

0171

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 II
TELECONFERENCE
October 14, 2021
9:00 a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Greg Encelewski, Chairman
- Judy Caminer
- Donna Claus
- Ed Holston
- Andrew McLaughlin
- Paula Nicklie
- 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

0172

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 - 10/14/2021)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Good morning everyone, this is Greg. I'm going to go ahead and call the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council back to order. We were recessed for the evening. It's approximately 9:00 o'clock. I think, DeAnna, you have some housekeeping announcements to make first and maybe we'll check out who we got and we'll get started.

Thank you.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We have opened up a videoconference option through Teams, along with this audio call. Again, all audio most go through our dedicated phone lines for court reporting purposes, but if you'd like to also join us on the videoconference, you can get that link by calling 907-786-3888, that has to be mailed to you -- or emailed to you, rather. The agenda and meeting materials can be found online on the Federal Subsistence Program website and that address is www.doi.gov/subsistence. If you'll go under the regions tab, click on Southcentral and you'll see a box there with meeting materials. You can open that up and either download it or just open it up and follow along with us live.

This Council did recess before they went to Proposal WP22-25B/26B so that's where we will start first when we get underway.

All participants, Council, Staff and public members are invited to attend and participate. Again, please wait to be recognized by the Chair. In a virtual meeting it's really challenging because normally we see when folks want to testify they'll come to the table or we'll have a blue card that says they want to testify and, of course, in the virtual world we don't have that. So please make sure that you say, Mr. Chair and identify yourself and we will do our best to recognize everyone. Sometimes when two or three people are talking at the same time it's difficult, but please keep trying if we missed you.

While you're on the teleconference,

0173

1 again, put our phone or microphone, if you are using a
2 headset on mute. If you don't have a mute button, use
3 star six. When you're ready to speak hit star six
4 again. It's very important to have phones on mute
5 because we need to have a clear administrative record.
6 Remember that our proceedings are being recorded, and
7 that everything said, even if it's not meant to be
8 heard, it will be recorded and it will appear on the
9 transcript, so please be respectful in providing
10 comments and make sure that you're muting your phones
11 when you're not speaking. Also, please do not place us
12 on hold. Some hold features do provide music and that
13 makes it impossible for us to continue with our
14 meeting.

15

16 At the beginning of each day there's an
17 opportunity to provide testimony on non-agenda items.
18 The Council Chair will announce that opportunity.
19 There's also an opportunity to provide oral comments on
20 wildlife proposals and closure reviews during -- after
21 the analyst presents the proposal analysis. The order
22 of receiving comments is outlined on Page 24 of the
23 meeting book and the Council Chair will help step us
24 through that during each proposal. I know that looking
25 from the book that there are several written public
26 comments submitted on the proposals and I anticipate
27 there will be a fair amount of public testimony as
28 well. Again, trying to make sure that we have a really
29 clear administrative record, please, again, wait for
30 the Chair to acknowledge you so that we can make sure
31 that you are being heard by the court reporter and that
32 your comment is being correctly and accurately
33 captured. There's an also an opportunity to submit
34 written public comments on the proposals. If you have
35 a written comment, please email it to
36 subsistence@fws.gov. Please clearly indicate the
37 number of the proposal or closure review you're
38 commenting on in the title of that email. The comments
39 need to be emailed prior to the proposal that you're
40 commenting on and the comments will then come to me via
41 Office of Subsistence Management. If there's less than
42 10 written comments we'll read them into the record, if
43 there's more than 10 we will tally them and the result
44 will be presented to the Council prior to their
45 deliberation.

46

47 I would also recognize we are having,
48 which is unusual, three Regional Advisory Council
49 meetings happening at the same time. We had thought
50

0174

1 that with Southcentral and Eastern Interior we would be
2 able to share today, doing a joint meeting on a fishery
3 proposal, but then when we saw how many wildlife
4 proposals that we had to take up as well as Eastern
5 Interior, I believe they got several as well, the
6 timing -- we weren't going to have time in our agenda,
7 so with that said, the timing actually made it three
8 RAC meetings in one week and that really stretches
9 Staff thin, Federal as well State. So as we go through
10 our agenda just please be patient, we are working in
11 the background to try to coordinate with each other,
12 and the other two RACs to make sure that we have as
13 much support as possible. And I will, again, do my
14 best to make sure that folks are on the line to support
15 us. But did want to let you know that up front, that
16 we are all trying to support three RAC meetings this
17 week.

18

19 Okay, so I think I'll start, Mr. Chair,
20 by seeing which Council members are online and then
21 I'll go to Staff and then the public and then we'll be
22 ready to get started.

23

24 So for Council members, when I call
25 your name if you can let me know you're on that would
26 be great.

27

28 Angela Totemoff.

29

30 MS. TOTEMOFF: Present.

31

32 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Angela.

33

34 Donna Claus.

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 MS. PERRY: Donna, are you with us this
39 morning?

40

41 MS. CLAUS: Did you just say Donna?

42

43 MS. PERRY: I did.

44

45 MS. CLAUS: Okay, yes, I'm here.

46

47 MS. PERRY: Okay.

48

49 MS. CLAUS: I'm having trouble with my
50

0175

1 connection.

2

3

MS. PERRY: Oh, okay, thank you.

4

5

Andy McLaughlin.

6

7

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Good morning.

8

9

MS. PERRY: Good morning, Andy.

10

11

Judy Caminer.

12

13

MS. CAMINER: Hello, I'm here.

14

15

MS. PERRY: Hi, Judy.

16

17

Aaron Bloomquist, are you back from

18

your hunt.

19

20

(No comments)

21

22

MS. PERRY: Still out searching, I

23

guess.

24

25

John Whissel.

26

27

MR. WHISSEL: Good morning, I'm here.

28

29

MS. PERRY: Good morning, John.

30

31

Paula Nicklie.

32

33

MS. NICKLIE: Good morning, I'm here.

34

35

MS. PERRY: Good morning, Paula.

36

37

Ed Holston.

38

39

MR. HOLSTON: Good morning, DeAnna.

40

41

MS. PERRY: Good morning, Ed.

42

43

Michael Opheim.

44

45

MR. OPHEIM: Good morning, I'm here.

46

47

MS. PERRY: Good morning.

48

49

Diane Selanoff.

50

0176

1 (No comments)

2

3 MS. PERRY: Dennis Zadra.

4

5 MR. ZADRA: Good morning, Dennis is
6 present.

7

8 MS. PERRY: Good morning.

9

10 Gloria Stickwan.

11

12 MS. STICKWAN: Good morning, here.

13

14 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Gloria.

15

16 Greg Encelewski.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I am here.

19

20 MS. PERRY: And, again, I'll call for
21 Diane Selanoff, Diane, were you able to join us.

22

23 MS. TOTEMOFF: Diane will be joining us
24 in about an hour, hour and a half, she had a
25 previous.....

26

27 MS. PERRY: Okay, thank you. And
28 actually I think I do have that note, thank you for
29 reminding me. All right, Mr. Chair, you do have 11 of
30 your 13 seated members participating this morning so
31 you do have a quorum. And if I could I would like to
32 go ahead and see which Staff are present as we dive
33 into these proposals. I've got quite a long list her,
34 I tried to capture everybody that was on yesterday so
35 this might be a little easier than everybody talking at
36 once to let me know they're online.

37

38 Let's see, Amy Craver, are you with us
39 this morning.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 MS. PERRY: Ameer Howard.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 MS. PERRY: Andy Moore (ph)

48

49 (No comments)

50

0177

1 MS. PERRY: Barbara Cellarius.

2

3 MS. CELLARIUS: This is Barbara
4 Cellarius. I'm the Cultural Anthropologist Subsistence
5 Coordinator for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and
6 Preserve. I didn't introduce myself yesterday so I
7 figured I'd do it now, thanks.

8

9 (Teleconference interference -
10 participants not muted)

11

12 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Barbara, for the
13 reminder. Yeah, as I call Staff out and you let me
14 know you're here, if you would identify who you are,
15 what your title is and what agency or community you're
16 with.

17

18 Ben Mulligan.

19

20 REPORTER: Sorry to interrupt, DeAnna,
21 but I'm going to request that whoever is not on mute,
22 I'm having a hard time hearing.

23

24 MS. PERRY: Okay. Again, star six, if
25 you don't have a mute button on your phone, that will
26 help with the background noise. Okay, thank you.

27

28 Brie Darr.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 MS. PERRY: Brian Ubelaker.

33

34 MR. UBELAKER: Yes, Brian Ubelaker is
35 present. I'm a Wildlife Biologist for OSM.

36

37 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Brian.

38

39 Brent Vickers.

40

41 MR. VICKERS: Good morning, DeAnna.
42 Council. Everyone else. This is Brent Vickers,
43 Supervisor, Cultural Anthropologist for OSM. Also
44 representing the OSM leadership team today. Thank you.
45 Beautiful morning.

46

47 MS. PERRY: Brett Christensen.

48

49 (No comments)

50

0178

1 MS. PERRY: Bronwyn Jones.

2

3

4 (Teleconference interference -
5 participants not muted)

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 MS. PERRY: Caroline Ketron.

10

11 MS. KETRON: Good morning, this is
12 Caroline Ketron. I am the Anthropologist and
13 Subsistence Coordinator for the Bureau of Land
14 Management, Glennallen Field Office.

15

16 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Caroline. I believe
17 I pronounced your last name wrong. I'm going to make
18 myself a phonetic note here.

19

20 Charlotte Westing.

21

22 MS. WESTING: Yeah, I'm here this
23 morning. I'm just listening but I'm here.

24

25 MS. PERRY: Okay, thanks. Good
26 morning.

27

28 Chris McKee.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 MS. PERRY: Dave Sarafin.

33

34 (Teleconference interference -
35 participants not muted)

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 MS. PERRY: Dana Kuhns. Again, star
40 six to mute your phones please. I'm sorry, Dana, was
41 that you.

42

43 Francisco Sanchez.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 MS. PERRY: George Pappas.

48

49 (No comments)

50

0179

1 MS. PERRY: Glenn Chen.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 MS. PERRY: Greg Risdahl.

6

7 MR. RISDAHL: Good morning, DeAnna.
8 This is Greg Risdahl. I am the Subsistence Program
9 Leader for the U.S. Forest Service. And good morning
10 to the Council.

11

12 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Greg.

13

14 Hannah Voorhees.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 MS. PERRY: Heather Sam.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 MS. PERRY: Heidi Hatcher.

23

24 MS. HATCHER: Good morning, this is
25 Heidi Hatcher. I'm the Glennallen Area Wildlife
26 Biologist for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

27

28 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Heidi.

29

30 Jackie Keating.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 MS. PERRY: Jarred Stone.

35

36 MR. STONE: Good morning, DeAnna. This
37 is Jarred Stone, Fisheries Biologist with OSM.

38

39 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Jarred.

40

41 Jason Herreman.

42

43 MR. HERREMAN: Good morning, everyone.
44 This is Jason Herreman. I'm the Kenai Assistant Area
45 Wildlife Biologist for Alaska Department of Fish and
46 Game.

47

48 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Jason.

49

50

0180

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

Jill Klein.

(No comments)

MS. PERRY: John Brendly.

(No comments)

MS. PERRY: John Kinsler.

(No comments)

MS. PERRY: Jordan Reimer.

(No comments)

MS. PERRY: Judy Putera.

Katya Wessels.

(No comments)

MS. PERRY: Ken Gates.

MR. GATES: Good morning, DeAnna and everyone. This is Ken Gates, Kenai Fish and Wildlife Conservation Officer. I'm the Federal in-season manager for Cook Inlet Federal subsistence fisheries. Thank you.

MS. PERRY: Good morning, Ken.

Kendra Holman.

(No comments)

MS. PERRY: Kim Yochum.

(No comments)

MS. PERRY: Leanne McDonald.

(No comments)

MS. PERRY: Lisa Grediagin.

(No comments)

MS. PERRY: Mark Burch.

0181

1 MR. BURCH: Good morning, this is Mark
2 Burch with the Department of Fish and Game. Thanks.

3
4 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Mark.

5
6 Mark Miller.

7
8 (No comments)

9
10 MS. PERRY: Marney Graham.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 MS. PERRY: Milo Burcham.

15
16 MR. BURCHAM: Yeah, good morning. Milo
17 Burcham with the Chugach National Forest.

18
19 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Milo.

20
21 Nick Fowler.

22
23 MR. FOWLER: Good morning, everybody.
24 Nick Fowler, Kenai Area Wildlife Biologist, Alaska
25 Department of Fish and Game.

26
27 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Nick, good morning.

28
29 Orville Lind.

30
31 MR. LIND: Camai. Chairman. Board
32 members. And DeAnna. Orville Lind, Native Liaison
33 with OSM. Good morning.

34
35 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Orville.

36
37 Pat Petrivelli.

38
39 MS. PETRIVELLI: Good morning. This is
40 Pat Petrivelli, BIA, Subsistence Anthropologist.

41
42 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Pat.

43
44 Pippa Kenner.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 MS. PERRY: Robbin LaVine.

49
50

0182

1 Rosalie Debenham.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 MS. PERRY: Stephanie Latimer.

6

7 MS. LATIMER: Good morning, this is
8 Stephanie. Teams assistant.

9

10 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Stephanie.

11

12 Steve Namitz.

13

14 MR. NAMITZ: Yeah, good morning. Steve
15 Namitz, U.S. Forest Service, Cordova District Ranger.

16

17 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Steve.

18

19 Sue Detwiler.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 MS. PERRY: Todd Eskelin.

24

25 MR. ESKELIN: Good morning. Todd
26 Eskelin, Wildlife Biologist, Kenai National Wildlife
27 Refuge.

28

29 MS. PERRY: Good morning, Todd.

30

31 Todd Rinaldi.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 MS. PERRY: Tom Plank.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 MS. PERRY: Valerie Lenhartzen.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 MS. PERRY: Victoria Florey.

44

45 MS. FLOREY: This is Victoria, National
46 Park Service Subsistence Program Analyst.

47

48 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Victoria.

49

50

0183

1 Odin Miller.

2

3 MR. MILLER: Odin Miller, Ahtna
4 InterTribal Resource Commission.

5

6 MS. LINNELL: And Karen Linnell,
7 Executive Director, Ahtna InterTribal Resource
8 Commission.

9

10 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Odin and Karen.

11

12 Jim Simon.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 MS. PERRY: Matt Piche.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 MS. PERRY: Okay. I know that was a
21 long list. I know several of these folks will be in and
22 out of the meeting, again, as they support the other
23 two RACs so thank you for your patience in letting me
24 get through that list. I find it a little easier than
25 just have everybody yell at one time. So I do see
26 Jordan and Heather, that you guys are on through chat,
27 so I'll mark that accordingly as well.

28

29 Okay, Mr. Chair, I think all the
30 housekeeping and roll call have been taken care of and
31 if you would like to move forward with comments on non-
32 agenda items or any other pre-announcements feel free
33 to do so. Thank you, very much.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I'm going
36 to do so exactly. First off the bat, I would like to
37 let the Council members know I have been requested
38 under the statewide proposals, there's 22-36 and they
39 want to move that just below.....

40

41 (Teleconference interference -
42 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:information
45 that will be pertinent to 36. So if there's no
46 objections we'll just do the 1 and 2 before 36, that's
47 the only correction I have on the agenda. If that's
48 okay. If there's objection let me know now.

49

50

0184

1 (No objections)

2

3

4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty. The
5 other things is, like DeAnna said, the non-agenda
6 items, public or tribal comments on anything that's
7 non-agenda item. Every morning we allow time for
8 comments or public testimony on that so here's your
9 opportunity if there's something on the non-agenda that
10 you want to talk to.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We're
15 going to go ahead and get back into our proposals. And
16 like DeAnna said we're on WP22-25B/26B, that's sheep
17 establish hunt, it starts 158 and we'll get the OSM
18 presenter.

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. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

MR. WHISSEL: This is John Whissel.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, John.

MR. WHISSEL: If you'd permit me I'd
like to propose a modification to the agenda.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,
John.

MR. WHISSEL: Okay. I'd like to do --
well, first the modification to the agenda is I'd like
to add an item to put together a work group that would
work towards a proposal for our upcoming fisheries
cycle to establish saltwater finfish and shellfish
harvest under Federal subsistence in Prince William
Sound.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. And where
on the agenda, do you have an idea here.

MR. WHISSEL: We could put it at the
very end. I'm not too particular about where it goes
on the agenda, just that it get on the agenda.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right, if
that's agreeable with the rest of the Council members

0185

1 we'll slide that in on the agenda, we'll put it under
2 -- G, I think we got, I think we'll make it H.

3

4 MR. WHISSEL: And I had one other item
5 to bring up whenever you're ready.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, if there's
8 no objection we'll put that on the agenda there, I
9 think under the bottom of 11, just before agency
10 reports.

11

12 (No objection)

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, go ahead,
15 John, you got something else.

16

17 MR. WHISSEL: The next thing is that I
18 feel we made a mistake yesterday and I wanted to go
19 back and, at the very least, put something on the
20 record acknowledging the inconsistency from yesterday
21 and at the very best go back and revisit our decision
22 regarding WP22-20/25A and 27, which extended Federal
23 subsistence for Cooper Landing. The inconsistency was --
24 sorry, did I cut you off, Mr. Chair.

25

26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No, no, you
27 didn't go ahead, you're fine.

28

29 (Teleconference interference -
30 participants not muted)

31

32 MR. WHISSEL: Okay. I heard something
33 on the line, I'll continue. The inconsistency was that
34 we established a criteria for C&T determinations for
35 Unit 15 for the residents of Moose Pass and then went
36 ahead on almost an identical proposal and did not
37 establish that same threshold. I feel that -- I feel
38 like our first choice regarding Unit 15C to withhold
39 that until more data could be brought in a proper C&T
40 determination for that area, and I think we should go
41 back to Cooper Landing and extend the same threshold
42 for access to Unit 15C.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Council,
45 would we like to go ahead and bring it back up on the
46 agenda and see what we want to do with it. John,
47 I.....

48

49 MS. PERRY: This.....

50

0186

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:guess we
2 could just -- go ahead does.....

3

4 MS. PERRY: This is DeAnna.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:someone want
7 to -- go ahead, DeAnna.

8

9 MS. PERRY: Yeah, so are we doing a
10 motion to reconsider.....

11

12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I guess that's
13 what we're.....

14

15 MS. PERRY:WP.....

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah.

18

19 MR. WHISSEL: Yes.

20

21 MS. PERRY: Okay. A motion to
22 reconsider WP22-20/25A/27; is the correct?

23

24 MR. WHISSEL: Correct.

25

26 MS. PERRY: Okay. So John do you want
27 to put that in the form of a motion so we could get a
28 second.

29

30 MR. WHISSEL: Yes. Move to reconsider
31 WP22-20/25A/27.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, John,
34 thanks. Is there a second to that motion.

35

36 MR. OPHEIM: Michael will second.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Michael seconded.
39 Okay, it's on the table for discussion, we'll revisit
40 it. John, do you want to go ahead and talk to it now.

41

42 MR. WHISSEL: Sure. I think I probably
43 said what I should have said now when I introduced the
44 topic but, yes. Yesterday we, I think we made a very
45 sound decision regarding the petition for Moose Pass to
46 have Federal subsistence access to harvest large game
47 in Unit 15C and an almost identical proposal with an
48 identical amount of back up for back up for that -- for
49 that area which we thought was not sufficient for the
50

0187

1 residents of Moose Pass, we found sufficient for the
2 residents of Cooper Landing, and I think that was
3 inconsistent. I feel perhaps we made an oversight and
4 we should go back and apply the same standards to
5 residents of Cooper Landing and not yet grant them
6 access to Unit 15C until they meet the same standard
7 that we established for the residents of Moose Pass for
8 a cultural and traditional finding.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Did you
11 want to put that in a motion, we got a motion to
12 reconsider, we got it on the table, do you want a
13 motion to drop 15C from that proposal?

14
15 MR. WHISSEL: Yes, Sir, I move to drop
16 15C from that proposal.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Do I have
19 a second to that motion.

20
21 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is Ed, I
22 second.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Ed seconds.
25 Okay, we're open for discussion on that part of the
26 proposal. I believe I'm thinking the amended, to drop
27 15C and we're going to discuss the vote on that first
28 and then go back to the reconsideration motion.

29
30 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is Judy.

31
32 MS. TOTEMOFF: Mr. Chairman.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I got two Mr.
35 Chairmans. I think Judy was on there first, and then
36 I'll get to you.

37
38 MS. TOTEMOFF: Yeah, go Judy.

39
40 MS. CAMINER: Thank you. So I'm just
41 wondering what the data shows. I mean Cooper Landing's
42 use is different from Moose Pass' use. So I don't know
43 if we want one of the analysts to speak to that or
44 review what the materials say. But it is a different
45 situation and I think we should just recheck the data
46 before we make a decision.

47
48 Thank you.

49
50

0188

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, that's a
2 good point, I'm not going to comment on it but I think
3 the data showed before we, hadn't in the past had 15C
4 included, so I don't think that changed. But anyway we
5 could ask someone to give us some breakdown if you want
6 to hear some more. I do know the one.....

7

8 MR. VICKERS: Hello, Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.

11

12 MR. VICKERS: Hello, Mr. Chair, this is
13 Brent Vickers, OSM.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Uh-huh.

16

17 MR. VICKERS: I just wanted to note
18 that Hannah Voorhees, who presented on the analysis,
19 I'm trying to contact her now, she was at the Eastern
20 Interior meeting this morning. I don't think she was
21 expecting a reconsideration so I'm trying to get her.
22 Nonetheless, the data that is there is the data that we
23 have on Cooper Landing. If you want to compare that to
24 Moose Pass that's certainly something you can do.
25 There is no other data that we can present on Cooper
26 Landing in regard to Unit 15C.

27

28 Thank you.

29

30 MS. STICKWAN: Can't you review it.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

33

34 MS. PERRY: So that analysis starts on
35 Page 138 if you want to start reviewing that.

36

37 MS. TOTEMOFF: Mr. Chair, this is
38 Angela.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Angela.

41

42 MS. TOTEMOFF: The discussion
43 yesterday, it was obvious that this was a very large
44 proposal and I feel like the decision -- people still
45 have some concerns with this and the decision that was
46 made was the decision that was made by the Council.
47 And I feel like if the people that were proposing this,
48 maybe should have broken it down a little more.
49 Because I just feel like this is kind of tripping up
50

0189

1 the Council a little bit. So I just wanted to make
2 that known that maybe if we could even create another
3 work group to work through this whole packet here. But
4 I don't think this is the correct -- an appropriate
5 time to go through the entire thing considering we
6 already made a decision yesterday.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, well, I,
9 for one voted against the decision. I could give you
10 my reasons, but 15C wasn't originally included and I
11 didn't feel that it should, and the proponent that
12 testified was asking for moose in just Unit 7 at the
13 time and I think that it's in an area that there's --
14 there's not near the data of the proof of the use there
15 and I wanted to keep it consistent with Moose Pass,
16 but, anyway, I think that we definitely needed more
17 understanding of where that is. I realize we have a
18 lot of new members here and when we go in and give C&T
19 generally -- we got another one on the agenda coming up
20 soon and we usually do a really thorough vetting of it,
21 public testimony and so on and so forth, so we do have
22 it on the table to reconsider. We're going to
23 reconsider it now and we'll go ahead and take comments
24 from the rest of the Council members. But thanks,
25 Angela, that was good comment.

26
27 Is there anyone else who would like to
28 speak to this reconsideration motion to drop 15C.

29
30 MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman. Members
31 of the Board. My name is Darrel Williams, I'm with
32 Ninilchik Traditional Council. D-A-R-R-E-L W-I-L-L-I-
33 A-M-S, for the record.

34
35 Yeah, this is what I was speaking to
36 when we were talking about the proposal. I really
37 appreciate having this discussion about this. This was
38 part of the problem that we had when we were reviewing
39 this, that it has been inconsistent and there's not
40 enough information to analyze and I think further work
41 is needed.

42
43 Thank you.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
46 Darrel. Anyone else on the Council want to talk on the
47 motion.

48
49 MS. CLAUS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is
50

0190

1 Donna.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,

4 Donna.

5

6 MS. CLAUS: I sat down with all this
7 stuff and reread it last night in the evening, and I'm
8 more confused than I was yesterday. And for me, to
9 reconsider, might be the best, because this has far-
10 reaching impact, it's not just Moose Pass.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Right.

13

14 MS. CLAUS: And what we did yesterday
15 is a pretty blanket -- I don't know, blanket is maybe
16 not the word, but I would appreciate being able to
17 reconsider everything. But right now I know we're just
18 doing 15C. So that's where I'm stand, I'm so confused
19 I'm just, yeah, but, anyway.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I appreciate that
22 comment. Yeah, we are on the one proposal, 22-20/25/27
23 and that was just for the C&T for Unit 7 and 15 and the
24 motion is to drop 15C on the reconsideration motion.

25

26 Anyone else want to speak to it.

27

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Does anyone want
32 to call the question and we'll take a vote on the
33 reconsideration of dropping 15C.

34

35 MR. WHISSEL: I'll call the question,
36 Mr. Chair.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's been
39 called. All in favor of the motion to drop 15C under
40 reconsideration signify by saying aye.

41

42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Opposed.

45

46 MS. CAMINER: Aye.

47

48 MR. OPHEIM: Aye.

49

50

0191

1 MS. PERRY: Point of order, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

4

5 MS. PERRY: Can we do a roll call vote.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I think you're
8 going to have to, I don't know that that's a point of
9 order, but I heard more yea than nay, but we'll go
10 ahead and do a roll call.

11

12 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This
13 is on the motion to reconsider dropping 15C from the
14 proposal, WP22-20/25A/27. It's my understanding the
15 actual motion to reconsider was by unanimous consent so
16 what we are voting on currently is the motion as just
17 described, again, 15C.....

18

19 MS. STICKWAN: 15C.....

20

21 MS. PERRY:from the proposal
22 WP22-20/25A/27.

23

24 MS. STICKWAN: But 15C moo.....

25

26 MS. PERRY: Just want to make sure that
27 everyone's.....

28

29 MS. STICKWAN: Just 15C moose. We're
30 voting on 15C moose, right.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.

33

34 MS. PERRY: So the vote again is to
35 drop 15C from the Proposal 22-20/25A/27.

36

37 MS. CAMINER: Clarification, DeAnna.
38 This is Judy, this is for sheep.

39

40 MR. WHISSEL: The proposal requested
41 moose.....

42

43 MS. PERRY: I'm sorry.

44

45 MR. WHISSEL:in 15C and it
46 requested sheep in all of 15. So it would revert to
47 15A and B, but not 15C for sheep.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's right.

50

0192

1 MS. CAMINER: Thank you.

2

3 MS. PERRY: Okay, with that
4 clarification, if we're ready to vote I'll go ahead
5 with roll call.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

8

9 MS. PERRY: I'm sorry, go ahead, was
10 there another question.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No, I said to go
13 ahead and call the vote.

14

15 MS. PERRY: Oh, okay. All right.

16

17 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yep, aye, to drop 15C
18 moose.

19

20 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Andy.

21

22 Judy Caminer.

23

24 MS. CAMINER: No.

25

26 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

27

28 John Whissel.

29

30 MR. WHISSEL: Aye.

31

32 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

33

34 Paula Nicklie.

35

36 MS. NICKLIE: Aye.

37

38 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Paula.

39

40 Ed Holston.

41

42 MR. HOLSTON: No.

43

44 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

45

46 Michael Opheim.

47

48 MR. OPHEIM: Nay.

49

50

0193

1 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

2

3 Greg Encelewski.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.

6

7 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

8

9 Diane Selanoff.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 MS. PERRY: Dennis Zadra.

14

15 MR. ZADRA: Dennis votes aye.

16

17 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

18

19 Gloria Stickwan.

20

21 MS. STICKWAN: I'm kind of -- I just
22 think about when our area was done, I don't know we
23 didn't go through this thorough -- as thorough as we
24 are now, we've allowed people in here that didn't have
25 use for fish and wildlife and now we're allowing -- and
26 now -- I don't know -- you guys -- the C&Ts done so it
27 doesn't matter now but it seems to me like -- I don't
28 see any sheep use when I read through where they looked
29 at State records, so I guess my vote has to be no, but
30 I hate to say no to subsistence use. I guess my vote
31 was no.

32

33 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Gloria.

34

35 Angela Totemoff.

36

37 MS. TOTEMOFF: I abstain.

38

39 MS. PERRY: And Donna Claus.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 MS. PERRY: Donna, are you on mute
44 perhaps.

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 MS. PERRY: Donna are you with us, are
49 you.....

50

0194

1 MS. CLAUS: Now can you hear me.

2

3 MS. PERRY: I can.

4

5 MS. CLAUS: I'm like Angela -- okay I'm
6 going to abstain like Angela did. I do not have an -- I
7 don't know enough.

8

9 MS. PERRY: Okay. Mr. Chair and
10 Council. The vote is 5 to 4 it passes.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: So do we need to
13 go back to the original motion, I guess we don't.

14

15 MS. PERRY: No, the way it was worded
16 it sounded like the motion to reconsider was by
17 unanimous consent, you asked if anyone objected to
18 doing that and then I think Mr. Whissel went straight
19 to his motion and what that entailed dropping 15C.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

22

23 MS. PERRY: I think the intent of the
24 Council's clear, thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Then
27 we're going to go ahead and move on to sheep, WP-
28 20/25B/26B and we could get the OSM presenter on that.

29

30 MR. UBELAKER: Yes, good morning, Mr.
31 Chair. Brian Ubelaker, OSM.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Good morning,
34 Brian.

35

36 MR. UBELAKER: This analysis starts on
37 Page 158 of your meeting book. And, once, again, for
38 the record my name is Brian Ubelaker, Wildlife
39 Biologist for OSM.

40

41 Proposals WP22-25B submitted by Michael
42 Adams of Cooper Landing and WP22-26B submitted by Lisa
43 Slepetski of Moose Pass requested a Federal subsistence
44 sheep hunt be established in Unit 7.

45

46 Proposal 22-25B specifically requests
47 establishing a season of August 10th through September
48 20th with a harvest limit of one dall sheep and that
49 the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge manger be delegated

50

1 authority to open and close the season in consultation
2 with ADF&G and the Chair of the Southcentral Alaska
3 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

4
5 The proponent state these changes are
6 needed to provide Federal subsistence opportunity to
7 harvest sheep in Unit 7 and that there is a history of
8 sheep harvest by rural residents of Unit 7. The
9 proponents further state the requested change would
10 provide opportunity for rural residents of Unit 7 to
11 engage in subsistence sheep hunting and provide a
12 meaningful subsistence priority.

13
14 Historically, sheep hunting has
15 occurred on the Kenai Peninsula for as long as it has
16 been inhabited. However, sheep hunting was closed in
17 1942 due to a conservation concern. Since then sheep
18 hunting has changed a little to the recognized
19 regulations of today. In 1959 a three-quarter curl
20 harvest limit hunt was established. Then in 1964 the
21 season was extended and a 7/8 curl harvest limit was
22 established. In 1989 the harvest limit was changed to
23 full-curl. Sheep populations had recovered enough by
24 2016 for the Board of Game to establish a non-resident
25 and a youth only hunt. No Federal sheep hunts existed
26 on the Kenai Peninsula prior to 2020 when the Federal
27 Subsistence Board established a Federal sheep hunt in
28 Unit 15 for residents of Ninilchik.

29
30 The Kenai Peninsula sheep population
31 experienced a sharp decline in the early 20th century.
32 The population then increased through 1968 to 2,190
33 individuals before declining until 1992 to 1,600
34 individuals. There has been an overall population
35 decline of 80 percent since the 1960. The 2011 to 2020
36 population estimate for the Kenai Peninsula ranged from
37 379 to 644 individuals. As of 2015 the subpopulation
38 estimates were 163 for the Kenai National Wildlife
39 Refuge, 165 for the Resurrection Trail subpopulation,
40 77 for the Grant Lake subpopulation, and 50 for the
41 Cooper Mountain and Crescent Lake subpopulations. It
42 is not believed that harvest is limiting the population
43 but rather results of climate change and habitat loss.

44
45 Historically, there has never been a
46 Federal hunt for Unit 7 for sheep. Federally-qualified
47 subsistence users have had to compete with sporthunters
48 for a limited number of sheep permits, which currently
49 is nine total. Average harvest in the Kenai Peninsula
50

0196

1 over the last 10 years is 3.9 sheep. The previous 10
2 year average was 6.9 sheep. Over the last 20 years the
3 number of sheep hunters on the Kenai has decreased by
4 roughly half. Harvest for the last 10 years is broken
5 down to 10.2 percent non-resident harvest, 15.7 percent
6 rural residents, and 74.1 percent non-rural resident.

7
8 (Teleconference interference -
9 participants not muted)

10

11 MR. UBELAKER: Other alternatives
12 considered included setting a harvest limit of three-
13 quarter curl horn or greater by Federal drawing permit.
14 Another option was to delegate authority to an in-
15 season manager who would set harvest limits, sex
16 restrictions and quotas.

17

18 If this proposal is adopted, the
19 established Federal sheep hunt would provide additional
20 opportunity to Federally-qualified subsistence users.
21 However, declining sheep populations are susceptible to
22 overharvest, if not managed carefully. Therefore,
23 Federal drawing permits should be established within
24 the harvest framework used by the State and the in-
25 season management should be delegated to the Seward
26 District Ranger to set harvest quotas, number of
27 permits, and any needed permit conditions.

28

29 Therefore, the OSM preliminary
30 conclusion is to support WP22/25B with modification to
31 establish a Federal drawing permit hunt for sheep in
32 Unit 7 with a harvest limit of one ram with full-curl
33 horn or greater and to delegate authority to the Seward
34 District Ranger of the Chugach National Forest and to
35 take no action on WP22-26B.

36

37 Thank you. And I would now be happy to
38 take any questions any Council members may have.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Questions.....

41

42 MS. STICKWAN: I want.....

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:for Brian.

45

46 MS. STICKWAN: I have questions.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go right ahead.

49

50

0197

1 MS. STICKWAN: On Page 145 you didn't
2 have information on sheep for that proposal that we
3 just took up. On Page 145 it says no survey -- 1991 --
4 no harvest of sheep or used sheep for Cooper Landing,
5 but in this proposal you have data, why didn't you add
6 it to the other proposal?

7
8 MR. VICKERS: Hello, this is Brent
9 Vickers from OSM. I'm sorry I was trying to do
10 something and perhaps that relates to me, so can you
11 please repeat the question if this is referring to the
12 C&T determination?

13
14 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, Proposal 22-
15 20/25A/27 on Page 145 it says during ADF&G's 1991 study
16 period no -- survey -- Cooper Landing households
17 harvested -- or used sheep, but in this proposal 22-
18 25B/26B there's data harvest. Why wasn't it included
19 in the last proposal, that data?

20
21 MR. VICKERS: Okay, thank you for
22 repeating that. I'm going to have to check, I'm not
23 the primary author on any of these, but I will do my
24 best to look through right now and get that response to
25 you as quickly as possible. Is that okay.

26
27 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, it just seems like
28 it should be consistent in all your writings because it
29 affects C&T. We just voted down one where it says
30 there's no use of sheep in the previous proposal, this
31 one says there are use of sheep. I mean it's
32 inconsistent and we just voted no because there was no
33 data to show but this proposal says there is data.

34
35 MR. VICKERS: Thank you. I understand
36 and I hope there's no inconsistency, we can address it
37 if there is. I will doublecheck what's written on both
38 of them to make sure that it all lines up and if it
39 doesn't then we will address that. But just give me a
40 few minutes to look through the reports real quickly.

41
42 Thank you.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any Council
45 members have any questions for Brian.

46
47 (Teleconference interference -
48 participants not muted)

49
50

0198

1 REPORTER: Sorry to interrupt.
2 Whoever's typing on the line, could you please mute
3 your phone.

4
5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Okay,
6 if no one's got any questions for Brian we'll have to
7 get back when you get the data to us but we'll go ahead
8 and move on to Board consultation, OSM Native Liaison.
9 Orville.

10
11 MR. LIND: Yes, good morning, Mr. Chair.
12 Council members. During the consultation session there
13 were no questions or comments on this proposal. Thank
14 you, Mr. Chair.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
17 Orville. Agency comments, how about the Alaska
18 Department of Fish and Game.

19
20 MR. HERREMAN: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
21 This is Jason Herreman with the Alaska Department of
22 Fish and Game. I'll provide our Department's position
23 and some background on sheep in the Kenai Peninsula for
24 you this morning.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, go
27 ahead.

28
29 MR. HERREMAN: So the State opposes
30 this proposal. If you look at our sheep populations on
31 the Peninsula they've been in decline for quite some
32 time. Despite what OSM listed there we don't do actual
33 population estimates for sheep, we do minimum counts
34 and look at trends. And if you look at the trend for
35 the Kenai Peninsula we have a greater than 85 percent
36 decline from historic numbers back in the '60s. We're
37 not doing very well at this point. Unfortunately the
38 Kenai is the fringe of dall sheep habitat in Alaska.
39 We are seeing some changes in the habitat. Warmer
40 weather winters, icing events, decreasing of brush
41 line, we don't know what the driving factor is for
42 these population declines at this time but we do know
43 very clear that they're occurring.

44
45 When we look at our survival of our
46 lambs each year, we're down to 13 percent observed in
47 our minimum counts. This is well below what we would
48 expect to see in a healthy population. We look for
49 around 25 percent for a healthy population for sheep.

50

0199

1 So it looks like we're not getting that recruitment in
2 here and it's allowing these populations to step down
3 gradually over time. When we look at specifically our
4 subpopulations on the Peninsula, we believe we have
5 five functional sheep subpopulations. We had the Grant
6 Lake area, Resurrection Trail area, Cooper Mountain,
7 Crescent Lake, those are all within Unit 7, which this
8 proposal refers to and then we have the Kenai National
9 Wildlife Refuge. Looking at these subpopulations in
10 Unit 7 we have two of them that are actually below what
11 is currently suggested in the literature as a minimal
12 viable population for wild sheep. Crescent Lake area,
13 Cooper Mountain for minimum count trends show less than
14 50 animals, unfortunately at this time. So we don't
15 really have a positive picture for sheep on the Kenai
16 Peninsula.

17
18 We don't believe that we can support
19 any more harvest on sheep at this time for the
20 Peninsula, particularly any ewe harvest or anything
21 below full-curl. We're starting to question whether or
22 not we can support the full-curl harvest that we have.
23 This last year we closed both the Crescent and Round
24 Mountain permit areas to harvest. Additionally we have
25 the Cooper Landing closed area, which has been closed
26 under Federal harvest for quite some time, going back
27 to the late '60s there.

28
29 So overall we have a high conservation
30 concern for sheep on the Peninsula and would like to
31 not see any additional harvest on these species, and
32 that's why the Department opposes this proposal and
33 establishment of a Federal season for sheep in Unit 7.
34 If one is established we suggest that the current State
35 regulations be put in place with a full-curl ram or a
36 broomed, rams, both horns, or rams at least eight years
37 or older as your bag limits, and that any areas closed
38 under State regulation remain closed under Federal
39 regulation as well.

40
41 Thank you, and I'm happy to take any
42 questions.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you,
45 Jason. Quite the report. Any questions from the
46 Council members, anyone want to ask Jason any question.

47
48 MR. WHISSEL: I'd ask a question, Mr.
49 Chair, this is John Whissel.

50

0200

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: Go ahead, John.

MR. WHISSEL: Thank you for the report and expressing the conservation concerns. I think that's something we all share here. Understanding that what we're doing here is establishing a ceiling for a harvest and delegating some authority to a manager, I'm just sort of curious where you read an increase harvest in here with that framework. Your concerns are regarding increasing the harvest and I see delegated authority with a manager who would responsibly manage the herd would be our expectations and put in limitations or restrictions on that harvest. Our job isn't to manage for this year, it's to establish a preference for rural residents to meet the subsistence needs. So within that framework, can you discuss your conservation concerns a little bit more clearly so I can understand them.

MR. HERREMAN: Sure, happy to John. So the way the proposal was written it was very unclear as to what would be asked for, what seasons and bag limits would be set, which is what raised the conservation concerns. If, what the Council passes, matches the current State regulations, there wouldn't necessarily be a conservation concern because as you're saying that would mainly be a change in allocation as to who is getting what permits and who is getting to hunt. But if you, say, were to set a lower bag limit or allow harvest in areas that are currently closed under State regulations then that would definitely cause a conservation concern.

MR. WHISSEL: Okay. Understood. Let me say it a little differently. There's already Federal subsistence harvest of sheep in that area, if I'm not mistaken, is that existing harvest creating an issue?

MR. HERREMAN: So currently there is Federal subsistence harvest in 15C. That was started last year. And that -- so far we've had one animal taken under that. That was a sub-curl ram, and we do have conservation concerns over that take. When that proposal was passed through this Board last cycle we asked that it be full-curl and the Board passed a three-quarter curl for that regulation and that continues to have concerns on our side.

0201

1 MR. WHISSEL: Thank you for answering
2 my questions, that's all I have. I understand it
3 better now.

4
5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Anyone
6 else got a question for Jason.

7
8 (No comments)

9
10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Jason,
11 good report. Federal, does anyone want to talk to
12 that, Todd, or anyone.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Then.....

17
18 MR. VICKERS: Mr. Chair, this is Brent
19 Vickers from OSM whenever you're ready I think I'm
20 ready to answer the previous question on the data
21 reporting.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that would
24 be good. Gloria, we're going to get a report now.
25 Thank you, go ahead.

26
27 MR. VICKERS: Yeah, I think there might
28 be some confusion, which is totally reasonable now
29 looking back at how we are presenting these proposals.
30 Again, we thought that this was all going to be an
31 efficient way of doing it and I definitely will
32 reconsider how we present these mega proposals in the
33 future. Nonetheless, I do think there's a little
34 confusion.

35
36 I looked through the reporting on both
37 the customary and traditional use proposal and on the
38 sheep season proposal and on the sheep proposal, which
39 we were discussing during this question, there is no
40 reporting of -- mention of reporting on -- from Cooper
41 Landing, the reporting of sheep harvesting is only on
42 the -- earlier discussed customary and traditional use
43 reporting and that was from the 1991 Division of
44 Subsistence survey, and which none of the households
45 sampled reported having being able to successfully
46 harvest any sheep.

47
48 MS. STICKWAN: Yes, exactly. And why
49 wasn't this information that you just mentioned
50

0202

1 included in the other proposal?

2

3

4 MR. VICKERS: I think that it's not
5 included in the other proposal because in the next
6 proposal, and, Brian, you're welcome to step in, we're
7 considering the conservation of sheep in Unit 7 and the
8 harvesting from sheep as a whole, rather than the use
9 of sheep and customary -- as a means of customary and
10 traditional use for a particular community. Brian, do
11 you have anything to add?

11

12

13 MR. UBELAKER: No, Brent, I believe
14 that pretty much summarizes the conclusion that I came
15 to as well.

15

16

17 MS. STICKWAN: Now I'm really confused.
18 Because I thought the last one was a C&T for Unit 7
19 sheep, customary and traditional use of Unit 7 sheep,
20 this proposal is also for customary and traditional use
21 -- or what is this prop.....

21

22

23

24 MS. PETRIVELLI: Mr. Chair.
25 MR. VICKERS: Mr. Chair -- go ahead,
26 sorry.

26

27

28 MS. PETRIVELLI: Mr. Chair, this is Pat
29 Petrivelli.

29

30

31 MS. STICKWAN: Oh, this is a hunting
32 proposal, sorry.

32

33

34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well,
35 we'll try one at a time, go ahead, Pat.

35

36

37 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah, well, I don't
38 know maybe Gloria figured out but in the proposal that
39 talks specifically about C&T use, yes, the household
40 survey that was done for one year of use did not show
41 use by Cooper Landing, but in that same analysis in
42 Tables 3 and 4 it showed that Cooper Landing did use
43 sheep and they harvested sheep in those areas. Which
44 is why the Staff recommended to support the request.
45 So there was harvest of sheep by Cooper Landing
46 residents and it shows in Tables 3 and 4 on Page 148
47 and 149. In the proposal you're looking at now, the
48 biologist only looked at sheep by anybody and the
49 harvest of sheep is so minimal, I think only nine sheep
50 are being harvested per year by anybody. And that's by

50

0203

1 -- it's not just specifically Cooper Landing residents.

2

3 MS. STICKWAN: Okay, thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We're
6 going to go ahead and move on then.

7

8 MR. HERREMAN: Mr. Chair, Jason
9 Herreman.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Jason.

12

13 MR. HERREMAN: Yeah, I just need to
14 correct one statement I said. Sorry. I said the 15C as
15 far as the current sheep harvest under Federal, and I
16 meant just Unit 15.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

19

20 MR. HERREMAN: So I just wanted to make
21 sure that was clear on the record.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

24

25 MR. HERREMAN: And as far as current
26 harvest, our last three year average for harvest in
27 Unit 7 is actually only two sheep currently.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I'm hoping
30 that clarifies some of it, there seems to be quite a
31 confusion of where the sheep got and who got them, but
32 obviously it's obviously a pretty low population and
33 really kind of a concern. So thank you, thank you,
34 Jason.

35

36 All right, we're going to go ahead and
37 move on here. We're going to go to -- was there any --
38 there was no Federal, is there any tribal comments.

39

40 MR. ESKELIN: Mr. Chair, Todd Eskelin,
41 Kenai Refuge.

42

43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

44

45 MR. ESKELIN: Yeah, the only comment I
46 had was I think, you know, when we established the Unit
47 15 draw hunt, it was imperative that we protect those
48 discreet populations, the areas that the State had
49 already closed, all drawing hunts on the State side and
50

0204

1 everything too. So I just wanted to kind of reiterate
2 that, you know, the in-season manager, there's
3 discretion in some cases to do things differently but I
4 -- you know if this passes I think it would be
5 imperative that we continue to uphold protecting those
6 discreet populations which would be the drawing hunts
7 in Unit 7 that have already been closed by the State.
8 That's my only comment.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, thanks,
11 Todd, that helps some. Okay, let's go ahead and move
12 on, is there any tribal agency comments, tribal
13 representatives.

14
15 MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chair. Members of
16 the Board. This is Darrel Williams, D-A-R-R-E-L W-I-L-
17 L-I-A-M-S with Ninilchik Traditional Council.

18
19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Darrel.

20
21 MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, a couple quick
22 comments. Because we've had some issues with the idea
23 -- you have to have some way to manage everything,
24 absolutely, I mean you always have to have that.

25
26 Some of the questions that come up,
27 from our previous experiences with delegation of
28 authority, is what will those frameworks be. They're
29 not real clear. And I think that's something that
30 would probably add to whether this proposal is voted up
31 or voted down, because the Federal Subsistence Board
32 cannot give away its authority. It has to have a
33 framework and it has to be documented in the details,
34 or there'll be problems. I mean that's one issue that
35 we had to address.

36
37 And it's also interesting because some
38 of this that brought the sheep hunting up, has been the
39 drawing permits. You know, in 2021, there were two
40 drawings available in Unit 7 and 15, you know, and that
41 was the D5156 permits, and like Todd was saying they're
42 not listing in the 2022 so it looks they're closed.
43 You know, but this is back to this idea that we were
44 talking about earlier yesterday, about those
45 allocations. It's really interesting we start talking
46 about we're going to do what State management says when
47 Federal subsistence is a priority and where is that
48 meaningful preference because, you know, I mean, it's
49 something that I think needs to be considered. Of
50

0205

1 course, it is a declining population. Material that's
2 here on Page 166, you know, they've also kind of lumped
3 together Unit 7 and 15 on that decline documentation
4 and I'm really kind of curious which one is -- is one
5 declining more rapidly than the other, or what that
6 could be. Because I could see this really having an
7 impact on the outcome of what would happen with this.

8

9 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
12 Darrel, good points. Questions for Darrel anyone.

13

14 MR. HERREMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd be
15 happy to address his questions if you'd like, Jason
16 Herreman with Fish and Game.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,
19 Jason.

20

21 MR. HERREMAN: So first a correction,
22 the draw areas were actually closed last year as well
23 so it wasn't just for this upcoming season, they were
24 closed last year. As far as decline being lumped
25 together, that decline is Peninsula-wide. When we
26 break it out by Unit 7 the same decline is occurring as
27 in Unit 15. There's not one area, you know, one
28 subunit or one unit that it is declining necessarily
29 over another, there is slight differences between our
30 subpopulations in where they're at but the decline is
31 Peninsula-wide.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that
34 clarifies it, thank you. Darrel, if you want to ask a
35 question back I'll allow it.

36

37 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
38 no, that's fine. I was just kind of curious if it was
39 different in one area over the other because it may
40 affect the outcome of the proposal. Thank you very
41 much.

42

43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Okay,
44 thank you, Jason. Okay, we're going to go ahead and
45 move on to advisory groups, comments, other Regional
46 Advisory Councils, anyone.

47

48 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, no other
49 Regional Advisory Councils commented on this proposal.

50

0206

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
2 DeAnna. Fish and Game Advisory Committee.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
7 Resource Commissions.

8
9 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, to my knowledge,
10 Denali nor Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource
11 Commissions had comments on this proposal. Thank you.

12
13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
14 DeAnna. Summary of written public comments.

15
16 MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, Brian
17 Ubelaker, OSM.

18
19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Brian.

20
21 MR. UBELAKER: There was one letter in
22 opposition submitted prior to the deadline and it was
23 opposed to the proposal as written with regards to
24 there being no gender or horn restrictions being stated
25 in the proposal. Thank you.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Brian.
28 Public testimony. Is there anyone that would like to
29 testify to this proposal.

30
31 (No comments)

32
33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Hearing
38 none, Regional Council's recommendation. The Chair
39 will entertain a motion to adopt.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone out there
44 on the Council want to make a motion to adopt it.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: So then.....

49
50

0207

1 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is
2 Judy.....

3
4 MR. WHISSEL: This is John Whissel.....

5
6 MR. HOLSTON: Mr. Chair, this is
7 Ed.....

8
9 MS. CAMINER:I'll make a motion
10 to adopt.

11
12 MR. WHISSEL: I'll step back.

13
14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Who is that that
15 made the motion.

16
17 MR. HOLSTON: This is Ed Holston.

18
19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks, Ed.
20 Is there a second.

21
22 MR. WHISSEL: I'll second.....

23
24 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Andy, second.....

25
26 MR. WHISSEL:this is John
27 Whissel.

28
29 MR. MCLAUGHLIN:it so we can
30 discuss it.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Andy seconded,
33 okay, good. We got a motion and seconded for Proposal
34 22-25B/26B sheep. We'll open for discussion now to the
35 Council and whoever wants to start first, go ahead.

36
37 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is
38 Ed.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Ed, go ahead.

41
42 MR. HOLSTON: Hello.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead
45 Ed.

46
47 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, I'm going to
48 support this proposal with the modification that was
49 presented by OSM talking about one ram with curl-curl
50

0208

1 or larger by Federal drawing permit. I think it's a
2 good idea. As I alluded to, or spoke to yesterday,
3 very few permits given by ADF&G. There's a huge amount
4 of interest and the odds of getting one of those
5 permits is really, really slim. This will allow
6 Federal subsistence users here a little bit of a break
7 with a little extension of the season.

8

9 Thank you.

10

11 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Andy.

14

15 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, thank you.
16 Through the Chair. You know seeing that non-residents
17 could even hunt some of the sheep on the years that the
18 drawings were happening, you know, for me to see
19 something that says no Federal subsistence priority,
20 that just doesn't sit right. So that being said, you
21 know, I'm well aware of the conservation concerns, it's
22 not just Kenai-wide, it's statewide, there's a sheep
23 decline, population decline. Alders are moving up,
24 they're losing their pasture slowly, the sheep
25 populations are going down, the densities everywhere in
26 these geographically isolated locations. You know,
27 historically I used to, many years, went to the
28 Wrangells back when it was any sheep, you know, and
29 that was about the meat. But conservation concerns,
30 you know, the evolution of how this all happened, and
31 then it went to one ram that I was allowed to get, then
32 it was a half-curl ram, then it was three-quarter curl
33 and each year was a new restriction and then it came to
34 full-curl, then it was one side could be broomed, then
35 it was both sides needed to be broomed, it just kept
36 getting more and more restrictive, okay, and -- but I
37 would support this with the modification. One
38 justification is non-residents and sporthunters, when
39 the drawing is open, that doesn't mean that this
40 Federal drawing even has to even be opened. You know
41 the resident and sporthunters and non-residents, during
42 the drawings could go do it, so I believe a Federal
43 drawing is warranted. You know the manager can close
44 that drawing even. You know we got to serve ANILCA on
45 this and even despite the statewide sheep declines, we
46 got to have a Federal subsistence priority here.

47

48 And along the lines of sheep
49 management, which is very traditional for managers,
50

0209

1 they made these restrictions all the way up to full-
2 curl. And also in that modification should be at least
3 -- you know, because if you get out there -- if you've
4 ever hunted sheep, like one time I had to pass up a ram
5 because both sides weren't broomed, one side was
6 broomed, and he was just half an inch shy of full-curl
7 on the other, so, you know, I mean you have to include
8 also both sides broomed, or one side broomed in that
9 horn restriction.

10

11 Anyhow, that's what I would say,
12 thanks.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, good info,
15 Andy, thank you. Anyone else want to talk to the
16 proposal before we vote on it.

17

18 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, this is Michael.

19

20 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is.....

21

22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Michael.

23

24 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, I think supporting
25 this would be a good idea. It gives additional hunting
26 opportunity for Federal subsistence users and it also,
27 you know, gives the authority to the in-season manager
28 there, you know, so it may never actually be a hunt but
29 at least it would be there if the opportunity ever
30 comes about. So I think I'll be supporting this one.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
33 Michael.

34

35 MS. CLAUS: Mr. Chairman, this is
36 Donna.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Donna.

39

40 MS. CLAUS: Can we get a summary of all
41 those -- all the options that OSM said should be
42 included.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, if someone
45 wants to go ahead and go over that that would be fine.

46

47 MR. WHISSEL: I can read it, Mr. Chair,
48 I'm looking right at it.

49

50

0210

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

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

MR. WHISSEL: The modification is to establish a Federal drawing permit hunt for sheep in Unit 7 with a harvest limit of one ram with full-curl horn or larger and delegate authority to the Seward Ranger District of the Chugach National Forest to close the season, set the harvest quota, number of permits to be issued and any needed permit conditions via delegation of authority letter only.

MS. CLAUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, if that helps. Anyone else, comments.

MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, I'd make a quick comment, this is John again.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, John.

MR. WHISSEL: Yeah, this situation seems a little bit like what we had with moose on the Copper River Delta and we've got a real good model here for State and Federal subsistence working together fairly harmoniously to the great benefit of conservation for the herd so I'm going to support this as well. And I really hope that we see these sheep rebound and we see some sound management, and, you know, if there's any question look to what we've accomplished here on the Copper River Delta. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, John. Any other comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Just for the record I'm going to support it also just for the light of potential opportunity for the Federal subsistence user. Everyone else gets it, we should certainly have a Federal subsistence priority. Okay, would someone like to call the question.

MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is Ed. I'll call the question.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's been called.....

0211

1 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:all in favor
4 of this proposal say.....

5

6 MR. WHISSEL:can I make.....

7

8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:aye.....

9

10 MR. WHISSEL:comment before
11 we.....

12

13 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

14

15 MR. WHISSEL:vote.

16

17 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, hold on,
20 hold on, one at a time. John, you wanted to make a
21 comment, go ahead.

22

23 MR. WHISSEL: Yeah, I believe the
24 motion on the table is to approve the original proposal
25 and in discussion we all supported the modification but
26 that wasn't the motion. So I'm suggesting we amend the
27 original motion.....

28

29 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Correct.

30

31 MR. WHISSEL:to reflect
32 supporting WP22-25B with modification if the motion
33 maker and second are amendable.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. If they're
36 amenable, I thought that was in there, okay, go ahead,
37 do you guys both agree to that.

38

39 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is Ed, Mr.
40 Chair. I believe, in my motion, I included the
41 modifications.

42

43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's what I
44 thought, yeah, okay, the second okay with that?

45

46 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Andy.
49 Okay, now, DeAnna, did you want to speak to me.

50

0212

1 MS. PERRY: I was just going to make
2 the same point, what I had in my record was to support
3 and then the discussion said with modification, but I
4 think the Council's intent is clear.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You had no faith
7 in me getting it cleared up, okay, anyway.

8
9 (Laughter)

10
11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, all in
12 favor aye.

13
14 IN UNISON: Aye.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Is anyone opposed
17 to it.

18
19 (No opposing votes)

20
21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Motion carries.
22 I'm going to get ready for the next proposal. I need
23 to take a five minute coffee grab and let's each take
24 five minutes. Morning time kind of gets high level,
25 and we'll be back in five minutes is that's good.

26
27 (Off record)

28
29 (On record)

30
31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I'm ready
32 to go on the next proposal if everybody's ready.

33
34 (Teleconference interference -
35 participants not muted)

36
37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Just a minute?

38
39 (Teleconference interference -
40 participants not muted)

41
42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Someone's making
43 a lot of noise.

44
45 MS. PERRY: Just a reminder for folks
46 as they call back in, or come back on the phone to
47 press star six to mute your phones. We're getting
48 quite a bit of background noise. Again, if your phone
49 does not have a mute button, please press star six, so
50

0213

1 we can minimize the background noise on the call.

2

3

Thank you.

4

5

6

7

(Teleconference interference -
participants not muted)

8

9

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, we're still
getting some feedback there, if you guys want to
doublecheck your phone. We're going to move on to
WP22-28/29, moose, extend season in Unit 7.

13

14

15

16

17

MS. TOTEMOFF: Mr. Chairman, just a
reminder, somebody is walking in the background outside
it sounds like, so if you could just star six your
phone that'd be great.

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: They listened to
you, thank you. Okay, this one starts on Page 182 if
we could have the OSM presenter.

23

24

25

MR. UBELAKER: Yes, good morning, Mr.
Chair. Brian Ubelaker, OSM.

26

27

28

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Brian,
you go right ahead.

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Sir.
Wildlife Proposals WP22-28 submitted by Michael Adams
of Cooper Landing and WP22-29 submitted by Seth Wilson
of Glennallen requests to extend the length of the
moose hunting season in Unit 7 remainder to September
25th.

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

The proponents state the Federal
subsistence season should not be more restrictive than
the State of Alaska hunting season which currently
closes five days later than the Federal season, and
that this proposal would allow more opportunity for
participation by Federally-qualified subsistence users.

43

44

45

46

47

48

Relevant regulatory history includes an
adoption in 2015 when the Board of Game shifted and
shortened the State season to later, from August 20th
to September 20th to September 1st through the 25th.
Then in 2018 they.....

49

50

(Teleconference interference -

0214

1 participants not muted - overriding)

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

MR. UBELAKER: A unit wide survey and population estimate has never been conducted in Unit 7 but the population trend is decidedly declining and has been since the 1970s. The most recent trend count conducted in Unit 7 has a bulk cow ratio of 25 to 100, which is within the ADF&G management objective. Moose harvest in Unit 7 has been declining since 2000 and the average harvest over the last five years is 20 moose per year.

Another alternative considered was suggested by Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. It stated that since the current Federal season is longer than the State season, the season opener should be shifted from August 10th to August 20th but still maintain the proposed date of September 25th. While this would shorten the overall Federal season by five days, it would move it closer to when the rut occurs, which should allow for hunter success more like current levels, plus Federally-qualified subsistence users would still be able to hunt without State competition for 12 days at the beginning of the season.

Adopting this proposal and extending the season would allow Federally-qualified subsistence users greater access to the resource. It would also allow for the alignment of Federal and State seasons.

Therefore, OSM's preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal WP22-28 and take no action on WP22-29.

Thank you, and I'd be happy to answer any questions anybody may have.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, questions for Brian on this one.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks, Brian. I guess there's no questions, doesn't appear to be. We'll go ahead and move on to are there any Board consultations, Orville.

MR. LIND: Mr. Chair, good morning. Again, Orville Lind, Native Liaison, OSM. There were

0215

1 no questions or concerns on this proposal, Mr. Chair.
2 Thank you.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
5 Agency comments, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

6

7 MR. HERREMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
8 Jason Herreman again. So I'll provide you a little
9 background on this as well as the State's position. As
10 OSM alluded to, we have not done any composition counts
11 in Unit 7 since 2014 so we don't have any good present
12 data at this time but the population is definitely at
13 low numbers. We believe it to be relatively stable at
14 the low numbers it currently is at.

15

16 The Board of Game did change season
17 dates on the State side back in 2015. When that was
18 done the season was extended five days on the end to
19 September 25th. At the same time seven days were
20 cutoff the front end of the season and this was to
21 account for the higher vulnerability of bulls at the
22 end of the season as they're entering the rut there.
23 We get a higher take of animals as they become more
24 vulnerable later in the season. I guess contrary to the
25 position stated by OSM, this would not align seasons
26 between the Federal and State season. Because as was
27 mentioned the Federal is still much longer than the
28 State season and there's already additional opportunity
29 provided to Federal subsistence hunters in Unit 7.
30 Additionally, Federal subsistence hunters are allowed
31 to take fork-antlered bulls. These were removed from
32 harvest on the State side due to issues and concerns we
33 had allowing them in the harvest. It drove our bull to
34 cow ratio numbers down in several of our subunits to
35 unsustainable levels, so they were removed on the State
36 side. These are still allowed to be harvested on the
37 Federal side.

38

39 So this conservation concern of the
40 extended season as well as the lower bag limit causes
41 the State to oppose this proposal.

42

43 And with that I'd take any questions
44 you have.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you,
47 Jason. Questions for Jason on the State's outlook on
48 it.

49

50

0216

1 (No comments)

2

3

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone.

4

5

(No comments)

6

7

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you, Jason, we'll move on. Federal, anyone want to comment there, Todd.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. ESKELIN: Thank you, Chair and Council members. You know the Refuge is in Unit 15 but we have traditionally always tried to maintain moose hunting seasons and bag limits on the Federal side consistent across 7 and 15. So I'm going to make my comments more from my perspective from Unit 15, but hoping that this Council will align 7 and 15 regulations consistently.

We do support extending the moose season to the 25th. And a lot of that comes from hunters who get permits from me to hunt on the Federal subsistence side of things, and consistently everybody talked about how it's too hot in August. You know when they were growing up here on the Kenai it was a good time to hunt moose and things are shifting later. So consistently starting on August 10th there are hunters that are complaining because, you know, it's 70 degrees and their ability to get a moose out of the woods safely is considerable. There's a lot of work that has to go into how they're going to actually do that ahead of time to not lose meat. So we were already, you know, very much on board with shifting the season later. But I would also, you know, point out, as hunters we do also know that that prime time of hunting in the latter part of the season when the leaves start dropping that visibility increases and the bulls are more susceptible to calls, does increase our harvest opportunity then. And so, you know, as OSM had mentioned in the analysis, we had proposed, and the RAC could make decisions on this, we had proposed modifying this to start the season August 20th rather than starting on August 10th and then extending those five days. And what that does for subsistence hunters is it gives them access to those last five days that aren't open when harvest is going to be increased -- harvest opportunity is going to be increased. But we don't see a ton of harvest in the period from August 10th to August 20th. And so, you know, as Brian had stated,

0217

1 from August 20th to September 1st when the State hunt
2 opens, there's still a tremendous amount of opportunity
3 for subsistence hunters to have that open period before
4 the State hunt begins when there's no competition.

5
6 The other part of that I wanted to kind
7 of show you was I just went back, briefly, through the
8 last three years and this year the period of time of
9 August 10th to August 20th we had two cows harvested
10 and no bulls. In 2020 we had one sublegal bull and one
11 cow. And then in 2019 we had one legal bull that would
12 have been legal both under both State and Federal
13 regulations and one cow. So what we're talking about
14 sacrificing in those 10 days those same moose are still
15 going to be available to subsistence hunters starting
16 on August 20th and running all the way to September
17 1st, when the State season opens. So I don't see this
18 as a loss of opportunity just because the days are
19 shortened, because those same moose are still available
20 only to subsistence hunters during that timeframe.

21
22 And, you know, as Brian stated too,
23 after September 1st we're only talking about forks, and
24 cows being the differences between people who are
25 exercising their State harvest ticket versus their
26 Federal subsistence one.

27
28 Lastly, the late season that we -- that
29 this RAC instituted back in -- I can't even remember
30 how far back it goes, but October 20th to November
31 10th, you know, that clearly adds to what we're talking
32 about about having a subsistence priority. So I just
33 don't see where cutting out the 10 days and adding five
34 during the prime time is really a loss in any -- from
35 any standpoint.

36
37 But I'd be willing to take any
38 questions.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you,
41 Todd. Any questions for Todd.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, hearing
46 none, is there any tribal representatives who want to
47 talk to the proposal.

48
49 (No comments)

50

0218

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: How about
2 advisory group comments, other Regional Advisory
3 Councils.

4

5 MS. PERRY: No other Regional Advisory
6 Councils commented on this proposal, Mr. Chair. Thank
7 you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Fish and Game
10 Advisory Council -- Committees.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
15 Resource Commissions.

16

17 MS. PERRY: This is DeAnna. There were
18 no SRC comments on this proposal.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
21 Summary of written public comments, OSM.

22

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

25

26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Brian.

27

28 MR. UBELAKER: There was one letter
29 written in opposition of this proposal. That it is
30 based on not supporting the rural determination for the
31 road-connected Kenai Peninsula. Thank you.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
34 Public testimony. Would anyone like to testify to this
35 proposal.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none,
40 we'll take the Regional Council recommendation. A
41 motion to support.

42

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Council members.

47

48 MS. CLAUS: Oh, dear -- oh, Mr. Chair,
49 I will make the motion to support this.

50

0219

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

2

3 MS. CLAUS: This is Donna.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Donna. Is
6 there a second.

7

8 MR. OPHEIM: Michael, second.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Michael Opheim
11 seconds. Okay, it's been moved by Donna, seconded by
12 Michael, it's on the table for discussion. We'll open
13 it up to discussion.

14

15 MR. HOLSTON: Mr. Chair.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Ed.

18

19 MR. HOLSTON: Okay, thank you. I'm
20 going to support this but I'd like it to be amended
21 based on Todd's comments. I agree, I think the season
22 ought to be August 20th, not August 10th, and I agree
23 it should be extended to September 21st. Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Did you
26 want to make that into an amended motion for the
27 proposal.

28

29 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, I'll make an
30 amended motion that we support 22 with the amended
31 version being the season would be August 20th to
32 September 25th.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. A second
35 for Ed on his amendment.

36

37 MS. CLAUS: I will second that, Mr.
38 Chairman. This is Donna.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Donna.
41 Donna seconded it, okay. Okay, I got an amended
42 proposal that we changed the dates August 20th to
43 September 25th in Unit 7 extend moose. Any other
44 discussion.

45

46 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is Judy.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy.

49

50

0220

1 MS. CAMINER: I would support the
2 proposal, it provides a subsistence priority by having
3 an extended season. Thank you.

4
5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone else like
6 to comment on it.

7
8 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, this is Michael.
9 I'm going to support it with Ed's amendments there.
10 And I think given an extra couple days when it's a
11 little bit cooler out, I think we're going to see a lot
12 more of those requests coming up with extending those
13 dates to cooler temps. I support that. It gives our
14 folks a little extra time to harvest some meat.

15
16 Thank you.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
19 Michael. Anyone else.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. And they
24 still have the late season also. So we got an amended
25 proposal and we could vote on that amended proposal.
26 If someone would call the question we'll go ahead and
27 take that vote.

28
29 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Question.

30
31 MR. OPHEIM: I'll call the question.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: The question's
34 been called for, all in favor of the amended proposal
35 WP22-28/29 extending with the changed dates August 20th
36 to September 25th signify by saying aye.

37
38 IN UNISON: Aye.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed.

41
42 (No opposing votes)

43
44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I got all ayes, I
45 didn't hear any opposition. Was there any opposed.

46
47 (No opposing votes)

48
49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, it carries.

50

0221

1 DeAnna, that was amended as the original proposal, do
2 we have to go back to it or is that sufficient.

3

4 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, you would have
5 to go back to the motion, as amended, since we already
6 had a motion on the table to adopt and then it was
7 amended.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Then let's
10 go back.....

11

12 MS. PERRY: Thank you. Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:to the
15 original and vote on the original motion then. All in
16 favor aye.

17

18 IN UNISON: Aye.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any oppose it.

21

22 (No opposing votes)

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I believe
25 that carries. I hope that's clear. Okay. Are you
26 good on that DeAnna, now.

27

28 MS. PERRY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You bet. Okay,
31 next proposal. Next proposal is WP22-30/31 moose
32 extend season in Unit 15, OSM, starts on Page 192 and
33 you can go ahead and make your presentation.

34

35 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
36 Brian Ubelaker, once again with OSM. And as you stated
37 the analysis starts on Page 192 of your meeting book.

38

39 Wildlife Proposals WP22-30 submitted by
40 Michael Adams of Cooper Landing and WP22-31 submitted
41 by Chugach Regional Resource Commission requests to
42 extend the length of the moose hunting season in Unit
43 15 to September 25th. The proponent states that the
44 Federal subsistence season should not be more
45 restrictive than the State hunting season which is
46 currently open five days later than the Federal season
47 and would allow for more opportunity for participation
48 by Federally-qualified subsistence users.

49

50

1 Recent relevant regulatory history
2 includes the 2014 establishment by the Federal
3 Subsistence Board of a cow moose hunt from October 20th
4 through November 10th in Unit 15C. Then in 2015 the
5 Board of Game aligned all State moose seasons in Unit
6 15 to September 1st through the 25th with a harvest
7 limit of 50-inch plus, four or more brow tines. They
8 also established a non-resident general season to Unit
9 15C at this time. In 2019 the Board of Game changed
10 harvest limits to 50-inch plus or three or more brow
11 tines. They also established a general season hunt in
12 15B and a resident any bull draw permit at the same
13 time.

14
15 State management objectives for the
16 moose population in Unit 15 include in subunit 15A, to
17 maintain a post-hunting bull/cow ratio of 25 to 100; in
18 subunit 15B west to maintain a bull/cow ratio of 20 to
19 25 per 100 for maximum hunting opportunity; 15B east to
20 maintain a bull/cow ratio of 40 to 100 for maximum
21 harvest of large antlered bulls; in 15C to maintain a
22 bull to cow ratio of 20 to 25 to 100 for a healthy
23 productive population.

24
25 Units 15A and C were under intensive
26 management from 2012 to 2017. The population objective
27 in Unit 15A at that time was 3,000 to 3,500 with a
28 sustainable harvest of.....

29
30 (Teleconference interference -
31 participants not muted)

32
33 MR. UBELAKER:180 to 350 animals.
34 Unit 15C's population objective was the same at 3,000
35 to 3,500 but with a harvest goal of 200 to 350. In
36 Unit 15A bull/cow ratios have been above ADF&G's
37 management objective since 2012. But for the same
38 timeframe population estimates have been below
39 management objectives. In Unit 15B there has been no
40 population census since 2001, but all metrics increase
41 the population is increasing. Unit 15C has a bull to
42 cow ratio at or above the management objective and has
43 been since 2002.

44
45 Moose harvest in Unit 15 has been
46 increasing since the harvest restrictions were lifted
47 for 2013. Federal harvest has averaged 12 moose per
48 year over the last five years which equates to 4.4
49 percent of the total harvest. And since the
50

0223

1 establishment of the cow hunt in 2014, cows have
2 averaged 27.2 percent of the Federal harvest.

3

4

5 Another alternative to consider is the
6 same as the previous proposal I just presented. Kenai
7 National Wildlife Refuge suggested, again, to shift the
8 start date from August 10th to the 20th but maintain
9 the proposed end date of September 25th. And this
10 would, again, shorten the season by five days but would
11 move the hunt closer to the rut. And Federally-
12 qualified subsistence users would still have the 12
13 days at the beginning of the season to hunt without
14 competition from sporthunters.

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

If this proposal were to be adopted the
resulting extension of moose season would allow more
Federally-qualified subsistence users greater access to
the resource and it would also align Federal and State
closing dates for the season.

Therefore, OSM's preliminary conclusion
is to support Proposal WP22-30 and take no action on
WP22-31.

Thank you, and I would be happy to
answer any questions anybody may have.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, any
questions for Brian.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Brian,
thank you. How about report of consultation, Orville,
anything on this one.

MR. LIND: Mr. Chair. Orville Lind,
Native Liaison, OSM. There were no questions or
concerns on this proposal either. Thank you, Mr.
Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Okay,
now we're going to go ahead and see if there were any
tribes.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: ANCSA
Corporations.

0224

1 (No comments)

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: Okay, there was none from Orville, so that's good there. How about the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

MR. HERREMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Jason Herreman for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. So similar to the last proposal, the State opposes this proposal as well for the similar reasons.

I would like to make a few corrections to what was presented by OSM there. We do have good population data for all subunits 15A, 15B and 15C for moose in this area. We did a population estimate for 15A back in 2020, one in 15B in 2017 and one in 15C in 2017. Numbers in 15A are low. Approximately 800 moose by our estimate. We have seen some good habitat turnover up there due to the recent fire activity in Swan Lake in 2019 so we do expect this population to grow in the future but it's at low numbers currently. 15B, again, low population there, approximately 800 moose. We expect to see this population begin to increase in the very near future due to the fire activity from 2014 and 2015. And down in 15C the population has been holding steady for recent years at around 3,500 moose. So overall, doing well, population-wise and expecting some positive changes for 15A and 15B.

As they alluded to, we've been below harvest objectives for A and B, so averaging 35 bulls a year in 15A under our general harvest, and 59 in 15A. We've been reaching objectives in 15C in recent years. But, again, we expect this to turn around in A and B here in the near future. In 15B the regulations were changed recently and we are now under general season harvest across 15B, it's no longer broken up in east and west. So that's an important thing to note.

As far as the Federal subsistence season currently, we'd like you guys to note that there's actually 44 additional days that Federally-qualified subsistence hunters have over those that must harvest under State regulations in Unit 15. So there is significant opportunity that's above and beyond State regulations currently. They're also allowed to harvest forked (ph) antlered bulls which are not part of the legal bag limit on the State side.

0225

1 (Teleconference interference -
2 participants not muted)

3

4 MR. HERREMAN:" So there is currently
5 ample opportunity, the State believes, to subsistence
6 priority in Unit 15.

7

8 The changes that have been suggested
9 will not align seasons between the State and the
10 Federal side. You still have the extended fall season
11 of October 20 through November 10th, which is well
12 outside of the season dates for the State season, and
13 you have the early season as well.

14

15 So just to reiterate the State opposes
16 this proposal and believes that there is ample
17 opportunity under the Federal subsistence regulations.

18

19 Thank you, and I'll take any questions.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right. Is
22 there any questions for Jason.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, hearing
27 none, we'll go ahead and move on then. Federal.

28

29 MR. ESKELIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is
30 Todd Eskelin, Kenai National Wildlife Refuge.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

33

34 MR. ESKELIN: Based on my talk on the
35 last proposal, I do not know that I need to comment on
36 this one but I'm available for any questions.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Any
39 questions for Todd.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Todd, just a
44 comment, on his 45 days, most of that is that late
45 season, correct?

46

47 MR. ESKELIN: Mr. Chair. Todd Eskelin,
48 Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. Not necessarily. You
49 know we have consistently in the last five to 10 years

50

0226

1 we've opened the season quite a bit earlier than the
2 State season opens. Before it was August 10th and the
3 State season opened August 20th. And then when they
4 converted to September 1st, obviously the gap became
5 even greater. So it's a combination of the beginning
6 of the season. If you accepted the modifications we
7 made in 7 and did that also in 15, we would still have
8 12 of those 44 days would be in the early season and
9 then the remainder would be that late season.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, that is the
12 two-thirds in the late -- okay, thank you. Any
13 questions for Todd.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right. Any
18 tribal representatives want to speak to this proposal.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, hearing
23 none, any advisory group comments, we'll go to other
24 Regional Advisory Councils.

25

26 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna.
27 No other RAC commented on this proposal.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
30 DeAnna. Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
35 Resource Commissions.

36

37 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna.
38 No SRC comments on this proposal.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
41 Summary of written public comments, OSM.

42

43 MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, Brian
44 Ubelaker.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Brian.

47

48 MR. UBELAKER: There was one letter in
49 opposition submitted and it was the same for the
50

0227

1 previous proposal, stating that they did not support
2 the rural determination for road-connected for Kenai
3 Peninsula.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
8 Public testimony. Would anyone in the public, anyone
9 out there wanting to testify to this proposal, 30/31
10 extend the season in Unit 15.

11

12 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I believe Hope
13 Roberts is trying to testify. I think there's some
14 connection problems, so I just want to see if she's
15 online.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I'm not hearing
22 her online, however, it looks like she has posted a
23 comment in the chat box of Teams and I can go ahead and
24 read that out.

25

26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

27

28 MS. PERRY: The comment goes as
29 follows: Camai, good morning. Hope Roberts,
30 InterTribal Liaison for CRRRC. Our team in the Federal
31 Subsistence Program submitted the request WP22-31 to
32 extend the moose season by five days on behalf of Port
33 Graham, Supiaq* residents. We thank you for
34 considering the changing seasons that affect
35 harvestable weather for rural residents. This mirrors
36 OSMs justification for supporting this proposal.
37 Additional hunting opportunity at the end of September
38 will allow rural residents to hunt when climatic
39 conditions are more favorable for harvesting bulls. In
40 the State hunt most utilized by residents of Port
41 Graham and Nanwalek, the average date of kill for a
42 moose has shifted from around September 11th in the
43 early 1990s to the end of September, in 2020 an
44 extension was granted so that the residents of these
45 rural communities could harvest their moose in early
46 October after not being able to harvest any during the
47 regular seasons previously. Lastly, we believe this
48 regulation will standardize hunting seasons between
49 State and Federal hunts in 15C, reducing confusion for
50

0228

1 hunters who utilize those areas. Again, Quyana, for
2 the consideration. And she just commented, I'm in the
3 hills of Valdez and only have chat available.

4

5 That was the comment, again, from Hope
6 Roberts from Chugach Regional Resources Commission.

7

8 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
11 DeAnna.

12

13 MR. HERREMAN: Mr. Chair, could I
14 address those comments, please. Jason Herreman with
15 the State.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,
18 Jason.

19

20 MR. HERREMAN: Yeah, so I think there's
21 a little bit of confusion on the propers for this. The
22 folks from Port Graham and Nanwalek, we don't have any
23 record of them harvesting moose across the bay on this
24 side of the Peninsula, they actually harvest under
25 TM549, a State draw Tier II hunt. And that season is
26 different than the general harvest season here or the
27 Federal subsistence season we're currently talking
28 about. You know I talk to hunters over there fairly
29 regularly including, you know, communications this year
30 and, again, I'm not aware of anyone from over there
31 coming up to harvest north of Kachemak Bay. So I think
32 there was a little bit of confusion in putting forth
33 that proposal. They do want to see an extension of the
34 TM549 season but I believe they just may have been
35 confused in submitting to the Federal Subsistence Board
36 rather than through the Board of Game.

37

38 Thank you.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, Jason, I
41 thank you for that. But I do believe they have C&T in
42 15C so they could slide over here and hunt, I believe.

43

44 MR. HERREMAN: Most definitely, Sir.
45 And I've suggested that to them in the past.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yep. Well, I'm
48 not suggesting it, but, Michael, he'll pick up on it
49 but, yeah, that's -- they do have the opportunity

50

0229

1 though. Okay, good comments. Anything else there.
2 Public testimony anyone.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I think
7 we're ready for the Regional Council's recommendation
8 and motion, and if you want to make that motion as is,
9 or motion as amended, because if we want to change the
10 dates we can make it all in one motion, I believe, but
11 DeAnna will correct me if I'm wrong, but hopefully we
12 could do it that way.

13
14 MS. PERRY: That's correct, Mr. Chair.

15
16 MS. SELANOFF: This is Diane Selanoff.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

19
20 MS. SELANOFF: This is.....

21
22 MS. TOTEMOFF: Mr. Chair -- oh, go
23 ahead, Diane.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I guess
26 Diane you go first.

27
28 MS. SELANOFF: Okay. This is Diane
29 Selanoff. I will make that motion to extend the moose
30 season.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Diane, do
33 you want to include in it the change in the dates to
34 the -- as we did in the last one?

35
36 MS. PERRY: So I.....

37
38 MS. SELANOFF: Yes.

39
40 MS. PERRY: understand Diane's
41 motion, it is a motion to support WP22-30/31 as
42 amended, the season being, I got to flip through and
43 see what the previous one was, August.....

44
45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: 20th.

46
47 MS. PERRY: 20th, thank you,
48 through September 25th.

49
50

0230

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Correct.

2

3 MS. TOTEMOFF: And this is.....

4

5 MS. PERRY: And we just need a second.

6

7 MS. TOTEMOFF:Angela Totemoff,
8 I'll second it.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Angela
11 seconded.

12

13 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
16 Angela. Okay, Council, we got the motion and it's been
17 amended. So we start with that one on the dates of
18 20th of August and go to the 25th of September. Anyone
19 want to make any comments before we take a vote on it,
20 we got a motion moved and seconded.

21

22 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is Judy.

23

24 MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael. I guess
25 my comments would be basically the same as the
26 previous. I think we'll see a lot of this, asking for
27 later dates, and so I am in support of giving our folks
28 a better chance at some meat in the freezer.

29

30 Thanks.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

33

34 MS. CAMINER: This is Judy.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone else got a
37 comment.

38

39 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is Judy.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy.

42

43 MS. CAMINER: I will support the motion
44 because of the preference it gives to subsistence
45 users. But those of you, such as yourself, with the
46 history of getting that earlier date, only approved by
47 the Ninth Circuit Court, it's kind of interesting how
48 climate change has taken over the process.

49

50

0231

1 Thank you.

2

3

4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Judy, I
5 would comment to that, too, because I'm not sure where
6 our position may be on that for changing what we fought
7 so hard to get. But the one thing that -- I'll make my
8 comment now, is that, you know, I agree that the later
9 date may be better. I've hunted here all my life and
10 have in this area, but, you know, intuitively when you
11 lose five days on the front you lose five, you know,
12 they give you 10 and take away -- or whatever -- I mean
13 you negatively lose five days, but I still support it.
14 So with that said it's getting kind of complicated.

14

15

Anyone else want to comment on it.

16

17

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair.

18

19

20

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,
Andy.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

So, anyhow, but I'll be in support of
this, thanks.

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I agree with you,
Andy. I don't know it's going to be a tough sell to our
people because we have a lot of people go out early
August. They have the opportunity then, the weather's
good enough and they get in, take care of the meat but

0232

1 I know a lot of them go out after the 10th opening,
2 looking for to the early season. So I mean you lose
3 basically -- you're not going to open until the 20th,
4 you lose 10 days on the first of the season, that's a
5 big chunk of the season and then gain five back so you
6 do the math, and in my math you lose five days. You do
7 get a couple days of better hunt potentially. We have
8 another problem down here in 15C especially on the
9 State lands because they close all the access to the
10 hunting so it gets complicated.

11

12 But, anyway, anyone else got any
13 comments.

14

15 MS. SELANOFF: This is Diane Selanoff.
16 I don't like losing the five day season but by
17 extending it, it gives you better opportunity for meat
18 preservation because the temperature can get a little --
19 and you won't have to deal so much with insects
20 getting on your meat. So you have the ability to get a
21 longer -- better preservation and you waste less meat.

22

23 And I'll call for the question.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, she called
26 for the question, that ends the comments so let's go
27 ahead and vote on the motion. There was a motion and
28 it was with the amended dates included in it. So all
29 in favor aye.

30

31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed.

34

35 (No opposing votes)

36

37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, so carries.
38 Okay, we're going to go ahead and move on here in just
39 a minute. Let me get time to organize a couple things
40 here.

41

42 (Pause)

43

44 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna.
45 I just wanted to let you know it looks like some
46 Council members are getting disconnected on our line so
47 I just wanted to let you. It sounds like the line --
48 the audio is not very stable.

49

50

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I was just
2 checking on that. I had one that informed me they were
3 out. Okay, the next one is, and we actually had a guy
4 testify some on this and this is going to be a fairly
5 long proposal, in my opinion, to figure out, it's
6 another one on C&T. It's WP22-32, gain status of C&T
7 to community of North Fork. I'm not sure what that
8 community is myself, but, anyway, Unit 15, and it
9 starts on 206. So if we could have the OSM do the
10 presentation on that we'll get started on that.

11
12 MS. KENNER: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
13 Chair. Members of the Council. The analysis for this
14 proposal begins on Page 208 -- excuse me, Page 206 of
15 your Council books. And my name is Pippa Kenner and
16 I'm an Anthropologist at OSM. I just wanted to say I
17 wish we could all be meeting -- there we go -- I just
18 wanted to say I wish we could all be meeting in person
19 because some of you know me, but a lot of your new
20 Council members probably don't and so I just wanted to
21 introduce myself. But now I'm going to turn off my
22 camera so I can see all my screens.

23
24 (Pause)

25
26 MS. KENNER: So Proposal WP22-32 was
27 submitted by Cork Graham and he requests the Federal
28 Subsistence Board to recognize customary and
29 traditional uses by rural residents of the North Fork
30 Road area in Nikolaevsk for black bears, brown bear,
31 caribou, mountain goat, moose and dall sheep in Unit
32 15. So we have divided the request into two areas, the
33 North Fork Road area and Nikolaevsk. This is to better
34 identify the rural residents addressed in the proposal
35 and a lot of the data is split between those two areas.

36
37 So the proponent states that his intent
38 is to afford wildlife subsistence harvest in the Kenai
39 National Wildlife Refuge. He describes the rural
40 lifestyle of many residents in his North Fork rural
41 community, including Nikolaevsk so include traditional
42 homesteading, off grid living, growing food and raising
43 livestock. The food security of many residents relies
44 on their capacities to hunt moose, bear, grouse,
45 waterfowl, and other wildlife and to fish, both fresh
46 and saltwater fishing. When hunting and fishing,
47 residents follow Alaska Department of Fish and Game
48 regulations. He describes the importance of Federal
49 recognition to increase harvest opportunities such as
50

1 those given to nearby Ninilchik, Cooper Landing, Hope
2 and Copper Center and Glennallen. Recognition of North
3 Fork rural community members customary and traditional
4 uses of local resources will help improve food security
5 of these rural Alaskans. Mr. Graham included
6 testimonials written by three other residents of his
7 North Fork rural community describing their reliance on
8 wild resources.

9
10 So at the inception of the Federal
11 Subsistence Management Program in Alaska in 1990 the
12 majority of the Kenai Peninsula was in the Kenai
13 Peninsula non-rural area established by the State. The
14 exception was the southern most portion around the
15 communities of Port Graham, Nanwalek and Seldovia in
16 Unit 15C. Now, the State did not allow subsistence
17 uses in nonrural areas. However, in 1992 at the
18 conclusion of its rural/nonrural determination process
19 the Federal Subsistence Management Program deemed that
20 large portions of the Kenai Peninsula were rural. The
21 status of a number of Kenai Peninsula communities
22 changed from nonrural to rural and these communities
23 were eligible to fish, hunt and trap under Federal
24 subsistence regulation. So the North Fork Road area
25 and Nikolaevsk in this proposal area situated in this
26 rural area, however, their customary and traditional
27 uses of fish and wildlife have not been recognized by
28 the Board. This is a request for the Board to include
29 the rural residents of the North Fork Road area and
30 Nikolaevsk in customary and traditional use
31 determinations for black bears, brown bears, caribou,
32 goats, moose and sheep in Unit 15.

33
34 Now, I'm going to talk a little about
35 the eight factors for determining customary and
36 traditional use. The Board makes customary and
37 traditional use determinations for the sole purpose of
38 recognizing the pool of Federally-qualified subsistence
39 users. The Board does not use such determinations for
40 resource management or restricting harvest. If a
41 conservation concerns for a particular population, the
42 Board addresses that concern through the imposition of
43 harvest limits or season restrictions rather than by
44 limiting the customary and traditional use finding.

45
46 So we have a 1998 study that included
47 residents of the North Fork Road area and Nikolaevsk
48 and the results of the study were described in the
49 analysis and I'm just going to move to it quickly and
50

1 give you a summary. So in the 1998 study Nikolaevsk
2 households reported harvesting caribou in Unit 7, and
3 outside the Kenai Peninsula area and reported
4 harvesting moose in Units 15A, 15B and 15C. Nikolaevsk
5 reported harvesting -- oh, now, I'm going to look at
6 the ADF&G fur sealing data base, although I only have
7 information from 1993 to 2010. And in that data,
8 Nikolaevsk reported harvesting six black bears in 15C.
9 One black bear outside of the Kenai Peninsula area and
10 one brown bear outside the Kenai Peninsula area. In
11 looking at the ADF&G harvest report database from 1986,
12 Nikolaevsk reported harvesting three goats and 45 moose
13 all from Unit 15C and moose hunting occurred in Units
14 15A, 15B and 15C.

15
16 Now, the picture's going to be a little
17 bit different for the North Fork Road area. In the
18 1998 study North Fork Road area households reported
19 harvesting black bears in Unit 15B, caribou in Unit 15B
20 and areas outside the Kenai Peninsula, and moose in
21 areas outside of the Kenai Peninsula area. For the
22 North Fork Road area a search of the ADF&G harvest
23 reporting database does not reveal harvest by this area
24 because the area does not have a post office and
25 reports are combined with nearby communities thus
26 information is not readily available that would reveal
27 if harvest have occurred, how many resources have been
28 harvested and where harvest may have occurred.

29
30 If the Board adopts this proposal,
31 rural residents of the North Ford road area and
32 Nikolaevsk will be eligible to harvest black bears,
33 brown bears, caribou, goats, moose and sheep during
34 Federal seasons in Unit 15.

35
36 If the Board does not adopt this
37 proposal, rural of the North Ford road area and
38 Nikolaevsk will continue to be eligible during State
39 seasons only to harvest these animals in Unit 15.

40
41 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
42 support the proposal Customary and traditional
43 patterns of use of wildlife by residents of North Ford
44 road area and Nikolaevsk have been affected by local
45 regulations. In 1978 the State recognized most of Unit
46 15 as a nonrural area in which subsistence regulations
47 could not be promulgated. Wildlife have been managed
48 primarily for sporthunting from drawings, quotas and
49 limited permits. Each of these systems particularly
50

0236

1 draw permits reduces the numbers of hunters. Limited
2 information exists describing subsistence uses by rural
3 residents of the North Ford area. Both communities
4 have demonstrated subsistence uses of wildlife in Unit
5 15. These uses have been primarily in Unit 15C, where
6 both communities and most of these resources are
7 situated. Customary and traditional use determinations
8 are meant to be broad and inclusive and for these
9 reasons the Board should recognize customary and
10 traditional uses of rural resident of the North Ford
11 road area and Nikolaevsk in Units 15A, 15B and 15C as
12 requested.

13

14 So thank you, Mr. Chair, that's the end
15 of my presentation.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
18 Questions for the presenter here. I have a ton of
19 questions myself but I'm not sure where I want to
20 testify publicly or if I want to ask you, or -- I'm
21 sure when we go through the process there's going to be
22 a lot of questions. I think that there's a lot more
23 data that's needed for this. I never even realized
24 that Nikolaevsk -- I know Nikolaevsk well, I know the
25 Russian people well, I know how they've established
26 their village, I know when I talk to the people down
27 there recently they didn't even know this proposal was
28 in, a lot of the families so I'm not sure what families
29 were supportive of it. But, you know, I talked to many
30 of them down there.....

31

32 (Teleconference interference -
33 participants not muted)

34

35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:from Pamona,
36 Latina, Asthesia, Yolana, Irena, Maxum, Katya, Dennis,
37 some people I know down there because they hunt -- for
38 many, many years, you know, they used to hunt on
39 Ninilchik Native land and so our land was used by -- we
40 issued permits and then it got so overrun and so
41 overused we had to cut it out and stop it.

42

43 But I'm real concerned about how this
44 C&T proposal came about, if it's -- you know, if it's
45 inclusive and it's broad, it definitely makes an impact
46 on Ninilchik's historical Native statistical area. Our
47 statistical area goes from Kasilof through Homer and
48 that's where we're recognized with the Federal
49 government, as a government to government relations.
50

0237

1 And so I think there's a lot of things that as we go
2 through here that I'm going to be asking for more
3 clarification on and understanding to exactly how this
4 come about and, you know, if they're even rural, you
5 know, a lot of that was determined nonrural and I think
6 there's even some question in there. I do know that
7 their practices are a lot different than the historical
8 traditional use of Ninilchik and surrounding areas,
9 Nanwalek and Port Graham, and that, I say, is not to
10 belittle or put down, because I want it to be fair and
11 equitable. But I do know that all their commercial on
12 the fishing side is very commercialized, and they do
13 dipping on the Kenai and they fish commercially. And
14 on the hunting, you know, they use State land, and so
15 the Federal land they were never allowed in. I do know
16 that we've had a lot of problem there.

17
18 And North Fork, when the community -- I
19 mean that was always considered in our realm was part
20 of Anchor Point. So I don't know if -- definitely I
21 feel that we haven't heard enough information on this
22 presentation so if you could explain that a little bit
23 or if we should go ahead and go through all the rest of
24 the testimony and see where we come up on this. I
25 think there's lots of questions that I need from the
26 OSM to be answered. So that's why I bring up my
27 concerns at this point.

28
29 Thank you.

30
31 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
32 did hear a couple of questions in there that I could
33 answer. This is Pippa Kenner.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Pippa,
36 please.

37
38 MS. KENNER: Yes, and, thank you again.
39 So the issue of whether or not the North Fork roaded
40 area and Nikolaevsk are in a rural area has been
41 settled. All of these areas that are outside of the
42 Homer nonrural area, those residents who live outside
43 of the Homer nonrural area are considered rural for the
44 purposes of adopting Federal subsistence regulations.

45
46 I think during the course of the
47 comments on this proposal will reveal some of the
48 answers to your other questions so it might be best
49 just move forward.

50

0238

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I'm fine
2 with that. But that opens another whole can of worms.
3 That means that Stretski, Happy Valley, Clam Gulch,
4 every little town, I could buy 600 acres and start a
5 village and I would be eligible for rural in this whole
6 Kenai Peninsula so obviously the whole thing has become
7 rural unbeknownst to me, but it sounds like there's a
8 big change in the opinion of what is rural and what's
9 not. So any one of these other small communities could
10 put in for C&T is what I'm hearing from you?

11
12 MS. KENNER: Thank you for the
13 question, Mr. Chair. This is Pippa. People -- yes,
14 residents of the nonrural -- the areas deemed rural are
15 eligible to have their subsistence uses identified by
16 the Board, that's true.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. And then
19 we need an analysis on how is that -- you know
20 obviously we're going to have a shortage, there's only
21 so much Federal opportunity, it's very limited, so it's
22 going to create a lot of other problems so we'll have
23 to work that as we go through. But I'll leave it at
24 that and we'll go ahead and thank you, Pippa, you kind
25 of answered some of my questions, or at least I hear
26 it. The other big question I have is I'm assuming you
27 guys met with all these people in Nikolaevsk,
28 Nikolaevsk is only one of the villages, it's a very
29 small village, actually it's kind of declining and
30 they're quite industrious, they're quite a bit farmers,
31 they came from Paraguay all the way up into Oregon and
32 from Oregon into Alaska, they made some settlement with
33 the State, they bought some land and so on and so
34 forth. And the North Fork group, I'm not sure what
35 that's all about, the Cottonwood area, that's all
36 Native property all in that area, everything from the
37 north side of Cottonwood is Ninilchik Native and CIRI
38 owned, probably Ninilchik has 70,000 acres and CIRI has
39 a lot there in the State side, not on the Fed side, but
40 on the State side. So it's a lot more in-depth is what
41 I'm saying that kind of needs to be identified of how
42 this is all starting to sort out. It's getting very --
43 it's going to be very interesting going forward.

44
45 So I thank you for your presentation
46 and I look forward for the testimony and all the
47 comments as we go through this, so, thank you.

48
49 Okay, Orville, what do you have on
50

0239

1 tribes and ANCSA Corps. I think -- do you have anyone
2 you had consultation with?

3

4 MR. LIND: You know, during the
5 consultation, Mr. Chairman, which was held August 19th
6 for Southcentral, we did not have any questions or
7 comments on that proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Okay,
10 agency comments -- yeah, that's good -- agency
11 comments, how about the Alaska Department of Fish and
12 Game.

13

14 MS. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This
15 is Bronwyn Jones. I'm sitting in for Jackie Keating
16 today. The Department has assessed this proposal and
17 we'll be submitting our comments to the Federal
18 Subsistence Board. We are neutral when it comes to the
19 eligibility to participate in subsistence hunting
20 opportunities.

21

22 And as Jackie mentioned yesterday a few
23 times, we strongly encourage additional subsistence
24 harvest and use surveys for Kenai Peninsula residents
25 in order to provide accurate data when assessing
26 subsistence harvest needs.

27

28 And I'd be happy to respond to any
29 questions.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, got we any
32 questions for the State.

33

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, I'm
38 going to assume no one has any questions at this time
39 so we'll move on. Federal.

40

41 MR. ESKELIN: Mr. Chair, Todd Eskelin,
42 Kenai Refuge.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Todd.

45

46 MR. ESKELIN: Yeah, I do have some
47 comments. You know as with the State, the Refuge
48 typically does not take positions on C&T. I don't think
49 that's normally our place who decides who qualifies and
50

0240

1 what not so these comments are really not based on any
2 of these communities or individuals in them.

3

4

5 But for years we've tried to bring up
6 the problems that we're having with some of the rural
7 boundaries along the Refuge, and not just in this area
8 but also in 15A and other areas. So, you know, as a
9 cautionary note, I think the Refuge would support a
10 much better review of the rural boundaries before we
11 get to the point where people are being given C&T and
12 then those boundaries change and we get into the
13 position where people may be had a hunt for a couple
14 years and then the boundaries changed.

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

And so some of the points I wanted to bring up is that when the boundaries were established which I think that was roughly 25 years ago, in a lot of cases the Refuge boundary maybe was used as the deciding line between the nonrural Kenai, or Nikiski area, and then the Refuge boundary line was used and everything that was on the Refuge was deemed rural. Well, nobody lives there. And then through Native land selections and what not properties along those boundaries were conveyed to Native associations, they were later subdivided and now people live in areas that are deemed rural because that's where the boundary was drawn 25 years ago.

So I think a more comprehensive review of those rural boundaries needs to be done before we start extending C&T along these areas.

The last -- you know I kind of focused on the 15A area and I know we're talking about 15C. That 15A area that I was talking about, literally the house -- the house in this one community -- I guess I won't call it a community, neighborhood, is less than 6 miles from Walmart and it's currently deemed rural. So that's just kind of, you know, one of the things I wanted to see us really do a better thorough review. And down on the North Fork area, I looked at this one -- looked at the boundaries and it appears to be that what we did back in, what was that, '95, I guess when we established the rural and nonrural areas is they used the coastline of Cook Inlet, and if you look at the GIS lines they're basically two miles in from the coast line. But the highway we use back and forth through that two mile buffer. So in some cases you go 1.3 miles, 1.2 miles off of the Sterling Highway and

0241

1 you cross this magic rural line and in other areas it's
2 almost a full two miles from the highway and then you
3 cross this rural line. And in the Tall Tree road area,
4 there was one place where you follow Tall Tree Road
5 down, 1.6 miles, you hit the rural boundary line, you
6 turn on the side street, you continue down that side
7 street and at the very end, 3.8 miles away the house is
8 actually back into the nonrural area, and so they drive
9 two miles through the rural area to get back out to the
10 highway.

11

12 But, anyway, my point is I don't know
13 that -- I don't know that we have done the review of
14 those rural determinations adequately enough -- there's
15 enough things that have changed since then. If you go,
16 you know, out towards Fritz Creek, 25 years ago that
17 wasn't a solid stream of houses from Homer out to Fritz
18 Creek, now it's a 45 mile an hour paved road and there
19 is no definition of where this community is, it's just
20 a random road here where one side of the neighborhood
21 gets rural determination and the other side doesn't.
22 So I think we do need to review that before we go to
23 this next level.

24

25 And I think -- yeah, I think that's
26 probably it for my comments on this at this point, but
27 I'm certainly willing and able to answer any questions
28 and I do have some experience in those areas. So just
29 holler if you need me.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank
32 you.....

33

34 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair. This.....

35

36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:Todd.....

37

38 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair,
39 this is Pippa. I have a quick question for the
40 testifier.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Pippa, I'll
43 let you go, I was talking to him myself, but go ahead.

44

45 MS. KENNER: Oh, oh, okay, thank you
46 very much. I just wanted to clarify who this person
47 is, I think they work for the Refuge and I just wanted
48 to get some clarification, are these your personal
49 comments or are these comments from the Fish and
50

0242

1 Wildlife Service. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 MR. ESKELIN: Todd Eskelin, Kenai
4 National Wildlife Refuge.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Did you get that,
7 Pippa, that's Todd Eskelin with Kenai National Refuge.

8

9 MS. KENNER: And these are Fish and
10 Wildlife Service comments then?

11

12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, I believe
13 they are.

14

15 MR. ESKELIN: Yep.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Todd, my
18 question to you is you point out the exact point I was
19 trying to bring up, the rural areas and the
20 determination. I mean I obviously don't believe there's
21 been any thorough determination made on these areas or
22 usage for that matter. So I do know it's quite a --
23 quite a can of worms back in there so we need to sort
24 it out but I'm not sure what we'll do. So we'll keep
25 moving forward and we'll see where we go but thanks a
26 lot Todd.

27

28 Okay, next, tribal, does tribal want to
29 talk to this proposal.

30

31 MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, my name is
32 Darrel Williams. D-A-R-R-E-L W-I-L-L-I-A-M-S for the
33 record.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Darrel.

36

37 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I'd like to speak
38 to this a little bit. First, I'd like to say that I
39 certainly agree with Todd's comments, they're spot on
40 and they're really aligned well with what I was going
41 to say.

42

43 In 2012 Fritz Creek and the North Fork
44 area was designated as urban. They were actually
45 excluded from the rural area. And I'm not -- and
46 apparently something has happened since then until now,
47 so that was question No. 1. You know, I mean how did
48 that process happen because I'm not aware of that
49 change but it just -- it's interesting how this has
50

0243

1 gone back and forth because we don't really know --
2 just like what Todd was saying, where we are at, at
3 this point.

4
5 You know, I'm also concerned about
6 inconsistencies in this process, like we dealt with
7 earlier today. You know in the past they've done
8 complete Section .804 analysis to be able to review
9 this kind of a C&T determination. Some of the issues
10 that we've had to review on this is like the CDP, you
11 know, the CDP is listed in the analysis is much, much
12 smaller than the actually area that's being affected.
13 In the past, you know, it talks about that there wasn't
14 a positive -- or negative determination but really in
15 the past the RAC, we've had many meetings and we are
16 probably talking 10 years ago, maybe 15 but, you know,
17 we've had a lot of discussions about just lumping
18 things into C&T proposals. And the discussion used to
19 be that, you know, communities needed to come forward
20 and deliver their proposals and ask for specific things
21 to be able have C&T move forward. And that's where I'm
22 concerned about a lot of these proposals, we're lumping
23 an awful lot of stuff together. And I appreciate the
24 comments from the analysis that different things were
25 harvested in different areas, you know. Like yesterday
26 we had the table of complete zero harvest and then a
27 one at the bottom to cover outliers which is really
28 interesting about how we're looking at this now, this
29 process seems to be changing.

30
31 I'm also concerned about the
32 stratification being used. It's very unusual
33 documentation for C&T process that we're seeing here.
34 We've had problems with this before because essentially
35 the way this was written, and this has to go --
36 actually the consistencies amongst other proposals, but
37 how this was written is it's one group versus the
38 other, rather than rural and nonrural. And I think
39 we're liable to have some real problems with that. I
40 know I'm concerned because when we had that particular
41 same issue it was very very clear that the law is
42 rural. We couldn't do tribal versus nontribal, we
43 couldn't do Ninilchik residents versus Happy Valley, I
44 mean that was not the option. And if was very -- a
45 very frustrating process to be able to get through that
46 but it was very clear in the end that that's how the
47 process has to work. So I'm concerned about how we're
48 using that. This is also something that we've seen in
49 work that's been done in this area before, is this
50

0244

1 stratification weighing of data that represents
2 something very different than what's being used with
3 other communities and I think it's something that
4 really needs to be looked at to be able to get -- just
5 like Todd was saying, to get an accurate representation
6 of what's going on here.

7
8 You know I think some of the species
9 documentation, it's a whole bunch put together, in the
10 past -- and I'm talking about the general, typical
11 process that's been used since I've been involved with
12 this, is that you have to ask for C&T for individual
13 species, you don't just get to ask for a whole bunch of
14 species and everything. I mean I've addressed this
15 with the Regional Advisory Council and the Federal
16 Subsistence Board probably 10 times over the years and
17 all of a sudden this has changed and this is why I'm
18 having a little bit of a problem with these analysis
19 and I'm saying, no, these analysis aren't complete
20 because they didn't follow the process that's been in
21 place for, what, I think I started working this in
22 2005, so I mean it's been in place for quite awhile.
23 And then that sudden change without the public process
24 happening, it was not published in the Federal
25 Register, you know, we didn't have public comment to be
26 able to change the process of who we do this, really
27 raises questions about how these analysis are being
28 done and if they are, indeed, complete. These are
29 things I'm talking about.

30
31 So it's just raised a lot of questions.
32 Especially from going from nonrural area and becoming a
33 rural area, that was missed, I wasn't aware of that and
34 that's part of my question in this process. And it may
35 be that it happened and I just didn't realize it.

36
37 But with all that said, I also oppose
38 the proposal and I hope the information helps.

39
40 Thank you.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
43 Darrel. Is there any other tribal representative who
44 would like to talk to this issue.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Advisory
49 group comments, other Regional Advisory Councils.

50

0245

1 MS. PERRY: No other RACs commented on
2 this proposal, Mr. Chair.

3
4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Fish
5 and Game Advisory Committees.

6
7 (No comments)

8
9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
10 Resource Commissions.

11
12 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna,
13 no comments.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
16 Summary of written public comments, OSM.

17
18 MS. KENNER: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is
19 Pippa Kenner ready to present those comments that were
20 received during the public comment period.

21
22 OSM received two written public
23 comments, both were opposed.

24
25 The Alaska Kenai Chapter of the Safari
26 Club International says we support a subsistence
27 priority in rural parts of Alaska but not on the road-
28 connected Kenai where characteristics of communities
29 have little to no difference from one another. An
30 individual that received a subsistence moose permit for
31 three years was told he lived outside the community of
32 Ninilchik so his recent request for a permit was
33 denied. This action resulted in Proposal WP22-32 to
34 expand the Ninilchik rural area to include the Road
35 Fork road. How can the Board justify rewarding illegal
36 behavior.

37
38 The next comment was from the Alaska
39 Outdoor Council. We oppose WP22-32, it would be in
40 Alaska's best interest if the Federal Subsistence Board
41 reduced the number of Alaskans allowed a priority to
42 harvest game on Federal lands just based solely on
43 where they live and not how they live.

44
45 Thank you, Mr. Chair. That's the end
46 of the public comments that were received during the
47 public comment period.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Pippa.

50

0246

1 Questions.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5

6

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, any other questions.

7

8

(No comments)

9

10

11

12

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, we'll go ahead and move to the Regional Council's recommendation, motion to support.

13

14

15

MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael. I'll make the motion to support WP22-32.

16

17

18

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Michael. Is there a second.

19

20

21

MS. CAMINER: I'll second, this is Judy.

22

23

24

25

26

27

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, well, there's a motion on the table it's been moved and seconded in support of 32 here. I'm going to open it up to the Council for discussion, this is Wildlife Proposal 22-32.

28

29

30

31

32

33

MS. STICKWAN: From what I heard from a little while ago, I think the proposal should be deferred or tabled until we find out what the boundary lines are. It's hard to say who has C&T where if you don't know where the boundary lines are.

34

35

36

37

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's a good point, Gloria, thank you. Other comments.

38

39

40

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is Judy. I have a question for the Staff.

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. CAMINER: Is it reasonable for the Council to expect that there would be the capability to acquire more data on household use and/or to specifically -- I mean I see we have the boundaries of these two communities but to delineate the boundaries that Fish and Wildlife seem concerned about by the next meeting, for example.

0247

1 MS. KENNER: Thank you for the
2 question. Through the Chair. This is Pippa Kenner.
3 As far as I know no more information about -- no more
4 quantitative information about recent harvest of these
5 species will be available. Concerning the boundaries,
6 what I have tried to do in the time I had, in the
7 analysis, is to describe where exactly on that road
8 system the boundary is. It might help if I am able to
9 tell you where those are. This North Fork Road area
10 begins when the North Fork Road intersects with Comic
11 Circle, about two miles east of Anchor Point, to the
12 south this North Fork Road area begins at the Anchor
13 River bridge where the North Fork Road intersects with
14 the Anchor River.

15
16 The North Fork Road intersects with the
17 Homer nonrural area at these two points.

18
19 That's all the information I have for
20 you as far as drafting a map. Yes, we would attempt to
21 have a better map drafted before the Board meeting.

22
23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Pippa,
26 question.

27
28 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is.....

29
30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, who's
31 there.

32
33 MS. PERRY: Hi, Mr. Chair, this is
34 DeAnna. Just following on on Judy's question on
35 boundaries, I just wanted to let you know that Pat
36 Petrivelli is also online if there are questions about
37 the rural/nonrural issue. So I just wanted to let you
38 know she's also standing by since we were talking about
39 boundaries regarding Judy's question.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, we're
42 talking about the actual physical boundaries, I don't
43 know that Pat knows them, we don't know them and we
44 live here so -- but, anyway, that's a good point, she
45 could probably enlighten us on some of the usage down
46 there, some other historical stuff too. So thanks
47 DeAnna.

48
49 So, Council members, other comments.

50

0248

1 MS. STICKWAN: I would like to hear
2 Pat.....

3
4 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.

5
6 MS. STICKWAN:what Pat has to
7 say.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, just
10 a minute, go ahead, was that John who wanted to talk
11 first.

12
13 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Andy here, but go
14 ahead Gloria.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, go ahead,
17 Gloria.

18
19 MS. STICKWAN: I just wanted to hear
20 what Pat Petrivelli had to say.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I don't
23 know that she had something to say, DeAnna was
24 suggesting we could ask her to talk if we wanted to so
25 if you want to hear her talk, Pat, you're certainly
26 welcome to come up and talk.

27
28 MS. PETRIVELLI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
29 This is Pat Petrivelli with BIA. And I was involved in
30 the analysis of the boundaries on the Kenai Peninsula
31 and the Board looked at it as part of the old rural
32 determination systems where they reviewed the rural
33 boundaries when the decennial census was released. And
34 so the boundaries were adjusted on the Kenai Peninsula
35 taking into account census changes and rewriting the
36 CDP boundaries from 1990 to 2000. And those changes
37 were made, I think, in 2007. And like Darrel said, it
38 changed in 2012 when the Board decided to change the
39 whole rural determination process and get rid of the
40 criteria being used and only make nonrural
41 determinations and once they did that they reverted
42 back to the pre-2007 boundaries. And after that, then
43 now the process is, if people want -- because there's
44 no longer a decennial review of rural or nonrural
45 determinations, they'll only be reviewed when someone
46 makes a proposal. And the time to make a proposal is
47 in January when -- with the fisheries proposal review
48 and someone can come up and say please review these
49 boundaries and that process will take four years and
50

0249

1 then once a decision is made then if someone -- a
2 community status changes from rural to nonrural,
3 they'll still have a five year grace period until their
4 nonrural.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, that
7 explains some stuff there, that's quite complicated
8 but, good, okay, thanks. Thanks, Gloria. Andy, you go
9 ahead.

10

11 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
12 Chair. The evolution of this rural versus nonrural
13 stuff, I recall, like Darrel was saying, over a decade
14 of this determination, how it's gone back and forth
15 kind of like what Pat was just saying.

16

17 We got North Fork and Nikolaevsk, added
18 population 750 people, now if that doesn't cause an
19 allocation issue coming up here, you know, it's similar
20 to how suddenly Chenega and Tatitlek, people using
21 Kings Bay and now Moose Pass is in there and OSM threw
22 Hope and Cooper Landing in on that so an .804 analysis
23 had to be done. So I'm guessing that OSM is going to
24 be getting really busy in the next few years doing all
25 sorts of .804 analysis stuff because, you know, there
26 are limited resources, it's just what's happening with
27 the human population.

28

29 I also might add on a side note, I'm a
30 bit creeped out about the State representative there
31 just saying that they'll submit their comments to the
32 Federal Subsistence Board, that kind of circumvents us
33 on the Southcentral RAC here. I would think that would
34 be important for us to get those comments prior to the
35 Board meeting. But anyhow, you know, if somebody has --
36 if they live remote and they don't have a post office
37 it's possible they had no census or possible they never
38 did a survey. So these anthropologist people, there's
39 no historical data, you know. So I believe, you know,
40 Pippa Kenner and Robbin LaVine, they're going to have
41 their work cut out for them trying to gather data on
42 things as we continue -- this is like the tip of the
43 iceberg, I believe. And we can't just draw a line.
44 Everybody's talking about oh I want to see where the
45 line is, well, when you draw a line that makes somebody
46 on one side of the street eligible but their neighbor
47 who lives 200 feet away on the other side of the street
48 then they don't qualify because they're outside that
49 boundary wherever it was designated. So that stuff is,
50

0250

1 you know, along the lines of what was being said over
2 in Kenai folks.

3

4

5 So, you know, I don't know, I think an
6 .804 analysis are going to have to get brought out here
7 as this stuff goes on, you know, certain communities
8 are going to take precedence over others on the use of
9 these limited resources and this is quite a slippery
10 slope we're headed down. So you know we got Moose Pass
11 stuff, it's like the ball is rolling and here we go,
12 you know, wow, we're going to have to have three or
13 four days for each of our meetings.

13

14

Thank you.

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: Well, good
comments, Andy. You know I picked up on that too,
that'll add another 750 or plus, I honestly don't know
the definition of either one of the boundaries of these
communities. I do know, like I stated before, I would
like to hear -- you know, we've in the past, you know,
when we had C&T determinations we spent months, weeks,
several years with Moose Pass, we went there we held
community meetings, we understood the issues, we
understood the boundaries, we understood the
characteristics and now we could have someone propose a
proposal, come in in a letter, a couple public
testimonies, three people, and they give out C&T, it
doesn't make sense to me. But something's definitely
changed in our process. And I understand that we're a
little kind on the changing of the boundaries here. I
do think that the Ninilchik Traditional Council is
going to really dig in to this, legally, and take a
good look at it. We have to figure out what's going
on. I'm really surprised that this even came in this
form to our Council.

But, yeah, it is a changing world and
by golly I know on the Peninsula that opens up the
whole Peninsula, literally, and it's a big change for
if you just say everyone that was nonrural before, all
outlying areas become rural, you know, it really adds
to the confusion of the whole issue.

We did do a public comment, we had a
comment yesterday from a guy, Cork, and he testified
and I wanted to make sure I didn't skip public
testimony but we did talk about it, was there anyone
else on public testimony before the Board finishes

0251

1 their deliberation.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Hi, this is Cork Graham calling back again today. I want to make it real quick and short for you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, go.....

MR. GRAHAM: There is the.....

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:ahead.....

MR. GRAHAM:question about the boundary. It is very confusing. That's the reason I even had to come up with this proposal after conversation and advisory from Todd Eskelin and DeAnna Perry in talking about what to do.

So a quick history on that.

I had my own personal situation where I thought I was actually part of the Ninilchik community, based on this map that Todd was looking at and then finding out three years later that I was not, and then also hearing about someone who had actually been receiving the opportunity for the moose tag in the Kenai Wildlife area in the Nikolaevsk area for much longer, I'm not -- I don't want to be quoted on it but I had heard that it was at least 10 years. And that's actually the reason I had included Nikolaevsk even so -- we are rural not even to the point of actually having a town where we have a post office like Nikolaevsk does but knowing the history, as you are well aware of, with the Old Believers in Nikolaevsk coming here from Manchuria to Brazil and then to Oregon and here and then also the split between the church and old church going up to Voznesenka, which is -- and that's going to be bringing up another question which is the rural qualification and that's how I created the map. And I noticed that in this document there is no copy of the original map that I had sent in that does visually define our area based on it being in the rural area outside of the map that is here, which is the Homer nonrural area, so we're outside of that and it's a boundary in a semi-circle that comes around and includes Nikolaevsk and comes back and around into where the Inglebreaksons live right there crossing the Anchor River, which is right there at the rural end and begin of the nonrural of the Homer area. That map is

0252

1 missing from this document, that might make it clearer
2 for people who had questions.

3

4 If there are any questions from anybody
5 I will stand down right now and be willing to answer
6 anything from anybody.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Cork, I have some
11 questions for you, and I just want to understand this
12 and make it clearer to the Council. What I'm hearing
13 is you took it on yourself to include Nikolaevsk, these
14 people didn't actually come to put the C&T in
15 themselves, and that's basically what I heard from the
16 people that I know that live there. In fact, I got one
17 of them working here today. So you included it because
18 of your story about the Federal permit thinking you was
19 in the Ninilchik area and so on and so forth and the
20 boundaries, and now wanting to get the North Fork in
21 there. That, I just want to clarify, that's what you
22 did and this was not a proposal that was originated
23 from Nikolaevsk.

24

25 MR. GRAHAM: Correct. It is from me
26 directly based on the information I was able to collect
27 from Todd and DeAnna about someone who had actually had
28 much longer use of the permit who resided in the
29 Nikolaevsk area.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, it
32 just -- Nikolaevsk shouldn't be in there, and -- the
33 C&T there, well, okay, interesting. Questions for Cork
34 here before we move on.

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, we're going
39 to go back to the Council members. I hope I didn't
40 miss anyone on this, it's a very important issue, we
41 want to get all the.....

42

43 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

44

45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

46

47 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Gloria.

50

0253

1 MS. STICKWAN: I was wondering if we
2 could get that map that he had and then OSM could show
3 it to us.

4
5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I imagine we
6 could. I don't know if we got time to get it and get
7 it for this meeting. There are just a ton of questions
8 that need to be answered on this thing and it's going
9 to take a lot more than a map for me. But we could
10 certainly try Gloria. Obviously Nikolaevsk. Cork,
11 could you see if you could resend that map and DeAnna
12 could get it out to us.

13
14 MR. GRAHAM: Yes, I can, I will email
15 it to DeAnna.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
18 And, DeAnna, would you email that to the Council
19 members.

20
21 MS. PERRY: Yes, I can do that. That
22 puts us in a little bit of a difficult position because
23 this was not shared with the public in the meeting
24 book.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I know. It
27 wasn't shared with the public and it's not coming from
28 Nikolaevsk and it's coming from a person that included
29 them, it's very, very strange. I, in good faith, could
30 not vote for it at all but I just don't understand it.
31 I'm baffled on this one. But anyway I would like to
32 hear from other Council members.

33
34 MS. SELANOFF: Mr. Chair, I have a
35 question, this is Diane.

36
37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Diane.

38
39 MS. SELANOFF: My question about
40 Nikolaevsk, were they added also because of their
41 longevity to the area proposed to the North Fork area.

42
43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I think Cork
44 included them because one guy that hunted there or
45 something, said he had a permit for quite a while or
46 something. I don't know if he really did but that's
47 what I hear.

48
49 MR. GRAHAM: Yes, that's correct. That
50

0254

1 was based on the information I received from Todd
2 Eskelin, who also said that this person had been
3 included in the same manner that I had been included
4 with the confusion about the boundary, which I totally
5 understand, because there's been quite a bit of
6 confusion of the idea. And actually just before I'd
7 been contacted by Todd Eskelin that I no longer
8 qualified, I had actually contacted the fisheries
9 biologist to see about getting those permissions to be
10 able to fish the area off of, I think it's, what, Port
11 Graham, for the halibut and at the time I talked with
12 the fisheries biologist I was under the assumption that
13 I was -- that my wife and I, and the people, you know,
14 locally were in the Ninilchik boundary and when I was
15 told by him that I was not, the fisheries biologist I
16 asked him, so where am I, because I am rural, he says,
17 you're in limbo. So that's what's also contributed to
18 this whole proposal for us to be recognized as people
19 who do have customary and traditional hunting and
20 fishing subsistence, et cetera, that are not recognized
21 and we're not included in the Ninilchik community based
22 on this boundary that was created years ago and it
23 seems to be confusing because that's the confusion that
24 led to me being told that I was previously able to
25 receive the moose tag that I applied for.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Cork, I
28 think we -- that was good -- good information, we got
29 it. But obviously the proposal was based on some
30 refusal for permits and someone that may have gotten a
31 permit out of Nikolaevsk or whatever, very interesting.
32 Other Council members want to comment on the proposal.

33
34 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, this is Michael. I
35 am just a bit confused on it. So do we need to go
36 through a rural determination process for this to.....

37
38 MR. GRAHAM: No.

39
40 MR. OPHEIM:even get to this
41 point of C&T, maybe somebody could help me with that.

42
43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I don't know
44 about that, we just have to make sure that the rural is
45 defined and the boundaries are defined correct because
46 it appears that they are in rural area. Whether that
47 qualifies for C&T is a whole 'another story. So what's
48 before us is not a rural determination, it's strictly a
49 C&T and it's very clear where that should be right now,
50

0255

1 until we get more info, but, anyway, that's -- that's
2 where I see it. I don't think it's defining the
3 ruralness. Although we will need it to make a good
4 decision.

5

6 MS. STICKWAN: Well, if they're not in
7 a nonrural area, they can still hunt.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, they hunt
10 on State land now so they're hunting, yeah.

11

12 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, it's Judy.
13 Perhaps we can get clarification, I thought they were
14 in a rural area.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I don't think you
17 can because the question is where is the exact
18 boundary, I think some are and some may not be, but
19 they are in a general rural area, yes.

20

21 MR. GRAHAM: To clarify, this is Cork
22 Graham again. Everybody who was in this proposal is
23 rural based on those are only residents outside of the
24 nonrural defined shaded area that's in the present
25 Federal subsistence regulations. And it's that
26 boundary that then sweeps up and around and includes
27 Nikolaevsk, comes down and then meets and actually the
28 parallel boundary meeting with the line that defines
29 Ninilchik community.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I, for one,
32 Judy, right now I'm not sure even where Ninilchik's
33 boundaries are anymore, it sounds like everything's
34 changing so it's an interesting situation. Okay,
35 Council members I'm not sure what we want to do on this
36 but we need to move on. We got to see what we can do.

37

38 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John
39 Whissel.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, John.

42

43 MR. WHISSEL: I am having a lot of
44 trouble trying to figure out how I was going to vote on
45 this coming into this. I'm having even more trouble
46 now. I think we're on the -- that area is troubling,
47 it's difficult especially with quote/unquote newer
48 communities attached to larger communities that are
49 nonrural and where we split that. I really feel like
50

0256

1 we need a little more analysis and a little bit more
2 support for this being a nonrural area as far as
3 Federal subsistence goes and having preference and
4 access to fish and wildlife resources. As a Council, I
5 don't know whether -- I mean I don't -- I hope
6 everybody else is a little more clearer than me but I'm
7 not super inclined to support this right now but rather
8 see this the start of a process where we get a lot more
9 detailed information and hopefully we can put some
10 resources into parsing this out.

11
12 MS. CLAUS: Mr. Chairman, this is
13 Donna.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Donna.

16
17 MS. CLAUS: Is it possible to table
18 this. I'm new to the Committee so I don't know if it's
19 possible to table things in these meetings.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I believe it is.
22 DeAnna, do you want to clarify that.

23
24 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So
25 tabling of a motion would be to suspend, like a pending
26 motion, which is what we're doing, but it's my
27 understanding we would have to revisit this before the
28 end of our meeting.

29
30 MS. CLAUS: Okay. So it's during the
31 meeting, we can only table it for the meeting, we can't
32 table it pending further information at the next
33 meeting; is that correct?

34
35 (No comments)

36
37
38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: DeAnna, did you
39 follow that.

40
41 MS. CLAUS: Yes, did you hear me?

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 MS. CLAUS: Yes, can we -- so we cannot
46 table it to the next meeting, pending information
47 gained, am I correct on her statement?

48
49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I believe that's
50

0257

1 what DeAnna said, you know, I think that.....

2

3 MS. CLAUS: Okay.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:we could
6 defer it -- we could defer it for more information, I'm
7 sure we could do that.

8

9 MS. CLAUS: Okay. So we could have a
10 motion to defer this. But do we have to set an exact
11 time for deferment or can we just defer it until all
12 the information is gathered.

13

14 MS. PERRY: You can postpone for a
15 certain time or you could do a motion to postpone
16 indefinitely. But again our next meeting would be just
17 before the next Board meeting and I'm not sure if we
18 can table it that long. I might have to throw out a
19 lifeline, so, Donna, if you could just give me a minute
20 let me see if we could table that to the next meeting.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: DeAnna,
23 we're.....

24

25 MS. CLAUS: I think -- oh, Mr.
26 Chairman, I think this is a very important thing to
27 deal with and I don't think it should be voted down. I
28 think we should find everything we need to deal with it
29 but we don't have that right now.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I think
34 differently but I'll give you my reasons here in awhile
35 because I think the proposal was made on an area that
36 the proponents that are living there did not be part of
37 that proposal. It's very clear. And we had that
38 testimony so to me.....

39

40 MR. GRAHAM: Excuse me, that.....

41

42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:it
43 doesn't.....

44

45 MR. GRAHAM:is incorrect. That's
46 why we.....

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You're
49 interrupting me speaking now.

50

0258

1 MR. GRAHAM:have the -- oh,
2 sorry.

3
4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, so I
5 believe that this didn't come from the total community
6 of Nikolaevsk, and it came from the two people there so
7 I think there needs to be more testimony, more people
8 come before the Council and we need to sort it out,
9 who's exactly requesting the C&T.

10

11 MS. CLAUS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman,
12 that's.....

13

14 MR. GRAHAM: Well, this.....

15

16 MS. CLAUS:exactly what I'm
17 saying, we need more information on all fronts about
18 this before we proceed.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Exactly.
21 Exactly.

22

23 MS. CLAUS: Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.

26

27 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, it's Judy.

28

29 MR. GRAHAM: If I may speak, this is
30 Cork Graham. I had proposed this as a North Fork
31 community for the very reason that it is not reliant on
32 Nikolaevsk, I continue to hear this response about a
33 reference to Nikolaevsk, the community is the rural
34 area of the North Fork that happened to include
35 Nikolaevsk because that is a rural area and it is along
36 the North Fork. And the boundary I just send to
37 DeAnna, she should have received an email by now, it
38 defines the area that is a rural area that we don't
39 have to go through the process like Moose Pass,
40 according to what I was advised, and we are now just
41 trying to get recognition for our customary and
42 traditional hunting and fishing.

43

44 Thank you.

45

46 MS. SELANOFF: If I may ask, how old is
47 North Fork, how long has that community been
48 established?

49

50

0259

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hang on, back up,
2 back up, who's speaking now?

3
4 MS. SELANOFF: This is Diane Selanoff.
5 And he said he was primarily asking for North Fork, but
6 I'm curious how old North Fork is and how long it's
7 been established and how they're referring to
8 traditional and customary uses.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

11
12 MR. GRAHAM: This is Cork Graham. I'd
13 be very happy to answer that. The community goes back
14 to 1947 when the initial homesteaders arrived in this
15 area. The actual creation of the North Fork system was
16 created by Elton Anderson and that was, as I recall,
17 was about 1959/1960 when he took a bulldozer and
18 connected the communities to the various homesteads
19 that are along the present North Fork Road that comes
20 in from the Sterling Highway and loops around and
21 connects up to Anchor Point.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I'm going
24 to ask to the Council members get back to their
25 deliberation and that we keep this -- we can't keep
26 having interruptions and back and forth so let's go
27 ahead and let the rest of the Council members weigh in
28 on this and.....

29
30 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:decide where
33 we can go on this with.....

34
35 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

36
37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead.

38
39 MS. PERRY: Sorry to interrupt but I
40 did want to come back to the question before, I think
41 the use of the word table is what threw me. So if this
42 Council wanted to postpone any action on this, they
43 could postpone this matter to a specific time, say, for
44 the next meeting, but they would use the words postpone
45 and not table, because that does have a different
46 meaning. And it looks like I did just receive the map
47 from Mr. Graham. So what is the Council's wishes,
48 would you like me to go ahead and send that out real
49 quick to everyone?

50

0260

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, you can
2 send that out DeAnna. We're probably going to go ahead
3 and move forward here but go ahead and send that map.

4
5 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John
6 Whissel. Thank you for getting us back on track there,
7 I appreciate your request to not have members of the
8 public, proponent or otherwise, interrupting our
9 deliberations.

10
11 I think we hit the nail on the head, is
12 that it seems like a small group trying to expand
13 access to a whole community. I don't see -- I see one
14 person on the phone speaking to this, I don't see any
15 public comments in support of this. So if the question
16 is called, I vote against this proposal today and I
17 think that's pretty much the crux of it today. But I
18 do agree that we need to figure out how to move on and
19 cover the rest of our large agenda, we can defer it to
20 the next cycle or next meeting, doesn't matter to me,
21 but, yeah, that's where I am.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I agree with you,
24 John, thank you. We do have a motion on the table, we
25 had a second, we're in deliberation. If someone would
26 like to talk to the matter or call the question we'll
27 take a vote, either way.

28
29 MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael, I'll call
30 the question.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's been
33 called for so we will take a vote. All in favor of
34 Proposal No. 32, establishing C&T for the North Fork in
35 Unit 15 signify by saying aye.

36
37 (No aye votes)

38
39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All those
40 opposed, nay.

41
42 IN UNISON: Nay.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: The proposal
45 fails. And the proposal, of course, could be rewrote
46 and come back so we'll move on. It's a little after
47 noon, do you guys want a lunch break today. I guess we
48 could take a lunch and.....

49
50

0261

1 MR. OPHEIM: Yes.

2

3 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:hopefully --

6 I hear a couple yes, and hopefully we could -- we have

7 quite a few more proposals, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 plus we

8 got some other requirements. We should be able to

9 finish it up today, hopefully, I'm going to be gone

10 tomorrow so if I am someone else will have to sit in.

11 Let's go ahead and break for lunch, how about make it

12 one hour, quarter after 1:00.

13

14 MR. OPHEIM: Sounds good.

15

16 MS. TOTEMOFF: I'll be back.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

19

20 (Off record)

21

22 (On record)

23

24 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, whenever you're

25 ready we can go ahead and reconvene.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I am ready

28 so let's go ahead and take up our next proposal, WP22-

29 33, eliminate black bear sealing requirements in Unit

30 11 and 12. OSM, you want to do your presentation.

31

32 MR. UBELAKER: I will, Mr. Chair, thank

33 you much.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

36

37 MR. UBELAKER: Good afternoon, Mr.

38 Chair and Council. Brian Ubelaker, Wildlife Biologist

39 with OSM. I'll be giving you a brief summary of WP22-

40 33 which begins on Page 229 of your meeting book.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

43

44 MR. UBELAKER: Proposal WP22-33

45 submitted by the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence

46 Resource Commission requests eliminating the sealing

47 requirement for black bear in Units 11 and 12.

48

49 The proponent states that people living

50

1 in remote locations need to drive to an Alaska
2 Department of Fish and Game office to have bears
3 sealed. The salvage requirement is necessary to seal
4 subsistence black bears in Units 11 and 12 is an undue
5 hardship for subsistence hunters who are interested
6 only in the meat.

7
8 Currently, Federal regulations are more
9 stringent than State regulations, which only require
10 harvest tickets but not sealing. Harvest ticket
11 reports provide sufficient harvest information to
12 monitor and protect black bear populations without
13 sealing and there is not currently a conservation
14 concern for black bears. Additionally, the proponent
15 requests that harvest ticket and sealing requirements
16 be included in Unit-specific regulations instead of
17 with the general provisions at the front of the
18 regulations booklet stating this would be clearer and
19 easier for subsistence users to understand as the
20 current layout of the Federal Subsistence Management
21 Regulations Booklet is confusing. However, this
22 request is outside the scope of a regulatory proposal
23 but the suggestion has been forwarded to the
24 appropriate reviewer.

25
26 The State Board of Game removed the
27 requirement for getting a bear hide or skull sealed for
28 Unit 11 in regulatory year 2011 and for Unit 12 in
29 regulatory year 2010 because the requirement for both
30 harvest tickets and sealing was determined to be
31 redundant.

32
33 Sealing requirements for black bear in
34 Units 11 and 12 have not changed under Federal
35 regulations since the inception of the program in 1990
36 adopting then current State regulations. Under
37 existing Federal regulations the salvage of the hide
38 and edible meat is required. When sealing is required
39 hunters must additionally remove the skull from the
40 field.

41
42 Unit 11 has not had population surveys
43 conducted. Through field observation and harvest data
44 it is believed the black bear populations are abundant
45 within areas of suitable habitat. The National Park
46 Service biologist estimated there to be 100 to 200
47 black bears per 1,000 square kilometers around the
48 McCarthy area in 2001. Unit 12 has not had population
49 surveys conducted either. Through limited radio
50

0263

1 telemetry data the Unit 12 population is estimated to
2 be 700 to 1,000 bears in 2012. While current
3 biological data for black bear in these units is
4 lacking, there is no current conservation concern
5 regarding black bears in Units 11 or 12.

6
7 Unit 11 is primarily hunted by
8 Federally-qualified subsistence users. The number of
9 harvested black bears reported annually fluctuated from
10 8 to 31 from 1998 to 2012. Unit 12 has historically
11 low human use of black bears, despite liberal hunting
12 regulations. The number of black bears harvested range
13 from 23 to 68 annually between 1995 and 2017.

14
15 The proposal, if adopted, would remove
16 the requirement for Federally-qualified subsistence
17 users to have the skull and/or skin of a black bear
18 sealed in Units 11 and 12. The process of harvesting
19 black bears for Federally-qualified subsistence users
20 would be simplified by removing this unnecessary
21 requirement. The State removed this requirement over
22 10 years ago resulting in Federal regulations being
23 more restrictive than State regulations. While
24 Federally-qualified subsistence users can hunt under
25 State regulations in part of these units, they cannot
26 within Wrangell-St. Elias National Park where only
27 State subsistence regulations apply.

28
29 Therefore, OSM's preliminary conclusion
30 is to support Proposal WP22-33.

31
32 Thank you for your time and I'd be
33 happy to answer any questions that anybody may have.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Very good, Brian.
36 Any questions for Brian.

37
38 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead. Go
41 right ahead.

42
43 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, thank you.
44 Yeah, I'd just like to ask the question so the way I
45 read the regulations, though, if a subsistence user of
46 a black bear did not have to seal it, but then I see
47 somewhere else where if they're going to make
48 handicrafts or say sell claw, necklaces or something
49 from their subsistence catch, is it still required to
50

0264

1 be sealed then, or is that also not required anymore?

2

3

MR. UBELAKER: Honestly, I apologize, I do not have an answer to that. I can look into it really quickly and hopefully get back to you while we're still discussing this topic if you would like.

7

8

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, I forgot where I saw that, one second. I could probably find it quickly. In 2008 Alaska resident hunters must obtain a State harvest ticket and report their hunting efforts, both of these units continue to require reporting of harvest black bears, if parts of the black bear are to be sold, sealing is required.

15

16

(Pause)

17

18

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, hello?

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I just see him on the video still looking at the regs, I think, Andy.

23

24

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you.

25

26

27

28

MR. UBELAKER: I apologize, I mean, I believe Andy has the existing State regulation.

29

30

31

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Does anyone else got an answer for Andy's question there?

32

33

MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair.

34

35

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead.

36

37

38

39

MS. CELLARIUS: This is Barbara Cellarius. And I'm just opening up the Federal regulation booklet.

40

41

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

MS. CELLARIUS: And it may be, and I'm sort of in the process of reading through it but there are Federal regulations that relate to handicraft so it might be that there's a Federal regulation that would apply. And I would say that the SRC proposal did not address the topic.

49

50

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

0265

1 MS. CELLARIUS: They were primarily
2 concerned about just that the requirement for hunters
3 to both have the hide sealed and also have to report
4 with a harvest ticket. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
7 Barbara. Yeah, it does leave us in a little bit of a
8 dilemma there if you're going to sell the goods.

9
10 MR. VICKERS: Mr. Council [sic].

11
12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.

13
14 MR. VICKERS: This is Brent Vickers
15 from OSM.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Brent.

18
19 MR. VICKERS: I just want to say that
20 unless someone else has the specific answer I will get
21 to the bottom of this as quickly as possible and try to
22 make sure that we can address that regulation as
23 accurately as possible right now.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that sounds
26 good, Brent, if you could get it. We'll continue on
27 with our procedure here.

28
29 MR. VICKERS: Okay, thank you very
30 much.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Okay.
33 Any other questions for Brian there.

34
35 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

36
37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, go ahead.

38
39 MS. PERRY: This is DeAnna, I just
40 wanted to make note our Council Member Michael Opheim
41 did a post a question in the chat and that is, does
42 that only pertain to the raw hide and skull if it's
43 being sold, and not, if you, yourself, are using the
44 hide and skull for crafts. So I just wanted to bring
45 that to Mr. Vickers' attention so that maybe he could
46 also include that in his research.

47
48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, good.
49 Good. I hope he picked up on that, thank you. All
50

0266

1 right. Okay, last chance any questions for Brian.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, hopefully we'll get back with an answer before we get through our deliberation here before we get going too far. Let's go ahead and move on with the report on the consultation from Orville.

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. LIND: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. Board members. This is Orville Lind, Native Liaison for OSM. During the consultation session we did not have any questions or comments on this proposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Orville. Okay, how about the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

MS. HATCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Heidi Hatcher with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game in Glennallen. The Department supports this proposal because it aligns the sealing requirements between State and Federal regulations.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Very good, thank you. Federal.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone want to talk to that.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: How about tribal, any tribal representative that would like to address it.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Advisory grou.....

MS. LINNELL: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:Advisory Councils.

0267

1 MS. LINNELL: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead.

4

5 MS. LINNELL: This is Karen Linnell,
6 Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission, I was trying to
7 unmute.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Oh, no problem,
10 go ahead, Karen.

11

12 MS. LINNELL: We're also in support of
13 aligning the regulations in regards to the sealing
14 requirements. If they're going to be taking the hide
15 out of state then they should be sealed. And then as
16 far as handicrafts are concerned, we had this kind of
17 issue in regards to migratory birds and those types of
18 things and if you recall, where an elder from Kake was
19 cited for using feathers in his artwork and it's a
20 protected type thing. If the gentle -- as the
21 gentleman said if it was the whole hide, claws, like a
22 rug or whatever they're going to do then that should be
23 sealed, but if they're going to be, you know, cutting
24 them up and making handicrafts with it there's no way
25 to keep the seal with the pieces. And so just wanted
26 to raise that and just say that we're in support of
27 aligning those regulations.

28

29 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Karen.
32 Good point, thank you. Any other tribal, we just went
33 back and we covered that, we covered the State and we
34 covered the Feds and let's go ahead and move on to
35 other Regional Advisory Councils.

36

37 MS. PERRY: I do not have any other
38 comments from Regional Advisory Councils on this
39 proposal.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Okay,
42 thanks, DeAnna. And Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
47 Resource Commissions.

48

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

50

0268

1 This is Barbara Cellarius and I'm the Subsistence
2 Coordinator for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and
3 Preserve and I'm going to be presenting a comment from
4 the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence
5 Resource Commission. And I'm just going to give you an
6 introduction about them since when I -- since this is
7 the first time I present a comment from them -- for
8 them today.

9
10 The Commission is a Federal Advisory
11 Committee that represents subsistence users of Federal
12 lands within Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and
13 Preserve. And as Gloria mentioned -- I think she
14 mentioned this, they met last week and so I'm going to
15 be presenting comments on the next several proposals
16 that are from the Commission.

17
18 This proposal was submitted by the
19 Commission. They support -- unanimously supported
20 WP22-33. This proposed change would align State and
21 Federal regulations and reduce the burden on
22 subsistence users by eliminating an unnecessary
23 requirement. There's not a conservation concern and
24 the harvest reporting would still be required.
25 Removing this regulatory requirement would be
26 beneficial to subsistence users, for example, people
27 living in remote areas would no longer need to drive a
28 long distance to an ADF&G office to have a bear sealed.

29
30
31 This question about sealing in order to
32 move the hides around did come up very briefly at the
33 SRC meeting and someone said, well, at least it would
34 be optional if someone needed -- if there was another
35 requirement that someone seal a hide, they could do it
36 but it wouldn't be required of every subsistence user.

37
38 And that completes the comment, Mr.
39 Chair.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, very good,
42 Barbara, thank you. We'll move on to summary of
43 written public comments.

44
45 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
46 have received a few written public comments.....

47
48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

49
50

0269

1 MS. PERRY:during the meeting --
2 I'm sorry, was someone else speaking.

3
4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Nope.

5
6 MS. PERRY: Okay. So the first comment
7 I received was from Becky Schwanke. She made a broad
8 comment for several proposals. So I will say that
9 comment now and again that goes for several other
10 proposals, and I will only mention it her specific
11 comment on subsequent proposals.

12
13 Her broad comment was thank you for
14 allowing me the opportunity to submit a few written
15 comments pertaining to the wildlife proposals in front
16 of the Federal RACs in coming days. For your
17 consideration, please accept the following general
18 comment as well a few proposal specific comments. As a
19 former ADF&G wildlife manager for Units 11 and 13,
20 along with my fellow Staff at the time, all since
21 retired, my office was tasked with drafting the first
22 State community harvest program handouts. We worked
23 hard to ensure we followed the proposer's intent as
24 well as the Board of Game's intent and subsequently the
25 Court's intent, et cetera. It was an exceptionally
26 arduous task, one, which our current State Staff and
27 Alaskan hunters continue to deal with. The hunt has
28 only gotten more complex and complicated and it truly
29 has created an all new pattern of who hunts in our
30 local area. Now, we have a Federal community hunt just
31 in its infancy. I see it following the same path as
32 the State hunt that of unnecessary complexity. I ask
33 that your RACs work closely with the original proposer
34 and consider alternate simpler ways to accomplish the
35 same robust harvest opportunity for moose and caribou
36 in this area by addressing the general designated
37 hunter system. More flexibility in this system could
38 be a very simple answer to this issue allowing for
39 shared harvest opportunity among a community of
40 individuals while maintaining a central hunt management
41 entity if only best for maintaining one source of
42 information/guidance for hunting rules and regulations.

43
44 Again, that was Ms. Schwanke's general
45 comment.

46
47 And her specific comment on this
48 proposal, 22-33 is: I support the request to eliminate
49 black bear sealing for Units 11 and 12. The black bear
50

0270

1 harvest reporting system is adequate to get necessary
2 biological data for this abundant local species.

3

4

5 Another comment was also received by
6 Ahtna Tene Nene'. That comment reads as follows: We
7 support WP22-33 which would eliminate the sealing
8 requirement for black bears in Units 11 and 12.
9 Because the State does not require black bear sealing
10 anywhere in Ahtna traditional territory, it is
11 currently more onerous for a Federal black bear hunter
12 than for anyone who's hunting under the State
13 regulations. Passing this regulation will make Federal
14 regulations equally or less restrictive than State
15 ones. Sealing requirements are especially onerous for
16 those who live a long ways off the road system. They
17 must travel into town to get their bears sealed.
18 Moreover, because there is no State sealing
19 requirements in the area this proposal would not
20 compromise another larger data set. AITRC and Ahtna
21 Gene Nene' support this proposal. In the past Ahtna
22 people have supported similar proposals for moose and
23 caribou meat salvage. As the proposer points out meat
24 on the bone keeps much better than meat that has been
25 removed. Also removing the meat from the bone is more
26 likely to create waste which makes it more difficult
27 for enforcement officials to determine whether or not
28 waste has occurred. Non-waste is a very important
29 value to the Ahtna people and the leg bones themselves
30 are edible in soups.

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Those were the two comments that I
received on this proposal, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, for
the comments, for the record. Okay. Is there anyone
who wants to give public testimony to this proposal.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right,
hearing none, I know we were waiting on a little
clarification but we probably have enough to move
forward so let's go into the Regional Council's
recommendation, motion to support.

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Motion to adopt.

0271

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We got a motion
2 to adopt and then I got to go back to DeAnna -- I got a
3 motion to adopt, is there a second on that motion.

4
5 MS. CLAUS: I will second it.....

6
7 MR. OPHEIM: Michael will second.

8
9 MS. CLAUS:Donna.

10
11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Donna seconded,
12 okay. That motion is moved and seconded. And we'll
13 get to it in a minute, DeAnna had a question, I think
14 she wanted to check and make sure we're all here. Go
15 ahead, DeAnna.

16
17 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I wanted to do a
18 roll call but since we already have a motion on the
19 floor I can do the same thing by doing a roll call on
20 this vote, it would accomplish the same thing.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. When we
23 get to the vote we'll let you call us by single. Okay,
24 any discussion, open to the Council members, it's moved
25 and on the table, 22-33 eliminate.....

26
27 MS. CLAUS: Mr. Chairman.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:the
30 requirement -- yes.

31
32 MS. CLAUS: I'm sorry, I butted in, go
33 ahead.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No, that's okay,
36 you -- I was just.....

37
38 MS. CLAUS: Okay. Okay. This is Donna,
39 and just like you on the past ones knowing the stomping
40 ground, this is my stomping ground. We live 100 miles
41 from the end of the road in the middle of Unit 11, in
42 the middle of Wrangell-St. Elias. I do subsistence
43 hunt, et cetera, out there, but you know what we don't
44 hunt bears, black bears, because we have to fly the
45 airplane for an hour and then drive for four hours just
46 to get to Glennallen so we don't even bother hunting
47 them for that very reason. So I think this would be
48 super.

49
50

0272

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Appreciate
2 that comment and info, thank you. Anyone else on the
3 Council want to speak to the proposal.

4

5 MR. OPHEIM: Yes, this is Michael. I
6 support this proposal. Aligning it with State regs and
7 making it easier on folks, especially if you got to fly
8 an hour, and drive four hours, that's just crazy, you
9 know, when you're just after the meat anyway so
10 definitely for that.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
13 Michael. Yeah, from all the testimony I heard, the
14 reports, it seems like we should support this without a
15 problem, but that's just my opinion, I'll support it.
16 But anyone else want to.....

17

18 MS. STICKWAN: I got something.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Gloria, go ahead.

21

22 MS. STICKWAN: I support this proposal.
23 It's more restrictive than the State, the sealing
24 requirements but the Federal -- I guess it hasn't been
25 brought up before that's why it's still in regulation.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, sounds
28 good. We don't want it more restrictive. Anyone else
29 on the Council.

30

31 MS. GREGIAGIN: Mr.....

32

33 MS. STICKWAN: I just.....

34

35 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Question.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's been
38 called for. Was someone trying to beat the question
39 and want to talk.

40

41 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to add
42 more.....

43

44 MS. GREGIAGIN: Well, Mr. Chair, this
45 is Lisa with OSM. If the Council wants to hear an
46 answer to the handicraft and sealing question I can
47 address that but, if not, feel free to move on. Thank
48 you, sorry.....

49

50

0273

1 MS. STICKWAN: I would like.....

2

3 MS.GREDIAGIN:for the
4 interruption.

5

6 MS. STICKWAN: I would like to hear
7 what the sealing requirement is for handicraft.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I'll.....

10

11 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, thank you. For
12 the record.....

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I'll agree, go
15 ahead.

16

17 MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay, thank you. For
18 the record this is Lisa Grediagin with OSM. And so
19 under Federal regulations, you may sell handicrafts
20 made from the non-edible byproducts of legally
21 harvested wildlife. And this includes the skin, hide,
22 pelt or fur of a black bear, including claws. So for
23 the purposes of this regulation, no, if you're making
24 handicrafts and selling them under Federal regulations
25 you would not have to get the fur -- the skin and skull
26 sealed, however, under State regulations you would need
27 to get the hide and skull sealed if you were selling
28 the entire hide and skull, but under Federal
29 regulations you can only sell handicrafts, you can't
30 sell the entire hide and skull; that's only state
31 regulations. So hopefully that answered your question
32 and if you need any clarifications I'd be happy to
33 provide that. Thanks.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Than.....

36

37 MS. STICKWAN: Are you saying if
38 we.....

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thanks, Lis.....

41

42 MS. STICKWAN: So I just want to be
43 sure, so you're saying if you make it into handicrafts
44 you don't have to get it sealed but -- under Federal
45 regulations, but if you sell it whole -- a whole fur
46 you have to get it sealed, under Federal. I didn't
47 understand that.

48

49 MS. GREDIAGIN: That's almost correct.

50

0274

1 Under Federal regulations you may only sell parts of
2 handicrafts, you can't sell the entire hide and skull.
3 And so under State regulations, the State regulations
4 read black bears hides and skulls may be sold after
5 sealing.

6
7 MS. STICKWAN: Okay, thank you. Mr.
8 Chair, I just wanted to add this would help people in
9 Unit 12 to be able to harvest more black bears without
10 the sealing requirement.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. If anyone
13 has any problem and gets cited we'll go see Lisa.

14
15 (No comments)

16
17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No comment, uh,
18 okay. Anyway, I got a.....

19
20 MS. GREDIAGIN: Oh, I'm laug.....

21
22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:motion on
23 the floor -- oops, someone's talking, who's there.

24
25 MS. GREDIAGIN: This is Lisa, sorry. I
26 was -- I laughed in response to your comment but I was
27 on mute so you didn't hear me.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Oh, okay, okay,
30 well, I was just going to say that's where our coverage
31 is, okay, thank you, Lisa. I got a motion on the
32 floor, I got it seconded, we've had discussion and I've
33 had the question called for. DeAnna wants to take a
34 roll call vote to make sure we're all here. So,
35 DeAnna, go ahead.

36
37 MS. PERRY: Thank you. The motion is to
38 support WP22-33, eliminating the sealing requirement
39 for black bear in Units 11 and 12.

40
41 Michael Opheim.

42
43 MR. OPHEIM: Yea.

44
45 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

46
47 Diane Selanoff.

48
49 MS. SELANOFF: Yea.

50

0275

1 MS. PERRY: I'm sorry, Diane, could you
2 repeat that.
3
4 MS. SELANOFF: Yes.
5
6 MS. PERRY: Thank you.
7
8 MS. SELANOFF: In support.
9
10 MS. PERRY: Thanks, I appreciate that.
11
12 Dennis Zadra.
13
14 MR. ZADRA: I support.
15
16 MS. PERRY: Thank you.
17
18 Gloria Stickwan.
19
20 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.
21
22 MS. PERRY: Thank you.
23
24 Angela Totemoff.
25
26 MS. TOTEMOFF: Aye.
27
28 MS. PERRY: Thank you.
29
30 Donna Claus.
31
32 MS. CLAUS: Aye. Yes.
33
34 MS. PERRY: Thank you.
35
36 Andy McLaughlin.
37
38 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Aye.
39
40 MS. PERRY: Thank you.
41
42 Judy Caminer.
43
44 MS. CAMINER: Yes.
45
46 MS. PERRY: Thank you.
47
48 Aaron Bloomquist.
49
50

0276

1 (No comments)

2

3 MS. PERRY: Still out.

4

5 John Whissel.

6

7 MR. WHISSEL: Yes.

8

9 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

10

11 Paula Nicklie.

12

13 MS. NICKLIE: Yes.

14

15 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

16

17 Ed Holston.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 MS. PERRY: Ed Holston.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 MS. PERRY: And Greg Encelewski.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.

28

29 MS. PERRY: Okay. The motion passes,
30 11 to 0. And, Mr. Chair, just for the record you do
31 have a quorum, 11 of your 13 seated Council members are
32 participating. Thank you for me allowing to do that
33 roll call.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Okay,
36 we got a couple of crossover proposals we'll move into
37 now WP22-34 modify salvage requirements of sheep in
38 Unit 11 and 12, and the OSM, if you want to go ahead
39 and give the analysis that'd be great.

40

41 MR. UBELAKER: I will. Thank you, Mr.
42 Chair. Brian Ubelaker, OSM, once again. This analysis
43 starts on Page 238 of your meeting books.

44

45 Wildlife Proposal WP22-34 submitted by
46 Seth Wilson of Glennallen requests a change in salvage
47 requirement to a bone-in for sheep tag in Units 11 and
48 12. The proponent states that there should be a meat
49 on bone salvage requirements for the two front
50

0277

1 quarters, two rear quarters, and ribs for all sheep
2 taken in Units 11 and 12. The proponent states that
3 deboning the meat in the field may lead to waste of
4 meat that is left on the bone. Keeping the meat on the
5 bone also allows for better meat handling ensuring that
6 all edible meat is cool and dry until it is out of the
7 field.

8
9 There has never been a bone-in
10 requirement for sheep hunters under Federal or State
11 regulations, however, this requirement does exist for
12 certain moose, caribou and bison hunts in both Federal
13 and State regulations.

14
15 If this proposal is adopted all
16 successful sheep hunters would have to pack out all
17 edible meat on the bone. This requirement would place
18 an undue burden on Federally-qualified subsistence
19 users harvesting sheep.

20
21 Therefore, it is OSM's preliminary
22 conclusion to oppose Proposal WP22-34.

23
24 Thank you, and I will try to answer any
25 questions anybody may have.

26
27 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, you may be on
28 mute.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I was on mute. I
31 thank Brian and hearing no one want to question him
32 we're going to go ahead and move on to the report of
33 the Board consultation from Orville Lind.

34
35 MR. LIND: I was on the phone, Mr.
36 Chairman. We did not have any questions or comments on
37 that proposal. Thank you.

38
39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you,
40 Orville. Agency comments, Alaska Department of Fish and
41 Game.

42
43 MR. MULLIGAN: Hi, Mr. Chairman, this
44 is Ben Mulligan from ADF&G. We are neutral on this
45 proposal. With that said, we do encourage hunters to
46 take all measures to ensure optimal salvage of meat,
47 and one of those ways is certainly to bring the meat
48 out while still on the bone. This leaves no question
49 for the hunter or for enforcement officers to see if
50

0278

1 the salvage requirement is being met. We also
2 recognize this could result in meat being less in the
3 field a little longer if multiple trips are necessary
4 to bring it out but, overall, the meat is still likely
5 to spoil and does a really good job of getting all the
6 meat out.

7

8 So thank you very much, appreciate it.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Any
11 questions for Ben.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Federal, you have
16 any comments on leaving the bone in or taking it out.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Tribal
21 representatives, anyone want to speak to this from the
22 tribal representatives.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none,
27 other Regional Advisory Councils.

28

29 MS. PERRY: I do not have any comments
30 from any of the other Regional Advisory Councils, Mr.
31 Chair.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Fish
34 and Game Advisory Committees.

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
39 Resource Commissions.

40

41 MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
42 This is Barbara Cellarius again presenting the comment
43 from the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource
44 Commission. The Commission unanimously opposed WP22-
45 34. A meat on the bone salvage requirement for sheep
46 puts an unnecessary burden on subsistence hunters
47 especially on users who are getting older and for whom
48 it is increasingly more difficult to pack out the extra
49 weight. SRC members question whether there was
50

0279

1 evidence of subsistence users wasting meat in the field
2 noting that they had not seen such waste and that they
3 personally cleaned, they used the term, scraped the
4 bones clean. If this is an issue with sporthunters the
5 State should address it before subsistence users are
6 punished with an unnecessary requirement.

7

8 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Okay,
11 we'll move on, summary of written public comments.

12

13 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I have.....

14

15 MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, Brian
16 Ubelaker.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

19

20 MR. UBELAKER: Go ahead, DeAnna.

21

22 MS. PERRY: No, Brian, this is your
23 turn, sorry.

24

25 MR. UBELAKER: No worries. I was just
26 going to say that there were no submitted comments
27 prior to the cut off but I know you had one DeAnna.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

30

31 MS. PERRY: Yeah, this is a little bit
32 of a new process so I think I jumped the gun there. My
33 comments were actually supposed to be under, I think,
34 public testimony but they are written public comments
35 so I'll go ahead with that.

36

37 Betty Schwanke, in addition to her
38 broad comments that I shared earlier, has a specific
39 comment on WP22-34. I oppose this request to require
40 meat on the bone salvage of dall sheep in Units 11 and
41 12. As a long time sheep hunter I have been on many
42 successful sheep hunts throughout these units and I can
43 say that meat waste has never been an issue for me or
44 my group of Federal sheep hunting friends. This
45 regulation is not necessary and would unnecessary
46 burden those hunters like myself and my family and
47 friends that hunt remote portions of the Park
48 backcountry on foot. In all of my years of sheep
49 hunting I have boned out a handful of sheep when
50

1 circumstances require it but not once have I lost any
2 meat to spoilage. Requiring us to pack out entire leg
3 bones would be a burden especially as the lower leg is
4 mostly bone with very limited shank meat. Requiring us
5 to pack out the entire rib cage would be an excessive
6 burden as we don't have that extra space in our packs
7 and it could possibly lead to more meat spoilage having
8 air get to the entire span of the thin rib rack
9 especially if one removed brisket meat. My family
10 holds sheep meat in the highest regards as do most of
11 our friends. We work very hard to get our harvest out
12 of the field in a timely manner every time to ensure we
13 don't waste this precious resource. This proposal just
14 makes no sense especially for this area. Park hunters
15 all start from trails or rivers, these are valley
16 bottoms way below the sheep, we don't fly into mountain
17 tops, we hike through timber to get to our hunting
18 areas. A select couple local hunt areas allow hunters
19 to fourwheel right up to the mountain, but the vast
20 majority of us hunt more remote country. In 25 years
21 of sheep hunting I have never personally observed a
22 light sheep pack. If a law enforcement officer does,
23 by all means, cite the hunter to encourage them to do
24 better next time. Don't punish the numerous sheep
25 hunters that hunt the right way for the right reasons
26 because of one person's fear that there might be an
27 issue. We all have a responsibility to help educate
28 new and novice hunters as to the best way to handle
29 wild game. We don't write proposals to punish our
30 fellow hunters for a non-issue.

31
32 Again, that was a written comment from
33 Becky Schwanke.

34
35 Another comment from Matt Synder reads,
36 Southcentral and Eastern Interior RACs. I'm writing
37 some comment on Proposal WP22-34 meat on bone
38 requirement for sheep in field. I do not like this
39 proposal. I started hunting sheep in '78 with my
40 parents and I've hunted and guided for sheep ever
41 since. I've packed plenty of bones out over the years
42 to boil for soup broth. As I get older I want lighter
43 backpack loads, not heavier, and not more loads to get
44 me out of the field. This proposal would require that.
45 So I've been deboning meat in the field especially for
46 long distance packs. The longer meat is in the field
47 the more chances you have of spoilage. When it's hot
48 out it's harder to cool meat. When on the bone the
49 legs are a larger mass and takes longer to cool, unlike
50

0281

1 smaller chunks of meat. People who do not know how to
2 debone meat very well are not going to do a better job
3 at home, the waste will be the same. Maybe informing
4 people how to debone carefully would be a better way to
5 go.

6
7 That was the comment received by Matt
8 Synder.

9
10 Mr. Chair, you may want to see if David
11 Roland is on the phone. I received a message that he
12 may be wanting to give a comment but I did not receive
13 a written comment from him. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
16 DeAnna. Is David Roland on the phone.

17
18 (No comments)

19
20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Anyone
21 else out there wanting to do a public testimony on this
22 thing, 34.

23
24 MR. WILSON: Mr. Chair.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

27
28 MR. WILSON: Mr. Chair, this is Seth
29 Wilson. I'd like to speak to the proposal which I
30 submitted.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You go right
33 ahead.

34
35 MR. WILSON: Well, first for the record
36 my name is Seth Wilson. I want to make sure that you
37 know there's a typo in my name on Page 238 of the Staff
38 comment. My name is misspelled as Williams. I'm a
39 resident of Gakona. I'm providing testimony to 22-34.
40 And for the interest of transparency I wanted to
41 disclose that I was a previous 10 year employee of the
42 Alaska Department of Fish and Game. I'm currently
43 married to the area wildlife biologist here.

44
45 But I want to be clear that I submitted
46 this proposal of my own accord and I want to provide a
47 little bit of context to it. A little bit about the
48 history and my reasoning.

49
50

1 So I began thinking about a sheep
2 salvage requirement about two years ago. I think it
3 was about the 2019 season, there were a couple
4 instances that I encountered that made me question
5 about how sheep salvage in the Wrangells and in
6 general. I went to the local wildlife Troopers and
7 asked them about their opinion. They commented to me
8 that they have noticed a trend towards quote/unquote
9 light packs in the Wrangells. I believe that sentiment
10 was repeated at a recent SRC from the Park Ranger as
11 well. And so I have no law enforcement background but
12 it is my understanding to enforce a salvage requirement
13 to cite a person, the State does need to collect
14 evidence and that would require traveling into the back
15 country, finding the remains and collecting evidence,
16 which is the wasted meat. I understand as it was
17 related to me, this is usually pretty difficult for an
18 enforcement officer, it'd require a helicopter ride, a
19 SuperCub ride during hunting season to find the remains
20 before the scavengers to collect evidence so these sort
21 of wanton waste cases are pretty difficult to enforce.
22 I was really looking forward to more comment from AWT
23 on this but -- so, a little more history, I brought
24 this issue up to the local AC, I think it would have
25 been January 2020, I proposed an idea of a wanton
26 waste, or a salvage -- on bone salvage requirement
27 because that's typically the management tool when
28 wanton waste is an issue. The AC was generally
29 favorable at that meeting. The comment -- I think the
30 direct quote was, I like it, but not enough to put a
31 proposal in so I submitted the proposal afterwards.
32 And I don't know, I submitted it to the Board of Game a
33 year and a half ago. The AC since met on it and voted
34 to, I believe they voted to not support. I don't know
35 if one of their representatives is on the phone. But
36 the Board of Game was delayed another year due to Covid
37 so they haven't deliberated on this yet. I submitted it
38 to the Office of Subsistence Management, to the
39 Subsistence Board because I was working on that Moose
40 Pass C&T proposal, real quick, I submit it, the sheep
41 salvage as an afterthought realizing people could
42 misconstrue this as targeting one user group over for
43 the other. I kind of wanted to be clear that we all
44 share the burden of conservation.

45
46 So I understand that it's a hard pill
47 to swallow. I want to thank you for the opportunity to
48 testify. I'll conclude it here and take any questions
49 that anybody on the phone has.
50

0283

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Seth, thank you
4 for that. Does anyone got any questions for his
5 proposal.

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well,
10 thank you, Seth. Anyone else with public testimony.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. If I don't
15 hear any others we'll go ahead and move on to the
16 Regional Council's recommendation and a motion.

17

18 MR. OPHEIM: Michael, I'll make a
19 motion that we support WP22-34.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Got a motion to
22 support by Michael, is there a second.

23

24 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I'll second so we can
25 comment.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, is that
28 Andy?

29

30 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right, it's
33 been moved and seconded, we're open for discussion.
34 Let's go ahead and take comments on it before we take a
35 vote.

36

37 MS. STICKWAN: This is Gloria.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead Gloria.

40

41 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to say that
42 this proposal was written by Seth Wilson, salvage on
43 meat, he's concerned about wasted meat. I just want to
44 say the Ahtna people use every part of the meat, and
45 the bone. They used to make spoons out of the horns.
46 But I can also see that it is more restrictive than
47 what the State has in regulation. So I would like -- I
48 also see it as a -- you know, the Ahtna people can
49 still bring out the bones if they want to and for other
50

0284

1 people it will make it less of a hardship for them to
2 bring out the bone, the heavy pack. So I support it
3 just because it's less restrictive -- it would make it
4 less restrictive than the -- oh, let's see -- it would
5 make it better for those people if it were not passed,
6 for those that hunt -- so (indiscernible - background
7 noise) bring out the bones. The Ahtna people can still
8 bring out the bones if they want to so I oppose this.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
11 Gloria. Anyone else want to talk to it.

12
13 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Andy.

16
17 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, thank you,
18 through the Chair. I'll make it fast here. You know
19 this is WP22-34 I'm definitely going to say nay on
20 this, requiring sheep meat to be on the bone, I,
21 myself, have spent a lifetime of extremely remote
22 hunting between, I don't know, six and 40 miles type,
23 mountain hunting is a tough thing. Sheep, goats, brown
24 bear, caribou, deer, I've brought them all back from
25 far, way back in. I also have a lifelong passion and
26 family traditional of not wasting any meat at all. A
27 lot of my hunts in my younger years were solo and the
28 fact is I just had debone stuff, you know. And what I
29 do now is I take pictures of the bones and the gut pile
30 of what's left in the field from moose to whatever just
31 so I can have my own proof if there was ever any
32 question. But I can tell you even the birds are
33 irritated when I leave something because there's not
34 much left, but there is bones. So I recover every once
35 of that meat and I'm going to oppose this, it's an
36 extra burden that shouldn't happen.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Andy.
39 The birds are definitely hungry in my area as well.
40 Anyone else.....

41
42 MS. CLAUS: Mr. Chairman.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go.....

45
46 MS. CAMINER: This is Judy.

47
48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:ahead.....

49
50

0285

1 MS. CLAUS: This is Donna.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Donna.

4

5 MS. CLAUS: Yeah, I am an elder
6 subsistence hunter in Wrangell-St. Elias. I have my
7 permit right now and it expires the end of October and
8 I'm looking forward to going and getting one but I know
9 that when I shoot one, I will walk up to it and I'll
10 probably sit down and start crying because now the work
11 begins. But like you said, the birds, I sometimes feel
12 sorry for the birds because they start coming to look
13 and there isn't anything left for them. And, boy, if I
14 had to carry the bones out they'd be pecking me because
15 I'd die.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Donna.
20 Judy, did you want to comment.

21

22 MS. CAMINER: Yes, thank you, Mr.
23 Chair. I support the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence
24 Resource Commission's recommendation so I'll be voting
25 against the proposal.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Judy.
28 Anyone else.

29

30 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, this is Michael.
31 I'll be opposing this, just making more burden on the
32 hunter out in the field, you know, we don't need that.
33 If somebody wants to bring the bones back they can, if
34 not, let the birds and the critters have them.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, anyone
37 else.

38

39 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to say that
40 I heard at our Wrangell-St. Elias meeting that it's not
41 the Federal hunters that are supposedly doing wanton
42 waste it's the sporthunters.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. I
45 would concur that our people pack everything out.
46 Anyone else that we missed would want to comment on
47 this proposal.

48

49 (No comments)

50

0286

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, hearing
2 none if someone wants to call the question we'll go
3 ahead and take a vote on it.

4
5 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Question.

6
7 MS. CLAUS: I'll call the question,
8 Donna.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's been
11 called by Donna. We will go ahead and vote. All in
12 favor of the proposal signify by saying aye.

13
14 MR. WHISSEL: Aye.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's one aye.
17 All those opposed.....

18
19 MR. WHISSEL: I'm sorry.....

20
21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:say

22
23 MR. WHISSEL: I'm sorry.....

24
25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

26
27 MR. WHISSEL:I rescind, I was
28 opposed.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that's what
31 I thought. Okay, no ayes. All opposed nay.

32
33 IN UNISON: Nay.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: It fails
36 unanimously.

37
38 MR. WHISSEL: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, I
39 heard any opposition when you said any -- when you
40 called the vote, my apologies.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, no problem.
43 No problem, I was going to check you on that anyway and
44 see -- I felt it was kind of unanimous, so that's good.
45 Now we're going to move on to -- let's see, we just
46 finished up salvage requirement -- so what we want to
47 do is we want to move now, DeAnna, if I'm not mistaken,
48 we're going to move down to the two statewide proposals
49 first before we go to 35 and 36?

50

0287

1 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, we can do 35 but
2 it's my understanding if we then switch to 01 and 02
3 that will provide a lot of foundation information for
4 the Council to then act on 36.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

7
8 MS. PERRY: So I believe we can go
9 ahead with 35. Thank you.

10
11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I'll do 35.

12
13 MR. UBELAKER: Yes, Mr. Chair, Brian
14 Ubelaker, OSM, once, again.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. You're on,
17 thank you.

18
19 MR. UBELAKER: Okay. And I promise
20 this is the last time you will hear from me today.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, that's
23 fine.

24
25 MR. UBELAKER: Let's see, Wildlife
26 Proposal WP22-35, which the analysis begins on Page 244
27 of your meeting books was submitted by the Ahtna
28 InterTribal Resources Commission and requests
29 establishing a may be announced caribou season in Unit
30 11 with a harvest limit of one bull by Federal book and
31 a Section .804 analysis.

32
33 The proponent states recent research
34 has determined that the Mentasta Caribou Herd
35 population has stabilized at a lower level than that
36 envisioned by the now outdated Mentasta Caribou Herd
37 Management Plan as necessary in order to resume
38 subsistence caribou hunting opportunities in Unit 11.
39 The proponent further states that the Nelchina bull
40 caribou collar data demonstrates that Nelchina bulls
41 frequent the Mentasta herd such that a bulls only
42 caribou hunt during times the Nelchina herd is present
43 in Unit 11 would not affect the biological status of
44 the Mentasta Caribou herd since the distinct Mentasta
45 cow caribou would not be open to hunting.

46
47 The proponent would like to resume and
48 continue subsistence uses of caribou in Unit 11 within
49 the Ahtna traditional use territory.

50

1 Note that this analysis only considers
2 the establishment of a season and harvest limit. The
3 .804 analysis may be conducted at a later time if a
4 caribou hunt is opened in Unit 11.

5
6 There has not been a Federal season for
7 caribou hunting in Unit 11 for most of the last 30
8 decades and there have been few proposals to establish
9 one. In the mid-to late 1990s the Federal season was
10 closed then opened with major restrictions and then
11 finally closed again as populations fell below
12 objectives. In 2012 the Federal Subsistence Board
13 rejected two proposals trying to establish a season on
14 Mentasta caribou. Caribou in Unit 11 may be part of
15 the Nelchina Caribou herd or Mentasta Caribou Herd as
16 the ranges of these herds overlap. These two herds are
17 considered distinct herds because females calve in
18 separate areas, although the herds mix during some
19 breeding seasons. The Nelchina Caribou Herd calving
20 grounds in the summer range lie within Unit 13. The
21 Mentasta Caribou Herd, the primary herd within Unit 11
22 calves in summers within the Upper Copper River Basin
23 in the northern and western flanks of the Wrangell
24 Mountains within Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and
25 Preserve.

26
27 The Mentasta Caribou Herd declined from
28 an estimated 3,200 caribou in 1987 to about 479 caribou
29 in 2019. The fall population estimate in 2020 was
30 almost 1,200 caribou, however, the increase from 2019
31 is not explained by calf production in the previous
32 year but may be due in part to Nelchina caribou
33 returning late from their winter range or may have
34 failed to migrate back to their traditional calving
35 ground. The Mentasta Caribou Herd population has
36 remained stable at relatively low levels since 2004 as
37 evidenced by low calf survival. The bull to cow ratio
38 has fluctuated widely between 1987 and 2020 ranging
39 from 35 to 124 bulls to 100 cows. While Nelchina bulls
40 have wintered within the range of the Mentasta herd
41 there is limited ability to predict the extent or
42 frequency of mixing between Nelchina and Mentasta bulls
43 and it is impossible to discern whether the harvest of
44 a bull would be from the Nelchina or Mentasta herd.

45
46 The Nelchina Caribou Herd is a popular
47 herd to hunt and experiences heavy harvest pressure due
48 to its road accessibility and proximity to Fairbanks
49 and Anchorage. Over 95 percent of the Nelchina Caribou
50

1 Harvest occurs in Unit 13. Between 2001 and 2019
2 harvest from the Nelchina Caribou Herd on State
3 regulations has averaged around 2,300 caribou per year.
4 Harvest under regulations in Units 12 and 13 combined
5 average 421 caribou per year. Harvest for the Mentasta
6 Caribou Herd in the '96/97 season was one caribou with
7 15 permits issued. In the '97/98 season 12 permits
8 were issued but no harvest was reported for caribou.
9 There has been no reported harvest from the Mentasta
10 Caribou Herd since 1998 as there has been no State or
11 Federal season for caribou in Unit 11. However, some
12 incidental harvest of Mentasta caribou may take place
13 during winter hunts targeting the Nelchina Caribou Herd
14 in areas of herd overlap in the adjacent units.

15
16 If this proposal is adopted the
17 additional harvest is unlikely to have any biological
18 effect on the Nelchina Caribou Herd, however, impacts
19 to the Mentasta Caribou Herd are a conservation concern
20 and deters from the principles in the Mentasta Caribou
21 Herd Management Plan. The Mentasta Caribou Herd has
22 fallen short of any metric that would support opening a
23 season for the past 25 years.

24
25 Current low population numbers are
26 indicative of poor recruitment and low survival rates
27 among cohorts within the population. And increased
28 opportunity for incidental harvest could further
29 exacerbate the decline of a population that is
30 currently a population concern. If this proposal is
31 adopted it would allow a harvest of caribou when the
32 Nelchina migrates through Unit 11 providing increased
33 subsistence hunting opportunity. Based on
34 participation and harvest by Federally-qualified
35 subsistence users from 1996 to 1998 when a very limited
36 open Federal caribou season occurred in Unit 11,
37 harvest from the Unit 11 caribou might be expected to
38 be very low, however, if Nelchina are easily accessible
39 along the Nabesna Road hunting effort and harvest could
40 be higher than what was experienced in 1996 to '98.

41
42 Therefore, OSM's preliminary conclusion
43 is to support Proposal WP22-35 with modification to
44 delegate authority to the Wrangell-St. Elias National
45 Park and Preserve superintendent to announce season
46 dates, harvest quotas and the number of permits to be
47 issued to defined harvest areas and to open and close
48 the season via delegation of authority letter only.
49 The timing of this migration differs from year to year
50

0290

1 and the number of Nelchina bulls that mix with the
2 Mentasta Caribou Herd within Unit 11 also varies year
3 to year. The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and
4 Preserve superintendent would have the needed data to
5 make these announcements year to year as timing and
6 numbers vary.

7

8 Thank you for your time, and I would be
9 happy to answer any questions that anybody may have.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right, thank
12 you. Is there any questions at this time.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, hearing
17 none, we have some other people who will probably add
18 some information as we go down the list here. We got a
19 couple of biologists around so if anyone has any
20 questions we'll bring them up as we go. Okay, report
21 on the Board's consultation, Orville.

22

23 MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Board
24 members. Orville Lind, Native Liaison, OSM. We did
25 not have any questions or comments on this proposal
26 also. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
29 How about agency comments, how about the Alaska
30 Department of Fish and Game.

31

32 MS. HATCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
33 This is Heidi Hatcher with the Alaska Department of
34 Fish and Game in Glennallen. We had a note that you
35 guys would like a bit of an update on the Nelchina herd
36 so I can give that now if that works.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

39

40 MS. HATCHER: All right. So just a
41 real brief overview of where the Nelchina herd is. For
42 the past several years we've been diligently working to
43 reduce the size of the Nelchina herd back to within
44 objective and we've now reached that goal. So the
45 Nelchina population objectives are to maintain a herd
46 of 35,000 to 40,000 animals after the fall hunt with
47 composition ratios of 40 bulls per 100 cows, and 40
48 calves per 100 cows. So the 2021 fall population
49 estimate is roughly 35,500 animals, which brings us
50

0291

1 right to within the lower level of our population
2 objectives. This means that if the herd cooperates
3 we're transitioning of a period of excess when we had
4 substantial harvestable surplus and a strategy of
5 reducing the herd to now using a maintenance strategy
6 where we can expect lower harvestable surplus annually
7 with a goal of maintaining the population in the
8 current herd size. Now, due to the migratory nature of
9 the herd the management strategy for the Nelchina herd
10 is to achieve the harvestable surplus during the fall
11 hunting seasons whenever possible. In recent history
12 the herd typically migrates out of Unit 13 through Unit
13 11, through Unit 12 and into Unit 20E to winter there.
14 Now, with that said Nelchina migration varies widely
15 from year to year. In recent history the herd has
16 really spent any significant time in accessible areas
17 of Unit 11, Federal hunters currently have Nelchina
18 harvest opportunity in Units 12 and in Unit 13 and
19 again the management goal for this herd when we are
20 maintaining it with an objective our goal is to reach
21 the harvestable surplus during the fall hunting season.
22 Which means that there will ideally be no harvestable
23 surplus left for the Nelchina herd when it reaches Unit
24 11.

25

26 So with that said our preliminary
27 position on this proposal is that we oppose it because
28 it would be adding an extra hunt to an already
29 complicated list of hunts for the Nelchina herd and it
30 would just over complicate things further.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I was on mute,
33 sorry, very good Heidi thank you. Any questions for
34 her.

35

36 MS. STICKWAN: What did you say the
37 count was?

38

39 MS. HATCHER: The latest fall
40 population estimate is about 35,500 animals and just a
41 note on that, some people might think that there's 500
42 animals harvestable surplus but those extra 500 animals
43 are actually representative calves which means they are
44 not harvestable surplus this season.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Anyone
47 else have any questions for Heidi.

48

49 (No comments)

50

0292

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you,
2 Heidi. We'll go ahead and move on down then. How
3 about the Federal.

4
5 MS. PUTERA: Mr. Chair, this is Judy
6 Putera, Wildlife Biologist Wrangell-St. Elias National
7 Park. I wanted to give an update on the Mentasta
8 Caribou Herd population estimate. It wasn't available
9 at the time of the analysis or at the time I put
10 together my wildlife report.

11
12 But estimate 495 caribou for 2021 fall
13 estimate -- fall population estimate. Which is -- is
14 just slightly above the 2019 estimate. And I don't
15 know, if folks are looking at the estimate for 2020 it
16 was 1,150 and that was reflected in -- and in a number
17 of Nelchina caribou having come back late through Unit
18 11 in the spring and failed to migrate all the way
19 through to Unit 13. So I just want to indicate that
20 our work this year indicates that that was the case and
21 we're back down to our lower levels.

22
23 I also wanted to state that we were
24 unable to put out any more radio collars this fall for
25 a number of reasons. And so having those collars is,
26 you know, will be really critical, I think, to any --
27 to any kind of management of any kind of hunt, you
28 know, just knowing where those animals are and our
29 effort is not to -- not to unintentionally target the
30 Mentasta caribou.

31
32 Thank you.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Judy.
35 Is there any questions, questions for Judy.

36
37 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes, Mr. Chair.

38
39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Andy.

40
41 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, thank you.
42 Through the Chair. Yeah, so it sounds like this is
43 quite a well monitored herd and, you know, 490-ish is
44 pretty constant, 400-plus, so the numbers are pretty
45 known. I would like to know what warrants this notion
46 of delegating authority. In the past I've heard that,
47 oh, it's for faster management, if all these monitoring
48 numbers are gathered and the data is there, why would
49 there need to be a delegation of authority on this?
50

0293

1 MS. PUTERA: Mr. Chair -- or through
2 the Chair. The intent of the proposal, as I understand
3 it, is to target Nelchina caribou, and Nelchina
4 caribou, whether they come through Unit 11 or not is
5 very variable. Sometimes they're there very early,
6 sometimes they're there very late, you know, however --
7 however long they stay is also variable. To not have a
8 delegated authority to open and close the hunt, we
9 could be -- you know the hunt could be open when the
10 only animals there are Mentasta caribou so that would,
11 you know, specifically target the Mentasta caribou
12 which is something we don't want to do. In addition to
13 the fact that we have a Mentasta Caribou Herd
14 Management Plan, that restricts harvest based on
15 certain parameters in the herd which we have not met.

16
17 Thank you.

18
19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, does that
20 help, Andy.

21
22 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yep, thank you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone else have
25 any questions for Judy.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We'll go
30 ahead and move on to tribal representatives. Any
31 tribal representatives want to talk to this issue.

32
33 MS. LINNELL: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is
34 Karen Linnell.

35
36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Karen.

37
38 MS. LINNELL: Hi, thank you, Mr. Chair,
39 for the opportunity to address the Commission on this
40 proposal. It was my proposal.

41
42 We've been unable to hunt caribou in
43 GMU 11 since the '80s based on the population of the
44 Mentasta Caribou Herd. And one of the things that just
45 fails to -- or that we noticed is that the -- and feel
46 that, is the Park isn't working to grow that herd,
47 they're barely monitoring it. Several years ago we
48 started a caribou working group that started the Bureau
49 of Land Management, the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC, Alaska
50

1 Department of Fish and Game and the Tetlin Wildlife
2 Refuge because that's the range where these caribou go
3 and it also included Ahtna InterTribal Resources
4 Commission. And one of the things that we found is
5 that at that time they only had like three or four
6 collars on the caribou and in talking and listening to
7 Staff at the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC meeting last week
8 there's only five collars on there. The management
9 plan requires about 40 to 50 collars on that Mentasta
10 Caribou Herd and they haven't met that obligation. And
11 then the other thing is that they've improved their
12 technology now, rather than radio telemetry, they have --
13 they've got some GPS collars so they can actually
14 locate them a little better for their counts. And our
15 Staff actually helped this year with the count in June
16 or July, I believe it was, so that we could participate
17 in it. We've offered to purchase collars to help them
18 better understand what's going on there, but simply to
19 deny a subsistence use because of a herd that they're
20 not managing for growth is just horrendous and failing
21 to meet their objectives as well.

22
23 You know even in my lifetime I was
24 barely out of high school, you know, when this hunt was
25 stopped and in talking with my dad about how they would
26 hunt for caribou over there it was something that they
27 would do in the wintertime, still with snowshoes, my
28 dad, and sometimes with snowmachine, he was a pilot and
29 would fly and all of those practices now are gone. You
30 can't fly to subsist. And then now we have changing
31 snow and ice conditions which can limit and restrict
32 access into Wrangell-St. Elias because the river ice is
33 so unpredictable. We're actually working on a project
34 with the Park Service to document that changing of the
35 snow and ice conditions.

36
37 But 40-plus years, you know, 40 years
38 of not being able to hunt this resource is too long.
39 It's been, according to their numbers, a constant 600
40 or so animals for a couple decades now and it's time to
41 change their management and allow for this hunt of
42 Nelchina caribou.

43
44 The idea of having a delegation of
45 authority for in-season management, I believe, it a
46 good one and I appreciate the recommendation by OSM.
47 This allows for the Park Superintendent to open the
48 season and close the season for when the Nelchina are
49 in GMU 11. If you do it by a calendar date you might
50

0295

1 not get them, and it could be when they're mingling
2 with the Mentastas. One of the things that we've
3 noticed in the last several years is that the caribou
4 haven't crossed through Federal lands in GMU 13 until
5 well after the season has closed. This year because of
6 all of the draw hunts and other hunts were closed they
7 actually did cross during the season and we know that
8 the caribou migration happens according to the weather
9 and the snow and ice conditions, that's what drives
10 their migration pattern. So along with this pressure
11 from hunting, I believe, is what happened with them
12 going east in the fall hunt and that not happening on
13 Federal lands.

14
15 We have a very narrow corridor of
16 Federal lands on the Richardson Highway where the
17 caribou cross, or restricted access in regards to the
18 type of access, so controlled use areas for a lot of
19 the Federal lands within GMU13. So the addition of
20 being able to hunt in GMU 11 for caribou on Wrangell-
21 St. Elias National Park and Preserve is an important
22 piece to that being able to provide for subsistence
23 needs.

24
25 I'd be happy to answer any questions if
26 you have any and I appreciate and want to say thank you
27 for the time to address this proposal.

28
29 Thank you.

30
31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Karen.
32 That was good info and enlightening, and so refreshing,
33 too, her memories. Anyone have any questions for
34 Karen.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Is there an.....

39
40 MS. PUTERA: Mr. Chair.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

43
44 MS. PUTERA: This is Judy Putera again.
45 If I may, can I address some of Karen's comments.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

48
49 MS. PUTERA: Yes, with all due respect
50

1 to Karen, it is absolutely not true that we are barely
2 monitoring this herd. We have tried to get out every
3 single year to monitor the herd, both doing a census
4 and a fall population composition count. It is not the
5 easiest thing to do, to monitor the herd, because it is
6 a fairly small herd and it is dispersed over quite a
7 large area. With respect to GPS collars, we over a
8 number of years, without the proper drugs and capture
9 drugs and testing of new drugs, we have, you know, yes,
10 fallen back on our efforts to collar. We have been
11 putting GPS collars out, and I appreciate Karen's offer
12 to buy collars but it's a little bit more complicated
13 than that, it takes a lot of money to, you know,
14 besides the collars to actually get them out,
15 considering helicopter and drive costs and the fees
16 that are required to get the data on a monthly basis.

17
18 And also I did want to clarify we -- we
19 wholly intended to put out collars this fall but the
20 weather's been not very conducive, it's -- we got snow
21 early, we need to capture those caribou up in the high
22 country and with the snow and the situation with Covid
23 and the hospitals being overrun and going into those
24 critical care protocols we made the decision, as U.S.
25 Fish and Wildlife did actually, to not put ourselves in
26 danger and put off that capture this fall.

27
28 Thank you, very much.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Judy.
31 Thank you for sharing that with us. Any other comments
32 on the tribal representatives or anything to do with
33 agency report comments.

34
35 MS. LINNELL: Yes, Sir, this is Karen
36 again.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Karen.

39
40 MS. LINNELL: I would say that we will
41 continue to offer our resources to help with this
42 monitoring. I know that there's subscription operations
43 that go with the collars and I never said you were just
44 going to just get collars and not have anything, you
45 know, any other support, we also have biologists on
46 Staff that are willing to and able to go out and help
47 with this process at no expense to the Park because
48 this is important to our being able to provide for
49 subsistence uses for our tribal citizens and the rest
50

0297

1 of the local residents here.

2

3

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4

5

6

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Karen.
Okay, if that's good, we're going to go ahead and move
on to advisory group comments. Is there any other
Regional Advisory council comments.

7

8

9

10

11

MS. PERRY: This is DeAnna, no, Mr.
Chair.

12

13

14

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Fish
and Game Advisory Committees.

15

16

17

(No comments)

18

19

20

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
Subsistence Resource Commissions.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
This is Barbara Cellarius again with Wrangell-St. Elias
National Park. And the Wrangell-St. Elias National
Park Subsistence Resource Commission supported WP22-35
with the OSM modification. And an additional
modification to establish a working group on the
Mentasta Caribou Herd Management Plan with tribal
involvement in that planning effort. The proposal
would provide for subsistence opportunity when Nelchina
caribou are present in Unit 11. Considerable concern
was expressed about potential harvest of Mentasta
caribou and the delegation of authority to the
superintendent would provide important tools for
managing the hunt. Updating the management plan is
similarly important for ensuring agreement on a
consistent cooperative approach for management.

38

39

40

41

42

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
Barbara. Okay, anyone else, Subsistence Resource.

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, how
about a summary of written public comment.

0298

1 MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, Brian
2 Ubelaker. There were no submitted written public
3 comments by our deadline.

4
5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Brian.
6 Public testimony, anyone want to testify anymore,
7 testify to this proposal.

8
9 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna.

10
11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, DeAnna.

12
13 MS. PERRY: I do have some written
14 comments that were received since the meeting began on
15 this proposal.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

18
19 MS. PERRY: Again Betty [sic] Schwanke
20 had an overall comment that I shared earlier. Her
21 specific comment on this proposal is: I support
22 efforts to address possible Nelchina caribou harvest in
23 Unit 11 when they migrate through each fall but I would
24 suggest that the Mentasta Caribou Herd Cooperative
25 Management Plan be updated first, which was originally
26 done cooperatively by the National Park Service and
27 ADF&G with an emphasis of a Nelchina harvest
28 opportunity within the range of the NCH, which is the
29 cooperative agreement. Given the interest by the local
30 tribal entities they should certainly have a voice in
31 this process as should all affected stakeholders. The
32 latest plan I have seen was from June 1195.
33 Regardless, it does account for winter hunts where
34 Nelchina caribou are the focus. It states that the
35 agency proposing the hunt shall be responsible for
36 flying/determining the mixing ratio between the two
37 herds prior to any harvest. This would not be any
38 different than for the Federal Nelchina caribou winter
39 hunt in Unit 12. It's been known for many years that
40 the MCH cow -- Mentasta Caribou Herd are genetically
41 different from Nelchina Caribou herd cows, while bulls
42 have less differentiation. That said, there are remote
43 pockets of very large non-migratory caribou bulls in
44 Unit 11 that I believe are truly Mentasta Caribou Herd
45 bulls. Any harvest of these bulls could be detrimental
46 to this remnant herd. When it comes to localized
47 harvest opportunity along the Nabesna Road, there's
48 certainly opportunity to target Nelchina bulls and this
49 Federal opportunity should be explored.

50

0299

1 Once a Federal harvest in Unit 12,
2 though, this harvest could -- I'm sorry -- this harvest
3 should be based on the full Nelchina Caribou Herd
4 population and composition data. At this time there
5 does seem to be adequate numbers to allow a limited
6 harvest in Unit 11 but this, of course, should be
7 predicated on a cooperative agreement between the
8 managing parties. I believe this would negate the need
9 to do an .804 analysis.

10
11 Again, that was the written comment
12 received from Betty [sic] Schwanke.

13
14 Another comment from Ahtna Tene Nene'
15 Federally-qualified subsistence users should be able to
16 engage in subsistence hunting for caribou in their
17 traditional homelands. This proposal would protect the
18 Mentasta herd by focusing harvest effort on Nelchina
19 bulls. Wrangell-St. Elias has the authority to
20 identify users who are most C&T dependent on Unit 11
21 caribou. In recent years the population of the
22 Nelchina herd has stabilized. Biologically this would
23 be a very conservative way to open up a new hunt as
24 only Federally-qualified subsistence users with a
25 customary and traditional use determination for Unit 11
26 caribou would be eligible to participate. Revise
27 management plan.

28
29 That was the comment received by Ahtna
30 Tene Nene' and concludes the written public comments
31 received during this meeting.

32
33 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, thank
36 you, DeAnna. We'll give one last chance for any other
37 public that missed on the phone or anyone want to
38 comment to it.

39
40 MS. LINNELL: Mr. Chair.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead.

43
44 MS. LINNELL: This was one more point
45 that I forgot to mention is in comments from ADF&G they
46 were talking about their goal for the Nelchina herd is
47 to have it all harvestable surplus would be harvested
48 before it got to Unit 11, it's, you know, that herd
49 crosses all those boundaries and, you know, looking at
50

0300

1 the ability -- and it's been that way because there was
2 no hunting in Unit 11, if we open this hunt that will
3 spread the density of hunters but it will also provide
4 again for additional opportunity in Unit 11.

5

6 Thank you.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Karen.
9 Okay. Any other last comments.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none,
14 I'll open it up to the Regional Council's
15 recommendation for a motion.

16

17 MS. STICKWAN: I move to support WP22-3
18 -- I mean I move to adopt Proposal 22-35.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Gloria
21 moved to adopt, is there a second.

22

23 MS. NICKLIE: Second by Paula.

24

25 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Second.

26

27 MR. OPHEIM: Second.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Paula seconded
30 it, thank you. Okay, we've got a motion, seconded and
31 it's on the table here and it's open for the Council's
32 discussion. As usual I'm going to let you guys just
33 got, whoever chimes in first I'll recognize you and
34 we'll move on, so, go ahead.

35

36 MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair, this is
37 Gloria. I support this proposal. We don't have a
38 problem with the delegation of authority. They would
39 have the authority to open and close the hunt. And
40 they have -- they can tell when the Nelchina Caribou
41 Herd is in the area because they have genetic studies
42 showing it's a different herd by the cows. So they can
43 tell when the Nelchina herd is there, and when the
44 Mentasta herd is by itself so they can close it when
45 the -- when they think there's a conservation herd of
46 Mentasta bulls being shot, overharvested, they have the
47 authority to close it and it gives the opportunity for
48 local people to get a caribou.

49

50

0301

1 I talked to -- I attended a meeting two
2 or three years ago in Slana, they had a community -- a
3 Slana meeting up there and there was a proposal from
4 Mentasta back then to open that hunt up for Mentasta
5 herd only and they -- they were talking about that
6 proposal back then and they wondered why they couldn't
7 hunt for Mentasta in their own backyard. This is a
8 proposal for Nelchina so it would just give people an
9 opportunity to get caribou for subsistence uses. It's
10 a monitored herd by Wrangell-St. Elias. According to
11 Judy, they put out collars, they know when the herd's
12 there, Mentasta herd, when the Nelchina crosses the
13 road, when it starts going over they know that so I
14 support this proposal. It'll just give more
15 opportunity for people to get a caribou and it would,
16 like Karen said, spread out more people being able to
17 hunt over in Unit 11 as well as 13. Unit 13 is really
18 crowded during the season by non-local hunters. Just
19 provide more opportunity.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks,
24 Gloria. Okay, just.....

25

26 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, this is Michael.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:to clarify
29 something there on our work here, Gloria, you made to
30 adopt, the preliminary conclusion didn't have it in the
31 original, so is that with the modification and if it's
32 agreeable with Paula, is that the intent of the motion?

33

34 MS. STICKWAN: Yes, I meant to say that
35 we support.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

38

39 MS. STICKWAN: Yep, modification.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Is that
42 okay with you, Paula, that's good, I want to make sure
43 because DeAnna wants to make sure, too.

44

45 MS. NICKLIE: Yes.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
48 Okay, anyone else want to speak to it.

49

50

0302

1 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, this is Michael.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead,
4 Michael.

5

6 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, I'm going to support
7 this giving hopefully some more opportunity for people
8 to get out and get some meat in the freezer. You know
9 it's a may open hunt it looks like so the in-season
10 manager will be in charge of that. So, yeah, it looks
11 like hopefully it will be a good hunt in the future.

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you,
14 Michael, anyone else.

15

16 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Andy real quick.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Andy.

19

20 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I support this with
21 the OSM modification, that that delegation of authority
22 be added there when the Nelchina herd is in Unit 11,
23 in-season manager can open or close the harvest, you
24 know, and it helps out Federally-qualified subsistence
25 users.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
28 Anyone else.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, if someone
33 wants to call the question we'll take a vote.

34

35 MS. STICKWAN: Question.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's been
38 called by Gloria. All those in favor of Wildlife
39 Proposal 22-35 with the modification signify by saying
40 aye.

41

42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone else.

45

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All opposed, nay.

50

0303

1 (No opposing votes)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: It passes unanimously, thank you. Before we swap to state proposals, we'll go to 1 and 2, then we'll go to 36, let's go ahead and take about a 8/10 minute break, okay, stretch your legs, get some more coffee, whatever we need to do, it's time for stretching.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We're going to go ahead and move on to statewide Proposal WP22-01, define participants in community harvest program and effects on harvest limit, 291. OSM.

MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Council. The analysis for WP22-02 [sic] begins on Page 291 of your Council books and it's also available at the Federal Subsistence Management Program web page. So my name is Pippa Kenner for the record, and I am an Anthropologist at the Office of Subsistence Management in Anchorage.

So Proposal WP22-01 was submitted by the Office of Subsistence Management and requests to clarify who is and who is not a participant in a community harvest system. First, I'll describe a community harvest system in Federal regulations. Community harvest systems generally allow hunters to harvest animals up to a community harvest limit. Individual harvest limits such as one moose do not apply to hunters in a community harvest system. Each hunter may continue to harvest until the community harvest limit is met. These regulations generally describe what animal species may be taken, where they may be taken and who may take them.

So the general regulation describing community harvest system harvest limits is split between Page 294 and 295 in your Council book. It says: An animal taken under Federal or State regulations by any member of a community within an established community harvest limit for that species counts towards the community harvest limit for that species. An animal taken as part of a community harvest limit counts towards every community members

0304

1 harvest limit for that species taken under Federal or
2 State of Alaska regulations. Now, what this regulation
3 doesn't say is that a person might not want to
4 participate in their community harvest system for
5 moose, for example. So this proposed regulation
6 clarifies that a person can request a registration
7 system where only people who register may participate
8 in the community harvest system. So this proposed
9 regulation reads: for the purposes of this provision
10 all residents of the community are deemed participants
11 in the community harvest unless the Board approved
12 framework requires registration as a prerequisite to
13 harvesting or receiving any fish, wildlife, or
14 shellfish pursuant to that community harvest, in which
15 case only those who registered are deemed participants
16 in that community harvest.

17
18 Currently there are a couple of
19 community harvest systems in regulation in the
20 Southcentral Alaska region. Notably, in Units 11, 12,
21 and 13 for moose and caribou and this community harvest
22 system will be coming up in a later proposal. However,
23 this proposed regulation will not affect existing
24 community harvest systems in Federal regulations.

25
26 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
27 support the proposal. Subsistence users and others
28 will find this revised regulation less confusing and
29 easier to use. And, finally, this Council is the
30 fourth to act on this proposal. The proposal is
31 request to change a general regulation that affects all
32 regions of the state and we are asking all Regional
33 Advisory Councils to act on this proposal. The
34 Kodiak/Aleutian, Yukon Kuskokwim Delta, and Western
35 Interior Alaska Council supported this proposal. And
36 the Southeast Alaska Council took no action, primarily
37 because they ran out of time.

38
39 Thank you, Mr. Chair. That's the end
40 of my presentation.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right, very
43 good. Questions.

44
45 (No comments)

46
47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any questions for
48 Pippa, anyone.

49
50

0305

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Just
4 making sure I'm not muted. Okay, we got the
5 presentation, how about consultation, Orville, were
6 there any tribes, ANCSA Corps consultation.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Orville, you
11 might have had a longer stretch or had to go somewhere
12 but I'll come back to you if you had any consultation.

13

14 Agency comments, Alaska Department of
15 Fish and Game.

16

17 MR. MULLIGAN: Hi, Mr. Chair, this is
18 Ben Mulligan at ADF&G. The Department is taking no
19 position on this proposal.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No position, uh,
22 okay, okay, Ben, that's a good one. Okay, Federal,
23 anyone on the Federal side got anything to say about
24 it.

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. How about
29 tribal representatives, anyone want to address it.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right.
34 Advisory group comments, other Regional Advisory
35 Councils, anyone.

36

37 MS. PERRY: No, Mr. Chair.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
40 DeAnna. Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

41

42 (Teleconference interference -
43 participants not muted)

44

45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
46 Resource Commissions.

47

48 MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
49 This is Barbara Cellarius presenting the comment for
50

0306

1 the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence
2 Resource Commission. The Commission unanimously
3 supported WP22-01. The proposed change clarifies who
4 is a participant in a community harvest system and
5 ensures that non-participants in a community harvest
6 system would retain individual harvest limits. This
7 proposed change will allow communities to meet their
8 subsistence needs whether they're participating in the
9 community harvest system or not.

10

11 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Barb.
14 Good description. Okay. Summary of written public
15 comments, OSM, has anyone submitted public comments.

16

17 MS. KENNER: No, Mr. Chair -- this is
18 Pippa. No written comments were submitted during the
19 public comment period.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Pippa.
22 Okay, public testimony.

23

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

25

26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, DeAnna.

27

28 MS. PERRY: I have received two written
29 public comments since the beginning of this meeting.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

32

33 MS. PERRY: One from Becky Schwanke.
34 Again, her general comment I mentioned before. She
35 states: WP22-01 and WP22-02, I would ask that you
36 table these OSM proposals and defer to the proposer's
37 request which is WP22-36 to clarify their own requested
38 regulation. Again, that comment was from Becky
39 Schwanke.

40

41 The next comment was from Ahtna Tene
42 Nene' We support WP22-01 to clarify regulations
43 defining who participates in a community harvest
44 program are and to establish harvest regulations for
45 fish, wildlife, or shellfish of the participants in a
46 community harvest program. Defining participants and
47 harvest quota for a community harvest limit will
48 clarify regulations to allow community harvest programs
49 to move forward such as Ahtna InterTribal Resources

50

0307

1 Commission community harvest hunt for moose and caribou
2 so that those community hunts to not affect non-
3 participating residents. Also AITRC and Ahtna Tene
4 Nene' support this proposal, if enacted it would help
5 to extend the benefits of the Federal subsistence
6 hunting regulations to individuals who have connections
7 to the eight Ahtna villages but who do not currently
8 reside in them. If this proposal is passed someone
9 from one of these villages could harvest an animal on
10 behalf of another Federally-qualified user residing
11 elsewhere. For example, a resident of Gakona could
12 harvest a moose on behalf of an elderly relative living
13 in Glennallen. This would help facilitate the
14 continuation of traditional kinship relationships in
15 the harvest, processing and use of wildlife.

16

17 Again, those comments were from Ahtna
18 Tene Nene' and conclude the written public comments
19 received during this meeting. Thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
22 DeAnna. And I had asked for public testimony, once
23 again, is there anyone in the public wanting to
24 testify.

25

26 MR. SIMON: Yes, Mr. Chair.

27

28 MS. LINNELL: Yes, Sir.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Go ahead,
31 address this, and tell us who you are and go ahead.

32

33 MS. LINNELL: You can go first.

34

35 MR. SIMON: Yeah, this is Jim Simon
36 with the Ahtna InterTribal Resources Commission. And,
37 Karen, if you would like to go first that's fine with
38 me, you're the boss.

39

40 MS. LINNELL: Thank you. Thank you,
41 Mr. Chair. I just want to say that we're in support of
42 this proposal. I think it's going to clear up some
43 things. You know, we've struggled over four years to
44 get the community harvest system hunt going for our
45 eight villages and the residents who live within that
46 community harvest system -- or in that census
47 designated place. Those were the boundaries that were
48 the quickest to identify, it's not what we originally
49 wanted and as you know community has a lot more to do

50

0308

1 with the people and not a location, as far as customary
2 and traditional use and that type of thing. Those both
3 tribal and non-tribal citizens who are a part of a
4 community versus, you know, so that's one thing.

5
6 And then just to say that it was never
7 our intent to -- throughout this process we were
8 talking about our neighbors opting into our community
9 harvest system and the current regulations doesn't
10 allow for that, it's kind of they must or they don't
11 hunt, and this will rectify that for them so that they
12 can hunt. And I'm one of the folks that live outside
13 of the eight communities and while this isn't the fix
14 for everything, my dad does live in one of the eight
15 communities and as a participant of the community
16 harvest system I'm not eligible to hunt for him this
17 year because I don't live in one of those resident
18 zones, and that's fine with me, and that's fine with
19 him. Right now our goal is to rectify the situation
20 for those who wish -- who do not wish to participate in
21 the AITRC managed community harvest system, so that
22 they can get their permits from the BLM or the National
23 Park Service without any issues and report to the BLM
24 or the National Park Service as needed.

25
26 And just want to say, thanks again for
27 the opportunity to speak to this proposal.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Karen.
30 You want to speak, Jim, go ahead.

31
32 MR. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
33 Council members. Yeah, just to add to on to what Karen
34 just shared, this proposal and the next proposal, WP22-
35 02, both came to light throughout the time period that
36 Ahtna InterTribal Resources Commission was in
37 negotiations with OSM and the Solicitor's office, et
38 cetera, to establish the framework for the Ahtna
39 InterTribal administered community hunt for moose and
40 caribou in the traditional use territory of the Ahtna
41 people. And, in that, the eight tribes, and through
42 their commission, has wanted to ensure that
43 establishing this community harvest system would not
44 impact others. You know, one of the things that's
45 important to understand about this and how it differs
46 from other Federal community harvest systems across the
47 state is like the Ahtna people are like a third or less
48 of the Federally-qualified users living within their
49 traditional use territory, so there was always a clear
50

0309

1 intention in establishing this community hunt to not
2 affect those who may not wish to participate.

3

4

5 And just some additional background,
6 you know, rural subsistence studies across the state
7 have long established that on average in rural
8 communities, 30 percent of a households of a community
9 harvest 70 percent of the resources for that community
10 and so the community harvest system, as you all
11 probably recall from the years it's taken, and it's
12 been before your Council to support this development,
13 is that now people don't need a Federal designated
14 hunter permit if they've registered for the community
15 harvest system in order to have someone else in the
16 community harvest a moose or caribou for them. So that
17 is why Federal community harvest systems exist.

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

And some of the other written public
comments that you've received on this and the second
proposal seem to be somewhat confused. This doesn't
really have anything to do with the next proposal,
WP22-36. This is just to ensure that Becky and others
who don't want to participate in the community harvest
system can continue to hunt with their individual
Federal harvest permits and their bag limits. So this
proposal addresses the bag limits, the next proposal
will ensure, No. 2, will ensure that someone who
doesn't want to participate in the community harvest
system can have someone use the Federal designated
hunter permit to harvest on their behalf.

So thank you and I'd be happy to answer
any questions if there are any, thanks.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Jim.
Any questions for Jim on that.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I think
that was pretty thorough, pretty good. Okay. We've
had all the public testimony, I don't hear any more.
Anyone -- we'll go ahead and go to the Regional
Council's recommendations.

MS. STICKWAN: I move to adopt WP22-01.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
Gloria. Motion to adopt, is there a second.

0310

1 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Andy, second.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Andy.

4 Okay, it's been moved and seconded to adopt 22-01.

5 We're open for discussion for the Council. Anyone that

6 wants to address it from the Council go right ahead.

7

8 MS. STICKWAN: First of all I just want

9 to say that, you know, when these proposals are

10 written, before they're written for the community

11 harvest system, they should be working with AITRC to do

12 these proposals jointly so it will be less confusing

13 for the public. It makes it easier by starting with

14 this one first, but we started with 36 first at

15 Wrangell-St. Elias and we were confused because it

16 started -- if we would have started with this one first

17 it might have made it easier for us to understand, but

18 I just think OSM should be working with AITRC when they

19 write proposals to make it less confusing. I just want

20 to say I support this because it'll clarify on the

21 record that people can still get their harvest limits

22 whether they're in the community hunt or not and

23 provide for subsistence needs. And the Ahtna people,

24 or anybody who wants to sign up for the community hunt

25 can sign up, and if they choose not to, they don't have

26 to. They can still hunt under the Federal hunt.

27

28 So it just provides more opportunity

29 for Ahtna to continue our customary and traditional

30 ways of hunting to provide for our subsistence needs.

31

32 Thank you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you,

35 Gloria. Anyone else on the Council.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You want to call

40 the ques.....

41

42 MS. CAMINER: This is Judy.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy.

45

46 MS. CAMINER: I was just going to say I

47 thought this was a really thorough analysis and

48 presentation and I'd be supporting it.

49

50

0311

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Correct, thank
2 you. Anyone else.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Does someone want
7 to call the question and we'll take a vote.

8
9 MS. STICKWAN: Question.

10
11 MR. OPHEIM: Michael will call the
12 question.

13
14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
15 Michael. All in favor of WP22-02 [sic] signify by
16 saying aye.

17
18 IN UNISON: Aye.

19
20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed
21 signify by saying nay.

22
23 (No opposing votes)

24
25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: The proposal
26 passes unanimous. We'll move on to the next one.
27 We'll move on to WP22-02, OSM, you coul.....

28
29 MS. KENNER: Good afternoon.

30
31 REPORTER: Hey, sorry, to interrupt Mr.
32 Chair. But I wanted to say that you just said WP02-02
33 and everybody voted and said aye, just so you're aware.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I thought we
36 voted on 1, okay, we're on No. 2, go ahead.

37
38 MS. KENNER: Okay, good afternoon and
39 members of the Council. The analysis for Wildlife
40 Proposal WP22-02 begins on Page 309 of your Council
41 books and, of course, it's on our -- at the Federal
42 Subsistence Management Program web page. And, again,
43 for the record my name is Pippa Kenner and I'm an
44 Anthropologist at the Office of Subsistence Management
45 in Anchorage.

46
47 So Proposal WP22-02 was submitted by
48 the Office of Subsistence Management and it requests to
49 clarify designated hunting regulations that currently
50

0312

1 prohibit the use of a designated hunter by a member of
2 a community operating under a community harvest system.

3
4 Earlier, we were just now talking about
5 community harvest system and now we're going to talk
6 about our designated hunter system. The current
7 designated hunter regulation is on Page 311 on your
8 Council books and just so you know what we're talking
9 about I'm going to read it to you. If you are a
10 Federally-qualified subsistence user you may designate
11 another Federally-qualified subsistence user to take
12 deer, moose and caribou on your behalf unless you are a
13 member of a community operating under community harvest
14 system. The designated hunter must obtain a designated
15 hunter permit and must return a completed harvest
16 report. The designated hunter may hunt for any number
17 of recipients but may have no more than two harvest
18 limits in his or her possession at any one time. And,
19 of course, underneath that are the unit specific
20 regulations, one of which is for Unit 6 in the
21 Southcentral Alaska region.

22
23 Now, what we're proposing is to simply
24 remove the language that says: unless you are a member
25 of a community operating under a community harvest
26 system.

27
28 And this is because if a person does
29 not register to participate in their community harvest
30 system, that person retains or still has an individual
31 harvest limit like for one moose and should be able to
32 designate that harvest limit to someone else to harvest
33 for them through the designated harvester system.

34
35 So the OSM preliminary conclusion is to
36 support the proposal. And also I want to point out you
37 are the fourth to operate -- to act on this proposal
38 because part of it is a general regulation that affects
39 all areas of the state. And so far three have taken
40 action, the Federal -- the Kodiak/Aleutians, Yukon
41 Kuskokwim Delta and Western Interior Alaska Council
42 supported the proposal, and, again, the Southeast
43 Alaska Council took no action primarily because they
44 ran out of time.

45
46 Thank you, Mr. Chair, that's the end of
47 my presentation.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Pippa.
50

0313

1 Is there any questions for her.

2

3

(No comments)

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: Okay. Hearing no questions, I'll check and see if Orville's done stretching. Orville, was there any consultation, tribes or ANCSA Corps.

MR. LIND: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. Orville Lind, Native Liaison for OSM. During the consultation held on August 19th there was a question about clarification on the designated hunter process from the village of Tazlina. And the OSM replied the clarification, that if you live in a community that has a community harvest system it prohibits the use of a designated hunter. And the other source came from TCC was in support of that. And that's all I have, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Orville, thank you. Questions for Orville on that.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Agency comments, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

MR. MULLIGAN: Hi, Mr. Chair, Ben Mulligan here. The Department, again, like 01, for 02 is taking no position at this time on this proposal. Thank you, Sir.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ben. Okay, anyone on the Federal side.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any tribal representatives want to speak to it.

MS. LINNELL: Yes, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Karen, is that you.

MS. LINNELL: Thank you. AITRC is in support of this. Again, this is to allow for folks who live in the communities, the eight tribal communities

0314

1 to be able to hunt or others who do not live in those
2 communities. It's not intended for -- like I said for
3 folks from Glennallen, like myself to be able to hunt
4 for a participant of the community harvest system but
5 those who chose not to participate in this community
6 harvest system should be able to have a designated
7 hunter to hunt for them, and that's the point of
8 clarification I want, this does not allow them to hunt
9 for a community harvest system participant it allows
10 them to hunt for those who are not participating in
11 that community harvest system.

12

13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Karen.
16 Okay, we'll go ahead and move on to advisory group
17 comments, is there any other Regional Advisory Councils
18 that spoke to this.

19

20 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I believe Pippa
21 has already stated the other Councils that have weighed
22 in so far.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Good
25 point, and the only one that didn't get to vote was
26 Southeast because they ran out of time it sounds like.
27 Okay. Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
32 Resource Commissions.

33

34 MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
35 This is Barbara Cellarius with a comment from the
36 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource
37 Commission. The SRC unanimously supported WP22-02 with
38 modification to authorize only residents of community
39 harvest system communities who opt not to participate
40 in the community harvest system to have a designated
41 hunter. With this modification community harvest
42 system participants would not be eligible for a
43 designated hunter under the Federal designated hunter
44 regulations. As Karen Linnell just explained, this
45 modification is consistent with the recommendation or
46 the intent of the Ahtna InterTribal Resources
47 Commission. This proposed change as modified would
48 allow people outside of a community harvest system to
49 have a designated hunter to meet their subsistence
50

0315

1 needs. This would be beneficial to subsistence users.

2

3 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, thank
6 you, Barbara. Okay. Summary of written public
7 comments.

8

9 MS. KENNER: There were not any. This
10 is Pippa. We received no written public comments
11 during the public comment period. Thank you, Mr.
12 Chair.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Pippa.
15 Public testimony, anyone want to testify to this one.

16

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

18

19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, DeAnna.

20

21 MS. PERRY: I'm just sharing one
22 comment, one written public comment that was received
23 during this meeting. That was from Becky Schwanke. In
24 addition to her broad comment mentioned earlier, her
25 specific comment on WP22-01 and 02. I would ask that
26 you table these OSM proposals and defer to the
27 proposer's request WP22-36 to clarify their own
28 requested regulation. That was the written by Becky
29 Schwanke, and the only one received on 20-02 [sic]
30 during the meeting.

31

32 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks,
35 DeAnna. Last call, any public testimony.

36

37 MR. SIMON: Yes, Mr. Chair, Jim Simon.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Jim.

40

41 MR. SIMON: Thank you. For the record
42 my name's Jim Simon. I'm a Consultant with the Ahtna
43 InterTribal Resources Commission. And I would like to
44 reference the testimony comments I provided on WP22-01.
45 And I would just like to add, hopefully, some
46 clarification of the issues that Karen Linnell and
47 Barbara have just mentioned.

48

49 The original proposal from OSM was

50

0316

1 shared with AITRCs Staff about this but one of the
2 things that wasn't -- we were not made aware of is that
3 this would allow someone who's registered in the
4 community harvest system to, rather than use a
5 community hunter of another registered hunter, but to
6 use a Federal designated hunter permit. And that was
7 not something that the Ahtna InterTribal Resources
8 Commission had sought. There were lots of discussions
9 during the negotiations of the community harvest system
10 framework to ensure that someone who is a resident in
11 one of the eight Ahtna tribal communities who wanted to
12 hunt for someone, an elder living outside of those
13 eight communities could be a Federal designated hunter
14 for them but the amendment that the Subsistence
15 Resource Commission from Wrangell-St. Elias made was to
16 keep that if you want to have someone else hunt for
17 you, if you are a community registrant, then that
18 hunter needs to be registered in the community harvest
19 system also.

20

21 Hopefully, as Gloria mentioned in her
22 comments on the previous proposal, hopefully in the
23 future there will be better coordination and
24 consultation in OSM Staff analysis' processes with
25 Ahtna InterTribal Resources Commission to make sure
26 that there aren't issues like this that crop up like
27 this in the future. This will also come up in the
28 discussions of WP22-36 where there is an OSM
29 modification to that proposal that would change the
30 months long negotiated community harvest system that
31 the Ahtna InterTribal Resources Commission does not
32 support. So -- but I will remind you all of that when
33 we get there.

34

35 Thank you very much.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Jim, I
38 don't know if it cleared it or made it a little -- but
39 I think we got it. So I'm going to go ahead and move
40 on to the Regional Council's recommendation to make a
41 motion and we'll go on from there and see what we need
42 to do, if we need to modify or amend. Would someone
43 like to make a motion to support and we'll start
44 deliberating.

45

46 MS. STICKWAN: I move to support WP22-
47 02.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Move to support

50

0317

1 22-02, Gloria, is there a second.

2

3 MS. NICKLIE: Paula, seconds.

4

5 MR. OPHEIM: Michael second.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I think Paula and
8 maybe Michael, maybe two seconds, I'm not sure. We do
9 have a second. And, DeAnna, you pick one. It's on the
10 table and let's go ahead and do some discussion on it
11 and make sure we got it clarified. There was some talk
12 of some modification there so I want to make sure we
13 don't have to vote on a modification first but it's
14 open for Council discussion.

15

16 MS. STICKWAN: I would like to see us
17 support Wrangell-St. Elias because they understand that
18 it's for those who don't participate in the community
19 hunt, have a designated hunter and those who do will be
20 able to have a hunter in the community harvest program.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks,
23 Gloria. DeAnna, could you help me out a bit here on
24 the clarification for that motion, it's to support 02,
25 and then Gloria just stated she wanted to support the
26 Wrangell-St. Elias, I think it was a modification, do
27 we need a separate motion.

28

29 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I do not have a
30 written copy of that Wrangell-St. Elias SRC
31 recommendation so I don't have that language in front
32 of me, I just have some rough notes and I would not be
33 confident in proffering that to the Council so I would
34 ask for Barbara to let us know. But the current motion
35 is to support and on Page 309 that's the proposal
36 requesting removing language from designated hunting
37 regulations prohibiting the use of a designated hunter
38 permit by a member of a community operating under a
39 community harvest system. That is the current motion
40 to support on the floor. If a modification wants to be
41 made, again, to reflect what Wrangell-St. Elias
42 Subsistence Resource Commission came up with, then,
43 yes, we would need a motion to amend the current motion
44 on the floor.

45

46 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
49 DeAnna. Is that clear to the Council there so if you

50

0318

1 were to -- Gloria, Ahtna -- Gloria, to follow the
2 intent of the SRC then we may have to vote on an
3 amended one first. Did I confuse you or do you want to
4 just stick with 22-02 as is.

5
6 MS. STICKWAN: 02 as is is less
7 confusing.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well,
10 that's the motion on the table, any other Council
11 members want to talk to it.

12
13 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, this is Michael.
14 I'll be supporting this. It gives opportunity for more
15 hunting and hopefully getting some people out getting
16 meat in the freezer. So I'll be supporting this.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
19 Michael. Anyone else.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, if
24 anyone wants to call the question we'll take it to a
25 vote.

26
27 MR. WHISSEL: Call the question.

28
29 MR. OPHEIM: Call the question.

30
31 MS. SELANOFF: This is Diane, question.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question was
34 called by John. All those in favor of the proposal 22-
35 02 as presented signify by saying aye.

36
37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38
39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed say
40 nay.

41
42 (No opposing votes)

43
44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, the
45 proposal carries. We'll move on now to Proposal WP22-36
46 establish community hunt in Unit 12, modify community
47 hunts in Unit 11 and 13. And, OSM, we'll let you
48 present that one, Pippa.

49
50

0319

1 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
2 just have a quick question, can somebody remind me what
3 that amendment was -- I was busy doing -- I was busy
4 doing something but now I'm being told there was no --
5 there -- was there no amendment to that motion or that
6 proposal?

7
8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We did not --
9 yeah, we did not amend it.

10

11 MS. KENNER: Okay, thank you. Great.
12 All right. So moving on. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
13 Members of the Council. The analysis for Wildlife
14 Proposal WP22-36 begins on Page 266 of your Council
15 books that were sent to you and of course it's always
16 at our web page. And for the record my name is Pippa
17 Kenner and I'm an Anthropologist at the Office of
18 Subsistence Management here in Anchorage.

19

20 So this proposal, WP22-36, was
21 submitted by the Ahtna InterTribal Resources Commission
22 or AITRC, and requests to codify temporary regulations
23 that expire June 30th, 2022, regarding the community
24 harvest system for moose and caribou in Units 11, 12
25 and 13. And I'm going to have to leave the Zoom
26 meeting so I can have all my files open, just a minute
27 please. There we go. All right.

28

29 So AITRC states that these proposed
30 changes are necessary to fully implement the AITRC
31 administered community harvest system for caribou and
32 moose in Units 11, 12 and 13. The proponent
33 additionally states that these community harvest
34 systems are a management partnership between the
35 Federal government and the Federally-recognized tribes
36 of the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory.

37

38 I want to explain to you what these
39 regulations would do. So on Pages 267 and 268 of your
40 Council book are regulations the Board adopted in April
41 2020 regarding the community harvest system in Unit 11
42 for moose and Unit 13 for moose and caribou.

43

44 Now moving on to the proposed
45 regulation on Pages 268 and 269 of your Council book is
46 a regulation proposed to you today. The proposed
47 regulation encompasses these temporary special actions
48 that are in effect through June 30th, 2022. These
49 temporary regulations were adopted by the Board in

50

1 January 2021. These are the regulations that are the
2 focus of this analysis. The proposed regulation in
3 this proposal have been brought to you after extensive
4 work by AITRC and agency Staff and these changes are
5 fully supported by OSM. Specifically, Proposal WP22-36
6 would codify these temporary regulations to allow
7 community members to opt out of the community harvest
8 system, thereby, retaining their individual harvest
9 limits; allow designated hunters as part of the
10 community harvest system; define the geographic
11 boundaries of eligible communities as the most recent
12 census designated places established by the U.S. Census
13 Bureau; specify that harvest reporting will take the
14 form of reports collected from hunters by AITRC and
15 submitted directly to the land managers and the Office
16 of Subsistence Management, rather than through Federal
17 registration permits, joint State/Federal registration
18 permits or State harvest tickets; it would set the
19 harvest quota for the species and units authorized in
20 the community harvest system as the sum of the
21 individual harvest limit for those opting to
22 participate in the system; and it would add moose and
23 caribou in Unit 12 to the community harvest system.

24
25 If this proposal is not adopted then
26 these temporary regulations describing the community
27 harvest system in Units 11, 12 and 13 for moose and
28 caribou will expire on June 30th, 2022. These
29 provisions clarify the intent of the Board. If not
30 adopted this will lead to confusion when AITRC and
31 Federal managers try to use this community harvest
32 system that's in regulation. Additionally, community
33 harvest systems for moose and caribou in Unit 12 will
34 not be added to codified regulations.

35
36 So once again I want to repeat that the
37 OSM preliminary conclusion is to support the proposal,
38 but we also want to do a modification. These
39 modifications are to move two things out of these
40 regulations into the community harvest framework. And
41 the community harvest framework is in the appendix of
42 the analysis, and it describes the details of how this
43 community harvest system will be implemented by AITRC
44 and the Federal Subsistence Board. The first thing
45 we'd like to move to the framework is the statement:
46 Animals taken by those opting to participate in this
47 community harvest system do not count towards the
48 harvest limits of any individuals who do not opt to
49 participate in this community harvest system. The
50

0321

1 second item is; designated hunters are authorized in
2 this community harvest system. We believe that these
3 two statements are more appropriately addressed in the
4 community harvest framework. And so OSM recommends
5 that the Council additionally approve changes to the
6 community harvest system framework that reflect this
7 conclusion. The existing Board approved community
8 harvest system framework, again, is in Appendix 1, and
9 it's at the end of the analysis.

10

11 So these regulation changes are
12 necessary to enable AITRC and Federal managers to fully
13 and effectively implement this community harvest system
14 on a long-term basis. These proposed regulation so
15 have already been approved by the Board in temporary
16 regulations through June 30th, 2022, when they will
17 expire. The Board should acknowledge these efforts by
18 adopting these changes into codified regulations.

19

20 Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the
21 Council, that's the end of my presentation. And I am
22 prepared to answer any questions you might have.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that's the
25 presentation, probably some questions. I'm going to
26 open it up, questions for Pippa on the analysis,
27 presentation, the appendix and the modifications and
28 the whole nine yards, so anyone with questions go
29 ahead.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, maybe the
34 questions will come later but thank you, Pippa, we'll
35 see where we're at. Thank you.

36

37 MS. KENNER: You're welcome, Mr. Chair,
38 thank you.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Report on
41 Board consultation, Orville, did you have any
42 consultation from the tribes or ANCSA Corps.

43

44 MR. LIND: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
45 Board members. We did not have any questions or
46 comments no this proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
49 Orville. Agency comments, Alaska Department of Fish

50

0322

1 and Game.

2

3 MR. MULLIGAN: Hi, Mr. Chair. For the
4 record, Ben Mulligan, again. At this time the
5 Department has no comments on this proposal. Thank
6 you.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ben.
9 How about on the Federal side, anyone want to comment,
10 questions.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, how
15 about tribal representatives, anyone like to address
16 comments under agency.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We'll move
21 on to.....

22

23 MS. LINNELL: I'm sorry, was that for
24 -- sorry, was that for tribal comments?

25

26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, it was,
27 Karen, I was waiting for you and I thought maybe you
28 were just going to let 'er go but you're up.....

29

30 MS. LINNELL: No, no, no.....

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:if you want
33 to talk.

34

35 MS. LINNELL:no.....

36

37 (Laughter)

38

39 MS. LINNELL: I wish, right. There is
40 some changes in the framework that I don't agree with
41 and that is to No. 16, saying whether or not they
42 register for the community harvest system, they can
43 designate someone to harvest for them. The community
44 harvest participants should be the only ones hunting
45 for other community harvest participants, not a
46 Federally-registered designated hunter from an outside
47 community coming into those communities to harvest for
48 those folks. That kind of defeats the purpose of the
49 community harvest system. And then, again, you know, I
50

1 wish OSM and their Staff would have contracted AITRC in
2 regards to their comments on this since it was our
3 proposal outside of tribal consultation. We've had
4 some things happening through this, as far as
5 communications, and getting information out, there
6 seems to be a breakdown there and so I just want to
7 raise that. And then I -- the framework was already
8 adopted and should be left alone until another time.
9 It was not AITRC's desire to have the census designated
10 places as locations for these communities but it was a
11 readily available defined map that was available at
12 that time. You know, through negotiations, after --
13 you know trying to get this on the books, the framework
14 has been adopted, let's go with that, I'd say, you
15 know, that there's some modifications in that framework
16 this -- by adopting this and the attachment, you're
17 changing my framework that -- that's something
18 different, you know, for this community harvest system
19 and that wasn't brought forward to AITRC for comment at
20 that time.

21
22 As far as, you know, the rest of it and
23 clearing it up, I do have a modification that I would
24 like to make and that is a clarification first. That
25 Units 11 and 13 are already on the books, this will not
26 affect that. This is to include the portions of GMU
27 Unit 12 that lies within the Ahtna Traditional
28 Territories, and I want to make that clear. That's the
29 modification that I would like to see. The map is in
30 your -- in your handout on Page 276 of the Ahtna
31 Traditional Use Territory, and it would be those
32 portions of GMU 12 that lie within that green shaded
33 area of the Ahtna Traditional Territory. And that's
34 the modification that I would like to offer up for the --
35 and that's all I have, I believe. So, I.....

36
37 MS. KENNER: Karen.....

38
39 MS. LINNELL: Thank you.

40
41 MS. KENNER:Ms. Linnell, when
42 you're done, this is Pippa Kenner with OSM and if you
43 don't mind could I respond to some of your comments.

44
45 MS. LINNELL: Sure.

46
47 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Ms. Linnell,
48 through the Chair. OSM fully supports the AITRC
49 proposal and not moving two items into the framework
50

0324

1 and leaving them in regulation as the proposal was
2 written is supported by OSM. So OSM would like to
3 support the proposal as written by AITRC and submitted
4 by AITRC.

5

6 MS. LINNELL: On the comments, it says
7 support 22-36 with modification to modify and clarify
8 regulatory language, see Page 279, right, that's the
9 OSM.....

10

11 MS. KENNER: Yeah, we wanted to move
12 two items into the framework, where the framework talks
13 about permitting and about the registration system but
14 it is no problem to us if these two items remain in
15 regulation. The two items are designated hunters are
16 authorized in this community harvest system and animals
17 may be taken by those opting to participate in this
18 community harvest system but they do not count towards
19 the harvest limits of any individuals who do not opt to
20 participate in this community harvest system. Those
21 two items.....

22

23 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair.....

24

25 MS. KENNER:that in the
26 conclusion we suggest moving into the framework would
27 be fine if left in the regulation. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

30

31 MS. LINNELL: Okay. Okay, so.....

32

33 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this
34 is Lisa.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Pardon.

37

38 MS. GREDIAGIN: This is Lisa, I'm sorry
39 I just need to clarify a few things Pippa said.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

42

43 MS. GREDIAGIN: The OSM modification is
44 not to move anything into the framework, the framework
45 is not changing at all by this proposal. It was just
46 included in the analysis for reference. The two items
47 that Pippa mentioned are being addressed through 22-01
48 and 22-02, so the reason OSM took that out of the
49 proposed regulation in 22-36 is because they're being
50

0325

1 addressed in a different way through 22-01 and 02, so
2 they just didn't need to be in 22-36 regulations
3 because it would be redundant.

4

5 MS. LINNELL: Okay.

6

7 MS. GREDIAGIN: So, sorry, I just
8 wanted to clarify. I thought there was a little
9 confusion about putting things in the framework.
10 Thanks.

11

12 MS. LINNELL: Okay, thank you so much
13 for that clarification, Lisa. But again I'd like to
14 offer an amendment, or request an amendment to this be
15 that GMU -- those portions of GMU 12 that lie within
16 the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory. And then if I
17 might, Mr. Chair, ask Jim Simon add to my comments
18 please.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

21

22 MR. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For
23 the record my name is Jim Simon, I'm a Consultant with
24 the Ahtna InterTribal Resources Commission.

25

26 It's very unfortunate that this has
27 become so complicated. The OSM Staff analysis has
28 provided some inaccurate information which is
29 concerning and, again, speaks to perhaps some changes
30 to be able to work with proponents. I know that OSM
31 often contacts proponents when they're modifying
32 proposals, et cetera. But the first inaccuracy that
33 I'd like to correct that Karen already briefly
34 mentioned is that the community harvest system
35 administered by AITRC in Units 11, 12 and 13 expire on
36 June 30th, 2022. That is incorrect. The only
37 temporary special action currently in place addresses
38 those portions of Unit 12 within the Ahtna Traditional
39 Use Territory. With the passage by the Federal
40 Subsistence Board of deferred Wildlife Proposal 18-19
41 in April of 2020, the community harvest system for
42 moose in Units 11 and 13, and caribou in Unit 13 were,
43 are already in permanent regulations and will not
44 expire June 30th, 2022.

45

46 That's the biggest issue. The other
47 issue that Lisa just mentioned, the Staff analysis does
48 say the modification to framework, Item 16, on Page 278
49 could read: and then changes to the community harvest

50

0326

1 system framework that the Federal Subsistence Board
2 approved and finalized in January of 2021.

3
4 It is my understanding that that
5 framework does not get put into codified regulations,
6 which I believe was another inaccuracy within the Staff
7 analysis presented to you.

8
9 So I encourage you to adopt this
10 proposal with the modifications that Karen Linnell, the
11 Executive Director of the Ahtna InterTribal Resources
12 Commission requested to not change the long, like four
13 months negotiated community harvest system framework,
14 that actually took longer, years, to actually make
15 happen and that any proposed changes by OSM to that
16 community harvest framework needs to involve the people
17 affected by those modifications, being the Ahtna
18 InterTribal Resources Commission.

19
20 Thank you, very much.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Jim.
23 Yeah, it's unfortunate that we couldn't sort it out, if
24 you look at it from our Council perspective, we're put
25 in kind of a precarious position to figure out all the
26 changes you want back and forth and where to go. My
27 understanding now, the clarification is, that Karen
28 would like Game Management Unit 12 to be the
29 modification within their area, within the Ahtna area
30 and also no changes to the framework, and then I think
31 we would be good, I hope I'm correct on that.

32
33 MS. LINNELL: Yes, Sir.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: But we'll go
36 ahead -- okay. If I'm correct on that we'll go.....

37
38 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair, this is Pippa
39 Kenner with OSM and I'm working right now on drafting
40 the amendment brought up by Ms. Linnell, thank you.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
43 If you'll get that to us by the time we get there
44 that'd be great. Okay, thank you, I hope we got it
45 straightened out. We're going to go ahead and move on
46 to advisory group comments. Any other Regional
47 Advisory Councils there.

48
49 MS. PERRY: No, Mr. Chair, not that I
50

0327

1 have heard of yet.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
4 Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
9 Resource Commission, Barbara.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No one there.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

18

19 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I do believe
20 Wrangell-St. Elias SRC did comment on this. And it
21 looks like Barbara may have to be calling back, she
22 might have gotten dropped.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Yeah, I
25 was sure she was going to comment, so anyway.

26

27 MS. CELLARIUS: This is Barbara, Mr.
28 Chair, I got -- my phone did something very strange.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That happens.

31

32 MS. CELLARIUS: But I am back, I didn't
33 have to redial, I was worried I'd have to redial and
34 all those numbers.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well,
37 we're to the point for you to give your Commission's
38 comments.

39

40 MS. CELLARIUS: Great. The Wrangell-St.
41 Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission
42 supported WP22-36 with the OSM modification plus an
43 additional modification to limit the land in Unit 12 to
44 that portion of Unit 12 within the Ahtna Traditional
45 Use Territory. The modification was recommended by a
46 representative of the Ahtna InterTribal Resources
47 Commission. And just to speak to the OSM modification
48 and the Commission's understanding of what that was.
49 When I -- the understanding that I had and shared with
50

0328

1 them was that the designated hunter issue and the non-
2 participant/participant community harvest limit issue
3 were addressed by Proposals 1 and 2, and so that was my
4 understanding of the OSM modification is that those two
5 issues were addressed elsewhere.

6
7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

8
9 MS. CELLARIUS: Okay, I'll stop there
10 that's the comment.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. That
13 sounds good. Okay, how about a summary of written
14 public comments.

15
16 (No comments)

17
18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: DeAnna, you got
19 any public comments.

20
21 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I believe that
22 Pippa is busy working on the language but I see here
23 that no public comments were received during the
24 written public comment period when the proposal book
25 was published.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

28
29 MS. KENNER: Thank you, DeAnna, this is
30 Pippa. And, Mr. Chair, if you're ready to move on to
31 public testimony I do have two written public comments
32 that I have received during this meeting.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I was ready, but
35 I thought Pippa chimed in so I was waiting but it's
36 okay, yes, go to the public testimony and you go ahead
37 and.....

38
39 MS. PERRY: Okay.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:read your
42 written public comments.

43
44 MS. PERRY: Great, thank you, Mr.
45 Chair. Again, Becky Schwanke did offer some general
46 broad comments over all of these proposals. And her
47 specific comment on this proposal, WP22-36 is: I would
48 like to see a simpler alternative to this unnecessarily
49 complex community harvest program work to allow
50

0329

1 community members an efficient way to harvest game for
2 others by addressing statewide designated harvest
3 regulations and please consider supporting area
4 specific community hunts. If you do choose to continue
5 with this hunt I fully support ensuring separation
6 between those who wish to participate and those that
7 don't. Harvesting wild game for others is a
8 longstanding tradition in this area and across our
9 state. Please help ensure our local hunters can
10 continue to do this whether they're participating in a
11 community hunt or not. Again, that was the written
12 public comment from Becky Schwanke.

13

14 And I also have a comment from Ahtna
15 Tene Nene' stating AITRC and Ahtna Tene Nene' strongly
16 supports this proposal, which would make permanent the
17 community harvest system passed by the Federal
18 Subsistence Board in WP18-19. It would also make
19 permanent all temporary and emergency special actions
20 to be able to include Unit 12 as part of the community
21 harvest system. AITRC worked for years to implement
22 this system and ensure it met all Federal regulatory
23 and statutory requirements. We believe the community
24 harvest system will open up greater harvest
25 opportunities for all residents of the eight Ahtna
26 villages, both tribal and non-tribal and we want to
27 ensure that it becomes codified and made permanent.
28 That was the written public comment received from Ahtna
29 Tene Nene' during this meeting.

30

31 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

32

33 (Pause)

34

35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

36

37 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, you may.....

38

39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Pippa, is that
40 you?

41

42 MS. PERRY: No, it's DeAnna. I just
43 wanted to bring to your attention that Pippa does have
44 some suggested language that she's placed in the
45 meeting chat on Teams but I know not everyone has
46 access to that.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No, we don't
49 so.....

50

0330

1 MS. PERRY: But do you want it read
2 into the record.

3
4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, if you could
5 read it into the record before we do our Regional
6 Council recommendation, I would like.....

7
8 MS. KENNER: DeAnna, may I.....

9
10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:that so
11 folks.....

12
13 MS. KENNER:may I make a
14 statement about.....

15
16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:could use
17 that if they choose.....

18
19 MS. KENNER:that first please.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Sure, who's this?

22
23 MS. KENNER: Oh, I'm sorry, this is
24 Pippa.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Go ahead,.

27
28 MS. KENNER: Okay. So we're -- Staff
29 are wavering between that portion of Unit 12 within the
30 Ahtna Traditional Use Territory. I'm seeking advice if
31 that is precise enough. I would like to ask AITRC
32 representatives if the language that includes Pickerel
33 Lake is the language that they're looking for or is
34 that not? That would be Unit 12, that portion within
35 the Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge and those lands
36 within the Wrangell-St. Elias National Preserve north
37 and east of a line formed by the Pickerel Lake winter
38 trail from the Canadian border to Pickerel Lake; in
39 Unit 12, that portion east of the Nabesna River and
40 Nabesna Glacier and south of the winter trail running
41 southeast from Pickerel Lake to the Canadian border.

42
43 Does that language work for AITRC or no?

44
45 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair.

46
47 MS. LINNELL: Why do you need to make
48 it so complicated when you have a map and you have the
49 GIS files, the KMZ files and everything for it already
50

0331

1 and it's on the map that you've provided to the
2 Commission. As far as -- it doesn't need to be,
3 because in your Handy Book do you, is it in the
4 regulations defining it that specific or you do it
5 based on mapping?

6
7 MS. KENNER: Thank you for the
8 question, Ms. Linnell. Through the Chair, this is
9 Pippa. Yeah, Karen, it is in the handy -- it is in
10 regulation but also I just received direction that we
11 can just say within the Ahtna Traditional Territory and
12 we can have additional conversations with you if exact
13 descriptors are needed. So for now we can just go
14 ahead with Ahtna Traditional Territory in Unit 12.

15
16 MS. LINNELL: Yeah, Ahtna Traditional
17 Territory, thank you.

18
19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, now you're
20 talking. Okay, you want to read it now.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We need that
25 language read to us or we're going to go ahead and move
26 on to our Council recommendation.

27
28 MS. STICKWAN: Thank you, Karen.

29
30 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this
31 is Lisa. And I think the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC
32 recommendation addresses Karen's concerns and their
33 recommendation is to support WP22-36 with the OSM
34 modification, but also the additional modification to
35 limit the land in Unit 12 to that portion of Unit 12
36 within the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory. So if that
37 sounds good, you could just say support with the
38 Wrangell-St. Elias SRC modification.

39
40 MS. LINNELL: No, because the OSM
41 recommendation is to modify the framework and I'm not
42 willing to address that at this point. I think that it
43 should be that you adopt 22-36 as written with the
44 modification to be GMU 12, that falls within the Ahtna
45 Traditional Use Territory.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

48
49 MS. GREGIAGIN: Mr. Chair, this is
50

0332

1 Lisa. I'd just like to clarify that the OSM
2 modification does not modify the framework at all.
3 Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Then we shouldn't
6 need in there, I guess, I'll go with Karen's.

7

8 MS. LINNELL: That's not what the
9 comments say in the recommendations from OSM, in their
10 conclusions. And I just want clarification and on the
11 record that this does not modify the framework. Thank
12 you.

13

14 MS. KENNER: Yeah, thanks, this is
15 Pippa, through the Chair. Karen, I think we should go
16 back -- I think we should not look at the OSM
17 conclusion. I think what you're saying is you want to
18 adopt the proposal as written with one modification, to
19 specify where in Unit 12 these regulations apply.
20 Nothing else will change. Thank you.

21

22 MS. LINNELL: Yes, Ma'am, thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Then
25 we'll.....

26

27 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this.....

28

29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Mr. Chair
30 is listening, go ahead.

31

32 MS. PERRY: I wondered if maybe I could
33 just throw some language out there because I think
34 we're really talking all around it. So I'm just going
35 to give it a stab and we'll see what folks want to say.

36

37 So as I understand it, before this
38 Council, they can support Proposal WP22-36 which
39 requests to codified temporary regulations that expire
40 June 30th, 2022 regarding the community harvest system
41 for moose and caribou in Units 11 and 13 and that land
42 in Unit 12 lying in the Ahtna Traditional Use
43 Territory.

44

45 I believe I've captured what the intent
46 of all parties has been so I'm just throwing that out
47 there to try to clarify and keep us going.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

50

0333

1 MS. LINNELL: You've almost got it.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You almost got
4 it.

5

6 MS. LINNELL: Almost got it.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You made it a
9 little more complicated than I would.

10

11 MS. LINNELL: No, 11 and 13 are already
12 in permanent regulation, it's just that portion of GMU
13 12 that's temporary.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Exactly.

16

17 MS. PERRY: Okay. And I guess
18 when.....

19

20 MS. KENNER: DeAnna, this is Pippa.

21

22 MS. PERRY:I read the.....

23

24 MS. KENNER: So I'm sorry, Ms. Linnell,
25 through the Chair. Much of this language is not yet in
26 permanent regulations. We have a basic structure in
27 permanent regulations. Okay, I am trying to get to
28 this so I can read it.

29

30 MS. LINNELL: I would concede to the
31 recorder's comments and say that that will work, thank
32 you.

33

34 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna,
35 and just for clarification. I was taking the
36 instruction that the support was for the proposal as
37 written, so that's what I was reading into the record,
38 and it does say Units 11, 12 and 13, but I put in there
39 the modification for the land lying within Ahtna
40 Traditional Use Territory in Unit 12.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That, I believe,
43 is okay, is that okay, Karen?

44

45 MS. LINNELL: Yes, Sir, thank you so
46 much.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We're
49 going to go with that and that's it. Okay, we're going
50

0334

1 to go to the Regional Council's recommendation, a
2 motion to support. You all just heard the motion and
3 we could get DeAnna or whoever to restate it but it's
4 pretty simple, we're supporting the motion with the
5 Unit 12 within the Ahtna Traditional Use area and
6 that's what we're working on. Discussion, I'd take a
7 motion to put that on the table.

8

9 MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael. I'll
10 make that motion to put it on the table.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
13 Michael. Is there a second.

14

15 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Second, Andy.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Andy, thank you.
18 Okay, the motion's been made, it's made by Michael and
19 seconded by Andy. It's on the table, we've went
20 through the clarification on it, we got a rewrite and a
21 couple other rewrites but we got a final one that
22 sounds the -- the latest we just read and that was okay
23 with all of us, I believe. So is there any
24 discussions, anyone want to talk to it before we take a
25 vote.

26

27 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to say I
28 support the motion as it was changed. I believe that
29 this will satisfy AITRC's position and it will provide
30 for customary and traditional use of moose and caribou
31 in Unit 11 -- I mean it will provide for resources for
32 Unit 11, 12 and 13 according to our customary and
33 traditional use of the area in the Ahtna Traditional
34 Territory.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
37 Gloria. Okay, anyone else.

38

39 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Question.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's been
42 called for. All in favor as the reading we last read
43 for the motion as we made it, signify by saying aye.

44

45 IN UNISON: Aye.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Is there
48 -- signify by saying nay on any of those opposed.

49

50

0335

1 (No opposing votes)

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: Okay, it passed and I hope we got the wording right, if not, write it the way we need it and then we'll be fine. Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy.

MS. CAMINER: I just want to congratulate AITRC you've been working on these concepts and ideas and proposals for so long, well, you finally have made a lot of progress and achievements. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, and I.....

MS. LINNELL: Thank you, Judy.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I thank all the Council for being patient to work through this issue, too, it took quite a few turns and bumps but I'm very glad it's going to work out here.

We're going to move on, we got to keep moving, we got a lot to go yet. So, No. C is next, individual customary and traditional proposal, ICTP 21-22, request individual C&T for salmon submitted by Martin.

MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, I'll turn my camera on just for a minute so you can see me. This is Barbara Cellarius, I'm the Subsistence Coordinator for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. And I'm going to turn my camera off so I can focus on the phone and you can hear me better.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

MS. CELLARIUS: I'll be doing the presentation.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.

MS. CELLARIUS: So for the record my name is Barbara Cellarius, I'm the Subsistence Coordinator for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. I will be presenting an overview of the

1 analysis conducted for customary and traditional use
2 determination proposal, ICTP 21-02. You can find the
3 full analysis on Page 327 of your meeting book.

4

5 Federal subsistence regulations allow
6 the Board to make individual customary and traditional
7 use determinations in NPS managed National Parks and
8 Monuments where subsistence is authorized but not in
9 National Preserves. As you likely recall the Federal
10 Board revised its policy on individual C&T
11 determinations at its January 2021 meeting and after
12 that you considered an individual C&T request for some
13 members of the Mayo family. Under the new policy
14 proposals can be submitted at any time and the Board
15 will act on the request at the first public meeting
16 following receipt of the recommendations from the
17 affected Regional Councils and the Subsistence Resource
18 Commission. So this is an action item for you today,
19 and for Eastern Interior this week as well.

20

21 As mentioned earlier in the meeting
22 analysis of C&T requests considers the eight factors in
23 evaluating customary and traditional use although the
24 factors are treated holistically rather than as a
25 checklist. This also applies to individual C&T
26 requests.

27

28 On March 9th, 2021 the Park received a
29 request from Kathryn Martin for an individual customary
30 and traditional use determination for salmon in the
31 Batzulnetas area of the Prince William Sound -- of the
32 Copper River drainage, Prince William Sound area. The
33 map on Page 329 of the meeting book shows the location
34 of Batzulnetas off of Nabesna Road in the far northwest
35 corner of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park.

36

37 In brief, Kathryn is the granddaughter
38 of subsistence rights advocate Katie John and
39 Batzulnetas is the site of her grandmother's
40 traditional fish camp at the headwaters of the Copper
41 River. Kathryn grew up in Mentasta Lake village which
42 has a customary and traditional use determination for
43 salmon in the Batzulnetas area and she began harvesting
44 resources at Batzulnetas in 1992. In 2005 she moved
45 away from Mentasta for employment and consequently lost
46 her eligibility to fish for salmon at Batzulnetas. She
47 currently lives in Tazlina, which is a rural community
48 on the Copper River and a resident zone community for
49 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park but it doesn't have
50

0337

1 C&T for salmon at Batzulnetas.

2

3 If approved, this individual C&T would
4 allow Kathryn to resume harvesting salmon at the
5 traditional site where her family has fished for
6 generations.

7

8 So to give you a little more background
9 on the location and her history of harvesting resources
10 there. Batzulnetas is an important traditional salmon
11 fishing site at the headwaters of the Copper River.
12 It's important for salmon fishing as reflected in the
13 traditional Ahtna name for one of the three named
14 localities now collectively known as Batzulnetas,
15 Roasted Salmon place refers to a specialty prepared by
16 the men of the village. The Batzulnetas area was
17 occupied until the 1940 when the occupants relocated so
18 their children could attend school but they continued
19 to fish at Batzulnetas. Kathryn Martin's family has
20 fished for salmon and harvested other subsistence
21 resources at Batzulnetas for many generations including
22 her great-grandfather Charlie Sanford, her grandmother
23 Katie John and her mother Eva John. Their ability to
24 fish at this site was disrupted by a State of Alaska
25 regulation that went into effect in 1964 that
26 prohibited subsistence fishing on the Copper River
27 tributaries and on the mainstem of the Copper River
28 above the mouth of the Slana River. Fishing
29 subsequently resumed following a series of lawsuits in
30 which Kathryn's grandmother, Katie John, was the lead
31 plaintiff. In addition to fishing for salmon Ms.
32 Martin has harvested moose, berries, firewood, roots
33 and steambath rocks in the Batzulnetas area. Salmon
34 are harvested using a fishwheel and a dipnet,
35 subsistence harvest methods characterized by efficiency
36 and economy of effort. Ms. Martin preserves the salmon
37 which she currently harvests using a family member's
38 fishwheel in the Tazlina area for future use by her
39 family and other family members by drying, jarring, and
40 freezing and she shares with family members who aren't
41 able to harvest or preserve salmon themselves. She
42 also makes stinkhead, which is a traditional fermented
43 fishhead that isn't really made anymore. Kathryn
44 learned fishing skills and values from her
45 grandparents, Katie and Fred John, her aunt Ruth Hicks,
46 and her great uncle Houston Sanford. She shares what
47 she knows about preserving salmon with her family,
48 including her children, nieces, nephews and
49 grandchildren as well as others who want to learn by
50

0338

1 taking them with her to harvest, process and put away
2 the fish. An important venue for sharing knowledge is
3 the annual Batzulnetas Culture Camp which takes place
4 at her grandmother's Native allotment at Batzulnetas.

5

6 If adopted, this proposal would
7 recognize Kathryn Martin's traditional customary and
8 traditional use of salmon at Batzulnetas and allow her
9 to resume fishing at a site where her family has fished
10 for generations.

11

12 Because this customary and traditional
13 use determination is for a single individual, the
14 effects on other users should be minimal.

15

16 The NPS preliminary conclusion is to
17 support the proposal. Ms. Martin exhibits a long-term
18 pattern of use of salmon at Batzulnetas. This pattern
19 has been repeated for many generations and -- repeated
20 for many years and through several generations.
21 Methods and means of harvest are characterized by
22 efficiency and economy of effort. Knowledge of
23 handling, preparing and preserving salmon is shared
24 among and between generations. Salmon is regularly
25 shared. The eight factors associated with determining
26 customary and traditional uses are evident. For these
27 reasons there is substantial evidence to support the
28 issuance of an individual customary and traditional use
29 application for the applicant.

30

31 I would note that Kathryn called into
32 the SRC meeting and spoke to her request.

33

34 I would be happy to answer any
35 questions that you have. Thank you, Mr. Chair and
36 members of the Council.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
39 Barbara. That was a good analysis. Any questions for
40 Barbara.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, hearing
45 none, we may come back to you but that's good we'll
46 move on for now. Report on any consultation from
47 tribes or ANCSA Corporations, Orville.

48

49 MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There

50

0339

1 were no questions or concerns on this proposal. Mr.
2 Chair, thank you.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
5 Orville. Agency comments, Alaska Department of Fish
6 and Game.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No comment.
11 Anyone from Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Federal.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any tribal
20 representatives who want to talk to it.

21

22 MS. LINNELL: Yes, Sir, Mr. Chair.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Karen.

25

26 MS. LINNELL: Thank you. This is Karen
27 Linnell, Executive Director for Ahtna InterTribal
28 Resources Commission. AITRC is in full support of this
29 proposal to grant individual customary and traditional
30 use to Kathryn Martin. Not only is she the
31 granddaughter of Katie and Fred John, but she was there
32 at every court hearing with Katie. You know the
33 ability and why we have Federal management is because
34 of her support of her grandmother during that time.
35 She not only cans and jars that fish but she is one of
36 the last ones that knows how to traditionally prepare
37 (In Native), or fermented fishheads, which is a
38 delicacy that our elders can't wait to get. She's
39 still using her grandmother's barrel to make it. And
40 passing that on that knowledge to her cousins, Doris
41 Charles, and Jean Henry's children and grandchildren as
42 well so that they remember and know where they come
43 from and sharing fish from that place. It's important
44 to be able to go home to fish.

45

46 It's getting that connection back to
47 your home that makes you whole.

48

49 And so I urge the Council to support

50

0340

1 this proposal. Again, thank you for your time.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Karen.
4 Any other tribal representative.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Advisory
9 groups. Any other Regional Advisory Councils talk
10 about it.

11

12 MS. PERRY: No, Mr. Chair.

13

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

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
20 Resource Commission, I think Barbara just gave the
21 whole presentation so do you want to.....

22

23 MS. CELLARIUS: Thanks, Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:say anything
26 else this is.....

27

28 MS. CELLARIUS: The Wrangell-St. Elias
29 National Park Subsistence Resource Commission
30 unanimously supported this proposal. Thank you, Mr.
31 Chair.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
34 Summary of written public comments.

35

36 MS. PERRY: I do not see any written
37 public comments on this proposal, Mr. Chair.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Any
40 public testimony.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any written
45 comments received, you did not see.

46

47 MS. LINNELL: I believe Kathryn
48 Martin's on the line.

49

50

0341

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Kathryn, if
2 you're on the line you're welcome to speak.

3
4 MS. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
5 just want to thank you for taking the time to look at
6 this. I appreciate everyone's supports and comments
7 that talked in favor of this. Just to let you know,
8 though, what Karen was saying is true, I do go back to
9 Batzulnetas every year for our culture camp. This last
10 year due to Covid we weren't able to hold a culture
11 camp but my kids said, mom, we go back every year and
12 so we ended up going back ourselves as a family because
13 they remember doing this since they were kids. And the
14 only thing was is that my one daughter were able to use
15 the wheel but the rest of us couldn't, it was just a
16 sad thing because we live in different areas now and
17 not considered a resident of Mentasta. But one of the
18 things that I would like to be able to do is to be able
19 to go back and, you know, use the wheel, get my fish
20 that I need to to supply to the families that I supply
21 to, which a lot of times is the elders. And I've been
22 in the Tazlina area for 16 years, I've never put a
23 fishwheel in in this area and I don't feel like I
24 should try and even do that because, you know, to me,
25 people have their family fishwheels down here, I've
26 used other people's wheels down here to get my fish but
27 for me to just go in and put a wheel in down here I
28 don't feel is appropriate and is not traditionally, you
29 know, the way we do things. So I'd appreciate if you
30 guys would vote in favor of this proposal. And if you
31 guys have any questions I could answer those, thank
32 you.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, thank you,
35 Kathryn. You're definitely the heartbeat of
36 subsistence, your tradition of keeping it going. So we
37 appreciate that. Is there any questions from the
38 Council for Kathryn.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none,
43 thank you very much, Kathryn, we're going to move on.
44 Regional Council's recommendation and motion to
45 support. I'll entertain a motion to support.

46
47 MS. STICKWAN: I make a motion.....

48
49 MS. NICKLIE: This is Paula, I'll.....

50

0342

1 MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael, I'll make
2 that motion to support.

3
4 MS. STICKWAN:to support 21-
5 02.....

6
7 MS. NICKLIE:make a motion to
8 support 21-02.

9
10 MS. TOTEMOFF: This is Angela, I
11 second.

12
13 MS. STICKWAN:ICTP 21-02.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I got Gloria, and
16 I got Angela seconding it.

17
18 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

19
20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

21
22 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair. I believe Gloria
23 said the motion was to support 22-02, this is the
24 individual customary and traditional use determination,
25 for those that have Teams, we have a form that we fill
26 out which is showing and basically there are two
27 determinations. The RAC can determine there is
28 sufficient evidence to support an individual customary
29 and traditional use determination for Kathryn Martin
30 for salmon in the Batzulnetas, or there is not
31 sufficient evidence, so that might help matters. But I
32 just wanted to make note that I think Gloria's
33 reference was to a different proposal.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I think it
36 was the right proposal, 02, but she might have didn't
37 get the right first part ICTP.

38
39 MS. STICKWAN: I said ICTP 21-02,
40 later, she didn't hear me.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, okay.

43
44 MS. PERRY: Okay.

45
46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, we got it
47 DeAnna.

48
49 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

50

0343

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We got it DeAnna,
2 we got it.

3
4 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Anyone
7 else on the Council want to comment to it.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone want to
12 call the question.

13
14 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is.....

15
16 MS. STICKWAN: I support this proposal.
17 Kathryn has long established, all her life the use of
18 this area along with her grandmother. Her grandmother
19 was Katie John, who had the lawsuit and we all allowed
20 to hunt and fish now because of Katie John, and she
21 learned a lot -- learned mostly everything from her
22 grandmother, I believe, and she practices it today. So
23 I support this.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
26 Gloria. Anyone else.

27
28 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is Ed, Mr.
29 Chair.

30
31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,
32 Ed.

33
34 MR. HOLSTON: You know, I'd fully
35 support this. This is one of the strongest C&T's that
36 I've seen or heard about, it's phenomenal. So I fully
37 support it.

38
39 Thank you.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ed,
42 that was my feeling. Anyone else.

43
44 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, Andy weighs in
45 here. Same thing, concur with all that, plenty of
46 evidence, a big section in the book here about C&T
47 determinations.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Andy.

50

0344

1 Any other Council members.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, if one of
6 you will call the question we could take our unanimous
7 vote.

8

9 MR. WHISSEL: Call the question, Mr.
10 Chair.

11

12 MR. HOLSTON: This is Ed, I call the
13 question.

14

15 MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael, I call
16 the question.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I think
19 John called the question. All in favor aye.

20

21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: And there's no
24 one opposing, I assume, no nays.

25

26 (No opposing votes)

27

28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I can't assume
29 that, so thank you. Anyway, unanimous, thank you.
30 We'll continue to go on and that was a really good one.
31 DeAnna, before we keep going here there's a few things
32 that are critical so let's see what we have to do in
33 the essence of time, I'm not sure we're going to get
34 through all this stuff. What is left on our agenda
35 that has to be done today?

36

37 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, the remaining
38 action items for the Council are 11C, that we just did,
39 the individual C&T, so we took care of that. The
40 annual report, 11E, identifying issues to put in our
41 annual report. We also need to pick future meeting
42 dates. And then there were two added items by this
43 Council during the meeting. One, was to draft comments
44 on three Board of Game proposals and one to establish a
45 work group to address finfish harvest in Prince William
46 Sound.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. With the
49 Council's permission could we go ahead and move to 11E,
50

0345

1 and then we'll come back if we have time and take care
2 of the action items.

3

4 MR. OPHEIM: Sounds good to me.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. No
7 objection, if I don't hear no objection that's what
8 we're going to do.

9

10 (No objections)

11

12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

13

14 MS. PERRY: Okay, Mr. Chair and Members
15 of the Council. The Federal Subsistence Board's reply
16 to this Council's annual report can be found in your
17 meeting books on Page 359. You'll remember that this
18 Council wanted to bring up the following issues of
19 concern to the Board.

20

21 Concerns for loss of crucial
22 representation across the Southcentral region due to
23 vacancies on the Council as a result of non
24 appointments or untimely appointments.

25

26 Changing climate affecting how this
27 challenge can -- let me start over. Changing climate
28 effects and how this can challenge the Council's
29 ability to make knowledgeable recommendations. It's
30 harder to predict the condition of various subsistence
31 resources and then problematic to recommend changes for
32 harvesting these resources.

33

34 This Council was concerned about the
35 initial proposed individual National Park Service
36 customary and traditional use process. They asked the
37 Board to defer its action until all RACs could provide
38 input, which the Board did.

39

40 They expressed concerns that the
41 preference for harvest opportunities under ANILCA is
42 being diminished. The Council has seen several
43 proposals lately where restrictions are being sought
44 for the Federal subsistence users and not necessarily
45 other groups and that it should not be up to the
46 subsistence users to be the sole group burdened with
47 sacrificing harvest to conserve species.

48

49 So I won't take the time to read each

50

0346

1 response, it's in your book, Pages 359 to 367, but if
2 you haven't reviewed it, please take a moment to do so
3 so that if there are any changes or if you feel there
4 was an inadequate reply we can address that and send a
5 letter to the Board. So the reply there's no action
6 required on the reply, I just had to bring that up to
7 your attention. And if that is okay and there's no
8 follow-up I can move on to identifying issues for the
9 annual report.

10

11 Are there any follow-ups for the
12 Board's responses to our last year's annual report?

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 MS. PERRY: Okay, hearing.....

17

18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone.

19

20 MS. PERRY:none -- I'm sorry.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, I was
23 just asking also, go ahead.

24

25 MS. PERRY: Okay, great. So starting
26 on Page 369 of your meeting book you'll see the details
27 about the purpose of the annual report. ANILCA
28 established these annual reports as a way to bring
29 regional subsistence uses and needs to the attention of
30 the directors of each of the four Department of
31 Interior agencies and the Department of Agricultural
32 Forest Service in their capacity of members of the
33 Federal Subsistence Board. You'll note under report
34 content from ANILCA's Section .805(a)(3)(d) of ANILCA,
35 Title VIII a list of issues not generally addressed in
36 the normal regulatory process such as: identification
37 of current and anticipated subsistence uses of fish and
38 wildlife populations within the region; an evaluation
39 of current and anticipated subsistence needs for fish
40 and wildlife populations within the region; a
41 recommended strategy for the management of fish and
42 wildlife populations within the region to accommodate
43 such subsistence uses and needs; and, recommendations
44 concerning policies, standards, guidelines regulations
45 to implement the strategy.

46

47 Again, this is an action item so at
48 this meeting the Council should be identifying topics
49 for the next annual report. We identify them at this
50

0347

1 meeting, we get some language to go with that topic and
2 then we revisit this at our winter meeting for full
3 approval.

4
5 So I am standing by to capture those
6 items that the Council would like to put in the annual
7 report as potential topics.

8
9 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10
11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay,
12 Council.....

13
14 MS. STICKWAN: I have.....

15
16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:members it's
17 up to you.....

18
19 MS. STICKWAN: This is Gloria.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:so this is
22 your report, this is the Council members report, and so
23 we'll.....

24
25 MS. STICKWAN: This is Gloria.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:and so we'll
28 take Council member's recommendations, anything that
29 you want to be putting in next year's annual report.
30 And we'll have.....

31
32 MS. STICKWAN: I would like to.....

33
34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:one more
35 chance to -- go ahead.

36
37 MS. STICKWAN: I would like to include
38 the letter on the concern that AITRC has about
39 subsistence use amounts. I think that we need to start
40 figuring out anticipated needs, subsistence uses for
41 fish and wildlife. We need to have a process in place
42 for that, and begin a way to address those issues.
43 We've had shortages of fish statewide and it's becoming
44 more and more important that we -- we need to start
45 working on subsistence use amounts. We need to have
46 Staff look at this.

47
48 And then I also had concern about the
49 FRMP and the shortages of money every year. We get
50

0348

1 reduced more and more for the FRMP, I would say that we
2 need to revise research and monitoring projects to
3 include tribes and regional organizations as the intent
4 of ANILCA was to include cooperative agreements with
5 Native organizations. If the State of Alaska has
6 concerns about, you know, cuts in fish and wildlife
7 populations funded through the State and Federal base
8 budgets they should -- it's getting more and more
9 competitive for FRMP, it seems like the State should
10 have their own programs and not compete with tribes
11 over this for FRMP monies. They need to include
12 tribes.

13

14 And I'm also concerned about the C&T
15 determination process. The way these proposals were
16 written were confusing. I know that -- I do believe
17 that we said to include all of them at one time, that
18 was mentioned in the past, but it's confusing for -- to
19 have them all included in one proposal, different
20 units, different species and not enough information
21 included. IF there's not enough information or
22 substantial evidence for C&T then monies need to be put
23 aside to do the research to get the information.

24

25 Those are my concerns to add to the
26 annual report.

27

28 MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael. I guess
29 I would continue, to add climate change and those
30 things that fall under that. Especially with John's
31 thinking of finfish and shellfish, ocean acidification
32 is a big one, I think, for that. So maybe that falls
33 under the FRMP that Gloria was talking about, that, you
34 know, maybe the tribes could look at that a little more
35 closely with those funds.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
38 Anyone else want to add something here.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I have a couple
43 that I would like to add to myself, so, DeAnna, if you
44 want to record this one.

45

46 We talked -- Gloria talked about the
47 C&T determination process. I think that that
48 definitely needs to be looked at and along with looking
49 at it, where I'm going, is the OSM, when they receive
50

0349

1 one that's in other areas that affect other areas, or
2 other C&T areas, that they need to be inclusive and we
3 need to work and figure out how it affects everyone
4 else. I foresee a real change in more and more C&Ts
5 coming along and less and less fish and game, and so
6 it's adding to -- exacerbating a problem, and we
7 definitely need to be prepared for that.

8

9 Okay, other people got something they
10 want to put in there.

11

12 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, Mr. Chair.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Andy.

15

16 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, this report
17 content Page 369 annual report, there's like four
18 bullet points in there about report content, you know,
19 anticipated subsistence needs. Things like they opened
20 up shrimping in Prince William Sound even though it's
21 State waters, not Federal, I believe this Federal
22 jurisdiction -- people have been utilizing the
23 resources here and they live in the middle of the
24 Chugach National Forest and tribal people live here and
25 there's commercial and sport things going on that are
26 running into a conflict with people that live here and
27 reside here and live off the land and sea.

28

29 One other thing on there, we're
30 supposed to identify current uses, shellfish, octopus,
31 shrimp, crab, finfish, including rock fish, which is
32 very limited by State allowable catch, that's a finfish
33 thing.

34

35 We're to recommend strategy, that's
36 another one of the bullet points there. A recommended
37 strategy would be co-management like what goes on in
38 many other places in the state, that State and Federal
39 both have jurisdiction over certain areas. So
40 recommending that strategy, I mean that's something
41 fully in our purview of what we're supposed to include
42 in an annual report.

43

44 Our concerns recommending issues that
45 are problems with policy, well, this is a policy. This
46 is a standard regulation guideline thing that's going
47 on. It seems like a pretty big thing, I mean there's
48 North Pacific Fishery Management Council, there's NOAA,
49 Department of Commerce, all sorts of things are
50

0350

1 involved with what goes on in the saltwater here but in
2 my opinion it's a pretty big deal. And now some other
3 Council members from different areas are also kind of
4 calling me and mentioning the same concerns that I've
5 been voicing for quite awhile.

6

7

Thank you.

8

9

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Andy.
10 I think those are all good points. And just for your
11 anecdotal information, in our area, in Cook Inlet, the
12 Feds control everything off of three miles and they
13 chose to close one of the major areas of the drift
14 fleet because they didn't want to manage it and they
15 turned it over to the State and so, you know, our
16 finfish are managed, Federal waters, that we go to go
17 to Seldovia to get halibut so it's kind of crazy and
18 there is some stuff that needs to be addressed there.

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

Anyone else they got anything they want
to put on there. I do like what Andy -- you know,
these four bullet items are all in need of stuff that
we could talk to them about.

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

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, John.

MR. WHISSEL: In the interest of
brevity, I'll just say to support Michael's opinion for
supporting FRMP research for finfish and shellfish in
Prince William Sound. And also the priorities for
ocean acidification and for establishing a Federal
subsistence harvest of finfish and shellfish in the
saltwater in Prince William Sound.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
Anyone else want anything in there.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: DeAnna, you
should have a pretty lengthy list there to start with
and I'm sure we could add to it. Can we add if someone
comes up with something or do we got to wait until we
all get together and agree on it?

0351

1 MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair, I've got
2 something to start with.

3
4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Okay, if
5 we got the -- we got the annual report. The next one I
6 had that you mentioned is our future meeting dates.

7
8 MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair, I am going
9 to ask Stephanie to pull up the latest and greatest
10 calendar. I did email that out to everybody, it was
11 either late last night or this morning, I've kind of
12 lost track. It was an updated calendar from that in
13 your book because there have been a couple of Regional
14 Advisory Council meetings since the book was put out so
15 for those folks that are on Teams, you can see the
16 updated calendar, for those not on Teams -- yes,
17 Stephanie, that's the right one, thank you very much --
18 for those that may not have it available in front of
19 them, if you didn't get the email, I can let you know
20 in addition to what you see in your book, for winter
21 meetings, Kodiak/Aleutians has selected February 22nd
22 and 23rd, so that's added; YKDelta has selected March 1
23 and 2; Southeast has selected March 22 through 24; and
24 Western Interior has selected February 16th through
25 17th. So if you could make note of those.

26
27 And, currently, this Council had
28 selected February 10th and 11th, so we need to make a
29 motion to either confirm those dates or a motion to
30 suggest different dates.

31
32 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, I'd like to
33 move to confirm 10th and 11th.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I got a
36 motion to confirm the February 10th and 11th, I
37 believe, is that what you said?

38
39 MR. WHISSEL: It is, yep, this is John.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Is there a
42 second to that motion.

43
44 MR. OPHEIM: Michael seconds.

45
46 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is Ed, I
47 second.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Michael and Ed
50

0352

1 seconded, it, both. All in favor aye.

2

3 IN UNISON: Aye.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, all.
6 Anyone opposed, anyone can't make that, any opposed.

7

8 (No opposing votes)

9

10 MS. STICKWAN: Did you say February
11 10th and 11th?

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, 10th and
14 11th, that's what we had previously had.

15

16 MS. STICKWAN: Okay, yeah.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Okay,
19 DeAnna, I think that one's done, I think we need to go
20 on to the other one.

21

22 MS. PERRY: Okay, Mr. Chair. So the
23 joint meeting with Eastern Interior, we need to set a
24 separate date for that. I'm told we could have a
25 virtual one day meeting just to talk with Eastern
26 Interior on that deferred proposal, FP21-10 that way we
27 can give it the attention that it deserves and so
28 looking at the winter calendar that's, again, on Teams,
29 it looks as though about the only time we could do that
30 would be the week of March 14th. Again, there wouldn't
31 be any travel for this, so we could just pick one day.
32 And what they've asked to do is pick our first, second,
33 and third choice for the dates of 14th through the
34 18th.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Has anyone
37 got any suggestions if we got to pick three days that
38 kind of ties up our week for other business that we
39 have but I guess we can do that.

40

41 MS. PERRY: And what will happen, Mr.
42 Chair, I just wanted to clarify that we'll put these
43 three dates forward and Eastern Interior is meeting
44 right now and they will take those three dates and
45 discuss them and then hopefully they'll pick one of
46 those three dates. So we are only meeting on one day,
47 but we're going to give three options to Eastern
48 Interior to see what works best for their Council.

49

50

0353

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I realize
2 that. My point is that the sooner we know the dates
3 the better. So it's up to the Council, which three
4 days you want, first part of the week or second part of
5 the week, of March 14th to the 18th.

6
7 MR. OPHEIM: I like the first part.

8
9 MR. WHISSEL: The only day I have a
10 conflict is the 15th.

11
12 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I'm out that whole
13 week. That's the only week I can't do it.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, that
16 leaves one out DeAnna, that's for sure.

17
18 MS. PERRY: So is the 14th everyone's
19 first choice to do a virtual meeting on March 14th?

20
21 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, we thought
24 about that -- thought about that, yeah.

25
26 MS. PERRY: Okay. And for second or
27 third dates, does anybody have a preference, I know
28 there is a conflict on the 15th and a conflict with
29 both John and Andy on the 15th. So do we want to look
30 at 16, 17 and 18, one of those, we have two more to
31 pick.

32
33 MS. CAMINER: This is Judy, the 17th is
34 not good for me. I mean I could if we had to but would
35 rather not.

36
37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I agree, Judy, I
38 might be having a Council meeting myself that day but I
39 could probably make the 16th or 18th.

40
41 MS. PERRY: Okay.

42
43 MR. WHISSEL: There we have it.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: How about 14, 16
46 and 18.

47
48 MR. WHISSEL: 14, 16 and 18.

49
50

0354

1 MS. PERRY: Okay. And, Mr. Chair, we
2 would need a motion just like we do on the other dates,
3 and, again, it looks like the 14th, 16th, and 18th, in
4 that precedence.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Do we have
7 a motion.

8
9 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, move to have
10 joint meeting with Eastern Interior regarding
11 outstanding fisheries proposals, priority first March
12 14th, second March 16th and third March 18th.

13
14 MS. TOTEMOFF: This is Angela, second.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Is
17 there a second to that.

18
19 MS. PERRY: I believe Angela seconded
20 it.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
23 All in favor of that, first, second and third, aye.

24
25 IN UNISON: Aye.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed. Any
28 opposed say nay.

29
30 (No opposing votes)

31
32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, DeAnna,
33 that passes unanimous. We got three dates for them,
34 hopefully they'll pick one that matches.

35
36 MS. PERRY: Okay. And then that brings
37 us to our fall meeting and there was a separate
38 document for this that I emailed. It's the fall
39 calendar. And that's showing up on Teams. And for
40 those that are looking at your book and can't see the
41 updated one I'll let you know that Kodiak/Aleutians has
42 selected September 20th and 21st; Southeast has
43 selected October 25th through 27th; YKDelta has
44 selected October 27 and 28th. So basically with those
45 two Council meetings that week, the week of October
46 24th is off the table. And then Western Interior just
47 selected October 19th and 20th.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: How about October
50

0355

1 13 and 14th, that seems to work.

2

3 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, I like those dates.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Does that work
6 for everyone, same dates as now?

7

8 MS. STICKWAN: What day is it?

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: The 13th is a
11 Thursday, 14th is a Friday, October.

12

13 MS. STICKWAN: I can't -- I was trying
14 to look for her email.....

15

16 MR. WHISSEL: That works for me.

17

18 MS. STICKWAN:but I can't.

19

20 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, that works for me
21 too.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, it's far
24 enough out I'll make it work.

25

26 MS. CAMINER: Very good.

27

28 MS. PERRY: And a motion to that effect
29 please.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Please.

32

33 MS. PERRY: A motion to that effect.

34

35 MR. WHISSEL: Move to hold fall SCRAC
36 meeting October 14th and 15th -- 13th and 14th, I'm
37 sorry, 2022.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, now you got
40 it.

41

42 MS. TOTEMOFF: This is Angela, I
43 second.

44

45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
46 Angela. All in favor of that aye.

47

48 IN UNISON: Aye.

49

50

0356

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed, say
2 nay.

3
4 (No opposing votes)

5
6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that's our
7 schedule.

8
9 MS. PERRY: Great.

10
11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: What did you have
12 next on there.

13
14 MS. PERRY: Again, just concentrating
15 on action items, the Council has completed all of the
16 action items required at this meeting with the
17 exception of the two new ones that were proposed by our
18 Council members, and, again, those were the Board of
19 Game proposal comments and establishing a work group
20 for finfish harvest in Prince William Sound. So that
21 would be up to the Council's discretion.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I'll be
24 back in one minute and we'll start on it.

25
26 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: One comment, DeAnna,
27 it's finfish and shellfish, it's not just finfish.

28
29 MS. PERRY: Thank you, I probably
30 didn't write quick enough. Thank you.

31
32 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: No problem.

33
34 MR. WHISSEL: DeAnna, I'm furiously
35 trying to type into my calendar, you're going to send
36 us an email confirming all these dates later on; is
37 that correct?

38
39 MS. PERRY: Sure I can do that.

40
41 MR. WHISSEL: Okay, thanks.

42
43 MS. PERRY: Probably after the -- all
44 of the Regional Advisory Councils and then it'll be a
45 nice full calendar and you can see when everyone is
46 meeting.

47
48 MR. WHISSEL: Okay, thank you.

49
50

0357

1 (Pause)

2

3

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I'm back, I stepped out a second, do you guys got all the committees appointed and ready for the finfish and the shellfish.

6

7

8

MR. WHISSEL: Almost.

9

10

(Laughter)

11

12

13

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Almost, okay, where are we at on it.

14

15

16

MR. WHISSEL: Do you want to let Gloria go first.

17

18

19

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, go ahead, Gloria.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

MS. STICKWAN: I said that I wanted to have the subsistence use amounts to be addressed by Staff for -- to begin the subsistence use amounts for fish and wildlife, our anticipated uses of fish and wildlife. I want to see that we start working on that because of the shortages of fish but even for wildlife, we need to start working on that process. That's what I would like to see for finfish as a beginning, I guess, but both of them should be worked on.

30

31

32

33

34

MS. PERRY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, are we going to the working groups, or were we going to the Board of Game comments. Sorry, I.....

35

36

37

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I thought we were on the working groups so I had stepped out a minute so I might be behind.

38

39

40

MS. PERRY: Okay, we're doing work groups okay.

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, John, you brought that up.

48

49

50

MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair. I'll just go

0358

1 straight to a motion since we -- since I gave some
2 background previously and we could get straight to the
3 discussion. I move to form a work group of SCRAC
4 members to develop a proposal for the upcoming
5 fisheries cycle to establish shellfish and finfish
6 harvest for Federally-qualified rural residents in
7 Prince William Sound.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. There's a
10 motion that he made, that John made, is there a second
11 to that.

12

13 MS. STICKWAN: I have a friendly
14 amendment.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, go ahead.

17

18 MS. STICKWAN: I would like to see
19 tribes involved in this, AITRC.

20

21 MR. WHISSEL: Gloria is that a
22 volunteer to join the work group?

23

24 MS. STICKWAN: I can't speak for them
25 but I would like to see them involved.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, that's up
28 to you, John, it's your motion, I thought we were
29 starting with the work group of the RAC members but we
30 could, at a later date, bring whoever we needed,
31 whatever resources, it's up to you guys, though,
32 however you want to do it.

33

34 MR. WHISSEL: I'm looking for a work
35 group of SCRAC members to put a proposal together to do
36 this that would follow the normal processes of
37 consultation and always happy to work with AITRC on
38 anything, but I'm looking for a work group to be an AC
39 group, of AC members.

40

41 MS. STICKWAN: You mean an Advisory
42 Committees, the Regional Advisory Committees.....

43

44 MR. WHISSEL: Yes. Yep.

45

46 MS. STICKWAN:that's -- only us
47 involved in this?

48

49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: For the start.

50

0359

1 MR. WHISSEL: I'd like to establish a
2 work group of Council members to start drafting a
3 proposal. I guess my idea is that we would involve
4 other people as that work group saw fit in
5 deliberations there, but only formally establish right
6 now that this would be Council members from this
7 Council on the work group.

8
9 MS. STICKWAN: To develop subsistence
10 use amounts for fish, finfish.

11
12 MR. WHISSEL: Finfish and shellfish in
13 Prince William Sound, yeah, we want to establish
14 saltwater use.

15
16 MS. STICKWAN: Okay. Okay.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yep. Do you want
19 a number in the RAC or do you just want to have the
20 committee formed?

21
22 MR. WHISSEL: I'm happy to have as much
23 involvement as anybody interested but I think we'd need
24 at least three people.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I've got a
27 motion by John to form a working group for finfish and
28 shellfish in Prince William Sound made up of RAC
29 members, Council members to start, is there a second.

30
31 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I second the motion,
32 this is Andy.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Seconded by Andy.
35 I'll open it for discussion, and we'll call the
36 question and we'll go ahead and vote on it and then we
37 could set it up and we'll go from there. All in favor
38 of the working group for the finfish and shellfish in
39 Prince William Sound signify by saying aye.

40
41 IN UNISON: Aye.

42
43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Anyone
44 opposed.

45
46 (No opposing votes)

47
48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that
49 passes. You got a motion to form it and now the
50

0360

1 devil's in the details so I'm going to leave that for
2 you to start and I think he said that anyone that was
3 willing to serve he would take. So I guess it's a
4 volunteer basis.

5

6 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, count me in,
7 Andy.

8

9 MS. STICKWAN: I would like to be part
10 of the working group since I fish on the Copper River.

11

12 MS. SELANOFF: This is Diane Selanoff,
13 you can count me in.

14

15 MR. WHISSEL: Wonderful.

16

17 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, this is Judy
18 with a suggestion. When we formed previous sub groups
19 we've also had a liaison from the Office of Subsistence
20 Management, so if the group wants to do that, that's
21 just a thought.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: At a much later
24 date.

25

26 MR. WHISSEL: Yeah, I would expect the
27 group would work closely with OSM but I don't think we
28 need to establish that formally here.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: John, I would
31 volunteer also as much I could because I do deal with
32 the Federals down here and I might be able to -- we do
33 have some similar problems.

34

35 MR. WHISSEL: Thank you. I think it
36 would be okay if people wanted to contact me later on
37 if they're thinking about it and we could move on with
38 the agenda. I think we have enough members now.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We'll move
41 on with the.....

42

43 MS. TOTEMOFF: Mr. Chairman, this is
44 Angela, I just have one comment.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Angela.

47

48 MS. TOTEMOFF: Would you be able to
49 send that meeting notice out to the entire group when
50

0361

1 the time comes even though they're not necessarily on
2 the committee.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Good point.

5

6 MS. STICKWAN: I would like DeAnna to
7 say specifically what this working group.....

8

9 MR. WHISSEL: Sure.

10

11 MS. STICKWAN:is going to be
12 working on to be clear to everyone.

13

14 MS. PERRY: So I believe it's what.....

15

16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I don't know that
17 DeAnna knows, but I know John knows and I got an idea
18 and Andy but, John, do you want to go ahead and
19 explain.

20

21 MR. WHISSEL: Certainly. I would like
22 the SCRAC to submit a proposal to the Federal
23 Subsistence Board to establish a harvest for finfish
24 and shellfish in Prince William Sound for the
25 Federally-qualified rural residents who live there. I
26 want to involve everybody and work incrementally to try
27 to do that and be heavy on consultation with all the
28 communities that would be involved and all the members
29 of the SCRAC that have an interest who live in or
30 within out Prince William Sound. The finfish cycle is
31 coming up so I'm putting it on the table now so that we
32 could have something to talk about when we -- at our
33 first finfish meeting. And that's basically it in a
34 nutshell. I don't have a good idea of any kind of
35 specifics at this point but that's what we would try to
36 figure out as a work group.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

39

40 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Gloria. Mr. Chair.

41

42 MS. PERRY: Mr.....

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Andy.
45 I got two or three talking here but go ahead, I think
46 Andy you wanted to talk.

47

48 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, sorry. Just to
49 clarify for Gloria, in my involvement, as I understand
50

0362

1 it, what I'm interested in is -- see what they've done
2 is they've drawn a line three nautical miles from the
3 shoreline and everything inside that three miles is
4 State and there's zero Federal subsistence priority so
5 people in the communities out here that are rural
6 subsistence users, that are Federally-qualified, some
7 that live right in the edge of Chugach National Forest,
8 all the land is run by Federal, and the streams, the
9 freshwater streams are Federal, okay, but the
10 saltwater, as soon as you walk down there and dig a
11 clam you're suddenly only able to dig clams according
12 to the State and not Federal, or put a shrimp pot out
13 there a half a mile away and now it's only State, so
14 there's rules about everything from shellfish to --
15 from octopus to crabs to how many rockfish you can
16 keep, the State only lets you keep one per boat, per
17 person so -- and people here live off of them, you
18 know, so there's a disservice going on to the
19 Federally-qualified subsistence residents of this area
20 where I'm at by only having State jurisdiction in
21 waters that should also have a dual Federal
22 jurisdiction. That's the way I see it.

23

24 MS. STICKWAN: And that's the way you
25 see it, John, right?

26

27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

28

29 MS. STICKWAN: Do you have the same
30 idea, John?

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I think
33 John.....

34

35 MS. STICKWAN: John, that's your idea?

36

37 MR. WHISSEL: I'm sorry, I was on mute.
38 Yes, that's my idea, I agree completely with what Andy
39 is saying, we want to shift some of these to saltwater.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We've got
42 the group formed and you guys got your goals and what
43 we're going to be working on, a proposal. So we're
44 going to go ahead and move on, we got -- Gloria, you
45 was next, you wanted us to look at some State proposals
46 coming up and there was three of them that DeAnna sent
47 out to us to look at, that's one item we added on the
48 agenda. So I'm not sure if you wanted us to just look
49 at them, or want to comment on them, but they're
50

0363

1 bringing them up on the screen for those of you that
2 can see them. And, Gloria, you could either talk to
3 them now or we could have DeAnna read them, however you
4 want.

5
6 MS. STICKWAN: I'm trying to find my
7 stapler, sorry. I just wanted to say that W210 [sic],
8 it's the -- they're trying to eliminate a community
9 subsistence hunt that was in our area for Unit 13 and
10 I'm opposed to that, eliminating this community
11 subsistence hunt, it's not a perfect good hunt, but
12 it's about the best one that the Board has come up with
13 so far and they're trying to get rid of it. And so I
14 just want this Council to support our subsistence hunt.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Do we want
17 a motion to support your subsistence hunt and oppose
18 that 210?

19
20 MS. STICKWAN: Yes, we want -- I make a
21 motion to oppose Proposal 210 to eliminate the
22 community subsistence hunt in Unit 13 because it's a
23 subsistence hunt and it provides opportunity --
24 reasonable opportunity for us to get a moose.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Is there a
27 second to that.

28
29 MR. WHISSEL: I'll second that, this is
30 John.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: John seconded it.
33 Okay, we got a motion on the floor to oppose State
34 Proposal 210, hunting season, bag limits, where they're
35 trying to eliminate the community subsistence harvest
36 in Unit 13 and they got an explanation below. So
37 that's what the motion is, that's what we're going to
38 oppose. Any discussion on it.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none,
43 someone want to call the question and we'll go ahead
44 and take a vote.

45
46 MR. WHISSEL: I'll call the question,
47 Mr. Chair.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's been
50

0364

1 called on the 210 proposal for the State, all in favor
2 of opposing signify by saying aye.

3

4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone object to
7 that motion, nay.

8

9 (No opposing votes)

10

11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Motion carries.
12 We'll move on to 211. Okay, this is a community
13 subsistence harvest area repeal call for Basin area,
14 community subsistence hunt area for moose and caribou
15 as follows. Gloria, do you want to talk to it.

16

17 MS. STICKWAN: It's the same proposal,
18 I probably should have picked this one instead of the
19 other one but this includes caribou as well and they're
20 basically getting rid of the community hunt so I would
21 oppose this.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Do you
24 want to make a motion so we have it on the record for
25 211.

26

27 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, I make a motion to
28 oppose to remove the -- repeal the community Basin area
29 -- community subsistence hunt area for moose and
30 caribou.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Second.

33

34 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Second.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Seconded by Andy.

37

Discussion.

38

39 MS. STICKWAN: Again, it's a
40 subsistence hunt, this is the best one we have so far
41 but it's not perfect but it's the best we can do for
42 now under State hunts.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Someone
45 want to call the question, we'll go ahead and vote.

46

47 MR. WHISSEL: Question.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's called

50

0365

1 for, all in favor of opposing Proposal 211 as stated,
2 signify by saying aye.

3

4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone object, in
7 opposition, nay.

8

9 (No opposing votes)

10

11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that
12 carries. The last one 212, I believe -- I was wrong,
13 213.

14

15 MS. STICKWAN: This proposal would
16 remove the requirement for Tier I caribou hunters to
17 hunt moose in Unit 13. Before this was passed by the
18 Board, Tier I hunters, there used to be like 30 to
19 50,000 people that could apply for Tier I and since
20 this passed by the Board of Game it helps to reduce the
21 numbers, while it's not perfect it does help to
22 decrease the numbers from 30 to 50,000 to less people,
23 like maybe 8,000 but before it was a lot worse. It's
24 not perfect but it's about the best we can do and,
25 again, it would help the subsistence hunters around
26 here. So I would say I oppose this proposal, I want to
27 keep it in place.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Would you
30 make a motion for this one.

31

32 MS. STICKWAN: Yes, I do, I'll make
33 that motion.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Is there a
36 second.

37

38 MR. HOLSTON: Second.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Seconded by Ed, I
41 believe. Is there any more discussion.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Call the
46 question.

47

48 MR. WHISSEL: Call the question, Mr.
49 Chair.

50

0366

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's called
2 for. All in favor of Proposal -- opposing Proposal 213
3 to remove their Tier I hunt signify by saying aye.

4
5 IN UNISON: Aye.

6
7 MS. STICKWAN: I guess I -- I guess I
8 got that backwards, I would like to keep it in place.
9 I'm sorry, I'm tired. I don't want to remove it, I
10 want to keep it, I'm sorry.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I think that's
13 what we're doing, we're opposing them trying to take it
14 away.

15
16 MS. STICKWAN: Okay, I'm sorry, I'm
17 just tired.

18
19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No, I think the
20 motion's fine, we're opposing them removing it.

21
22 MS. STICKWAN: Okay, thank you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You bet. So was
25 there any nays.

26
27 (No opposing votes)

28
29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: So I think we've
30 opposed all three proposals if I gathered everything
31 right.

32
33 MS. STICKWAN: Got it.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. DeAnna, we
36 have -- unfortunately, we got, you know, we got tribal
37 governments to give reports, Ninilchik, Ahtna, Native
38 Village of Eyak, and then we go to Ahtna and we got a
39 bunch of other stuff here too. We have the Fisheries
40 Resource Management Program we didn't talk about. We
41 got the Forest Service, Park Service, Bureau of Land
42 Management, Office of Subsistence, future meetings, we
43 got that done, closing comments. What's the pleasure,
44 DeAnna, what do we got to do here on the rest of the
45 agenda?

46
47 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, it is up to the
48 will of the Council. All required action items have
49 been met. I can do my best to reschedule most of these
50

0367

1 reports and presentations. I know a lot of people
2 spent a lot of time putting together some really good
3 material and information so perhaps we can provide that
4 to the Council in the winter meeting when we'll have a
5 little bit more time or if the Council would still
6 continue to keep going, we can do that as well, it's up
7 to you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. It's up to
10 the pleasure of the Council. I know it's about 20
11 after 5:00 and I imagine the reports would take another
12 hour to two hours, we.....

13

14 MR. VICKERS: Mr. Chair, this is.....

15

16 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question for
17 DeAnna.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I got --
20 just before, I had one asking before you Gloria, who
21 was on there.

22

23 MR. VICKERS: Look this is Brent
24 Vickers from OSM. I just wanted to say that the FRMP
25 report, while there is no motion to act on anything it
26 does provide an opportunity for you, the Council, to
27 weigh in and make comments on the proposed FRMP
28 projects in your region. So that's just something for
29 you to consider.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.

32

33 MS. STICKWAN: That was my -- that was
34 my question for DeAnna, is, would we have time to
35 address this at another meeting or should we make
36 comments now or -- the meeting -- the February meeting
37 is when -- the Federal Board is when, I forget, is it
38 in January or.....

39

40 MR. VICKERS: This is Brent Vickers
41 again from OSM. The Board meeting is in January, I
42 believe, unless, Jarred, do you want to correct me.
43 Thank you.

44

45 MS. PERRY: No, it's in April. It's in
46 April. The wildlife cycle is in April.

47

48 MR. VICKERS: Oh.

49

50

0368

1 MS. STICKWAN: The FRMP for fisheries
2 is in January?

3
4 MR. STONE: Mr. Chair.

5
6 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes, yes, it is.

7
8 MR. STONE: Mr. Chair.

9
10 MS. STICKWAN: Well, I.....

11
12 MR. STONE: Mr. Chair, this is Jarred
13 Stone.

14
15 MS. STICKWAN:was.....

16
17 MS. PERRY: Perhaps Jarred Stone could
18 clarify, he was prepared to give the presentation, I
19 might be confusing what Gloria's meaning with the
20 regulatory meeting in April so, Mr. Chair, may Mr.
21 Stone address the Council and Gloria's question.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: How about he just
24 address this Monitoring Program and we'll take that if
25 that's something we could act on, if it's okay with the
26 Council.

27
28 MR. WHISSEL: I'd be happy to take up
29 Agenda Item 11D.

30
31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

32
33 MR. WHISSEL: This is John.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Would the rest of
36 you -- let's go ahead and do 11D.

37
38 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yep, let's go.

39
40 MR. OPHEIM: All right.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, let's go
43 ahead Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program.

44
45 MR. STONE: All right, good evening,
46 Mr. Chair, and Members of the Council. My name is
47 Jarred Stone and I am a Fisheries Biologist with the
48 Office of Subsistence Management. I am here today to
49 present you with a brief overview Fisheries Resource
50

0369

1 Monitoring Program and its accomplishments to date.
2 You can find these materials in your Council books on
3 Page 340. I'll give a short overview of the Monitoring
4 Program, briefly describe the funding process, give an
5 overview for the Southcentral region and then finish by
6 requesting Council comments on any of the particular
7 projects.

8

9 This is not an action item, there is no
10 motion necessary for this process.

11

12 The Office of Subsistence Management
13 administers the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program
14 and funds research and monitoring that advances
15 projects that are strategically important to the
16 Federal Subsistence Management Program. The Monitoring
17 Program also supports collaboration and cooperation
18 among Federal agencies, the State of Alaska, and Alaska
19 Native and rural organizations.

20

21 I'll now describe how the Monitoring
22 Program's funding process works.

23

24 The program is divided into six
25 regions, which are listed on Page 340 of your Council
26 books. These regions correspond with Federal
27 subsistence fisheries areas and generally hold stock,
28 harvest and community issues in common. During the
29 first step of the process the Regional Advisory
30 Councils with support from OSM Staff and Federal and
31 State fisheries and land managers ensure that the
32 Monitoring Program focuses on the highest priority
33 subsistence fisheries information needs for each
34 region. Councils ensure issues of local concern and
35 knowledge gaps related to subsistence fisheries are
36 identified for priority information needs. And these
37 information needs influence and guide the rest of the
38 funding requests. Ideally, principal investigators
39 will work closely with Councils in order to develop
40 strong proposals that are responsive to those needs.
41 The Office of Subsistence Management provides technical
42 assistance as needed.

43

44 The second step in the funding process
45 is requesting new project proposals, which the program
46 does every two years. Submissions must be complete, on
47 time, address a priority information need and address
48 the five criteria outlined in the notice of funding
49 opportunity in order to be competitive. Once
50

1 submitted, the Technical Review Committee evaluates and
2 scores each project proposal package. The Technical
3 Review Committee is a standing InterAgency Committee of
4 senior technical experts brought together to evaluate
5 project proposals and ensure the Monitoring Program is
6 maintaining consistency with its mission. It is the
7 responsibility of the Technical Review Committee to
8 develop the strongest possible Monitoring Program for
9 all regions across the state based on the evaluation
10 criteria, which includes strategic priority, technical
11 and scientific merit, investigator ability and
12 resources, and partnership and capacity building and
13 cost benefit of the project. A more detailed
14 description of the criteria can be found on Page 345 of
15 your Council books.

16
17 Once a Draft Monitoring Program is
18 developed it's brought before the Regional Advisory
19 Councils for their input and comments. This is where
20 we are at in the current cycle and we'll come back to
21 this in a moment. Additional comments on the Draft
22 Monitoring Program for the Southcentral region will be
23 provided by the InterAgency Staff Committee. These,
24 along with comments developed by the Council are all
25 provided to the Federal Subsistence Board. The Board
26 takes into consideration comments and concerns
27 generated by the process and endorses the Monitoring
28 Plan. Final approval of the Monitoring Plan is made by
29 the Assistant Regional Director of OSM.

30
31 So now that I've discussed how the
32 Monitoring Program works, we are now at a point in time
33 where we are seeking your input on the proposed
34 projects for the Southcentral region. So the
35 Southcentral region you can find the figures I'm about
36 to reference on Page 349 of your Council books.

37
38 Since 2000 the Office of Subsistence
39 Management has funded 53 projects costing 16 million
40 for the Southcentral region. Of these the Department
41 of Interior had 18 projects funded, the Alaska rural
42 organizations had 17 projects funded, the State of
43 Alaska received funds to conduct 13 projects and the
44 Department of Agriculture had three funded projects and
45 other organizations had two projects funded.

46
47 In the Southcentral region you can see
48 from Figure 2 that the project leads have been
49 predominately the Department of Interior agencies and
50

0371

1 Alaska rural organizations. For the 2022 cycle there
2 is an anticipated 2.25 million dollars available for
3 new projects statewide. That available funding amount
4 for 2022 is budgeted for each project's first year, not
5 the total project request, and is subject to the final
6 budget determined by the Assistant Regional Director.

7
8 For the Southcentral region there were
9 a total of two projects that were submitted during the
10 current cycle. The projects are listed in numerical
11 order by project number. Justifications for each of
12 the proposed projects by the Technical Review Committee
13 can be found on Page 351 of your Council books. And
14 the project executive summaries which were submitted by
15 the primary investigators are located on Page 354.

16
17 So we have two projects that were
18 submitted for the region, which include the Copper
19 River Chinook Salmon in-river Abundance and estimating
20 in-season harvest and effort by fishwheel users in the
21 Copper -- Upper Copper River.

22
23 This wraps up a short summary of the
24 projects under consideration. And as a reminder,
25 today, I'm asking for your comments on any of the
26 proposed projects in the Southcentral region. Again,
27 there is no action needed for today. We want to ensure
28 is that selected projects have the greatest chance at
29 successfully answering the Councils priority
30 information needs as possible. And we also want to
31 know if the Council has any specific concerns about a
32 project based on the provided materials.

33
34 That concludes my presentation for
35 today and would be glad to take any comments or
36 questions that you might have.

37
38 Thank you, Mr. Chair and Members of the
39 Council.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Very
42 good presentation. So Council members what is your
43 pleasure, did you want to address or you got concerns
44 or you got things you want supported or not supported,
45 now is the time so I'll leave it open to the Council
46 members to go ahead and speak at your will.

47
48 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to make
49 comments about Project No. 20551 -- I mean 22-551. I
50

0372

1 think this project would contribute to a better
2 understanding of the in-season harvest in the upper
3 Copper River. It would help managers to be able to
4 better understand on what's happening on the Copper
5 River and provide subsistence uses, especially in low
6 year runs for chinook and salmon, if we could get in-
7 season harvest data that would be given better data to
8 work with and they could report in a timely manner and --
9 as proposed. So I support that. Those are my
10 comments.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Good, thank you,
13 Gloria. Others.

14
15 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this.....

16
17 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: This is Andy here.

18
19 MR. WHISSEL:is John. I -- oh, go
20 ahead, Andy, you can go first.

21
22 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Go ahead, John.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Andy.
25 Go ahead, John.

26
27 MR. WHISSEL: Okay. I would remiss if
28 I didn't advocate and support for Project No. 22-504,
29 my good 'ol Copper River Chinook Salmon in-river
30 abundance, we need to desperately need to continue
31 monitoring this at last until the State is able to take
32 over with an in-season measurement by sonar, and I will
33 leave it at that.

34
35 Thank you.

36
37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thanks. Andy.

38
39 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, that was exactly
40 where I was headed on the 22-504 and also the 22-551.
41 Of special concern to people around here is the salmon
42 that go up the Copper River, what affects us, the same
43 stuff that's going on in the upper Copper there with
44 Gloria and Ahtna folks up there, so, yeah, anything
45 that can help monitor the Copper River. I know the
46 Kenai and -- salmon are declining all over the place
47 but Copper River's affects Cordovans and people the
48 people that I'm kind of -- the constituencies that I'm
49 representing.
50

0373

1 Thanks.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.

4

5 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, I would be --
6 I would like to support 22- -- I'd also like to say I
7 also support 22-551, I don't want to appear to be
8 advocating one over the other, they're both great.
9 Thanks.

10

11 MS. STICKWAN: I support both of them
12 too.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I see you
15 got some here on the Cook Inlet area projects, you
16 know, I see Kasilof coho, I know they've been trying to
17 figure out what's going on there for quite awhile, that
18 seems to be dropping on the whole Peninsula. Of
19 course, I'd like to see something there. I don't see
20 anything on the kings here but they studied them a lot,
21 the chinook on the Kenai are definitely in peril and
22 there's some problems there. So if you come up with
23 any projects could support that area, we need to find
24 out why we're dwindling on the Kenai and the Kasilof
25 would be great.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 Anyone else.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I hope that
34 gives you some information there and if we come up with
35 something else we'll get back, I guess.

36

37 MR. STONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
38 Thank you for your time.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
41 Alrighty, okay, Council members, we could make a
42 decision now, I think DeAnna said she could reschedule
43 our reports. I do apologize to the tribal governments
44 and all the presenters that we're going to miss out on
45 because those are always important, we always need more
46 time than we think. Just a comment, this agenda was
47 extremely full and they were very complex because they
48 were not very clearly defined. One thing that's very
49 hard for me as a Chairman is consistent modifications
50

0374

1 and rewrites that we have to do and I think it's been
2 addressed that, you know, maybe a little better work
3 with the OSM and the proponents and the proposals
4 because it seems like we're almost in a work session
5 rewriting proposals as we go through here. So I
6 apologize for not getting to you guys. If you guys
7 want to stay until tomorrow, I have other commitments,
8 to get these reports, or if you want to schedule them,
9 DeAnna, that would be great if we could get them at our
10 next meeting. And we could also send in our report,
11 Darrel, I guess if you're still on the line there, I'm
12 assuming you have a report and I don't know if you
13 wanted to -- if there's anything from any organization
14 that we need to get into this meeting, please speak up.

15

16 MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, this
17 is Darrel Williams. You know, just in summary our
18 fishing went really well this year and we can do the
19 report later. I don't think there's anything that's
20 really pressing or no new information that I'll going
21 to be able to provide.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
24 How about Native Village of Eyak.

25

26 MR. WHISSEL: We'd be happy to
27 postpone.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. How about
30 Ahtna InterTribal Resources Commission.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Anyone on
35 any of the other Federal agencies for reports, we got
36 the Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, Park
37 Service, Bureau of Land Management, anyone need to --
38 need some action or something that we need to get out
39 before our next cycle.

40

41 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chairman, this is
42 Greg Risdahl with the U.S. Forest Service.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,
45 Greg.

46

47 MR. RISDAHL: My son is home now -- my
48 son is home now from daycare so I would be very happy
49 to be able to postpone my general report and the law
50

0375

1 enforcement report on the Russian River until next time
2 if that's okay with the Council.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: It's fine with
5 us, I think. Thank you, Greg. Yeah. Okay, DeAnna, I
6 think we're getting ready to wind down. One thing we
7 always do is have closing comments. And I think it's
8 just always helpful to me and to everyone else if we
9 could just briefly go through the Council and just any
10 closing comments or issues that you want to make a
11 quick comment on. We could just start down the list of
12 our Council members and make sure we don't miss anyone.
13 We'll start with Ed, Ed, you got a comment or anything.

14

15 MR. HOLSTON: Yeah, this is Ed. Just a
16 quick closing comment. I'm glad to hear that we'll be
17 able to hear the agency reports at the next meeting.
18 That's one of the parts of these meetings I enjoy the
19 most and I was getting worried there that we wouldn't
20 be able to entertain ourselves with those reports. But
21 in closing I want to especially thank DeAnna for all
22 her hard work on this. I know she just wrapped up a
23 four day meeting, she's probably brain dead by now.
24 And, Greg, again, great meeting, you ushered us along.
25 I'm actually surprised we made it through this far.

26

27 Thank you, very much.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ed.
30 Thank you, Ed.

31

32 Michael, you got any comment.

33

34 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, it was a great
35 meeting. Completely educational. Some great work
36 done. I think DeAnna and all of her crew should be
37 definitely be proud of being able to get answers for us
38 with all the stuff that was going on. Great work
39 keeping us on track there, Greg. And hopefully see
40 everybody at the next winter meeting.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, thank
43 you, Michael.

44

45 Diane.

46

47 MS. SELANOFF: Very good meeting. Yes,
48 we got a lot done so good meeting, and good
49 organization. Thank you. Have a nice evening.

50

0376

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.

2

3 Dennis.

4

5 MR. ZADRA: Yes, I just would like to
6 reiterate the work. I'm not -- I'm listening to all
7 this stuff and I'm learning so much and so I'm very
8 grateful for that. And I guess I just hope that we get
9 to meet in person on the next meeting because the
10 virtual stuff I don't think is nearly as effective.
11 But that's all I got. Thanks, everyone.

12

13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
14 Dennis.

15

16 Okay, Gloria.

17

18 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to say I
19 think it was a good meeting and we got a lot done
20 considering. And thank you for your service as the
21 Chair and for DeAnna and for everyone else that serves
22 on here, giving up your time.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
25 Gloria, good comments.

26

27 Angela.

28

29 MS. TOTEMOFF: Thank you, Sir. I just
30 want to say I appreciate your leadership during these
31 meetings. You run a tight ship and when you have so
32 many proposals to go through you provide a lot of
33 guidance and I just highly appreciate that. And I also
34 appreciate DeAnna's effort in all these meetings
35 because she does a really great job keeping us on
36 track. So I'll see you at the next one.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.

39

40 Donna.

41

42 MS. CLAUS: Yeah, you and DeAnna
43 deserve trophies because we got so much done. I don't
44 know how you guys can get everything organized like it
45 is. I know it takes a lot of people, other than just
46 you two but we see you two, so, I say thank you. And I
47 learned an awful lot this time and I feel much more
48 comfortable now. I appreciate that. Thank you.

49

50

0377

1 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Donna.

2

3

Andy.

4

5 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, thanks, Greg.
6 Yeah, I think the C&T stuff is going to increase, it's
7 going to be allocation issues on limited resources and
8 we're heading down a (indiscernible - fades off)

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, you kind of
11 faded off there, Andy, I don't know what happened but
12 you was doing good.

13

14 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Oh, sorry, I don't
15 know. Yeah, my phone is goofy sometimes.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

18

19 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Anyhow, yeah, thanks
20 to everybody. I was just saying we got to buckle up on
21 the C&T stuff because here we go, like Alice in
22 Wonderland, down the rabbit hole. Thanks to DeAnna,
23 unbelievable to all the organization that has to go
24 into making these booklets and all this business with
25 OSM there. And, Greg, thanks for keeping us cruising
26 through all the agenda items one by one. And also the
27 agency folks who trudged through this whole quagmire
28 with us. But I wanted to welcome all the new people,
29 it'll be fun to see new faces when we go back in person
30 again. Anybody can feel free to contact me if there's
31 some way I can help with some type of subsistence issue
32 in your area. And I look forward to going -- doing
33 what I can with this work group, hoping some marine
34 waters stuff can happen Federally here in Prince
35 William Sound. And I look forward to networking with
36 people.

37

38 Thank you.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Andy.

41

42

Judy.

43

44 MS. CAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
45 everyone else for your hard work and participation and
46 patience and organization. It is great to be back and
47 hope to see you all at the next meeting one way or the
48 other. I'm just pleased how much participation there
49 is from everybody on the RAC, that's what it's all
50

0378

1 meant to be.

2

3

Thank you.

4

5

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: John.

6

7

MR. WHISSEL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8

Well, it is not just here but across the board, it is abuse Council and Board Staff week. I have never seen so many giant agendas and this was the heaviest list certainly since I've sat on the SCRAC and since I've been watching the SCRAC. DeAnna, thank you so much for putting this together. To the rest of the OSM Staff I understand we gave you a little hassle about the way some of this was organized but choices had to be made and we were able to work through an incredible agenda in our allocated time. So that goes -- I'm astounded. Thank you so much for all that work.

18

19

20

I really feel good about -- we had some meaningful collaboration with Fish and Game at this meeting, which I appreciate. We had great engagement from the public and Regional Advisory -- or State Advisory Councils, like Tom Carpenter weighing in on the deer proposals. I really like when meetings go that way so I'm grateful to everybody that participated and I'll leave it at that.

27

28

29

Thank you.

30

31

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, John.

32

33

Paula.

34

35

MS. NICKLIE: Yeah, as a new member, I want to thank you, Mr. Chair, and Staff for putting this all together. Lots of great information. Looking forward to the next meeting and future meetings. Sorry I missed yesterday.

39

40

41

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Good to have you, thank you. Okay, I'm just going to make a few comments. You know it takes us all and I'm very happy with the Council participation, I think we wall participated and asked questions, virtual does just kind of suck. I mean you can't say it any other way. If we were in person it would be so much better where we could look at each other and get expressions.

47

48

49

50

1 I do think that, you know, there's some
2 concerns. Like Andy mentioned, the C&T stuff, and I
3 really, really encourage when people put together
4 proposals to bring the proponents of those proposals --
5 you know when we get one written person or two or three
6 it's just -- you know, if a community is proposing
7 something they should have some support there. I know
8 old Ralph Lohse was really strong about that, I feel
9 strong about that, too. If someone's wanting C&T they
10 got an issue with the Fish and Game, you know we need
11 to come forward with it. You know the other thing is
12 the agencies are working their ass off to get
13 everything right for us and, DeAnna, you did an
14 outstanding job and all the members here, we are living
15 in perilous times and uncertain times and, you know,
16 there's a failing of fish stocks in just -- it's almost
17 statewide it's become an epidemic and it's kind of
18 scary of what we're facing ahead and shortages and
19 this.

20
21 So I thank everyone, I talked enough
22 today. Hopefully we can get together and we'll have
23 plenty of the time in the future. I look forward to
24 the working groups. I look forward to getting with
25 Eastern Interior and just seeing if we can't resolve
26 our differences on Fish Proposal 10. And I still feel
27 strongly that the Federal Board passed that duty back
28 to us and they should have handled it, but I just had
29 to mention that. But thank you much. And, DeAnna, you
30 did outstanding, is there anything I need to do before
31 we adjourn.

32
33 MS. PERRY: No, just a motion to
34 adjourn. And I just would like to thank everybody for
35 their patience and their hard work. This was a
36 monumental book we sent to you and new members you did
37 great, rising to the education and I just wanted to
38 take a moment to thank everybody, and all the Staff,
39 all the agencies that pulled together and collaborate
40 on these meetings. It really is a team effort. So
41 thank you all.

42
43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Very good. So a
44 motion to adjourn is in order.

45
46 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, move to
47 adjourn.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: There's a motion
50

0380

1 to adjourn, is there.....

2

3 MS. CLAUS: I second that.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, it's
6 seconded. And I'm all in favor -- aye.

7

8 IN UNISON: Aye.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, we stand
11 adjourned until the next time. Look forward to seeing
12 you in person and sharing smoked fish and stories.

13

14 (Off record)

15

16 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

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

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 II taken electronically on the 14th 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 19th day of November 2021.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/22