 thank you. I think we got through most of the
29 introductions. Hopefully we covered everyone. When we
30 did go through a roll call we didn't introduce or let
31 each of the Council members tell us a little bit about
32 themselves but they're going to do that under their
33 Council member reports so I'll ask them to give their
34 name and talk under there. So I think we got the
35 instructions.

36

37 We're on No. 5, that's the adoption of
38 the agenda and so the Chair is looking for adoption of
39 the agenda as presented.

40

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

42

43 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John
44 Whissel. I move to adopt the agenda.

45

46 MS. SELANOFF: This is Diane Selanoff,
47 I second.

48

49 NUMEROUS PEOPLE TALKING

50

0020

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We kind of got
2 several people talking.

3

4 MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair. I wanted to
5 add a few Alaska Board of Game proposals.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I got a motion on
8 the floor to adopt the agenda but I didn't have -- and
9 then we'll go back to Gloria, I overheard you speaking
10 on the Board something but I got a motion on the floor --
11 is there a second to adopting the agenda.

12

13 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is Ed.

14

15 MS. TOTEMOFF: This is Angela Totemoff,
16 I'll second.

17

18 MS. STICKWAN: But it was about the
19 agenda.

20

21 MR. HOLSTON: I'll second.

22

23 MS. STICKWAN: That was about the
24 agenda.

25

26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I got about three
27 people talking at the same time there so I'm not sure
28 who they are.

29

30 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is Ed, I
31 second that motion.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ed.
34 Okay, discussion. I think, Gloria, you had a question
35 on the agenda.

36

37 MS. STICKWAN: I wanted to add
38 something to the agenda but you already passed it.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I got it
41 adopt and a second, we haven't approved it yet so it's
42 the pleasure of the Council, we.....

43

44 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to.....

45

46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:could modify
47 it and make it a motion and second to include it,
48 Gloria.

49

50

0021

1 MS. STICKWAN: Board of Game proposals,
2 some of them.

3
4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Board of
5 Game proposals coming up is what I think I.....

6
7 MS. STICKWAN: I'll email it.....

8
9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:hear
10 what.....

11
12 MS. STICKWAN: I'll email it to DeAnna.

13
14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

15
16 MS. STICKWAN: The ones I want.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, is that
19 okay with John and Ed.

20
21 MR. WHISSEL: I'm not sure what we're
22 -- we're adding a discussion on upcoming State Board of
23 Game proposals.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's my
26 understanding, she wants to send a few in and I'm not
27 sure which ones and she wants to add it to our agenda.
28 I'm not even sure which ones.

29
30 MR. WHISSEL: Are we talking about
31 sending comments in to Board of Game proposals?

32
33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All I heard is
34 she wants to put some in, some.....

35
36 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:some new
39 ones.

40
41 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.

42
43 MR. WHISSEL: Okay. We can discuss
44 Board of Game proposals. I'd be more comfortable if we
45 knew which ones we were talking about.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well,
48 Gloria's going to.....

49
50

0022

1 MR. WHISSEL: It's okay.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:email them
4 and we can get.....

5

6 MR. WHISSEL: It's okay.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:them put on
9 our agenda somewhere. I got a motion to adopt the
10 agenda with an amendment of putting some Board of Game
11 proposals upcoming that Gloria's going to send in,
12 seconded by Ed. Any other discussion.

13

14 MR. WHISSEL: Call for the question.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none,
17 I'll.....

18

19 MS. TOTEMOFF: Mr. Chair, this is
20 Angela Totemoff.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

23

24 MS. TOTEMOFF: Is there a deadline to
25 submit proposals for discussion?

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I don't know for
28 discussion, I think we're going to review them but,
29 yeah, DeAnna, could you tell us how we should properly
30 put that.

31

32 MS. PERRY: Well, the easiest way would
33 be for John to, with the concurrence of the second,
34 amend his motion to adopt the agenda to include the
35 Board of Game proposals that Gloria would like to put
36 on the agenda. And it would be preferable if Gloria
37 could at least give us the numbers of those proposals
38 otherwise the Council is kind of voting blind on them.
39 Gloria, do you have a list. I know you're going to
40 email them but could you at least give us the numbers.

41

42 MS. STICKWAN: Proposal 210 -- can you
43 hear me, Proposal 210.

44

45 MS. PERRY: Okay.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Got that.

48

49 MS. STICKWAN: Proposal 211.

50

0023

1 MS. PERRY: Okay.

2

3 MS. STICKWAN: Proposal 213.

4

5 MS. PERRY: Okay.

6

7 MS. STICKWAN: And I think that's about
8 it.

9

10 MS. PERRY: Okay, that's three.

11

12 MS. STICKWAN: Three proposals, that's
13 it.

14

15 MS. PERRY: Okay. So, Mr. Chair, if
16 John would like to, with the concurrence of the second,
17 amend his motion to adopt to include adding Board of
18 Game Proposals 210, 222, and 213, that would be my
19 suggestion on how to move forward and then vote.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. John and
22 Ed, do you agree for 210, 11 and 13.

23

24 MR. WHISSEL: Yes, Sir, this is John
25 Whissel, I'll agree to amend my motion.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
28 Ed.

29

30 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is Ed. I go
31 along with that, thank you.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. One last
34 question before I take a vote, DeAnna, where are we
35 going to put it on the agenda.

36

37 MS. PERRY: It would need to go under
38 new business. This Council's not discussed the Board
39 of Game proposals, we did Board of Fish at the last
40 meeting, but not Board of Game, so I would suggest it
41 be the last item under new business which would be G,
42 so that would fall under F, 11F, it would become 11G,
43 Board of Game proposal discussion on 210, 211 and 213.
44 Mr. Chair.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Okay, I
47 think we got it cleared up. So all in favor of the
48 motion and second, discussion, say aye.

49

50

0024

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any Council
4 members opposed.

5

6 (No opposing votes)

7

8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, it
9 passed and it'll be under G, No. 11. Thank you. We'll
10 go ahead, we got the agenda approved with the
11 modification. So I'm ready to review and approve the
12 previous minutes on Page 5 they start.

13

14 (Teleconference interference -
15 participants not muted - several)

16

17 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, I move to.....

18

19 MS. TOTEMOFF: Mr. Chair, this is
20 Angela Totemoff.

21

22 MR. WHISSEL:approve the
23 minutes.....

24

25 MS. TOTEMOFF: I move to approve.....

26

27 MR. WHISSEL:from the March
28 2021.....

29

30 MS. TOTEMOFF:the minutes of.....

31

32 MR. WHISSEL:meeting.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Is that you John?

35

36 MR. WHISSEL: I'm sorry, the February
37 2021 meeting.

38

39 MS. TOTEMOFF: This is Angela.....

40

41 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Second.

42

43 MS. TOTEMOFF:Totemoff, second.

44

45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Angela, go ahead.

46

47 MS. TOTEMOFF: I was just seconding the
48 motion, Mr. Chairman.

49

50

0025

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: It's been moved
2 and seconded. Moved by John, seconded by Angela. Any
3 other discussion, any questions on the minutes.

4
5 (No comments)

6
7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, all
8 in favor, aye.

9
10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Opposed.

13
14 (No opposing votes)

15
16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing no
17 opposition, the minutes are approved. Okay, very good.
18 Okay, now we're going to go ahead and move into Council
19 member reports and I think what we'll do is we'll just
20 go down our roster and we'll start at the top of the
21 roster and let each one of you give your reports.

22
23 So, Ed, you're on the top there if you
24 want to start with your report, please.

25
26 MR. HOLSTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
27 Yep, this is Ed Holston, Cooper Landing. A little
28 reflection on last summer, we had a very strong first
29 and second run of sockeye salmon. Most of the
30 subsistence users that dipnetted up at the falls had a
31 successful season. Other than that it was another
32 warm, unseasonably warm spring and summer. We had
33 another large, very large bug, beetle flight, it's
34 about the third or fourth year, it's almost like beetle
35 apocalypse now. A lot of dead trees. A lot of people
36 concerned about potential fire risk in Cooper Landing.

37
38 That's about all I have to say, thank
39 you.

40
41 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair. We're still
42 getting quite a bit of an echo.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I could
45 hear it, yeah.

46
47 MS. PERRY: So I just want to make sure
48 that everybody has their mute on when they're not
49 speaking. I'm wondering if one device is feeding off
50

0026

1 another device and that's where we're getting the echo.
2 So it could be some external speakers. If you have
3 external speakers plugged up, just make sure that your
4 phone is muted so that we're not getting that echo
5 back. I've been hearing it for quite a few minutes now
6 and if we could troubleshoot that, that would help.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, thanks,
11 DeAnna. I heard it also so -- it sounds better right
12 now hopefully it stays that way. Okay, Michael, are
13 you on the phone.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Seldovia, Michael
18 are you there.

19

20 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair. Michael did
21 have to step away. I have a note from him but he
22 should be back shortly so maybe we can get his member
23 report a little later.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Sounds
26 good. Let's go ahead to move to Diane Selanoff.

27

28 MS. SELANOFF: Good morning, this is
29 Diane Selanoff. This summer was -- our salmon was
30 really slow. You know, I was getting very concerned in
31 August about where the pinks were at but they
32 eventually did come in and finally did come in in some
33 abundance, and in some cases some of the salmon were
34 almost nonexistent. For example, the chum or dogs were
35 like almost nonexistent. There were a few out there
36 but not like in the past. Although the interesting
37 thing is, kings were in abundance because people were
38 up fishing for silvers. They were, you know, catching
39 kings by rod and reel, which is unusual and in the
40 abundance they were.

41

42 And I was just made aware that there's
43 a lot of squid in the, especially the Valdez Bay, where
44 people are going out and catching like five gallon
45 buckets full with a rod and reel. So that's a huge
46 surprise.

47

48 Although it seems that the deer (ph)
49 season has been going great but -- well, yeah, that's
50

0027

1 all I had.

2

3

Thank you.

4

5 (Teleconference interference -
6 participants not muted - several)

7

8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Is Dennis there
9 now.

10

11 MR. ZADRA: Yes, I'm here. I hope I
12 didn't miss anything. But, yeah, can everyone hear me.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hear you fine,
15 Dennis.

16

17 MR. ZADRA: Okay, great. I guess the
18 report from down here in Cordova, we did had a very
19 dismal run, especially early season on the Copper for
20 the commercial fleet. We were only allowed 36 hours
21 for the entire early run and so it was pretty
22 devastating. We did get subsistence opportunities when
23 we weren't able to fish commercially, and so people did
24 go out and were able to get their fish. But overall
25 the health of the Copper River does not seem to be very
26 good.

27

28 It seemed to be a pretty decent berry
29 year. It seems the bears are doing good.

30

31 I guess a comment on the goat hunting
32 was pretty good this year as well and so -- and deer
33 hunting seems to be good so far. So everything is
34 doing well except for the salmon on the Copper River.

35

36 That's all I got.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thanks, Dennis.
39 Yeah, unfortunately we're seeing a lot of that lately.
40 Thank you for your report. Go ahead, Gloria, you want
41 to go ahead and give your report.

42

43 MS. STICKWAN: We had a Wrangell-St.
44 Elias meeting on October 5th and 6th and Barbara
45 Cellarius will give our comments on the proposals when
46 we talk about the Federal proposals.

47

48 This summer, as you said, for our fish
49 for kings and sockeyes were low, low runs again this

50

0028

1 year. Probably won't meet the king salmon escapement
2 goal and sockeyes was just barely met.

3
4 We had a bear mauling in Wrangell-St.
5 Elias.....

6
7 (Teleconference interference -
8 participants not muted - several - echoing overriding
9 speaker)

10
11 MS. STICKWAN: Other than that it was a
12 good summer weather -- that's it, thank you.

13
14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
15 Gloria.

16
17 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

18
19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, go ahead.

20
21 MS. PERRY: This is DeAnna. I noticed,
22 Mr. Chair, when you turned on your camera a moment ago
23 the echo got really loud so I'm wondering if maybe your
24 computer speakers are on.

25
26 (Teleconference interference -
27 participants not muted - echoing overriding speaker)

28
29 MS. PERRY: Did you turn the speakers
30 off, and so all your audio is on your telephone.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, I'll
33 doublecheck. I thought it was off but we'll check it.

34
35 MS. PERRY: Okay. Yeah, we're still
36 getting quite an echo so I don't know if maybe someone
37 has their phone attached to some external speakers in
38 some manner but it's quite -- there's quite an echo.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I can hear
41 it too.

42
43 MR. WHISSEL: DeAnna, could you --
44 could whoever's in charge of the meeting universally
45 mute everybody on Zoom and then computer speakers won't
46 matter.

47
48 MS. PERRY: I think that has already
49 been done. I see people will pop themselves off
50

0029

1 occasionally so we are kind of keeping an eye on that.
2 But it's almost like someone has their microphone open
3 and when somebody else is speaking there's this
4 feedback so it might not necessarily be the Teams, it
5 may be that they plugged it into their computer just to
6 use the external speaker. So, yeah, again, if we could
7 all make sure that we're on mute when we're not
8 speaking, that way if you are listening through your
9 external speakers that's not going to come back on to
10 your phone and out into what we're listening to.

11

12 So I'm not hearing it right now, well a
13 little, but thank you, sorry for the interruption, Mr.
14 Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, I
17 disconnected my Teams so we'll see what happens there.
18 But, anyway, let's go ahead, Angela, do you want to go
19 next.

20

21 MS. TOTEMOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
22 Can you hear me okay.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I can hear you
25 good.

26

27 MS. TOTEMOFF: Okay. So reporting for
28 the Tatitlek area and the Prince William Sound. Again,
29 we had a cold and rainy summer and just mirroring what
30 everybody else has said. Our fish runs were pretty low
31 as well. We were actually pretty hopeful in April when
32 herring came for the first time in a long time,
33 however, our seaweed beds aren't where they're supposed
34 to be, so even though we did have some herring there,
35 the seaweed beds weren't there to help them, you know,
36 spawn in the right areas. So they spawned really deep
37 down into the water so it wasn't a very successful
38 season.

39

40 And just following with kings and red,
41 they were pretty limited as well as into the fall with
42 silvers. Humpies were also -- our pinks were very late
43 this year coming into the streams so that was
44 interesting.

45

46 Another thing that they noticed was
47 there's a ton of seagulls and an obnoxious amount of
48 seagulls that were coming into the area in the middle
49 of the summer, so July area as well as crows, and oddly
50

0030

1 enough the eagle count was a little bit down is what
2 they were noticing.

3

4 In terms of game, they were getting a
5 lot of -- I don't know if whales fall into the game
6 area but they were getting more whale sightings which
7 is also pretty interesting. Bears were coming closer
8 to the community, which is something that doesn't
9 happen very often, as well as porcupines. So all that
10 was pretty interesting that they were seeing more
11 sightings of those.

12

13 Deer season is -- we're right in the
14 middle of that, coming to the end of that, I guess.
15 And it's doing really well.

16

17 Our berries, because of the cold
18 weather, were a pretty sad sight. Salmonberries, even
19 at the end of their season, were still pretty green and
20 they came in kind of miss-happened. So that was
21 interesting to observe. Blueberries, of course were
22 pretty small, not as big and plump as they normally
23 were. Same with highbush cranberries, hard to find.
24 And then interesting the one berry that did do really
25 well was the current this year. So that's what we
26 observed in that part of the Prince William Sound.

27

28 We didn't do a ton of hunting in the
29 Anchorage area unfortunately but we did do a couple of
30 berry -- berry picking sessions up in Hatcher Pass and
31 that seemed to be okay. It's not like -- it's not like
32 Prince William Sound berries but they were good.

33

34 And that's all I've got, Mr. Chair.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
37 Angela. Thank you. Next, what about Donna.

38

39 MS. CLAUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
40 In the middle of the Wrangell-St. Elias where we are
41 there was incredible amounts of rain. We're usually
42 extremely dry. We got probably three times the amount
43 of rain we've ever gotten before. We also got the
44 earliest snow we've ever had in 40 years living there,
45 and it was cold like -- I'm just mirroring what other
46 people are saying from now on. It was really cold. We
47 had one day of 80 degrees, usually we're pushing 100
48 degrees for a few days in the summer.

49

50

0031

1 Our rod and reel fishing throughout
2 Wrangell-St. Elias was lousy. It was really hard to
3 find fish and then we go to the coast for silvers and
4 there weren't many silvers coming in. The hunting was
5 good but the conditions are miserable, just miserable
6 hunting conditions. But the animals seem to be fine
7 for our area. And all I can say, it was a pretty cold
8 winter for our summer.

9
10 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you for
13 your report. Thank you. Andy, you want to go ahead
14 and give your report.

15
16 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
17 Chair. Less amount of deer was harvested so far this
18 year. Kind of interesting, I thought the numbers would
19 be up here for the community here in Chenega Bay where
20 I live. I don't know if any goat.....

21
22 (Teleconference interference -
23 participants not muted - echoing overriding speaker)

24
25 MR. MCLAUGHLIN:we'd like to
26 continue to see King's Bay over there resurveyed, if
27 possible, if the cameras that were put out might not
28 have been in the best place to capture that, or maybe
29 some more immigration has happened since then.

30
31 Definitely black bear numbers are doing
32 better than a few years ago when that drastic decrease
33 had happened. I hope that -- that's probably because of
34 the more restrictive registration hunt with the State,
35 anyhow, the road to Whittier and what not as well. I
36 kind of suspect maybe they recovered from some type of
37 disease that went through because it wasn't just here,
38 it was all the way over to Seward the numbers had
39 dropped, anyhow, but now that there seems to be a lot
40 more bears.

41
42 Anyhow, continued need for Federal
43 subsistence jurisdiction in the marine waters of Prince
44 William Sound. What goes on here, even in the
45 summertime, some people are digging clams in the middle
46 of summer. I wouldn't say that's advisable but they
47 take their own risks for paralytic shellfish poisoning.

48
49 Our berry crop, like other people have
50

0032

1 reported was not great, on the salmonberries. It seems
2 like the blueberries were good.

3

4 Anyhow, I've noticed some local kids
5 getting some grouse here and there, maybe they're on
6 the upswing of the cycle for that.

7

8 Anyhow the summer was incredibly rainy.
9 Fall seems to be typically on time for the rain, like
10 typical, tops of the mountains are starting to get
11 white, berry bushes turning yellow.

12

13 Anyhow, this Federal subsistence
14 jurisdiction in marine waters is an important thing.
15 People here live on the lands and I mean historically,
16 you know, you could do an .804 analysis and know that
17 crabs and shrimp and other things that people use in
18 the tidal zone, herring, okay. This year no -- usually
19 some schools of herring are around in April and come
20 along the coast, and there was no herring to speak of
21 this year, which is interesting. I saw on the sounder,
22 I could see some schools of bait fish way down deep
23 some days in the summer, so those might have been herring.

24

25 We have no silvers here this year, this
26 fall, none. I've known of no silvers caught by anyone
27 in the bay here or in the -- I don't know about the
28 hatcheries but I know here at the village, none.

29

30 Let's see tribal members have been
31 traveling farther to get reds. It seems like the reds
32 maybe came on late or something, I mean they may be
33 going to the hatcheries and north of here to other
34 fisheries that aren't the ones that typically go by
35 here. I ended up settling for pinks because I didn't
36 jump on the low number of dogs that happened early.
37 There wasn't very -- you know, the dogs come in first,
38 and, oh, well, there'll be some reds later but, anyhow,
39 there wasn't a ton of dogs. That's mostly a terminal
40 harvest fishery from the hatchery, but some of them are
41 going by here to Kami (indiscernible - echoing) and
42 other places and other places so less salmon than
43 typical.

44

45 Anyhow statewide, it was brought to my
46 attention, statewide, not just in my zone, but the
47 Federal migratory waterfowl season is closed in certain
48 winter months, that's not just here and forgive my
49 ignorance I wasn't aware of that, but anyhow that seems
50

0033

1 to be something that needs to be addressed, too,
2 statewide, activity of opportunity and I would think
3 that if somebody needed to get their -- a duck or
4 something in the middle of winter, because they are an
5 overwintering population, and they have winter months,
6 I guess, that's closed.

7

8 So anyhow that's it for Chenega Bay,
9 thank you.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Andy.
12 Good report. I keep getting feedback on this thing,
13 it's weird, but thank you. Judy, how about you,
14 welcome back, good to see you, and why don't you go
15 ahead and give us a report.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 MS. CAMINER: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
20 DeAnna. Council members. And everybody else, on, I
21 wish I could see you all. This is Judy Caminer from
22 Anchorage, former and now very appreciative to be a
23 current RAC member again. And I wanted to specifically
24 thank Fish and Wildlife and others for all the efforts
25 they made to ensure that the Councils have been made
26 whole with full membership. That's a huge step in the
27 direction and great support for subsistence.

28

29 As others have said, to me, it seemed
30 like a very short summer, especially here in Anchorage
31 at elevation we had 15 inches of snow a few weeks ago
32 and tremendous number of downed trees because it was so
33 early. So short summer. I did find a lot of berries
34 and did okay with fish but it's gone pretty fast.
35 Well, we're back to fall now, but still a lot of damage
36 to clean up here.

37

38 But I look forward to working with
39 everybody and learning some new names and duties and
40 seeing if we've made progress on some proposals. I have
41 listened in to some of your meetings over the last
42 couple years but I'm sure I'm not fully up to speed on
43 all the issues and look forward to hearing the
44 presentations and a productive meeting.

45

46 Thanks very much.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. No,
49 DeAnna, I don't have external speakers, I'm on a good
50

0034

1 phone system but, anyway, I do get the bounceback when
2 I talk, though, it's interesting.

3

4 I just saw a note that Michael is back,
5 so let's go back up and catch Michael.

6

7 MR. OPHEIM: Yes, this is Michael in
8 Seldovia. It's been a pretty fast and furious year
9 here, been getting some bears tagged here recently,
10 probably five or six, we've got some really healthy
11 bears. It's been kind of nice.

12

13 We had a pretty good king salmon run,
14 that's been really good this year. We're watching our
15 weir right now. We're trying to get 100 fish up
16 through there but the water just started flowing
17 through the weir yesterday so there was 25 silvers
18 there. Hopefully in the next few, four or five days
19 here we'll get some rain and get some fish moving.

20

21 I think everybody's been pretty
22 successful, everything's looking pretty good for
23 hunting around here, pretty happy.

24

25 That's all I've got right now.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, good to
28 hear you Michael. I don't know about this feedback here
29 but typical of the phone systems but good to hear you.
30 Thank you for your report.

31

32 Aaron, I think he's still gone on his
33 hunt, so, John, I think you're up.

34

35 MR. WHISSEL: Thank you. Well, the
36 Copper River sockeye run was -- the run was not all
37 that we hoped that it could be but I'd like to point
38 out in terms of passage it was actually very good. We
39 ended up with an in-river abundance 1,262 fish above
40 our upper management limit of 75,000. But again as
41 Dennis did point out, that came with extremely limited
42 access for the commercial fishery. They essentially
43 did not fish this year. There was abundant subsistence
44 opportunity and most diligent subsistence users who are
45 able to get out into the saltwater to do their fishing
46 were able to get their fish. But it wasn't an easy
47 year to get your sockeye especially earlier in the
48 season, it seemed like the run kind of came into its
49 own sort of late June.

50

0035

1 The king salmon, I think we heard
2 Gloria mention king salmon escapement not being met.
3 And, again, we haven't put that number out. The Native
4 Village of Eyak provides the in-river abundance number.
5 We're working hard to get that number finalized for the
6 Board of Fish meeting on November 30th and we'll have a
7 preliminary report today, I believe, on that. The king
8 salmon run anecdotally didn't seem like it was off the
9 charts. There's a chance it didn't meet escapement but
10 we're not quite there yet to saying that.

11
12 In terms of other resources, we had a
13 pretty strange berry year this year. It was good and
14 bad, I think. The salmonberries and the early season
15 berries came on very, very late, almost a month late.
16 People were wondering in the early part of the summer,
17 late part of the spring where all the salmonberries
18 were and then they sort of came on real late. But then
19 the late season berries did real well. We seemed to be
20 having strawberry plants moving around and colonizing
21 areas that we didn't find them before. In some places
22 I seen a few raspberry plants leaking into salmonberry
23 patches and starting to sort of take those over. So
24 the berry situation here is a little bit interesting.

25
26 We're seeing more than usual bear
27 activity in town through the fall which may be
28 indicative of not a lot to eat out there. We tend to
29 see more bears when there's fewer resources out
30 available for them in the wild this time of year. But
31 it's not uncommon, as we approach October, November to
32 have bears coming into town before they go and
33 hibernate.

34
35 As far as other fisheries resources go
36 we had a great year in the Sound. Pink salmon were
37 incredibly abundant. The commercial fleet was able to
38 do a lot of harvest especially sort of later in the
39 season. We had not a great chum run, it seems, and a
40 decent amount of sockeyes elsewhere besides the Copper
41 River.

42
43 Halibut fishing I think has been pretty
44 good around here in these parts, not great, but pretty
45 good. Most people seem to be able to get their flat
46 fish and we've been doing some subsistence longlining,
47 we've been able to connect fairly regularly.

48
49 And it seems like the deer season is
50

0036

1 off to a decent start. I see some folks bringing some
2 deer back in, people are filling their moose tags.

3

4

5 One thing I wanted to mention in line
6 with Andy, which I guess I should have maybe mentioned
7 when we adopted the agenda is that I also agree we need
8 to start moving towards subsistence harvest of
9 saltwater resources at the Federal level as they do in
10 other communities. I feel like the time has come for
11 us to formally put together a work group and that would
12 draft a proposal for the upcoming fisheries cycle. So
13 if it's okay with everybody else I'd like to make some
14 time to put that together at today's meeting -- or this
15 meeting.

15

16

That's it for me, thanks.

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 ENCELEWSKI: Okay, good, John.
We've missed that putting that on the agenda but we'll
talk about that somewhere in there today and see if we
can't address saltwater stuff.

Paula, are you still out, she's not
going to be here until later I take it, DeAnna.

MS. PERRY: That's correct, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Did I miss
anyone besides myself.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I'm going
to go ahead and give you a brief fish report from what
I see here in the Ninilchik area. We do have Darrel
Williams with our Resource Department and he'll be
giving you a pretty in-depth thorough report later on
the fish and stuff.

But one of the themes that I'm hearing
a lot of you saying is poor fish run. It was extremely
poor commercial fish year this year, in fact, the
setnetters were literally busted, they were shut down
and closed, never opened again after the 19th of July
because of a weak return of the kings to the Kenai once
again and so the kings are real low, especially the
second run. Silvers didn't seem to show up that I hear
of. Once again everyone gets pinked and pinks seem to
be dominating the food chain nowadays. Anyway, later on

0037

1 the reds did show and we did get our subsistence fish
2 for the community out of the Kenai, our net on the
3 Kenai and that was really thankful and so we were able
4 to fill all our permits. The reds actually got
5 overscaped in the Kenai and they were very late that
6 they came in late. So that's an interesting phenomena
7 happening there.

8

9
10 Everyone tells me the blueberries were
11 phenomenal but damn it we couldn't find them so I'm not
12 sure, I must have been in the wrong patch, but, anyway.

13

14 Moose hunting, you know, we had some
15 pretty good luck with success with our moose on the
16 State land here and on Native lands lately. We do some
17 predator control, as I mentioned before, and we do
18 monitor trespass. We kind of got that under control.
19 We've been inundated by some locals down south. But
20 anyway we did have a fairly good harvest on the early
21 moose. There's still a later season coming up.

22

23 All in all the fishing was bad.

24

25 I will tell you one thing that's been
26 interesting. We've also had the cold and the rain, but
27 the alders are out of control, they're growing like
28 mad. Of course they provide nitrogen, but they sure as
29 hell take up and block off the roads and everything
30 else. So we've actually started a program here in
31 Ninilchik that we're going to try and open some of the
32 local logging roads and trails for our people to get in
33 and do their subsistence hunting and berry picking and
34 fishing and so we're working on that.

35

36 Along with everyone else, you know,
37 we're still in some bit of Covid restrictions. We're
38 still getting a few cases here in the community and so
39 that's why I guess we're back on these video meetings
40 or teleconferences rather. So I'm going to let Darrel
41 and them go into detail on the other reports but if you
42 got any questions for me later that'd be fine.

43

44 So we'll go ahead and conclude our
45 reports, DeAnna, and then we'll move on to No. 8. No.
46 8 is a service award and I'm not sure who's giving that
47 DeAnna.

48

49 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I will
50 brag about our Council member, Michael Opheim. And

0038

1 hopefully when we are in person we can have someone
2 physically give him that award or if we find ourselves
3 back in the virtual world, we might have to mail it.

4

5 But Michael Opheim, our Council member
6 has served 10 years. He's getting his 10 years of
7 service certificate. Michael, son of Norman and Nancy
8 Opheim from Kodiak is of Aleut descent and currently
9 resides in Seldovia, Alaska as an active member for
10 almost 47 years. Michael grew up harvesting from the
11 land with family members. Michael grew up hunting,
12 fishing, and gathering with his family to make sure
13 there was food for the winter. As most young Alaskan
14 men do he commercial fished, worked construction, drove
15 fuel truck for the local gas station and later earned
16 the position of Environmental Coordinator for the
17 Seldovia Village Tribe in 2003. As the Environmental
18 Coordinator, Michael is responsible for the
19 administration and management of the Indian General
20 Assistance Program and other environmental projects.
21 Under his leadership the SVT environmental office has
22 flourished bringing essential environmental projects to
23 Seldovia to benefit the entire community. Michael
24 finds his best days are those that allow him to have
25 time in the field doing what he loves best. As the
26 Environmental Coordinator, he's been able to travel
27 throughout the state, which allows him the opportunity
28 to establish many contacts and friends throughout
29 tribal communities.

30

31 Michael's been on the local Advisory
32 Committee for ADF&G for around 15 years and has been
33 the Chair for four years. Michael's been on the Cook
34 Inlet Regional Citizen's Advisory Council for around 12
35 years and was on the local Seldovia Oil Spill Response
36 board for about eight years before stepping down.

37

38 Michael believes that we are the
39 stewards of our natural resources and works to ensure
40 those resources are available for the coming
41 generations.

42

43 I just wanted to say a little bit about
44 his bio because he is one example of the many quality
45 and caliber of volunteers that we have serving as
46 Council members. So I just wanted to extend
47 congratulations for Michael on his 10 years of service.
48 And, again, we'll be making sure that he gets his
49 certificate either at the next meeting, if we have that
50

0039

1 in person, or we will mail it but we kind of wanted to
2 make a big deal so if we can embarrass him and make him
3 blush, then that's what I want to do.

4

5 (Laughter)

6

7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
8 Michael, congratulations. I know it takes a lot and
9 it's a lot of commitment and you've always been there.
10 You've been a good member and much contribution to the
11 good of subsistence users, so thank you very much.

12

13 Do you want to say anything or do you
14 want to just accept it and we'll give it to you when we
15 see you.

16

17 MR. OPHEIM: I'll just say thank you
18 and it's been a lot of fun. It's a great learning
19 experience, every one of these meetings is a learning
20 experience and thoroughly enjoyed all 10 years.

21

22 Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thanks, Michael.
25 Thanks for your commitment.

26

27 All right, I'm going to go ahead and
28 mention now that public and tribal comments on non-
29 agenda items, they're available each morning. And
30 DeAnna, I don't know if you got anyone that's got a
31 comment or put in for one, but I'll let you speak to
32 that now.

33

34 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We
35 do have some public comments but they are for
36 proposals. And then, of course, Mr. Williams, has his
37 report under agency reports. So those are agenda
38 items. I do not see anybody in the queue for non-agenda
39 items, but we could open up the phones and see if
40 anyone would like to identify themselves as having a
41 comment on non-agenda items at this time.

42

43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone got a
44 comment on non-agenda items at this time.

45

46 MS. LINNELL: Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, go ahead.

49

50

0040

1 MS. LINNELL: This is Karen Linnell
2 with Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission. Just in
3 listening to member comments today and heightened
4 awareness of the low returns on the Copper River I
5 would ask and request that you include this item in
6 your letters to the Federal Subsistence Board and
7 Secretary. I was slightly dis -- I was pretty
8 disappointed last year, or at the last meeting when it
9 wasn't included as an item. It's been brought up
10 multiple times. I know Gloria's brought it up multiple
11 times over the last few years. And I would just ask
12 that this Commission include that concern and the
13 management of the fishery for sustainability as an item
14 of concern by this Commission.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Karen.
17 And you also could bring that up under your report when
18 you give your report under AITRC and we'll definitely
19 discuss it at that time. Thank you for that comment.
20 IS there any other public comments on non-agenda items.

21
22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, hearing
26 none we're ready to move to the old business and we
27 have an .805(c) report, information update, on Page 12,
28 and as the Council Coordinator, DeAnna, you can give us
29 that I take it.

30
31 MS. PERRY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.
32 Council members, in your meeting books on Page 12 is
33 the letter and enclosure from the Federal Subsistence
34 Board. It's known as the .805(c) report. This report
35 provides the action taken by the Board on proposals
36 affecting residents of Southcentral. I believe we
37 provided a summary of the Board's actions at our last
38 meeting as well as me sending you an email. But as a
39 reminder, I'll just go through it quickly, on the
40 consensus, FP21-09, that was modifying the naming
41 (indiscernible - echo) of early run and late run Kenai
42 chinook with specific date ranges, that was adopted by
43 the Board. FCR, that's a closure, 21-06, the closure
44 to Federally-qualified subsistence users in Toklat
45 River was adopted by the Board. And, again, those two
46 proposals were on the consensus agenda.

47
48 On the non-consensus agenda, FP21-12
49 was taken off of the consensus agenda to go on non-
50

0041

1 consensus so that a full discussion could happen. So
2 I'll start with that one. That was a proposal to
3 modify Federal regulations to remove the use of
4 monofilament or multifilament mesh dipnet prior to
5 August 15th in the upper Copper River for salmon, that
6 was not adopted by the Board, in deference to the
7 Southcentral and Eastern Interior RACs, as well as the
8 Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission.

9
10 FP21-11, which was to add a new harvest
11 reporting structure for the upper Copper River was not
12 adopted by the Board consistent with the Office of
13 Subsistence Management and Wrangell-St. Elias
14 Subsistence Resource Commission recommendations.

15
16 FP21-10, which was to create a new
17 dipnet fishery in lower Copper River for sockeye
18 salmon, the Board deferred this proposal until such
19 time as the Southcentral and Eastern Interior RACs can
20 meet and work and try to develop a compromise proposal
21 that, again, can be supported by all affected.

22
23 Continuing with the non-consensus
24 agenda, FP21-13, which was to prohibit fishing with
25 dipnet from boats in upper Copper River for salmon,
26 that was not adopted by the Board in deference to the
27 Southcentral RAC and the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence
28 Resource Commission recommendation.

29
30 FP21-14, which was to prohibit use of
31 fishfinders while fishing from a boat in upper Copper
32 River for all fish, that was initially adopted per
33 Eastern Interior Advisory Council and the Wrangell-St.
34 Elias Subsistence Resource Commission. This did come
35 back to the Board for further discussion.

36
37 (Teleconference interference -
38 participants not muted - several)

39
40 MS. PERRY: And the Board's final vote
41 was to adopt this proposal with a clarification. That
42 was to clarify that the Board's intent in the
43 regulations would reflect that the use of fishfinders
44 will be prohibited while fishing from the boat,
45 however, the device does not need to be removed from
46 the boat as was put in that original proposal.

47
48 The last item of Southcentral to go
49 before the Board was the nonrural proposal, RP19-01 and
50

0042

1 that was to designate Moose Pass as a rural community.
2 The Board adopted this proposal as modified by Office
3 of Subsistence Management, and that modification was to
4 include the communities of Crown Point and Primrose.

5
6 So this is just a formal opportunity to
7 bring your attention to the Board's actions in document
8 form. Of course that letter contains more details than
9 the summary I just gave. So it's for your information
10 only, it's not an action for the Council. And I just
11 wanted to bring that to your attention, if you'd like
12 to read it all, it starts on Page 12 of the meeting
13 book.

14
15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
18 DeAnna. Any questions for her, or Council members, on
19 the report that the Federal Board came back to us. I
20 think it's pretty explanatory.

21
22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: If not let's go
26 ahead and.....

27
28 MR. HOLSTON: Mr. Chair.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question, go
31 ahead.

32
33 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is Ed, can you
34 hear me?

35
36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,
37 Ed.

38
39 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, back to Fisheries
40 Proposal 21-11. Since we won't be reporting, daily
41 reporting in the upper Copper River district, how would
42 that affect Cooper Landing, Moose Pass and Hope, do we
43 have to submit a similar proposal to be considered?

44
45 MS. PERRY: So I wonder if maybe
46 someone from Staff could speak to any of the
47 implications that Ed just mentioned.

48
49
50

0043

1 (No comments)

2

3 MS. PERRY: Ed, if we do not have a
4 biologist that could speak to those impacts.....

5

6 (Teleconference interference -
7 participants not muted - several)

8

9 MS. PERRY:we can get back to
10 you. But if you could maybe mention that again. I
11 know the audio's not real clear so we apologize for
12 that but if you could restate your question, Ed, and
13 maybe some of the biologists on the phone might be able
14 to answer that. If not, we could definitely provide
15 that answer to the Council at a later date. So, yeah,
16 Ed, if you could restate that please.

17

18 MR. HOLSTON: Sure. Fisheries Proposal
19 21-11 that the Board rejected, that proposal was daily
20 harvest record of salmon being reported. It was
21 rejected. The reason was -- that it was rejected, said
22 there's no evidence that a mandatory three harvest
23 reporting requirement is the best way to collect such
24 information. I was wondering how that would affect us
25 in Cooper Landing, Moose Pass and Hope with our
26 dipnetting up at the falls and we're required to report
27 within a three day period. I was wondering if we need
28 to -- or somebody needs to put in another proposal to
29 see if we do, indeed, need to keep reporting every
30 three days.

31

32 Thank you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Good question,
35 Ed. Someone, hopefully will give us an answer here.

36

37 REPORTER: Hey, Mr. Chair, sorry to
38 interrupt, this is the court reporter. Can we have
39 everybody try and mute their lines so that we can
40 figure out what's going on with this echo situation.

41

42 (Teleconference interference -
43 participants not muted - several)

44

45 REPORTER: Hopefully that will fix it
46 and -- sorry you can proceed.

47

48 MS. TOTEMOFF: This is Angela Totemoff.
49 Just one comment about the meeting. It also may be
50

0044

1 that people that are teleconferencing in with a speaker
2 might be in close vicinity to another person that's
3 teleconferencing in. So just keep in mind that if you
4 have two people in the same office, address your volume
5 or use your headset.

6

7 REPORTER: Thank you very much.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thanks, Angela,
10 good point.

11

12 MR. SARAFIN: Mr. Chair, this is Dave
13 Sarafin. I might be able to provide a little
14 information on the last question.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, appreciate
17 it Dave, go ahead.

18

19 MR. SARAFIN: Okay. Yeah, just some
20 comparison information regarding the fisheries in the
21 Copper River. It's a very complex network of managing
22 covering, you know, hundreds of miles and a lot of it's
23 based on historical use with, you know, with a heavy
24 basis on the sonar counts. So it's kind of a complex,
25 spread out system, whereas, I'm not too familiar with
26 the management on the Kenai but it could possibly be
27 managed more on a specific tributary basis, and that
28 stock of concern in that -- or being affected in that
29 tributary. So there would be some differences in the
30 fisheries and importance possibly on -- or how the
31 information might be actively implemented into
32 management, at least with the current management
33 system, however, there are possibilities for improving
34 management in the Copper River and other systems as
35 well.

36

37 That's mainly just a quick response, or
38 somewhat of a response.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Did that help,
41 Ed?

42

43 MR. HOLSTON: No, I'm still unclear how
44 I, or some of the local residents should proceed with
45 this. I suspect a new proposal on the fisheries cycle
46 would be needed to relinquish that requirement that we
47 have for reporting every three days.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I would

50

0045

1 follow that -- I'm not sure but I think we could get it
2 ironed out on the next cycle here.

3

4 MR. HOLSTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
7 Alrighty, well, thanks for that, we'll try and get that
8 defined and we'll work on that. We'll make sure to see
9 if we got to put in another proposal or what we need to
10 do.

11

12 No. 2, nonrural determination policy
13 update OSM.

14

15 MS. LAVINE: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
16 Members of the Council. For the record my name is
17 Robbin LaVine and I'm the Subsistence Policy
18 Coordinator for the Office of Subsistence Management.
19 I'm going to present you with a brief update on the
20 nonrural determination regulatory cycle, where we're at
21 in the cycle timeline and next steps for review of the
22 policy. This remains an agenda item for your Council
23 because yours is the first region to test drive the
24 2017 nonrural policy. This is not an action item.

25

26 This is where we're at in the cycle
27 timeline. We have finished our first nonrural
28 regulatory cycle under the 2017 nonrural policy,
29 completed all work associated with our first nonrural
30 proposal RP19-01. As you just heard, the Board took
31 action, rescinding the nonrural status for the
32 community of Moose Pass. That community was determined
33 to include the census designated places of Moose Pass,
34 Crown Point and Primrose. This allows residents of
35 Moose Pass to participate in Federal subsistence
36 harvest opportunities open to all rural residents only.
37 The next steps for Moose Pass is that residents will
38 need to have their customary and traditional uses
39 recognized for specific resources in their region and a
40 number of customary and traditional use determination
41 wildlife proposals from Moose Pass residents are on
42 your agenda this fall. They'll come before the Board
43 for action during the April regulatory meeting and
44 we'll announce a call for proposals to change fish and
45 shellfish regulations, including customary and
46 traditional uses of fish and shellfish in early 2022.

47

48 And proposals to change nonrural
49 determinations will also be accepted at that time for
50

0046

1 the next four year regulatory cycle.

2

3 So the next steps. We'll continue to
4 review the policy for increased clarity and guidance.
5 If any modifications to the policy are proposed they
6 will be presented to all the Councils statewide before
7 being presented to the Board for action.

8

9 Once again this is not an action item
10 and I'm ready for your questions.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks,
13 Robbin. Questions on the nonrural determination.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That was good.
18 Well, I guess you got off easy, okay. Well, thanks,
19 Robbin. Board of Fish proposal comment update, and
20 DeAnna, you're going to give us an update on this -- I
21 think they're in here but.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I don't hear you
26 DeAnna.

27

28 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I love
29 the mute button. At our last meeting this Council
30 identified for discussion some Alaska Department of
31 Fish and Game Board of Fish proposals. You will find
32 the letter that we sent to the Board of Fish in your
33 meeting books starting on Page 20. You'll see that we
34 provided comments on Proposal 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15,
35 16, 18 and 20 -- I think I actually just missed on
36 there. We provided formal comments to the Board of
37 Fish on these proposals. I just wanted to bring to the
38 Council's attention that that letter is in your book
39 and remind the Council that the Board of Fish will take
40 up these proposals during their upcoming meeting,
41 November 30th. The latest Board of Fish meeting cycle
42 list is in your book on Page 18. And as a reminder, if
43 the public.....

44

45 (Teleconference interference -
46 participants not muted - several)

47

48 MS. PERRY:would like to provide
49 individual comments on proposals, the comment deadline

50

0047

1 is November 15th and you can visit the Board of Fish
2 website for more information on how to submit those
3 proposals.

4

5 So, again, Mr. Chair, just bringing
6 everyone's attention to the actual final letter that we
7 sent with our comments and to advise the Council, as
8 well as any public listening that comments are being
9 accepted on these proposals through November 15th.

10

11 Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is not an
12 action item, it's just more for your information.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
15 DeAnna. Yeah, that's all in the book there, and
16 comments there, and if you want comments to the Board
17 of Fish, November 15th and meeting on November 30th.
18 So thank you for that and we'll keep that in mind. I
19 am ready to move to No. 11 on our agenda and it's new
20 business. I'd like to go through this first part
21 before we get into proposals and then we'll take a
22 little stretch and then see how long these guys are
23 that are going to tell us about our harvest. We do
24 have Southcentral Federal subsistence wildlife updates.
25 I got Judy Putera, I got Milo and I got Todd. So
26 however you guys want to start, if we want to start on
27 those updates, reports, we could start on those next.

28

29 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, this is
30 Barbara Cellarius from Wrangell-St. Elias.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hello, Barbara, I
33 didn't see you in the book here but you go ahead.

34

35 MS. CELLARIUS: Well, I'm just calling
36 in on Judy's behalf. She's in another meeting today
37 and we don't know anticipate that you will get to the
38 Unit 11 proposals until later in the meeting so she
39 would request that she be able to provide an update
40 when you actually get to Unit 11.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

43

44 MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
47 Milo, you there.

48

49 (No comments)

50

0048

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Milo, I know you
2 was hanging out so come on down.

3
4 MR. BURCHAM: Yeah, I'm here. And we
5 had agreed that I don't have much to report at this
6 much and time, and with the agency report I can give an
7 update and then certainly at the next winter meeting
8 I'll have a full harvest report. But we're kind of in
9 the middle of harvest season right now, I don't have
10 numbers for you and it wouldn't be very meaningful.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
13 Thank you, Milo. Todd, how about you.

14
15 MR. ESKELIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
16 am ready for a quick update on Unit 15, the 1505 moose
17 hunt. We gave out 80 permits so far. I think the five
18 year average is probably around -- but we're starting
19 to see a lot more users focusing on that season so I
20 expect to get permits coming in here pretty soon. The
21 harvest in the early season was three cows (cuts out)
22 that's pretty consistent with what we've had the last
23 two or three years with the harvest being -- on the
24 State side being pretty high for local residents so
25 they haven't participated in the moose hunt nearly as
26 much as they have in earlier years. Drawing hunts, we
27 gave out one sheep, two caribou and four goat draw
28 tags. And out of all those we had one caribou. And
29 just kind of an update, from other.....

30
31 (Teleconference interference -
32 participants not muted - several)

33
34 MR. ESKELIN:hunters that I
35 talked to, everybody felt like it was a fairly late
36 fall. The leaves dropped really late, moose grazing
37 was a little bit later than normal and so it seemed
38 like the bull movement from the high country was a
39 little later than normal. One hunter described it as
40 being slow and then all of a sudden it was like the
41 flood gates opened up and everybody was having
42 opportunity and if you missed that date when they all
43 showed up, you were kind of late to the party.

44
45 So that's kind of this fall's hunting
46 season in a nutshell and I'm available for any
47 questions if anybody has anything.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thanks, Todd. I
50

0049

1 got questions on proposals when we get to them, so
2 don't leave us.

3

4 MR. ESKELIN: Yeah, definitely not. I
5 have several proposals that I planned on commenting on
6 so talk to you then.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
9 Anyone else that I missed on there, on the agenda here.
10 This is wildlife harvest updates.

11

12 MS. KETRON: This is Caroline with the
13 BLM Glennallen Field Office. I can give a brief harvest
14 update for what we've got.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Sure, appreciate
17 it.

18

19 MS. KETRON: Okay. So, so far this
20 season we've issued 2,520 Federal caribou permits for
21 Unit 13 and 1,160 Federal subsistence moose permits.
22 This is about normal for our office based on previous
23 years. And we expect to issue about 200 caribou
24 permits over the winter season.

25

26 For moose, our harvest so far is -- or
27 harvest reports so far is 58 moose, which is a little
28 bit low for us. Our five year average is 77. And to
29 echo other folks, anecdotally, folks have mentioned it
30 was hot at the start of the season and moose didn't
31 start moving around until late. So it'll be
32 interesting to compare everybody's final numbers this
33 season.

34

35 For caribou, we show a harvest
36 currently of 188 caribou, 123 male and 65 female.
37 There was a good push the last week of the season
38 across the Richardson and so we saw a lot of Federal
39 harvest that week so we're still receiving some caribou
40 reports but we'll see if those numbers change. We're
41 still, you know, finalizing all of that. And from
42 calling our local Fish and Game folks, Heidi Hatcher or
43 I think I talked to Joel but they reported that there
44 is a large portion of the Nelchina still on the west
45 side of the Richardson so there may be some good
46 opportunity for folks when the winter season opens up
47 next week.

48

49 And that concludes my wildlife report.

50

0050

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, thanks for
2 giving that. Any questions.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty. Well,
7 we're ready to move to the wildlife proposals, Office
8 of Subsistence Management analyst are going to give a
9 report but before we start on these proposals let's
10 just go ahead and -- I think everyone's been here for
11 almost two hours, take five minutes and grab a cup of
12 coffee if you can find one, stretch your bones and
13 we'll be back in five minutes.

14
15 (Off record)

16
17 (On record)

18
19 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead.

22
23 MS. PERRY: Do you want me to do a
24 quick roll call to make sure everyone's back, it's up
25 to you.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I think
28 that was only five minutes, I hope we didn't lose them.

29
30 MS. PERRY: Okay.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Let's go ahead,
33 DeAnna, we're No. B on wildlife proposals, OSM Fish and
34 Wildlife Anthropologist.

35
36 MS. PERRY: Yes. And, Mr. Chair,
37 before we dive into that, I'm going to ask Stephanie to
38 put the presentation procedure for proposals on the
39 Teams visual. And for those of you who are following
40 along with your meeting books, that can be found on
41 Page 24. And we've kind of annotated this just to make
42 sure it's clear. I know we have some new folks on our
43 Council. So I just wanted to bring their attention to
44 this procedure. The Staff analyst will give an
45 introduction and presentation of information, then the
46 Chair will call on Orville Lind to do a report on Board
47 consultations and those were held with tribes and ANCSA
48 corporations. Then it's time for agency comments. The
49 State will have the opportunity, then Federal agencies,
50

0051

1 and then tribal representatives. I know sometimes we
2 have accidentally called them under No. 2, but they are
3 actually under agency comments. The next group to
4 comment is advisory group comments such as Regional
5 Advisory Councils, Fish and Game Advisory Committees,
6 Subsistence Resource Commissions. Then the analyst
7 will come back and inform a Council of the summary of
8 written public comments. Then the Chair will invite
9 the public to testify on the proposal. And then at
10 that point the Regional Advisory Council puts a motion
11 on the table, discussion. And then for the Council
12 members, normally when we are in a room together we
13 have these items on the back of our nameplates, but
14 there are five questions here that show kind of an
15 outline of questions to answer when you're formulating
16 your justification. That helps us put a good
17 justification on the record. So we will scroll down to
18 that when we get ready for the Council discussion.

19

20 But I did want to bring that to
21 everyone's attention before we get started. And also I
22 do have note of some folks who want to provide some
23 comment, and looking at the book, again, there are
24 several written public comments. In getting through
25 all of these proposals in two days and expecting a fair
26 amount of public testimony, I thought about an
27 effective way to get through our public comment period.
28 There's a protocol that has worked successfully in the
29 past for special actions testimony and that's if people
30 have already provided a comment or in this case if
31 you've already provided a written comment it might be
32 good to maybe summarize your comments like maybe the
33 highest points or the most important points you want to
34 make to the Council and then use the remainder of your
35 time for maybe anything new that you've learned since
36 those comments were put in. Again, just trying to make
37 sure that we have enough time to let everybody who
38 wants to provide a comment have the opportunity to do
39 so. So, again, that's just a suggestion that's helped
40 us in the past.

41

42 So, thank you, Mr. Chair.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty. Well,
45 thanks DeAnna, that's a good explanation and we have a
46 little guide here to look at. So we're ready to go
47 ahead and start into regional proposals and we're going
48 to start with Wildlife Proposal 22-12 revise deer hunt,
49 access and season dates. So the introduction and

50

0052

1 presentation will be the OSM analysis, we're ready for
2 the presenter there.

3

4 MS. PERRY: And that'll be Milo.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Milo.

7

8 MR. BURCHAM: Okay, can you all hear
9 me?

10

11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Sounds good,
12 Milo.

13

14 MR. BURCHAM: Okay. Did I hear the
15 introduction correctly, we're talking about WP22-12?

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's correct.

18

19 MR. BURCHAM: Okay. This is Milo
20 Burcham from the Chugach National Forest. Thanks. I'm
21 sorry we couldn't be in person but nice to see some of
22 your faces on screen.

23

24 Proposal 22-12 was submitted by the
25 Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory
26 Council and requests that the deer season in Unit 6 be
27 extended from the current closing date of December 31st
28 to January 31st. The proponents believe that
29 lengthening the deer season in Unit 6 from December 31
30 to January 31 should be authorized because many
31 subsistence users are not able to harvest enough deer
32 to feed their families due to mild winters which
33 decrease hunter success. Winter snow that push deer to
34 the beaches where they are more easily accessed by
35 hunters have occurred later in recent winters. Hunters
36 that cannot participate in early season hunts must wait
37 until later in the season when reduced foliage allows
38 deer to be more easily seen and heavy snow pack forces
39 deer down near the coast where they are more
40 accessible.

41

42 By 1990 the Board adopted subsistence
43 regulations for deer hunting from State regulations.
44 The initial Federal season was from August 1st to
45 December 31st with a limit of five deer but antlerless
46 deer could only be taken from September 15th to
47 December 31st. The current season dates include the
48 October 1 through December 31 antlerless season adopted
49 in 1991. Seasons have been adjusted in response to
50

1 weather events and deer population levels since that
2 time. In 2012 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
3 closed the State deer season to residents and non-
4 residents on December 7th, 2012 via emergency order.
5 The closure was due to heavy snowfall that concentrated
6 deer on and near beaches which likely increased the
7 populations vulnerability to harvest. The Copper
8 River/Prince William Sound Fish and Game Advisory
9 Committee and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
10 agreed that the deer population in Unit 6 should be
11 protected from overharvest following the severe winter
12 of 2011/2012 when the population experienced an
13 estimated overwinter mortality of 50 to 70 percent. As
14 a result in 2012 the Board approved emergency special
15 action with modification shortening the antlerless
16 season from October 1st to December 31st to October 1st
17 to December 7th. In 2013 the State issued an emergency
18 order to close the resident and non-resident antlerless
19 deer season in Unit 6 at midnight on October 31st, 2013
20 subsequently the Board closed Federal public lands in
21 Unit 6 to the harvest of antlerless deer by Federally-
22 qualified subsistence users as well. These actions
23 were taken to reduce the hunting mortality of female
24 deer and aid in population recovery following the
25 severe winter of 2011/12.

26
27 Sitka black-tailed deer were introduced
28 in Unit 6 between 1916 and 1923. The deer population
29 in Prince William Sound is limited by snow depth and
30 duration. Heaving snow events have caused major winter
31 mortality events in the area. Deep snow concentrates
32 deer along beach fringes which can be overgrazed if
33 deer are forced to remain there for an extended period
34 of time and it can result in starvation. Deer are also
35 more vulnerable to harvest while concentrated on
36 beaches and harvesting under these circumstances could
37 become additive to total mortality rather than
38 compensatory and result in higher total winter
39 mortality. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game and
40 the Chugach National Forest use deer pellet surveys in
41 Unit 6B as an index of the relative deer density. And
42 the mean number of deer pellet groups observed declined
43 overall from 1996 to 2019 but it showed marked increase
44 approximating 1996 levels since then.

45
46 Approximately 45 percent of the
47 reported harvest was by local Federally-qualified
48 subsistence users, and that's residents of Cordova,
49 Chenega Bay and Tatitlek and Whittier. 50 percent by
50

1 non-Federally-qualified Alaska residents and five
2 percent by non-local Federally-qualified subsistence
3 users. Approximately 98 percent of reported harvest by
4 local Federally-qualified subsistence users was from
5 Cordova residents. And from 2006 to 2012 the sex ratio
6 of the harvest was approximately 62 percent and 38
7 percent female. Harvest reports between 2005 and 2010
8 showed that most of the annual deer harvest occurred
9 during October, November and December, and in October
10 it was 25 to 30 percent, November 25 to 35 percent, and
11 December 18 to 24 percent. Few deer have been
12 harvested during the extended January season since the
13 season was lengthened in 2016. A large proportion of
14 the yearly take of deer by residents of Cordova, the
15 largest of the three communities occurs on Hawkins
16 Island, which is relatively -- which is in relative
17 close proximity to town.

18
19 The effects of the proposal. If this
20 proposal is adopted it would lengthen the deer season
21 by one month through January 31st in Unit 6. A longer
22 season would provide increased opportunity for
23 Federally-qualified subsistence users to harvest deer
24 during the winter when they are more accessible because
25 snow often pushes deer to lower elevations and on to
26 the beaches in Prince William Sound. By allowing the
27 harvest of either sex deer during the extended season,
28 hunters would not have to discriminate between does and
29 bucks that have already shed their antlers. Although
30 the deer population in Unit 6 has largely recovered
31 from the decline after the severe winter of 2011/12
32 deer are more vulnerable to harvest when they are
33 pushed to the beaches where they are easily accessed by
34 hunters on boats. It is thought that when winter
35 conditions are severe hunter harvest can become an
36 additive source of mortality to winter kill.
37 Additionally, heavy harvest of does can slow recovery
38 of the deer populations after severe winter events.
39 Federally-qualified subsistence users, especially
40 residents of Cordova harvest a significant portion of
41 the deer taken in Prince William Sound and are
42 responsible for most of the harvest from Hawkins and
43 Hinchinbrook Island. While few bucks have been
44 harvested from Unit 6D during the January season since
45 2016, increasing the harvest limit and allowing the
46 harvest of does in the late season would likely
47 increase participation in the late season hunt.

48
49 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
50

0055

1 support WP22-12 with modification. And that
2 modification is to restrict the harvest limit during
3 the January season to just two deer. And the
4 justification is that while lengthening the deer season
5 by one month, through January 31st, and allowing the
6 harvest of does would provide additional opportunity to
7 harvest red meat, it also increases harvest pressure at
8 a time when deer can be pushed to beaches by deep snow
9 where they are most vulnerable. Qualified rural
10 residents already have a long liberal season for deer
11 in Unit 6 extending five months from the 1st of August
12 through 31 December for up to five deer and an
13 additional month through 31 January for up to one buck.

14
15 (Teleconference interference -
16 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

17
18 MR. BURCHAM: (Indiscernible) to
19 provide additional opportunity to qualified rural
20 residents. This would also reduce additive mortality
21 during more severe winters when the -- and speed
22 recovery when deer populations fall due to these
23 events.

24
25 (Teleconference interference -
26 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

27
28 MS. PERRY: I believe we've got someone
29 on the line that's not muted. Was that a Council
30 member with a question for our analyst.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 MR. WHISSEL: Someone who just said the
35 words, timeframe-wise.

36
37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. Whoever it
38 was, it wasn't appropriate for the conversation. But,
39 anyway, Milo, good presentation. Question's for the
40 presentation from the Council. Any questions.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none,
45 Milo, we'll let you step down for a minute. Thank you.
46 Okay, next consultation, Orville, Camai, how's it going
47 and do you have anything to report on consultation.

48
49 MR. LIND: Good morning, Mr. Chair.

50

0056

1 Good to hear you on. Council members. Orville Lind,
2 Native Liaison for the Office of Subsistence
3 Management. I am doing fine, thank you, Sir. During
4 the consultations August 19th for Wildlife Proposal 22-
5 12, we did not have any comments or questions on the
6 proposal. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you,
9 Orville. Okay. Agency comments, I guess there wasn't
10 any ANCSA, no consultations, let's move to No. 3,
11 agency comments, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

12
13 MS. WESTING: Hello, this is Charlotte
14 Westing, I'm the Area Biologist in Cordova, Alaska. I
15 can provide the Department of Fish and Game's comments
16 on this proposal.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

19
20 MS. WESTING: As it's been stated in
21 both our analysis and the analysis provided by Federal
22 Staff, this population occurs the farthest north of its
23 range and was an introduced population so it's pretty
24 vulnerable to fluctuations relating to large snow
25 events. So you can have natural mortality from a big
26 snow event but the other thing that happens is these
27 deer become a lot more accessible to hunters. And
28 that can be both good and bad. We've seen during other
29 big snow events significant increase of deer taken in
30 November and December related to other years. And the
31 best example of this was the big winter of 2011/2012.
32 If you look at our average harvest of deer on Hawkins
33 Island, which is in close proximity to a large number
34 of Federally-qualified subsistence users, our five year
35 average harvest is about 315 deer. In the big snow
36 winter of 2011/2012 we took 840 deer from that island,
37 so more than double the amount that we take in a normal
38 winter. And so that just shows the magnitude of what
39 Federally-qualified subsistence users can take when the
40 conditions provide the opportunity to do so. So
41 there's this question of were these deer going to die
42 anyways and they died and ended up in people's freezers
43 or were additional deer taken to what would have died
44 from the severe winter.

45
46 And the concern we have is that, you
47 know, it's great for deer to end up in freezers but we
48 can exacerbate a long-term decline and slow the
49 recovery of the population if we have these pulses of
50

0057

1 unsustainable harvest particularly on the doe segment
2 of the population.

3
4 The Federal analysis of the proposal
5 cited an in-season response capability and I'd like to
6 highlight that we don't have the ability to respond
7 very quickly and with much power in-season because we
8 don't get harvest information for many months following
9 when it occurs. So our ability to respond in-season is
10 poor, so our only -- and the history shows that we take
11 action the year following a big winter event. So I
12 just wanted to clarify that we don't have the ability
13 to really respond to big season events, in-season, we
14 generally don't have the data to support those
15 decisions.

16
17 Another thing we wanted to bring up is
18 the difficulty with enforcement of deer and their
19 harvest by Federally-qualified subsistence users on
20 Federal land. Many of these deer that have been pushed
21 to the beach by a large snow event are standing below
22 the mean high water mark and that means they're no
23 longer on Federal land and that can create a tricky
24 situation for both users and enforcement personnel as
25 far as figuring out where that deer was standing when
26 the shot was taken.

27
28 And so as a result of all these
29 factors, the State opposes the proposal as written
30 citing the concern about excessive harvest of female
31 deer and that affecting the long-term ability to
32 sustain harvest opportunity for residents in Unit 6 and
33 all users. And that's the only comment I have on this
34 proposal at this time.

35
36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, very, very
37 good, very thorough comments, appreciate that.
38 Questions.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, let's hear
43 the agency on the Federal side, let's see what they --
44 who's got that one.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, it looks like no
49 Federal agencies are offering a comment at this time.

50

0058

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I wanted
2 to give them plenty of time but I don't hear it. How
3 about tribal, any tribal representatives want to under
4 agency comments.

5
6 (No comments)

7
8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I don't
9 hear anyone coming forward. How about advisory group
10 comments, other Regional Advisory Councils.

11
12 MS. PERRY: We have no current Regional
13 Advisory Council comments on this proposal, Mr. Chair.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. How
16 about Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

17
18 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman, can you
19 hear me, this is Tom Carpenter.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hello, Tom.

22
23 MR. CARPENTER: How are you doing.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Good.

26
27 MR. CARPENTER: Glad to speak with you
28 all again. I have some comments from the Copper
29 River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee regarding
30 this proposal so I'll just kind of state our position
31 and state some possible options that the RAC might
32 consider when looking at this.

33
34 First of all, when I was writing up my
35 comments, the one thing that I recognized when I was
36 looking through the regulatory book on the Federal
37 side, but because no C&T has ever been done for deer
38 for communities in Prince William Sound, a proposed
39 change to this regulation will allow all rural
40 residents of the state of Alaska to participate. This
41 could greatly influence the deer that is harvested in
42 January, specifically during big snow events. I think
43 you've heard some of the estimate that Ms. Westing
44 provided you in regards to the amount of deer that can
45 get harvested in some of these islands in Prince
46 William Sound when we have big snow events and some of
47 the actions the State and Federal government, along
48 with the Federal Board have taken to try to minimize
49 this during those events. I do also agree and I've
50

1 spoken with Milo a little bit about this, too, that
2 trying to make an in-season determination when one of
3 these events takes place or when unusually high levels
4 of harvest, even not during a big snow event takes
5 place, would be quite difficult.

6
7 I think this proposal has a lot to do,
8 also, with what you're going to determine with the next
9 proposal, WP22-13. I think specifically does and
10 fawns, yearlings, in December and January, during big
11 snow events tend to congregate right down along the
12 fringes between State and Federal lands at the mean
13 high water line and on the treeline, I think the
14 enforcement issues that has been spoke about in regards
15 to people from hunting from a boat on State waters
16 where deer might necessarily be standing on Federal
17 land could be an issue for people that are not real
18 familiar with the regulations and the changes between
19 the State and Federal system. I mean when you look at
20 Alaska, there are does that can be harvested and there
21 are regulations that exist in Southeast Alaska where
22 most of the deer population is in this state, but when
23 you look at the areas that are open to Federal land for
24 doe harvest, specifically, in January, there are very
25 few people and there's very little Federal land that
26 exists where that's allowed. The Federal system
27 utilizes State harvest tickets, they rely on the State
28 for harvest information, they don't currently have a
29 system to issue harvest tickets, for deer specifically,
30 and they do not collect the harvest information
31 themselves. So there is a real dual management
32 situation here that needs to be considered.

33
34 I think if such an event were to
35 happen, the District Ranger in Cordova does have a
36 delegation of authority that, without, really up to
37 date, in-season information that could be provided to
38 him, I think even a decision on his behalf to close the
39 deer season is going to be difficult. I think, from
40 our point of view, you know, currently you're allowed
41 to hunt one buck in January under Federal regulations,
42 currently. One of the things that I've heard is that
43 the success rate has been low. One of the reasons the
44 success rate's been low in January is sometimes it's
45 hard to identify bucks and hunters tend to be a little
46 bit more cautious because when the bucks lose their
47 antlers obviously they don't want to make a mistake and
48 shoot the wrong species.

49
50

0060

1 I think the OSM's recommendation to
2 allow two deer to be harvested in January is a little
3 bit too far reaching. I think if you were going to make
4 some changes to give a little bit more opportunity, one
5 of the conclusions that you might reach is to just
6 change the wording in the current regulation from one
7 buck to one deer. That does allow a little bit more
8 opportunity. It eliminates the recognition problem for
9 most hunters. And I think keeping the deer limit to
10 one in January, you will really stop overharvest
11 problems that will deal, and turn into long-term
12 management problems and recovery rates for these deer.
13 I think it will eliminate that problem as well.

14
15 So that's all I have for now. I
16 appreciate the time to comment. I'd be glad to answer
17 any questions if anyone has one.

18
19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Tom.
20 Good points. Any questions for Tom.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, we're going
25 to move on then. Subsistence Resource Commissions.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: None.

30
31 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I haven't
32 received any written comments but I would ask Barbara
33 just to confirm that the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC did not
34 have comments on this proposal. I know they met just
35 last week.

36
37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

38
39 MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, DeAnna.
40 It's Barbara Cellarius with Wrangell-St. Elias National
41 Park and Preserve. And, yes, the SRC has comments on
42 33 through 36 plus No. 1 and 2 that you'll get to later
43 in your meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Okay,
46 how about summary of written and public comments.

47
48 MS. PERRY: I believe Milo will be
49 providing that summary.

50

0061

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Milo.

2

3 MR. BURCHAM: I'm sorry, DeAnna, I
4 thought you were doing that and we only have the one
5 that came from Southeast. That's the only written
6 public that I'm aware of but I don't have that at my
7 fingertips.

8

9 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair. Written public
10 comments on 22-12 start in the meeting book on Page 37.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

13

14 MS. PERRY: The first is from Richard
15 Harris and it goes as follows: As a lifelong deer
16 hunter of Southeast Alaska I'm writing to oppose the
17 Federal subsistence proposals for deer harvesting in
18 Southeast Alaska. I've hunted some of these areas my
19 entire life, access to the areas listed is very
20 difficult needing good weather and much planning. I
21 believe the weather controls much of the hunting
22 pressure from non-Federally-qualified users in these
23 areas, somewhat self-regulating. I could understand
24 supporting a lower per hunter harvest number in some
25 areas but shutting down these areas down entirely
26 during the period of October 15th through December 31st
27 to non-Federally-qualified hunters is not acceptable.
28 Limiting hunting to any months other than October 15th
29 to December 31st should be considered a complete
30 shutdown as this is the only period a hunter can
31 actually hunt and experience the calling of a deer
32 during the rutting season. Any regulation changes made
33 should include changes to the Federally-qualified user
34 as well. Not all, but some are doing as much damage to
35 the resource with immediate access and extended hunt
36 seasons as the non-Federally-qualified user who has
37 limited access and shorter harvest seasons. Also, as I
38 understand, these proposals have no basis, there is no
39 evidence of a resource shortage or that non-Federally-
40 qualified users on Federal lands are having an actual
41 impact on Federally-qualified subsistence users ability
42 to harvest adequate supplies of deer in the specified
43 areas. I hope that you will take these comments into
44 consideration and reject these proposals.

45

46 Again, that comment was from Richard
47 Harris and he was putting this comment to Wildlife
48 Proposal 22-07, which was a Southeast proposal, and
49 WP22-12, which is a Southcentral proposal.

50

1 And additional comment along the same
2 lines was from Charles Schultz. He was commenting on
3 Southeast proposals 7, 8, 9 and 10 as well as this
4 proposal for Southcentral WP22-12. His proposal is --
5 I'm sorry his comment to the proposal. I am writing to
6 oppose the Federal subsistence proposals that affect
7 Southeast Alaska deer hunting. I oppose WP07, 08, 09,
8 10 and 12. Proposal 7, 8, and 9, again, those are the
9 Southeast proposals, prevent non-Federally-qualified
10 users from access to deer hunting on public lands. As
11 an Alaska resident I also rely on deer meat and is a
12 primary source of red meat that is locally available.
13 Eliminating non-Federally-qualified subsistence users
14 from access to hunt deer in areas around Angoon,
15 Hoonah, Pelican is entirely unfair to those who live in
16 other areas of the state who are non-Federally-
17 qualified hunters. There's no science to suggest that
18 the overharvest of deer is related to non-qualified
19 subsistence users, in fact, I would suggest that the
20 overharvest in the areas around Hoonah, Angoon and
21 Pelican, may actually be from the subsistence users who
22 may be killing every available deer seen in late
23 season, on the beach, and uncaring if the deer is
24 antlerless and uncaring of size. Preservation of
25 breeding antlerless deer may prove to allow fawn bearing
26 deer an opportunity to give birth in the spring. Also
27 education of subsistence hunters to harvest mature deer
28 would improve the size of deer and, thereby, increase
29 the available pounds of edible meat.

30
31 Extending the season in Unit 6 is
32 exactly a dichotomy of what the Subsistence Board may
33 be wanting to achieve. The complaint of less
34 harvestable deer will only be compounded if deer
35 seasons are extended during their most vulnerable
36 times. Then the subsistence deer harvest will continue
37 to overextend the available deer to breed for next year
38 and likely they will complain that non-subsistence
39 harvest is to blame.

40
41 Hunters of deer need equal access to
42 public lands. We are all Alaskans trying to provide
43 natural local deer meat. Please take the comments of
44 non-subsistence hunters into consideration. Also
45 consider making all Alaskans subsistence users, we all
46 live here. We all have subsistence needs based on size
47 of community we live in.

48
49 Again, that comment could be found on
50

0063

1 Page 38 of your meeting book, it's from Charles
2 Schultz. And because this comment was submitted to
3 Proposal 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12, we did have to include it
4 in our public comment section for Proposal 12. I
5 realize most of this talks about Southeast Alaska but
6 just wanted to explain that we do have an obligation to
7 let the Council know of these comments.

8

9 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
12 DeAnna. That's written public comments. We're going
13 to move on then to public testimony. I don't know how
14 many we're going to have. If it gets too many we may
15 set a time of five minutes, we'll see how it goes. But
16 we'll open it up for public testimony, including any
17 written comments received.

18

19 No. 6 Public. Council Coordinator.

20

21 MS. PERRY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, could
22 you repeat that.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I'm ready for the
25 public testimony and I'm asking you, do you want to see
26 who's in the cue to testify.

27

28 MS. PERRY: Yes, we could announce
29 that. Mr. Chair, we did have a couple folks earlier
30 today mention that they wanted to testify on 12 -- or
31 I'm sorry, on 14. But I do not have anybody in the cue
32 for 12, so I would just directly go to the phones to
33 see if there's any public member or tribal member who
34 would like to make a comment on Proposal 22-12 at this
35 time. If so, press star six to unmute your phone.
36 Again, star six to unmute your phone.

37

38 MS. CLAUS: Mr. Chairman, this is Donna
39 Claus. I was on Page 38, there seems to be another
40 written comment that went to Office of Subsistence
41 Management, I was wondering -- after the Richard Harris
42 one, that applies here, right? That's all.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes. Because
45 they did include No. 12 in that.

46

47 MS. CLAUS: Should that one be read too
48 or not. I'm new to this so I'm just curious.

49

50

0064

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I think she
2 read that. I think she read Page 38.

3
4 MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair. I read
5 both comments, 37 and 38 verbatim because they were not
6 summarized. I know that most of the verbiage talked
7 about the Southeast proposals but because these
8 comments did have 22-12 in the title we have an
9 obligation to provide this information to the Council
10 for its deliberation on this proposal. There may have
11 been some generic comments made within both these
12 proposals and maybe that's why both gentlemen wanted
13 this to be considered under 22-12. Yes, both of those
14 comments were read into the record.

15
16 Thank you.

17
18 MS. CLAUS: Okay. I didn't understand
19 that it was two separate ones when you were reading.
20 Excuse me.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, no problem.
23 No problem, good question. Okay. We got no public
24 testimony.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Regional
29 Council's recommendation. Council members it's up to
30 you now to put it on the table.

31
32 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair, Andy
33 here.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Andy.

36
37 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, motion to adopt
38 so we can get to the discussion.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Andy.
41 Is there a second.

42
43 MR. OPHEIM: Michael seconds.

44
45 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, I second, this
46 is John Whissel.

47
48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Michael Opheim
49 seconds it.

50

0065

1 MR. OPHEIM: Yep.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We're open for
4 discussion on it. Council members, you go ahead and
5 just say your name and we'll start discussion.

6

7 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair, Andy
8 here again.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Andy.

11

12 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
13 Yeah, so this kind of stemmed from something I
14 introduced years ago if you people can recall there was
15 a great concern for Cordova overharvesting, you know,
16 because they have a higher population density of people
17 there doing the hunting and mostly on Hawkins Island.
18 As Charlotte Westing said, you know, 800-some deer can
19 come off of one island, you know, on a high winter
20 event. So that proposal a long time ago kind of got
21 modified, accepted with modification for one buck for
22 the month of January and only in 6D. So this kind of
23 going to five deer in all of Unit 6, you know, there's
24 definitely a huge conservation concern that would
25 happen regarding that. I believe that even in non-snow
26 event years additive mortality can occur. I've seen
27 that many years here, in 30 years in the community in
28 Western Prince William Sound where I live, even if you
29 want to call it a limited harvest, not necessarily
30 Federal but state-wise, a new influx of hatchery
31 personnel, it can be a seine boat that comes over from
32 Cordova, charter boats out of Whittier, or private
33 boats out of Whittier. It can be a certain new family
34 moves into the community, has a big boat and does a lot
35 of overharvest. You know the reality is that one boat
36 with five people can get 10 deer and they do this if
37 it's brown, it's down kind of thing going on and that,
38 even on a non-winter event year can give us on these
39 other batch of islands over here a lot less deer in the
40 next year or two. It almost mimics one of these
41 events.

42

43 So a long time ago when we did the one
44 buck thing in 6D, that was, I think that -- you know, I
45 think Mr. Carpenter said, you know, there's no data
46 collected on that, it's such a small percent,
47 Federally, over here in 6D, I don't really know over
48 there the Cordova side. But I would support this,
49 somewhat, the Office of Subsistence Management's
50

0066

1 modification, about the antlerless part of this. I
2 like Mr. Carpenter's one deer thing instead of limiting
3 it to a buck only, because bucks are hard -- that was
4 my argument a long time ago, how are they going to tell
5 the bucks when the antlers fall off. So I do believe
6 lengthening the season adapts us to these climate
7 change situations that are undeserving Federally-
8 qualified subsistence users. For years we've been
9 putting that in the annual report, that we need to be
10 able to change these season timings, you know, because
11 of availability or access issues.

12

13 So I do know that Milo has the in-
14 season response, the delegated authority to Federally
15 close things, which we voted on to have a sunset clause
16 but Office of Subsistence Management decided not to
17 provide that part of it up to the Board when that
18 happened. So that did pass and he's got the supposed
19 ability to react quickly, although he knows what's
20 going on in a delayed sense over in the eastern part of
21 Prince William Sound, he knows what's going on -- he's
22 got his finger on the pulse over there, I do believe he
23 still should call around over here to the western side
24 to know what's going on over here because they are very
25 different population density issues. Sometimes the
26 snow events are over here and the rain events are over
27 there and their deer are doing just fine. Anyway,
28 that's besides the point about that sunset clause.

29

30 However, I support this with a
31 modification. The public comments from the Southeast
32 seem to be primarily Unit 7 driven and not necessary
33 Southcentral for this Proposal 12. I believe one deer
34 would be fine instead of just one buck. And I'm fine
35 with including all of Unit 6 as long as Milo can keep
36 tabs on what that harvest is over in the east side. So
37 I don't think it should be limited to one buck and Unit
38 6D only, I think one deer -- so modifications of one
39 deer and including all of Unit 6.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you,
44 Andy. Before we move on, we would have to have a
45 modified proposal there, are there other comments. I
46 got a motion and I got a second and we're under
47 discussion.

48

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

50

0067

1 Whissel.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,
4 John.

5

6 MR. WHISSEL: Thanks to everybody who's
7 commented and weighed in on this. I got the ball
8 rolling on this proposal the last time we all met in
9 person. And the idea was very much what Andy just
10 stated, it was to shift the season a little bit in
11 response to the timing of different points of access
12 for the harvest. So for those that aren't familiar,
13 deer hunting is somewhat akin to goat hunting, sheep
14 hunting, it happens on mountains most of the season.
15 Early in the season -- right now I'm looking out at
16 Hawkins Island and it's green to the top and if you
17 wanted to go hunt you'd have to get to one of those
18 high meadows. You have to access the island from a
19 boat, so you have to hike up basically from the shore.
20 A lot of people who hunt like that, many people who are
21 able-bodied, younger, enjoy the exercise and the
22 opportunity to get out and the nice weather we have and
23 hike those peaks and get the early season deer. The
24 meat can be really good quality before they're
25 substantially into the rut and it ends up being a
26 really good harvest. But there are a lot of people who
27 live around here and I'm sure elsewhere who, while
28 they're able to get out and harvest a deer, aren't able
29 to climb a mountain. And those two things are pretty
30 far apart in the terms of the amount of effort needed
31 to complete your harvest. What I'm talking about
32 mostly older people, and people who are somewhat
33 infirmed and, if not, disabled and don't qualify the
34 threshold for disability, and historically when you
35 speak to tribal members here, the people who had a
36 tougher time with mobility tended to hunt later in the
37 season. The elders tended to hunt when the snow fell
38 and hit the beaches and the younger folks tended to
39 hunt earlier in the season. And it's that mind set and
40 tradition that we're trying to continue and sustain.
41 So it's not necessarily getting more deer, it's not
42 necessarily that we don't have access, it's -- and I
43 believe it was stated once before, the snow is coming
44 down later, that sort of second phase of the season
45 where the deer are in the lower lands, they are --
46 sometimes that doesn't even occur during the deer
47 season, sometimes
48 that's happening in February and March now.

49

50

0068

1 So the idea is to bring some
2 opportunity into the time where we would reliably have
3 some deer pushed down.

4
5 The proposal was initially stated as a
6 complete extension of the season with the idea that
7 there would be some talk and some negotiations about
8 maybe a less, substantial way to go about it and I
9 really do like a lot of the ideas that are put forward
10 on the table. I don't feel strongly one way or another
11 about whether or not we -- whether we take one
12 compromise than another, I like OSMs, I like what Tom
13 had to say, I like what Andy had to say, I think
14 there's room for any of those to work. But the one
15 thing that I would like to make sure that we establish
16 is that the buck requirement is really challenging and
17 it puts people into a position to violate the harvest
18 unintentionally, because it's so hard to determine sex
19 at that time of year, even at the end of the season we
20 have now, in the month of January it's very difficult
21 tell once the horns -- or the antlers have fallen off,
22 whether you've got a male or female. And people
23 harvest females by accident. And the idea is to just
24 remove that burden and just let people take their deer
25 without having to deal with that uncertainty as long as
26 the resource can sustain it.

27
28 So I would -- procedurally, I mean I
29 would be very interested to hear what everybody else
30 has to weigh in on, but this is very much thought to be
31 an extension of the ball Andy got rolling that started
32 out with a very incremental, one buck in January,
33 bumping it up one ratchet. I sure wish we had a way to
34 split out these people who kind of need this harvest
35 and just open it up to them but unfortunately we don't.
36 I'm not terribly moved by people from Southeast who
37 have an opinion about what we're doing with our herd up
38 here and asking us to violate ANILCA so I don't feel
39 like I'm going to support a lot of what I heard from
40 that public comment that DeAnna read. And I'm
41 certainly ready to talk about a lower limit and a
42 modified version of this proposal.

43
44 Thanks for letting me go on about this,
45 this is a near and dear one to my heart and I really
46 look forward to our discussion as well.

47
48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, John, that
49 was a good talk although you didn't come up with a
50

0069

1 specific proposal but we're working towards that, so
2 that's good. Any other Council members that got a
3 comment now, before -- we got the motion on the table
4 and we got a second and we're still addressing the main
5 motion.

6
7 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, this is Michael.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead,
10 Michael.

11
12 MR. OPHEIM: I was wondering -- as I
13 was reading it, I was wondering if it wasn't for an
14 elderly population, just reading how that was written
15 and, you know, I'm always for trying to get folks out
16 and more opportunity to harvest. And if that's a way
17 to help some elders get out and get some food that
18 would be great. I do like Tom's suggestion of one
19 deer, you know, instead of one buck, make it a little
20 easier on the folks out hunting, not putting them in
21 jeopardy of harvesting the wrong critter. So I would
22 be in support of it.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thanks, Michael,
25 good. Any other Council members want to comment on
26 this proposal.

27
28 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is Judy.

29
30 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, Judy has her
31 hand up, I don't think you're on Teams and can't see
32 it, but Council Member Judy Caminer does have her hand
33 up.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Judy,
36 you're being too polite just speak up, go right ahead.

37
38 MS. CAMINER: Thanks, didn't want to be
39 talking over too many people, a lot of good ideas
40 flowing here. And I apologize if I missed this,
41 because my phone just dropped the meeting, but anyhow
42 it was mentioned -- I think Andy said about, you know,
43 in-season numbers could be monitored and the hunt could
44 be closed, but I thought -- maybe I could use some
45 clarification on that, I wasn't sure that those in-
46 season numbers were available that quickly --
47 anyway, just perhaps if I could get some clarification
48 whether that is an option or not, from Milo or others
49 please.

50

0070

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

2

3 MR. BURCHAM: Thank you, Judy. I can
4 answer that question, Chair, and Council. This is Milo
5 Burcham of the Chugach National Forest. And we do not
6 have in-season numbers of deer harvest and, you know,
7 we have hearsay of how harvest is going or there's a
8 lot of deer on the beach or something like that, but
9 it's just that and as far as hard numbers of what the
10 harvest is like, if it's over or average, we don't have
11 that kind of information to make in-season management
12 decisions.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, good,
15 thanks Milo. Anyone else got questions, comments or
16 hands up.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I'm going
21 to suggest either John or Andy, if you guys want to
22 make a modified proposal, we got the original motion on
23 here to bring it on for WP12. I don't know if we could
24 modify that motion but if you guys wanted to change it
25 this would probably be the time to do it.

26

27 MR. WHISSEL: Yes, Sir, Mr. Chair. I
28 wanted to give all the members an opportunity to
29 comment before doing that. I would propose that we
30 amend to a single deer to January 1st to January 31st
31 as Tom Carpenter suggested.

32

33 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: And including all of
34 Unit 6?

35

36 MR. WHISSEL: Including all of Unit 6,
37 yes.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: And that's your
40 motion to amend that?

41

42 MR. WHISSEL: Yes.

43

44 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Second, Andy here.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, seconded by
47 Andy. Any discussion on that modification, motion.

48

49 (No comments)

50

0071

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, all
2 in favor of the modified motion signify by saying aye.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed to
7 it.

8
9 (No opposing votes)

10
11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: DeAnna, just for
12 clarification we approved the modified motion here, do
13 we have to pass the original motion?

14
15 MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair. John's
16 amendment for the single deer including all of Unit 6,
17 his motion was to amend and so now the Council must go
18 back to the main motion and as amended.

19
20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Right.

21
22 MS. PERRY: So what you just voted on
23 was to amend the motion, and now you need to go back
24 and actually vote to include the amended language of
25 one single deer, not buck, including all of Unit 6. So
26 now we're back to the motion, as amended, and we do
27 need a vote, Mr. Chair.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
30 That's where I was going, thank you.

31
32 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

35
36 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Actually when I made
37 the motion to adopt, I said motion to adopt with
38 modification but I'd be happy to make the first motion
39 as amended as we just discussed.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, is there a
42 second to that.

43
44 MR. WHISSEL: I think you need
45 Michael's second because he was the second.

46
47 MR. OPHEIM: I'll second -- I'll agree
48 to it.

49
50

0072

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You guys are
2 tangling me up in procedure, because you're amending
3 the motion, you agreed to amend it from the original
4 motion, then we didn't need to worry about it, is that
5 where you're going at.

6
7 MR. WHISSEL: Yeah, I think we just
8 took the step of.....

9
10 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

11
12 MR. WHISSEL: getting the motioner
13 and the second to approve the amended motion, that we
14 voted on the amended motion, that's all.

15
16 MS. PERRY: I think it would be.....

17
18 MR. WHISSEL: The motion is amended by
19 the proposer and the second so we just call the
20 question.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We passed the
23 amended motion so.....

24
25 MS. PERRY: Yes, that would be.....

26
27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: we already
28 passed that.

29
30 MS. PERRY: Yes.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: So the amended
33 motion is passed, we need to approve the original
34 motion as amended now.

35
36 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is Judy.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy.

39
40 MS. CAMINER: I'll certainly support
41 this amended motion because I do think it's supported
42 by local knowledge and biological information and would
43 certainly benefit subsistence needs and uses.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Anyone
46 else got a comment before we vote on it.

47
48 (No comments)

49
50

0073

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: DeAnna, do you
2 want me to -- I'm going to ask you to be put on the
3 spot, could you read the amended motion for our final
4 vote. You got on here that you want to restate the
5 final motion so if you'd do that for me I'd appreciate
6 it.

7
8 MS. PERRY: Sure. The motion is to
9 support the proposal as amended to include the language
10 of one single deer, and including all of Unit 6.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Correct.

13
14 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to add that
15 we support this because of the weather conditions
16 there, to have a hunt in January.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, we'll
19 include that as part of our justification, thank you.
20 Okay. All in favor, aye.

21
22 IN UNISON: Aye.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed.

25
26 (No opposing votes)

27
28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, we passed
29 our first wildlife proposal, 22-12 as amended and we're
30 on a roll now. Do we want to move on to the next one
31 before lunch or do you guys want to go to lunch, I
32 don't know how long 22-13 will take, but what's the
33 pleasure of the Council.

34
35 MR. WHISSEL: I'm happy to continue
36 with this one, this is John.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, hearing no
39 one else speaking right now, let's go ahead and try
40 Wildlife Proposal 22-13, and we need the introduction
41 and presentation of the draft analysis, OSM.

42
43 MR. BURCHAM: Okay, thank you Chair and
44 Council. This is Milo Burcham again from the Chugach
45 National Forest and I'm here to present the analysis
46 for WP22-13.

47
48 Proposal WP22-13 submitted by the
49 Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory
50

1 Council requests that deer be removed from the Unit 6
2 specific designated hunter regulation allowing any
3 Federally-qualified subsistence user to designate
4 another qualified user to harvest deer on their behalf
5 in Unit 6 as is allowed for large mammals and most of
6 the rest of Alaska. Currently only elderly or disabled
7 hunters may designate another to harvest deer on their
8 behalf in Unit 6.

9
10 The proponents would like to change the
11 current designated hunter regulation specific to Unit 6
12 so that any Federally-qualified subsistence user could
13 qualify another qualified subsistence user to harvest
14 deer on their behalf. Hunting deer can be physically
15 demanding, especially early in the season before snow
16 pushes deer to lower elevations. This would allow one
17 member in a family who is capable of harvesting deer
18 early in the season to fill permits of other family
19 members or other individuals later in the season.

20
21 Currently qualified rural residents
22 fall under the Unit 6 specific designated hunter
23 regulation requiring a hunter be blind, at least 65
24 years of age, 70 percent disabled or temporarily
25 disabled to designate another hunter to harvest deer on
26 their behalf. This analysis in consultation with the
27 proponent addresses the original intent of the
28 proponent by just removing deer from the existing Unit
29 6 designated hunter provision. The additional text
30 contained in the proposal, as submitted, stating that
31 qualified rural residents may designate others to
32 harvest deer on their behalf is unnecessary as it is
33 addressed in existing Federal regulation.

34
35 Prior to 2002, there was no designated
36 hunting provision for Unit 6. Three requests for a
37 designated hunter provision in Unit 6 were submitted to
38 the Federal Subsistence Board that year. Three
39 proposals
40 to adopt a designated hunter provision were submitted
41 in 2002 largely in response to the Federal subsistence
42 moose drawing hunt in Unit 6C. After deliberation the
43 Board adopted the current designated hunter provision
44 unique to Unit 6 allowing Federally-qualified
45 subsistence users who are blind, 65 years of age or
46 older, 70 percent disabled or temporarily disabled to
47 harvest any moose, deer, black bear or beaver on their
48 behalf in Unit 6, and goat in Unit 6D unless the
49 recipient is a member of a community harvest system.
50

1 The resulting designated hunter provision adopted by
2 the Board was a compromise recognizing the coveted
3 nature of draw moose permits for Unit 6C moose and
4 allowed for the designation of another hunter to
5 harvest deer, moose, caribou, black bear, beaver or
6 goat by hunters who are blind or over 65 years of age,
7 70 percent disabled or temporarily disabled. In 2003,
8 the Board adopted Wildlife Proposal WP03-02, with
9 modification to standardize the designated hunter
10 regulation statewide. The Office of Subsistence
11 Management submitted the proposal to provide equal
12 harvest opportunity for subsistence users across the
13 state. This proposal established a statewide
14 designated hunter program for subsistence harvest of
15 moose, deer and caribou subject to unit-specific
16 regulations.

17
18 The current proposal, WP22-02 submitted
19 by OSM, to request removing language from general and
20 unit-specific regulations prohibiting the use of a
21 designated hunter if the recipient is a member of a
22 community operating under a community harvest system;
23 that doesn't apply in this case.

24
25 On a statewide basis, findings from a
26 comparison of household harvest in a community
27 documented that it is uncommon -- it is uncommon for
28 about 30 percent of the households in a community --
29 I'm sorry -- it is not uncommon for about 30 percent of
30 the households in a community to produce about 70
31 percent or more of the community's wild food harvest.
32 A conclusion from this study was that individual bag or
33 harvest limits do not allow for these practices and a
34 recommendation for alternative management tools such as
35 the transferrable bag and community bag limits are
36 identified as being more compatible with the customary
37 harvest patterns of particular rural Alaska areas.

38
39 The effects of this proposal are
40 removal of deer from the Unit 6 designated hunter
41 provision would allow any Federally-qualified
42 subsistence user to harvest deer in Unit 6 on behalf of
43 other qualified users. This would allow additional
44 access to deer by families or individuals that are
45 unable to hunt themselves as Federal regulation allows
46 for designated hunters in the remainder of Alaska for
47 deer, moose and caribou. Biological effects of the
48 Unit 6 population would be minimal because winter
49 severity has as great of an effect on Prince William
50

0076

1 Sound deer populations as does hunting pressure, and
2 in-season management authority could be used to
3 mitigate conservation concerns if they develop.

4

5 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
6 support WP22-13, and the justification is allowing any
7 Federally-qualified subsistence user to designate
8 another qualified subsistence user to harvest deer on
9 their behalf in Unit 6 would provide additional access
10 to deer for individuals and families unable to harvest
11 deer themselves, whether as a result of physical
12 limitations, lack of boat access or other reasons.
13 This would also make the Unit 6 designated hunter
14 regulation more consistent with the statewide
15 regulation for designated hunters.

16

17 That's a summary of the OSM conclusion
18 for WP22-13.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Milo.
21 Questions for Milo. Council members, anyone.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you,
26 Milo, not hearing any. We'll move to consultation,
27 Orville, was there any -- OSM liaison, consultations.

28

29 MR. LIND: Good morning, Mr. Chair,
30 this is Orville Lind, Native Liaison for OSM. During
31 the consultation session there were no questions or
32 comments on this proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
35 Orville. Agency comments, Alaska Department of Fish
36 and Game.

37

38 MS. WESTING: Hi, Mr. Chair, this is
39 Charlotte Westing with the Alaska Department of Fish
40 and Game. I'm happy to provide comments.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go right ahead,
43 Charlotte, thank you.

44

45 MS. WESTING: Okay. So this proposal,
46 the State's position on this proposal, it really
47 matters how the previous proposal goes as far as if the
48 late season opportunity for deer is dramatically
49 liberalized, as the previous proposal kind of sought to

50

0077

1 do in its original form, then allowing additional bag
2 limits from a household to be taken could potentially
3 exacerbate that concern for overharvest even farther.
4 So what we're looking at is concerns about numerous
5 non-hunting members of the household and potentially
6 children and their bag limits being available if the
7 regulation no longer requires disability or an age
8 designation to allow for a designated hunter to be
9 established.

10

11 So, yeah, basically, the State is just
12 concerned about harvesting a lot of deer because
13 additional bag limits are available at a time where
14 deer are vulnerable for harvest.

15

16 So we're also concerned about
17 enforcement challenges with -- as I stated in the
18 previous proposal, hunting high water mark and the
19 ability for users and enforcement Staff to determine
20 when a deer has been taken on Federal land when they're
21 potentially at the mean high water mark or below that.

22

23

24 The State also has concerns about
25 recordkeeping for the harvest. If a hunter has taken
26 deer under the harvest ticket system for a number of
27 different hunters, how will our harvest reports be
28 sorted out after the fact and that is an area of
29 concern for us. We have a difficult time, as it is,
30 getting accurate harvest information.

31

32 And then, additionally, I'd just like
33 to reinforce that neither Fish and Game, nor the Forest
34 Service have the ability to really respond in-season to
35 a concern on anything but hearsay. And so this
36 proposal is the one that specifically stated that in-
37 season management could be used if excessive harvest
38 were occurring, and we just haven't had the ability to
39 do that, to respond in real time to something.

40

41 So for those reasons, the State opposes
42 this, as it's written now.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
45 Questions for her, anyone.

46

47 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John
48 Whissel, I have one question.

49

50

0078

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go right ahead,
2 John.

3
4 MR. WHISSEL: Charlotte, if I interpret
5 your statement correctly, the State's opposition is
6 based upon the potential for the Federal Subsistence
7 Board not to take this RACs recommendation but, instead
8 to approve the full proposal, WP12, in which case the
9 potential for overharvest is huge, but would the State
10 have an opinion on the revised proposal and whether
11 that is conservative enough to use the normal
12 designated hunter rules here.

13
14 Thanks.

15
16 MS. WESTING: Yeah, Member Whissel,
17 through Mr. Chair. I would have to consult with other
18 leadership within the State to make sure that everyone
19 is consistent on the position, I would say that the
20 concerns are greatly alleviated with the modification
21 if that's approved to the previous proposal, but the
22 enforcement concerns still exist, so that's still
23 there. But I would need to consult with them further
24 on if those concerns are completely alleviated by the
25 modifications too for WP22-12.

26
27 MR. WHISSEL: Enforcement concerns
28 exist -- those enforcement concerns exist right now
29 with the harvest as it stands; is that correct, in
30 terms of.....

31
32 MS. WESTING: So enforcement concerns
33 exist -- sorry, through the Chair, is it all right if I
34 respond.

35
36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.

37
38 MS. WESTING: Enforcement concerns
39 always exist as far as, you know, whether or not
40 Federally-qualified subsistence users are harvesting on
41 Federal land or at or below the mean high water mark,
42 or whatever, that exists currently and will probably
43 always exist. The thing I struggle to understand is a
44 system where people can contain the harvest -- can
45 possess the harvest tickets of other people and
46 validate those harvest tickets and the paper trail
47 that's related to all of that. And I'm not clear on
48 how that paper trail all comes down because it's
49 administered through the Federal side. In most cases
50

0079

1 the hunter is in possession -- for example, on a State
2 proxy hunt, the hunter is in possession of their
3 hunting license, their proxy paperwork and the other
4 person's harvest tickets while they're hunting, but I'm
5 not clear on how that's administered through the
6 Federal system.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, John, I
9 hope that answered your questions.

10

11 MR. WHISSEL: It certainly did, thank
12 you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
15 How about Federal, we'll move on to agency comments,
16 Federal comments.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Milo, anyone.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No comments,
25 okay. Any tribal representatives, comments on this
26 proposal.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Advisory
31 Group comments, other Regional Advisory Councils,
32 DeAnna, was there anyone.

33

34 MS. PERRY: There have been no Regional
35 Advisory Council comments on this proposal, Mr. Chair.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Fish
38 and Game Advisory Council -- Committees, any Fish and
39 Game Advisory Committee.

40

41 MR. CARPENTER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this
42 is Tom Carpenter again with the Copper River/Prince
43 William Sound Advisory Committee. We have some
44 comments that I would like to submit for the record.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

47

48 MR. CARPENTER: So for WP22-13. We also
49 had grave concerns with the prior proposal if passed

50

0080

1 through the RAC process as submitted, that the
2 potential for overharvest was great. I'm assuming now
3 that the Federal Board will give deference to the
4 recommendation that the Southcentral RAC is going to
5 submit to them for their consideration. So that does
6 eliminate some of our concern.

7
8 But some of the other concerns that we
9 have in regards to changing this rule that currently
10 exist is that once, again, you know, all rural
11 residents of the state of Alaska qualify to participate
12 in this Federal deer hunt and this change to the
13 designated hunter regulation would also be very
14 meaningful to them. One of our suggestions is probably
15 that before you consider passing and changing this rule
16 that's been around for about 20 years and quite frankly
17 it's worked really effectively because it's very
18 similar to the State's system so the confusion levels
19 are very low, and what it does do is it allows for the
20 elderly, people that have some sort of disability, some
21 sort of temporarily disability, there is no doubt that
22 we never want to take the ability for those people to
23 be able to participate or to share in the taking of
24 wild game, that's not in question. But considering
25 that the deer is such a huge protein component in the
26 Prince William Sound communities, specifically Chenega,
27 Tatitlek, and Cordova, before you might consider
28 passing this, you might want to consider a C&T analysis
29 for deer in Prince William Sound. Because I think if
30 you take that role, and take on that problem first and
31 get that established, who has a C&T for deer, you're
32 going to eliminate a very large potential issue of all
33 rural residents being qualified. So take that into
34 consideration.

35
36 I think some of the other things that
37 we're really worried about is one of the things with
38 deer hunting specifically is that it's one of the first
39 big game species in Prince William Sound that families
40 can pass on hunting traditions, hunting areas, methods
41 of hunting, things like that with kids and most
42 families will continue to do that but there are going
43 to be many instances in which there are certain people
44 that are going to take advantage of the fact that they
45 might not want to continue to do that, or do the right
46 thing by passing these traditions down to their
47 children or to their nephews or nieces or what have
48 you, or other kids in the community, because now they
49 can just go grab a bunch of tags and go out and shoot a
50

0081

1 whole bunch of deer and that kind of violates the long
2 traditions that have been passed down in Prince William
3 Sound in regards to deer harvest. You know the Federal
4 Board, 20 years ago, reacted to this area by passing a
5 very thoughtful proposal that deals with designated
6 hunters, basically considered three proposals, finally
7 adopted, as the analysis suggests, language that the
8 Native Village of Eyak proposed that created the
9 existing regulation in the Federal hunting regulations
10 that's worked every since. I mean to my knowledge the
11 only designated hunter regulations that have ever been
12 utilized for any game species, and Milo can correct me
13 if I'm wrong, have been for the moose hunt. It has
14 never even been suggested that the deer hunt -- and I
15 could be wrong about that so don't quote me, and Milo
16 can surely correct me.

17
18 But I think the big thing to consider
19 in regards to this, because this is a very big change,
20 this will change things dramatically from long historic
21 ways of doing things here. Because I think that this
22 proposal -- I understand it came from the RAC, that it
23 was generated by somebody on the RAC, I think this
24 proposal is best if it comes from the public, because
25 if people really demand change they're going to ask for
26 it, and in my experience I have not heard, or have not
27 had people come up to me and suggest that this is an
28 extremely important change that they'd like to see
29 here.

30
31 So anyway those are my suggestions or
32 excuse me, our comments and if anybody has a question
33 I'd be glad to answer it.

34
35 Thank you.

36
37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Tom.
38 Any questions for Tom. Those are good comments, Tom,
39 thank you. Questions.

40
41 MS. TOTEMOFF: Mr. Chairman, this is
42 Angela.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Angela.

45
46 MS. TOTEMOFF: I just would like to
47 have it shown on the record that I do support what Tom
48 is saying and I share those sentiments as well.

49
50

0082

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
2 Angela. Okay, then.....

3
4 MS. STICKWAN: Tom, I didn't really
5 understand what you were saying. Did you say do a C&T
6 first?

7
8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: He did suggest
9 that.

10
11 MR. CARPENTER: Through the Chair. Ms.
12 Stickwan. Yes, I think that because of the way the
13 regulation is currently written that all rural
14 residents qualify, that on this particular proposal
15 would also allow all rural residents to use the new
16 designated hunter regulations, and because of all the
17 other things that we've talked about in regards to
18 overharvest and things like that and Federal
19 authorities not really having the ability to react
20 effectively in-season, it seems to me that the RAC or
21 somebody in the public should request that OSM does a
22 C&T analysis for the Prince William Sound communities
23 and then you -- you stop the problem from exacerbating
24 into large volumes of people that are going to have the
25 ability to participate.

26
27 MS. STICKWAN: Thanks.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
30 Gloria. Any other questions for Tom.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
35 Subsistence Resource Commissions, any comments.

36
37 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I believe the
38 Wrangell-St. Elias will have comments on later
39 proposals but not on this one.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
42 Hearing none there, how about a summary of written
43 public comments.

44
45 MR. BURCHAM: This is Milo from the
46 Chugach National Forest. And, sorry, DeAnna, for
47 putting you on the spot last time but I can summarize
48 these public comments; there were none.

49
50

0083

1 (Laughter)

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that's --
4 thank you. Public testimony, anyone got a public
5 testimony on this proposal 22-13.

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, hearing
10 none, I'm going to go ahead and move on then. Regional
11 Council's recommendation. Does somebody want to put a
12 motion up.

13

14 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John
15 Whissel. Move to adopt WP22-13.

16

17 MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael, I'll
18 second that.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, seconded by
21 Michael. Okay, it's been moved and seconded, we're
22 open for discussion. Council members.

23

24 MR. WHISSEL: I'd start -- I think the
25 comment from Tom, again, is super helpful. The
26 intention here is the same as the last one, is to get a
27 little bit more access to the people who are less able
28 to get their own deer. I think the idea of a C&T
29 designation before this is really, really good. I think
30 that's an excellent way to approach it and I would
31 support doing a C&T before expanding this, provided
32 that we can get confirmation, for the record, from OSM
33 that his assessment is correct and this harvest would,
34 in fact, be extended to every rural resident in the
35 state. I'm wondering if that analysis or that
36 confirmation is available from someone attending the
37 meeting?

38

39 MR. BURCHAM: This is Milo with the
40 Chugach Forest. And it is true, that all State rural
41 -- all rural residents have C&T for deer in Prince
42 William Sound so it would it extend to all rural
43 residents as I see it.

44

45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Milo.

46

47 MR. WHISSEL: With that in mind I think
48 I would, with my second, I would amend my motion to
49 amend the proposal to conduct a C&T for Sitka black-

50

0084

1 tailed deer in Prince William Sound.

2

3 MR. OPHEIM: As the second, I'd go with
4 that.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, we've got
7 an amended motion, got it moved and seconded to conduct
8 a C&T. And so that's the amended motion we.....

9

10 MS. CLAUS: Mr. Chairman, does that
11 mean the C&T would need to be done before this motion
12 is put in action?

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.

15

16 MS. CLAUS: Thank you.

17

18 MR. WHISSEL: Okay. So, correct, we
19 would.....

20

21 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.

24

25 MS. PERRY: I just wanted to let you
26 know that Judy has her hand up.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I can't see
29 her hand, I see a hand there, but no waiving -- Judy,
30 go ahead.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Judy, you're up,
35 you want to address this. We got an amended motion on
36 the floor and it's been moved and seconded.

37

38 MS. CAMINER: Yes, are you able to hear
39 me now?

40

41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, can hear
42 you now.

43

44 MS. CAMINER: Sure. Question for Milo
45 or others. Is there information on how many, you know,
46 non-rural residents are participating in this hunt. I
47 mean my first reaction in hearing the original
48 analysis, yeah, C&T might help address this concern,
49 but do we have a sense of how many people from
50

0085

1 elsewhere are making use of the hunt right now?

2

3

MR. BURCHAM: This is Milo, I'm going to need a minute to look that up. I believe it is in my analysis, if I was to summarize that, it's a very small number of non-rural residents from outside of Prince William Sound come into the Sound to harvest deer. But if you'd give me another few minutes I'll see if I can find that in my analysis.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. VICKERS: Hello, Mr. Chair, this is Brent Vickers from the Office of Subsistence Management.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, good to hear you, go right ahead.

MR. VICKERS: Hello. Hello everyone. Great discussion so far. I just want to add in considering a customary and traditional use determination, that would require a new proposal. Adding a C&T right now would be beyond the scope of what this proposal's about. It's certainly a great idea but it's not something that can just be added on right now. It would require a new proposal to go through at the next wildlife cycle.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I appreciate that.

MR. VICKERS: Yeah, thank you very much everyone.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Appreciate that. I was thinking that same thing, in fact, I text the coordinator on that.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: DeAnna, did you concur with that?

MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair, so it sounds like with the clarification by OSM, is that if this Council did not want take action on this proposal because they want C&T to be determined first, then they would oppose this proposal, it would go nowhere, and then someone, either this Council or someone from the public would need to put in a new proposal during the

0086

1 next wildlife cycle to specifically ask for that C&T
2 determination. And I'll just doublecheck with Brent if
3 that's his understanding as well.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That sounds
6 correct.

7

8 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.....

11

12 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:Gloria.

15

16 MS. STICKWAN: I was just wondering if
17 we could just defer our own proposal rather than oppose
18 it until a C&T is done?

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 MS. STICKWAN: Did you hear me?

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I heard
25 you, but I don't know, I'm waiting for someone to say
26 that. I don't know if we want to defer it or not, if
27 we're going to get the C&T we may as well as vote it
28 down but anyway whatever you guys want, it's fine.

29

30 MR. VICKERS: Hello, Mr. Chair, this is
31 Brent Vickers again.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Uh-huh.

34

35 MR. VICKERS: Just to speak on what
36 DeAnna was saying, yes, either way, you could still --
37 as far as I'm concerned you could still go through this
38 proposal any way you'd like, and then a C&T
39 determination could come before and it could come after
40 this proposal is approved, or however you would like to
41 go with it. You don't need to wait for a C&T to move
42 forward with this. A C&T -- waiting will prolong the
43 procedure, you will have to wait for the next wildlife
44 cycle in two years so just think about that.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yep, thank you.

49

50

0087

1 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, John.

4

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

6

7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Oh, Andy. Sorry,
8 go ahead, Andy.

9

10 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
11 Chair. So, of course, transferrable bag limits, to me,
12 is a conservation concern but this is like a proxy
13 thing, it's like elderly and disabled people getting to
14 designate to use deer resource, I don't know it's not a
15 huge concern to me about the record's keeping. The
16 data collection, of course, and the enforcement is -- I
17 mean even with the enforcement part, it says right
18 here, the designated hunter may hunt for any number of
19 recipients but may have no more than one harvest limit
20 in their possession at any one time, that is quite a
21 limiting factor within it itself. And hearing Milo say
22 there's not a lot of people kind of taking advantage of
23 this. Proxy hunting, to me, you know, gives qualified
24 subsistence users an opportunity to obtain food. I,
25 myself, would be into saying nay of striking deer off
26 of this, you know, it's -- or we take no action, so a
27 nay of opposition or we just take no action on this.
28 It seems enforcement is relatively cut and dry. And
29 then, you know, supporting the C&T designation of deer --
30 I knew that was going to be a separate thing. So,
31 anyhow, that's where I'm at on this WP22-13. I'm going
32 to say nay. I don't think deer should be struck yet.

33

34 MR. BURCHAM: And this is Milo Burcham,
35 I can report back on the question that was asked
36 earlier.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, go ahead.

39

40 MR. BURCHAM: As far as how much is
41 taken by non-local Federally-qualified subsistence
42 users is just five percent is the number I have from a
43 Fish and Game report. Approximately 45 percent of the
44 reported harvest, resident harvest was by local
45 Federally-qualified subsistence users and that's
46 residents of Cordova, Chenega Bay, Tatitlek, and
47 Whittier, 50 percent was by non-non-Federally-qualified
48 Alaska residents and five percent by non-local
49 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

50

0088

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. That
2 leaves about 50 percent that would be unqualified
3 Federal, okay. Any other discussion on the proposal
4 before we take a vote on it.

5
6 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John
7 Whissel. I would like to offer that -- to me it does
8 matter whether we approve this before or after a C&T
9 has been done. My idea would be to get that done first
10 and to use -- to benefit from that C&T analysis and
11 determination in order to deliberate and decide on this
12 proposal. So procedurally whether we just table this
13 proposal and don't take action on it or we vote it down
14 and bring it up again, I'm ambivalent about that but I
15 do not want to carry forward with this until a proper
16 C&T has been done. So that would be my leaning on how
17 it stands right now.

18
19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks,
20 John. Yeah, well, procedurally what I see is as the
21 Chairman is we have a motion on the table, we have a
22 second on this proposal so we need to take a vote on
23 that somehow, one way or the other.

24
25 MS. STICKWAN: Can somebody clarify the
26 motion.

27
28 MS. PERRY: This is DeAnna.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, DeAnna.

31
32 MS. PERRY: Currently the motion by
33 John is to adopt, and I'm assuming that means support,
34 the proposal. And I just switched screens so bear with
35 me just a second.

36
37 MS. CLAUS: Adopt as written.

38
39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yep.

40
41 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.

42
43 MS. PERRY: So the motion is to adopt
44 or support the request that deer be removed from Unit 6
45 specific designated hunter regulation allowing any
46 Federally-qualified subsistence user to designate
47 another qualified user to harvest deer on their behalf
48 in Unit 6 as allowed for large mammals in most of the
49 rest of Alaska. To this point, this motion has not
50

0089

1 been amended. This is the motion on the table as
2 seconded by Council Member Opheim.

3

4 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

7

8 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, thank you. So
9 for clarity, in my view, a nay means we would be
10 getting the C&T designation figured out first before
11 this ever passes, instead of striking, so a nay; is
12 that correct?

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's correct,
15 if we vote it down. And then someone would have to
16 come up with a C&T proposal. But I need to take a vote
17 on the proposal as supported, and the motion on the
18 table now, or we need to make a motion to amend it or
19 do something different with it and then go back.

20

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

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, John.

25

26 MR. WHISSEL: I call the question.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's been
29 called for. All in favor of Proposal as presented to
30 support WP22-13 signify by saying aye.

31

32 (No aye votes)

33

34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Those opposed,
35 nay.

36

37 IN UNISON: Nay.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: The proposal
40 fails. Now, we could either request the public or we
41 could consider making a C&T request, or a proposal, we
42 would have to put it together by ourselves I guess or
43 by someone. DeAnna, where does that leave us, lunch.

44

45 MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair, as far as
46 the C&T proposal, we wouldn't be able to do anything on
47 that until the next wildlife call for proposals and as
48 Brent said that's a couple years. So, yes, lunchtime
49 would be appropriate.

50

0090

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right, what's
2 the pleasure of the Council, I got to take a little run
3 down the road, would one hour be sufficient, we've got
4 a lot of work to do. How about 1:30 we all reconvene.

5
6 MS. TOTEMOFF: Perfect.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Perfect, okay,
9 we'll see you all at 1:30. Good job.

10
11 (Off record)

12
13 (On record)

14
15 MS. PERRY: Good afternoon everyone.
16 This is the Southcentral Subsistence Regional Advisory
17 Council. I would just like to remind everyone to press
18 star six or the mute button on your phone that way we
19 can limit the background noise. Again, star six.

20
21 And, Mr. Chair, if you are ready I can
22 take a roll call and make sure that all Council members
23 have come back from lunch.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I am ready,
26 DeAnna, go right ahead.

27
28 MS. PERRY: Okay. Dennis Zadra.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 MS. PERRY: Edward Holston.

33
34 MR. HOLSTON: Here.

35
36 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

37
38 Michael Opheim.

39
40 MR. OPHEIM: Here.

41
42 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

43
44 Diane Selanoff.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 MS. PERRY: Gloria Stickwan.

49
50

0091

1 (No comments)

2

3 MS. PERRY: Angela Totemoff.

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 MS. PERRY: Donna Claus.

8

9 MS. CLAUS: I'm here.

10

11 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

12

13 Andy McLaughlin.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 MS. PERRY: Judy Caminer.

18

19 MS. CAMINER: Good afternoon.

20

21 MS. PERRY: Good afternoon, Judy.

22

23 Aaron Bloomquist.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 MS. PERRY: Still out hunting, I

28 believe.

29

30 John Whissel.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 MS. PERRY: Paula Nicklie. I believe
35 she is going to be joining us later. Paula, just
36 making sure.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 MS. PERRY: Okay. Again, for Council
41 members just joining us I'm taking a roll call so if
42 you'll unmute your phones just long enough to let me
43 know you're here. We do not have a quorum at present
44 so I will go back and ask if Diane Selanoff has joined
45 us.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 MS. PERRY: Dennis Zadra.

50

0092

1 (No comments)

2

3 MS. PERRY: Gloria Stickwan.

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 MS. PERRY: Angela Totemoff.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 MS. PERRY: Andy McLaughlin.

12

13 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, I'm here. It
14 took four attempts to get in, it kept kicking me out.

15

16 MS. PERRY: Okay, Andy, that might be
17 some of the issues, we've got several Council member
18 who aren't back.

19

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible -
21 breaking up)

22

23 MS. PERRY: I couldn't understand who
24 just spoke, was that another Council member letting me
25 know they're here.

26

27 MS. SELANOFF: This is Diane Selanoff,
28 I'm here.

29

30 MS. PERRY: Hi, Diane, thank you.

31

32 MS. STICKWAN: This is Gloria, here.

33

34 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Gloria.

35

36 MR. WHISSEL: This is John Whissel, I'm
37 here.

38

39 MS. PERRY: Perfect.

40

41 Angela, are.....

42

43 MR. WHISSEL: It took me multiple tries
44 to get through. I think something's funny with the
45 phone line.

46

47 MS. PERRY: Yeah, that's what we're
48 hearing so thanks for your persistence.

49

50

0093

1 Angela, are you back with us.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 MS. PERRY: How about Dennis Zadra.

6

7 MR. ZADRA: Yes, Dennis is present.

8

9 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Dennis.

10

11 And Greg Encelewski.

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I am here.

14

15 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, you have 10 out
16 of your 13 seated members and you have a quorum.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, thank
19 you. Well, I hope you guys all had an energizing
20 lunch, something to keep us going here. We're going to
21 go ahead and move on, we've got Angela still out but
22 she should be here shortly. We're going to start with
23 Wildlife Proposal WP22-14, black bear harvest permits
24 and that's on Page 49 and I'll get my little thing here
25 and we'll get started. Introduction and presentation
26 of the draft analysis, OSM.

27

28 MR. BURCHAM: Thank you, very much,
29 Chair Encelewski. This is Milo Burcham of the Chugach
30 National Forest and I'll present 22-14. As Greg just
31 mentioned this is on Page 49 of your Council book.

32

33 Proposal 22-14 was submitted by Dan
34 Schmalzer and Nick Docken of Cordova and requests that
35 black bear harvest limit in Unit 6 be increased from
36 one to two black bears per year and that the Unit 6D
37 season would close if the harvest quota was met.

38

39 The proponents request the ability to
40 harvest two black bears in a regulatory year, this
41 would allow Federally-qualified subsistence users
42 additional opportunity to harvest red meat. Currently
43 if a hunter harvests a black bear in the fall they
44 cannot harvest another in the spring. They cite cost
45 of living, reduced ferry service and Covid19
46 restrictions as factors making Prince William Sound
47 residents more dependent on wild renewable resources.
48 Additionally, many local residents do not have access
49 to moose and deer because boats or airboats are often

50

0094

1 necessary to harvest these species. Black bear hunting
2 opportunity is easily accessed from the Copper River
3 Highway and does not require a boat.

4

5 In 1990 the Federal Subsistence Board
6 adopted interim subsistence regulations for black bear
7 hunting at bait stations that aligned with State
8 regulations. The Federal and State bear baiting season
9 in Units 6A, B and C has been April 15th to June 15th
10 and since regulatory year 2005/6 the State baiting
11 season in Unit 6D has been April 15th to June 30th.

12

13 The Alaska Board of Game has taken
14 several incremental measures to reduce black bear
15 harvest observed in Prince William Sound in 6D.....

16

17 (Teleconference interference -
18 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

19

20 MR. BURCHAM:the Board adopted
21 Proposal WP14-09 with modification to lengthen the
22 season for hunting black bears with bait in Unit 6D by
23 two weeks to run through June 30th to require the use
24 of a Federal registration permit and to set a quota of
25 20 black bears taken over bait during the extended
26 Federal baiting season. In February 2015 the Board of
27 Game adopted Proposal 210 to change the black bear hunt
28 in Unit 6D to a registration hunt.

29

30 Black bears are common throughout Unit
31 6 except for Kayak and Middleton Islands along the
32 north Gulf Coast of Alaska and Montague, Hinchinbrook,
33 and Hawkins and several smaller islands in Prince
34 William Sound. A sharp decline in black bear harvest
35 was observed in the years following the severe winter
36 of 2011/12, which may have resulted in low recruitment
37 of young for the following years. This information and
38 reports of fewer black bear sightings by many user
39 groups prompted the U.S. Forest Service and the Alaska
40 Department of Fish and Game to begin a collaborative
41 research project on Prince William Sound black bears.
42 That project is ongoing.

43

44 From 2005 to 2010 the hunting pressure
45 and take of black bears in Unit 6 was greatest in Unit
46 6D which coincides with the greatest densities of black
47 bears and ease of access by Anchorage hunters through
48 Anton Anderson Tunnel. An average of 427 black bears
49 were taken per regulatory year between 2004 and 2013,
50

0095

1 which exceeds the State management goal to average 200
2 black bears over a three year period. Without accurate
3 population estimates it is difficult to determine if
4 current harvest levels are sustainable. Although it is
5 difficult to determine the status of black bear
6 populations using harvest data, the decrease in age of
7 harvested male bears during the high harvest from 2005
8 to 2009 suggested that the harvest was having a
9 population level effect reducing the overall
10 population. More compelling was a sharp drop in total
11 Unit 6D harvest during 2012 and 2013. The total
12 reported harvest of black bears taken in Unit 6D by
13 Federally-qualified users from 2010 to 2019 was 24
14 black bears ranging from zero to seven bears per year
15 accounting for just one percent of the total Unit 6D
16 black bear harvest on average.

17
18 If adopted, this proposal would allow
19 Federally-qualified subsistence users to harvest two
20 black bears in Unit 6. This would allow additional
21 harvest opportunity for rural residents of Unit 6.....

22 (Teleconference interference -
23 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

24
25 MR. BURCHAM:that would help
26 offset increases in the cost of living, reductions in
27 ferry service and restrictions imposed to mitigate the
28 Covid19 pandemic.

29
30 In Unit 6D where conservation concerns
31 have existed Federally-qualified subsistence users have
32 harvested less than eight bears per year. From a total
33 harvest that has ranged from 91 to 453 bears between
34 2010 and 2020. While some conservation concerns still
35 exist for black bears in Unit 6D concern would be
36 mitigated if the Federal season closed when the State
37 closes its season if the black bear harvest quota is
38 reached in Unit 6D.

39
40 Current Federal regulations in Unit 6D
41 require a State registration permit. Permission from
42 the ADF&G would be needed to use a State permit with a
43 different harvest limit under Federal regulations.
44 Alternatively, Federal users may be able to obtain two
45 State registration permits, or a Federal permit could
46 be established.

47
48 The OSM's preliminary conclusion is to
49 support Proposal WP22-14 and the justification is that
50

0096

1 increasing the Federal subsistence harvest limit from
2 one to two black bears in a regulatory year would be
3 the subsistence harvest opportunity and allow
4 Federally-qualified rural residents of Unit 6 to
5 harvest an additional bear providing an additional
6 source of red meat. The small numbers of black
7 harvested by Federally-qualified subsistence users in
8 Unit 6D and closing the Federal season in Unit 6D if a
9 State quota is met mitigate conservation concern.

10

11 And that's the analysis.

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, thank
14 you, Milo. Are there questions for Milo.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We're
19 going to go ahead, if no questions, report on the Board
20 consultation, Orville.

21

22 MR. LIND: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
23 Board members. This is Orville Lind, Alaska Native
24 Liaison for OSM. During the consultation sessions,
25 August 19th, there were no questions or comments on
26 this proposal Thank you, Mr. Chair.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
29 Orville.

30

31 (Pause)

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Oh, I was muted,
34 I went on to -- sorry, report on the Board
35 consultation, we've done, agency comments, I was going
36 to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

37

38 MS. WESTING: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
39 This is Charlotte Westing, Area Biologist for the
40 Alaska Department of Fish and Game and I'll represent
41 the State's comments at this time.

42

43 Our No. 1 concern about this proposal
44 is that the analysis provided by OSM almost completely
45 focuses on harvest in 6D, 6 Delta. But there is
46 significant harvest in 6C, which is closest to Cordova
47 and there is a lot of participation by Federally-
48 qualified subsistence users in that area. So we don't
49 have population data for any these subunits for black
50 bears and for most areas of the state we don't have any

0097

1 information about black bear populations. But if we
2 use harvest data where effort has been mostly
3 consistent, we think that it can probably parallel some
4 of what's going on in the population. So we have data
5 across a larger area to the east and all the way over
6 to the southern Kenai that suggests for a period of
7 time harvest and potentially the population of bears
8 was increasing into about the middle of 2000s and then
9 after that time it began to decline. And then after
10 severe weather events in and around the years of
11 2011/2012 that decline became quite a bit severe.

12

13 (Teleconference interference -
14 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

15

16 MS. WESTING: And so if we look at
17 harvest data from Unit 6C we see that trend
18 paralleled. In late 2000s we were taking about 40
19 bears a year, now we're taking about 20 bears, and so
20 of that take the harvest in Unit 6C has a higher
21 percentage of females in it and in some years it can be
22 50 percent, most years it's more like 35, which makes
23 it a little bit more challenging to manage it
24 sustainably. And then there are also-- most of the
25 people that are hunting in that area, well, over 60
26 percent in many years are Federally-qualified
27 subsistence users. So the potential impact of this
28 proposal is great and one of the concerns we have is
29 that people will take two bears, not because they
30 really want to bears but they can shoot the first bear
31 they see and then also shoot a really large bear if it
32 comes into a bait station later. And bait stations are
33 a popular spring hunting methods and means to use in
34 Unit 6C.

35

36 So it's true that black bear harvest by
37 Federally-qualified subsistence users is low in 6D,
38 it's a very small proportion of the overall harvest,
39 that's not the case for 6C, and this proposal is
40 written for the entire unit of Unit 6.

41

42 So that's the bulk of our concerns
43 about this proposal.

44

45 Additionally, there's some enforcement
46 concerns as far as the facet users would have to get
47 two -- potentially two registration permits and two
48 sets of harvest tickets to adequately report their
49 harvest and just, overall, this will -- it can increase
50

0098

1 pressure and while it wouldn't be significant most
2 likely in 6D, it could be very significant in 6C. And
3 the best evidence we have is that the population hasn't
4 really rebounded to the levels it was at in the late
5 2000s.

6
7 And I'm happy to take -- so the Fish
8 and Game opposes this proposal.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Questions.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No questions
15 for.....

16
17 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, I'd ask one
18 question, this is John Whissel.

19
20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, John.

21
22 MR. WHISSEL: Charlotte, would you
23 consider there to be the same impact if the proposal
24 were modified to only allow one bear per subunit, allow
25 two bears total, with one bear per subunit?

26
27 MS. WESTING: That could -- Mr. Chair,
28 through -- Council Member Whissel through Mr. Chair.
29 It's -- it would somewhat alleviate those concerns,
30 however, across a broader scale, we don't feel that
31 there's evidence that the population has rebounded
32 enough to necessitate a two bear bag limit for the
33 unit. It alleviates some of the concerns, for sure, an
34 additional potential solution to alleviate some of the
35 concern is allowing only one of the bears to be taken
36 in the spring, but we still have concerns that these
37 populations are not at a point that would make a two
38 bear bag limit appropriate.

39
40 MR. WHISSEL: Thank you.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Any
43 other questions.

44
45 (No comments)

46
47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks,
48 Charlotte. We'll move on then, how about the Federal
49 side.

50

0099

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Milo, you going
4 to talk on that.

5

6 MR. BURCHAM: No, I don't have anything
7 separate to -- no separate comments and it was
8 incorporated into the analysis.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, very good.
11 Tribal representatives.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We're
16 going to move on to advisory group comments. Was there
17 any other Regional Advisory Councils, any crossover
18 proposals, anything affecting this one.

19

20 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is not a
21 crossover proposal so we did not hear any comments from
22 other Regional Advisory Councils.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, good
25 enough. How about Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

26

27 MR. CARPENTER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
28 This is Tom Carpenter again with the Copper
29 River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Tom.

32

33 MR. CARPENTER: We have some comments
34 on Proposal WP22-14. This proposal requests a unit-
35 wide harvest limit change from one to two bears. For
36 many reasons that were addressed by the area biologist,
37 we agree that this is a big change from the historic
38 harvest levels that we've had.

39

40 This proposal, you know, when you talk
41 about Unit 6, Unit 6 -- or sub-Unit 6D and 6C, which
42 mainly consists of Prince William Sound and parts of
43 the Copper River Delta are quite different than the
44 rest of Unit 6, Unit 6B and Unit 6A, which is basically
45 the Copper River east, you know, basically halfway to
46 Yakutat. Very low populations of people, very little
47 black bear harvest, you know, with the exception of
48 some guided activity to the far east. You know since
49 the '90s to about 2012, the bear harvest has more than
50

0100

1 doubled, specifically in Prince William Sound. Most of
2 that is due to the Whittier Tunnel being built as was
3 stated earlier. The State took many different courses
4 of action over a number of years. You know, this hunt
5 went from a harvest ticket hunt to a registration hunt,
6 shortened the season, smaller skull sizes and higher
7 levels of females in the harvest were noticed, and then
8 finally the State put into registration within 6D,
9 specifically, that black bears were not allowed to be
10 taken from a boat, which seemed to help slow the rate
11 of harvest down and it seemed to help slow the total
12 opportunistic person to just shoot the first bear they
13 seen, no matter what size, or even trying to determine
14 if it was a male or a female. After the big snow
15 event, about 10 years ago, there was a steep decline in
16 estimation of overall population of black bears,
17 specifically in Prince William Sound, but really across
18 Unit 6 as whole.

19

20 The State and the Forest Service
21 entered into a three year study which cost roughly
22 about \$300,000 to find out and to try and answer some
23 of the questions as to maybe why this happened, to look
24 at the overall fitness of the black bears in very
25 specific, to look at migratory patterns, denning
26 patterns, you know, and fitness. That study hasn't
27 been completed all that long ago and it just seems
28 really inappropriate after we had such a huge decline
29 after a really high level of harvest for so many years
30 to go and double the bag limit, specifically across
31 Unit 6 as a whole.

32

33 I suggest and the Advisory Committee
34 suggests that there could be potential opportunity for
35 Federally-qualified subsistence users in 6B and 6A,
36 which does have reasonable access, not great access,
37 part of it's, you know, the Copper River Highway or the
38 Copper River Corridor itself, you know, it does give
39 more opportunity so there could potentially be a way to
40 amend this proposal to give a little bit more
41 opportunity in those subunits specifically. I think
42 from a resource conservation perspective, I think it's
43 a little bit too early to jump on a proposal like this
44 because we just don't know yet -- for the number 1
45 reason, we really don't truly know how many black bears
46 there are, and we just don't know that if the rate of
47 harvest could be increased to such a level at this
48 point. I think a couple things, if you were to go and
49 adopt some sort of change to this proposal, I think

50

0101

1 ultimately the Federal regulations need to mirror in
2 6D, if you thought that you were going to make a
3 change, you have to eliminate take from a boat. Take
4 from a boat needs to be -- it needs to be a mandatory
5 part of this requirement, it needs to be in the Federal
6 regulations. I also think that, you know, allowing
7 people to have a little bit more opportunity for red
8 meat is a noble idea, I just don't think at the time,
9 you know, maybe five years from now we could be in a
10 different situation, or maybe a different proposal
11 could be worded to be more specific to certain parts of
12 Unit 6, but Unit 6 as a whole is just too broad and we
13 just don't have enough information to make that
14 determination.

15

16 That's all I have, thank you.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Tom.
19 Questions. Questions for Tom.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, hearing
24 none, any Subsistence Resource Commissions.

25

26 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I do not have
27 any comments from either Wrangell-St. Elias or Denali
28 Subsistence Resource Commissions on this proposal.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
31 DeAnna. How about a summary of written public comments,
32 OSM.

33

34 MR. BURCHAM: Milo Burcham, Chugach
35 National Forest and there are no written public
36 comments.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Milo.
39 Public testimony, anyone got signed up, anyone want to
40 do public testimony.

41

42 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, Nick Docken and
43 Dan Schmalzer both indicated earlier that they would
44 like to testify. So if Mr. Docken is on the line
45 perhaps he could go first.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that'd
48 fine. Nick, go ahead.

49

50

1 MR. DOCKEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My
2 name is Nick Docken. I live in Cordova and an avid
3 outdoorsman. My household highly values our
4 subsistence opportunities and being immersed in this
5 lifestyle and culture is a big part of why we made
6 Cordova our home. I've been thinking about this bear
7 proposal for a couple years, as we've had a growing
8 desire to hunt black bear and utilizing bear meat
9 annually with prioritizing our spring hunting
10 opportunities.

11
12 The current State bear regulatory year
13 doesn't allow one to hunt in the spring if you harvest
14 a bear in the fall. Here's an example. In 2020 I
15 didn't harvest a spring bear, and during an
16 unsuccessful fall mountain goat hunt in the Alpine I
17 had an opportunity to take a large male bear feeding up
18 in the berries. As much as I really desired to harvest
19 that bear I refrained because I know I wouldn't be able
20 to hunt that following spring, which is when I and most
21 users prefer to hunt black bear, but I would have
22 really loved to harvest that fall bear. All
23 surrounding GMUs have a two or three bear limit and no
24 closed season. With a lot of the discussion concerns,
25 we thought the biggest concern would be from population
26 and harvest fluctuations and history in 6D, Prince
27 William Sound over the last decade, but data shows
28 total Federally-qualified subsistence users average
29 bear harvest in 6D is 2.4 bears per year, that's one
30 percent of the overall 6D harvest.

31
32 After submitting our proposal we
33 chatted with our local ADF&G biologist and expressed
34 their concerns about high spring harvest in 6C around
35 Cordova, especially of small bears being brought in
36 harvested over bait in the spring, and these are 50
37 percent subsistence-qualified users hunting in 6C. So
38 our initial intentions weren't to harvest two bears in
39 the spring, but to be able to harvest a fall berry-fed
40 Alpine bear and also have the opportunity to hunt that
41 immediate following spring.

42
43 So hearing your concerns I propose to
44 modify our proposal to state just as such. Allow for a
45 second bear to be harvested, but only one bear in the
46 spring as this would help avoid any potential excess
47 harvest over bait in 6C. A second subsistence bear
48 would be on Federal lands in 6D, like Tom stated
49 there's a regulation that you can't shoot from a boat,
50

0103

1 I would support to keep this with this proposal as
2 well.

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

Thank you, Mr. Chair and the Council as well as everyone else that has commented or worked on this proposal, for your time.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Nick. Questions for Nick.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks, let's move on to the next gentleman.

MS. PERRY: Dan Schmalzer, if you're on, go ahead with your comment.

MR. SCHMALZER: Hi, hey, this is Dan Schmalzer. I've been a Cordova resident for the past -- about a decade now. I value the opportunity to harvest black bears, it's a great resource. I'd like to just reiterate what Nick said about opportunity to harvest one in the spring and the fall. I'm totally on board with those modifications of one bear in the spring, one bear in the fall and the idea of not harvesting a bear in 6D from a boat. So, yeah, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, well, thank you, Dan. Any questions for Dan.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Any other public testimony out there on the phone, anyone else.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, hearing none, I'm going to go ahead and move us up to Regional Council's recommendations. So we could entertain a motion to support and debate this proposal.

MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John Whissel. I move to adopt WP22-14.

MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael, I'll support -- or second that.

0104

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Michael Opheim
2 seconded, okay. It's open for discussion, it's been
3 moved and seconded. We'll have discussion on WP22-14.
4 You guys heard all the reports so what's the Council --
5 go ahead, and if I don't see you, Judy, you speak up
6 this time, but whoever wants to go first, that's fine.

7

8 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John
9 Whissel, I'll speak to my motion.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, John.

12

13 MR. WHISSEL: I've been thinking about
14 this one a lot, quite a bit. I agree with everybody
15 who's spoken up on this. I firmly believe that in there
16 -- in this resource there is a way to partition a
17 harvest to provide an extra bear to Federally-qualified
18 user. I know the proposal was not written in a way
19 that it achieves that. And I think the comments from
20 the proposers are excellent and very good steps to get
21 there and, honestly, I would want the harvest
22 distributed into different units, as I mentioned, when
23 we spoke to Charlotte from ADF&G. If the proposal had
24 been submitted that way I would be in favor of it, I
25 would vote to support it. My problem with supporting
26 it today is that it hasn't been scoped adequately.
27 It's a fairly substantial change and maybe it still
28 doesn't -- it's something I'd like to do more than
29 consider for five minutes while we deliberate, some
30 changes that detailed. And making harvest fairly
31 complicated brings it's own burden that I think needs
32 to be evaluated. So I would love to see this again at
33 the next wildlife cycle. I would love to find a way to
34 provide that extra resource but I have to agree with
35 the State analysis, and with the Regional Advisory
36 Council -- or sorry, Fish and Game Advisory Council,
37 what Mr. Carpenter had to say, and I think it's just a
38 little too much modification is needed to get it
39 through without having it reassessed by OSM and
40 everybody else who we invite to provide an opinion, and
41 the public.

42

43 Thank you.

44

45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: John, I think you
46 did a good job covering that, thank you. Is there
47 other Council members who would like to speak to the
48 issue.

49

50

0105

1 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, this is Michael.
2 This has been a tough one for me just because we've
3 suffered through a bear decline since like 2009, we're
4 just seeing the bear population kind of bouncing back
5 here in the last couple years. We had a bunch of bears
6 in town last year, and this year we've had some really
7 beautiful healthy bears, probably the healthiest bears
8 I've seen in 15, 20 years. Just amazing, they've been
9 fat since they came out in the spring. And -- but, you
10 know, we went from a two bear harvest to a three bear
11 harvest during this decline in this bear population.
12 We asked about getting the number dropped back down to
13 two and were told that we needed data, you know, as
14 opposed to Fish and Game's needing only -- they felt
15 they could support the additional harvest. So I'm kind
16 of torn.

17
18 You know there's a small number of
19 Federal users but, you know, it's -- I kind of worry
20 when you start doubling harvest limits and maybe some
21 more information would be good, I guess, for me to make
22 a decision to support this moving forward.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Michael,
25 thank you. Good comments. Anyone else have any
26 comments they'd like to make.

27
28 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Andy.

31
32 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Hey, thank you. Yeah,
33 this has been, you know, kind of a tough one. Being
34 out here I see the bear population coming back from
35 that previous decline. I, myself, have been up hunting
36 goats and seeing bears in the fall and thought, wow,
37 that guys eating blueberries, I bet he's delicious and,
38 you know, I -- around here people don't hunt bears in
39 the fall, they hunt them in the spring, you know, I
40 think it kind of uses up the fat and they haven't been
41 into the fish and the streams and what not. You know,
42 it's kind of interesting that our 6D bear quota is 20
43 but that gets shut off if the State quota gets met,
44 okay. That, in itself, is kind of an anti-ANILCA thing
45 because there's supposed to be a rural subsistence
46 priority for Federal users that takes a precedent over
47 the State sporthunters, you know, and so seeing that
48 our use, Federally-wise of that resource being like a
49 one percent, kind of, to me, seems to warrant a bit of
50

0106

1 a priority for people if they needed. I've been on
2 multiple phone consultations with people about this,
3 this specific 22-14 proposal.

4
5 I like everything everybody's saying
6 here, you know, this one percent of Federal use is kind
7 of minuscule, statistically-wise. I mean of course
8 we're going to listen to the State because the State --
9 you know, the conservation concern issue but still, you
10 know, data should warrant that, but we should be
11 talking Federal subsistence data, and not State data,
12 you know.

13
14 I could get behind this kind of with
15 perhaps more input. I like the modification, one in the
16 spring, one in the fall, so they can't harvest both of
17 them in the same season. I also like the modification
18 one bear per subunit so they're not nailing two out of
19 the same place. You know, that's a big issue here. 6C
20 and 6D almost always manages almost for the same darn
21 thing and almost for a decade here I've been always
22 lobbying has different stuff, from deer population
23 densities to whatever in Prince William Sound compared
24 to 6C. And over in 6C is where all the population
25 density of humans, the user resource takes a little
26 more hit on to the populations, I believe. But, of
27 course, there's the Whittier Tunnel, and the bear
28 thing. You know, I like the no boat. So kind of three
29 things I could get behind on this, one bear in the
30 spring, one in the fall, one bear per subunit, and no
31 use of boats. So there kind of needs to be a rewrite
32 on this and I'd be behind it if those three things were
33 met because this is considering Federally-qualified
34 subsistence use, which is like one percent of the take
35 because that data does warrant it.

36
37 Anyhow, that's where I'm at, thank you.

38
39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Andy.
40 Others. Anyone else want to make a comment or
41 observation or input. Council members.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, we
46 have a motion on the table, we got it seconded, we've
47 had discussion, if someone wants to call the question
48 we'll go ahead and take a vote.

49
50

0107

1 MR. OPHEIM: I'll call the question,
2 this is Michael.

3
4 MS. TOTEMOFF: This is Angela, I'll
5 call the question.

6
7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. The
8 question's been called for. All in favor of Proposal
9 WP22-14 signify by saying aye.

10

11 (No aye votes)

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All opposed, nay.

14

15 IN UNISON: Nay.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: The proposal
18 fails. And I'm assuming that someone's going to bring
19 that back in a rewrite. All right, let's try to move
20 on to some trapping and see what happens there. WP22-
21 14 increase black bear harvest -- 22-15, we're going to
22 do traps setbacks for furbearers along trails. OSM,
23 introduction.

24

25 MR. UBELAKER: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is
26 Brian Ubelaker, Wildlife Biologist with OSM.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hey, Brian, good
29 to hear you, go right ahead, give us a good analysis.

30

31 MR. UBELAKER: I will give you the best
32 that I can, Sir.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

35

36 MR. UBELAKER: This analysis does begin
37 on Page 58 of your meeting books. Wildlife Proposal
38 WP22-15 submitted by the Cooper Landing Community Safe
39 Trails Committee requests prohibiting trap and snare
40 usage within 1,000 feet of specified trails, roadways
41 and campgrounds.

42

43 The proponent states this population
44 growth in the community and increased tourism is
45 increasing the potential of encounters between
46 recreation users and traps. Signs asking trappers to
47 voluntarily set traps 400 yards away from the areas
48 listed in this proposal were put up in 2019, 2020 and
49 2021. The proponent expressed that voluntary adherence
50

1 is not enough, well understood boundaries that are
2 enforceable are needed. The proponent conducted a
3 community surveys of landowners, post office box
4 holders and businesses in the Cooper Landing census
5 designated area to get feedback on trap setbacks,
6 distance of setbacks and specific locations. The
7 proponent received approximately a 33 percent return on
8 the surveys and this proposal reflects the results from
9 those responses. The proponent specifically refers to
10 four trails, three sections of roadway and four
11 campgrounds in the Cooper Landing area. These can be
12 found listed on Page 61 of your meeting books.

13

14 The proponent states the impacts to
15 Federally-qualified subsistence users would be
16 negligible as it would only restrict trapping on a
17 small portion of Forest Service lands in Unit 7 and
18 would also reduce the risk associated with abandoned
19 traps near the areas specified in this proposal.

20

21 Cooper Landing Community Safe Trails
22 Committee plans to submit a proposal for the Board of
23 Game 2022 meeting requesting a trap or snare usage
24 within 1,000 feet on the same specified trails,
25 roadways, and campgrounds identified in this proposal
26 be prohibited.

27

28 Historically, user conflicts between
29 local residents and trappers have occurred in the
30 Cooper Landing area, primarily over pets getting caught
31 in traps. ADF&G stated that while there is a lot of
32 talk about dogs getting caught in traps, the number of
33 dogs actually caught in traps and reported to ADF&G is
34 low. The Alaska Trappers Association posted several
35 signs in highly traffic areas of Cooper Landing warning
36 trappers to avoid conflict by not trapping near trails
37 and turnouts and cautioning pet owners to be
38 responsible and keep their pets on a leash.
39 Additionally, in an Alaska Trappers Association Ethics
40 Video stresses the importance of proper trap placement
41 to avoid busy roads, trapping pets and potentially
42 offending passerbys with the sight of a trapped animal.

43

44 Adoption of Proposal WP22-15 would
45 decrease trapping opportunity for Federally-qualified
46 subsistence users because they would have to travel
47 greater distances and spend more time accessing
48 trapping areas. Federal regulations would become more
49 restrictive than State regulations, however, all users
50

0109

1 would still be able to hunt and trap without any
2 restrictions under State regulations. The maximum
3 distance from roads and trails in other management
4 areas where trapping is prohibited is a quarter mile, a
5 1,000 foot setback, while less than a quarter mile, is
6 still a long distance to offset traps from roads and
7 trails.

8

9 In 2015 Board of Game members expressed
10 concern about trappers having to travel 250 feet from
11 trails during their discussion of the proposal
12 regarding trapping. Hunting and trapping restrictions
13 for specific areas may be more effectively addressed
14 other than the Federal Subsistence Board. While the
15 State does not have any trapping restrictions specific
16 to Unit 7 it does restrict trapping in some management
17 areas.

18

19 Therefore, OSM's preliminary conclusion
20 is to oppose Proposal WP22-15.

21

22 Thank you for your time and I would be
23 happy to take any questions anybody may have.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right, Brian,
26 thank you. Any questions.....

27

28 (Teleconference interference -
29 participants not muted - music)

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that was a
32 good one. Any questions.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, thank
37 you, Brian.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: OSM Native
40 Liaison, Orville, you got any report for us.

41

42 MR. LIND: Good afternoon, Mr.
43 Chairman. Council members. Orville Lind, Native
44 Liaison for OSM. During the consultation sessions we
45 did not have any questions or comments on Wildlife
46 Proposal 22-15.

47

48 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

49

50

0110

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Okay,
2 agency comments, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

3

4 MR. FOWLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 Council members. This is Nick Fowler, I'm the Area
6 Biologist for the Kenai Peninsula located in Soldotna.
7 I'll be providing the State's response to this
8 proposal. Federal subsistence regulations regarding
9 trapping season dates largely align with State
10 regulations, and in few circumstances the Federal
11 subsistence trapping season occurs for a shorter
12 duration within the State regulation season dates.
13 This proposal would limit opportunities of Federally-
14 qualified subsistence trappers during their respective
15 Federally-qualified subsistence trapping season.
16 However, where season dates for species are in
17 accordance, Federally-qualified users could still trap
18 under State regulations which do not exhibit similar
19 setback restrictions.

20

21 With that said, ADF&G would ask the
22 Federal Subsistence Board to consider the potential
23 reduced opportunity and confusion this could cause
24 trappers and, additionally the confusions it may create
25 for enforcement in determining whether a trap was
26 placed within proposed setbacks was under Federal or
27 State regulations.

28

29 Alaska Department of Fish and Game is
30 neutral on this proposal because there is no biological
31 concern.

32

33 Thank you, very much, Mr. Chair.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Thank
36 you, Nick. Okay, how about the Federal response.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any comment.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Tribal
45 representatives.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Other Regional

50

0111

1 Advisory Councils.

2

3 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is not a
4 crossover proposal or statewide proposal and I have
5 received no public comments from other Regional
6 Advisory Councils.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
9 DeAnna. Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Haven't heard
14 any. Subsistence Resource Commissions.

15

16 MS. PERRY: No comments from either
17 Denali or Wrangell-St. Elias SRCs.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
20 Summary of written public comments.

21

22 MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, Brian
23 Ubelaker.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Brian.

26

27 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
28 We did have a number of written comments submitted
29 before our deadline. There were 36 grand total, 25 in
30 support of, and 11 opposing. I will give you what I
31 hope is a fairly brief, but all inclusive summary of
32 all 36 public comments.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

35

36 MR. UBELAKER: Reason for opposition
37 letters to this proposal included several different
38 ideas.

39

40 One, likely diminishment of subsistence
41 opportunity in a rural community. One commenter said
42 the Federal Subsistence Board should only concentrate
43 on remote Federal lands and that if enacted this
44 proposal would be in opposition to ANILCA mandates.
45 Several letters said the problem could be solved with
46 an ordinance from local government. One commenter
47 submitted this would be much more restrictive than
48 regulations on firearm discharge along roadways. Many
49 opposers stated this would place trappers in an unsafe
50

0112

1 situation by moving them farther out into the
2 wilderness. The major theme of the opposition letters
3 was that the idea was the problem was caused by dogs
4 that were off leash.

5
6 Letters in support of the proposal
7 stated that safety in highly traffic areas was a main
8 motivator for this proposal, which is trying to avoid
9 accidental injury to pets, children and people. The
10 areas in concern are seeing more and more public use in
11 the winter and as stated by several supporters,
12 trapping activities do not mix well with other
13 recreational uses.

14
15 That is the end of my summary of
16 written comments, thank you.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
19 Any questions for Brian.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none,
24 there was quite a few, I hope we all had time to read
25 them. Public testimony. I know that one person that
26 called me, I'm sure there is someone out there that
27 would like to testify to this.

28
29 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I believe David
30 Nees is online to provide some public testimony.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, we could
33 start with David.

34
35 MR. NEES: Hi, this is David Nees, can
36 you hear me.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I hear you fine.

39
40 MR. NEES: All right. Hi, I'm David
41 Nees, I've been a property owner in Cooper Landing for
42 nearly 20 years. I never received this survey from the
43 Safe Trails Committee, probably because I hadn't picked
44 up a post office box until about two years ago. So
45 mine is just what I would have responded had I got it.
46 Most of the things that I've seen with the conflict in
47 here has to do with off-leash dogs as was mentioned
48 previously. Just a reminder, we are in this unit,
49 basically in Chugach National Forest and they have an
50

0113

1 off-leash requirement that imposes a \$50 fine for
2 anywhere on a developed trail, if you have your dog
3 off-leash. Research in Canada has indicated that dogs
4 will occasionally bring bears back to the owner if
5 they're off-leash, so it's a safety -- it's conflicts
6 with people with off-leash pets.

7

8 The increased winter activity has to do
9 with the grooming of the ski trail, that's relatively
10 new in the last 10 years, they are grooming up at the
11 Russian River, Trail River, Crescent Creek and then
12 there's an area behind across from our dump where they
13 do a loop back by Russian Gap. So if you're going to
14 have a regulation, it would be better if the Forest
15 Service would indicate with signage or the user groups
16 with signage. Alaska Trappers have, indeed, put
17 signage up. I seen one at (indiscernible - muffled)
18 pullouts, site trails, I always have a problem with
19 this one, at the Y, the lake there. They have a sign
20 on the Old Seward Highway that goes back in there.

21

22 So it's an interesting proposal but I
23 really think if you had a look at the statistics you
24 would find that the incidents of traps catching things
25 other than what they're designed to are very, very
26 rare. So it's not a big public safety hazard. And the
27 other thing is that, you know, a responsible trapper --
28 and two of the local boys here trapped for about four
29 years, follow the regulations, do well, get themselves
30 some skins that they can sell, and their money to go to
31 college and stuff with. So, yes, there is more winter
32 activity because of the grooming of the ski trails and
33 most of this is just basically, if you have people with
34 dogs in the winter during trapping season that are off-
35 leash then you have the potential for conflict.

36

37 So I think it would be better addressed
38 not in a place -- because it limits the use of, people
39 like myself that would want to go out and trap and then
40 sell the skins and stuff because that's part of the
41 Federal use of wildlife, so I don't want to ever trap a
42 dog, I don't want ever trap a child, I don't want to
43 ever a human, but making me walk 1,000 feet in deep
44 snow up on the Russian River trail or a 1,000 feet on
45 the Upper Russian Lake Trail because somebody wants to
46 ski and let their dog run loose seems to be an
47 imposition on my ability to gather wildlife resources.

48

49 That's all I have.

50

0114

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right, good
2 comments. Do we have any questions for David.

3
4 MS. SONDRUP: I'd like to make a
5 testimony.

6
7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

8
9 MS. SONDRUP: Hi, my name is Christie
10 Sondrup, I'm a former resident of Cooper Landing,
11 Alaska. I am for the proposal for trapping. I have a
12 personal experience from back in 2014 with a pet. And
13 it was me and two friends were out on Waikiki Beach,
14 which is a very well known hangout spot for locals in
15 January of 2013 and we had gone to stop by, we did let
16 our dog off-leash and within, you know, about a minute
17 we heard a loud clapping noise and discovered that our
18 six month old puppy had been killed by a conibear trap.
19 This particular instance was extremely traumatizing for
20 all three of us. And the fact that the area that this
21 trap was placed was not considered ethical. It was --
22 it was very difficult, as a person who does not trap,
23 to understand how the trap works to try to release our
24 dog. It took about 10 to 15 minutes. Some of the
25 concerns that we had during the time was personal
26 injury to ourselves while trying to disengage this
27 trap. Unfortunately where it was placed was an area
28 that where actually a group of people with young people
29 were at just the day before and anybody could have
30 easily stepped into it.

31
32 So in the proposal, I do agree that
33 traps should be placed in less conspicuous areas away
34 from trails where there is known high rec use, whether
35 that's for dogs or humans. I'm not, personally,
36 against trapping, I'm just against unethically placed
37 traps in high use areas. And after my personal
38 experience I did a lot of research of other folks in
39 Cooper Landing, as well as the Kenai Peninsula who have
40 run into similar instances where with dogs just
41 stepping right off of trails. So that is my two cents.
42 And that's, I guess all I have to say.

43
44 REPORTER: Thank you so much, really
45 quick, could you please spell your name for us.

46
47 MS. SONDRUP: Yes, my name is Christie,
48 C-H-R-I-S-T-I-E, last name Sondrup, S-O-N-D-R-U-P.

49
50

0115

1 REPORTER: Great, thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Any
4 other public testimony.

5

6 MS. SCHMITT: I would like to make a
7 comment.

8

9 MS. DAMBERG: Mr. Chair.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I got two people
12 answered, but one said they wanted to make a comment,
13 who was that, Angela?

14

15 MS. SCHMITT: Thank you. My name is
16 Nicole Schmitt, I can be in the cue or I can comment
17 now, whatever's best.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Nicole.

20

21 MS. SCHMITT: I am also -- and for the
22 record that's N-I-C-O-L-E, last name Schmitt, S-C-H-M-
23 I-T-T. And I am also testifying in support of this
24 proposal. As a trail user in the area, I also have a
25 dog but sometimes recreate with my dog leashed,
26 sometimes just on my own, particularly Devil's Creek,
27 the Lower Russian Lake Trail and Crescent Creek. I
28 also frequently use the pullouts that are identified in
29 this proposal, both to let my dog out to have a break,
30 to myself to have a break, stretch on drives between
31 the Peninsula and Anchorage. And what my concern
32 really is is that the trapping regulations as they
33 currently stand by both the Federal agencies and State,
34 basically relies on a trapper's code of ethics, which
35 is not binding in any way. And these are designated
36 multi-use trails and public spaces so it's difficult to
37 really enjoy multi-use when there's not regulation
38 creating a safety buffer around those areas. And it
39 seems to me like the conversation around the Federal
40 rules being more restrictive than the State, which I
41 understand as being a legitimate issue, seems to fall
42 around timing of the regulatory year for this area
43 following the Federal Subsistence Board now and the
44 State, just by way of the way this is structured,
45 hearing something like this next year, so at least as I
46 interpreted it it didn't seem like the intention was to
47 have a more restrictive Federal rule, but to just
48 create reasonable safety buffers around these common
49 multi-use areas. Especially, because as the

50

0116

1 regulations stand now, a dog could be on a leash on a
2 trail and would not be protected if the trap is placed
3 right next to the trail. If you needed to a tree to
4 use the restroom, outdoor recreation, that is also not
5 protected. So if 1,000 feet is too cumbersome in
6 distance, then, you perhaps even a smaller setback
7 would be appropriate but I do think that, you know, we
8 don't live in California, we live here where we can use
9 these trails and enjoy living, I think there's space
10 and people are interested in a cooperative approach. I
11 think this proposal is a really good start.

12

13 And then my final comment is that I
14 think local trappers are generally extremely
15 responsible and do follow those codes of ethics, but in
16 Cooper Landing, the proposal area this is discussing
17 does fall along a major corridor and I think one that
18 falls to a lot of roadside recreational trapping from
19 trappers who might not necessarily be in the community
20 and have to face these issues. So it would be helpful
21 to just have some sort of clear regulation that allows
22 safety buffers for these multi-use trails and pullouts.

23

24 Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, thank
27 you, Nicole. Questions for Nicole, anyone.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Who's next in the
32 line.

33

34 MS. DAMBERG: Hello, this is Carl
35 Damberg, for the record. I'd like to comment on
36 Proposal 22-15.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go right ahead.

39

40 MS. DAMBERG: For the record my name is
41 spelled Carol, C-A-R-O-L, last name is Damberg, D-A-M-
42 B-E-R-G. So I formerly worked as the Regional
43 Subsistence Coordinator for the Fish and Wildlife
44 Service, I recently retired. And I was hoping to just
45 provide a few comments or thoughts on this proposal,
46 WP22-15 for the Regional Advisory Council to consider.

47

48 I do support this proposal in concept.
49 I support the importance of trapping and I support the

50

0117

1 rights of subsistence users to practice and continue
2 trapping, first and foremost. Personally, I've trapped
3 in other regions of the United States and I've also
4 managed trapping programs on Federal lands, and, thus,
5 I have some experience with, and an understanding of
6 the conflicts that can happen around trapping. I don't
7 look at this proposal as an anti-trapping proposal at
8 all. I look at it as a request to find a compromise in
9 a limited area to find a balance between skiers,
10 hikers, hunters, trappers, walkers and campers. This
11 proposal, although, it seems to be -- people have
12 wrapped their heads around the dog issue, it's not just
13 about dogs, it's about all users and what we do on and
14 off trail.

15

16 It's hopefully a request to make a
17 really clear demarcation for user groups of what to
18 expect when they're using a trail, a campground or a
19 parking pullout, in this specific area of the Kenai
20 Peninsula. The proposal is really seeking to find a
21 compromise in a region of Alaska that apparently is
22 seeing a very higher use -- public use, especially in
23 the winter season, which is when the trapping occurs. I
24 have done some skiing down that area and I ski in other
25 parts in Alaska so I have some idea of where we're
26 talking about. I do think that trapping should
27 definitely be supporting in this region, but to reduce
28 the conflicts on Federal lands this proposal is asking
29 just to create several trap free zones and areas that
30 are more heavily used by other winter recreationists as
31 well. So this would allow all users to know where
32 traps can and cannot be used and it would allow
33 trappers and other recreational users to coexist
34 through an agreed regulation.

35

36 I ask that if the Regional Advisory
37 Council supports this proposal, it will show
38 willingness and recognition to find a compromise to
39 reduce a long-term user conflict. I fully understand
40 that if it passes, Federal regulations would be more
41 restrictive than the State regulations, but it also
42 signals to the Board of Game, and the State and the
43 public that the Regional Advisory Council is aware and
44 sensitive to these issues and is willing to try and
45 find a limited and reasonable compromise to reduce user
46 conflicts. Ultimately, yes, the Board of Game would
47 need to pass a similar proposal in the future to align
48 State and Federal regulations. Obviously this is the
49 ultimate goal.

50

0118

1 In closing, I guess I'd just say, if
2 the Regional Advisory Council cannot support this
3 proposal, maybe they can discuss some of the other
4 solutions that might be acceptable to support,
5 different setbacks, distances, modified areas, you
6 know, whatever. But recognizing and offering possible
7 ideas to reduce conflicts would be really helpful. I
8 don't anticipate these conflicts going away. Trappers
9 and other user groups can coexist successfully. Both
10 groups have the right to use Federal lands and this
11 proposal is requesting a path forward to do so in a way
12 that considers the concerns of all users.

13

14 Thank you so much for this opportunity
15 and for considering my thoughts today.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right, thank
18 you, Carol. Anyone else there, next one.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, hearing no
23 more public testimony we're going to go ahead and move
24 on to the Regional Council recommendations. We could
25 take a motion for WP22-14 -- 15 establish a setback,
26 that's what I want the motion on, 15.

27

28 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, this
29 is Ed Holston.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Ed.

32

33 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, I move we adopt 22-
34 15 regarding trap setbacks.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ed. A
37 second to that.

38

39 MR. WHISSEL: I'll second that, this is
40 John Whissel.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, John.
43 Okay, it's on the table for discussion. I'll open it
44 up to Council member's input and discussion before we
45 vote on it. So whoever wants to start go right ahead.

46

47 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is Ed.

48

49 MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael. Go ahead

50

0119

1 Ed.

2

3

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Ed.

4

5

MR. HOLSTON: Okay. Yeah, just a little background. I'm pretty familiar with this issue, have been for a long time. Yeah, there's been a low incidence of pets being caught in traps, I have yet to see any figures on that. I know, personally, a number of people that have either lost pets or pets who have lost legs, et cetera. One point, I believe, and I may be wrong, and someone from the Forest Service may correct me on this, but I think the leashing of pets by the Forest Service is only on campgrounds, not so much on trails. Before I was a RAC member, I was also on the local Fish and Game Advisory Committee and that committee over the years has proposed a number of proposals to the Board of Game, at least four of them. Some were just kind of flat out, you know, stopping trapping, et cetera, et cetera, some was setbacks. All those proposals submitted to the Board of Game were denied and the main reason was this was not a biological issue, it's a social issue.

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

Now, I've talked to the local trails committee here and I kind of counseled them that they were probably going to have some problems or issues, mainly because this is more restrictive to Federal subsistence users than are allowed under State regulations and their best bet, and it's not a good bet, but is to go to the Board of Game with a similar proposal. We're kind of between a rock and a hard spot for two reasons. One, we're unincorporated so we don't have the legal ways of setting up our own trapping standards around our community. I know before I was on the RAC working with the Fish and Game Advisory Committee I approached the Forest Service numerous times that they could issue restrictions trapping, like setbacks. Forest Service declined to take this issue up. So Cooper Landing, unfortunately, is in kind of a tough situation. This is not going to go away. Probably 90 percent of the people in the community support this proposal.

But, anyway, I will probably have a hard time -- not a hard time, it's going to tough for me to vote for this proposal only because it, as written, it is more restricted to Federal subsistence users.

0120

1 That's all my comments, Mr. Chair.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ed.

6 Good comments, appreciate it. Who would like to go
7 next.

8

9 MS. CAMINER: This is Judy, Mr. Chair.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy.

12

13 MS. CAMINER: I was just wondering, Ed,
14 or other residents, could you tell us a little bit
15 about some local discussions that may have gone on
16 because I do see it as something really a bit out of
17 our purview and more of a local user conflict issue,
18 and I'm also wondering if the traps are marked.

19

20 MR. HOLSTON: Judy, I kind of lost what
21 your question -- this is Ed, excuse me, what your
22 question was.

23

24 MS. CAMINER: Okay.

25

26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: She asked if
27 traps were marked and she realizes the local, it's kind
28 of a little out of our reach there, but, one, is the
29 traps marked and I believe they are but, anyway,
30 someone else could answer that.

31

32 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is Ed, again,
33 Mr. Chairman. I don't believe the traps are marked. I
34 know Fish and Game has posted, in the past -- or, not
35 Fish and Game, but the Trapping Association, has posted
36 some signage but it's very limited. The only signage
37 I've seen -- well, maybe one has been along Snug Harbor
38 Road. However, the issue here is we're surrounded by
39 lots of different public lands. We've got -- in Cooper
40 Landing, we've got a lot of borough lands, we've got
41 State lands and we've got Federal lands. This proposal
42 is just going to deal with those lands that are under
43 the purview of the Forest Service.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right, thank
48 you. Any other questions, comments.

49

50

0121

1 (No comments)

2

3

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: If not I got a couple comments of my own, if I may, I'll indulge me. I'm going to say a couple things. I think there's been good comments on both sides and I understand it's a user group and there's a lot of conflict there, but, myself, and I think most of you know me, I'm not going to vote for something that's more restrictive than the State use, I just don't believe that's right. I also had some personal calls, and I'm not going to mention names, but from Cooper Landing, of guys that do trap in there and I got a complete rundown of the conflict and what's going on there and I think it does need to go to the Board of Game and I think it does need to go to someone else, locally, there to resolve that. This fellow told me he is working with the local user groups to accomplish that.

19

20 But, anyway, that's my comment. So I don't know, at least the way it's written now that I could support it. But I'll open the floor for the rest of you to comment, but since I didn't hear any I just give you my two cents.

25

26

Thank you.

27

28

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.

29

30

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Just a couple quick things, thank you. This is Andy McLaughlin here. You know, trapping at a campground certainly seems lame to me ethically-wise, but, you know, like everybody's saying we're not the ethics police or the safety policy, that's not what this Advisory Council is about. You know making Federal regulations more restrictive than the State certainly is something anti- our ANILCA directives. So it's an issue that's not really serving the subsistence user. And, you know, somebody in their public comment, their testimony was asking well what's the solution, well, creation of better signage, you know, better signage on both sides, trapping ethics as well as leash law adherence, as well as danger to winter users of an area where trapping does exist. So anyhow this conflict's not going to go away. I've been a trapper my whole life and I mean from elementary school on, it's something that happens, and I'm sorry

0122

1 to hear the conflict over there. But I'm with Ed, it's
2 a social thing.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you for
5 your comments, Andy. Other comments.

6

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

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, John.

11

12 MR. WHISSEL: I tend to agree with what
13 my fellow Council member said about who's
14 responsibility this issue is to sort out. Our job is
15 clear, through ANILCA, and it's not this. These
16 conflicts -- what I really want to weigh in to say is
17 these conflicts are best sorted out by the people
18 involved, by the trappers and the people that want to
19 use the other trails, coming together and speaking to
20 each other respectfully and acknowledging that there's
21 an issue on both sides that has to get sorted out or
22 they're best sorted out by the land owner, in this --
23 you know, if they can't get it to a compromise to come
24 together and put a proposal together to governing
25 bodies then the Forest Service should straighten this
26 out and provide some areas for dogs and the rest for
27 trapping. But it's not for us to partition this issue,
28 or to sort out two user group conflicts, it's to
29 provide a meaningful preference for rural subsistence
30 users to access these resources for cultural and
31 traditional means.

32

33 Thanks.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, John.
36 Any other Council member comments.

37

38 MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead,
41 Michael.

42

43 MR. OPHEIM: I agree with what
44 everybody else is saying, you know, it's not really our
45 rope and pony show there but, you know, it is a tough
46 situation. I know there's been several dogs around here
47 that have been trapped, some killed, you know, and --
48 but, yeah, just hopefully they can figure something out
49 and work this out and, you know, maybe come out with
50

0123

1 some great idea of, you know, like in the past there
2 were the snowmachiners have one side and the skiers
3 have another, or something like that but, you know,
4 it's a shame when somebody loses a pet or heaven forbid
5 somebody ever gets injured. But, you know, hopefully
6 they can work it out or take it to Board of Game and go
7 through that way and, you know, maybe some day we'll
8 see it come back or maybe we'll see it create something
9 that can be used in different areas of the state, so,
10 yeah. That's my two cents on it.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
13 Michael. Any other Council input.

14
15
16 (No comments)

17
18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We've got
19 a motion to adopt, a motion and a second, so anyone
20 want to call the question and we'll take a vote on No.
21 15.

22
23 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Question.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's been
26 called for. All those in favor of Wildlife Proposal
27 22-15 signify by saying aye.

28
29 (No aye votes)

30
31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Opposed, nay.

32
33 IN UNISON: Nay.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: The proposal
36 fails. Okay, we're going to take on a huge effort now,
37 they're all very important but this one here is so
38 important that they threw about one, two, three, four,
39 five, six, seven, eight, nine in one fell swoop, so
40 we'll see how we tackle that. WP22-16, 17, 18, 19, 21,
41 22, 23, 24, and 26A, caribou, goat, sheep, moose,
42 Moose Pass C&T, Unit 7, 15A, 15B, 15C, starts on 118
43 and we'll have OSM give the analysis on that.

44
45 (No comments)

46
47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I think you're
48 muted there, I don't hear you.

49
50

0124

1 MR. VICKERS: Okay. Yeah, there's
2 always too many buttons to push and I don't push the
3 right one.

4
5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
6

7 MR. VICKERS: All right, hello, Mr.
8 Chair and members of the Council. This is Brent
9 Vickers. And I'll be presenting Wildlife Proposals
10 WP22-16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26A. The analysis
11 begins on Page 118 of your meeting book. The proposals
12 include all customary and traditional use determination
13 requests submitted for Moose Pass this cycle. The
14 proposals were combined so that they can be considered
15 together.

16
17 Proposal WP22-16 requests that the
18 Federal Subsistence Board recognize the customary and
19 traditional use of moose in Unit 7, 15A and 15B by
20 residents of Moose Pass.

21
22 Proposals WP22-17, 18 and 19 requests
23 that the Board recognize customary and traditional use
24 of moose in Units 7 and 15 by residents of Moose Pass.

25
26 Proposals WP22-21 and 22 requests that
27 the Board recognize the customary and traditional use
28 of caribou in Units 7, 15B and 15C by residents of
29 Moose Pass.

30
31 Proposals WP22-23 and 24 request that
32 the Board recognize the customary and traditional use
33 of goats in Unit 7 remainder and Unit 15 by residents
34 of Moose Pass.

35
36 And Proposal WP22-26A requests that the
37 Board recognize the customary and traditional use of
38 sheep in Units 7 by residents of Moose Pass.

39
40 The companion proposal, WP22-26B,
41 requests that a harvest and season be established for
42 sheep in Unit 7.

43
44 Discussion.

45
46 The proponent of Proposal 22-16 states
47 that residents of Moose Pass have a long tradition of
48 moose hunting in the Kenai Peninsula. Residents of the
49 area currently participate in all available State moose
50

1 hunting opportunities available locally and moose is
2 shared within the community.

3
4 The proponent of Proposals WP22-17
5 through 19, 21 through 24 and 26A notes that Moose Pass
6 was recently recognized as a rural community. The
7 research that went into this determination demonstrated
8 that residents have customarily and traditionally used
9 a wide variety of resources including moose, caribou,
10 goats and sheep. The proponent also notes that
11 competition with non-local Alaskans and non-residents
12 makes it difficult to draw tags in regular State hunts.
13 It states that adding Moose Pass to the existing
14 determination would create a more meaningful
15 opportunity for subsistence harvest. Because there are
16 existing customary and traditional use determinations
17 for moose, caribou, and goats in the units included in
18 this request and a no Federal subsistence priority for
19 sheep in Unit 7, the analysis only considers whether
20 the existing determination should be revised and
21 expanded to include Moose Pass. It does not analyze
22 other community use.

23
24 Regulatory history. Moose Pass, which
25 includes the census designated places of Moose Pass,
26 Crown Point and Primrose first received rural status
27 earlier this year when the Board adopted Proposal RP19-
28 01. No previous customary and traditional use
29 determinations have been made for the community.

30
31 Eight factors for determining customary
32 and traditional use. For conducting a customary and
33 traditional use determination analysis eight factors
34 are considered. You can find them listed on Page 125
35 of your book. Please keep in mind that these factors
36 are not a checklist. The Board makes customary and
37 traditional use determinations based on the holistic
38 application of these eight factors as well as reports
39 and recommendations of the Regional Advisory Council.

40
41 Use of species by residents of Moose
42 Pass. ADF&G Division of Subsistence conducted its only
43 comprehensive subsistence survey in the Moose Pass area
44 from 2000 to 2001. During the study period, 28 percent
45 of the surveyed households attempted to harvest moose
46 resulted in 16 pounds of moose meat per person. One
47 percent of the surveyed households attempted to harvest
48 caribou and were successful, and 10 percent surveyed
49 households used the resource. The harvest resulted in
50

1 approximately 3.5 pounds of caribou meat per person.
2 Goats and sheep fill a common niche in the subsistence
3 hunting and diets. During the Division of Subsistence
4 study period 30 percent of surveyed households
5 attempted to harvest goat resulting in one-half pound
6 of goat meat per person. Four percent surveyed of
7 Moose Pass households hunted for sheep during the
8 survey year but no sheep were harvested. Approximately
9 five percent of surveyed households received and used
10 sheep. All four species were shared among residents of
11 Moose Pass.

12
13 Resource use areas. The Division of
14 Subsistence survey also mapped Moose Pass hunting areas
15 during the period 1990 to 2000. Map use areas should
16 not be considered exhaustive. The data demonstrates
17 intensive local use and opportunities are available
18 typical of subsistence practice characterized by
19 efficiency of effort and cost. Moose, caribou and goat
20 were taken in the mountains surrounding Moose Pass,
21 Cooper Landing and Sunrise as well as the foothills and
22 flats northeast of Sterling. Caribou were hunted
23 around Resurrection Creek west to the Chickaloon River
24 and south of the mountains west of Summit Lake as well
25 as just east of Summit Lake and near Sterling Highway
26 near Resurrection Pass Trail. Most goat hunting
27 occurred in the vicinity of Granite, Ptarmigan, Vogt
28 and Southern Kenai Lakes, Trail Creek, Summit Lake,
29 Crescent Lake, Bear Lake and near the city of Seward.
30 Other spots for goat hunting were around Resurrection
31 Bay and along Resurrection River. Sheep hunting
32 occurred in areas south of Seward Highway near Tern and
33 Grant Lakes around Crescent Lake, the corridor of the
34 mountains stretch south from Trail Lake to Bear Lake
35 including Lark, Andy Simmons, Sheep and Paradise
36 Mountains and scattered areas on the eastern half of
37 the Kenai Peninsula, some along the rocky shores of the
38 Gulf of Alaska.

39
40 Participation in State hunts. Residents
41 of Moose Pass hunt moose, caribou, goat and sheep under
42 State regulations. Because of competition for permits
43 and other restrictions on hunting, lack of
44 participation should not be interpreted as a lack of
45 interest or customary use. From 2009 to 2019 State
46 harvest records show that there was 112 hunts for moose
47 in Unit 7 and 12 hunts for moose in Unit 15 by
48 residents of Moose Pass. During the same year State
49 harvest records show that there were nine hunts for
50

1 caribou in Unit 7 and one caribou hunt in Unit 15B by
2 residents of Moose Pass. No caribou were hunted in
3 Unit 15C by residents of Moose Pass during this time
4 period. From 2009 to 2019 State harvest records show
5 that there were seven hunts for goat in Unit 7 and no
6 hunts for goats in Unit 15 by residents of Moose Pass.
7 During the same period, State harvest records show that
8 there were 19 hunts for sheep in Unit 7 by residents of
9 Moose Pass.

10
11 Effects of the proposal. If Proposals
12 WP22-16, 17, 18, and 19 are adopted residents of Moose
13 Pass would be added to the customary and traditional
14 use determination for moose in Unit 7 and all of
15 subunits of 15.

16
17 If Proposals WP22-21 and 22 are adopted
18 the residents of Moose Pass would be added to the
19 customary and traditional use determination for caribou
20 in Units 7,, 15B and 15C.

21
22 If Proposals WP22-23 and 24 are adopted
23 residents of Moose Pass would be added to the customary
24 and traditional use determination for goats in Unit 7
25 remainder and Unit 15.

26
27 If Proposal WP22-26A is adopted
28 residents of Moose Pass would be added to the customary
29 and traditional use determination for sheep in Unit 7
30 and allowing them to harvest sheep under Federal
31 subsistence regulations in the unit if a Federal season
32 is established.

33
34 If these proposals are rejected,
35 residents of Moose Pass could continue to hunt moose
36 under State regulations in Units 7 and 15 and caribou
37 under State regulations in Units 7, 15B and 15C, it
38 could also continue to hunt goat under State
39 regulations in Unit 7 remainder and 15.

40
41 OSM preliminary conclusion. The OSM
42 preliminary conclusion is to support WP22- -- all of
43 them and take no action on Proposal WP22-16 -- so to
44 support all proposals except for WP22-16, which would
45 be a no action.

46
47 Justification. No action need be taken
48 on WP22-16 as it duplicates the content of Proposals 17
49 and 18. Moose Pass residents' patterns of moose
50

0128

1 hunting and harvest in Unit 7 and all subunits of Unit
2 15 exhibit the characteristics of customary and
3 traditional use. The same is true for caribou in Unit
4 7, 15B and 15C, for goat in Unit 7 remainder, and Unit
5 15, and sheep in Unit 7. Use of moose, caribou and
6 goat by Moose Pass residents has been documented on the
7 Kenai Peninsula as shown through community testimony
8 related to Moose Pass' for the recent rural
9 designation, a subsistence survey and data from
10 residents hunting under State regulations. State
11 harvest records for Moose Pass residents hunting for
12 goats should be interpreted in the context of the
13 history of limited hunting opportunity, particularly in
14 Unit 15, use of sheep in Unit 7 has been demonstrated
15 through a subsistence survey and community testimony.

16
17 Thank you, that concludes my
18 presentation.

19
20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right,
21 thanks. Let's see that's quite a bit. Okay, questions
22 for Brent at this point.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I'm sure we're
27 going to have quite a few questions, I think we may
28 have to take this in smaller chunks but we'll wait and
29 see when the rest of the reports come in, consultation
30 with tribes, the State and maybe we'll figure a better
31 way to tackle it for the Council. So we'll go ahead
32 and move on but thank you for the presentation, it was
33 good, and we'll move on to the next step and see where
34 we end up. Thank you. Okay, Orville, do you have any
35 Board consultation.

36
37 MR. LIND: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
38 Council members. On August 19th when we conducted
39 tribal consultations, I think the only comment was that
40 our timing, of course, for consultations didn't meet
41 some of the needs and as these wildlife proposals
42 mentioned, we did not have any questions or comments on
43 August 19th consultations. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
46 Orville. Tribes, no consultations, okay, agency
47 comments. We'll go ahead and let the Alaska Department
48 of Fish and Game make their comments.

49
50

0129

1 MS. KEATING: Good afternoon, Mr.
2 Chair. Members of the Council. This is Jackie Keating
3 with the Division of Subsistence at the Alaska
4 Department of Fish and Game. The Department has
5 assessed all of the proposals that were just presented
6 by OSM and we will be submitting our formal comments to
7 the Federal Subsistence Board. But for the record
8 today, the Department is neutral when it comes to
9 eligibility to participate in subsistence hunting
10 opportunities. And, in addition to that, for the
11 record today we are strongly encouraging additional
12 subsistence harvest and use research for the Kenai
13 Peninsula area to provide adequate data when assessing
14 subsistence harvest needs. As mentioned by OSM there
15 is only currently one year of comprehensive subsistence
16 harvest research for the Moose Pass area.

17
18 I am available to respond to any
19 questions.

20
21 Thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that one
24 threw me for a loop, but that's good. Question's from
25 the Council.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We could get you
30 more data. Anyway, okay. How about Federal response
31 there, agency comments.

32
33 (No comments)

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Todd, was you
36 going to talk at this time?

37
38 MR. ESKELIN: No, Mr. Chair, I wasn't
39 going to speak on this proposal.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well,
42 we'll do it for you, thank you, Tribal, Darrel, were
43 you going to speak.

44
45 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. My
46 name is Darrel Williams, I'm with Ninilchik Traditional
47 Council, for the record. You know I guess the place to
48 start, I may need a minute going through this, but I'm
49 pro-subsistence, I think everybody knows that,
50

0130

1 everybody who's had experience working with me
2 throughout these years and it's really interesting on
3 this because the way the process has always worked is
4 there's a C&T determination, and then there's a methods
5 and means evaluation, and then an evaluation of what
6 those bag limits should be. And I will say that there
7 is so much lumped into this that I'm sitting here
8 thinking, well, the early run of sockeye, black bear
9 are going to be in the river in June -- I mean there is
10 so many different species and things that are not
11 evaluated at all in this proposal -- or in this
12 evaluation, it's really hard to start anywhere.

13

14 For example, you know, I'm going
15 through the information and I'm looking on Page 130
16 about people who hunted caribou and one person hunted
17 caribou in six years in Unit 15B. I have to raise an
18 eyebrow. You're talking about one person, and how do
19 we do a C&T on one person about a community doing that.
20 When we've done this in the past, you know, the Section
21 .804 analysis and everything else goes on and on and on
22 and we have to really evaluate these things and this is
23 turning into something really weird, because we haven't
24 even looked at methods and means or bag limits. I'm
25 really glad the State made a comment about the data,
26 too, because a lot of this data that they're using is
27 20 years old. We've had other problems with proposals
28 we're going to talk about during the cycle, you know,
29 where we're using the 1991 data and that's 30 years
30 old, and we've had to argue this before because the
31 data was weighted and stratified, and I mean all kinds
32 of great little statistical tricks to make it look
33 really cool and there's a real problem with that, and
34 there's ethics problems that we've dealt with for many
35 years but this same information keeps coming up over
36 and over again.

37

38 Just to start with that.

39

40 You know, we had similar problems in
41 the past.

42

43 I also was sad to hear that Mr. Lohse
44 died, my heart goes out to the family.

45

46 But I remember having this conversation
47 in the past about -- and, particularly, we used some of
48 the same methods to be able to map subsistence uses,
49 very well documented and it took years to get through
50

0131

1 our C&T process. And it was interesting because we
2 ended up with a much larger area that were qualified
3 for C&T. The best example that comes to mind is
4 Kodiak. And the folks in Kodiak were very, very upset
5 because they thought we were going to have C&T in
6 Kodiak, which we were eligible and by all rights could
7 have had, and what happened was is we reached this
8 amicable position about saying who goes how far and how
9 do we do this. It's interesting listening to the
10 discussions today because there's a lot of references
11 to census designated places, right, when you talk about
12 CDPs, well, CDPs don't align with game management units
13 and I get the idea of using a CDP as an area to be able
14 to look at, there is parts of CDPs that are delineated
15 by different topographical features such as rivers or
16 mountains or something like that. That would be
17 similar to game management units but they don't work
18 that way, you know, so that's another kind of problem
19 that we're having. When we're going to evaluate moose
20 and goats, they do live in different places, guys. And
21 we do manage them differently, you know, that's problem
22 No. 1.

23

24 Problem No. 2, is we're taking a whole
25 bunch of people -- and actually Michael Opheim talked
26 about this earlier, about now you're starting to talk
27 about allocations, right, what mechanism is going to be
28 in place to protect the subsistence process guaranteed
29 under ANILCA. There's a proposal that's later on in
30 the book that speaks to how the sheep hunts wants to be
31 changed and given authority to the Wildlife Refuge
32 manager, well, it's really interesting. Because we
33 have in-season management, we have those kinds of
34 things and we do have deference to subsistence users
35 and meaningful preference where other things are
36 supposed to close first, and we talked about that today
37 already too.

38

39 And, you know, I'm not trying to beat
40 the dead horse, but I'm saying in this aggregation of
41 proposals that has been put together, I don't see
42 anybody can clearly go through this and say this is a
43 good decision or a bad decision because there's not
44 enough information there, it hasn't been evaluated, you
45 know, and I'm pro-subsistence and I'm sitting here I
46 can't make heads or tails out of this, there's not
47 enough information here. We are doing, what, eight
48 proposals in less than 20 pages, what is that? I
49 really am stunned.

50

1 And then I have to start looking at
2 what is moose, what is caribou, and then I see that
3 there's use mostly in 15A and Unit 7, and now we're
4 talking about well, we want 15C and we want, you know,
5 next it'll be Kodiak, and we want to hunt up in Denali.
6 How is that going to work because those are the
7 questions that aren't being answered in the analysis.
8 So it really brings me back to have to look at this and
9 say, you know, I'm not even sure if we're following the
10 process at this point. Where is the methods and means
11 evaluation. Where is the bag limits evaluation. It's
12 not here guys.

13
14 And this is why I'm like, man, you
15 know, I'd really like to say oh, yeah, go subsistence
16 but the problem with this is that there's so much
17 wrapped up in here I don't see how we can move forward
18 with this and I have real pause with this. And
19 especially because we've addressed these issues before,
20 this was 10, 15 years ago but we did have to deal with
21 this previously. And it's also interesting because
22 that's not being cited about when we had to deal with
23 these kinds of issues in the past. When you go through
24 the reference material that was used to put this
25 together.

26
27 So, you know, I'm really curious about
28 everyone's idea on that and how that should be because
29 you know what I'm also afraid of is we're going to set
30 a precedence by aggregating proposals into something
31 else. And I think that the devil's really in the
32 details when it comes to this kind of stuff because we
33 want to be good stewards, and we want to do a good job
34 in what we do and be successful in management, in
35 harvest, in reporting, all those kind of things and
36 being able to put things in the freezer for people.
37 But the problem is, is that, I think if it gets too
38 loose like this and we don't look at that kind of
39 stuff, I know when it goes to the Federal Subsistence
40 Board I would have these questions and I'm not sure if
41 this is actually good to move forward. You know I hate
42 to be that way, guys, but I'm trying to be objective in
43 what's been presented in this whole thing.

44
45 You know the success rates, the amount
46 of use, you know, it's the same thing. When we're
47 talking about one person who hunted in an area in so
48 many years, that's kind of questionable and, you know,
49 are we really meeting those objectives that we have
50

0133

1 under C&T and trying to manage subsistence harvest, I'm
2 not real sure.

3

4

5 So with those kind of things said, I
6 would actually not support this because it is
7 aggregated in a way that it cannot be evaluated and I
8 would ask that the Regional Advisory Council consider
9 taking no action on this and maybe sending this back to
10 be reevaluated and, at least, divide it up into
11 species. You know, if we're going to start treating,
12 you know, mountain goat and moose and managing them the
13 same, boy, that could simplify a lot of stuff for a lot
14 of people but it's not effective management in any idea.

14

15

16 So it kind of sounds like bad news and
17 I feel bad kind of delivering this but, guys, this just
18 wasn't very well done. And I can't get a good enough
19 handle on it to be able to have specific substantive
20 comments to be able to evaluate this proposal one way
21 or the other, and that's my big part of the problem
22 with this.

22

23

24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of
25 the Board. I hope you understand what I'm saying.

25

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, Darrel,
28 thank you. And I think you brought out an excellent
29 point, when you aggregate everything together like
30 that, you know, C&T was a lot different in the past and
31 I know we're trying to be more all inclusive but we're
32 certainly crossing a lot of boundaries here and we're
33 crossing areas to other subsistence areas and some
34 areas that hadn't been used. So I'm not sure how this
35 is all going to shake out but we'll press on and we'll
36 keep moving and we'll keep that in mind. So thank you
37 for your detailed explanation. And I hate to say it,
38 too, but I kind of concur.

38

39

40 Okay, advisory group comments -- is
41 there any other tribal comments before I leave, any
42 other tribal entity want to speak to that.

42

43

44 MS. LINNELL: Yes, Sir, this is Karen
45 Linnell with Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission.

45

46

47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go right ahead,
48 Karen.

48

49

50 MS. LINNELL: I'd have to say that I

50

0134

1 also concur with Darrel Williams on this. You know
2 there's a process, you know, following that process is
3 key. We had the same similar situation when we had a
4 new community deemed eligible here for Wrangell-St.
5 Elias and their eligibility and where they
6 traditionally fished was in lower Tonsina but all of a
7 sudden they got eligibility for Slana near Katie John
8 and they had never, ever fished there. So bypassing
9 processes. And then borrowing a fishwheel from
10 somebody and then being eligible because you borrowed
11 that fishwheel, you know, under a State permit doesn't
12 make you eligible. So, to me, I agree these processes
13 are in place and we need to be able to follow it step
14 by step and I also feel that OSM should have listed any
15 other opportunities or any other documentation as
16 pointed out by Mr. Williams, on what's been attempted
17 before and what happened and why it didn't happen then.
18 Those are important parts to this history of this
19 request. And so I would concur that this needs to go
20 back to OSM for further evaluation before this
21 Commission acts on it.

22

23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Karen.
26 Okay, others. Advisory group comments. Other Regional
27 Advisory Councils, was there anything, DeAnna, you want
28 to speak on or anyone.

29

30 MS. PERRY: Not on this proposal, Mr.
31 Chair.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Fish and
34 Game Advisory Committee.

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
39 Resource Commissions.

40

41 MS. PERRY: No comments on this
42 particular proposal, Mr. Chair.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
45 Summary of written public comments, OSM.

46

47 MR. VICKERS: Yes, hello, this is Brent
48 Vickers, Mr. Chair. Let me get to that, sorry, I was
49 writing down notes from the speakers. For summary of
50

0135

1 written public comments, two written public comments
2 were received. Both in opposition to these proposals.
3

4 The Alaska Kenai Chapter of the Safari
5 Club International stated that they do not support a
6 subsistence priority on road connected portions of the
7 Kenai Peninsula.
8

9 The proposals being considered in this
10 grouping, the Alaska Council -- Outdoor Council opposes
11 WP22-16 through 22. They stated that providing a
12 priority to certain users on the Kenai Peninsula
13 exacerbates conflict between Federally-qualified
14 hunters and Alaskans living in non-Federally-qualified
15 areas of the state.
16

17 Thank you.
18

19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Anything
20 else there, summary -- okay, we'll go to public
21 testimony. I'll go ahead and open it up for public
22 testimony.
23

24 MS. HETRICK: Mr. Chair.
25

26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.
27

28 MS. HETRICK: Good afternoon, Mr.
29 Chair. Members of the Council. For the record my name
30 is Willow Hetrick. Thanks for allowing me to testify
31 today. I have been working for (indiscernible - cuts
32 out) and natural resources management arena. A Board
33 member of the Kenai Mountain Turnagain Natural Heritage
34 Area and I participate in (indiscernible - cuts out) in
35 managing applications on behalf of the community of
36 Moose Pass, Chamber of Commerce, and the Moose Pass
37 Public Library.
38

39 My family moved to Moose Pass from
40 Prince William Sound so that myself and my siblings
41 could go to school and my parents chose Moose Pass, in
42 particular, because of its small town feel where people
43 take care of their neighbors, where a kid could grow up
44 living off the land and where they could provide for
45 our family. Now my entire family are proud homeowners
46 in Moose Pass and I harvested my first moose in
47 Abernathy Creek drainage, several years I harvested my
48 first caribou in that same drainage with my husband and
49 my second caribou came from the Killy River, my
50

0136

1 daughter's namesake.

2

3

4 In 1990, one year after my family moved
5 to Moose Pass, the Federal Subsistence Board used an
6 arbitrary aggregation criteria to exceed the population
7 thresholds for Seward. I was five years old. 10 years
8 later the Alaska Department of Fish and Game visited
9 Moose Pass to conduct the first comprehensive harvest
10 assessment of wild resources and use survey and that
11 was the only survey that has been done by the
12 Department.

12

13

14 What are our most important resources
15 in the community, moose, caribou, salmon and sheep.
16 These are the same resources our neighboring rural
17 communities of Cooper Landing and Hope are harvesting.
18 99 percent of Moose Pass households use at least one
19 wild resource. 91 percent attempt to harvest. And the
20 same percentage at least harvest one wild -- one big
21 game. 59 percent, at least, give away resources to
22 another household. And 24 percent of residents are
23 hunters. 62 percent of the residents classify
24 themselves as fisher people.

24

25

26 You know I will say that my husband and
27 I, we share every animal that we get with the entire
28 community, no questions asked. In fact, just last week
29 we processed a moose and passed away 10s and 10s of
30 pounds around the community.

30

31

32 The residents that live in Moose Pass
33 today are largely not the ones that are from 20 years
34 ago. My generation has aged. We are living there,
35 recreating, subsisting off the land. New families have
36 moved in that value that same subsistence lifestyle.
37 We are surrounded by the Chugach National Forest which
38 comprises approximately 80 percent of the entire Unit
39 7. So a resident must travel for miles not to be on
40 Federal land that is open to subsistence for other
41 neighboring communities. What little amount of land
42 within the Chugach National Forest is easily accessible
43 for subsistence harvesting are lands that surround our
44 community.

44

45

46 Mr. Chair, I ask that the Southcentral
47 RAC support WP-16 through 26 today. I -- we know that
48 we need more information. We've been asking for OSM
49 and the Department to survey our community to get more
50 information to support these proposals and we are

50

0137

1 looking forward to the Board's C&T determination
2 process, and we're standing by to help. There's not a
3 single person in the community that is objecting this.
4 We're all ready, we want to help inform OSM's analysis
5 for a positive C&T determination for moose, caribou,
6 and sheep.

7

8 Thank you for your time.

9

10 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, you may be on
11 mute.

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I was on
14 mute. I said thank you to Willow and I asked if there
15 was any questions for her. And if not, who would like
16 to testify next.

17

18 MR. WILSON: Mr. Chair.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.

21

22 MR. WILSON: Hi, this is Seth Wilson.
23 I submitted one of the proposals for the moose C&T for
24 Moose Pass and I would like to provide testimony.

25

26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. You go
27 right ahead.

28

29 MR. WILSON: So I submitted the moose
30 C&T proposal even though I'm a resident of Gakona. I
31 was partially raised down in Moose Pass. I learned to
32 hunt there when I was young. I still return regularly
33 to hunt with my dad who's 73. And at 73 years old he
34 was ecstatic to find Moose Pass was determined rural by
35 OSM. Him and I imagined a lot of people are sort of
36 chomping at the bit to take advantage of this new
37 opportunity.

38

39 Growing up down there, and returning
40 down there, moose hunting was always sort of the
41 pinnacle of our year. We -- excuse me -- we always had
42 certain areas we always liked to hunt, we had certain
43 methods we used to hunt moose and moose hunting didn't
44 just start in September, we spent -- we started
45 scouting around in May and June looking for moose. So
46 I understand that the SRC is taking a pretty big bite
47 with potentially a C&T findings in one proposal and
48 that's not something I would ever really cherish to do
49 but in regards to your next step. I would encourage to
50

0138

1 at least take action on the moose C&T for Unit 7 for
2 residents of Moose Pass. I'm looking down and
3 scrolling through the Staff analysis, and I see, what I
4 think would be enough information to support, at the
5 very minimum right now a positive C&T determination for
6 residents of Moose Pass in Unit 7, looking specifically
7 at Table 2021B. It shows people have hunted around the
8 community consistently through the past decade even
9 though we all know the harvest has really diminished.

10

11 But I think I'll wrap it up there. I'd
12 encourage you to at least make a positive determination
13 for moose at this point and then take the other animals
14 in stride. So I'll conclude my testimony with that.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Seth, thank
17 you. I got a couple questions for you and then I'm
18 going to ask the Council if they got questions.

19

20 First of all 73, that's a great age,
21 that just happens to be my age. But you addressed that
22 you hunted in the area and you specifically said Unit 7
23 and I've always felt that that was the area you guys
24 hunted in, you know, but these proposals, they're
25 covering 7, -- they're not only covering Unit 7,
26 they're covering Unit 15A, B and C. And I could even
27 see 15A and B are fairly close contiguous, but, you
28 know, all the way down to 15C it's getting kind of a
29 stretch. So I think that's why Darrel and some of us
30 are bringing up some of these ideas, how do you throw
31 it all together, C&T for one unit, and 7 would probably
32 have been pretty easy to do a good analysis of that.

33

34 But, anyone, thank you for that, that
35 was my question on it, but you answered me that you, at
36 least Unit 7.

37

38 Okay, questions from the Board, anyone
39 else got a question for Seth here.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Who's the
44 next one up for testifying.

45

46 MR. GRAHAM: Good afternoon, this is
47 Cork Graham, I would like to make a commentary.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

50

1 MR. GRAHAM: Fantastic, thank you. I'm
2 the author of the WP22-32 proposal. And I wrote it
3 based on my experiences. First having living here in
4 '90 -- '91 after I came back from Central America, and
5 it was actually quite a healing experience for me as a
6 combat Veteran to come here and I wrote my first book
7 in the Hidden Hills area. I was introduced to the
8 story of those who had subsistence hunted here in
9 Alaska since arriving in the '30s and then a lot of
10 people, like the Priestlys and the Andersons, who had
11 come up here from, as I recall, Arizona, right after
12 World War II, and hearing their stories of how they
13 subsisted here. And actually the laws in this area, in
14 the 15C area, had changed, I guess, in '87. And it's
15 interesting that as these regulations have changed, it
16 seems more based towards a trophy and tourism clientele
17 than it originally was, which is subsistence or a
18 natural resource as a food source, for the Alaska
19 residents.

20

21 And the reason I wrote the proposal was
22 first I was introduced -- I do want to make a comment
23 that Safari Club made a libelous statement about how I
24 had been hunting illegally for three years. It's not
25 illegal if I go to a representative of the government
26 who tells me that I am legally hunting and will issue
27 me a tag. That kind of annoyed me when I read that
28 from Safari Club, which I find very interesting,
29 because I've been an outdoor writer, conservationist, I
30 graduated with a minor in biology from San Francisco
31 State. I started as an outdoor writer for the Times in
32 San Mateo County back in '97 in San Francisco and I
33 actually had a 10-year free membership to the SCI in
34 California. And that's not the way they used to play
35 back there in California where they would make a
36 statement, with either having not fully read the
37 proposal, or making a libelous statement about
38 someone's background or experience hunting in Alaska.
39 So I'd like to make that as a point, that if this is
40 the way that the Safari Club is going to play their
41 games, that's not the right game to be playing a game
42 when this is in regards to something as important as
43 food security, which I think a lot of us, here in the
44 United States, and especially here in Alaska where we
45 have questions about supply and food supply within the
46 next five to 10 years. So I'm very concerned about
47 that. That's the reason I wrote this proposal. I
48 wanted to keep on having access to the subsistence
49 opportunities in the Kenai Wildlife Refuge area, which,
50

0140

1 as I was reminded by the biologist, Todd Eskelin, is
2 the only option based on Federal lands, which this
3 opportunity for subsistence is available. And I just
4 heard Seth talking about -- and you were talking about
5 GMU 7 and 15, 15A, B and C, and how that stretches out,
6 which, again, that does bring the question of Federal
7 lands again, compared to which when I think subsistence
8 it would be something along the lines as pre-what-1987
9 and 1986 in Alaska where they had a variety of hunting
10 opportunities for residents, who lived rurally, and
11 also even people who lived in Homer, saying -- I have
12 friends that went through hunting experiences in
13 January who are residents of Homer who could go out and
14 get their meat for the rest of the year.

15

16 Again, I wrote this proposal with the
17 idea of food security. Food security is a very strong
18 idea for us right now, especially on our homestead,
19 where we were so worried about even getting our high
20 tunnels in because they were sitting in a railcar for
21 30 days in Chicago because of Covid and also people not
22 willing to come to work to continue transporting the
23 high tunnels over to Seattle so that they could be
24 shipped up here. So we have some very grave concerns
25 here, and, hopefully a lot of other people being aware
26 of these concerns and they do revolve around food
27 security but at the same time, considering my
28 background, you don't want to kill the golden goose,
29 which is to destroy the resource by putting too much
30 demand on it.

31

32 So with that in mind, I hope that you
33 to take my proposal to heart and will accept it and
34 have it as a new area for the Northfork community.

35

36 Thank you.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, we weren't
39 on the Northfork so I'm not sure that that was --
40 that's later on in the book.

41

42 MR. GRAHAM: Understood.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Sorry about that.
45 Anyway, I thought you were testifying for the whole
46 conglomerate here that we're on now. Okay, is there
47 any more public testimony on WP22-16 through 26A.

48

49 MR. VICKERS: Mr. Chair, this is Brent

50

0141

1 Vickers from OSM, and if you don't mind I'd like to
2 address some of the questions and comments that I've
3 heard.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, DeAnna,
6 that should be acceptable, correct?

7

8 MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair, I think
9 some explanation might be in order. We've talked about
10 C&T as well as methods and means and there might be
11 some need for clarification before the Council starts
12 deliberating.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I just want
15 to make sure that it's okay under public testimony for
16 OSM because they could come before, but this is fine,
17 it's good with me. So if the Council has no objection,
18 please enlighten us.

19

20 (No objections)

21

22 MR. VICKERS: Yes, thank you. No,
23 DeAnna, is exactly right, I just wanted to clarify some
24 of the things I heard so that we are all on the same
25 page with this particular proposal. First of all I
26 would like to -- in regard to aggregating all the
27 different proposals, I'm sorry if this -- if people
28 found this confusing or overwhelming, this is a
29 decision that several of us at OSM made in -- it was
30 actually in response to the Regional Council's request
31 to condense the meeting book and to make things more
32 brief, and so with that in mind we decided to aggregate
33 these very similar proposals that were basically being
34 analyzed using a lot of the same data into one
35 presentation more or less. And that was -- our goal
36 with that was to make it easier on the Council and
37 others, and I'm sorry if it's made it confusing.
38 Please feel free to ask questions about the particular
39 proposals that you'd like.

40

41 Second, as far as means and methods and
42 customary and traditional use, the means are methods
43 are excellent ways of addressing conservation issues.
44 Customary and traditional use, on the other hand is not
45 about conservation issues. And let me read this part
46 here from the analysis. The Board makes customary and
47 traditional use determination for the sole purpose of
48 recognizing the pool of users who generally exhibit the
49 eight factors and not for resource management or for
50

0142

1 restricting harvest. If a conservation concern exists,
2 the Board addresses that concern through harvest
3 limits, season restrictions or Section .804 subsistence
4 user prioritization process, not customary and
5 traditional use determinations. In 2013 the
6 Southcentral Alaska Regional Advisory Council made a
7 recommendation to change the way such determinations
8 are made by making area wide customary and traditional
9 use determinations for all species.

10

11 I hope that helps to separate the
12 different issues that we could be discussing. If there
13 are conservation concerns, that would have to be going
14 through different proposals on bag limits and seasons
15 and possible closures, .804 analysis, those
16 conservation concerns are not addressed in the
17 customary and traditional use determination. Also, I'd
18 like to say that in regards to other attempts for
19 customary and traditional use determination, which I
20 think was alluded to in the comments, and I'm sorry if
21 I'm misaddressing this, but keep in mind Moose Pass
22 just received non -- a rural determination. So just
23 this year, after a four year process, they were
24 determined to be a separate entity from Seward and are
25 now -- and are just now officially recognized as rural
26 and so they did not have the capacity to submit C&T
27 determinations since they were not Federally-qualified
28 subsistence rural users to begin with.

29

30 And, I'm sorry, again, for all the lack
31 of data, that's something that we would love to have
32 more on from Moose Pass and the Kenai Peninsula, we
33 hope that we can do -- we're trying to do the best with
34 what is available and also keep in mind that a lot of
35 the lack of harvesting, local, or in their immediate
36 vicinity may be due to restrictions on those who are
37 not Federally-qualified prior to the attempt to be qualified.

38

39 Thank you, that is all.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I'm not
42 sure what that meant, but that's okay.

43

44 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is Judy.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Judy, go ahead.

47

48 MS. CAMINER: One more clarification if
49 I might. This proposal.....

50

0143

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You got a very
2 weak phone but go ahead.

3

4 MS. CAMINER: Is that any better?

5

6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Much better,
7 thank you.

8

9 MS. CAMINER: Okay. The speaker
10 doesn't work well. Clarification then. This proposal
11 clearly is on C&T, but seasons and bag limits still
12 need to be established for each of these species for
13 Moose Pass then; is that correct?

14

15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, that's what
16 I would think, but.....

17

18 MS. CAMINER: So we're just taking it
19 one step at a time here.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, not really,
22 we're including a whole bunch of areas, we're including
23 a unit of bigger areas, we're including four units and
24 they may have C&T in some and they may not in others,
25 so it's not one at a time, it's a big bag of stuff.

26

27 MS. CAMINER: Agreed. But eligibility
28 only not necessarily any seasons or bag limits, yet.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Right.

31

32 MR. VICKERS: This is Brent Vickers
33 from OSM. They would be added to -- Moose Pass is
34 proposing to be added to the existing customary and
35 traditional use list, so if they were accepted, the
36 means and bag limits that already exist would be there
37 for them under the regulations that are already there.
38 We're not establishing a specific means and limits for
39 Moose Pass, they would be added to the list of reg --
40 of those communities who already have C&T
41 determinations and the existing relations that applies
42 to them.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: So they would be
45 added to the list with all the methods, means and
46 they'd have every benefit of any other C&T qualified
47 user?

48

49 MR. VICKERS: Yes, exactly, thank you,

50

0144

1 Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, Judy, that
4 kind of changes the methods there but there's your
5 answer.

6

7 MS. CAMINER: Yep, that's what I wanted
8 everybody to hear, thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
11 Okay, do we have any other -- we had OSM give us a
12 little clarification, we had public testimony, I'm
13 still opened up at this time, is there any public
14 testimony on all these proposals.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: If not I'm going
19 to move forward to the Regional.....

20

21 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:Council's
24 recommendation -- someone wanted to speak, go ahead.

25

26 MS. STICKWAN: I was wondering why they
27 didn't wait to do an interview, more depth interviews
28 with people proposing this before they let this go
29 forward to get more information from the people about
30 use in this area? Why wasn't that done?

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I don't know,
33 maybe we could get someone to answer it, that's my
34 concern, because it's going to impact all the other
35 surrounding areas who have C&T and eventually it's
36 going to have to be an allocation process of who gets
37 what so it does need to be sorted out a bit, I believe,
38 Gloria. So but anyway, can anyone answer Gloria's
39 question there.

40

41 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, please have
42 somebody answer my question.

43

44 MR. VICKERS: Hello, this is Brent
45 Vickers from OSM. And if I'm hearing correctly, you're
46 asking why there weren't more interviews done to areas
47 that would be affected by this C&T determination; is
48 that correct?

49

50

0145

1 MS. STICKWAN: I was just wondering why
2 more interviews weren't done with people, or to get
3 more information about uses in these areas, customary
4 and traditional use in these areas? Why couldn't you
5 have done more interviews before this proposal was
6 submitted?

7

8 MR. VICKERS: Okay, thank you, I
9 understand. So basically why weren't we able to do
10 more collection of data, particularly through
11 interviews in areas before we submitted this analysis
12 on this Federal proposal. And typically we rely on
13 data that already exists. We typically don't collect
14 our own data for analysis. We typically don't do
15 interviews. We use testimonies from public meetings,
16 we use proponent's -- we use written comments, but
17 collecting data, it's something -- while we wish we
18 could, because of how quickly we need to do analysis
19 and the number of analysis that we have and the Staff,
20 the manpower that we have, the number of Staff members
21 working on analysis is something that's actually not
22 done through OSM. OSM tries to get the available data
23 through ADF&G, through other research through
24 universities, and other institutions, we use that
25 secondhand data and basically produce summaries and
26 analysis for the Councils and the Board, but as far as
27 collecting our own data in this amount of time, it's
28 not something we have the capacity really to do. I
29 wish we did. And maybe the testimony and comments that
30 come to these meetings might be able to be used in the
31 future but as far as us doing one on one interviews,
32 that's -- we just don't have the capacity for that.

33

34 Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Does that help
37 you, Gloria?

38

39 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Okay,
42 I don't hear any more public testimony we're going to
43 move on to Regional Council's recommendation and a
44 motion to support.

45

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

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, DeAnna.

49

50

0146

1 MS. PERRY: So since there are so many
2 proposals, I didn't know if the Council would like to
3 take each of these individually because there have been
4 individual comments on a few of these. There are a
5 couple of pages that we could look at in our books that
6 might help step us through that. On Page 118 there's a
7 general description in the general description area, I
8 don't know if the Council would like to step through
9 each one of these separately or.....

10

11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I think --
12 I could ask the question, I will put that question
13 before the Council. I think the Council has a question
14 on the whole process here, so I don't know if going
15 through one by one, if they want to do that. But would
16 the Council like to hear a breakdown of them
17 individually or would you like to take this vote or
18 what's the wishes.

19

20 MR. HOLSTON: Mr. Chair, this is Ed.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yep, go ahead,
23 Ed.

24

25 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, I'd like to vote on
26 all the proposals instead of each one at a time. Thank
27 you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, then
30 at this time I'll open it up once again for a motion to
31 support and if I don't get a motion it's going to go
32 down. So the table is open for a motion to support.

33

34 MR. HOLSTON: This is Ed, Mr. Chair,
35 I'll make that motion to support.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Is there a
38 second to that motion.

39

40 MR. OPHEIM: Michael seconds.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Michael seconds
43 it. Okay, now as a Council we're going to take them as
44 a group and we're open for discussion. So I think
45 we've had a fair amount of interaction. So let's go
46 ahead and air this one out a little bit and see where
47 we could get on it.

48

49 Who would like to speak first to the

50

0147

1 proposals.

2

3

4 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, this is Michael. I
5 was kind of questioning it because of all of them
6 clumped up like that, but I think with the
7 clarifications we've had it makes sense now to me that
8 it's being put forth this way. And so it would be -- I
9 would definitely be in support of this group of
10 proposals going through and keep these folks out there
11 getting the resources they need. And, then hopefully,
12 you know, there's some data that needs to be collected.
13 Hopefully, you know, somebody like maybe Willow's group
14 there, maybe she's willing to be doing some surveys or
15 something, who knows. I know they're not CIRC (ph)
16 related but it's something that's pretty close in
17 there, it'd be great to get that data. You know she's
18 saying that there's only one time Fish and Game's been
19 through there, that's a shame because obviously folks
20 are using those resources. You know, maybe not down to
21 15C here, but they are using the resources.

21

22

That's my two cents.

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 ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks,
Michael. I have the same question, by lumping them
together you are putting 15C in there, keep that in
mind. But, anyway, who else would like to go next.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is Judy.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy.

MS. CAMINER: That was going to be my
comment, too. From what I heard it sounds like the
concern is either 15, or specifically 15C and this
Council supported Moose Pass becoming classified as a
rural community so I'd like to see the Council support
their opportunity to hunt for subsistence resources.
So maybe we need to pare it down a little bit and
really get at the heart of our concern.

Thank you.

(Teleconference interference -
participants not muted)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I think that's
what we're trying to do. You know we got a big broad
brush here. We want them to be able to utilize their

0148

1 C&T but we want it to be in areas that they do have
2 historic.....

3

4 (Teleconference interference -
5 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

6

7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:customary
8 and traditional use identified. So, I, for one.....

9

10 (Teleconference interference -
11 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:you know
14 (indiscernible - unmuted phones overriding speaker)
15 comes but there's definitely a problem on my side.
16 But, anyway, who's next.

17

18 MS. TOTEMOFF: Mr. Chair, this is
19 Angela Totemoff.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Angela.

22

23 MS. TOTEMOFF: I'm having a hard time
24 understanding you. I would just like to remind
25 everybody to please mute. Thank you.

26

27 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair, Andy
28 here.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Andy.

31

32 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, you know, this
33 -- wow, you know, this seems like the cart before the
34 horse, kind of these things to me.....

35

36 (Teleconference interference -
37 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

38

39 MS. PERRY: Pardon me. Pardon me,
40 Andy. Folks, I need you to please look at your phones
41 and make sure you are on mute. We are hearing a lot of
42 background noise and unable to hear the Council
43 members. Please check your mute button or press star
44 six.

45

46 MS. STICKWAN: Can you get the operator
47 to see whose phone that is.

48

49 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Maybe we got it.

50

0149

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I hope so, go
2 ahead, Andy.

3
4 MS. PERRY: Sorry for the interruption
5 Andy.

6
7 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Okay, not a problem,
8 yeah, it sounds like those kids are having a good time.
9 Anyhow, I kind of wanted these things to be separated
10 out under each thing instead of one big blanket.
11 Sorry, Ed, but each one has such a -- it's not
12 necessarily a can of worms, but a lot of details that
13 need to be recognized. You know if we're talking C&T,
14 something like -- like on the first part, for example,
15 like the WP22-16, that's basically Unit 7 moose for
16 Moose Pass. I was all for Moose Pass having rural
17 designation and if you look on the map of Page 146 it
18 shows their old historical sites of what they
19 considered moose, and I guarantee those people have
20 been using subsistence resource moose for many decades
21 but it doesn't show Kings Bay as far as their thing and
22 there's the Nellie Juan and the Kings River which is in
23 Unit 7 and as soon as we say, yeah, they got carte
24 blanche on Unit 7 and they also have C&T and suddenly
25 they're instantly on this list like Hope and Cooper
26 Landing was for Kings Bay when we had to run the .804
27 analysis that proved that Tatitlek and Chenega Bay had
28 a precedent. So I think that's just one of my many
29 concerns of reading all of these different species. It
30 sounds like Greg's got some similar kind of concerns
31 about allocation processes that are going to have to be
32 required for some of this stuff.

33
34 You know, same with on that map about
35 the sheep or the goats or whatever, Paradise Lakes,
36 that's not on there but people from here historically
37 have gone over there to get sheep but there is no
38 Federal subsistence priority on sheep. So if we start
39 looking at WP 22 through 26A and B and all this other
40 business, sheep in Unit 7, if you can look it says no
41 Federal subsistence priority so it's nobody, no
42 communities have a Federal subsistence priority but if
43 we blanket that in suddenly Moose Pass is the only
44 community that gets a sheep priority. So it's almost
45 like we got to ferret out a lot of details amongst a
46 bunch of this giant ball of information that doesn't
47 seem to be able to be all inclusive.

48
49 Anyhow that's what I got at the moment.
50

0150

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, thank you,
2 Andy. My comments were along the same line. I'll go
3 ahead and make them now. That, you know, I definitely
4 supported Moose Pass to be included in a rural
5 determination and they are and so around their area
6 there is no question about it, you know. But Moose
7 Pass, if you look at it on the map like it says, it's
8 above Cooper Landing, Unit 7 I mean that's an area of
9 C&T that's got no question in my mind. Probably shift
10 over to some of 15A and maybe even a little 15B, and
11 I'm not sure how much -- you know, the lower end of
12 Kings Bay, definitely 15C is a question to me because
13 that's an area that we're now trying to get -- make the
14 north road and the Russian community and a whole bunch
15 of ones with C&T and new villages and, you know, we
16 have to be good stewards and figure out how we're going
17 to do this, are we just going to open up the whole, you
18 know, they made the ruling for rural determination and
19 non-rural, there was reasons for that and so obviously
20 that's changing because I could see now that we're
21 going to have to open up Clam Gulch, Happy Valley, you
22 know, every other little spot in between without due
23 diligence. And so that's my concern. I don't have a
24 concern at all about a C&T for Moose Pass in their
25 historic area, absolutely not. And so that's why I was
26 trying to get this thing slimmed down to where it
27 should be and take it piece by piece and as they ask
28 for other areas as Cooper Landing did and other people
29 did then we go through a thorough analysis of that and
30 make a decision. So that's my comment. That's the
31 reason I have a little heartburn with just taking it
32 carte blanche and just saying, yeah, everything on that
33 map you now have C&T and maybe even preference of C&T
34 and so it's -- it's something we need to think about.

35
36 Thank you.

37
38 Who would like to talk next on this.

39
40 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is Judy
41 again.

42
43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy.

44
45 MS. CAMINER: So what I'm hearing -- I
46 am hearing a lot of concern on 15 and I think there's
47 certainly nothing wrong with a cautious approach and
48 trying to figure out ways that more data could be
49 collected. But I would certainly support amending the
50

0151

1 proposal to include Unit 7 only.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I would certainly
4 support that, that's for sure. Any other comments out
5 there from the Council members.

6

7 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is
8 Ed.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Ed.

11

12 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, I support the C&T
13 on 7 but I also support the C&T on 15A and B. Thank
14 you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I could probably
17 see that, too, Ed, thank you.

18

19 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, this is Michael
20 again. Yeah, I'd support it if it was paired down a
21 little bit, 7, 15 A and B as well.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

24

25 MS. STICKWAN: But Unit 7.

26

27 MS. TOTEMOFF: Mr. Chairman, this is
28 Angela Totemoff.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Angela.

31

32 MS. TOTEMOFF: I support pairing it
33 down as well.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
36 Angela.

37

38 MS. SELANOFF: Mr. Chair, this is Diane
39 Selanoff.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Diane.

42

43 MS. SELANOFF: I would like to see it
44 paired down also. So from this point do we go back and
45 have them resubmit the proposal or do we just act on
46 the proposal with the modified areas.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: If someone wants
49 to make a modified -- amended to just Unit 7, or 7 and
50

0152

1 A and B, then we'll entertain it and we'll go from
2 there.

3

4 MS. SELANOFF: Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.

7

8 MS. TOTEMOFF: Mr. Chair, this is
9 Angela. Would you like a friendly amendment to include
10 Section 7 and Section 17 -- or 15A and B.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: If you so move
13 I'll accept it and we'll look for a second.

14

15 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question before
16 you make a motion. Is this for all these species
17 listed and everybody's okay with all the species listed
18 for these units.

19

20 MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Good question.

23

24 MR. OPHEIM: I'm okay with the species
25 listed.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I guess I would
28 be too.

29

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

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, DeAnna.

33

34 MS. PERRY: Just so the record's clear,
35 I wonder if Angela could state in her motion that this
36 was an amendment on the motion to support to include
37 all of these proposals, but that the geographical area
38 is only for Unit 7, Unit 15A and B. That would make
39 the record clearer that we are addressing all the
40 proposals.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's correct.

43

44 MS. TOTEMOFF: That's correct, yes.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I do need a
47 second though.

48

49 MR. WHISSEL: This is John Whissel,

50

0153

1 I'll second.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, DeAnna,
4 there's a second. Okay, we're still on discussion now,
5 we got a motion to amend it.....

6

7 (Teleconference interference -
8 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:to just Unit
11 7, 15A and 15B. Is there any discussion on that, if
12 anyone wants to call the question on that we'll take
13 that vote on that.

14

15 MR. VICKERS: Mr. Chair, this is Brent
16 Vickers from OSM. I just had a quick question for
17 DeAnna, if you don't mind.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

20

21 MR. VICKERS: I'm wondering if the way
22 to go about what's been said, it sounds like accepting
23 all proposals, except not supporting WP22-19, which is
24 exclusively for moose in Unit 15C and then WP22-22,
25 accepting it with modification to only be Unit 19B
26 [sic], and not 15C, I just want to clarify if that's
27 the way to go about it or to accept all except for
28 anything mentioning 15C. Thank you.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I think
31 we're trying to leave out 15C for now. So if you try
32 and just say moose it doesn't leave out 15C, it leaves
33 it open for the other.....

34

35 MR. VICKERS: No, yes, sorry, Mr.
36 Chair, yes. The ones that I mentioned are the only
37 proposals, the only single proposals that mention Unit
38 15C for any species. So the Unit 15C is only mentioned
39 in WP22-19, which is specifically moose in Unit 15C,
40 and WP22-22, which is for caribou in Unit 15B and 15C.
41 So since those are the only two of the long laundry
42 list of proposals, we're just basically not supporting
43 22-19 but we are -- or excuse me -- you are suggesting
44 supporting 22-1 -- not supporting 22-19, which is only
45 for Unit 15C moose and you are approving WP22-22, with
46 modification so that it's just caribou in Unit 15B and
47 you're modifying it so it does not include 15C.

48

49 Does that make sense?

50

0154

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Not really but
2 we'll let the rest of the Council think about it.

3

4 MR. VICKERS: Well, yeah, DeAnna, do
5 you understand what I'm saying here, I just want to
6 make sure that this is done, procedurally, the correct
7 way.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, that
10 clouded it for me. I was real clear about just
11 eliminating 15C.

12

13 MS. PERRY: Yes, and that's one of the
14 reasons why I thought maybe, I mean, as painfully as it
15 might be, you know, to go through these one by one. I
16 know 16 is a duplicate of 17 so, you know, we could
17 leave one of those out. So I mean there's a current
18 amendment on the floor, we could.....

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: It's already
21 moved and seconded.

22

23 MS. PERRY: Right. There's no vote,
24 there's an amendment on the floor. So you could amend
25 one more time but then you would have to go back to the
26 main motion, that's my understanding. Or if you just
27 want to go through these separately, I know it's a lot,
28 but it might be a lot cleaner on the record.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I don't
31 know where the separate needs to be because I think I
32 got a motion and I got a second to.....

33

34 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's been
37 called.

38

39 MS. STICKWAN: What are we -- I
40 had.....

41

42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Oh, you got a
43 question.....

44

45 MS. STICKWAN:a question.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:go ahead.

48

49 MS. STICKWAN: What is procedurally

50

0155

1 wrong with our motion, I don't understand what.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I don't see
4 anything wrong with it, that's what I'm trying to get
5 at, yeah.

6

7 MS. STICKWAN: I don't know why he said
8 that and I'd like to know why he said that.

9

10 MS. PERRY: I think what he's getting
11 to is procedurally there's nothing wrong with it, but,
12 because some of these proposals do address 15C and
13 that's not what this Council wants to support, that
14 kind of shows a little conflict, so I think that's what
15 Brent was trying to say. Procedurally, there's nothing
16 wrong with the way the motion is but it's just
17 reconciling what the current amended motion is and what
18 the intent of the Council is, is in conflict, because
19 some of these proposals, like Brent said, 19 and 22,
20 they do mention 15C. So you see where we were saying
21 support, it might be a little confusing, I think that's
22 what Brent was trying to say. But, no, there's nothing
23 procedurally wrong -- procedurally wrong with the
24 current amended motion.

25

26 MR. VICKERS: This is Brent from OSM,
27 that's all I need to know, I just want to make sure
28 that we don't go forward with something and realize
29 afterwards that we should have voted on it a specific
30 way. That's all, thank you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
33 Procedurally we're okay, we're okay. I think it
34 addresses it, I'm not sure how you guys sort that out.
35 But, the proposals, I think our intent is very clear.

36

37 MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.

40

41 MS. STICKWAN: I was wondering if we
42 could have Staff write up what our intent of our
43 proposal -- our motion is.

44

45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, we could
46 but we probably ought to figure it out ourselves, we
47 don't want Staff figuring it out because I don't know,
48 I mean.....

49

50

0156

1 MS. STICKWAN: Well, because.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:it was
4 pretty clear to me, and I see where they're getting at,
5 they're saying there's some overlaps in there but it
6 wouldn't really matter. We got a motion on the table
7 to pair it down to C&T for Unit 7, 15A and 15B and that
8 should clarify it, that's what we said.

9

10 (Teleconference interference -
11 participants not muted)

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Are we good with
14 that or do we got to do something else.

15

16 MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael, I thought
17 that kind of cleared it up. I thought that by removing
18 the 15C and leaving the rest there was really clear.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I'm with
21 you, Michael, I'm good with that. If someone wants to
22 call the question we'll vote on it and I think we'll be
23 fine.

24

25 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is Judy.

26

27 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is Ed.

28

29 MR. WHISSEL: This is John, I'll call
30 the question.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, John,
33 we're going to go ahead and take a vote on it, so all
34 in favor of the amended motion to support C&T for Unit
35 7, 15A, 15B signify by saying aye.

36

37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Opposed.

40

41 (No opposing votes)

42

43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: And to clarify
44 that for all of us, and, Gloria, that included all of
45 those proposals but they won't carry over to 15C at
46 this time.

47

48 MS. STICKWAN: I said aye in support.

49

50

0157

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Okay, now,
2 do we need to go back DeAnna and approve the original
3 motion?

4

5 MS. PERRY: Yes, you voted to amend the
6 motion and now you're voting on the main motion as
7 amended.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

10

11 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is Judy.

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy.

14

15 MS. CAMINER: Consistent with the
16 duties of the RAC we are supporting -- I'd like to see
17 this motion supported -- this proposal supported to
18 provide more subsistence opportunities.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
23 Anyone else want to comment on it before we take a vote
24 on the main motion.

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone want to
29 call the question, we got a main motion, we got it
30 moved and seconded, and we could vote on it.

31

32 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, I'll call the
33 question. This is John.

34

35 MR. OPHEIM: Michael, I'll call the
36 question.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I think the
39 question was called twice. All in favor of the main
40 motion signify by saying aye.

41

42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I think I heard
45 all ayes, I think it carries. Now, while we still got
46 everyone, did we get that clarified enough that we
47 could get through this without any other modifications.

48

49 (No comments)

50

0158

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 ENCELEWSKI: You good Brent.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: DeAnna, you okay
with it?

MS. PERRY: Yep.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I don't
know about you guys but I need to stretch a little bit,
how about a couple minute break here and then we'll go
into the other ones, 25 and 27.

MR. OPHEIM: Sounds like a plan.

MS. CAMINER: Sounds good.

(Off record)

(On record)

MS. PERRY: Andy McLaughlin.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes, I'm here.

MS. PERRY: Thank you.

Judy Caminer.

MS. CAMINER: I'm here.

MS. PERRY: Thanks, Judy.

John Whissel.

(No comments)

MS. PERRY: Paula Nicklie, have you
joined us, I think it was going to be after 4:30, but
just in case. Paula, have you joined us yet?

(No comments)

MS. PERRY: Ed Holston.

(No comments)

MS. PERRY: Michael Opheim.

0159

1 MR. OPHEIM: I'm here.

2

3 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

4

5 Diane Selanoff.

6

7 MS. SELANOFF: Yes, I'm here.

8

9 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Diane.

10

11 Dennis Zadra.

12

13 MR. ZADRA: Yes, I'm here.

14

15 MS. SELANOFF: This is Diane Selanoff,
16 I'm here.

17

18 MR. ZADRA: Dennis is here.

19

20 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Dennis. And I
21 believe, Diane, that was you, I do have you down if
22 that was you.

23

24 MS. SELANOFF: Thank you.

25

26 MS. PERRY: Gloria Stickwan.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 MS. PERRY: John Whissel.

31

32 MR. WHISSEL: I'm here.

33

34 MS. PERRY: Thanks, John.

35

36 Ed Holston, were you able to get back
37 on. I know Ed lost power so he wasn't sure how long his
38 phone would last.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 MS. PERRY: And Greg Encelewski.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I'm here,
45 DeAnna.

46

47 MS. PERRY: Okay. Mr. Chair, you do
48 have eight of your seated Council members, you do have
49 a quorum.

50

0160

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
2 Well, we'll go ahead and try to move forward some and
3 see if we could get at least one more done here. We
4 got Wildlife Proposal 22-, last 25A, last 27, C&T Unit
5 7 and 15, and we just talked about one part of 15, so
6 that's Page 138 so we'll go ahead and have OSM analysis
7 of that proposal.

8

9

Transcriber Note

10

11 Hannah Voorhees contacted Computer Matrix Court
12 Reporters requesting she be titled as Dr. Voorhees in
13 transcripts and not Ms. Voorhees

14

15

End Transcriber Note

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

DR. VOORHEES: Good afternoon, Mr.
Chair and members of the Board. This is Hannah
Voorhees and I'll be presenting Wildlife Proposal WP22-
20, 25A and 27. This analysis begins on Page 138 of
your meeting book.

These proposals include all customary
and traditional use determination requests submitted
this cycle for Cooper Landing. The proposals were
combined so they could be considered together and for
brevity.

Proposal WP22-20 requests that the
Federal Subsistence Board recognize the customary and
traditional use of moose in Unit 15C by residents of
Cooper Landing.

Proposal WP22-25A requests that the
Board recognize the customary and traditional use of
sheep in Unit 7 by residents of Cooper Landing.

A companion proposal, WP22-25C requests
that a harvest and season be established for sheep in
Unit 7.

Proposal WP-22 and 27 request that the
Board recognize the customary and traditional use of
sheep in Unit 15 by residents of Cooper Landing.

The proponent states that residents of
Cooper Landing have a history of customary and
traditional use of resources throughout Unit 7 and 15.

1 The proponent indicates that Cooper Landing residents
2 participate in all subsistence opportunities in the
3 region. She argues that exclusion from the customary
4 and traditional use determination for moose in Unit 15C
5 and sheep in Unit 7 and 15 have denied Cooper Landing
6 residents subsistence opportunity. Because there is an
7 existing customary and traditional use determination
8 for moose in Unit 15C and sheep in Unit 15 as well as a
9 no Federal subsistence priority status for sheep in
10 Unit 7 this analysis only considers whether the
11 existing determinations should be revised and expanded
12 to include Cooper Landing. It does not analyze other
13 communities use.

14
15 Customary and traditional use
16 determinations have previously been made for residents
17 of Cooper Landing for other wildlife species in Unit 7
18 and 15. In 2008 the Board recognized the customary and
19 traditional use of moose in Unit 7, 15A and 15B by
20 residents of Cooper Landing. In 2014 the Board
21 rejected a proposal requesting recognition of Cooper
22 Landing's customary and traditional use of moose in
23 Unit 15C. At that time this Council did not support
24 the proposal due to lack of information and testimony
25 from residents of Cooper Landing. Also in 2014 the
26 Board recognized Cooper Landing's customary and
27 traditional use of caribou in Unit 7. In 2020 the
28 Board recognized customary and traditional use of
29 caribou in Unit 15B and 15C and use of goat in Unit 7
30 remainder in all of Unit 15 by Cooper Landing.

31
32 In his previous presentation, Brent,
33 addressed the eight factors for determining customary
34 and traditional use as well as Board policy and this
35 Council's past recommendations on making recognition of
36 use broad and inclusive and area wide. I refer you
37 back to that presentation.

38
39 So now I'll address use of species by
40 residents of Cooper Landing in these areas.

41
42 ADF&G, Division of Subsistence,
43 conducted a subsistence survey in Cooper Landing in
44 1991. Moose were the most widely used land mammal in
45 Cooper Landing during the study period. 28 percent of
46 surveyed households hunted moose resulting in 19 pounds
47 of meat per person. During the same study period no
48 surveyed Cooper Landing households harvested or used
49 sheep. However, a 1.2 percent of surveyed households
50

1 had used goat which filled a similar niche in
2 subsistence hunting and diet. Moose were shared among
3 residents of Moose Pass [sic], no sharing of sheep was
4 documented during the study year. As part of the 1991
5 survey ADF&G mapped 50 Cooper Landing households
6 harvest and search areas for moose and sheep during
7 their time living in the community. Mapped community
8 use areas should not be considered exhaustive. Areas
9 used for moose hunting by residents of Cooper Landing
10 included the northern portion of Unit 15C covering the
11 southern and eastern lakes of Tustumena Lake.
12 According to the same study, goats or sheep were hunted
13 in the mountains around Cooper Landing and the
14 mountains of Turnagain Pass, the mountains east of
15 Tustumena Lake, the head of Kachemak Bay, the southern
16 top of the Kenai Peninsula and in the mountains east of
17 Resurrection Bay. This includes portions of Unit 15
18 and 7. Residents of Cooper Landing hunt moose and
19 sheep under State regulation. Because of competition
20 for permits and other restrictions on hunting lack of
21 participation should not be interpreted as lack of
22 interest or customary use. From 1987 to 2019 State
23 harvest records show that there were 14 hunts for moose
24 in Unit 15C by residents of Cooper Landing and one
25 moose was harvested. For that same period, State
26 harvest records indicate that there were 42 hunts for
27 sheep by residents of Cooper Landing in Unit 7 and four
28 sheep were harvested. Also during the same period,
29 State records show there were 16 sheep hunts by
30 residents of Cooper Landing in Unit 15 and two sheep
31 were harvested.

32
33 If this proposal is adopted, residents
34 of Cooper Landing would be added to the customary and
35 traditional use determination for moose in Unit 15C and
36 sheep in Unit 7 and 15 allowing them to harvest these
37 species under Federal subsistence regulation. There is
38 currently no Federal subsistence season for sheep in
39 Unit 7 but Cooper Landing would be eligible for such a
40 hunt once established. Currently the Federal
41 subsistence hunt for sheep in Unit 15 is for a harvest
42 limit of one ram with three-quarter curl horn or larger
43 by drawing permit. Only one sheep permit is awarded
44 each year for the Federal subsistence hunt in Unit 15.
45 If Cooper Landing is added to the customary and
46 traditional use determination for sheep this would
47 increase competition for these drawing permits.

48
49 If the proposal is rejected Cooper
50

0163

1 Landing residents could continue to hunt moose under
2 State regulations under 15C. They could also continue
3 to hunt sheep under State regulations in Unit 7 and 15.

4

5 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
6 support Proposals WP22-20, 25A and 27.

7

8 The Board has previously recognized
9 Cooper Landing's customary and traditional use of other
10 wildlife in Units 15, including 15C and Unit 7. Based
11 on these previous determinations, Cooper Landing has
12 already established a recognized pattern of harvest and
13 use of wild resources in these areas consistent with
14 the eight factors. Cooper Landing resident's pattern
15 of moose hunting and harvest in Unit 15C and sheep
16 hunting and harvest in Unit 7 and 15 generally exhibit
17 the characteristics of customary and traditional use as
18 shown through comprehensive subsistence surveys and
19 data from residents hunting under State regulations.

20

21 Thank you. I'm available to take any
22 questions.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Any
25 questions.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, well,
30 thank you for your presentation. Orville, you got any
31 report on consultation for us.

32

33 MR. LIND: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
34 Council members. There were no questions or comments
35 on this proposal during the consultation session.
36 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
39 Orville. Agency comments, how about the Alaska
40 Department of Fish and Game.

41

42 MS. KEATING: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43 This is Jackie Keating again with the Division of
44 Subsistence, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Thank
45 you for the opportunity to comment. Our comment is
46 similar to the previous one. We have assessed all
47 these proposals and are submitting comments to the
48 Federal Subsistence Board. But, again, we are neutral
49 when it comes to eligibility to participate in
50

0164

1 subsistence hunting opportunities.

2

3

4 I would like to take this opportunity
5 to say I appreciate all the discussion we've been
6 hearing about the need for more data in these Kenai
7 Peninsula communities. We fully agree with that
8 assessment and so I did just want to take the
9 opportunity to say that in other regions, various
10 Regional Advisory Councils will support us for
11 Fisheries Resource and Monitoring Program funding to
12 conduct comprehensive surveys. Even though we ask
13 about all resources besides fish, that type of research
14 allows us to put fisheries harvest in context of other
15 wildlife resources too. So I did just want to float if
16 there is interest among this Council for us to do that
17 type of work that next time Fisheries Resource and
18 Monitoring priority information needs are up for
19 discussion that's something we would love to help
20 develop so we can continue providing some more data on
21 these topics.

21

22

Thank you.

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 ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
That's a good opportunity, thanks, we should do that,
yes. All right. Okay, is there Federal agency
comments on this proposal.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, how
about tribal representatives.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman. Members
of the Board. This is Darrel Williams, Ninilchik
Traditional Council. For the record, D-A-R-R-E-L W-I-
L-L-I-A-M-S. To speak to Proposal 22-20 and the rest
of them that are aggregated together this is the same
problem as we talked about before, it's an aggregated
proposal.

This one actually does have more data
but there are some real questions about it. One, for
the record, again, we've been doing this for a long
time, the 1991 data should not be used because of the
way it was put together. We've had this argument for,
what, 15 years now. It's really clear that we are --
but apparently it still gets used so apparently the
precedence is that bad and biased data is good data.

0165

1 Then we look at the actual information that's in the
2 analysis like on -- you know, for example, on Page 144
3 it talks about how the survey identified, what, 4,800
4 pounds of moose that were harvested from this area.
5 But it's really interesting, because when we actually
6 go to look at actual harvest information that's
7 published in this analysis on Page 148, over 13 years
8 that was one moose. Guys, those are some big moose.

9

10 (Laughter)

11

12 MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, this stuff is not
13 adding up, it's the same problem. This is poorly done.
14 And it's not that it's confusing by aggregating stuff
15 together, it's that it is incomplete and that's the
16 problem, and that's the problem. Because when we see
17 stuff like this, it's like, man, this looks pretty
18 sketchy guys and, you know, same thing, I'm pro-
19 subsistence, I want people to be able to go out and
20 subsist and do those kind of things. But the problem
21 is, is I'm looking at this stuff, when this moves
22 forward to the Federal Subsistence level people are
23 going to look at this again and harder and if I was the
24 one looking at this I'd be like, yeah, those are some
25 really big moose, you know, coming in at 8,000 pounds
26 or something like that. So I don't think it's been
27 done very well. And I understand that OSM isn't doing
28 analysis or they're not -- excuse me, that wasn't right
29 -- that they're not compiling data. But the problem is
30 is that we need data for this to be able to make these
31 decisions because right now the precedence is, you
32 know, that we just did just a little bit ago that,
33 well, one person tried to hunt and they weren't
34 successful and then for C&T purposes they shared not
35 being successful, right, and they handed down that
36 knowledge of not being successful to the community, it
37 doesn't add up.

38

39 As a matter of fact, when we start
40 looking at this kind of stuff it doesn't really even
41 pass the chuckle test because we're saying, if there's
42 no harvest how do we determine the long-term use that's
43 happened in an area.

44

45 For example, fish traps were in
46 Ninilchik were outlawed in the '50s, that'd be a good
47 reason where you'd actually see no use, or use decline.
48 But in this particular example it's not put together
49 very well so there's more questions about this.

50

0166

1 So, again, I would submit the position
2 for this set of proposals to be sent back, reevaluated
3 individually to be able to get actually good data to
4 move forward with.

5
6 Thank you.

7
8 DR. VOORHEES: Mr. Chair, this is
9 Hannah Voorhees. I just wanted to note that the
10 information on Page 148 is for reported harvest in 15C
11 whereas the information from the subsistence surveys is
12 actually for all moose harvested, reported as harvested
13 in community surveys by the community of Cooper Landing
14 for the entire year in any area. So there's no reason
15 that those should line up necessarily.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks for
18 your clarification. Any other tribal representative
19 want to speak to this.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Advisory
24 group comments, other Regional Advisory Councils.

25
26 MS. PERRY: No Regional Advisory
27 Councils commented, Mr. Chair.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Fish
30 and Game Advisory Committees.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
35 Resource Commissions.

36
37 MS. PERRY: No SRC Committee -- or no
38 SRC comments on this proposal.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Summary of
41 written public comments.

42
43 DR. VOORHEES: Mr. Chair, this is
44 Hannah Voorhees for the record. Two written public
45 comments were received and both were in opposition to
46 these proposals.

47
48 The Alaska Kenai Chapter of the Safari
49 Club International stated that they do not support a
50

0167

1 subsistence priority for rural Alaskans on road
2 connected portions of the Kenai Peninsula.

3

4

5 Of the proposals being considered in
6 this grouping, the Alaska Outdoor Council specifically
7 lists opposition to WP22-20 -- so -- sorry -- so the
8 Alaska Outdoor Council is also registering their
9 opposition but only to WP22-20 specifically. They
10 state that providing a priority to certain users on the
11 Kenai Peninsula exacerbates conflict between Federally-
12 qualified hunters and Alaskans living in non-Federally-
13 qualified areas of the state.

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 ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
Public testimony. We got anyone signed up to talk for
public testimony on this proposal.

MS. PERRY: No one indicated earlier.
I'm not sure if anyone is on the phone who would like
to provide comment at this time.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, anyone out
there.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none,
we're going to move on to Regional Council's
recommendation and motion to support.

MR. HOLSTON: Mr. Chair.

MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael, I'll make
that motion to support this little conglomerate of
proposals.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Michael.
Is there a second.

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

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, we got a
motion to accept on the table and seconded. Let's go
ahead and open it up for discussion, go ahead Council
members.

MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is
Ed. One of the issues we're facing here in Cooper

0168

1 Landing is that, for example, I put in for a goat
2 permit for 15 years or more and it's very low odds
3 chance of getting that permit. Mostly the people that
4 get the permit are outside hunters. We've got a little
5 bit of a change previously with goats. But sheep is
6 also another issue. Here in Cooper Landing it's really
7 tough because we get a lot of non-rural residents
8 putting in for those permits. So the odds of a
9 resident of Cooper Landing getting one of those permits
10 is pretty slim.

11

12 So that's about all I have to say.
13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I
16 understand that Ed, but, good comment, thank you. It's
17 getting that way everywhere. Any other comments that
18 we have on this proposal. I know we got a motion to
19 support this.

20

21 Once, again, my comment is once again
22 they put 15C in there again, trying to take another
23 shot at getting it approved. I don't see the data to
24 back that up, but, that's me. So I'll leave it up to
25 the rest of you to decide what you want to do.

26

27 Any other comments.

28

29 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, this is Michael.
30 I'm not totally clear on this, but, you know, they did
31 mention the head of Kachemak Bay so -- that they were
32 hunting moose up there or something so it sounds like
33 they have been down this way into 15C and, you know,
34 it's kind of a tough area to -- very few moose it seems
35 like anymore, but maybe that was later years, or
36 something, earlier years, you know, definitely some
37 nice hunting up that direction for sure for 7 and 15A
38 and B. But I'm kind of supportive.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, any other
41 comments.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing no other
46 comments someone want to call the question.

47

48 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is Ed, I'll
49 call the question.

50

0169

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ed.
2 We'll take a vote on it then, all those in favor aye.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All those
7 opposed, nay. I'm opposed, nay. I believe it passed.
8 We forgot to restate the final motion but it should be
9 fairly clear, DeAnna, I hope so.

10
11 MS. PERRY: Yes, I had the motion to
12 support the proposals listed.

13
14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, good
15 enough. That brings us to probably the conclusion for
16 the day. I got to take a look here, it's getting close
17 to 5:00 and I think we're going to need more time to go
18 through the next couple proposals. So, DeAnna, unless
19 you got something short we're going to call it a day.

20
21 MS. PERRY: Okay. I did grab the three
22 Board of Game proposals that Ms. Stickwan mentioned
23 earlier that she'd like the Council to take a look at.
24 I'll email that to everybody overnight so at least they
25 have that in front of them for tomorrow's discussion.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that would
28 be great. Anyone else on the Council got anything we
29 need to complete today before we recess and come back
30 in the morning.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none,
35 well, I think we did a good stroke of business. We're
36 going to have a tough day tomorrow, we got a long ways
37 to go, anyway, hope we make it. You guys all have a
38 wonderful night and thank you much for your due
39 diligence and we'll recess until 9:00 a.m.

40
41 (Off record)

42
43 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

44
45
46
47
48
49
50

0170

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through _____ contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I taken electronically on the 13th day of October;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 16th day of November 2021.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/22