

1 KODIAK/ALEUTIANS FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME I

7
8 Kodiak, Alaska
9 March 23, 2010
10 9:00 o'clock a.m.

11
12
13 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 14
15 Speridon Simeonoff, Sr., Chair
16 Patrick Holmes
17 Richard Koso
18 Alexander Panamaroff
19 Sam Rohrer
20 Della Trumble
21
22
23 Regional Council Coordinator, Michelle Chivers

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Recorded and transcribed by:
45
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
47 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
48 Anchorage, AK 99501
49 907-243-0668
50 sahile@gci.net

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Kodiak, Alaska - 3/23/2010)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Good morning, everyone. This -- I'm Speridon Simeonoff. Let's call the meeting to order. The time on the wall says 9:02 I guess. We have the roll call, please.

MR. HOLMES: Tom Schwantes.

(No comments)

MR. HOLMES: I believe he's absent. Myself, Patrick Holmes here. Richard Koso is absent. Sam Rohrer.

MR. ROHRER: Here.

MR. HOLMES: Al Cratty I believe was going to be absent. We have a vacant position. Alex Panamaroff.

MR. PANAMAROFF: Here.

MR. HOLMES: Della Trumble.

MS. TRUMBLE: Here.

MR. HOLMES: Speridon Simeonoff.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Here.

MR. HOLMES: And Tommy Johnson and I don't think Tommy's here yet. That's it.

Mr. Chairman.

MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair. We do have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Thank you, Pat. I'd like to welcome everyone to our Kodiak/Aleutians meeting here at new Fish and Wildlife Visitors Center in Kodiak. Maybe we can start with a round of introductions. I'll go first. I'm Speridon Simeonoff, Chair of the Kodiak Aleutians RAC and from Akhiok.

1 MS. TRUMBLE: Good morning. My name is
2 Della Trumble and it's been a while since I've been
3 back, but it's kind of -- it's good to see all the
4 faces again. It looks like we all got a little older,
5 but we're still here, so -- it's good to be back.

6
7 (Laughter)

8
9 MR. HOLMES: I'm Pat Holmes and I don't
10 think Della's any older at all. Alex has gotten a lot
11 grayer since I've seen him before.

12
13 (Laughter)

14
15 MR. HOLMES: I'm from Kodiak. And I'm
16 an avid supporter of subsistence.

17
18 MR. ROHRER: I'm Sam Rohrer. I'm also
19 from Kodiak and that's all for now.

20
21 MR. PANAMAROFF: Alex Panamaroff, Jr.
22 I live in Larsen Bay and I'm glad to be on the Board
23 here and recognize some faces that I've seen -- oh, a
24 few centuries ago. I'm glad to be here.

25
26 MS. CHIVERS: Michelle Chivers, Council
27 Coordinator.

28
29 MR. CLARK: Maureen Clark with the
30 Office of Subsistence Management.

31
32 MS. BROWN: Cole Brown, Wildlife
33 Biologist for OSM.

34
35 MS. PETRIVELLI: Pat Petrivelli, BIA
36 Subsistence Anthropologist.

37
38 MR. PYLE: Bill Pyle, Wildlife
39 Biologist with Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge.

40
41 MR. SUNDSETH: Kent Sundseth, Deputy
42 Refuge Manager for Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge.

43
44 MR. WHEELER: Good morning. I'm Gary
45 Wheeler, Refuge Manager, Kodiak National Wildlife
46 Refuge.

47
48 MS. PETERSON: Chris Peterson, Wildlife
49 Biologist, Izembek National Wildlife Refuge.

50

1 MS. HOFFMAN: Nancy Hoffman, Izembek
2 National Wildlife Refuge, Refuge Manager.
3
4 MR. FRIED: Morning. Steve Fried,
5 Fishery Biologist, OSM.
6
7 MR. BERG: Morning. My name's Jerry
8 Berg. I'm on the InterAgency Staff Committee for Fish
9 and Wildlife Service out of Anchorage.
10
11 MR. PAPPAS: George Pappas, Department
12 of Fish and Game. I'm on the Subsistence Liaison Team,
13 Fish and Wildlife.
14
15 MR. FOX: Geez, I'm the only civilian
16 here. Don Fox. I'm Secretary for Kodiak Fish and Game
17 Advisory Committee.
18
19 MS. HUPP: I'm Lisa Hupp. I work for
20 Woody Island Tribal Council.
21
22 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you and
23 welcome. At this time, we're supposed to have election
24 of officers. I kept going through -- over that in my
25 head. I was wondering if it's appropriate for us to
26 elect officers without a full Board.
27
28 MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair. That is fine.
29 I mean if you want to elect someone as an officer and
30 they're not here, I mean hopefully they'll be fine with
31 it if you do that, but as far as I know, we are fine
32 with going forward with it as long as you have a
33 quorum.
34
35 Thank you.
36
37 MS. TRUMBLE: I just told Mitch I think
38 -- in my opinion, I'd like to make a motion that
39 officers remain the same.
40
41 MR. ROHRER: Second.
42
43 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and seconded
44 to retain the officers. Is there any discussion. Pat.
45
46 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I think
47 that's a swell idea because all we've been able to do
48 is get in one teleconference and we really haven't met
49 as a body, so I think we should continue with the same
50 slate of officers that we've had.

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Pat.
2 Michelle.
3
4 MS. CHIVERS: Do you want me to
5 announce the officers so the audience knows who they
6 are?
7
8 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: When we get done
9 with the motion. Any other discussion.
10
11 (No comments)
12
13 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No other
14 discussion. Is there any objections to the motion?
15 Seeing no objections, then the motion carries.
16
17 (No objections)
18
19 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: At this time we'll
20 do the swearing in of the officers.
21
22 MS. CHIVERS: Okay. As the officers
23 stand right now, Mitch Simeonoff is the Chair, Al
24 Cratty is the Vice-Chair, and Pat Holmes is Secretary.
25
26 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Stand up, Pat.
27
28 (Applause)
29
30 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. That done.
31 Item 5 is review and adoption of the agenda. Now, it's
32 noted here at 1:30 we'll have the call in from I guess
33 the Aleutians concerning the caribou out of Unimak
34 Island and later on this afternoon, probably around
35 4:00, we'll have other people coming in to make
36 testimony on the extension of the airport to at Buskin.
37
38
39 So with that, is there any other
40 additions to the agenda from the Board. Agencies? No.
41 Then a motion would be in order to adopt our agenda as
42 amended.
43
44 MR. PANAMAROFF: So move.
45
46 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Alex moved to
47 adopt the agenda. Is there a second.
48
49 MS. TRUMBLE: Second.
50

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and second.
2 Any discussion.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no
7 discussion, is there any objection.
8
9 (No objection)
10
11 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no
12 objection, then the motion carries. Next is the
13 approval of minutes of our March 31st, 2009,
14 teleconference.
15
16 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. Move to
17 adopt.
18
19 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Do I hear a
20 second.
21
22 MR. ROHRER: Second.
23
24 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and
25 seconded. Any discussion. Any corrections to the
26 minutes of our March 31st meeting -- teleconference.
27
28 (No comments)
29
30 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: If there's no
31 discussion, then is there any objections to approving
32 the minutes of our March 31st teleconference.
33
34 (No objection)
35
36 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no
37 objections, then the motion carries. Council members
38 reports. All right. I guess I can go first. I don't
39 have very much to report, but I do appreciate we had
40 Gary Wheeler and Tanya Lee come out to Akhiok, spend a
41 day out there with the kids in the school and they got
42 stuck out there for a day. Experienced our weather out
43 there.
44
45 We did have -- while they were there,
46 the blizzard was coming in. They just made it out and
47 then the deer population started coming back around the
48 mountain and right behind them was a big old boar just
49 following them around. He kind of got in front of the
50 ridge there and made himself a bed and there are deer

1 all around. He was a happy bear. And I don't have
2 much else to report than that, but it's been a pretty
3 mild winter, you know, just last -- couple weeks ago,
4 that blizzard we had was about the worst it ever got.
5 I don't know what that means, but it's not the kind of
6 winter we're used to.

7

8 That's all I have. Pat.

9

10 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I've been
11 doing some volunteering work with the three local
12 Kodiak tribes on different environmental issues and on
13 the FAA field proposal for the Buskin and that's been
14 quite rewarding to work with local elders and members
15 of the tribes and I think it was really great for you
16 to arrange for that bear to come down for the meeting
17 down there for everybody.

18

19 And I did do a little bit of networking
20 with Stanley Mack, the Aleutians East Borough, this
21 winter and last year and wrote a letter on behalf of my
22 observations of having worked in King Cove when they
23 were doing the -- some of their discussions with the
24 Secretary of Interior on getting access to Cole Bay
25 from King Cove and while it isn't a subsistence issue,
26 it certainly is important to folks out there.

27

28 So I don't really have anything else to
29 report.

30

31 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Pat.

32 Della.

33

34 MS. TRUMBLE: Well, basically I think
35 for the most part within the immediate region -- I live
36 around King Cove and then Unit 9 and 10 is in regard to
37 the caribou issue and I think there's also I think the
38 issue I think that -- and I've talked to Nancy a little
39 bit about this is in regard to the population of wolves
40 in the region. That seems to -- we're observing them a
41 lot more and when we grew up out there, never saw a
42 wolf, and now it's -- you just don't -- you know, you
43 see them quite frequently.

44

45 And the other issue I think that we've
46 been working on is the EIS on the Izembek Refuge
47 Enhancement Act and both Nancy and I were -- well, I
48 was in the Anchorage hearing -- we were in the
49 Anchorage hearing and then the D.C. Scoping and we will
50 continue with that through the end of April with five

1 communities within our region.

2

3 But other than that, I think now that
4 we're more involved, I know Sally and I have been talk
5 -- Sally McNamera, Aleutians East Borough, and
6 discussing some of the discussions that he's had with
7 Pat over the last year. So we've kind of been in touch
8 in that respect. But other than, we've kind of been
9 having a winter just like you.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Della.
12 Sam.

13

14 MR. ROHRER: I have nothing to report.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Thank you.

17

18 MR. PANAMAROFF: Thank you, Mr.
19 Chairman. Like I said earlier, I'm glad to be on this
20 Board. Hopefully I could contribute. I only have one
21 thing that I wanted to talk about this morning that
22 I've been getting some input from some of the village
23 people and that I understand is happening not only in
24 the Larsen Bay area, but also in some other villages.

25

26 We have a problem with some hunters
27 fish -- hunt -- I'm sorry -- hunting right outside of
28 the village right within the village areas and they're
29 driving the game away from where we normally do our
30 subsistence hunting. And most of the land that they're
31 hunting on is Refuge land. And when we want to go and
32 do our subsistence, we have to go further out. So we
33 have to take a skiff and go travel across the bay or --
34 and some of the other bays, so we need some kind of
35 steerage on what we can do as far as maybe put some
36 kind of a buffer zone around the areas where -- you
37 know, where we live.

38

39 It's getting harder and harder every
40 year to subsist on -- in our areas and also I
41 understand that the fishing portion I believe is staked
42 -- it's all State waters in the area I live in. So I
43 probably have to talk to State people for that. Same
44 thing with fishing. We got commercial fishing both
45 coming in fishing all the areas right around the
46 villages and we can't -- when we need to go out and do
47 some subsistence for our fishing also, we do the same
48 thing. We have to go way away from the areas. It's
49 getting harder every year.

50

1 So like to have some input on that and
2 have some help as far as what we can do to fix the
3 problem that we have.

4
5 Thank you.

6
7 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Alex.
8 I'm sure we'll -- you'll make contact with someone here
9 that can help you. Maybe during a break, you can get
10 together with Gary or someone from the Refuge.

11
12 At this time, we're going review and
13 make recommendations on wildlife proposals.

14
15 Cole Brown.

16
17 MS. BROWN: Good morning. Mr. Chair.
18 Members of the Council. My name is Cole Brown. I'm a
19 wildlife biologist for the Office of Subsistence
20 Management. I will be presenting the analyses for you
21 today for the wildlife proposals.

22
23 There are a number of statewide
24 proposals. There are five of them that we're going to
25 go over and none of them specifically deal with this
26 Kodiak Regional Advisory Council, but they're statewide
27 issues that we need to have input on.

28
29 So the first is WP10-01. The analysis
30 for this proposal begins on Page 17 of your books.

31
32 Proposal WP10-01 was submitted by OSM
33 and requests the addition of a definition for drawing
34 permit to the Federal Subsistence Management
35 Regulations. Existing Federal Subsistence Management
36 Regulations do not include a definition for drawing
37 permit. However, because this term is used in hunting
38 regulations, a definition should be provided.

39
40 The proposal would apply to the entire
41 State, giving a definition for drawing permit. It does
42 not affect fish and wildlife populations, subsist uses
43 or other uses and would help clarify the regulations.

44
45 OSM preliminary conclusion is to
46 support the Proposal WP10-01 with modification to
47 simplify and clarify the definition of drawing permits,
48 that they're based on a random drawing for all
49 similarly situated Federally-qualified subsistence
50 users. The modified regulation would read drawing

1 permit, a permit issued to a limited of Federally-
2 qualified subsistence users selected by means of a
3 random drawing.

4

5 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Comments from Fish
8 and Game.

9

10 MR. PAPPAS: Good morning. Mr. Chair.
11 George Pappas, Department of Fish and Game. The
12 Department is not presenting comments for Proposals No.
13 1 through 5 on the statewide issues. We're collecting
14 input, public testimony, new information statewide and
15 this will be the tenth time I've had to say this this
16 year. Also we're not providing comments on C&T
17 proposals which it doesn't look like you have some
18 here. You don't have any. Excuse me. So thank you
19 very much. We'll be taking notes before we finalize
20 positions.

21

22 Appreciate it.

23

24 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you. Other
25 Federal, State, Tribal Agencies. None here. Staff
26 Committees -- InterAgency staffing committees.

27

28 MR. BERG: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
29 Chairman. Jerry Berg, Fish and Wildlife Service. The
30 Staff Committee did review all these proposals, but we
31 -- all of our comments were incorporated into the
32 analysis, so we don't have any comments -- any
33 additional comments to provide to you at the meeting.
34 So that will be the case for all these proposals.

35

36 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Thank you.
39 Is there any written or public comments.

40

41 MS. CHIVERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
42 There were no written public comments.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Budget Council
45 recommendations. How does the Council feel about this
46 WP10-01. Pat.

47

48 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. Ms. Brown.
49 I guess the idea of this is when things would be so
50 difficult for subsistence that this would be like a --

1 beyond a community level. It would be if you could
2 allow some harvest, then there would be a random
3 drawing to allow for some small harvest in the
4 community so that people could continue with their
5 customary and traditional practices. Is that the
6 concept behind this?

7
8 MS. BROWN: Yes, sir. That's it
9 exactly. There are a couple places where it currently
10 exists. Currently in the hunting regulations in Unit
11 19A, there is a drawing permit for a moose hunt and we
12 just notice that there wasn't a definition in the regs
13 for it. So that's our attempt to put that in there,
14 and this proposal cycle round WP10-09 which is for the
15 Southeast, they have requested a drawing permit hunt
16 for there, and the same situation. We don't have a
17 definition for it, so this is us just providing a
18 definition for the case that there is a drawing permit.
19 But your definition -- your explanation is correct.

20
21 MR. HOLMES: Thank you, Ms. Brown. Mr.
22 Chairman. I think I would support this proposal. It
23 seems to have very good merit in being able to provide
24 for customary and traditional use of resources in a
25 restricted means.

26
27 Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other Board
30 comments.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. WP10-01 I
35 think a motion would be in order for this Board to
36 support.

37
38 MR. HOLMES: Move to adopt. Mr.
39 Chairman.

40
41 MR. PANAMAROFF: Second.

42
43 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and
44 seconded. Any discussion.

45
46 MS. BROWN: Excuse me. It's support
47 with modification for the -- to the clarify the
48 regulation.

49
50 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes. Yes.

1 MS. BROWN: Thank you.
2
3 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other
4 discussion.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No there
9 discussion. Is there any objection.
10
11 (No objection)
12
13 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No objections.
14 Then the motion carries. Support with modification.
15 I'm sorry. Go ahead.
16
17 MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman. Just to we
18 can make sure everything's tied up nice and neat, maybe
19 we should get Della and make sure we have her vote as
20 well.
21
22 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Let's take a short
23 break until she comes back in. I need to get a cup of
24 coffee.
25
26 (Off record)
27
28 (On record)
29
30 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. We're back.
31 We'll continue. We were in Council deliberation and a
32 motion was made to support with modification and when
33 you walked out, we lost the quorum, so we couldn't --
34 so now that we have a quorum. He's in the room. He's
35 not going away.
36
37 The Board decided to support with
38 modification.
39
40 MS. BROWN: That's fine.
41
42 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay.
43
44 MS. BROWN: I could hear you with one
45 ear out there, so --
46
47 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: All right. Next
48 one.
49
50 MS. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 Members of the Council. WP10-02 is just a status
2 report. There is no action required. A more detailed
3 briefing on this issue can be found in your books on
4 Page 20.

5
6 WP10-02 was the deferred proposal of
7 WP08-05, but it is the same proposal. It was just
8 given a new number for this regulatory cycle. The
9 proposal requested clarification of the Federal
10 Subsistence Management Regulation governing the use of
11 brown bear claws and handicrafts for sale. The Federal
12 Subsistence Board deferred the proposal at its May 2008
13 meeting and voted to form a work group to address the
14 issue of developing a method of tracking brown bear
15 claws made into handicrafts for sale.

16
17 The Board directed that the working
18 group include representatives from all interested
19 subsistence Regional Advisory Councils as well as State
20 and Federal Staff. At an initial scoping meeting
21 between Federal and State Staff was held in January of
22 2009 and a draft charge was developed.

23
24 A briefing on the status of the work
25 group was provided to all Regional Advisory Councils
26 during the winter 2009 meeting cycle and at that time,
27 representatives from interested Regional Councils were
28 selected to participate in the work group. At the work
29 group's only meeting in June 2009, participants from
30 the Councils posed a number of questions directed at
31 whether or not brown bear tracking is a problem for
32 subsistence users and if regulations needed to be
33 changed.

34
35 These questions prompted Federal and
36 State Staff to conduct further research and to meet as
37 Agency Staff to compare notes and to follow up on
38 research questions which occurred twice during summer
39 2009. The work group attempted to meet again during
40 the summer of 2009, but this was not possible.

41
42 Another briefing on the status of the
43 work group was provided during the fall 2009 Regional
44 Advisory Council meeting. The work group will meet
45 during the spring or summer of this year 2010 to
46 address the questions raised at its first meeting and
47 to begin working towards resolution of the issues.

48
49 The work group's findings will be
50 presented to each Council for their recommendations

1 during the fall 2010 meeting cycle and for a full
2 report to be provided to the Federal Subsistence Board
3 for action at its January 2011 meeting. The report
4 will also be provided to the Alaska Board of Game at an
5 appropriate meeting.

6

7 The proposal will be deferred until
8 that time.

9

10 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. No action
13 required on WP10-02. We'll just go ahead and move to
14 the next one.

15

16 MS. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17 Wildlife Proposal 10-03 submitted by Office of
18 Subsistence Management is found on Page 21 of your
19 books. This proposal requests the addition of a
20 general provision in Federal Subsistence Management
21 Regulations to allow the harvest of fish and wildlife
22 by participants in a cultural or educational program.

23

24 Now this proposal is a housekeeping
25 measure to provide clarity on how these permits are
26 currently being issued within Office of Subsistence
27 Management. The adoption of this proposal will not
28 change how the Office of Subsistence Management
29 currently issues these permits. Most requests for
30 these permits come from cultural camps sponsored by
31 Native nonprofit organizations.

32

33 This proposal puts into regulations the
34 guidelines the Federal program currently follows when
35 issuing these permits. The modified regulation has
36 four parts. First, it defines a qualifying program.
37 Second, it alerts the public that the Office of
38 Subsistence Management needs time to process the
39 application while at the same time, it allows the
40 Office of Subsistence Management to accept a request
41 for a permit at any time which is the current policy.

42

43 And it states that these applications
44 should be submitted 60 days prior to the earliest
45 desired date of harvest. That just gives a starting
46 point. We will accept permits if they're earlier than
47 that, but we need time to process through that, so
48 that's why we put in the 60 days.

49

50 Third, the modified regulation gives

1 direction to the local field manager in the area where
2 the harvest will occur; and fourth, it gives direction
3 on how to issue follow-up permits.

4
5 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
6 support Proposal WP10-03 with modification to simplify
7 the proposed regulation. The modified regulation
8 should read, a qualifying program must have
9 instructors, enrolled students, minimum attendance
10 requirements, and standards for successful completion
11 of the course. Applications must be submitted to the
12 Federal Subsistence Board through the Office of
13 Subsistence Management and should be submitted 60 days
14 prior to the earliest desired date of harvest. Harvest
15 must be reported and any animals harvested will count
16 against any established Federal harvest quota for the
17 area in which it is harvested. Requests for follow-up
18 permits must be submitted to the in-season or local
19 manager and should be submitted 60 days prior to the
20 earliest desired date of harvest.

21
22 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23
24 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Department of Fish
25 and Game comments.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: None. Federal,
30 State, or Tribal.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: InterAgency.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Fish and Game
39 Advisory Committee.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No public
44 testimony.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Summary of written
49 public comments.

50

1 MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair. There were no
2 written public comments.

3
4 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Board
5 deliberation. WP10-03. Pat.

6
7 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I guess I
8 would ask the OSM if 60 days is absolute minimum amount
9 of time it takes to process a permit. I don't mean to
10 be picky, but, you know, with the State, if somebody
11 wants something like that at the local office, they
12 call the area manager guy and say, gee, we've got
13 Spirit Camp at Dig Afognak going and we want to take 50
14 fish and he just says no problem, go for it. And they
15 do it the same day they ask. So I'm just wondering why
16 does it take 60 days for a permit to be processed in
17 Anchorage.

18
19 MS. BROWN: Member Holmes through the
20 Chair. This is just giving a guideline. That's why we
21 put in the word should in bold. We do accept last
22 minute requests for permits. We did so last year for a
23 sheep cultural and educational permit in Anaktuvuk
24 Pass.

25
26 Because of how our program is
27 structured, we have to go through the ISC review. They
28 need to be polled and then it needs to go to the
29 Federal Subsistence Board for approval. So getting all
30 those ponies lined up takes some time. It's not that
31 it can't be done. It's just we're putting a should
32 clause for -- mostly for people that are asking for
33 recurring permits. They know that they're going to be
34 doing it next year. This just gives a guideline

35
36 For the people that, you know, have
37 last minute desires to go out there, we can certainly
38 accommodate that and we have done so in the past, but
39 we're trying to get it a little bit more -- to a point
40 where we can address each one with the same amount of
41 consideration.

42
43 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you. Any
46 other comments.

47
48 MS. TRUMBLE: Could you give me a
49 little bit more clarification on number 2 on the
50 application. And I guess what I'm looking at is what

1 exactly -- maybe just a little better definition of
2 what this means. And where I'm looking at more I think
3 is -- it has when no permit has been issued within
4 previous five years or when there is a request for
5 harvest in excess of that provided in paragraph G1 will
6 be considered.

7

8 Are there -- if someone hasn't -- an
9 organization maybe hasn't applied for a permit -- what
10 is the purpose of the within the last five years?

11

12 MS. BROWN: Member Trumble through the
13 Chair. We have a number of permits that are given
14 every year to the same organization and so that time
15 frame of up to five years is because you see those
16 permits coming every year.

17

18 We put this in to give us clarity to
19 show that new programs that come up, we're going to
20 have to look into that program to see if it's a
21 legitimate program for all the standards. Does it have
22 qualified instructors. Does it have all the parameters
23 that we listed out as being a cultural or educational
24 pernitee.

25

26 So if we haven't been working with this
27 entity before, this just provides us a way that we can
28 look into that, find out if that -- whatever they're
29 asking for for the harvest is going to be able to
30 sustain that. So it's looking at a new pernitee versus
31 somebody that's coming in and has done this for maybe
32 the past five years. It's just giving it a time frame
33 of somebody that we've dealt with before.

34

35 And I guess they modified it and
36 removed those provisions.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: They removed all
39 of section 2?

40

41 MS. PETRIVELLI: On Page 26 has the
42 modification.

43

44 MS. BROWN: Right.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: General
47 regulation, is that it?

48

49 MS. PETRIVELLI: That's what it will
50 be. It's more simplified.

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Does that answer
2 your question?
3
4 MS. TRUMBLE: That takes care of it.
5
6 MS. PETRIVELLI: Much better.
7
8 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I have one
9 question I guess that -- a camp -- say a cultural camp
10 applies for a permit. Now if we have our camp during
11 the open season of these animals, can a camp apply for
12 its own permit without using the permits of the hunters
13 that have applied? Okay.
14
15 MS. PETRIVELLI: That's what it's
16 designed for.
17
18 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: What I'm saying is
19 a cultural camp can apply for a permit to harvest
20 animals. Okay? And the hunter has his own permit, his
21 hunting license and permit to go hunt then. So the
22 camp itself can have a permit.
23
24 MS. BROWN: Yes, Mr. Chair. That's
25 exactly what this is dealing with.
26
27 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay.
28
29 MS. BROWN: Two separate.
30
31 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Any other
32 Board deliberations. Sam.
33
34 MR. ROHRER: Yeah. I have a question
35 on the modified regulation. It seems that the modified
36 regulation removes any kind of -- I guess any kind of
37 limit on -- okay. Let me start over. Okay. Under the
38 original regulation, once you have a permit approved,
39 you had five years -- correct me if I'm wrong. You had
40 five years where you could request the same permit and
41 then after five years, it had to be relooked at by the
42 Federal Subsistence Board and the office of OSM? Is
43 that correct?
44
45 MS. PETRIVELLI: This is Pat Petrivelli
46 with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the way the
47 permit system worked is people could apply for a
48 cultural/education permit and a couple years ago, they
49 tried to simplify the application. So they said a camp
50 could submit their permit and meet all those

1 requirements and then they could renew it every year.
2 And that five-year provision was in there in case they
3 didn't renew it in five years because then they -- you
4 know, there might be a whole new camp, a whole new
5 system that would not know the requirements for the
6 camp or, you know, that you have to have the -- the
7 hunter has to be a Federally-qualified user and all
8 that.

9
10 So that's where that five year came up.
11 Now, there was -- in the proposed regulation, it did
12 have the limit of one large mammal and 25 fish and the
13 Staff Committee reviewed the proposed language and so
14 many of the requests are like one moose, one muskox up
15 North, and then 25 fish doesn't really go very far. So
16 they would have to keep making exceptions every year
17 and so they just decided to be flexible and as long as
18 it -- we left in the -- it would count against --
19 whatever would be harvested would count against any
20 established Federal harvest quota.

21
22 So as long as there's a Federal harvest
23 quota and those limits requested are within the Federal
24 harvest quota, there wouldn't be a conservation
25 concern. And so they left -- they figured that was
26 significant enough. So they just wanted to make it as
27 -- the language as simple as possible, but there still
28 would be the procedure for applying for it and there's
29 that main one, the initial application.

30
31 And then the second time when they
32 follow up, they wouldn't have to go to OSM. They could
33 come to the Refuge office and say we're the camp that
34 got the permit last year and we want to do it again and
35 just provide that. So the follow-up permits -- but it
36 was still whoever gets the application would review
37 what they're requesting to make sure it follows the
38 Federal harvest quota and it would be to address the
39 conservation concerns.

40
41 So I don't know if that answers your
42 question or not.

43
44 MR. ROHRER: Yeah. That does. I have
45 a little bit of concern about the request for the
46 follow up permits and just tell me what you think on
47 this. But it seems like there should be some review
48 period. I don't know, after five years, after a
49 certain amount of years that it goes back to OSM, the
50 Subsistence Board relooks at it. What's your thoughts

1 on that?

2

3 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, I mean if the
4 rest of the Council members think that's important, but
5 at OSM, I don't think anyone felt that because usually
6 these camps, you know, they just come to the program
7 and ask and they usually ask for so many fish every
8 year and so many moose and it's the same people usually
9 and so we didn't see any problem with them keeping
10 asking.

11

12 In fact some camps, when they keep
13 applying for it, they get tired of it and they have
14 actually put in regulatory proposals so that it's part
15 of the regulation as a special provision that they get
16 their moose every year and you'll find those in
17 regulations in Unit 6 for moose, the Sobriety Culture
18 Camp and there's for whales up north, they get a moose
19 and three musk.....

20

21 MS. BROWN: Well, they put in a
22 proposal for the muskox.....

23

24 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah.

25

26 MS. BROWN:and it's one muskox
27 and one moose.

28

29 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah.

30

31 MS. BROWN: They've just put in a
32 proposal.....

33

34 MS. PETRIVELLI: And it's just part of
35 the regulations. So it just becomes -- it's just a
36 vehicle whether -- because they -- it's like someone
37 who always gets a moose. You know, they always have
38 the camp, you know, and it's just whether they get a
39 permit through this cultural permit or they put in a
40 regulatory proposal to keep getting it.

41

42 So is the concern that -- I'm not -- I
43 don't think we have a concern as long as there's the
44 resource available. We don't see any problem with.....

45

46 MS. BROWN: I think maybe, Member
47 Rohrer.....

48

49 MR. ROHRER: Uh-huh.

50

1 MS. BROWN:is that as long as
2 it's the same people, you know, as long as it's the
3 same cultural camp, the same instructors, they've
4 already established those criteria to be a cultural or
5 educational program. If there's any change in that or
6 if suddenly they don't have the students or the
7 instructor that is a Federally-qualified subsistence
8 user that could actually harvest the animal, under
9 those conditions, then it would be relooked at, but if
10 it's the same thing every, then it's just -- it's
11 better to expedite it rather than be caught up in the
12 red tape.

13

14 MR. ROHRER: Yeah, I understand that
15 and I appreciate your comments. I guess my concern was
16 what you mentioned there, the program name stays the
17 same, but instructors come and go and -- maybe the same
18 name stays there, but eventually the entire program's
19 different. How is that relooked at, but I guess you
20 answered that.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: One more question.
23 A camp can apply for permits for -- they got to apply
24 -- get a permit for each animal harvested or you name
25 all the animals you want to harvest and one permit.

26

27 MS. BROWN: That's correct, Mr. Chair.
28 So if they want to go in for one moose or three moose,
29 they need to be specific about the species that they
30 want to harvest and the quantity that they want to
31 harvest on one permit, yes.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: On one permit,
34 okay. And the qualifications for instructors, they got
35 to be a certified teacher or what?

36

37 MS. BROWN: No. There's -- within the
38 qualifying program, they must have instructors,
39 enrolled students, minimum -- just to make sure that
40 it's not just a bunch of people getting together and
41 going for a hunt, that there's actually a structure to
42 it that they're providing either a cultural experience
43 or an educational or both experience, so that it's an
44 actual program.

45

46 But the qualified instructors is just
47 how the program is going to be defining it not OSM --
48 except for the program themselves.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: And what does the

1 agency look for? Do you look for outcomes? Do they
2 need to submit like if this instructor is going to take
3 out five students, do you want a written outcome as to
4 -- to qualify that program or how do you know for sure
5 he's a qualified instruction unless he has students?
6 Just by the permit -- the camp saying that we have this
7 person who's going to take these students out?

8
9 MS. PETRIVELLI: I used to work for OSM
10 five years ago and when I was there -- and I don't
11 think it's changed much, but the anthropologists would
12 help write up the application and then the camp would
13 get the permit and the main thing that they are
14 concerned about is the reporting of the harvest from
15 the animals.

16
17 And we would just assume that the
18 activities were carried out and generally local people
19 would let you know if people are not doing the right
20 thing, are using the permit improperly, but the main
21 thing is the reporting afterwards that you were either
22 successful harvesting the animal or not successful.

23
24 Now whether you -- whether so many
25 people signed up for the class or completed it, but you
26 would work with the person when you're submitting the
27 application, describing what kind of camp you have. So
28 like there was a camp in -- it was by Glennallen,
29 but -- and they got fish, and so it was a fish camp and
30 they ran a fish wheel and then they described the
31 elders that were working with them and then local
32 people knew who those elders were and so -- and then
33 the kids came from Chickaloon and they were in the fish
34 camp. And I was lucky enough -- and maybe it was
35 because it was my last year there, but I went on a
36 field trip and I went to the fish camp, you know, but
37 not everyone ground truth those activities, but
38 generally the local -- that's why it's renewed with a
39 local person because then they would know -- so -- and
40 it's, one, to protect the harvesters, you know, so that
41 they don't get arrested if they're harvesting out of
42 season or they're harvesting more.

43
44 You know, but then another -- local
45 people will know if there's a real fish camp or not or
46 a real, you know, spirit camp that's carrying out the
47 activities. You know, it's just to -- because we want
48 to allow those activities to go forward.

49
50 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Thank you.

1 Any other Council deliberations. Della.

2

3 MS. TRUMBLE: I think the modified
4 regulation -- when I was looking at the other one, I
5 had concerns and my reasoning was that I think when you
6 have to go through processes to get permits to do a
7 cultural activity to this extent, you know, some of the
8 stuff you shouldn't have to -- shouldn't be regulated,
9 then you take the whole spirit of what you're doing out
10 of it.

11

12 And so what I'm saying though the
13 modified regulation I think cleans that up a little bit
14 because in my mind, it's having to go through a process
15 60 days and going through that step was something that
16 people do and should continue to do. That does -- did
17 concern me.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you. Pat.

20

21 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. I like this
22 modified regulation better
23 and with your explanation of should allowing for a
24 shorter term contact if someone's just getting a camp
25 started up or in the case where the main coordinator or
26 instructor just gets the job a month before the camp's
27 taking off and they find out there is no permit. I
28 think that's a good approach to be able to allow for
29 that.

30

31 I do have one question that relates to
32 overlapping jurisdiction. I don't know if George
33 disappeared. He's -- what happens in the case of let's
34 say in Dig Afognak where it's on -- I believe it's
35 corporation land -- Native corporation land, so it
36 falls under State regs and yet the fishing takes place
37 in the three-mile buffer zone around the Afognak which
38 is Maritimes Refuge and yet Fish and Game is the one
39 that gives out subsistence permits here for both
40 Agencies. I would assume that if you've got one Agency
41 that gives you a permit for the cultural camp and it's
42 acceptable for them, then it would be mutually
43 acceptable for the other and so one wouldn't have to
44 get two permits to do Dig Afognak. If you've got the
45 State one -- I mean that's -- you know, you get into
46 the old jurisdiction thing again and so that's a
47 question of what happens in that case because we've got
48 -- that would be the same thing in Old Harbor or like
49 Akhiok for fishing, but -- you know, or mountain goat
50 hunting. You know, what happens where you have

1 overlapping jurisdiction.

2

3 MS. BROWN: Member Holmes, through the
4 Chair. I believe that you would not unless the Federal
5 land was closed for some reason. You could use the
6 State permit otherwise, but I believe there may have
7 been cases where that Federal land in that area was
8 closed except to Federally-qualified subsistence users
9 and therefore -- I believe it might have been the case
10 for when we gave one for a camp in Anaktuvuk Pass that
11 -- and especially for Park Service land too, I think
12 that was the case is that they got a State permit, but
13 then in order -- if they went and found the sheep on
14 Park Service land, they wanted to make sure that they
15 had the right permit.

16

17 We worked with the State with that
18 permit and looked at the entity -- the program in and
19 of itself as well and ended up just granting them the
20 Federal permit. But I think it's each isolated case.
21 For the most part, yes, you probably would just need
22 one, but in extenuating circumstances, we'd be happy to
23 work with the State and provide that opportunity
24 regardless.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 MR. HOLMES: Thank you.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other Board
31 deliberations. WP10-03.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I'd entertain a
36 motion.

37

38 MR. HOLMES: I'll move to adopt. Mr.
39 Chairman.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Move to support
42 with modification to simplify the proposal I think.

43

44 MR. PANAMAROFF: I second.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and
47 seconded. Any discussion.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No further
2 discussion. Is there any objection.

3
4 (No objections)

5
6 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Seeing no
7 objections, then the motion carries. Next proposal.

8
9 MS. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
10 Members of the Council. The analysis for WP10-04 can be
11 found on Page 27 of your Council book. Proposal WP10-
12 04 was submitted by the Office of Subsistence
13 Management and would remove a number of Game Management
14 Units from the areas for which the Assistant Regional
15 Director for Subsistence Management has the delegated
16 authority to open, close, or adjust Federal subsistence
17 lynx seasons and to set harvest and possession limits.

18
19 Now this is a statewide proposal
20 because all rural residents have customary and
21 traditional use determination for lynx. The units in
22 question are Interior units and not actually Kodiak
23 units, but because all residents have a customary and
24 traditional use, we're presenting this to all Regional
25 Advisory Councils.

26
27 Lynx trapping seasons are adjusted
28 annually based on recommendations, determined by the
29 using the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's tracking
30 harvest strategy for managing lynx. The Alaska Board
31 of Game removed Units 6, 12, 20A, 20B, 20C east of the
32 Teklanika River, 20D, and 20E from the list of units
33 that are managed using the lynx harvest strategy.

34
35 Because of this action, these units
36 should also be eliminated from Federal regulation.
37 Over time the State has removed a number of units from
38 its lynx tracking strategy. If this proposal is
39 adopted, it would align Federal and State regulations
40 regarding lynx management.

41
42 Season and harvest limits can still be
43 changed through the normal regulatory cycle or through
44 a special action if needed. There would be no adverse
45 impacts to subsistence users. Only the authority
46 delegated to the Assistant Regional Director for the
47 Office of Subsistence Management would be affected.

48
49 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
50 support with modification to delete the regulatory

1 language found in Section .26, subsection F.3 and
2 delegate the authority to open, close, or adjust
3 Federal lynx seasons and to set harvest and possession
4 limits for lynx via a delegation of authority letter
5 only and an example of that letter can be found on
6 either Page 32 or Page 39.

7
8 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9
10 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Department
11 of Fish and Game comments.

12
13 (No comments)

14
15 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I'll remember it
16 next time.

17
18 (Laughter)

19
20 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Federal, State and
21 Tribal.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: InterAgency Staff.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Fish and Game
30 Advisory Committee.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Written public
35 comments.

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: None. Board
40 deliberation. I was looking at this. Areas 20 and 10,
41 no Council have made a recommendation to support. It's
42 usually been our -- the Kodiak/Aleutians usually don't
43 support something unless the area in which it affects
44 have made a recommendation. Now, if we're.....

45
46 MS. BROWN: The option could be to take
47 no action if their units were not involved. That may
48 have been what was done. Do you know if.....

49
50 REPORTER: I have the transcripts.

1 MS. BROWN: She has the transcripts.
2
3 (Discussion between Reporter and Ms.
4 Brown)
5
6 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I'm not getting
7 any of that.
8
9 REPORTER: Eastern Interior supported
10 the proposal, but Western Interior took no action.
11 It's not in their region.
12
13 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah.
14
15 MR. PAPPAS: NWA opposed.
16
17 REPORTER: And Northwest Arctic
18 opposed.
19
20 MS. BROWN: For different reasons.
21
22 REPORTER: Yes, for different reasons.
23
24 MR. PAPPAS: (Nods affirmatively)
25
26 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.
27
28 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I think we
29 probably should just not take any action on this unless
30 Gary's interested in bringing in some lynx for us. I
31 had some when I was in high school. They're pretty
32 tasty and make great fur, but I kind of doubt that he'd
33 be keen on that. So I'd like to make a motion that we
34 take no action on this proposal.
35
36 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Was that your
37 motion, Pat?
38
39 MR. HOLMES: Yes. We take no action on
40 this proposal. Mr. Chair.
41
42 MR. PANAMAROFF: I'll second.
43
44 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and
45 seconded. Any discussion.
46
47 (No comments)
48
49 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no
50 discussion, is there any objection.

1 (No objection)

2

3 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no
4 objections, then the motion carries.

5

6 Okay. Next proposal.

7

8 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chair. Members of the
9 Council. Proposal WP10-05 was submitted by Office of
10 Subsistence Management and starts on Page 43 of your
11 Council books.

12

13 This is also a housekeeping proposal
14 and seeks to update, clarify, and simplify the
15 regulations regarding accumulation of harvest limits
16 for both fish and wildlife. This is a statewide
17 proposal and will be reviewed by all ten Regional
18 Councils.

19

20 The wording in the general Federal
21 Subsistence Regulations concerning accumulation of
22 harvest limits dates back to 1990 and 1994. There is a
23 need to update the wording. While the Federal
24 Subsistence Board has addressed a number of area-
25 specific proposals concerning the accumulation of
26 harvest limits over the years, this part of the general
27 regulations has not been updated to reflect those
28 changes to the unit and area-specific regulations.

29

30 Proposal WP10-05 addresses those
31 inconsistencies. Proposal WP10-05 does not affect fish
32 and wildlife populations, subsistence uses or other
33 uses. Rather the proposal seeks to update, clarify,
34 and simplify the general regulations with reference to
35 accumulation of harvest limits. The proposed wording
36 changes retain the general prohibition of accumulation
37 of Federal and State harvest limits and point to unit
38 and area-specific regulations for details and
39 exceptions.

40

41 This proposal does not change any unit
42 or area-specific Federal Subsistence Regulations
43 concerning the accumulation of harvest limits or the
44 time frame whether it's daily, seasonal, or regulatory
45 year for harvest limits.

46

47 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
48 support Proposal WP10-05.

49

50 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you. No
2 Fish and Game comments.
3 Federal, State, and Tribal Agencies.
4
5 (No comments)
6
7 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: InterAgency Staff.
8
9 (No comments)
10
11 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Fish and Game
12 Advisory Committee.
13
14 (No comments)
15
16 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Written and public
17 comments.
18
19 MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair. There are no
20 written public comments.
21
22 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Regional Council
23 deliberations. Pat.
24
25 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. Ms. Brown.
26 As I get older, I kind of lose meaning of verbiage.
27 Could you clarify what accumulation of harvest limits
28 is.
29
30 MS. BROWN: Member Holmes through the
31 Chair. It would be if there's a possession limit or a
32 harvest limit through the State and also through the
33 Federal program. You cannot combine those to increase
34 your harvest limit. Currently for -- for this
35 proposal, there are certain unit and area-specific
36 regulations that provide daily possession or possession
37 limits for certain species and those exist for
38 currently ptarmigan, grouse, caribou, wolf, hare,
39 beaver, fish, and shellfish.
40
41 It doesn't change any of that. It's
42 just updating for certain conditions and that's in
43 subsection .26 which it would be for wildlife. .27
44 would be for fish and .28 would be for shellfish and
45 that's on Page 45 of your Council books.
46
47 So this proposal is just providing
48 additional clarity in the general regulations, so the
49 first part of the regulations. It doesn't touch any of
50 the area-specific regulations. So if you go to Unit,

1 you know, 10 or something and you have limits,
2 accumulation verbiage in that area for those species,
3 it doesn't deal with that. It's only talking about the
4 general position, that in general you cannot have an
5 accumulation of harvest.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Della.

8

9 MS. TRUMBLE: I'm trying to get my head
10 turned around to the stuff again and it's taking me a
11 little bit, but if you -- can you explain to me in the
12 case now let's say five years from now, we got our
13 caribou back in 9D, and in the past we had a Federal
14 subsistence permit that allowed us for one -- when we
15 first opened for one caribou and I think it got raised
16 to two. And then the State opened for one or two
17 caribou. So people were able to harvest both those
18 caribou. Does this apply to that scenario?

19

20 MS. BROWN: Yes. So if you got one
21 caribou through the State, but you are a Federally-
22 qualified subsistence user and the limit on Federal
23 land was two, then you'd be able to harvest under two,
24 but you couldn't harvest three. You couldn't harvest
25 one under State and then two under the Federal. That
26 would be the accumulation of harvest.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Does that mean you
29 can harvest one under State and then only one other
30 from Federal.

31

32 MS. BROWN: Correct. If the limit was
33 two on the Federal land, that's correct.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: There's some
36 wording that was removed from the regs. However,
37 harvest limits for grouse in some units, ptarmigan,
38 caribou, regulated by a number that may be taken per
39 day. Harvest limits of grouse and ptarmigan are also
40 regulated in number that can be held in possession.

41

42 Do you have a harvest limit on
43 ptarmigan?

44

45 MS. BROWN: There may be a possession
46 limit. I don't have information on which area-specific
47 or which unit-specific these regulations are currently
48 in. We'd have to go through the book and look at it,
49 but if it's putting in here that there's a daily or a
50 possession limit like how you have with waterfowl, you

1 can take up to certain amount per -- and have within
2 your possession a certain amount.
3
4 So there would be for grouse. For
5 ptarmigan, you're usually allowed -- yeah. Yeah. So
6 for example, Unit 11. You're allowed to take 20
7 ptarmigan per day but only allowed to have 40 in
8 possession. Make sense, Pat?
9
10 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: That does it?
11 Okay. We're under Board deliberation, right? Okay.
12 Anything else from the Board.
13
14 (No comments)
15
16 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: A motion is in
17 order.
18
19 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman, I move that
20 we adopt the proposal.
21
22 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved.....
23
24 MR. PANAMAROFF: Second.
25
26 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and
27 seconded. Any discussion.
28
29 (No comments)
30
31 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. I didn't
32 look at the book at what areas it covers, but the
33 animals in there, you know, we have a lot -- we have
34 some of these animals in there that would affect Kodiak
35 Island. So feel comfortable with making a
36 recommendation here.
37
38 Any other discussion.
39
40 (No comments)
41
42 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no other
43 discussion, is there any objection.
44
45 (No objections)
46
47 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Seeing no
48 objections, then the motion carries.
49
50 WP - next one please. Jumps right up

1 to 42. Time out. Take a break. Okay.

2

3 (Off record)

4

5 (On record)

6

7 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Call back to
8 order. Before we get into the next proposal, there may
9 be a couple more questions for Cole on WP10-42 -- or
10 05.

11

12 MS. BROWN: Okay.

13

14 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Della.

15

16 MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you. I asked Mitch
17 to bring this back up because I kind of want to clear
18 this in my mind a little bit that let -- using a couple
19 scenarios. I think the first being with caribou.

20

21 If a hunter gets a State permit and a
22 Federal permit and wants to -- and doesn't know
23 technically -- you go into a certain area to hunt and
24 sometimes you have to go farther inland and you're
25 crossing boundaries, whether they're on State or
26 Federal lands. So assuming you harvest your caribou on
27 State land, so you're going to take that one caribou
28 and then that's your caribou for the whole -- the
29 season.

30

31 So you're not going to use the other
32 permit. How do you -- how are you anticipating and
33 enforcing some of these issues and using that one. And
34 then also using the same thing for bear. A lot of
35 times the guides get their -- a permit for State and
36 Federal and if it's one bear, how are you going to --
37 what is the process on enforcement for this?

38

39 MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. George Pappas,
40 Fish and Game. This is somewhat related. The State
41 Troopers have said on record, say you have a State hunt
42 that has a bag limit of one -- an annual limit of one
43 and a Federal subsistence hunt have a bag limit of two.
44 If you shoot a Federal subsistence animal, say a
45 caribou or what have you, under Federal subsistence
46 permit on the State side, that's considered -- you're
47 only allowed one animal per year independent on how you
48 have a hunt.

49

50 So if you shot a Federal subsistence

1 caribou and then want to go use your State permit in
2 the same region on the State side, the enforcement
3 folks would say that's -- you'd be over your bag limit.

4
5

6 Conversely if you went and did your
7 State hunt first, State property, private -- not
8 Federal public lands and you did harvest your one
9 animal, you'd be done with the State hunt for the year,
10 but if the Federal Subsistence Regulations allow an
11 additional animal, that other animal would have to come
12 from Federal public lands from a Federal public
13 subsistence hunt with the permit.

14

15 How they enforce that, that's a very
16 good question. Maybe if we hear from enforcement.

17

18 MS. TRUMBLE: I think my.....

19

20 MR. PAPPAS: It would be part of the
21 sealing process. You have harvest recording on the
22 back of your permit or hunting license. I would assume
23 that would be the basics for enforcement tools they
24 would have.

25

26 MS. TRUMBLE: I think my concern with
27 this is it's going to be confusing not only to the
28 hunter, but I would really hate to see someone getting
29 in trouble for -- because in the past, there's been a
30 process and then looking at the bears and I don't know,
31 you know, Nancy can answer -- look -- that's something
32 to think about when -- what this is. You know, how are
33 these -- I know that the guides, they do a lot of
34 areas. We get permits with the King Cove Corporation
35 for certain areas and that's technically on State land
36 and under State regs because they're on the corporation
37 lands. They're not on Federal lands.

38

39 But some of these guides get permits on
40 Federal lands and how is that going to work? You know,
41 just.....

42

43 MS. HOFFMAN: Yes. Just speaking for
44 the bears, it's a sealing process. They have to bring
45 it through to be sealed and that's how we can keep
46 check on it. If they don't bring it in -- they have 30
47 days to bring it in. If they don't bring it in, if you
48 get caught, you're busted, but otherwise.....

49

50 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Michelle.

1 MS. HOFFMAN: Does that help?

2

3 MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair. I do know
4 that both under the Federal and State permits they are
5 required to send in their hunt report and that's
6 generally how we know if they have harvested. I mean
7 there's a space for if they harvested one, then they
8 would check it off and then that would indicate that
9 they've already taken theirs, but there's also a space
10 for they did not hunt or they did not -- they were
11 unsuccessful. So that's the way that it's tracked
12 between both Agencies and then the database is kind of
13 closely tied. They can actually access each other's
14 databases to make sure that -- that's kind of the
15 enforcement -- that would be a way that that's enforced
16 by the law enforcement officers out of each Agency.

17

18 Thank you.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay.

21

22 MS. TRUMBLE: I was basically thinking
23 in the case of caribou that you get a Federal and a
24 State. You're only -- you're going to only harvest
25 one, but you're going to have to determine -- in fact
26 the determination point is going to be whether it was
27 on State lands or Federal lands.

28

29 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Does that clear it
30 up a little bit. Go ahead.

31

32 MR. BERG: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
33 Jerry Berg with Fish and Wildlife Service. I just
34 wanted to try to clarify -- you know, it's always been
35 very clear in the wildlife regulations that it's not
36 allowed to accumulate and you can see the regulation on
37 Page 45 in your analysis where it's always been very
38 clear it was -- but it was not quite as clear in our
39 fish regulations when we adopted the fish regulations
40 in 2000.

41

42 It was not quite as clear and so this
43 attempt is really to help clarify it for both fish and
44 wildlife. So some areas in fisheries, you can
45 accumulate your sportfish caught limit in that area
46 with your subsistence caught limit. In some areas, you
47 cannot. And it won't change those unit-specific
48 regulations like Cole was saying, but it does make it
49 very clear statewide that it's not allowed unless
50 specifically allowed in a specific area.

1 So it really just clarifies for
2 fisheries and adopts the same nonaccumulation that has
3 always existed for wildlife into fisheries to make it
4 real clear. So that's the main reason that this
5 proposal was brought forward was to clarify it for
6 fisheries to make it the same for wildlife. But it's
7 always been that case for wildlife that it's been very
8 clear that you cannot accumulate between State and
9 Federal regulations.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you. I
14 think the question was enforcement. You know, we
15 understand we're not going to accumulate our harvest,
16 but the enforcement process, you don't -- if I
17 harvested a deer under State and caught one or caribou
18 and then I'm walking home and I happen to see another
19 caribou and I say, well, I can have two, but am I in
20 State or Federal land. You know, a lot of hunters are
21 not going to carry a book around and, you know, stop
22 and check your -- check they regs while they're out on
23 the hunt.

24

25 It is prudent for a hunter to know, you
26 know, a certain amount of knowledge of, you know, where
27 they're hunting, what they're hunting for, and what
28 areas they're in, but when you get into the excitement
29 of the hunt, you know, who's going to think, oh, we're
30 at the line. Am I over it or have I gotten to Federal
31 lands. And then you harvest another caribou and you're
32 not on Federal lands, then you get called on it and say
33 -- you know, is that just the way it's going to be?
34 You know, is there leeway between whether you're
35 hunting on State land or Federal land and you end up
36 with two animals on State land. I thought it was over
37 the line, but it wasn't. You know, that enforcement
38 process -- keeping an eye out for the hunters is
39 probably what we're trying to do here.

40

41 MS. TRUMBLE: I think my concern was in
42 the past we had been able to harvest one Federal and
43 one State. Okay. As far as fisheries, the fisheries
44 subsistence is done in State waters. That we --
45 there's never been an issue that I'm aware of in
46 Federal waters. It's always in State waters.

47

48 So -- and that's not a big concern for
49 me, but the wildlife part of it is.

50

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. That's all
2 the discussion we -- okay.

3
4 MS. TRUMBLE: yes

5
6 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. WP10-43 and
7 44, Cole.

8
9 MS. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
10 Members of the Council. Proposals WP10-43 and 44 were
11 submitted by the Alaska Wildlife Alliance and combined
12 because they were very similar.

13
14 As written, the Alaska Wildlife
15 Alliance seeks to close wolf hunting and trapping in
16 Unit 10 where wolves do not occur. The analysis for
17 these proposals starts on Page 58 of your Council book
18 and per the proposal, addresses areas within Unit 10
19 that are not Unimak Island since wolves do occur on
20 Unimak Island.

21
22 There are wolves on Unimak Island and
23 they have occasionally immigrated to islands west of
24 Unimak by crossing on ice flows. The proposals would
25 add complexity to the Federal regulations with
26 virtually no effect to subsistence users or the
27 resource.

28
29 If either of the proposals were
30 adopted, it would cause Federal and State regulations
31 to be further out of alignment, making it more
32 confusing for the Federally-qualified subsistence user.
33 If the proposals were adopted by the Federal
34 Subsistence Board, hunters and trappers would still be
35 able to take wolves under State regulations on Alaska
36 Maritime National Wildlife Refuge lands.

37
38 As such the adoption of these proposals
39 by the Federal Subsistence Board would not have the
40 effect sought by the proposal.

41
42 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to be
43 neutral on the Proposals WP10-43 and 44.

44
45 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46
47 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Fish and Game.

48
49 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
50 George Pappas, Department of Fish and Game. Our

1 comments begin on Page 63 and will be incorporated into
2 the record as appears and I'll do my best to summarize
3 here.

4

5 Wolf distribution in the Aleutians is
6 limited to Unimak Island. It is unlikely that any
7 wolves will disperse to other Aleutian Islands because
8 of the distance between those islands. Because wolf
9 trapping can only occur on islands that have wolves,
10 wolf trapping does not occur on the majority of the
11 islands in Unit 10.

12

13 Under WP10-44, if wolves were
14 colonizing other islands, the trapping season for
15 wolves would automatically be open to that island.
16 That proposal is circular with no meaningful effect on
17 hunting opportunity in Unit 10. Adoption of this
18 proposal is not expected to result in benefits for wolf
19 conservation or Federal subsistence use of wolves in
20 Unit 10. The only effect of this proposal would make
21 wolf trapping regulations in Unit 10 unnecessarily
22 complicated and impacts for subsistence users, there's
23 no impact on Federal subsistence users.

24

25 If these proposals are adopted, Federal
26 subsistence hunters and trappers will still be able to
27 hunt or trap wolves wherever they occur on all lands in
28 Unit 10 under State regulations and the Department
29 opposes this proposal. I believe we've seen a couple
30 dozen, maybe three dozen of these type of proposals put
31 in the Federal subsistence process for this cycle from
32 a couple of organizations.

33

34 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35

36 *****
37 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
38 *****

39

40 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
41 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

42

43 Wildlife Proposal WP10-43:

44

45 This proposal requests federal
46 regulations state there is no wolf hunting season in
47 portions of Unit 10.

48

49 Wildlife Proposal WP10-44:

50

1 This proposal requests federal
2 regulations state there is no wolf trapping season in
3 portions of Unit 10.

4

5 Introduction:

6

7 Wolf distribution in the Aleutians is
8 limited to Unimak Island. It is unlikely that wolves
9 will disperse to other Aleutian Islands because of the
10 distance between Unimak Island and other Aleutian
11 Islands. Because wolf trapping can only occur on
12 islands with wolves, wolf trapping does not occur on
13 the majority of islands in Unit 10. Under WP10-44, if
14 wolves were to colonize other islands, a trapping
15 season for wolves would automatically be opened on that
16 island. The proposal is circular with no meaningful
17 effect on hunting opportunity in Unit 10. Adoption of
18 this proposal is not expected to result in benefits for
19 wolf conservation or federal subsistence use of wolves
20 in Unit 10. The only effect of this proposal is to
21 make wolf trapping regulations in Unit 10 unnecessarily
22 complicated.

23

24 Impact on Subsistence Users:

25

26 There is no impact on federal
27 subsistence users if these proposals are adopted.
28 Federal subsistence hunters and trappers will still be
29 able to hunt or trap wolves wherever they occur on all
30 lands in Unit 10 under state regulations.

31

32 Opportunity Provided by State:

33

34 The state provides wolf hunting
35 opportunity on all islands in Unit 10. The wolf
36 hunting season is August 1 through May 25, and the bag
37 limit is 10 wolves per day. The state provides wolf
38 trapping hunting opportunity on all islands in Unit 10.
39 The wolf trapping season is November 10 through March
40 31, with no harvest limit.

41

42 Recommendation:

43

44 Oppose.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you.
47 Federal, State, Tribal Agencies.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: None. InterAgency
2 Staff Committee comments.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: None. Fish and
7 Game Advisory Committee.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Written or public
12 comment.

13
14 MS. CHIVERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
15 There is one written public comment and you can find it
16 on Page 64. This was from the Alaska Professional
17 Hunters Association and they felt that there needs to
18 be population control measures that will enable prey
19 species to live within a balance of what their habitats
20 will provide. Wolves have to be included into the
21 management process in an active enough manner to
22 provide maximum human benefit from the prey species.

23
24 This type of management provides the
25 best stewardship possible for the prey species as well
26 as all people who depend upon or enjoy the benefit of
27 high density population equilibriums.

28
29 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

30
31 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Regional Council
32 deliberation. Della.

33
34 MS. TRUMBLE: I'd recommend that we
35 oppose this. I guess if there was a concern of
36 conservation, I would agree, but in my mind and from
37 what I'm seeing and hearing from everybody else, there
38 is definitely not a concern for population control on
39 wolves. In fact what I'm hearing is there's really too
40 many. So I'd recommend the Council oppose and I've
41 never heard of wolves moving around on ice packs and
42 our waters are rough. Something I'd like to see
43 though.

44
45 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

46
47 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I agree
48 with Della. Anybody that's going to cross Unimak Pass
49 would I think rather automatically rule out of the
50 probability of wolves riding an iceberg across. I'd

1 have been scared spitless on 120-foot boats and I don't
2 think I'd do an iceberg.

3
4 But I have seen lots of wolves on
5 Unimak Island when I've camped there doing different
6 projects and on the Peninsula. I have a question for
7 Staff, Mr. Chairman.

8
9 Can't we modify proposals that are
10 submitted? And I guess my question would be is --
11 could this Council given the large populations of
12 wolves on the Alaska Peninsula and Unimak Island --
13 we've seen the populations of those caribou decline to
14 the point where they are almost incapable of surviving
15 on their own.

16
17 I'd like to know if we can increase the
18 bag limit of wolves with this proposal by modifying it.

19
20 MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Holmes.
21 I think you'd be getting too far away from the original
22 proposal so that the public wouldn't know that a
23 proposal like that was advertised and wouldn't know to
24 come in and comment on it. So I think it might be just
25 a little too far different from what's been proposed
26 here.

27
28 MR. HOLMES: But we could take an
29 action to submit it for the fall meeting.

30
31 MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman. Yes.
32 Absolutely. Well, during the next wildlife cycle, yes.

33
34
35 MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. My
36 first comments on this proposal are why are we wasting
37 paper with it. Why are we even having to look at it.
38 It's absolutely nonsense. You don't hunt a wolf where
39 there isn't a wolf. I mean it's a waste of paper.

40
41 However, Pat, that was a great comment
42 and let's modify it anyways. If -- you know, if the
43 proposal get -- or if our modification gets shot down
44 by OSM, so be it, but let's modify it.

45
46 What is the current harvest limit on
47 wolves in Unit 10? Does anyone know off the top of
48 their head?

49
50 MS. BROWN: Yes. It's five. It's on

1 Page 59 of your book. So for hunting, it's five wolves
2 from August 10th through April 30th. For wolf
3 trapping, it's no limit from November 10th through
4 March 31st. And under the State, it's ten.

5
6 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Della.

7
8 MS. TRUMBLE: Maybe as a
9 recommendation, I think -- there's a couple things
10 here. Maybe -- you know, understanding that we want to
11 deal with this issue is one thing, but maybe stepping
12 back and looking at not only Unit 10 but 9D, that we
13 look at those and do a good proposal that we know would
14 pass and also I'd like to get more recommendation and
15 try to work with Izembek to come up with -- and the
16 State because we can come up with something I think
17 that only is going to pass but is going to be
18 effective.

19
20 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other Board
21 comments.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: A motion to accept
26 or -- go ahead, Della.

27
28 MS. TRUMBLE: Mr. Chair. I'd like to
29 make a motion to oppose this -- what is this, 43, 44?

30
31 MR. HOLMES: I'll second, Mr. Chairman.
32 I think we've probably raised the blood pressure of the
33 Staff enough at this point.

34
35 (Laughter)

36
37 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Been moved and
38 seconded. Any discussion.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no further
43 discussion, is there any objections to the motion?

44
45 (No objections)

46
47 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no
48 objections, then the motion carries. Next one, Cole.

49
50 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chair. The next

1 proposal is WP10-42 and I understand we're going to be
2 addressing that this afternoon at 1:30.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes. There'll be
5 people calling in at 1:30 and we'll get to that one
6 when 1:30 comes around.

7

8 MS. BROWN: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
9 Chair. That is the extent of the analyses I have to
10 present to you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Then next
13 on the agenda would be the Kodiak/Aleutians proposal
14 that we -- looks like we've done that. Fisheries
15 closure review. Steve Fried.

16

17 MR. FRIED: Good morning. I'm going to
18 have a short presentation on the Federal Fisheries
19 Closure Review, FCR10-02. It's on Pages 65-68 of your
20 Council books.

21

22 Basically the closure locations are
23 Kodiak area Federal public waters in Womens Bay, Gibson
24 Cove, and near-shore waters around the Karluk River
25 mouth and Afognak Island. The current Federal
26 regulation closes the harvest of king crab in this area
27 to everyone except Federally-qualified subsistence
28 users.

29

30 The current State regulation actually
31 has closed the Kodiak area commercial fishery but still
32 allows the harvest of king crab by subsistence users
33 and there's both the current Federal and State
34 regulations are on Page 65 of your books.

35

36 The Federal closure was initiated
37 during the 1995-1996 season and the last time the
38 closure was reviewed was in 2005. Essentially the
39 justification for the original closure was made for
40 resource conservation concerns. Subsistence crab
41 harvest in Kodiak have dropped dramatically and as I
42 mentioned, the commercial fishery has been closed for
43 quite a long time.

44

45 There is no specific management
46 objective for either the Federal or State red king crab
47 subsistence fisheries in the Kodiak area, although the
48 State does have a threshold abundance set for reopening
49 the commercial fishery and State trawl surveys have
50 continued to show that the population is not anywhere

1 near that threshold.

2

3 Subsistence harvest of red king crab in
4 the Kodiak area has been very small since the collapse
5 of the stock. There is a requirement from the Alaska
6 Department of Fish and Game subsistence permit to
7 participate in the Federal subsistence crab fishery as
8 well as the State subsistence crab fishery. And as far
9 as I could find out, annual harvest documented through
10 these permits have often been well below a hundred
11 crabs per year.

12

13 The OSM preliminary recommendation for
14 the closure is to maintain the status quo, in other
15 words, to just keep it open to Federally-qualified
16 subsistence users and close it to all other users.
17 There continues to be a conservation concern for the
18 species in Kodiak including Federal public waters. The
19 stock remains at very low levels. There's no
20 indication of improvement over the near term.

21

22 Marine waters under Federal
23 jurisdiction in Womens Bay appear to be a known area
24 for the larger Chiniak Bay area. Womens Bay waters in
25 particular are very easy to access from the Kodiak road
26 system. Restricting taking of red king crab in Federal
27 public waters for nonsubsistence uses is deemed
28 necessary for the conservation of red king crab and
29 also to help ensure the continuation of Federal
30 subsistence users.

31

32 That kind of summarizes those pages and
33 I will now either take questions or allow the Council
34 to discuss.....

35

36 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Does this also
37 affect the south end of Kodiak Island or just dealing
38 specifically with these areas here?

39

40 MR. FRIED: Specifically on Kodiak, it
41 would be the Federal waters around Womens Bay and then
42 there's some near-shore waters around the Karluk and
43 then all around Afognak Island, there are Federal
44 waters. It's all the Federal waters that are
45 encompassed by the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife
46 Refuge.

47

48 So in general -- you know, it's a
49 fairly small area in relation to all the waters in
50 Kodiak area. Just the Federal public waters.

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. And the
2 harvest limit for subsistence use, is that three per
3 person in the household or per household?

4
5 MR. FRIED: Yeah. In addition to the
6 closure, the way that Federal and State regulations are
7 different is for the harvest limit. The State's
8 reduced the harvest limit to I think it was -- trying
9 to see here. I think it's three. They went from six
10 per person to three per household per year. The
11 Federal regulation is still for -- I think it's six per
12 household per year.. Trying to see what page it's on.
13 As far -- but it's the number -- you can only fish one
14 pot, just as the State, and the shell size is the same.
15 So it's just the harvest limit that's larger for the
16 Federal regulation than for the State.

17
18 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other
19 questions for Steve.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: So we go through
24 all of the proposals before we make recommendations or
25 do you want to deal with them one at a time?

26
27 MR. HOLMES: Let's do them one at a
28 time.

29
30 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. FCR10-02.
31 We need Fish and Game comments.

32
33 (No comments)

34
35 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: None. Federal,
36 State and Tribal Agency comments.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: InterAgency Staff.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Fish and Game
45 Advisory Committee.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Written public
50 statements.

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Regional Council
4 deliberation and recommendation. Pat.

5

6 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. Womens Bay
7 is probably the only place on this end of the island
8 where there's king crab at all left and it's a really
9 important nursery area and it really would be -- if we
10 see any rebuilding at this end of the island, then it
11 would be occurring fed out of Womens Bay.

12

13 And when they did their -- Fish and
14 Game did their last trawl survey, they found that only
15 -- or they found that 29 percent of the females they
16 looked at, 30 percent only had half clutches and I'm
17 concerned with Womens Bay. I think that having a limit
18 of six, all the harvest that's going to occur on this
19 end of the island is going to come out of that bay
20 basically and I think it should be zero, but I --
21 probably a reasonable compromise would be to go to a
22 limit of three.

23

24 And the problem I see at Womens Bay is
25 that there's a lot of confusion on the island with
26 who's a Federal subsistence user and who's a State user
27 and you go out and get a State permit and I've been in
28 there when people that live on the base are saying,
29 well, hey, I've this permit, can I fish subsistence and
30 they say yes. But the thing is, is if you live on --
31 correct me if I'm wrong, Steve. But if you live on a
32 military base, you cannot participate in the Federal
33 fishery. And that is fraught with a potential of folks
34 that really aren't qualified going out there and taking
35 six crab a year and they are quite enthusiastic
36 harvesters and -- so my inclination would be to address
37 this proposal and drop the bag limit to three and I'll
38 leave other on the Councils open for some comments. I
39 know probably Sam has fished around this area for
40 subsistence back when we had crab and might have some
41 thoughts or other folks, but to me it's a very
42 worrisome thing biologically, having a larger harvest
43 limit when we probably shouldn't even have any there.

44

45 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Go ahead, Steve.

46

47 MR. FRIED: Just for a point of
48 clarification, the closure review is just for whether
49 or not to maintain this closure, Federally
50 nonqualified subsistence users. But right now, you

1 know, for the regulatory proposal period for new
2 regulations for fisheries is open until -- I think it's
3 tomorrow close of business. So that would be the
4 appropriate place to propose changes in, you know,
5 harvest limits and things like that.

6

7 FCR10-02 is just whether or not to
8 maintain the closure to nonsubsistence users. You
9 really -- there's really no point in getting into the
10 other parts of the fishery, you know, in relation to
11 the closure review.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. So to
14 change the harvest limit from six to three would
15 require another proposal which would be due tomorrow?

16

17 MR. FRIED: That's correct. Right.
18 And, you know, but if the Council wanted to do that,
19 they can develop a proposal and just hand it to
20 somebody on the Federal OSM Staff and it's submitted,
21 so -- it's fairly -- should be fairly easy to do. I'm
22 just saying that this isn't the vehicle to do that.

23

24 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Understood.
25 Okay. Pat, your concern is -- you consider submitting
26 a proposal from this Board?

27

28 MR. HOLMES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd be
29 glad to write one up.

30

31 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Any further
32 board deliberation on FCR10-02.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: If there's no
37 further deliberation, then a motion would be in order.
38 Do I hear a motion. A motion to support FCR10-02.

39

40 MR. PANAMAROFF: I'll so move, Mr.
41 Chairman.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Do I hear a
44 second.

45

46 MR. HOLMES: Second.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and
49 seconded. Any discussion.

50

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no
4 discussion, is there any objection.
5
6 (No objections)
7
8 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Seeing no
9 objections, then the motion carries. The next one.
10 Okay. Is that all the proposals you had, Mr. Fried?
11
12 MR. FRIED: Yeah. I just had the
13 closure review.
14
15 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Then the
16 next item is to call for proposals. Since we don't
17 have a lot of people on the Board here, you wanted to
18 submit a proposal where you get one by the end of the
19 day and submit it. Yeah. Bring it back to the Board
20 before we adjourn today.
21
22 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. If we break early
23 for lunch, I can have lunch and I'll -- I've got it on
24 my computer.
25
26 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. With that
27 consideration, then we'll break early for lunch so Pat
28 can get his proposal and at 1:30 we'll have the call in
29 from the Aleutians and we'll take care of this other
30 proposal that we skipped over earlier. So be back a
31 little before 1:30.
32
33 MS. CHIVERS: Earlier.
34
35 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Earlier than 1:30.
36
37
38 MS. CLARK: So everybody's here.
39
40 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Come back
41 at 1:00 o'clock. Go ahead, Maureen.
42
43 MS. CLARK: Mr. Chair, if you wanted,
44 we could begin the Agency reports.
45
46 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay.
47
48 MS. CLARK: Just.....
49
50 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: If you want to get

1 that done, we can. Good enough for me. Agency
2 reports, we'll start with Office of Subsistence
3 Management.

4

5 MS. CLARK: Mr. Chair.

6

7 (Pause)

8

9 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Go ahead, Maureen.

10

11 MS. CLARK: Mr. Chair, the Office of
12 Subsistence Management has nothing, although I did want
13 to draw your attention to the letter from Pat Pourchot
14 with the Interior Secretary's office giving a status
15 update on the review of the subsistence program. In
16 your blue folder.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: This letter from
19 Pat Pourchot sums up pretty much the meetings we've had
20 in Anchorage and his second to the last paragraph says
21 that during February and March, they'll make
22 recommendations. So that I guess is pending,
23 recommendations to address all the concerns brought
24 forward by statewide RACS.

25

26 MS. CLARK: That's my understanding,
27 Mr. Chair. That Mr. Pourchot will make those
28 recommendations to the Secretary. I don't know if he's
29 made them already or not.

30

31 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Doug.

32

33 MR. ROHRER: Mr. Chair. I have a
34 question for Ms. Clark. Will the RACs get a chance to
35 look at these comments -- or not the comments, but the
36 options and recommendations that'll be submitted to the
37 Secretary? I'm assuming not because you just said that
38 you didn't know if they had been submitted yet.

39

40 MS. CLARK: That's my understanding,
41 Mr. Rohrer -- through the Chair. And Mr. Simeonoff, I
42 think you probably remember from the meetings with Mr.
43 Pourchot he said he regretted that the Councils weren't
44 meeting during the time that the review was being
45 conducted. But, yes, the recommendations would be
46 submitted to the Secretary. They wanted to do it in a
47 timely fashion and there wasn't time to get all the
48 Councils together for that specific purpose.

49

50 MR. ROHRER: Just another comment. I

1 appreciate that he regretted it. This is a big enough
2 issue that the time should have been made for that to
3 come before the Regional Councils. It's too late now,
4 but that was poor planning I would say on whoever came
5 up with the timeline for submitting those comments. So
6 I appreciate he regretted it, but it would have been
7 nice if he could have acted on those regrets a little
8 bit more.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

11

12 MR. HOLMES: I agree with Sam and a
13 couple times I've -- when Mitch hasn't been able to go
14 to the Board meetings or -- in talking with some of the
15 other Chairmen, I found some difficulties that RACs
16 have had with the bureaucracy of OSM and also with both
17 the Federal and State Government and I think one thing
18 that I'd like to say is that our region probably has
19 the least amount, at least from what I read in the
20 paper and -- least amount of controversy between our
21 RAC and our Advisory Committee.

22

23 And -- because what we've done is we
24 get together and talk over issues and I think the
25 mountain goat situation that we had several years ago
26 was a case in point and it's really unfortunate that
27 legally we have to supposedly be operating under
28 Federal rules. And so if you want to have let's say a
29 study group or our committee talking to the State
30 committee, then you can only have four or five people
31 do it.

32

33 And when our Advisory Committee takes
34 an action to the State on the island, generally they
35 call up all the villages and they ask, hey, here's an
36 important issue, what do you think. So if you've got
37 five villages, you're automatically out of the loop and
38 when we have talked about subsistence things and found
39 compromise either on the State side or the Federal side
40 to do with folks in the village and people in our
41 community want to do, where we've been illegal because
42 we have more people involved. And usually when we have
43 our study group going on game issues or fish or birds,
44 sometimes we found in order to open up the goose season
45 for the folks down on the south end of the island, we
46 did it through the State system. But that involved
47 probably 10 or 15 people getting together on the phone,
48 having coffee, meeting in town, meeting all over the
49 place, all without any sanctions, but it works.

50

1 And to me sometimes -- and I'm not a no
2 party person, an anti-government person. I'm a pro-
3 government person. But we need to have some
4 flexibility when there are problems so that we can
5 legitimately talk to each other. And where I see
6 places in the State where they've gone by the strict
7 interpretations of OSM, they continue to have problems
8 because they don't talk to each other, and that's some
9 kind of flexibility in my mind needs to be fit in and
10 the way that we've done it here is we just assume,
11 okay, we'll just pick -- like any other group does, we
12 pick State rules which doesn't limit the number of
13 people that talk to each other and do it and then we
14 get back together and we talk about it and our Council
15 and the Advisory Committee does it and we come up with
16 a compromise.

17
18 And so it's really unfortunate that
19 that flexibility isn't there and that would be kind of
20 my comment that I probably would like to send to Mr.
21 Pourchot and I probably will because there are some
22 logistic difficulties that are built into the Federal
23 bureaucracy that prevent problem solving at times.

24
25 And so I'm sorry, but I just had to get
26 that off of my spleen and I do agree with Sam and maybe
27 we'll sit down and write him a letter ourselves. But I
28 really would like to see this come back to the Council
29 at some point and in fact I'd like to make a motion
30 when we get Della back and have a quorum at least
31 coming from our Council on these points and we
32 understand he has deadlines, but it would be really
33 nice to see these points come back through the Federal
34 Board and through the Regional Councils so that we do
35 have more input because that's the whole idea of a
36 Council is provide communications from the public to
37 the bureaucracies.

38
39 Anyway -- so I'm quiet for a while.

40
41 I guess as long as you're still
42 recording, it's great at least he's asking and has done
43 it at a higher level and done it with AFN and through
44 the Chairmen and hopefully we can bring it back.

45
46 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Well, I did know
47 that I'll -- I'll probably get a copy of his
48 recommendations in the mail. So we'll have that before
49 our next meeting and if they have a Federal Subsistence
50 Board meeting before he sends his recommendations, I'll

1 probably have it then too. And we in recess until
2 Della gets back. I'm sorry.

3

4 (Pause)

5

6 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: The next item on
7 the agenda, Fish and Wildlife field office. It says
8 for information only. We could probably hear from them
9 if they're here.

10

11 MR. FRIED: Good morning. There isn't
12 anybody here from the Anchorage Fish and Wildlife field
13 office and that report on Page 69 refers to a project
14 funded through the fisheries resource monitoring
15 program on McLees Lake sockeye salmon and essentially
16 that funding ended this last season.

17

18 This year we did have a call for
19 proposals. There weren't any proposals submitted to
20 continue that project and what happened was come the
21 summer, the run was very poor and this made two years
22 in a row with a poor run there and that had
23 restrictions on the subsistence fishery as far as time
24 and area restrictions.

25

26 So what happened then was that we were
27 contacted by the Anchorage field office and they wanted
28 to submit a proposal and had to be out of cycle because
29 we were already too far into the process with the
30 proposals we'd already received to continue funding
31 this for at least another two years because there's a
32 concern that with the poor run that it wasn't a good
33 time to stop monitoring that run. They needed some
34 information to manage the fishery and the only thing
35 available without -- the projects funds a weir.
36 Without the weir, then it would just be, you know,
37 sporadic aerial surveys.

38

39 And I just wanted to let the Council
40 know that the project will be funded for two years.
41 Because it's out of cycle, it doesn't go through the
42 full review process, so there really isn't a review by
43 the technical review committee and then the Councils
44 and the public. It just underwent an internal review
45 within OSM and then it was either approved or
46 disapproved by Pete Probasco who's the Assistant
47 Regional Director in charge of OSM.

48

49 And so he did approve funding for it,
50 so it will continue for another two years, to make sure

1 that, you know, this run is conserved and, you know, we
2 can provide, you know, as much subsistence opportunity
3 as possible. So I hope that helps a little bit.

4
5 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Steve.
6 Okay. Now we can jump back. Pat, you wanted to create
7 a motion.

8
9 MR. HOLMES: I need to.....

10
11 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Oh, that was in
12 relation to Pat Pourchot's communication.

13
14 REPORTER: Pat. Pat. Pat.

15
16 MR. HOLMES: Yes.

17
18 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I'd like to.....

19
20 MR. HOLMES: Thank you. Not only am I
21 deaf, but I can't see the little red light either when
22 it's off. I'd like to -- okay -- present a motion that
23 Kodiak Regional Advisory Committee request that when
24 Mr. Pourchot finalizes his recommendations to Secretary
25 that those recommendations come back to the Councils
26 for some level of review.

27
28 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Let the
29 motion reflect that it's coming from the
30 Kodiak/Aleutians Council, okay, Tina.

31
32 REPORTER: (Nods affirmatively)

33
34 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Do I hear a
35 second.

36
37 MR. ROHRER: Second.

38
39 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and
40 seconded. Any discussion.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no
45 discussion, is there any objections to the motion.

46
47 (No objections)

48
49 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Seeing no
50 objections, then the motion carries. Okay. We've

1 heard from the Anchorage Fish and Wildlife. We're at
2 Izembek. Is Nancy Hoffman here?

3
4 MS. CHIVERS: Yeah. Sorry. These were
5 not included in the report. So -- Mr. Chair. I'm not
6 sure what happened here. The report was submitted and
7 I'm not sure why it wasn't placed in the book. There
8 is -- you can see it on the agenda, but there's no page
9 number or anything. So Nancy just handed me her report
10 which is what I just handed out to.....

11
12 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Does this come in
13 conjunction with the things we're going to have at
14 1:30?

15
16 MS. HOFFMAN: No. This is just what --
17 it's just an annual -- or the routine biannual report
18 for the activities of subsistence on the Refuge.

19
20 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Go ahead.

21
22 MS. HOFFMAN: Okay. So this review --
23 I think it's pretty much the same format that's been
24 presented prior. I'll just give you some high points
25 and then -- I won't read it to you.

26
27 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Will you
28 require any action at the end of this?

29
30 MS. HOFFMAN: No.

31
32 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. I
33 won't.....

34
35 MS. HOFFMAN: Not unless you want to
36 give me gifts or something. Okay.

37
38 Just give you an update on Unit 9.
39 I'll start with the caribou. There -- again this is an
40 ongoing issue of surveying for caribou. There was
41 difficulty surveying for them because of the patchiness
42 of the snow or having any snow cover and so to date we
43 don't have a survey of caribou in Unit 9D. And as soon
44 as we can, we'll let you know what we have.

45
46 The State did conduct a composition
47 count in October and the bull to cow ratio was up to 21
48 bulls per cow. That's an increase. And the calf to
49 cow ratio was 43 to 100. So you can notice that both
50 of those ratios are increasing over the past year.

1 We did provide funds for these
2 composition counts and surveying with the State, so we
3 work in conjunction with them. And there's a table of
4 summarizing for the last five years of population
5 counts. Again you'll see that we have not done a
6 population count at the Refuge since '07. But once we
7 get some good conditions, we'll be right up there.

8
9 Next page is caribou on Unit 10. We
10 were successful to get up and the weather allowed us to
11 get over there and do two multi-day surveys. In the
12 report, it talks about the two-day survey was conducted
13 in January. We just finished another survey last week
14 and so we counted -- there was a minimum of 400 caribou
15 on the northern part of Unimak Island. Snow conditions
16 deteriorated as we went south and it was mottled and so
17 you can't count caribou well with those kind of
18 conditions.

19
20 Also in October of last year, the State
21 put out six collars on caribou. We were able to locate
22 all six and five of them we could see animals in those
23 collars. The other collar was laying on the beach. We
24 were unable at that time to recover that collar, so
25 five were definitely identified so that's like an
26 83 percent survival which isn't too shabby.

27
28 So if weather permits, we get better
29 snow again, then we'll attempt again to count more, but
30 we know there's a minimum of 400 on the northern
31 section.

32
33 Brown bear, there was a hunt in October
34 on Unimak and three bears were harvested and sealed by
35 the Refuge. And the State in conjunction with the
36 Refuge conducted a -- what they refer to as a road
37 hunt, so around the road system at Cold Bay and that
38 was in October from the 1st to the 21st. 16 permits
39 were issued; 7 of those were successful.

40
41 Another three bears were sealed that
42 were taken outside that road system. So there's a
43 total of ten bears were sealed.

44
45 The midwinter black brant survey was
46 conducted in Izembek, along the west coast of the
47 United States and Mexico and those results are not
48 available yet. The surveys -- aerial surveys are
49 conducted in February, came up with a total of 26,400
50 brant and the numbers are reflected in that table that

1 follows.

2

3 Fall of '09, the brant bag limit was
4 reduced to two brant per day. The fall production
5 counts were conducted in September of -- in October of
6 '09 and the percentage -- you can look at the table
7 that's presented in the report. The percentage of
8 juveniles recorded in these counts was about 20 --
9 almost -- was 26.8 and so that's an increase from '08
10 numbers. In '08, it was 15.3 and it increased up to
11 26.8.

12

13 There was also a spring survey in '09
14 of emperor geese and the total was close to 92,000
15 birds. That's an increase of 42 percent from the prior
16 year. The three-year average is a little over 78,000.
17 And the spring three-year average of 80,000 geese is
18 needed to opening the season for hunting.

19

20 Population counts were conducted in
21 spring and fall staging along the coast of the
22 Peninsula in Alaska and -- so it's not specific just to
23 Izembek. And then the following two tables give you a
24 summary from 2005 through 2009 on Emperor surveys and
25 also on the production counts.

26

27 Again the fall production counts of
28 emperors were conducted in September and October and
29 the percentage is pretty close to -- the percentage of
30 juveniles was almost identical to 2008, so right around
31 26 percent.

32

33 The Refuge is continuing to collect
34 information avian influenza and we attempted to collect
35 information on swans. Weather permitted us from doing
36 that. We worked with the hunter harvest and collected
37 many birds from -- people volunteered from guides to
38 just anybody that was coming through and that table
39 reflects how many birds were taken. To date the highly
40 pathogenic strain of avian influenza has not been
41 detected in Alaska.

42

43 And then the final page gives you some
44 -- Websites and information to follow the avian
45 influenza. This information -- and this will be --
46 2010 will be the last year for most of our avian
47 influenza sampling. It will be more of looking at the
48 overall health and disease for waterfowl -- water
49 birds.

50

1 And that concludes my summary.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: The birds that you
4 checked for influenza, the pintail and the green-winged
5 teal. Did you test other birds like the emperor goose,
6 eiders? Do you test all birds or just these three?

7

8 MS. HOFFMAN: We had proposed to sample
9 eiders and we do that usually from a roundup because
10 they're molting, but that wasn't done last year because
11 of a lot of logistics -- issues. People were having
12 babies and new jobs and we couldn't get people
13 together.

14

15 We don't -- there's no harvest of
16 emperors and so we don't collect them and there's
17 certain species that we key in on that have a higher
18 probability of carrying or being -- where you can
19 detect the influenza in them. And so these birds were
20 determined by the migratory bird group that these were
21 ones that would be higher likelihood of carrying the
22 influenza that we could detect. We don't sample Canada
23 geese either. Those are plentiful.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. And last
26 year, they reported that there weren't any surveys in
27 Mexico because of problems down there. Are the -- were
28 you able to get surveys this year?

29

30 MS. HOFFMAN: Yes. Yeah. Last year,
31 there was -- they were fearful of the hijacking of
32 planes and so this year, yeah, they did conduct --
33 there's a full Mexico and United States survey. And I
34 believe that's under brant, under that first paragraph.
35 Mexico was included this year.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Della.

38

39 MS. TRUMBLE: Nancy, maybe -- there's a
40 couple things and first maybe if we could talk about
41 the black brant. Maybe you can report on the grant
42 that the Izembek has received and basically what will
43 entail in regard to the black brant and then I'd like
44 to talk a little bit about the caribou.

45

46 MS. HOFFMAN: I'm sorry, Della. Talk
47 about the black brant in what we've received?

48

49 MS. TRUMBLE: No. You applied for a
50 grant.....

1 MS. HOFFMAN: Oh.
2
3 MS. TRUMBLE:to work
4 cooperatively with the tribe and the corporation.
5
6 MS. HOFFMAN: Okay. Yeah. We're
7 working with USGS and Humboldt State University and
8 Humboldt National Wildlife Refuge and the Aleutians
9 Tribe -- or actually it'd be King -- it's not even King
10 Cove. It's.....
11
12 MS. TRUMBLE: We're paying her if she
13 gets this right.
14
15 (Laughter)
16
17 MS. HOFFMAN: Wait, wait, wait. Della
18 taught me this one. Adaukik Tribe.
19
20 MS. TRUMBLE: Agdaagux.
21
22 MS. HOFFMAN: Agdaagux. Thank you.
23 And it's a cooperative venture and it's looking at the
24 productivity. There's -- we're seeing 30- to 40,000
25 wintering brant and that's a large number. It's
26 becoming more and more each year. And so we want to
27 look at what does that mean to the habitat and we have
28 eelgrass that they feed on and we want to know how does
29 that affect that forage. And so we're going to be
30 looking in cooperation with these other Refuges and
31 universities at the production of eelgrass and the
32 number of birds that are coming through and also are
33 they changing their staging areas as they come up the
34 coast from Mexico.
35
36 And so we're going to have folks out
37 reading bands and also doing sampling and we recruiting
38 students or individuals from local -- from King Cove to
39 help with that and then also graduate students from
40 Humboldt State. David Ward is heading this up. He's
41 with USGS and we're going to start it this fall.
42
43 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Go ahead, Della.
44 You had two parts, right?
45
46 MS. TRUMBLE: Yeah. Looking at the
47 caribou, first of all, I think on 9D, show the
48 composition and the calving and one of the things that
49 we had done in the past that was very successful and
50 I'm not sure how this would work today given that I

1 know the plane is down at this time for one these
2 surveys. But looking at -- we had a local subsistence
3 user with an ADF&G game person and Fish and Wildlife
4 and that was -- turned out to be a very good count I
5 think and -- because the guys -- the local fishermen or
6 -- and subsistence user on the ground and they're able
7 to contribute in areas that they're seeing animals that
8 not necessarily where the transect lines are going with
9 where you do the surveys.

10

11 So that may be something to think
12 about, but the other concern looking at Unimak and we
13 can probably bring this up later when we talk about
14 Unimak is the lack of surveys and over a three-year
15 period is a long time I think and not able to do the
16 surveys. And I'm wondering if it's possible that the
17 Refuge can contract that survey work out somehow to
18 make sure that it gets done because we both know in our
19 area there's a limit.

20

21 You've got to wait for snow and then
22 you've got to wait for a nice day. I mean we're
23 talking -- I mean it's beginning to start stacking
24 things against us when we realize, you know, that we've
25 got to get these surveys complete. If there is a
26 concern that we're able to address it sooner than later
27 when we're looking at the population of these animals.

28

29 And I'm not sure what -- you know, if
30 it's possible to contract some of this work out. I did
31 see where Rod did those surveys. Who is -- Rod is a
32 sports guide in Cold Bay and, you know, I just --
33 something to think about, but I think it needs -- we
34 need to address some of these issues sooner than later.

35

36

37 MS. HOFFMAN: Yeah. I understand what
38 you're saying and it is a concern that we haven't done
39 it in so long, but it isn't that we didn't have -- I
40 mean there are instances prior to my arrival that we
41 didn't have the resources. But this past year, we had
42 the resources and it was just weather dependent and it
43 was tons of snow and a clear day and you go over there
44 and still half the island doesn't have snow. And
45 counting caribou when it's spotty, like you got patches
46 of snow or no snow, and they blend in really well with
47 the brown dying vegetation and the depth -- it's hard
48 enough. It's a rock or a caribou.

49

50 So I don't know if it would really

1 matter if we have a contractor do it or us. It's one
2 -- the conditions have to be right. And so we had all
3 of the resources available. We had a plane, a pilot.
4 We brought in even a local subsistence user and he'll
5 be an observer, just to show people, you know, this is
6 real. We're not making it up.

7

8 And still it's -- we grabbed every day
9 we could.

10

11 MS. TRUMBLE: I mean, Nancy, it's not
12 an issue, but if it's real that we're not making it up.
13 It's an issue of everybody utilizing their resources,
14 to be able to take a look at what's out there.

15

16 I had some concern because it lists --
17 this count survey has been an issue for quite a number
18 of years -- the population. Because it's so sporadic.
19 I mean it'd be nice being able to get the -- you know,
20 get these counts done on a yearly basis, but Unimak
21 being a concern now. I hate for us to get to a point
22 where we're having to shut everything down totally
23 because.....

24

25 MS. HOFFMAN: Right.

26

27 MS. TRUMBLE: You know where I'm headed
28 with this.

29

30 MS. HOFFMAN: Yeah.

31

32 MS. TRUMBLE: And I just don't know
33 what the answer is to it.

34

35 MS. HOFFMAN: Well, one thing we've
36 added this year -- last year, prior they haven't done
37 summer counts and so we did our first summer count last
38 year. We've always done winter counts and there's
39 always been trouble. So we picked up -- everybody else
40 was doing summer counts. So we started doing summer
41 surveys and then this year, we'll do it again.

42

43 So now instead of trying to count once
44 a year, we're going to try to count twice a year. So
45 that should be an improvement.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

48

49 MR. HOLMES: Last year Sam and I, when
50 we teleconferenced I inquired about the potential of

1 using helicopters. In 1982, I had a survey of the
2 chain and gave the Refuge at Adak a helicopter for a
3 day and three hours, they counted the island and that's
4 granted smaller than Unimak, but I was wondering have
5 you explored with the Coast Guard using machines
6 availability and I know we've used them here on the
7 island in Kodiak on training flights to assist Fish and
8 Game and do other things for other Agencies, and I was
9 wondering if you've had a chance to explore that this
10 year. Or even with your own Agency, giving up on fixed
11 wing and just getting out with the helicopter because
12 you can fly much more precise area and the nice thing
13 about helicopters is caribou sure do move and they can
14 tell them from rocks easily.

15
16 MS. HOFFMAN: Yes. We have considered
17 helicopters and we're looking into that. We're going
18 to start by looking into it with our avian influenza
19 work, looking at the cost of what it would be -- if we
20 have downtime of paying that downtime. So, yeah, we're
21 considering that.

22
23 And I have started conversation with
24 the Coast Guard.

25
26 MR. HOLMES: That'd be splendid. I
27 think that's a great idea particularly when you're
28 combining projects and then -- because getting a
29 machine out to the area is often the most difficult
30 part is justifying enough hours to get a good charter,
31 but I appreciate you looking into those options because
32 I think that's probably the one way of getting work
33 done because basically Unimak and South Peninsula has
34 got Aleutian weather as you point out and it's pretty
35 tough to get that done with a fixed wing. So thanks
36 for checking those options out.

37
38 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Nancy, your survey
39 says there was 400 caribou in the north end of Unimak
40 Island. What is the critical population for caribou
41 for -- later on this afternoon, we're going to talk
42 about the closure of that area. Is this population --
43 is it down to a critical number? Is 400 a really low
44 number to warrant a closure of that area?

45
46 MS. HOFFMAN: We don't know.

47
48 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: We don't know.
49 Okay. Before we go any further, I just want to
50 acknowledge Rick Koso made it in. Thanks for coming,

1 Rick.

2

3 MR. KOSO: Yeah. Thanks. It's good to
4 be here.

5

6 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman. Cole Brown
7 with OSM. The question is at 400 caribou, what does
8 that mean in terms of a viable population for harvest.
9 We don't know -- what ADF&G has as a management
10 objective is to keep the Unimak herd at 1,000 to 1,500
11 animals and that's due to the limited habitat already.
12 So it's up to debate on how much habitat is available,
13 the quality of that habitat because there hasn't been
14 any recent studies accordingly.

15

16 So at 400 animals, we're sitting there
17 with a quandary on what that actually means. So that's
18 something that we can discuss when we get to 42.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Thank you.
21 Della.

22

23 MS. TRUMBLE: I think that was another
24 note I had. I've been looking at those reports because
25 I'm -- for some reason, I'm thinking at one time the 9D
26 and 10 caribou was looked at at one population group.
27 And if that's going to be split, does that smaller
28 populations or thresholds -- or different threshold
29 numbers for the two units and exactly what does that
30 mean.

31

32 And looking at Unimak at one point and
33 700 being probably a number and then now it's 400, but
34 yet you don't -- you're not able to get a full count.
35 You know, it just -- that is some concern. But I know
36 that if they're going to be split, what are those
37 numbers going to be?

38

39 MS. BROWN: They have been split. They
40 were split -- my understanding from ADF&G, they split
41 the southern herd in Unimak in 2007. The -- they do
42 not have a management plan for Unimak herd, but the
43 Southern Peninsula, they do. At the Southern
44 Peninsula, I believe it's the management goal of 3,000
45 to -- yeah, 3,500. And so they've split those
46 management objectives already for those two herds.

47

48 MS. TRUMBLE: Yeah. And I think
49 there's a minimum one time on that threshold on the 9D
50 that was like 3,500.

1 MS. COLE: Let's see. The information
2 I have is the Southern draft management plan is to
3 sustain a total population of 3,000 to 3,500 animals,
4 maintain a fall bull-cow ratio of 20 to 40 bulls per
5 hundred cows and to discontinue harvest when the
6 Southern Peninsula caribou herd is below 875 with a
7 period of decline for three years and that's
8 specifically for those caribou. They have not
9 identified anything like that for the Unimak Island.

10

11 MS. HOFFMAN: Also keep in mind that
12 that is the Alaska Fish and Game's and based on hunter
13 harvest and maximum yield. So that's not a biological
14 threshold.

15

16 MS. TRUMBLE: The reason I was going
17 back through that because if there's not changes and
18 they've been split, I think there really needs to a lot
19 of community input and to both those herds and as to
20 what the plan -- management plan will be. And I just
21 hate to see us get to where we did before where we
22 built -- those herds got built up and then they're back
23 down.

24

25 As a management tool, I think -- we've
26 got -- it's something we've got to keep on I think
27 consistently but -- and cooperatively to not get to --
28 keep getting to this point. Rick is actually from King
29 Cove, born and raised like I was, and so he may have
30 some things to say and has lived Cold Bay quite a
31 number of years.

32

33 MR. KOSO: Yeah. I guess my question
34 would be do you have any way of building that herd back
35 up besides just cutting people off from hunting or do
36 you have a predator control that you're looking into?
37 I know the State does, but I don't know if the Federal
38 Government does.

39

40 MS. HOFFMAN: Can we address this
41 during the proposal? Talk more about it. I have some
42 comments to share with you then.

43

44 MR. KOSO: Yeah. I don't have a
45 problem with that.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Pat.
48 Before -- I think some of this discussion is going to
49 come back up again this afternoon. We could limit our
50 discussion now so we can get to other reports.

1 MR. HOLMES: I just had one question on
2 birds. I was wondering the goal for emperor geese and
3 we've had former RAC members and then also one of our
4 members, Tom Schwantes, always ask you questions about
5 emperor geese and -- as well as Pete Squartsoff. In
6 fact I think that's why Pete always liked to have
7 meetings at Cold Bay is to go down and look at the
8 birds.

9
10 But the goal I think on emperor geese
11 is 80,000 average for three consecutive years and with
12 this spring survey of 91-, almost 92,000, the three-
13 year average is 78,000 and that's like 2.2 percent
14 short of the goal. I was wondering if you had an idea
15 or if your bird people had what the confidence limits
16 were around those estimates because, you know, you're
17 pretty darn close to that goal of 80,000 and -- or you
18 might even have it given whatever the -- you know, the
19 range around the estimates. So I was just -- you
20 probably don't have that information, but I had to ask.

21
22
23 MS. HOFFMAN: You're right. I don't
24 have it handy, but I can ask and see what they can --
25 I'm sure they have that information. I could find that
26 out for you.

27
28 MR. HOLMES: Thank you.

29
30 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other
31 questions.

32
33 (No comments)

34
35 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Rick.

36
37 MR. KOSO: No.

38
39 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. All right.
40 Thank you, Nancy.

41
42 MS. HOFFMAN: Thank you.

43
44 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Bill, you going to
45 take about ten minutes for your report.

46
47 MR. PYLE: Yes, sir.

48
49 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Cool.

50

1 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair. I know I missed
2 a lot of this meeting this morning. So was Nancy the
3 first one to show up on the stage here and make a
4 report or -- it was -- did I miss a couple reports.

5
6 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No. Nancy was
7 probably the first. We had Maureen gave an overview --
8 little bit of an overview of meetings we had with Pat
9 Pourchot and McLees Lake was the informational and that
10 was from the Anchorage Fish and Wildlife. Steve gave
11 that report. And Izembek with Nancy was probably the
12 second person and a lot of her discussion is going to
13 come back up again this afternoon at 1:30 when people
14 call in from the Aleutians.

15
16 MR. KOSO: Yeah. Okay. Thanks. I
17 just.....

18
19 MR. PYLE: Mr. Chair. My name is Bill
20 Pyle with Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge and I would
21 refer the Council to Pages 72 to 77 in their handbook
22 for the Refuge's activity report. I will be presenting
23 on all the nonfisheries and essentially addressing just
24 highlights and Mr. Wheeler, the Manager, will be
25 talking about fisheries.

26
27 Our report builds on the results from
28 2009 surveys as well as some research that was reported
29 -- some of those results were reported in our fall
30 report and then we have additional analyses and those
31 are included in the report that you have now and we
32 also address some of the forecasted activities for
33 2010.

34
35 So starting under brown bear, we
36 conduct surveys down in Southwest Kodiak Island during
37 the summer and these are used to index trends in
38 composition of the bear population and we did surveys
39 -- we've been doing them a long time and the survey last
40 year indicated that the composition of female brown
41 bears was down from the long-term average of 17 percent
42 and if that persists, then, you know, we'll see what
43 happens with the bear population, but basically it was
44 -- that was quite a dip that we noted.

45
46 We are -- we have been doing pilot
47 study work on bear population in the Karluk Lake
48 vicinity here over the last couple years and this was
49 to gear up for doing a full-scale study related to
50 understanding -- detailed understanding of bear habitat

1 use and movement patterns in that area.

2

3 So in case of last year, we monitored
4 three female bears and sampled habitat at 570 bear use
5 locations and documented habitat characteristics and we
6 learned a lot about what it takes to do this kind of
7 intensive study and we're gearing up to ideally put GPS
8 collars on over, you know, probably 20 to 25 bears in
9 that region come late May and early June.

10

11 And we're doing this study in
12 cooperation with the University of Idaho and the
13 Department of Fish and Game.

14

15 Regarding Sitka blacktail deer, we will
16 do what we usually do in April with our annual deer
17 mortality surveys and looking at indexing trend in over
18 winter mortality in three different regions of Kodiak
19 Island. And then we are continuing our cooperation
20 with the Department regarding harvest assessment. This
21 is the harvest survey questionnaire. I just got one
22 the other day as a matter of fact and we cooperate with
23 the Department on that survey process.

24

25 Regarding Federal subsistence hunts,
26 you see a table there in your handbook and I would just
27 refer you to the number of permits that were issued
28 last year. We're still getting feedback on the results
29 of those. I won't mention them, but in any way, we've
30 had 55 designated deer hunting permits issued over the
31 course of late fall and into January. There's been
32 four bear permits issued among two or three villages.
33 I'm not exactly sure of the number of villages, but --
34 and then also we had five elk permits issued and
35 results -- you know, we've only had one elk harvested
36 under subsistence regulations since the hunt was
37 initiated in the late '90s.

38

39 Okay. Moving to sea otter. I will
40 just quickly mention. It's an item not in your
41 handbook, but it's certainly worth mentioning that back
42 in October 8th of 2009, the Fish and Wildlife Service
43 designated critical habitat for sea otter and Federal
44 Agencies that undertake, fund, or permit activities
45 that may affect critical habitat are required to
46 consult with the Service to ensure such actions do not
47 adversely modify or destroy designated critical
48 habitat.

49

50 In the Kodiak area, that critical

1 habitat essentially encompasses all near-shore waters
2 within a 10 fathom or 60 foot depth and there is no
3 anticipated impacts to commercial fisheries, one.
4 Secondly, it does not affect the subsistence harvest of
5 sea otters.

6
7 I have informational news release
8 that's on the table over there that summarizes the
9 critical habitat designation as well as addresses some
10 of the questions pertaining to commercial fishing and
11 hunting, potential implications of this designation.

12
13 We are in concert with Marine Mammals
14 Management and National Oceanographic Atmospheric
15 Administration. We're providing support for a study to
16 further understand the composition of sea otter diets
17 here in the Kodiak area.

18
19 Pertaining to migratory birds, we have
20 been doing some of the normal monitoring surveys and
21 some of those based on results from surveys last
22 summer, we were surveying the west side. We estimated
23 that harlequin duck have continued to decline in the
24 Uyak Bay area. I would refer you to the figure that
25 shows the change in harlequin duck numbers between
26 essentially 1994 and 2010 and we also survey other bays
27 and everywhere else we go, we understand that, you
28 know, there's really essentially no significant trend
29 in harlequin ducks other than Uyak Bay.

30
31 And so the numbers are down there and
32 the Council has been aware of that for some years now
33 and we have taken some actions continue to take actions
34 down there trying to understand more about what are the
35 sources of decline. In addition, specifically working
36 with folks down in Larsen Bay, including waterfowl
37 hunting guides to get the word out in terms of what the
38 status of that local population of harlequins is and to
39 encourage restriction of the harvest as a voluntary
40 measure.

41
42 So we continue to have communication
43 down there and I would note that harlequin ducks are a
44 long-lived species and they have a low reproductive
45 rate. So, you know, even if we were to assume that
46 harvest was in fact restricted which it's to some
47 extent self-limiting because of the low number of birds
48 that are down there now, that it would probably take
49 quite a few years to actually see a response in the
50 population. So we plan to keep an eye on it and

1 continue surveys in that area.

2

3 We conducted a survey -- aerial survey
4 of Steller's eider. It's the first in almost ten
5 years. We noted a decline in the population from about
6 4,000 birds back at the beginning of the decade to
7 2,700. We're not -- we're kind of on the eastern
8 fringe of wintering areas for Steller eiders.

9

10 Migratory birds, subsistence harvest
11 surveys. We will be working with the Department to
12 conduct a harvest survey in the Kodiak area. The last
13 was in 2006. The target areas include the villages of
14 Karluk, Larsen Bay, and Port Lions and Akhiok and as
15 well as a sample of the Kodiak road system. And so
16 Tonya Lee with the Refuge will be heading that up and
17 working with the Tribal Councils as appropriate and
18 surveyors to collect that information.

19

20 As a note, I provided information to
21 the Council, a summary of the last harvest survey. It
22 was conducted in 2006 and in fact the results have only
23 recently become available. I went ahead and
24 highlighted a few of those summary results in a little
25 handout that I provided the Council. The full report
26 is available from the AMBCC Website and it is still in
27 draft form, but I don't expect it to change much. This
28 is what it looks like. You might recognize the
29 character on the front there.

30

31 But in any case -- so that's it for the
32 harvest survey. Gary, over to you.

33

34 MR. WHEELER: Okay. I have just one
35 fisheries project that I'd like to highlight and that
36 is our study on chinook salmon fry in the Karluk River.
37 Due to the reduced population of chinook salmon in the
38 Karluk over the -- about the last five years or so, the
39 Refuge sought out funding from our regional office to
40 begin to try to assess what might be the cause in the
41 reduction of chinook.

42

43 And so we obtained funding and
44 cooperation with the Department of Fish and Game and
45 personnel from both of our Agencies went out to the
46 Karluk this past year to try to find chinook --
47 juvenile chinook in the Karluk River. This is the
48 first time to our knowledge that this type of sampling
49 effort had been undertaken. So we utilized baited
50 minnow traps and sampled 23 different river sections

1 between April and October and the late -- late in the
2 year -- in the fall essentially was the only time we
3 were able to trap chinook.

4
5 We got 20 -- or rather 52 juvenile fish
6 and most -- well, essentially all of these were caught
7 in the lower third of the river during the fall. So --
8 and you can see the -- in our report, the numbers for
9 the other species that were captured in the minnow
10 traps, essentially 3,800 Dolly Varden, 1,600 steelhead
11 or rainbow trout, 2,500 sockeye, 500 coho, 400 and --
12 well, almost 500 stickleback, a couple of lampreys and
13 one sculpin.

14
15 So you can see the chinook numbers were
16 very low and -- in comparison with these other species.
17 We were able to secure funding again for this year and
18 we will begin our sampling effort as -- basically as
19 soon as the river thaws. It's frozen right now.

20
21 So that is the extent of the report on
22 that project.

23
24 MR. PYLE: Changes in Refuge Staff.
25 Most of you've met Kent Sundseth, the new Deputy Refuge
26 Manager sitting behind us. Jason Oles, new Park
27 Ranger, was -- has started his tour and then we expect
28 to hire a new wildlife biologist to help with the
29 studies of subsistence species and coordination of
30 responsibilities. Hire in April and then actually have
31 the position staffed in June. This was a position
32 occurred by Brando Sito in the past.

33
34 Old Harbor Tribal Council was awarded a
35 grant for support of bear-proofing the town's landfill
36 and for undertaking associated measures to reduce bear-
37 human conflict. That's very significant. This is --
38 they were awarded a grant under the Services
39 Tribal-Wildlife grant program and we will -- in
40 conjunction with the Department, if there's any
41 technical support that's needed, we'll be glad to help
42 out.

43
44 This really is a significant maneuver.
45 It builds on the tradition reducing bear-human conflict
46 here in Kodiak Island and the precedents that were
47 established first by Larsen Bay and secondly by Port
48 Lions with successful development of bear-proofing
49 around those landfills and so hats off to Old Harbor
50 for starting that and working to reduce conflict.

1 Larsen Bay Tribal Councils continue to
2 make progress towards completion of its Tribal-Wildlife
3 grant with the goal of completing it by next winter.

4
5 The Fish and Wildlife Service is
6 cooperating with Native corporations and the National
7 Resource Conservation Service to conduct soil surveys
8 on the Refuge and this year we will -- the NRCS will be
9 working in the Old Harbor and Akhiok vicinities.

10
11 That concludes our report. Thank you.

12
13
14 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Bill.
15 Any questions. Alex.

16
17 MR. PANAMAROFF: I have a couple. The
18 first one is on the harlequin ducks. What determines
19 their migration into the bay areas? The reason I'm
20 asking this our weather conditions have changed quite a
21 bit in the last 15, 20 years because I can remember
22 before when we used to have -- get a lot of them up
23 around Bear Island area there on the outside coming
24 into the bay usually when you had big storms and a bad
25 winter.

26
27 And the last few winters, it hasn't
28 been that -- we have had, you know, mild winters. So
29 would that have a determination on the migration of the
30 ducks coming into the bay area?

31
32 MR. PYLE: Well, it certainly could and
33 that is one possible source of change is that, you
34 know, given a change in weather patterns and ocean
35 conditions, food availability that in fact some of the
36 ducks have potentially moved to other places. However,
37 we really haven't detected changes such as those, for
38 example, over in the adjacent Uganik Bay, essentially
39 the population has been flat for the entire time.

40
41 But clearly distribution patterns are
42 influenced by the changes in conditions. So we really
43 don't know the specifics of seasonal distribution and
44 how that's changed through time. We just, you know,
45 see what we see when we're out there sampling during
46 the summer and then we come back in the winter and in
47 fact the winter survey that we typically do in
48 February, the results are essentially consistent. A
49 different survey process, but, you know, it also
50 reflects this kind of trend of decline in Uyak Bay and

1 contrast with the trend in adjacent Uganik Bay.

2

3 MR. WHEELER: Yeah, I just -- you did
4 mention it, Bill, but the surveys that we have depicted
5 on the figure there are summer surveys, so they would
6 be done in the late summer.

7

8 MR. PANAMAROFF: Okay. Thank you. I
9 have one other on the chinook salmon in the Karluk
10 River. I was born and raised in Karluk, so I -- you
11 know, I've noticed a lot of changes there. One of the
12 main changes was, well, the river used to go all the
13 way down towards what they usually Crumunside (ph).
14 And I can't remember what year. We had a big storm and
15 the river changed from way down there, the mouth of the
16 river opens now right about the middle of the spit.

17

18 Now, when it did that and the next few
19 years, I noticed that in the lagoon area, you don't
20 have hardly any water compared to what it used to have
21 in there before. Would that make a difference on the
22 chinook going up the -- not much water -- not getting
23 up there and maybe staying outside where commercial
24 fishermen are getting -- you know.

25

26 MR. WHEELER: That could be a
27 possibility. I guess my other thought would be that
28 the lagoon area would be a pretty important area for
29 the smolt to spend time to acclimate to salt water and
30 so if you have a smaller lagoon, that could have an
31 influence perhaps on juvenile survival as well, so
32 that's a good comment and we appreciate that.

33

34 MR. PANAMAROFF: Yeah. Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

37

38 MR. HOLMES: Good strategy to have your
39 comments right before lunch. I won't be as poky about
40 harlequins as I am at every meeting.

41

42 I'm glad that you're working with the
43 lodges and talking with them, but I guess my question
44 would be is have you folks looked into harvest logbooks
45 because you only have five lodges and a few other
46 guides, and I'm just looking and, you know, the
47 comments that say that 11 or 12 years I've been on this
48 Council, every year we see the slope for Uyak Bay going
49 down. I don't see how environmental conditions would
50 be different for Uyak than they are for Uganik. The

1 only difference is the amount of birds that are being
2 taken.

3

4 And the decline from last year to this
5 year is 52, so even if you threw out the guides and
6 just had five lodges having ten clients each took one
7 duck, that's -- in four years, your index is going to
8 be zero. It probably won't be, but, you know, it's a
9 pretty darn steep slope and I know Rick's commented on
10 before. Some folks of Kodiak don't eat harlequins. I
11 told a joke about trying one one time and it was like
12 the stone soup and I threw out the duck and ate the
13 sauce.

14

15 But I know some old-timers here,
16 harlequins are really important to them and so I would
17 urge anything you can do to document what the actual
18 harvest is would be really an important thing to do
19 because you really don't have that big a pool of folks
20 to find out what's going on. And I'm sure the folks in
21 Larsen Bay would really like to see those duck numbers
22 come up. So thank you very much.

23

24 MR. PYLE: Mr. Holmes, thank you for
25 your suggestion and observations and hopefully the
26 harvest survey that will occur this year which takes
27 in Larsen Bay will provide additional opportunity to
28 document the level of subsistence use which the
29 previous survey indicated is very low, but it does
30 occur.

31

32 And then with respect to sport hunting,
33 I would have to say that to the best of my knowledge,
34 we have not actually requested, you know, some review
35 of logbooks by waterfowl hunting guides, but we need to
36 continue that conversation and examine that possibility
37 to, you know, see if anybody's willing for us, you
38 know, to do that.

39

40 I don't know the details of what the
41 process would be, but that's an excellent suggestion.
42 Clearly, you know, they understand that the client is
43 down -- or that the numbers are down. The
44 availability's down and they seem to be -- you know,
45 they indicate that, you know, they're concerned and
46 they're doing what they can to restrict harvest, but it
47 doesn't take much as you indicated when you have very
48 few birds left to have further impact.

49

50 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. That's my concern

1 because folks that I know that live down there, you
2 know, there's become quite a market for Europeans
3 flying in to get a trophy harlequin because that's one
4 of the few places in the world they could get one for
5 their collection and quite frankly, I'd rather seem
6 them go into Alex's pot than to be flying out to West
7 Germany or something.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Bill.
10 I did have one question concerning the subsistence area
11 up in Afognak. Do you issue subsistence use permits to
12 hunters out of Homer? The reason I ask is that I've
13 recently come back from Juneau and I met some people
14 from Homer and said they do all their subsistence
15 gathering in northwest Afognak and I was kind of
16 wondering about that because they said they spent a
17 whole summer over there just subsistence gathering.

18

19 So do we -- does Kodiak issue
20 subsistence permits to people out of Homer?

21

22 MR. WHEELER: Not to my knowledge.
23 That's the first I've heard of it and essentially for
24 the -- I mean my thought is essentially we would be
25 issuing permits for folks within this region and Homer
26 is not within Unit 8, so -- yeah. Good point. Kent
27 says Homer is not rural either. So they wouldn't be
28 qualified subsistence users.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Well, that
31 may be information they shared that they probably wish
32 they didn't.

33

34 (Laughter)

35

36 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: But one other
37 question. I heard recently that bear guides out in
38 Kodiak, I heard something to the effect that they may
39 be rotating their hunt areas. Is there something to
40 that?

41

42 MR. WHEELER: Well, permits will be --
43 for the existing guides, will be expiring here in a
44 couple years anyway. So the Service will be
45 readvertising the opportunity for guiding on the Refuge
46 and the guides will need to recompetete then. So we
47 don't have any other plans beyond that anyway for
48 changing the guide system.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Well,

1 that's probably just an idea that somebody put out --
2 behind the reapplying for the hunt area. I've heard
3 discussion that some bear hunters are in such a poor
4 area, they don't get any bear and the way to get away
5 from that was to have the bear guides rotate their
6 permits to hunt in a different area.

7

8 MR. WHEELER: I have not heard anything
9 regarding a proposal like that, so.....

10

11 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay.

12

13 MR. WHEELER: Not that I'm away of.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any question --
16 Rick.

17

18 MR. KOSO: Yeah. I got one question.
19 Mostly probably for clarification. On the subsistence
20 fisheries, I'm a little confused of what your status
21 would be versus the State's status. I've always gotten
22 my subsistence license through the State and so -- in
23 my mind, what -- I know you guys probably working with
24 the State, but what's your place in the subsistence
25 fishery part of this?

26

27 MR. WHEELER: Well, there are some
28 Federal waters and so we would have jurisdiction then
29 on those Federal waters. For instance, just off the
30 mouth of the Buskin River would be one area. Maritime
31 Refuge waters around the Afognak and near-shore off the
32 old Karluk Indian Reservation are also Federal waters
33 there, but yeah, we definitely work very closely with
34 the State on Federal subsistence.

35

36 MR. KOSO: Yeah. You know, I know
37 there was some Federal jurisdiction there, but I've
38 always in my mind thought that the State managed and
39 issued the subsistence even within those regions. I've
40 never ever went to the Fish and Wildlife to get a
41 subsistence fishery permit.

42

43 MR. WHEELER: Now, we don't issue
44 permits. Essentially it's if you're a qualified
45 Federal subsistence user, then you have rights under
46 the Federal Subsistence Regulations to.....

47

48 MR. KOSO: Thank you. That's all I
49 have.

50

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Rick.
2 Any other question. Okay. Thank you, Gary.

3
4 Bill.

5
6 MR. PYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7 Members of the Council.

8
9 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Now, we have gone
10 quite a ways into our lunch hour, so we have like 40
11 minutes. I could suggest probably -- yeah, go to
12 Subway right across the street here and be back by 1:00
13 o'clock. We have a lot of people hopefully will be
14 calling in at 1:30. 1:15. Okay. Okay. 1:15.

15
16 (Off record)

17
18 (On record)

19
20 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Let's go
21 ahead and call this meeting back to order. It's 1:25.
22 And for information I guess if anyone wanted to testify
23 on the next item on our agenda, there's a sign-up sheet
24 in the back. There's a white paper. Just sign up on
25 there and hopefully anybody that calls in we'll get
26 their names and the next item on our agenda is the
27 Proposal WP10-42.

28
29 Cole.

30
31 MS. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
32 Members of the Council. Again my name is Cole Brown
33 with OSM and I will be presenting the analyses for
34 Proposal WP10-42.

35
36 This was submitted by Izembek National
37 Wildlife Refuge in conjunction with the Alaska
38 Department of Fish and Game. They request that the
39 closing of the Federal season for caribou in Unit 10,
40 Unimak Island, during the fall and winter seasons due
41 to decreased population and low productivity of the
42 caribou herd.

43
44 During fall composition surveys in
45 2008, biologists estimated 260 caribou with a bull-cow
46 ratio of nine bulls to ten cows. Do we have someone on
47 the line?

48
49 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. This is Lem Butler
50 with Department of Fish and Game.

1 MS. BROWN: Hi, Lem. We just got
2 started with Proposal 10-42. So I'm just reviewing
3 that right now.

4
5 MR. BUTLER: Okay.

6
7 MS. BROWN: Just kind of reiterate the
8 major component here. During fall composition surveys
9 in 2008, biologists estimated 260 caribou with a bull-
10 cow ratio of nine bulls to a hundred cows which
11 represented a 71 percent decrease in the bull-cow sex
12 ratio.

13
14 As previously stated that we heard
15 today in testimony from the Izembek National Wildlife
16 Refuge Manager, the last survey in 2009 and 2010 did a
17 population survey and found 400 caribou, but no age or
18 sex composition data is available.

19
20 In 2008, the ratio of seven calves to a
21 hundred cows was similar to ratios observed in 2005 and
22 2007, but was significantly lower than the previous
23 surveys in 2000 and 2002 that had ratios of around 26
24 calves to a hundred cows.

25
26 Calf recruitment from 2005 to 2008 was
27 not sufficient to offset adult mortality and helps to
28 explain the overall decreasing population trend for the
29 Unimak Island herd. In October 2009, a fall
30 composition survey was completed on Unimak Island and
31 showed further reduction in bull-cow ratios. They
32 found five bulls to a hundred cows and three calves per
33 a hundred cows for the fall 2008 composition survey.

34
35 These sex ratio thresholds in caribou
36 are precipitously close to the identified threshold of
37 .08 where below which the fecundity may collapse in a
38 population.

39
40 Specific limiting factors causing the
41 low calf recruitment and subsequent population decline
42 are not known. Three limiting factors to consider are
43 habitat composition and habitat availability for
44 caribou, predator species composition and abundance,
45 and any present disease on Unimak Island.

46
47 The first potential limiting factor
48 which is habitat assessment on Unimak Island, Alaska
49 Department of Fish and Game area biologists have
50 acknowledged that there have been no recent vegetation

1 assessments of the area to determine how much lichen
2 and other critical vegetation for the caribou is
3 available.

4
5 Caribou parturition of calves is
6 closely cue to plant phenology and closely coincides
7 with the flush or green up of highly nutritious plant
8 growth. Many studies conducted in the Arctic countries
9 have shown that the onset of plant growing season has
10 advanced in response to warming; whereas the timing of
11 caribou calving has not.

12
13 Consequently the peak demand for
14 resources by reproductive females now falls
15 significantly later than the season peak of resource
16 availability. In addition, for those calves that are
17 born, subsequent calf growth depends on this high-
18 quality forage to maximize body condition before
19 winter.

20
21 In addition, lower rates of conception
22 result from failure of adults to regain sufficient body
23 mass and poor forage quality in the summer can cause
24 cow caribou to skip a breeding season to regain body
25 condition due to be nutritionally stressed.

26
27 In addition, low bull-cow ratio has
28 been identified. Five bulls per a hundred cows were
29 seen in 2009 with the main cohort being young bulls.
30 Low pregnancy rate can occur to the scarcity of bulls
31 but also due to the cohort composition resulting in
32 fewer adult females conceiving during their first
33 estrus-cycle due to their hesitation to mate with young
34 bulls.

35
36 The resulting synchronization of
37 females mating in the later estrus-cycle would make
38 parturition later when resources are less abundant or
39 nutritious. The second potential limiting factor
40 predation by brown bear, wolves, and eagles, no
41 standardized baseline or continuous survey has been
42 done regarding predator composition and species
43 abundance on Unimak Island. Wolves have been seen
44 during caribou counts and have been identified by
45 Alaska Department of Fish and Game biologists as being
46 a potential limiting factor to the Unimak Island
47 caribou population. However, brown bears have been
48 shown to have a significantly higher impact on caribou
49 survival with higher predation rates than other
50 predators, including wolves, when calves are less than

1 ten days old.

2

3

4 Studies conducted in Alaska have shown
5 that 39 percent of radio collared calves died as
6 neonates which is less than 15 days old. And 98
7 percent of those deaths were attributed to predation
8 with brown bears being the main predator. There has
9 been no assessment of bald eagle predation on Unimak
10 Island.

11

12 Third potential limiting factor is
13 disease. In 2000, the prevalence of pneumonia was in
14 the Northern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd and was
15 identified as a limiting factor for that population.
16 There has been no disease research completed on Unimak
17 Island.

18

19 Harvest has been primarily under the
20 State general hunt and has been primarily bulls since
21 2001 with total harvest numbers remaining below 21
22 animals annually. Prior to 2007, there were very few
23 Federal registration permits issued to hunt caribou on
24 Unimak Island. However, in 2007, 16 permits were
25 issued to hunt under the Federal registration hunt.
26 However, only two caribou were reported being
27 harvested. The Alaska Board of Game closed all hunting
28 for caribou on the Unimak Island. At its February
29 meeting, the Federal Subsistence Board authorized
30 special actions to close the fall and winter seasons
31 for 2009. This proposal addresses those closures.

32

33 If this proposal is adopted, the
34 Federal caribou hunting season for Unit 10 would
35 continue to be closed and opportunity would be
36 suspended for Federally-qualified subsistence users to
37 harvest caribou in Unit 10 during this regulatory year.
38 Both the bull-cow and calf-cow ratios are extremely
39 low, our conservation concern for the Unimak caribou
40 population, and do not support continued harvest at
41 this time. Eliminating the harvest opportunity would
42 allow the herd to grow and would provide for a more
43 sustainable subsistence harvest in the future.

44

45 OSM preliminary conclusion is to
46 support Proposal WP10-42. Since writing this proposal,
47 there has been new developments with one of the
48 proponents. The Izembek National Wildlife Refuge
49 Manager now has additional information and has been
50 looking at maybe a different support or opposition of
the proposal. So I'd invite the Manager to come up and

1 kind of share her concerns and her information and we
2 can kind of lay out for the Council maybe some things
3 to consider with this information and lack of
4 information, what are the possibilities, where we can
5 go with this proposal in accordance with this new
6 information and we'll just kind of lay it all out
7 there. We now have ADF&G on the line We can hear some
8 information about that and our job is just to give you
9 that information and let deliberation.

10

11 MS. HOFFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12 Okay. As Refuge Manager of Izembek National Wildlife
13 Refuge and as host head units of Alaska Maritime and
14 Alaska Peninsula, I have concerns and comments I'd like
15 to share with you and to also consider before you make
16 recommendation for Proposal WP10-42, closure of Federal
17 season for caribou on Unit 10, Unimak Island.

18

19 I began working with the State of
20 Alaska on this proposal not long after I became the new
21 Refuge Manager at Izembek. When first approached by
22 the State, I thought it would be a reasonable request
23 and having the general and subsistence seasons close at
24 the same time would be best for allowing the caribou
25 herd numbers to increase. I listened to comments from
26 concerned citizens during the September '09 WSA09-07
27 public hearing. I asked more questions and looked for
28 a closer examination of harvest numbers both the
29 subsistence and guided hunts the Refuge permitted on
30 Unimak Island within the Refuge files and talked story
31 with elders who were born and raised in still live in
32 False Pass.

33

34 From this information, I began to
35 question if Unimak Unit 10 subsistence unit should be
36 completely closed to C&T subsistence use. I received
37 public comments from -- that U.S. Fish and Wildlife
38 Service was just jumping onboard with the State
39 closure. Only two caribou have been harvested over the
40 last ten years, so why would that limited number of
41 harvested animals affect the overall population.
42 Residents of False Pass made a statement that people in
43 the community do not have the means to access caribou
44 in the inland area of the island. Local communities
45 hunt a ten-mile stretch of beach along a ten-mile area
46 near the city of False Pass.

47

48 RAC members made clear their concern as
49 why the caribou surveys on Unimak Island were not
50 completed in the past. I understand that concern and

1 told the RAC at the last meeting that I would do
2 everything in my power to complete an aerial in winter
3 2010. Aerial surveys for caribou on Unimak have not
4 been successful in the past based on varied valid
5 reasons. The Refuge was successful in conducting two
6 -- that's in January and March -- two-day surveys on
7 Unimak Island. Both attempts were only able to
8 complete the survey on the northern half of the island.
9 The maximum number of caribou observed in those surveys
10 on half of the island was 400 animals.

11
12 As reported in our -- as noted in our
13 report, the six caribou that were collared which were
14 deployed in October were found. However, only five
15 collars were on caribou. According to a False Pass
16 resident of 60 years, a local subsistence user I spoke
17 with in February, caribou has historically been
18 harvested from lands east of Unimak Island across the
19 Isanotski Strait on the Alaska Peninsula and that's
20 Unit 9D.

21
22 Harvesting caribou west of the land
23 surrounding False Pass is not a traditional subsistence
24 area and caribou are usually taken as they migrate
25 through the False Pass area. Caribou are still taken
26 if they pass through this area and it doesn't really
27 matter the season. The False Pass elder also mentioned
28 that the population of False Pass is at this time
29 probably no greater than 25 people. I mean this number
30 will be verified after the 2010 Census.

31
32 According to our Refuge records --
33 files, we reviewed the harvest levels of Unimak Island
34 over the past decade. I realize prior to 2007 harvest
35 level was four per person and then in 2007 through
36 2008, it was reduced to two caribou per person. From
37 this review, I also gained knowledge that between --
38 about 16 Federal subsistence permits are requested for
39 caribou, only 2 were harvested as compared to 90
40 caribou harvested by two licensed guides during the
41 same ten-year period.

42
43 Being the new kid on the block, I began
44 to question what's going on and as a Federal land
45 Manager, do we really have the data to support this
46 proposed closure. In addition, to the best of my
47 knowledge, there is no caribou management plan for the
48 Refuge and the State of Alaska that we have jointly
49 agreed upon for Unimak Island. I began to question if
50 I made a sound decision in supporting this proposal to

1 the Office of Subsistence.

2

3 In summary, after hearing the comments
4 and concerns of people in the public and also from the
5 hearing in September, reviewing harvest levels over the
6 past decade, talking to local rural residents of False
7 Pass, and completing a partial aerial caribou survey
8 that showed at least 400 animals, I may have been hasty
9 in proposing the total closure of subsistence use on
10 the island. I now better understand and support the
11 RAC's determination in voting perhaps a no action on
12 this proposal as written. I do not understand --
13 sorry. I do not think the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
14 Service and the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge have
15 good science data to support the complete shutdown of
16 subsistence. And just wonder maybe we could reduce the
17 harvest from two to one and we could put a quota on it.
18 Maybe in this next season that quota could be zero.

19

20 There are many -- or there are several
21 options we could use to modify this existing permit. I
22 can bring up Jerry Berg. We could talk about other
23 options or.....

24

25 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Della.

26

27 MS. TRUMBLE: I did hear a line -- I'm
28 hoping False Pass is on line. You do have a schedule.
29 It's on Page 55 and I know, Lem, you are on line, but
30 this shows on the successful harvest of caribou for
31 local, nonlocal, and nonresident. And looking at the
32 nonresident, are these permits allowed by -- has
33 anything passed the '06-'07 on Unimak -- '06-'07, '07-
34 '08, or '08-'09, any numbers that bring this schedule
35 up to date?

36

37 MS. BROWN: Are you talking to Lem or
38 anyone who will answer?

39

40 MS. TRUMBLE: Anybody

41

42 MS. HOFFMAN: And you're talking to
43 State permits.

44

45 MS. BROWN: You're talking about Table
46 3, Della.

47

48 MS. TRUMBLE: Yep.

49

50 MS. BROWN: Okay.

1 MS. TRUMBLE: Table 3. And this -- if
2 this is State and there's allowable Federal, what are
3 -- what is -- the Federal is -- where I'm headed with
4 it -- because I have heard it from people in False Pass
5 and whether -- and they can speak to that themselves if
6 there's a real issue with this. But I think a concern
7 that I did hear is with guides coming in with hunters
8 and harvesting caribou and that's why I brought that up
9 because it -- that's why I'm questioning the
10 nonresident numbers.

11
12 MS. BROWN: Okay. So I'm -- we don't
13 have the regs on hand for the 2007 through 2008. I'm
14 looking through the regulatory history in the proposal
15 -- or the analyses. Lem, are you on line? Lem.

16
17 MR. BUTLER: Yes.

18
19 MS. BROWN: Do you happen to recall for
20 those regulatory years what was available to nonlocal
21 users or nonresidents, what was in the regs at that
22 time?

23
24 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. This is Lem Butler,
25 Fish and Game, Area Biologist. I believe our regs have
26 been consistently one caribou for -- under the State
27 regs throughout the 2000 to 2010 period.

28
29 MS. BROWN: And then for nonresidents,
30 was there a harvest opportunity given to them and when
31 and is that still in occurrence?

32
33 MR. BUTLER: All hunting has been
34 closed to this point by the Board of Game, so there's
35 no harvest opportunity under the State regulations. At
36 the time when we were offering a hunt, it was for
37 Alaska residents and non-Alaska residents, so
38 nonresidents of the State of Alaska could hunt during
39 that time period.

40
41 MS. BROWN: Okay. And was that just
42 for the September -- it was the September season; is
43 that correct? And was there a harvest quota on it?

44
45 MR. BUTLER: No harvest quota and it
46 was the -- yeah, I don't have my regulations in front
47 of me either, so I can't tell you what the actual
48 season dates were, but I'm sure if there was --
49 probably -- it probably started about August 10th, ran
50 through September would be my guess.

1 MS. BROWN: Okay. So the last known
2 time that there was a nonresident hunt would have been
3 prior to this recent State closure in 2009; is that
4 correct?

5
6 MR. BUTLER: Right. The last hunt was
7 in the fall of 2008, just prior to getting our first
8 very low bull ratio. I think we came back from that
9 survey with nine bulls per hundred cows and that's what
10 initiated efforts to close all hunting at that point.
11 Prior to that, there were a lot of bulls and pregnancy
12 rates were really good. We did have concerns about the
13 low calf recruitment, but we were still doing really
14 well in terms of reproductive success and things -- and
15 those sorts of primers that we looked at when we're
16 trying to determine harvestable surplus. Certainly of
17 course there is no harvestable surplus. This
18 population may actually go away very rapidly at this
19 point based on the bull ratio which is rapidly
20 declining and the continued lack of calf recruitment.

21
22 So that's our main concern relative to
23 this hunt and why we feel taking any animals at all
24 from this population will have consequences.

25
26 MS. BROWN: Okay. Thank you, Lem.
27 Della, does that answer your question?

28
29 MS. TRUMBLE: Yes, it does. I think at
30 this point it does, but I guess in looking at these
31 without those years on the schedule and then what you
32 were saying, Nancy, with the Federal, are you
33 recommending to just keep the Federal at the -- where
34 it's at on Unit 10? Or just it's open for discussion.

35
36 MS. HOFFMAN: Yeah. Right now it's two
37 per person, so I would say we don't have enough
38 information, but two would probably be too high, so how
39 about one and if we had a quota of zero at this point
40 until we have more information, then we could up it,
41 and then we don't have to -- there's just other options
42 to do this.

43
44 We do have a new biologist on staff and
45 so it is a priority that we're going to develop a study
46 plan to look at the caribou in relationship with
47 plants, animals, including humans, that interact on the
48 landscape on Unimak.

49
50 MS. TRUMBLE: And I guess my next

1 question leads into the issue that was predation with
2 both bears and wolves because I have heard cases where
3 the guys are out fishing and have observed both bears
4 and wolves that have been after the caribou. And I
5 recall being on this Council -- last time I was on and
6 my issue was that in regard to the predation and
7 because of the wolves and after that, we've noticed a
8 large -- a big decline in the caribou on the species
9 and I know you've -- there has been some effort on some
10 control, but do you have an update on anything else at
11 this point that you're looking at in the near future?

12
13 MS. HOFFMAN: Just clarifying, looking
14 at in the future as far as research and control?

15
16 MS. TRUMBLE: Control.

17
18 MS. HOFFMAN: We need a picture of
19 what's really going on there first and looking at the
20 numbers, population of everybody, be it wolves, bear,
21 caribou. And then from there, come up with a
22 recommendation. So at this point, there's just -- I
23 can't find any information.

24
25 MR. BUTLER: This is Lem Butler. Can I
26 have a chance to answer some of that.

27
28 MS. BROWN: Go ahead, Lem.

29
30 MR. BUTLER: Yeah, thanks. You know,
31 relative -- I heard several things that were poorly
32 stated I think in the Federal report. First, brown
33 bear predation on caribou calves isn't -- hasn't been
34 shown to be significant on the Alaska Peninsula. In
35 fact, in the Southern Alaska Peninsula herd, less than
36 8 percent of the calf mortalities are attributed to
37 brown bears and for a lot of reasons, we think the
38 caribou play out very similarly with Unimak.

39
40 There is a lot of evidence that would
41 suggest that there is a predation issue on caribou
42 calves. The body condition of these caribou is
43 excellent. It's even better than the Southern Alaska
44 Peninsula Caribou Herd and for the time period where we
45 had decent bull numbers, we had very high pregnancy
46 rates, all of which suggest that there are no nutrition
47 issues associated with this herd.

48
49 Also given the Southern Alaska
50 Peninsula herd and what was done there, again the two

1 herds were very similar. Both -- in both herds, body
2 condition of the females was very good. Pregnancy
3 rates were very high. In other herds, we had
4 chronically poor calf recruitment. Both herds,
5 however, have good production initially of caribou
6 calves.

7
8 With the Southern Alaska Peninsula
9 herd, removing just a handful of wolves in that key
10 period resulted in an increase in caribou calf survival
11 from what was less than 1 percent to 69 percent
12 following the application of wolf control and it's --
13 you know, the other herds in the area didn't respond,
14 so that really suggests, if you look at the three herds
15 in the area, the Northern Alaska Peninsula herd,
16 Southern Alaska Peninsula herd, and the Unimak herd,
17 the climate changes wouldn't explain that sort of
18 thing. It suggests strongly that predation was indeed
19 the limiting factor and the primary factor associated
20 with that. It wasn't tied back to any environmental
21 change at all, which would suggest that, you know, if
22 we can get that kind of response from the adjacent
23 herds that there's no reason to believe that we
24 wouldn't get a similar result on Unimak should we apply
25 it.

26
27 Again pregnancy rates were really good
28 prior to this decline in bull ratios. We were looking
29 at almost 90 percent pregnancy rates for breeding age
30 cows. The cows are in good condition, but by the time
31 we'd get there two weeks later, the calves were down
32 to, you know, 90 percent loss at that point, so we're
33 looking at 10 percent survival of calves through the
34 first period. Again very consistent with predation
35 issue on caribou calves and not any other associated
36 disease or habitat or nutrition problems.

37
38 MS. BROWN: Okay. Thanks, Lem. Those
39 were identified as potential limiting factors
40 especially in lieu if there's actually been no on-the-
41 ground research done. So I'm a little confused because
42 we also have the ADF&G press release regarding the
43 decline of Unimak Caribou Herd and concerns by the
44 State Wildlife Managers distributed from your office
45 and it conflicts with what you just said regarding
46 biologists attribute the low pregnancy raw to the
47 scarcity of bulls. You just said that there was a
48 pregnancy rate, so I'm a little concerned on the
49 information there.

50

1 MR. BUTLER: I'm the one that's
2 generating that information and again what we had was
3 prior to -- let's see, what was it now -- 2008 I think
4 was where we had the nine bulls for hundred cows. So
5 prior to that in 2007 prior, we were looking at good
6 pregnancy rates. As soon as we nine bulls per hundred
7 cows, the following year, we saw a reduction in
8 pregnancy rates down to 12 percent and now we're
9 looking at five bulls per hundred cows, so we're
10 expecting to see that continue trend of poor pregnancy
11 relative to the availability of bulls. The problem is
12 again getting the bulls to find the females during the
13 appropriate period of time.

14
15 And when we're looking at the
16 composition of these herds, we finding large groups of
17 just all cow caribou with no bulls in the area. We're
18 probably looking at a total of 20 bulls in the
19 population or roughly -- roughly currently and we can
20 expect further loss in that simply due to the age of
21 those bulls. I mean they have been recruited well
22 since prior to 2005. We get that big decline in the
23 bull ratio because of age effects. The bulls just
24 don't live as long as the cows. That trend should
25 continue given that we aren't seeing any influx of
26 caribou calves. So we're looking at continued
27 reproduction problems in this population. So I'm not
28 really sure quite how you're reading that press
29 release, but that's how it should be stated in there.

30
31 MS. BROWN: Okay.

32
33 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat, did you have
34 a question. No. Okay. Go ahead. Continue with your
35 introduction of the proposal.

36
37 MS. BROWN: Well, that's the extent of
38 it in terms of information. Our conclusion is based
39 off of lack of information. I understand Mr. Butler is
40 making reference to the other Peninsula caribou herds
41 and what has happened with them. There is other
42 research, you know, in other caribou herds where wolf
43 control did not work, where the predation was actually
44 primarily from brown bears. This happened up in the
45 Denali National Park. It happened up north and it's --
46 these are all just potentials. It's laying it out there
47 and I think that coming to a preliminary conclusion
48 that it's immediately wolves, it is a consideration,
49 absolutely, but it may not be the only consideration.
50

1 And from ADF&G where they went in and
2 they had population grown in the Delta Caribou Herd
3 after wolf control, it wasn't because of the wolf
4 control. There were -- although the calf-cows
5 increased after wolf control, there was also increase
6 of calf-cow ratios in an adjacent Denali herd where
7 there was not wolf control. The they identified other
8 predators as being brown bears and golden eagles that
9 were taking the young neonates. And there's other
10 studies that show that if you're under ten days old as
11 a neonate caribou that it's predominantly brown bear.

12
13 Now I'm not saying that that's what
14 happening. I'm saying we don't know and to go in there
15 is what the Refuge Manager is talking about. They have
16 a new wildlife biologist. They're talking about
17 looking at what the habitat is out there, what the
18 composition is, what's the availability of that
19 habitat, what are we looking at in terms of the age and
20 sex composition since we just went in and we saw 400
21 other caribou. We don't know what that is. It could
22 be higher than the five bulls. It could be higher than
23 the three calves, but we don't know.

24
25 This is the information that we have to
26 operate off of. So my recommendation from this
27 analyses is to not have a knee-jerk reaction to
28 immediately go in there and apply something that we
29 don't know what the effect is going to be. If the
30 limiting factor is not wolves, going in and reducing
31 wolves is not going to have an effect on an increasing
32 that.

33
34 Now we're hearing information that has
35 not been substantiated from the ground and I think
36 that's what the Manager is talking about is getting in
37 there and finding out what the source of this
38 population decline is. It could very well be wolves,
39 but we don't know that right now.

40
41 So where do we stand with this
42 proposal. There are many options that we can do. We
43 can continue with the OSM preliminary conclusion which
44 is in conjunction with the Alaska Department of Fish
45 and Game but now currently under question with Izembek
46 National Wildlife Refuge to support this proposal which
47 means for the next regulatory cycle, we would have a
48 closed season. Another option would be to provide some
49 kind of modification to this which is what the Manager
50 is talking about and it could be something that we've

1 seen in other regulations where especially I think in
2 Unit 13 where they had the caribou herd. They give the
3 delegated authority to the land manager in consultation
4 with the ADF&G and with the Chair of that particular
5 Regional Advisory Council to consult on what is going
6 to happen for that next season.

7
8 Now it could be we could establish a
9 quota in which this next season the quota could be zero
10 because we want to get in there and see what's going on
11 first. But that would leave a much easier vehicle to
12 then come back and adjust that per year rather than
13 going through the special action way. So there's
14 taking this proposal, supporting it, we close it for
15 the next regulatory season. The Manager goes in, they
16 do their assessment, and lo' and behold they see a high
17 bull-cow ratio, they see a high calf-cow ratio. This
18 next regulatory season, we can put in a special action
19 and there could be a season -- a Federal season or, you
20 know, whatever's determined at that time.

21
22 Or you can modify the proposal as it is
23 written now to look at giving that delegated authority
24 to the Manager in conjunction with ADF&G, establishing
25 a harvest quota, establishing a delegated authority for
26 them to determine what sex of the animal that can be
27 taken, how many can be taken that year. All sorts of
28 options. So it's just for us to lay down what -- the
29 current information that we have and do not have and
30 what do we do with that.

31
32 MR. BUTLER: This is Lem. Can I make a
33 comment to that?

34
35 MS. BROWN: Yeah. Of course. Go
36 ahead, Lem.

37
38 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. It really concerns
39 that analysis. The sample size of 220 caribou for the
40 cow position of a population that we're looking at
41 possibly 400, that's a really good sample size. We've
42 had local ratios two years in a row. There's no reason
43 at this point to think that we're going to come up with
44 any different solution in this equation. We are
45 looking at a very good statistical sample of that
46 population. So I really think that you need to
47 approach this as we do have a local ratio. We've had
48 chronically low calf ratios and we need to address that
49 from the conservation point of view. This is -- we've
50 have very clear concerns again that if this trend

1 continues, we're looking at a potential loss of the
2 population currently.

3

4 I just can't see how you'd continue
5 hunting at this pint. The State's currently looking at
6 developing a plan to translocate bulls to this
7 population. So again having a hunt where you got to --
8 the management -- one of the management Agency's
9 considering adding to the population is -- would be
10 pretty surprising. We're also looking at the potential
11 to apply predator controls we've discussed and will
12 continue discussing with the Federal Government because
13 again based on what we're seeing -- and it's not just
14 things that we're not seeing on the ground. We're not
15 just speculating when I saw that we're seeing again
16 high pregnancy rate followed by an absence of calves a
17 short period of time later, within a week. Very high
18 loss there.

19

20 Again we are getting our composition
21 surveys. We're trying to continue to gather
22 information. We'd agree with that point, but all the
23 available information points to again a clear
24 conservation concern and it's pointing at predation,
25 again given the very good pregnancy rates and the very
26 good body condition that we've seen in this herd to
27 this point. So I guess I'd just really encourage the
28 RAC to really consider that when they're making a
29 decision on this. The State again clearly would
30 support this proposal to close all hunting seasons at
31 this point because we feel that there's no potential
32 for harvest and all -- any harvest would be detrimental
33 at this point to this population.

34

35 MS. BROWN: Okay. Thank you, Lem.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: All right. Thank
38 you. That concludes your introduction of the proposal?

39

40 MS. BROWN: That's correct. So OSM
41 preliminary conclusion is to support the Proposal WP10-
42 42 as written. ADF&G supports this proposal as is
43 written due to the conservation concern. Izembek
44 National Wildlife Manager has brought forward their
45 opinion now on the proposal. That's what we've laid
46 out for you and then basically you can deliberate on
47 that.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Fish and
50 Game.

1 MR. PAPPAS: Lem took care of it.
2
3 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Lem. Okay.
4 Federal, State, and Tribal Agencies.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: InterAgency Staff.
9
10 MR. BERG: Thank you, Mr. chair. Jerry
11 Berg with Fish and Wildlife Service. I don't really
12 have any additional information. You know, at our
13 Staff Committee meeting, we supported the OSM
14 conclusion and obviously there's some new information
15 available now that we didn't have available to us.
16 We'll let the Council know that I did work with OSM
17 Staff and the Refuge Manager to draft up some language
18 if the Council wants to go down the path of some
19 alternate language rather than just voting it up or
20 down. So if you want to go down that road, I've
21 drafted some language for you to take a look at if you
22 decide to do that.
23
24 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25
26 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you. Fish
27 and Game Advisory Committee.
28
29 (No comments)
30
31 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Written or public
32 comments.
33
34 MS. CHIVERS: There were no written
35 public comments. Thank you.
36
37 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Is there anyone on
38 line from False Pass?
39
40 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: False Pass is
41 here. increased number of wolves
42
43 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Can you speak
44 clearly and state your name, please. Do you have any
45 comments on this proposal.
46
47
48 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll comment
49 (indiscernible-away from microphone) wants to comment.
50

1 MS. HOBLET: Hello. My name is Ruth.
2 I just wanted to put in we know living here on the
3 island that there has been an increased number of
4 wolves around. There is a lot more than we've seen
5 before.

6
7 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Is that your
8 testimony, Ruth? Do you have more or is there someone
9 else with you that would like to speak? If there is
10 someone else, will you please have them get closer to
11 the mic and speak clearly so we can get your name,
12 please.

13
14 MS. HOBLET: I guess nobody else has
15 anything to say right now.

16
17 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. We'll just
18 move on then. We're at the Regional Council
19 deliberations. Della. I'm sorry. Go ahead, Della.

20
21 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay. All right. I'm
22 having a little bit of a flashback here because I
23 recall the very reason I got on this Council and I had
24 been involved with it for nine years. I'd been off of
25 this from 2004 till now, which is six years -- is this
26 caribou issue. We're talking 13 years. I'm going to
27 be -- try to be as respectful as I can because I just
28 -- I started remembering all of this stuff.

29
30 MS. BROWN: I wasn't here.

31
32 MS. TRUMBLE: And here we sit today 14
33 years down the road. The same -- very same issues that
34 came up when this herd collapsed on 9D. We're sitting
35 here. Some of the very same issues. But yet we don't
36 have good data. We can't get these counts done. The
37 issue of predator control I brought up when I was on
38 here 2004 and to say we don't think it's -- can be --
39 maybe it's not wolves. Maybe it is. Maybe these
40 counts are accurate. Maybe they're not.

41
42 But I'm going to tell you and Ruth
43 Hoblet just told you the same thing as the President in
44 the Tribal Council in False Pass. We grew up out
45 there. Ruth is born and raised in King Cove as is
46 Rick. And she has lived in False Pass since probably
47 '73 and represents that community very well.

48
49 We did not see wolves when we were
50 growing up. When you can look out -- when I brought

1 this up in 2004, you can look at a wolf at 3:00 or 4:00
2 in the morning outside on the road in front of your
3 house. Today you can see them at 1:00 o'clock in the
4 afternoon by the clinic. They're all over by the
5 airport and up through that road system. There is a
6 problem. And I hear it from the fishermen, but to
7 shrug it off, what I'm trying to say is this is really
8 important for the fact that caribou is something that
9 we have lived off of and to kind of look at this
10 lightly in a sense that, well, we don't have the
11 information, I -- that's a concern to me because this
12 has been a concern before, but there needs to be a
13 better effort, a cooperative effort to address these
14 problems because the effect of it is on the people that
15 live in our communities.

16

17 And I hate to -- in a way feel there's
18 -- I guess I really feel bad about what's going on here
19 and I think there are some serious issues and concerns
20 and why this is happening and I think a better effort
21 to be -- you know, coming up to us and saying that we
22 need to do this. I realize we have to do something.
23 It's serious. But to have to get to this point and yet
24 really not having good information is a concern for me.

25

26 MS. BROWN: I absolutely agree with
27 you, Member Trumble, and I absolutely did not mean to
28 give the impression that OSM is taking this lightly.
29 The information that was given in the report was meant
30 as -- and concurrent to what your statement was is
31 that we have been dealing with this caribou herd since
32 '93, since the last collapse and there hasn't been a
33 real attempt to get in there except for as you just
34 mentioned, the prior couple of seasons.

35

36 It is also our desire to have better
37 information and this report was in an attempt to say
38 this is the information that's lacking not that we are
39 attributing -- or shrugging anything off. That this is
40 a very serious issue. It's something that is very
41 important to the subsistence users out there. It's
42 something that as managers it has not been dealt with
43 in accordance with the priority for those users out
44 there and I think that with the new Manager, the new
45 wildlife biologist for the Federal system, we're going
46 to be able to get more information. So hopefully we
47 can start the baseline and look at what is happening
48 out there and as you just mentioned, there's residents
49 from False Pass and as you have stated that this is
50 information that needs to be conveyed and when it's

1 being conveyed, it needs to be taken seriously and then
2 when it's being taken seriously, you can look in to
3 what the management -- direction you're going to take
4 to protect that subsistence use.

5
6 So I agree with every merit that you
7 said. I think that we're at -- where we are right now
8 because of not doing that before. So now we're at a
9 conservation concern. Now the information that we have
10 has us at a very low bull-cow ratio. It has us at an
11 extremely low calf-cow ratio. What do we do about
12 that. What do we take to the Federal Subsistence Board
13 to try and increase that herd so that in the future,
14 this doesn't happen.

15
16 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Go a head, Sam.

17
18 MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. I have
19 a question -- two questions for Lem Butler and then a
20 couple comments. Lem, this is Sam Rohrer. I'm on the
21 RAC. Two numbers you said and I want you to repeat
22 them just to make sure I copied them down right. What
23 did you estimate the fall -- the bull-cow ratio for
24 2009-2010?

25
26 MR. BUTLER: We estimated in fall of
27 2009 that there were five bulls per hundred cows.

28
29 MR. ROHRER: Okay. That's what I
30 thought. And then the second thing was did I hear you
31 say an estimate on the number of bulls total on the
32 island?

33
34 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. if you apply that
35 and the other data to the population size of 400, you
36 get about 20 bulls on the island.

37
38 MR. ROHRER: Okay. Thanks. And that's
39 what I thought you had said. I mean look at these
40 numbers. This is a no-brainer. When you have 20
41 bulls, you don't keep the hunting season open. You
42 just can't. Even if only two bulls are killed, you
43 absolutely can't keep the hunting season open. This --
44 I mean this is a no-brainer.

45
46 Second, to sit here and compare the
47 Unimak Caribou Herd with the Delta herd, I'm sorry. It
48 doesn't make any sense. Let's look at the herd that's
49 right next door. In 2008, 20 wolves were killed. What
50 did the cow-calf ratio do. It went from 1 to 39. This

1 is a no-brainer. We have people testifying to
2 increased number of wolves they're seeing there. We
3 need wolf control and the Refuge needs to look at that.
4 We need to figure out a way to make this happen. But
5 -- I mean I agree we need to get more accurate counts,
6 but we have enough data to know the wolves are causing
7 a problem with the caribou.

8

9

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

10

11 MR. HOLMES: I agree with my colleagues
12 on the RAC. In 1984, I lived for a fair amount of the
13 summer at East and West Anchor Cove on Unimak Island
14 and I saw two wolves and I reported that to some of the
15 elders in False Pass and they were totally blown away
16 that there were wolves at all because they had hardly
17 seen any. I talked to a former colleague on Fish and
18 Game that flies surveys and when he started on the
19 Peninsula 20 years ago, he flew a couple of years
20 before he saw any. Last year, just not looking for
21 wolves, but just flying his surveys, last year he said
22 that he saw 35 and that was just not even looking for
23 wolves but ones that got in front of me when he was
24 counting fish.

25

26 I think that it is -- I think that some
27 of your arguments are using hypotheticals and I think
28 comparing -- it wasn't Delta. It was Denali and
29 grizzly bear/brown bear, yeah, they're the same
30 species, but in my experience of growing up in Alaska,
31 the grizzly bear can run down an adult caribou. A
32 brown bear is three times as big and it takes a lot of
33 energy to get those drumsticks moving on a brown bear
34 to be able to cause predation. I think that argument
35 is invalid. I think that if it was a habitat
36 consideration, then why didn't it decline before. If
37 it was brown bears, why didn't it decline before the
38 wolf population increased.

39

40 So in my mind, the logic is it is not
41 correct in that. Initially I was inclined to, you
42 know, provide for some harvest for folks at False Pass,
43 but I think when you get down to where you only have
44 the potential of 20 bulls on the island, then I'm
45 pretty skeptical about that, about having a harvest. I
46 think that we might want to look, Mr. Chairman, at some
47 alternate language, if there could be some flexibility.
48 So if they were to find out if there was some potential
49 or if their counts were off or if part of the herd was
50 down in the southwest end of the island and missed part

1 of it to where we could provide for some in-season
2 adjustment where the Refuge Manager and Lem Butler
3 would say hey, there's something good cooking here, we
4 can have some kind of small harvest quota for the
5 people at False Pass, I think that's something that we
6 should look at.

7

8

Mr. Chairman.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Thank you,
11 Pat. I have one little question that's where is the
12 traditional ecological knowledge in this issue? Has
13 someone been talking to the people in the villages to
14 get that information?

15

16 MS. HOFFMAN: The knowledge I've gained
17 is just talking to residents, have lived there for 60
18 some years, born and raised, on their experience of
19 where they've harvested and what they have seen. But I
20 have no biological data that anyone from there has
21 supplied to me.

22

23 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. We're going
24 on 14 years with this same issue. You know, Aleutians
25 is a pretty big area and the problem is centered right
26 here. Has there been anyone talking to the villages in
27 that area to get their input of what they think the
28 problem might be?

29

30 MS. HOFFMAN: The Village of False
31 Pass?

32

33 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: False Pass, all
34 the villages in between. You know, Unit 10 and 9D.....

35

36 MS. HOBLET: Was somebody talking? We
37 couldn't hear you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Unit 10 and 9D,
40 there's Sand Point all the way to False Pass. There's
41 villages in there and has anyone been talking to those
42 people and getting their input on what they think the
43 problem might be? You know, local residents can -- you
44 know, they're there every day. They can -- if there's,
45 oh, many wolves like Della says, you know, talking to
46 the people in these villages will give you a pretty
47 good idea of -- you know, maybe there is a problem, you
48 know.

49

50 MS. HOFFMAN: Yeah. Talking -- I mean

1 for customary and traditional it's King Cove, False
2 Pass, and Akutan. And so I've talked to -- heard from
3 people from King Cove and from False Pass but nothing
4 further.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay.

7

8 MS. TRUMBLE: Nancy, is that -- for 9D
9 and Unimak, it's Sand Point. They're also doing False
10 Pass, King Cove, Cold Bay.

11

12 MS. HOFFMAN: 9D, but Unit 10 on Unimak
13 is not -- 10 is King Cove, False Pass, and Akutan.

14

15 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay.

16

17 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Go ahead, Della.

18

19 MS. TRUMBLE: Sand Point also.

20

21 MS. HOFFMAN: Yeah. That's what.....

22

23 MS. TRUMBLE: Yeah, exactly. I guess
24 I'd like to ask Ruth as the President of False Pass
25 Tribal Council what her opinion of closing, you know,
26 doing a closure this next year, but my bigger concern
27 with this after she is done, I'll let you know again,
28 but I'd ask Ruth, you know, what does the community
29 feel and support at this time. I know I did forward
30 them the State closure when I got it from someone and
31 they were able to look at that, but I'm curious as to
32 what the community feels.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Did you get that,
35 Ruth?

36

37 MS. HOBLET: We couldn't hear any --
38 too much of what you were saying.

39

40 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay. Ruth, I'll try
41 that again. I guess I'm curious at this point what the
42 community thinks in regard to this. I know I did
43 forward to you and Tommy the emergency closure from the
44 State and then what do you feel at this time from the
45 community on the Federal side?

46

47 REPORTER: Did you hear that?

48

49 MR. HOBLET: Hi. This is Shane Hoblet
50 in False Pass. I feel like, you know, that closure is

1 -- I guess I feel like that's what it needs, but more
2 than just it being closed, I believe that we do need
3 that predator control on the wolves. I guess -- just
4 as a testimony, I guess I've never seen as many wolves
5 in two weeks here -- in the last two weeks even. This
6 afternoon there was one on the road again right behind
7 my house actually and, yeah, I just feel like the
8 closure is needed but also the predator control is
9 definitely needed.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Thank you.
12 Is there anyone else there that would like to make a
13 statement. Okay. Nancy.

14

15 MS. HOFFMAN: The public hearing in
16 September, I do have some input from Tom Hoblet from
17 False Pass, if I could read that to you.

18

19 He's a resident of False Pass. The
20 people and the community do not have the means to
21 access the hunt for caribou inside the island of
22 Unimak. They hunt a ten-mile stretch of beach along
23 the ten miles -- about ten miles from town. He also
24 said there are more bears and wolves around during
25 caribou calving season which may cause more predation
26 during this time of the year.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Was that ten miles
29 from town or ten miles of beach?

30

31 MS. HOFFMAN: About ten miles from town
32 along that ten-mile stretch of beach.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Oh, okay.

35

36 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Rick.

39

40 MR. KOSO: Yeah, I would like to just
41 add a little information to this. I've traveled
42 through False Pass for many years salmon fishing. I've
43 never seen wolves through that area. I fished up in
44 Urilia Bay which is about three-quarters way to Unimak
45 Pass on the -- if you went west and about 2005, I've
46 seen about six wolves and they were attacking the --
47 there was a half a dozen caribou and they were
48 attacking them. They were about three miles inland
49 right up from Urilia Bay. There was a lot of bears.
50 I've never seen any bears attack caribou especially

1 when the salmon are in. It's much easier to go get a
2 fish than it is to go get a caribou.

3

4 But the wolves for sure, you know, I've
5 never seen in them past. In about 2005, when I start
6 observing a lot more wolves on Unimak.

7

8 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah. Go ahead,
9 Nancy.

10

11 MS. HOFFMAN: The hunting subsistence,
12 you can take five wolves a day from August through
13 April and I'm just wondering why more wolves aren't
14 taken through subsistence and also trapping.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Della.

17

18 MS. TRUMBLE: I'll speak to that and --
19 one of the things -- and growing up, there were more
20 people trapping. That's lot of what our parents and
21 then before them did. But the younger people don't
22 necessarily do that anymore. That's part of the
23 problem. But you also -- Pat and I looked at earlier
24 where one -- I think 9D has five wolves and Unimak has
25 ten, and then there's -- on subsistence, it was open.
26 The basic bottom line is nobody is harvesting these
27 animals for any real reason. That's part of the
28 population growth and I think when you look at bears,
29 once the corporations and the land that the
30 corporation, for instance, took the -- where you lease
31 the land for a guide to go and hunt, that contributed
32 also to a population jump in the bears. I think if you
33 looked at the Joshua Green and those -- so there are
34 the human factor that contributes to this not only from
35 the point of predation but also has contributed to why
36 some of these populations have increased and the bigger
37 picture is what are we going to do about it.

38

39 If we support this -- which I'm sure we
40 will -- to close it because it's apparent we need to do
41 something, what's going to be the plan. I mean it's
42 apparent there is -- we've got some issues and in my
43 mind, to be really honest, Nancy, predation is a big
44 part of it and it's a concern and it has been for the
45 last ten years and it continues today. And I realize
46 we -- you're probably the fourth Manager down the line
47 that's heard this and I give you a lot of credit for
48 making an effort, but we've got to do something.

49

50 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Rick.
2
3 MR. KOSO: Yeah. I've also observed
4 caribou swimming across that channel from 9D over to
5 10. Do you ever record very much caribou traversing
6 back and forth from Unimak to the main land? Because
7 I've seen them on and off swimming through the channel
8 there going back and forth.
9
10 I've even observed the moose one time.
11
12
13 MR. BUTLER: Do you want me to take a
14 stab at that?
15
16 MS. HOFFMAN: Yeah. Yeah. Being an
17 island population, an island ecosystem, that would be a
18 common practice. I have a document here from the
19 Alaska field station, Fish and Wildlife Service of
20 1916, Charles Manson, and he went over the brown bear,
21 caribou, species there on Unimak and he said these
22 animals, caribou in particular -- this is a section on
23 caribou talking about the Peninsula and the island.
24 These animals annually cross from the Alaska Peninsula
25 to Unimak, there having been -- during several winters,
26 he's seen as many as 500 animals at one time swimming
27 across the Isanotski Strait to the island and the
28 distance is about one mile.
29
30 And then he goes on to explain
31 populations were high on the Peninsula and it makes
32 sense for them to go over to the island. So I'm sure
33 it comes and goes in population density.
34
35 MR. KOSO: I got another question,
36 Chairman.
37
38 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Go ahead, Rick.
39
40 MR. KOSO: I guess I was looking at
41 your 9D -- your count on 9D. I'm just kind of a little
42 confused on your -- you know, you got your total
43 calving count, but then I look over at the population
44 count. How could you come up with a calving count when
45 you don't have any data or don't even have any --
46 nothing available from '07 through '09? So I guess I'm
47 a little confused on how you come up with the 800 count
48 on the calving. That's on your -- that's this right
49 here. I was just looking here. It's.....
50

1 MR. HOLMES: Oh, that's on 9D.
2
3 MR. KOSO: Yeah. 9D. That's what I'm
4 -- I said 9D.
5
6 MS. TRUMBLE: This one's on Unimak.
7
8 MR. KOSO: This is 9D now, but I was
9 asking about 9D because the caribou go back and forth
10 to 10 to 9D all the time, so it's -- I just got -- it's
11 on 9D and I was just kind of curious to how you come up
12 with the count you did.
13
14 MS. HOFFMAN: Okay. You're referencing
15 the 800 with the three asterisks on there -- table?
16
17 MR. KOSO: Yeah. Yeah. Then you've
18 got the two asterisks on the -- the population count.
19 You don't have anything on the population count.
20
21 MS. HOFFMAN: Right. So that was a
22 summer count. Like I had mentioned before, in the past
23 from my knowledge, the Refuge did not perform summer
24 counts on caribou -- Izembek, but they did along in the
25 Peninsula in 9D. And so this year -- this past year,
26 we did a joint effort with State Fish and Game and came
27 up with this count of looking at an entire unit. And
28 that's how that 800 number came up for 9D.
29
30 MR. KOSO: So where's the population
31 count?
32
33 MR. BUTLER: That is the population
34 count.
35
36 MR. KOSO: The 800?
37
38 MR. BUTLER: 800 caribou.
39
40 MR. KOSO: Oh, so that's total. I see
41 it just says -- I guess I was a little confused then on
42 the population count.....
43
44 MS. HOFFMAN: So that.....
45
46 MR. KOSO:count.
47
48 MS. TRUMBLE: The fall count and summer
49 count.
50

1 MR. KOSO: Yeah. Uh-huh. But.....

2

3 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. There are two
4 different counts there. Izembek's traditionally done a
5 winter count, so the -- if you're looking at the same
6 composition table and the last column, it says INWR
7 counts would be the winter counts conducted by Izembek
8 National Wildlife Refuge. And then the State has
9 always conducted summer counts post calving. That's
10 what we do on caribou throughout the State of Alaska
11 and that's what they do in Canada as well.

12

13 For a time there, from 2000 to 2006, we
14 weren't doing those counts. We'd just get one in terms
15 of our resources and staff availability. We had
16 concerns for the Northern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd
17 which was declining rapidly during that period and
18 Izembek was able to provide enough data to us that we
19 didn't feel like we needed to invest in a post-calving
20 count during that period.

21

22 MS. HOFFMAN: Lem, this is Nancy. So
23 -- I don't know if you're looking at the exact same
24 table. I imagine you probably are, but so you're
25 saying that 800 for the summer post-calving count is
26 actually the population count or they're the same?

27

28 MR. BUTLER: Post-calving count and
29 population count, yes, they're all minimum population
30 counts. Post-calving count will always be a little bit
31 higher than a winter count because you have more calves
32 on the ground, but that's the total number of caribou
33 observed. It's a census that we do. We're trying to
34 actually observe every caribou. I do throw in a
35 correction factor associated with radio collars. So I
36 think we actually counted 720 so -- and, you know, with
37 the -- I think we have three caribou collars that were
38 missing, so we associate a few animals with those
39 individuals and came up with the 800 because that's our
40 -- so that is our population count in July. That's the
41 July population size in 2009.

42

43 MS. HOFFMAN: Okay. So I'm safe to say
44 -- to tell Rick that those two are identical --
45 population count and summer post-calving count.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Della.

48

49 MS. TRUMBLE: Nancy and Cole and Lem,
50 what are your plans between let's say now and this

1 fall? Like right now, we're supposed to be working on
2 fish proposals. This is asking for an emergency
3 closure. And then in the fall, we're supposed to be
4 doing the wildlife proposals. Where I'm headed with
5 this, between -- if we were to support this emergency
6 closure for right now and in between now and our fall
7 meeting, are we going to be able to have any data to be
8 looking at this again and making some decisions that
9 make some sense because we've got some information?
10

11 MR. BUTLER: This is Lem. You know,
12 what we'd plan to do, we plan to do a composition count
13 of the herd in about two weeks to try to see how the
14 over-winter calves survival has faired on the few
15 calves that are available and to reconfirm the bull
16 ratio. This summer we'll do a pregnancy check and
17 we'll probably do a follow-up check at two weeks when
18 the calves get -- get survival to that point and then
19 depending on when your fall meeting is in October is
20 when we do our fall compositions which is what you're
21 looking at when you see the bull and calf ratios that
22 are listed. That's recruitment of calves to fall and
23 bulls and the, you know, breeding season essentially.
24

25 So we do plan to do that. We've also
26 discussed deploying collars on caribou calves to
27 investigate mortality. We're going to do one last year
28 of wolf control work in the Southern Alaska Peninsula
29 Caribou Herd, so we will be in that area and we're
30 considering that as a possibility. Probably more
31 likely to do that if we're actually doing a predator
32 control effort on Unimak which doesn't seem like that's
33 going to come about at this point. But that would be
34 an option to try to gather more data. Again there's a
35 lot of evidence that suggests that it is a calf
36 survival issue following birth and as was noted, you
37 know, the bear population hasn't really changed. It's
38 been around. We are seeing a lot of wolves that time of
39 year, so just to confirm what we're seeing and the
40 other herds have the same thing where there's
41 predominantly wolf predation, but we can verify that on
42 Unimak potentially.
43

44 But, you know, again I'm not going to
45 commit to that. It kind of depends on follow-up
46 discussions.
47

48 MS. HOFFMAN: This project as I had
49 mentioned, we have new Refuge biologist and it's a
50 priority for the Refuge. We're going to develop and

1 implement hopefully this year -- we will this year.
2 It's going to be long term, so it won't be immediate
3 data, but we'll -- we don't know any predator numbers
4 or their population levels and I'd like -- we'll be
5 doing it cooperatively with our partners be it the
6 corporation, Isanotski Corporation that's over there,
7 with the State, with universities to develop and
8 implement this plan.

9

10 So it is immediate. It's a priority.
11 We're going to have money to start it.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Della.

14

15 MS. TRUMBLE: I think given that we
16 could beat this to death and I hope we're not back here
17 in five years. I mean this is really sad in my mind.
18 I can see why I stayed away. Given that we can fix
19 this and I think cooperatively we -- everybody with the
20 State, Federal, and local, we need to put all their
21 efforts -- good efforts forward in to fixing this
22 problem and -- because it's the only way it's going to
23 get resolved.

24

25 I think given that I would support the
26 closure in that we have these reports in front of us at
27 all fall meeting either in King Cove or Cold Bay, that
28 we have some data in front of us that we can make
29 decisions and take action that's going to be better for
30 us in the future. This has to stop. I'm sorry. It
31 really does. We have to fix it.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

34

35 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I was
36 wondering, with Della's last comments in mind, if we
37 might look at this alternate proposal. It would read
38 Izembek National Wildlife Refuge Manager is authorized
39 to establish a quota, restrict harvest by sex, and
40 close the hunt if necessary after consulting with ADF&G
41 and the Chair of a KRAC and I was thinking that this
42 would be a way in which the harvest could be closed at
43 this point, but it could also be reopened if there was
44 additional information without having to go through the
45 whole system all over again and wait for a two-year
46 cycle.

47

48 So I'd like to propose on that that we
49 insert in front of the word and restrict the harvest by
50 sex and open or close the hunt and then that would

1 allow the Refuge Manager to open or close given
2 available information and I certainly echo the passion
3 that's been laid out in this whole discussion.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Sam.

6

7 MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. I
8 think even if Lem is a hundred percent off on his
9 numbers, you're still only looking at four bulls. I
10 just don't -- I don't see any justification whatsoever
11 to leave open -- any possibility of opening the season
12 up until the herd comes back up and even if we -- like
13 I said, even if we see that his numbers were a hundred
14 percent off, that's only 40 bulls. That's only a ten
15 bull to hundred cow ratio. That's still not enough to
16 open up the season. We're going to have to see a
17 couple years of better numbers to even consider
18 reopening the season. I just don't see any reason why
19 to go with this proposed new changes. I think the
20 season needs to be closed and that's it unfortunately.
21 It's too bad that that's where we're at, but I think
22 it's -- I think that's what we need to do.

23

24 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chairman.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Rick.

27

28 MR. KOSO: Yeah. I'm -- you know, I'm
29 kind of with Pat on this deal here because it gives the
30 Refuge Manager the flexibility to either close or open
31 on her prerogative. And if they find new information
32 or see something different, then we don't have to wait
33 two years to take action. This will give her instant
34 action. And, you know, but -- and I guess the other
35 question I had -- the question I get is how many
36 animals are we going to need before we can have a
37 subsistence opening in Area 10 and 9D. I guess I'll
38 ask the Refuge Manager that question.

39

40 MS. HOFFMAN: So the question is how
41 many do we need to open it?

42

43 MR. KOSO: Yes, ma'am, for the
44 subsistence fish -- or hunt.

45

46 MS. HOFFMAN: We don't have that
47 information.

48

49 MR. BUTLER: This is Lem. do you want
50 me to take a stab at that?

1 MS. HOFFMAN: Yeah. As a Refuge
2 Manager, I don't know, but, yes, as Fish and Game, yes,
3 please, Lem.

4
5 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. You know, 400
6 caribou isn't a problem in terms of the population
7 size. It's the bull ratio that's the real problem with
8 pregnancy rates and the continued lack of recruitment.
9 If you had 400 animals and 35 bulls per hundred cow and
10 20 calves per hundred cow, we could have a subsistence
11 hunt no problem right now. We'd like to see some
12 growth in the population, but you can harvest from a
13 small herd.

14
15 I think the big problem with the small
16 herd though is availability. As that population size
17 gets bigger, it will be more accessible to residents of
18 False Pass and, you know, as the caribou herd occupies
19 more of the country. So I think we really -- to have a
20 good hunt for people, we need a thousand animals, but
21 again you could, you know, have a limited harvest from
22 this population size if the population is performing
23 differently and that bull ratio increases. You know,
24 it's given that predation is an increasing factor as
25 population size decreases, if the wolves and bears are
26 taking the same number of caribou from a small
27 population as they would from a big population, then
28 that small population, it works out to be a much bigger
29 percentage of calves and adults.

30
31 So, you know, it -- again there'd be a
32 lot of reasons to consider trying to get the population
33 size back up both in terms of it being less accessible
34 to predation and in terms of availability to hunters.
35 So that'd be something that the RAC would want to
36 consider.

37
38 But to answer your question again from
39 a population of 400 with different performance primers,
40 you could have a hunt at this point. But the problem
41 is that we don't have that population.

42
43 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Della.

44
45 MS. TRUMBLE: I think I'm going to
46 agree with Pat and Rick on this that the language
47 allows for the ability to make decisions. I mean part
48 of this too we looked at was the fact that some of
49 these counts are not actually accurate because you
50 can't see, that being part of it, but they're also -- I

1 think in regard to Rick's question and some of the --
2 there was a discussion or shows somewhere that the DNA
3 between these two herds are different, meaning they're
4 not really the same; is that correct? I saw that
5 somewhere?

6

7 MS. HOFFMAN: So you're saying.....

8

9 MR. BUTLER: The two herds are
10 distinct, but they're relatively similar. They're
11 about as distinct as the Northern Alaska Peninsula and
12 Southern Alaska Peninsula herds are from one another,
13 which makes sense. You know, the founding populations
14 obviously had shared some genetic relationship just due
15 to the proximity of the two herds, but they do show
16 patterns that -- you know, that we recognize that make
17 them a distinct herd including fidelity to calving
18 grounds and such. So they do appear to be genetically
19 and reproductively isolated at this point.

20

21 MS. HOFFMAN: If they were truly
22 genetically different, then we could -- you know, it's
23 at low status, we could list it. I'm not certain.
24 These did come -- chances are this population on Unimak
25 came from the Southern herd and so as Lem said,
26 genetically that's where that material came from.

27

28 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay. Mr. Chair. I'll
29 go -- I would agree with both Rick and Pat to use the
30 language that allows after some work and studies were
31 done that we can possibly take a good look at this in
32 the fall and make some good decisions and maybe some
33 caribou will come in on some icebergs.

34

35 (Laughter)

36

37 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Rick had a
38 question. Then.....

39

40 MR. KOSO: Yeah. I know where to get
41 them caribou is Adak and I think Pat had the same idea
42 there. I think we need to transplant possible some of
43 those bulls off of Adak. I think we've got plenty to
44 give there, so -- that's just an idea and a thought
45 that came from Pat and I thought about it myself a
46 little, so -- thank you.

47

48 MR. BUTLER: This is Lem. Adak is
49 pretty far away although it would be a good donor
50 population just because of its size, but it's also

1 different genetics. It's Nelchina Caribou Herd in
2 origin, so it's an Interior Caribou Herd. What we'd
3 like to do is take bulls from the Souther Alaska
4 Peninsula Herd which is performing very well right now
5 with the benefit of predator control and translocate
6 them to Unimak to get the bull ratio up to 25 bulls per
7 hundred cow. Probably take about 15 caribou bulls to
8 do that. So that's -- it's just due to proximity
9 logistics, similarities in genes, and other shared
10 attributes that it'd probably be the source herd that
11 we'd be looking at.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Yes. Go
14 ahead.

15

16 MR. PAPPAS: Yes, George Pappas,
17 Department of Fish and Game. See if I can't throw a
18 variable in here. The proposal's to close the area.
19 The minute language that's being presented here is to
20 basically delegate full -- full delegate authority to
21 manage the hunt, close, open, set close, what have you.
22 I'm not sure if that's the same proposal. You might
23 want to have -- take a break and call legal counsel to
24 determine whether or not establishing full delegate
25 authority is not a separate proposal for an area
26 because it's a big -- this is a big issue in other
27 parts of the State where this language has been
28 requested by the Federal Board before and they've said
29 no or they've restricted it only to close or what have
30 you.

31

32 So I'm not trying to complicate the
33 issue. You know, we have not had a chance to review
34 this. The public has not seen this. How would you
35 establish a quota. You know, what's the definition of
36 consultation. Is it actually working in a work group
37 or is it leaving a voice mail. We've seen it all on
38 the State side, so we're a little bit wary when we see
39 this type of language come forth at this stage in the
40 game.

41

42 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you for
45 that. At this time, then we'll -- Board will -- will
46 we need to start this process over again since we got
47 new wording on the proposal and does this new
48 proposal.....

49

50 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Go ahead, Rick.
2
3 MR. KOSO: On the original proposal
4 that they presented that both the State and Feds are in
5 agreement on, I would certainly be in agreement with
6 them to make sure that we -- you know, that
7 conservation comes first. To save these caribou, we'd
8 be looking at if we were wrong, let's say that -- you
9 know, what's it going to take to get back together to
10 make it right. And I think I would be in support of
11 the Fed and the State's original proposal to make sure
12 that we get something on record and onboard to be able
13 to have conservation immediately there or emergency
14 closure, whatever it takes.
15
16 So I would be willing to withdraw the
17 amendment there to fully support the original.
18
19 MS. TRUMBLE: Pat had the original
20 amendment. I had the original motion. He had the
21 amendment. You supported it and then.....
22
23 MR. KOSO: No. The one that they come
24 up with, the State and the -- the Feds and the State.
25 The original.....
26
27 MS. TRUMBLE: Oh, the original.
28
29 MR. KOSO: The original proposal. And
30 that's the one I'm supporting.
31
32 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: And we have a
33 motion. You made a motion.
34
35 MS. TRUMBLE: Yeah. I made a motion.
36
37 MR. KOSO: Nobody second.
38
39 MS. TRUMBLE: Because he was amending
40 it and then it went.....
41
42 REPORTER: There's no motion or
43 amendments on the table.
44
45 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Council
46 deliberation. That's where I thought we were.
47
48 MR. KOSO: Yeah. I didn't hear any
49 call for a motion.
50

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I didn't call for
2 a motion yet, right.

3
4 REPORTER: Right.

5
6 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, we didn't get a
7 second, so I don't think we got a motion because I was
8 proposing it. Della kind of proposed it and there's a
9 question as to whether or not we have an amendment on
10 the table and I think I agree with the Chairman that we
11 were having discussions and then we have the question
12 as to whether or not we want to address this amended
13 suggested wording, but Mr. Pappas from the State
14 coordination group with Fish and Game is suggesting
15 that if we wanted to pursue this that we need to ask
16 OSM legal counsel. So I guess that's the question. Do
17 we want to back up and just close or do we want to deal
18 with this amended wording, but if we want to approach
19 this amended wording, then we need advice from the
20 counsel.

21
22 MS. TRUMBLE: Cole, what happened with
23 9D when it was closed? What was the process? What has
24 happened?

25
26 MS. BROWN: When it was.....

27
28 MS. TRUMBLE: When it closed -- was it
29 closed or was it given -- was it closed officially or
30 was it like given this, where it gives the Refuge
31 Manager authority to close it and then open it?

32
33 MS. BROWN: It was just closed.

34
35 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah. Just
36 there's new wording on this addition to the proposal
37 and I guess the question is the Izembek National
38 Wildlife Manager is authorized. I guess the question
39 is where does that authorizing come from.

40
41 MS. TRUMBLE: It's in there. It's
42 in.....

43
44 MR. BERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jerry
45 Berg with Fish and Wildlife Service. We have a number
46 of areas in our regulations where the Federal
47 Subsistence Board delegates that authority to a Refuge
48 Manager or a Park Superintendent or a Forest Service
49 Ranger and so it's a common delegation of authority
50 that the Federal Board uses to have the management at

1 the local level. And so -- so these issues don't have
2 to keep coming back up and going through this process.
3 It kind of keeps the decision making at the local
4 level.

5
6 So this -- you know, this would be one
7 avenue. It would leave the hunt on the books, but it
8 would give -- and it would give the Manager the
9 authority to establish a quota or restrict it if
10 necessary, but, you know, like Mr. Holmes was saying,
11 the Manager could also just close the hunt until
12 there's enough information to have a hunt and then they
13 would need to establish a quota in consultation with
14 ADF&G.

15
16 Now whether -- you know, George Pappas
17 brought up whether you can go that far on this proposal
18 and I guess my personal opinion is I think you can.
19 Now the solicitor may disagree with me, but one way to
20 get around that is you could take action to support
21 this alternative language. If the legal staff don't
22 believe that's allowed, then you could submit a special
23 action that does the same thing and then it would be
24 handled through a special action process. So you can
25 do it another way if that's -- if that becomes a
26 problem.

27
28 Thank you.

29
30 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Thank you.
31 Who was first. Sam.

32
33 MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. I have
34 a little bit of concern with the language keeping
35 decision making local so it doesn't have to go through
36 this process. This process is here for a reason. We
37 need to keep this process.

38
39 This is how we've handled other
40 closures. This is how we did it in 9D. You close the
41 season. It only -- all we have to do to get the season
42 back open is submit a proposal to the Subsistence
43 Board. If there's a huntable surplus, they're going to
44 give us the season back.

45
46 MS. TRUMBLE: And can somebody talk
47 about process because if we close this and 9D has been
48 closed, then you have to go wait for the wildlife cycle
49 to go through and generate a proposal, get it passed,
50 then it's got to go through the Federal statewide Board

1 and then it's got -- you're looking at a year, year and
2 a half, two year process. And this -- what this allows
3 I think is what they're saying is it gives some
4 flexibility that once these reports and things are made
5 available that there may be an opportunity to allow for
6 a subsistence hunt and that gives the Refuge Manager
7 that authority if the communities agree and this
8 Council agrees that that should happen. And that's
9 where the flexibility is coming in on this. Otherwise
10 you have to go through the whole process again.

11
12 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Do we --
13 okay. Before we conclude this deliberation, can we
14 take a break. Ten minutes.

15
16 (Off record)

17
18 (On record)

19
20 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Let's call back to
21 order. Everybody take your seats so we can continue
22 our Board deliberation. I think what we're all coming
23 up with is we need clear definitions of what the
24 process is and -- you got someone here that can explain
25 the process from the proposal to -- the end of that
26 proposal and what emergency orders would be, what
27 amendments to a proposal would be.

28
29 MS. CLARK: I think I probably should
30 have the Fish and Wildlife Staff address that in
31 particular perhaps Jerry Berg and Nancy.

32
33 MS. TRUMBLE: I think -- yeah. The
34 question is, if this is closed like Unit 9D is closed
35 and then if there was an emergency or a special action
36 to open it, that special action is effective for -- is
37 it 60 days? You still have to go back through the
38 process of submitting a proposal to allow for a
39 subsistence hunt and that goes through the other --
40 what exactly are the processes?

41
42 MR. BERG: Mr. Chair. Jerry Berg with
43 Fish and Wildlife. Yeah. There's two different kinds
44 of special actions. You can submit a special action
45 that is go for 60 days and then there's another special
46 action that's a temporary action that's good until the
47 end of the regulatory year, but you have to have a
48 public meeting in the affected area for that long of a
49 change. And -- which we did, if you remember, to have
50 the hunt that's currently in place for this Unimak

1 herd and that was a public hearing that was held last
2 fall. Actually it was just a teleconference, but -- so
3 there's two different kinds of special actions.

4
5 So, yeah, for the length of this
6 season, it is a little bit cumbersome because you have
7 to submit multiple special actions to actually close
8 the season for the entire season. And -- so certainly
9 it would -- you know, if you are able to delegate that
10 authority to the Refuge Manager to either open or close
11 the hunt, then that could be done without having to go
12 through the special action process.

13
14 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Getting back to --
15 that's Kodiak/Aleutians Advisory Council that does --
16 we can't delegate authority to anyone.

17
18 MR. BERG: Yeah. Mr. Chair. Yeah.
19 That would be your recommendation to the Federal
20 Subsistence Board and then the Federal Board has the
21 authority to delegate that authority to the Refuge
22 Manager.

23
24 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

25
26 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. If we were
27 to use the wording that you submitted, would that have
28 to be put in there somewhere? Is that -- it -- right
29 now, it says the Manager is authorized. This would
30 have to go back to the Federal Subsistence Board. We'd
31 have to put in different wording in here.

32
33 MR. BERG: Again, Mr. Chair, yeah.
34 That wording would be your recommendation to the Board.
35 So any action you take here today will be a
36 recommendation to the Federal Board and then the
37 Federal Board will take the final action when they meet
38 in May. So there's no need to put any additional
39 wording in the regulation referring to the Federal
40 Board because your recommendations already are going to
41 the Federal Board.

42
43 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Understood.
44 Further deliberation by the Board.

45
46 The wish of the Board. I need a motion
47 to approve or support or not support WP10-42.

48
49 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I'd like to
50 move that we support the proposal.

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: A motion has been
2 made. Do I hear a second.
3
4 MR. KOSO: I'll second it.
5
6 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and
7 seconded. Discussion. Sam.
8
9 MR. ROHRER: Mr. Chair. Are we talking
10 the original proposal or the.....
11
12 (Council nods affirmatively)
13
14 MR. ROHRER: The original proposal not
15 the amendment. Okay.
16
17 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Good question.
18
19 MR. KOSO: Call for the question.
20
21 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Question is
22 called. All those in favor say aye.
23
24 IN UNISON: Aye.
25
26 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Those opposed.
27 Motion carries. Now, that's the original proposal as
28 it is in the book that closes it.
29 MS. TRUMBLE: I understand.
30
31 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I'm just trying
32 to.....
33
34 (Laughter)
35
36 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF:so that I
37 understand it and I can.....
38
39 MS. TRUMBLE: I want to start over. I
40 haven't seen a caribou in a long time.
41
42 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. This
43 concludes the discussion on WP10-42. The next item on
44 our agenda is, Pat, you wrote a proposal.
45
46 MR. HOLMES: Yes. Mr. Chairman. You
47 gave me a couple of homework assignments. One was
48 earlier on the crab and I guess we can do that when we
49 do the fish stuff and then the other one was a
50 discussion on the wolf harvest for Unit 10 and I hope

1 that OSM will correct me. I believe that when Federal
2 management began that they adopted the State harvest
3 regulations unless there was information from the
4 Federal side that supported something different.

5
6 And so I was looking in a regulation
7 book, the one from -- the Federal Public Lands Harvest
8 of Wildlife for Unit 10 specifies five wolves. Our
9 Refuge Manager from Izembek said that that was daily.
10 I had asked Ms. Brown and she thought that it was an
11 annual limit and the State regs for Unit 10, it's ten
12 wolves per day. And so I think that what we could do
13 is look at this wolf harvest for both Unit 9 and 10 and
14 increase the harvest in Unit 10 to ten wolves per day
15 or any other number that if we wanted to address wolf
16 harvest and so I guess that's kind of the context
17 behind what I wrote down here is for both Units 9 and
18 10.

19
20 The regulation would read rural
21 residents of Unimak Island, Alaska Peninsula,
22 Management Units 9D, 9E, and 10 may harvest ten wolves
23 per day or whatever the Council would wish to have and
24 to provide residents the ability to utilize wolves in
25 the customary and traditional manner and eliminate
26 confusion between State and Federal regulations.
27 Impact: It might benefit caribou calf survival. How
28 would this change affect subsistence uses. It would
29 provide materials for customary and traditional
30 handicrafts. How would this affect other users. No
31 effect.

32
33 And so I guess that's the question as
34 how the RAC wants to proceed on this, if they want to
35 increase the wolf harvest for Unit 10 and we could just
36 strike Unit 9 and so the numbers of critters is I guess
37 up to the Council.

38
39 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat, you said
40 there was numbers already established in the regs for
41 Unit 9?

42
43 MR. HOLMES: Again the regs -- in the
44 Federal regulations for Unit 10, it says five wolves
45 and for Unit 9, it says ten wolves. And we probably
46 need some clarification from Staff because during the
47 comments, our Refuge Manager said that it was five
48 wolves daily. And then Ms. Brown earlier had told me
49 that it was five wolves -- five and ten respectively
50 only on an annual basis. So I guess we need that

1 clarification first.

2

3 MR. BUTLER: This is Lem. I can help
4 you with that.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Go ahead, Lem.

7

8 MS. BROWN: Go ahead, Lem.

9

10 MR. BUTLER: Okay. Yeah. Under the
11 Federal regs, it is an annual limit of five wolves in
12 Unit 10 and ten wolves in Unit 9. So that would be
13 something that you could adjust. The State regs also
14 apply to local residents, so actually under the State
15 regs, even local residents are able to take ten wolves
16 per day in Unit 10 and I think it's the same in Unit 9,
17 ten wolves per day there as well. So it's a case where
18 the Federal regs are actually more restrictive than
19 State regs currently, but under State regulations,
20 local subsistence hunters, Federally-qualified users
21 can harvest more animals than are listed under the
22 Federal regulations through the State regulations. If
23 that makes sense. I can try to restate that if that
24 doesn't make sense.

25

26 MR. HOLMES: I got you fine there, Lem.
27 That's kind of how I interpreted it. So, Mr. Chairman,
28 would you like me to make this as a motion and then
29 we'd discuss it and dissect it.

30

31 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Go ahead, make the
32 motion.

33

34 MR. HOLMES: Okay. Mr. Chairman. I'd
35 like to make a motion from the Kodiak Regional Advisory
36 Council that Unit 9 and 10 wolf harvest be increased to
37 ten per day and then we'd have the normal resident
38 information that we have on here.

39

40 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Do I hear a
41 second.

42

43 MR. KOSO: I second.

44

45 MR. ROHRER: Second.

46

47 MR. KOSO: Oh, excuse me. Go ahead.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and
50 seconded. And just for clarification, I -- whenever

1 you make a motion, please remember it's
2 Kodiak/Aleutians. It's not just Kodiak.

3
4 (Laughter)

5
6 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Discussion.
7 Any discussion from the Board. Della.

8
9 MS. TRUMBLE: I appreciate Pat's
10 efforts and the State's on this wolf issue, but I just
11 want people to be aware. I haven't observed a lot of
12 take of wolves in either 9D or 10. People -- I mean
13 the cost to go anywhere is extremely high, number one,
14 and they're -- people don't have a market for it. They
15 haven't been trapping. They haven't been doing it. So
16 I think this helps this issue with the population, but
17 we really need to look at this picture as a whole.
18 That's my comment.

19
20 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes, Maureen.

21
22 MS. CLARK: Mr. Chair. If we could
23 just clarify the motion that Mr. Holmes made is to
24 submit a proposal during the next regulatory cycle.
25 It's not a special action and it -- so the next
26 regulatory cycle, you'll -- yeah. Yeah. Okay.

27
28 MR. HOLMES: (Nods affirmatively)

29
30 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. By that,
31 you mean just -- we don't need to submit this by
32 tomorrow?

33
34 MS. CLARK: No. That's for fishery
35 proposals. The deadline -- tomorrow is for fisheries
36 proposals. So the deadline -- I don't have the
37 deadline for wildlife proposals, but it's in the
38 future. Okay. Yeah.

39
40 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Any further
41 discussion.

42
43 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes.

46
47 MR. KOSO: Yeah. I'm going to support
48 this proposal too and the reason being is that Della
49 brought up expenses out in the region and a lot of
50 times people only be able to afford to go out once or

1 twice a year. And they might spend two or three days
2 out there and if their limits to like five per year,
3 then they're not going to be able to harvest what
4 they'll be able to normally harvest with this proposal.
5 So I'm in support of this proposal.

6
7 Thank you.

8
9 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Rick.
10 Anything else.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: There's no further
15 discussion, is there any objection to the motion.

16
17 (No objections)

18
19 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: There's no
20 objection to the motion, then the motion carries.
21 Thank you, Pat, for doing this work on very short
22 notice.

23
24 Then the second one.

25
26 MR. HOLMES: The second one is in
27 dealing with the.....

28
29 REPORTER: Pat, Pat, Pat, Pat, Pat.

30
31 MR. HOLMES: Pardon me. I'll get it
32 down here sometime.

33
34 (Laughter)

35
36 MR. HOLMES: I'm so used to just
37 talking all the time and not turning it off.

38
39 REPORTER: I'm sorry, but, thanks.

40
41 MR. HOLMES: The -- would be from the
42 Kodiak Regional Advisory Committee.

43
44 MS. THOMPSON: Kodiak/Aleutians.

45
46 MR. HOLMES: Aleutians Advisory
47 Committee, KRAC -- okay. Anyway. I'm glad Della's
48 back because she can grab my beard and bang my head on
49 the table because when you get past 65, whatever word
50 comes close to the right initial falls out. Okay.

1 (Laughter)

2

3 MR. HOLMES: Okay. The regulation
4 proposal would be to amend the Federal subsistence
5 harvest of king crab for the Kodiak -- I didn't insert
6 this -- Kodiak Management Area limit from six per
7 family to three per family and -- or per household. I
8 guess it should read household rather than family. And
9 basically what it would do is reduce the harvest limit
10 to three per household, would reduce the harvest of the
11 depressed king crab stock and hopefully potentially
12 would help recovery. It would reduce the harvest in
13 the short run and with the concept of conservation for
14 the long run and wouldn't have an effect on sport,
15 recreational, and commercial fisheries. So I guess
16 when the Qaw quit eating them, then maybe we'll have
17 some more, but it gives us a little better chance and
18 makes a parallel regulation with the State regulation.

19

20 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Pat.
23 So a motion would be in order for this proposal.

24

25 MR. HOLMES: I guess, Mr. Chairman, I'd
26 like to move that we submit -- and you want to scribble
27 on top. I pulled off the wrong form. It should be
28 fisheries -- that the Kodiak Regional --
29 Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory Committee -- there
30 we go -- amend the Federal subsistence harvest of king
31 crab for the Kodiak Management Area harvest limit from
32 six per family -- or from six per household to three
33 per household.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Do I hear a
36 second.

37

38 MR. PANAMAROFF: Second.

39

40 MR. ROHRER: Second.

41

42 MS. TRUMBLE: Second.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and
45 seconded. Discussion.

46

47 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Rick.

50

1 MR. KOSO: Yeah. I guess my question
2 would be is this proposal coming from you, Pat, or did
3 you go through Fish and Wildlife to find out if we are
4 in jeopardy?

5
6 MR. HOLMES: We had a discussion
7 earlier from Dr. Fried and he presented the latest
8 information for king crab for the Kodiak area and the
9 total numbers of females is down to a rather amazingly
10 low level and they found in the last trawl survey that
11 30 percent of the females had partial clutches and the
12 concern was not so much for the southern part of the
13 island but more for this end and that there's some
14 known nursery areas that are close at hand to where
15 most of the folks in town try for king crab.

16
17 And so the -- when the State had
18 dropped their harvest level to three, the Federal level
19 stayed at six, and so I'm just trying to align the two
20 together to, you know, prevent any misinterpretation
21 and won't reduce the harvest a whole lot because
22 they're only taking a few hundred crab a year, but it
23 would have I think some positive effect here for close
24 to town where most of the harvest takes place.

25
26 So I guess it's coming from me spinning
27 off from the earlier comments from Dr. Fried on the
28 State closures that occurred a while back.

29
30 MR. KOSO: Yeah. Mr. Chair. Yeah.
31 Thank you for that. I guess another question on this
32 before I would join forces with you would be it doesn't
33 affect the Tanner, the other crab species, just king
34 crab.

35
36 MR. HOLMES: Yes, sir, just king crab.

37
38 MR. KOSO: Thank you.

39
40 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other
41 discussion.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no further
46 discussion, is there any objections to the motion to
47 submit this proposal.

48
49 (No objections)

50

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Seeing no
2 objection, then the motion carries. Okay.
3
4 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair.
5
6 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes.
7
8 MR. KOSO: I understand on this
9 proposal that would be under the fisheries and this one
10 has to be in by tomorrow or by today or.....
11
12 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes.
13
14 MS. CLARK: That's correct, by tomorrow
15
16 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: This is the one we
17 have to turn in by tomorrow. Okay. Call for proposals
18 is over. We're down to.....
19
20 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I had some
21 other fisheries proposals that the Council might wish
22 to consider. And I never thought that when I retired
23 from Fish and Game, I'd end up writing proposals again.
24
25
26 (Laughter)
27
28 MR. HOLMES: But a lot of these have
29 come to my attention recently form folks in town.
30 Let's talk -- the first one here, it says fishery
31 regulation proposal to liberalize salmon limits. This
32 proposal is -- I have been corresponding with Dr. Fried
33 and Theo, the regulation specialist with OSM, because I
34 didn't know if I'd be able to get a chance to get these
35 through the Advisory Council in time.
36
37 And it was brought to my attention the
38 Federal regulations for subsistence salmon harvest is
39 different from the State and the State is actually more
40 liberal. The local area biologist, James Jackson, over
41 there on the wall, is the area biologist now and then
42 his boss are here, but they did a review and thought
43 that it would be better for people that lived in rural
44 areas to not have to get a subsistence permit every
45 time they caught 25 fish per household member as is
46 difficult enough in the villages to get a permit.
47
48 And so the State regs excluding the
49 road system allows that a person can get their permit
50 and the State handles the permits for the Feds. They

1 can get their permit and that there isn't a limit on
2 what they catch. They just need to fill out their
3 permit at the end of the season and send it in. And so
4 this proposal, if you choose to endorse it -- I'll
5 probably send it in anyway -- this would give some --
6 under Federal regulations, it would make it as liberal
7 as what occurs with the State now.

8

9 So I guess I'll take some questions.

10

11 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Go ahead, Rick.

14

15 MR. KOSO: Yeah. I really don't feel
16 comfortable making a decision on something that I'm
17 really not familiar with and I don't really have the
18 other side of Fish and Wildlife to sit here and tell us
19 what they think of the thing, so I'd have a hard time
20 putting a stamp on this -- an approval as it stands
21 right now.

22

23 MR. HOLMES: Rick, these proposals will
24 all come back to our Council in the fall, so if you
25 chose not to address them at this time, I can just
26 submit them as an individual and then we can all
27 discuss them again when they come up to the Council
28 before they go to the Board of Fish. But there's three
29 of them lumped together here.

30

31 MR. KOSO: Yeah. Pat, that's good.
32 Then I could maybe see more information. I guess I've
33 attended a lot of fishery meetings and done a lot of
34 fisheries stuff and, you know, most of the regulation
35 stuff that I've been always -- used to dealing with
36 especially on the fisheries always came from the State.
37 And so like I say, I'm a little uncomfortable by not
38 having them show me another side of this picture. So
39 -- currently I'll still be against -- you know, against
40 it.

41

42 MR. HOLMES: Oh, well, basically what
43 this is, is this makes it for Federal users, it makes
44 this as liberal as it is for the State users because
45 the State liberalized their whole program their last
46 Board cycle and so this allows local subsistence users
47 to not have -- because if you -- let's say you lived at
48 Larsen Bay under -- and you wanted to fish there or at
49 Karluk and use the Federal regs at Karluk, then you
50 have to -- every time you get 25 fish, then you have to

1 come and get another permit in order to continue
2 fishing. Whereas if you fish under State regs, you
3 don't have to do that. And so I'm just trying to make
4 it as liberal on the Federal side as it is for the
5 State side and that's the objective of it.

6

7 And maybe if you want, I could just
8 explain these and submit them and then you could deal
9 with them in the fall.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Della.

12

13 MS. TRUMBLE: I have a question, Rick.
14 Earlier this morning before you got here, there was --
15 approved something that basically says unless a bag
16 limit or it's going to apply to fish also, that if
17 there was a limit of 250 fish a day, then how does that
18 work with the Federal things? You know, if you had a
19 total of 250 fish, you can't go get 25 fish from the
20 Federal; is that correct? Unless there was -- how does
21 that apply?

22

23 MR. HOLMES: Well, I could probably
24 punt it to James Jackson here for the State and.....

25

26 MR. JACKSON: Hello. My name is James
27 Jackson. I'm the Area Management Biologist for Kodiak
28 salmon and herring commercial fisheries. Could you go
29 ahead and repeat the question actually.

30

31 MS. TRUMBLE: We passed -- there was a
32 -- and I can pull it up here. We passed -- there was
33 something that we passed earlier today that said if
34 there's two different allocations by State and Federal
35 that if there was a cap of 250 that you can't --
36 whatever -- you could take 25 here and then you're
37 going to get 225 over here, but your cap is going to be
38 the 250. Is that correct?

39

40 MR. JACKSON: Yep.

41

42 MR. KOSO: Can I interject just for
43 second. Maybe we could answer two questions at one
44 time. I guess I talked a little bit about it and where
45 I've got my problem with this deal is that there are
46 certain areas that the Feds control and there are
47 certain areas where the State controls. So I guess I'm
48 a little confused as to where this will apply. You're
49 saying it'll apply on certain deals, but as far as I
50 understand, it's just going to apply -- what we put

1 here will just apply through the Federal lands or
2 Federal controlled property. It wouldn't be controlled
3 in State property or State lands.

4
5 So this is just -- the way I understand
6 it is just for Federal.

7
8 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: George.

9
10 MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. Mr. Koso.
11 State regulations apply in all lands and waters in
12 Alaska unless superseded by Federal regulation. For
13 subsistence in the fresh waters in areas that the
14 Federal subsistence fisheries are authorized, I'm not
15 sure we have State subsistence fisheries. Do we?

16
17 (Pause)

18
19 MR. PAPPAS: There is some crossover.
20 There's some crossover where you can fish both a
21 Federal subsistence fishery or a State subsistence
22 fishery, but there are areas I guess in this region
23 that there's only a Federal subsistence fishery. We
24 don't have State subsistence fisheries like main river
25 -- main stem Karluk maybe upriver. I think that might
26 be an example.

27
28 MR. WADLEY: I guess I'm not -- my name
29 is Jeff Wadley. I'm an Area Biologist for the Region
30 4. I'd guess I'd have to look at the State
31 regulations. I'm not a hundred percent sure, but off
32 the road system and on Kodiak, subsistence -- State --
33 there is State subsistence fishing allowed.

34
35 MR. KOSO: Well, I get all my
36 subsistence fishing from the State. ADF&G gives -- and
37 I fish Adak for my subsistence and it also includes
38 Federal land I fish on out there. So I'm a little
39 confused as to where this proposal that I see here,
40 which I'm not against. I'm just not understanding the
41 regulation between the two, if this is even effective
42 on the State. State lands, State water, State
43 controlled properties.

44
45 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

46
47 MR. HOLMES: This doesn't affect -- the
48 State regulations are more liberal and what I'm trying
49 to do is to get it so that people -- because the Buskin
50 River, we have 2,000 permits fished there. That's

1 Federal waters. We have -- probably out of that I
2 guess on Afognak, there's a three-mile area around
3 Afognak -- four mile? Three miles. And there's
4 probably I'd guess maybe 50 people go up there from
5 town and then we have Federal waters down at the mouth
6 of the Karluk River along that beach down there.

7
8 And so as it sits now, under State
9 regs, it's more liberal, but if a person -- all I'm
10 trying to do is just get the two regulations to read
11 the same because we've had problems here in town with
12 -- I'd say rumored problems with people in town here
13 wanting to fish the mouth of the Buskin and so I've run
14 across people out there, the old-timers and the elders,
15 I've kind of run this through and the State -- oh,
16 what, 25 years ago, 30 years ago -- put in a
17 restriction for fishing from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. --
18 9:00 p.m.

19
20 And so everybody gets a State permit,
21 but if you're fishing under Federal rules, some people
22 say, okay, I'm fishing Federal rules and so in this --
23 in the case of the time, I have a regulation for time --
24 fishing time. There's been some people going out and
25 preempting fishing sites, fishing early, saying I'm
26 fishing Federal regs, but in reality some of them live
27 on the base and they aren't really qualified Federal
28 subsistence users.

29
30 So I'm just trying to get the State and
31 the Federal regulations on time and limits the same and
32 also a loophole on herring. And that's all I'm trying
33 to do and it doesn't change the Federal regs.
34 Everybody goes through the State regs, but there's
35 problems in a person coming and saying well, I'm
36 fishing under Federal regs to get themselves a special
37 deal over somebody else and so that's why I've got
38 these three proposals, is just to try to make it so
39 it's a clean playing field. When you get your permit,
40 everybody's playing with the same rules.

41
42 And it's not that I'm changing anything
43 from the State side because the State side's basically
44 more liberal than the Feds on reporting. And so this
45 would make somebody that was fishing in Federal waters
46 that lived out of town, make it a whole lot easier for
47 them not to have to get an extra permit and -- or come
48 back and renew it. And the same with the proposal time
49 would be getting people fishing from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00
50 p.m. and if folks on the Council felt that the villages

1 should have a different timeline, that could be amended
2 and it could just say Kodiak Management Area.

3
4 I guess what I'd suggest, Mr. Chairman,
5 is perhaps I just should -- because everybody's getting
6 tired. Maybe what I should do is just submit these
7 into the process and they'll come back to the RAC this
8 fall for comment and then people can take these home
9 and read them and see what they think, unless they're
10 passionate about submitting them as RAC proposals
11 because it's -- you know, it'll work either way.

12
13 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Yes.

14
15 MR. JACKSON: Just for a point of
16 clarification. On the Kodiak road system with a State
17 permit, you can only take 25 salmon, but off the road
18 system, there is actually no limit. It's not 250 fish.
19 I don't know.....

20
21 MS. TRUMBLE: Where we are from.....

22
23 MR. HOLMES: Unlimited.

24
25 MR. JACKSON: Yeah. And in Federal
26 waters, for example, say Karluk Lagoon, with a State
27 permit, you can still fish in there and take as many
28 fish as you want. So I think what Mr. Holmes is trying
29 to do is just kind of clarify the law on both Federal
30 and State and make them the same.

31
32 MS. TRUMBLE: I was kind of curious is
33 because in this WP10-05, it's combining the both and
34 this is -- how in the world -- it was my question
35 earlier. How are we going to -- the accumulation,
36 yeah, it's -- and then enforcement issues. Good luck.

37
38 (Laughter)

39
40 MR. KOSO: Well, Mr. Chair, I'll -- you
41 know, if -- Pat knows certainly a lot more about this
42 area than I do and I just wanted clarification and I
43 think I got enough clarification. So if Pat wants to
44 present this here to the RAC Board to be presented as
45 back and then he'll have my support.

46
47 Thank you.

48
49 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Rick.
50 He did present it to the Board. If the Board wants to

1 hear the rest of the proposals and take it from there
2 or have him submit it, they'll come back to us in
3 October. So it's up to the Board right now.

4
5 MR. HOLMES: A question was asked as
6 what would be my preference. It would be nice if the
7 Council would consider these because they do carry more
8 weight coming as a Council proposal than as an
9 individual proposal. But I guess I'd leave that up to
10 you and if you'd like me to continue, then I shall.

11
12 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I'd say continue.

13
14 MR. HOLMES: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
15 Chairman.

16
17 The first -- that first one that we
18 just went through, that basically makes the same
19 playing field and I just did a cut and paste from the
20 State regs and put them into Federal regs.

21
22 And then the second one that says
23 fishery regulation proposal time, that relates to
24 having opening for subsistence purposes from 6:00 a.m.
25 to 9:00 p.m. And that's basically what is in State
26 regs. I know that a former member, Pete Squartsoff,
27 felt that there shouldn't be a time limit because in
28 his mind, folks should be able to fish all night. So
29 that would be a question is if you'd want to amend that
30 now or at another time or leave it the way it is.
31 Under the existing regs, it's 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.
32 Under State and under Federal, there isn't any time.

33
34 The third proposal is -- I don't think
35 there'd be any problem with. This is subsistence
36 herring and basically what it provides for is there is
37 no subsistence herring limit under Federal regulations.
38 Under State regulations, there's one for 500 pounds and
39 when it came up, I argued against it, when I was on the
40 Fish and Game Advisory Committee, but it's a point well
41 taken because they have had problems here in the past
42 with people seining up herring at the end of the season
43 and claiming that it was subsistence and then using
44 that herring for crab bait or using it for longline
45 bait and using it for commercial and I know that our
46 Council has had a long-time position about selling or
47 using subsistence things in any commercial way and so
48 the third proposal on herring would put a limit of 500
49 pounds per year. And I know I'm lucky to get two or
50 three buckets, so -- but anyway, those are the three

1 proposals.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Would you consider
4 putting in gear type? 500 pounds, I mean who's going
5 to deploy a 300 fathom net for 500 pounds.

6

7 MR. HOLMES: Pardon me?

8

9 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Would you consider
10 putting a gear type in here. Like if you can --
11 probably setnet for 500 pounds or use setnet only.

12

13 MR. HOLMES: I hadn't even thought
14 about a gear. I just was trying to get a harvest limit
15 and I don't know -- is there a limit on gear for
16 subsistence herring?

17

18 MR. WADLEY: I'm not really sure. I'd
19 have to look at the regulation, but I'm pretty sure you
20 can take herring with seine too, so.....

21

22 MR. HOLMES: And I kind of think that's
23 the case because, you know, folks will go out and make
24 a little small set and everybody divides it up, but I
25 think at this point it wouldn't be necessary to define
26 gear. I know that if I get 50 pounds or a hundred
27 pounds in a little ten-foot net I'm happy and anybody
28 that wants to be a glutton for punishment, you know,
29 500 pounds of herring is a whole lot to handle.

30

31 So I hadn't really -- Mr. Chairman, I
32 hadn't addressed gear. I'm just trying to get a limit
33 so that the subsistence herring wouldn't be used for
34 commercial purpose.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes.

37

38 MR. JACKSON: I was going to point out
39 that under current State regulations, it is just set at
40 500 pounds and the idea, as Mr. Holmes was trying to
41 say, was the initial intent of that was to keep
42 fishermen from -- before the Tanner crab fishery, going
43 out and grabbing their own bait and that's why we set a
44 limit on that. Because we actually do have a food and
45 bait fishery. It's actually a separate fishery.

46

47 And I do believe, like Mr. Wadley said,
48 that the subsistence gear type's open to both purse
49 seine and gillnet right now.

50

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. That's
2 under State regs. Then the Federal reg -- what's
3 that.....
4
5 MR. HOLMES: I don't know that there's
6 any gear. Is there gear defined under Federal regs?
7 It is? Okay.
8
9 MR. ROHRER: It's allowed.
10
11 MR. HOLMES: Okay. Sam has your answer
12 there.
13
14 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair.
15
16 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes, Rick.
17
18 MR. KOSO: Yeah. Pat, I'm in agreement
19 with all of your stuff here because I'm not -- I've
20 fished Kodiak herring for a few years and I'm kind of
21 into -- when you talk about time limits as far as
22 fishing, I know for a fact that it's a heck of a lot
23 easier to catch herring at night than it is during the
24 day. Because during the day, they sound and they're
25 very hard to get, so I would -- if I was a subsistence
26 fisherman, I'd certainly want to do the night fishery
27 rather than the day fishery, so -- I'm kind of like
28 what Pete Squartsoff. I think that the time in there
29 would be -- put a burden on the subsistence fishermen.
30
31 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yep. I'm the same
32 way. Okay.
33
34 MR. HOLMES: Perhaps then if it would
35 please the Council, then maybe what I'd do is have it
36 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. on the Kodiak road system and --
37 rather than being away from town because the problem is
38 primarily at the Buskin River.
39
40 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair. You know, I'm
41 still against the time frame on that. The reason being
42 is that you're on a 500 pound limit anyway and then
43 you're getting into enforcement.
44
45 MR. HOLMES: The herring has no time.
46 The time is on salmon.
47
48 MR. KOSO: Oh, okay.
49
50 MR. HOLMES: No. Anytime you want to

1 do the herring.

2

3 MR. KOSO: So you're just -- that was
4 just the salmon then.

5

6 MR. HOLMES: Yeah.

7

8 MR. KOSO: Okay. I 'm sorry. I was
9 mistaken for herring.

10

11 MR. HOLMES: And, Mr. Chair, if you'd
12 please with my geezer brain, I forgot one other section
13 under this liberalized salmon limits and presently the
14 State regulation -- and I'll paraphrase it -- basically
15 requires that when you're catching salmon that
16 immediately upon catching the salmon that you record it
17 on your permit.

18

19 And nobody does that and what I would
20 suggest is wording that I got from the Office of
21 Subsistence Management that they use in Cook Inlet that
22 follows a lot closer to traditional practices. And
23 that would be to say that the catch must be recorded
24 prior to leaving the fishing site. So when a person's
25 finished fishing, you got your net rolled up, then you
26 sit down and you take your little tally book out and
27 you write it down.

28

29 And what I'll probably do is I still
30 think I've got another month or so for the State
31 regulations and I've to talked to the area biologist
32 and with the idea of changing that for the Kodiak
33 Management Area under the State regs so it would read
34 the catch must be recorded prior to leaving the fishing
35 site and then that way it gets all the salmon stuff all
36 reading the same.

37

38 And that's kind of my whole objective
39 is to make it less confusing and to make it so that if
40 a person's out fishing and the brown shirt that says
41 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service doesn't bust you for
42 something that a brown shirt that says Alaska Fish and
43 Wildlife Protection, just so that it's as simple as it
44 can be and straightforward across the Board. And
45 that's kind of the intention of these proposals. Mr.
46 Chairman.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Getting back to
49 the proposal on time, you mentioned the road system.
50 That's all roads in the Kodiak area?

1 MR. HOLMES: There's -- basically the
2 way that this one is written is for the whole Kodiak
3 Management Area and that's basically what's existing
4 under State regulations. And if the Council wanted to
5 add something different for Federal regulations, then
6 that would be your pleasure. Myself, this is what we
7 have, but there may be places where people do fish
8 differently. And so if a person wasn't fishing in
9 Federal waters and you wanted him to have a more
10 liberal one for other locations, then we could specify
11 something like the Kodiak road system, but I think
12 again that's going to create enforcement problems. So
13 that might be something to think on and, you know, we
14 can amend these proposals once they come back to us in
15 the fall or you could amend it going in.

16
17 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Say you had a --
18 if I can drive to Big Creek on my four-wheeler and I go
19 fishing there, would I have to abide by a different set
20 of rules than I would if I took my boat over to the
21 headwaters of Big Creek?

22
23 MR. HOLMES: Well, right now, it's --
24 the regulation is 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. because you've
25 got the State permit and under the Federal permit, it
26 has no time and -- but you can't -- I think at Big
27 Creek -- I don't know that you could be in Federal
28 waters there. I don't.....

29
30 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Federal waters
31 don't start at Old Harbor from Sitkalidak Strait?

32
33 MR. JACKSON: I'm not sure.

34
35 MS. PETRIVELLI: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.
36 I remember when I worked in the Kodiak area, we looked
37 at some of these regulations and isn't it the Kodiak
38 road system specifically defined in the sportfish
39 regulations?

40
41 MR. HOLMES: Well, there is a specific
42 definition for that and I was offering that for an
43 alternative if the Council didn't like this time.

44
45 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah.

46
47 MR. HOLMES: I just have the time is
48 what it is presently under the State regs and even with
49 a Federal permit, you get the State -- you go to the
50 State and get their permit because it's -- flows

1 through the State and so when you sign that, in one
2 perspective, you're saying you agree with those
3 regulations. And so what I'm trying to do is clear up
4 a thing in that, you know, you have Federal regulations
5 that don't have any time on it.

6
7 And so that's confusing and that would
8 be one alternative in my mind because to me the biggest
9 problem is the Buskin. Now, the State having 6:00 a.m.
10 to 9:00 p.m., they feel is very valid and if I might --
11 when that went through the -- to the State Fish and
12 Game Advisory Council, the concern that was expressed
13 at that time around the island was that some places
14 people leave the nets out for days or weeks and don't
15 pick them. And so fish end up getting wasted and so
16 that was a reason that they -- that plus enforcement
17 was the reason they went to 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. But
18 I do recognize that people do fish different ways and
19 different times. And so that's why I just identified
20 that point because if you do set it up, then it would
21 be -- and I'm getting awful tired.

22
23 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah. We're all
24 tired. I can speak to that too, but my concern is it's
25 road system is not going to be defined as taking your
26 four-wheeler over to the river. You have to fish for a
27 certain amount of time whereas if you took your skiff
28 over to the mouth of the river, you can fish for a
29 longer period of time. And the reason for that is
30 there are places in the villages where you can drive to
31 and that's not going to be construed as the road
32 system.

33
34 MR. HOLMES: Okay. Mr. Chairman. On
35 that first page, there is a definition of what is
36 considered the road system and it defines the line from
37 Crag Point to Saltery Cove and includes the waters of
38 Woody and Long Island, saltwaters bordering the area
39 within one mile of Kodiak Island, excluding waters
40 bordering Spruce Island. And so basically it's the
41 knob up here where Kodiak's at and that whole thing has
42 the 25 limit per family member and then if you catch
43 extra fish, you go in to Jeff or James and you say,
44 gee, I caught too many fish. I need another permit or
45 I would like to get more fish and they give you a new
46 permit.

47
48 And the way under the State regulations
49 is, is that if you're not fishing there, there is no
50 limit and it's recognizes that folks living in Larsen

1 Bay have more difficulty getting permit and they don't
2 take that many fish anyway, so it just makes it
3 liberal. So what I was hoping or proposing is just
4 adopting that verbatim into the Federal regs.

5
6 And just to make it easier for people
7 to -- well, basically get both permits the same.
8 That's all I'm trying to do.

9
10 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: All right. Thank
11 you, Pat. So the next step would be to move to submit
12 these proposals from the Kodiak/Aleutians? Is
13 that.....

14
15 MR. HOLMES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That
16 would be the case and then they'll get published in the
17 book and come back and if folks have second thoughts or
18 things they want to change, then we can discuss those
19 things at that time as well. I was just trying to get
20 this to the Council so they'd have plenty of time to
21 think about it and -- anyway, I'm done.

22
23 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes, Rick.

26
27 MR. KOSO: I thought this is not taken
28 in the Peninsula. This is just for Kodiak, isn't it?
29 Yeah. Okay. I heard you say Peninsula and I was going
30 to say huh. We got enough regulation. I'm a person
31 that is against regulation because we're so regulated
32 already that anything to do with regulation and
33 restricting us more, then you're going to get a no
34 answer out of me right away.

35
36 So that's where I stand on this whole
37 thing.

38
39 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah. Any other
40 questions.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No further
45 discussions. Oh, Maureen, you have something.

46
47 MS. CLARK: Don't forget a second
48 there.

49
50 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No, I didn't -- we

1 didn't make a motion yet.

2

3 MR. HOLMES: Okay. Mr. Chairman. I'd
4 like to make a motion that these three proposals that I
5 have on liberalizing salmon limits, catch recording,
6 fishing time, and the subsistence herring loophole,
7 that they be submitted by the Regional Advisory Council
8 for consideration at the fishery cycle at the Federal
9 Subsistence Board.

10

11 MR. ROHRER: Second.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and
14 seconded. Any discussion.

15

16 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes, Rick.

19

20 MR. KOSO: Again, I'm just somebody
21 that thinks we're already regulated to the tilt and
22 there are some things in there -- I know we're doing
23 all three of these at one time, and if you broke them
24 down, I'd probably say yeah, I'd vote for one or two of
25 them, but to vote them all in, I'll have to vote
26 against this.

27

28 Thank you.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah. I know you
31 get all them in. We just voting to submit these
32 proposals. They will come back to us in October for
33 further scrutiny.

34

35 MR. KOSO: Yeah, I understand that, but
36 I don't like the way they're doing it right now, so I'm
37 going to vote against it.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Understood.
40 Any other discussion.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: There's no further
45 discussion. Is there any objection to the motion.
46 Your objection will be noted, yes.

47

48 REPORTER: Yes. Okay.

49

50 MR. KOSO: (Nods affirmatively)

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: There's one
2 objection. There's no further objections, then the
3 motion carries. Okay. We are -- where's our
4 coordinator.

5
6 MR. KOSO: Ready to adjourn? I'll make
7 a motion.....

8
9 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No. We're not
10 done yet. We're not done yet.

11
12 Yes, Gary.

13
14 MR. WHEELER: Mr. Chairman. The Refuge
15 has been working on a fishery proposal and I believe
16 you have it in your packet there. And basically this
17 regulation is to prohibit an owner-operator or employee
18 of a lodge, charter vessel, or other enterprise that
19 furnishes food, lodging, or sportfish guiding services,
20 they may not furnish to a client or guest of that
21 enterprise salmon that has been taken under subsistence
22 fishing regulations.

23
24 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I'm sorry. I
25 don't know where that proposal is.

26
27 MR. WHEELER: Michelle, here are extra
28 copies. Basically the Refuge fisheries biologist,
29 Kevin VanHatten, has been working with the sportfish
30 division of the Department of Fish and Game. We feel
31 that there is a loophole in the existing regulations
32 that -- where we might have a sportfish season open
33 with nonretention type regulations and a subsistence
34 fishery open on that same body of water.

35
36 We could have guides or lodge owners
37 who are Alaska rural residents catching fish and
38 retaining them under subsistence regulations and they
39 could conceivably provide those subsistence caught fish
40 to their clients or guests. And we feel with the
41 addition of this regulation, it would then allow --
42 because the systems -- because the systems would have
43 low returns and that's the reason for the nonretention
44 regulations under sportfishing, we'd like to be able to
45 allow as many returning fish into those systems as
46 possible.

47
48 So basically the regulation that you
49 have before you was the way we had been working on this
50 and in further discussion with some of the Staff today,

1 I think we're proposing to simplify the language a
2 little bit on this and just if you look under number 2
3 there, first it would apply to Kodiak only, so there's
4 a different regulation number there, 100.27.I.9 for
5 Kodiak area only. So this would only apply to the
6 Kodiak area.

7
8 And then secondly we would simplify
9 this to say an owner-operator or employee of a lodge,
10 charter vessel or other enterprise that furnishes food,
11 lodging, or sportfish guide services may not -- and
12 then we would eliminate that I there and just go right
13 down to what we have as 2 -- may not furnish to a
14 client or guide of that enterprise salmon that has been
15 taken under subsistence fishing regulations, period,
16 and eliminate the A, B, C.

17
18 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: What number did
19 you give this? 100?

20
21 MR. WHEELER: 100.27.

22
23 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: .27?

24
25 MR. WHEELER: Yeah. I.9. And those
26 are the Kodiak area regulations. So I would propose --
27 I'm submitting this to the Council to see if you're
28 willing to submit this as a proposal to Office of
29 Subsistence Management as a Council proposal.

30
31 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: And after the
32 first paragraph, it goes to number 2 and ends with
33 regulations and then everything after that would be
34 struck?

35
36 MR. WHEELER: Yeah. You would strike
37 out the A, B, and C and just eliminate the whole
38 sentence here under I and just cross out the little ii
39 and it would just be one sentence there.

40
41 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Okay. And
42 the rest of the numbers would remain the same? 3, 4, 5,
43 and 6 would remain the same?

44
45 MR. WHEELER: The only change in number
46 5 on the second page is to cross out the second
47 sentence there. So it would just be one sentence under
48 number 5.

49
50 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I'm sorry. Pat,

1 go ahead.

2

3 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. Gary, for
4 clarification, I guess the purpose of this would be if
5 you had a case where a guide or an outfitter was
6 working with folks and they were say fishing sockeye at
7 Karluk and you had a restriction that limited only the
8 harvest of chinook, let's say, to qualified subsistence
9 users, then you couldn't have someone that was a guide
10 or an outfitter catch a nice king salmon and then turn
11 around and give it to his buddy Rick and that way it
12 would allow for folks that were qualified subsistence
13 users to take those fish when populations were low and
14 basically it's an allocation tool in terms of that for
15 subsistence fishermen, but also it would I think be a
16 conservation tool by reducing the total harvest on king
17 salmon if they were being stressed I guess is the whole
18 idea of this.

19

20 MR. WHEELER: Yes. You're absolutely
21 correct. Those fish would be reserved for subsistence
22 users and this would prohibit then a guide who is a
23 subsistence user from harvesting the fish and giving
24 them to their clients who are nonsubsistence users.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Did I understand
27 that right? Did -- the subsistence user cannot give
28 his fish to the client, but the client who caught a
29 fish that he wasn't supposed to catch can give it to a
30 subsistence user?

31

32 MR. WHEELER: No. That would not be
33 allowed.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No. It doesn't
36 work the other way around.

37

38 MR. WHEELER: Doesn't work the other
39 way around, no.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. I thought I
42 heard that. I'd better ask.

43

44 (Laughter)

45

46 MR. WHEELER: No.

47

48 MS. TRUMBLE: You're still awake.

49

50 (Laughter)

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah, I'm still
2 awake. Okay. Sam.

3
4 MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. Mr.
5 Wheeler, I actually thought that was a regulation
6 currently. I thought we had -- I thought I'd had
7 discussion -- maybe it was with the State about that
8 with shellfish about catching -- furnishing king crab to
9 -- I know that's common practice with some folks,
10 furnishing king crab to paying clients which I don't
11 think is legal either.

12
13 Anyways, definitely I support that.
14 I'd be fine with keeping the original number 1 and
15 number 2, not allowing the guides to engage in
16 subsistence salmon fishing, but that part doesn't
17 really matter. But anyways, yeah, I fully support that
18 and thank you for the good proposal.

19
20 MR. WHEELER: Thank you.

21
22 MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair.

23
24 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Rick.

25
26 MR. KOSO: Yeah. So I understand that
27 you want us to present this proposal for you or you
28 want us to approve it here and you present it. How do
29 you want to work that?

30
31 MR. WHEELER: Well, I would appreciate
32 it if you -- if the Council would adopt this and
33 present it for us.

34
35 MR. KOSO: Yeah. Well, I like the
36 proposal and I certainly would approve it.

37
38 MR. WHEELER: Thank you.

39
40 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other
41 questions. Comments.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Then a motion
46 would be in order to.....

47
48 MR. ROHRER: I move to adopt the
49 proposal.

50

1 MR. KOSO: Second.
2
3 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and
4 seconded. Discussion.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: There's no
9 discussion. Is there any objection.
10
11 (No objections)
12
13 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No objections,
14 then the motion carries. Okay.
15
16 MS. CLARK: I'm sorry. Mr. Chair. Can
17 we just clarify that it's a motion to submit not a
18 motion to adopt.
19
20 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes.
21
22 MS. CLARK: Okay. Thanks.
23
24 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you for
25 that. Motion to submit. Let that show in the record.
26 Okay. If there are no other, then we are at new
27 business of the FAA. Did anyone sign up for that? If
28 no one -- is anyone on line for submitting -- making
29 testimony on FAA. Yeah. Did you sign that white paper
30 back there?
31
32 MR. SIROCHUCK: I did.
33
34 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay.
35
36 (Pause)
37
38 MR. SIROCHUCK: Thank you, Mr.
39 Chairman. My name is Mike Sirochuck and I'm Chairman
40 of the Kodiak State Parks Advisory Board -- Citizens
41 Advisory Board. And we submitted a letter to you in
42 advance of this meeting about a concern that we have
43 related to FAA proposals for runway extensions at the
44 Kodiak Airport.
45
46 Because Kodiak State Parks has the
47 Buskin State Recreation Site there, we are of course
48 concerned about how these proposals might affect the
49 park experience there. But in relation to this body,
50 we're concerned about the potential negative effects on

1 subsistence fishing on salmon runs in the Buskin River.

2

3 The FAA has put out -- they put out a
4 draft environmental impact statement which the State
5 Parks Advisory Board was able to review and that is the
6 basis of the comments that we have presented to you in
7 our letter. Since that time, they've put out another
8 draft EIS for Agency review which the Citizens Advisory
9 Board, despite our repeated requests, was not allowed
10 to review. It's our understanding that the Agencies
11 have submitted their review comments at this time and
12 that the FAA is looking over those comments and will be
13 publishing a draft EIS possibly in July or August --
14 they didn't seem to be very sure of the timeline at
15 this time -- for public review.

16

17 It's our hope at the Citizens Advisory
18 Board that this Council will take a close look at the
19 environmental impact statement and a close look at this
20 issue as it relates to subsistence fishing here in
21 Kodiak, specifically the Buskin River.

22

23 There was an article in the Kodiak
24 newspaper just this week that stated that the projects
25 for this year's red salmon run in the Buskin were
26 pretty low, which suggests that again subsistence may
27 be limited or even nonexistent at the Buskin River
28 again this year. In the draft EIS that we were able to
29 view, there were statements to the effect that
30 extending the north-south runway which is Runway 1836
31 -- and I apologize, I don't have a picture of that for
32 you. But it's a runway that runs north and south and
33 ends far short of the Buskin River right now.

34

35 However, one of their alternatives is
36 to extend that runway 1,200 feet filling in the ocean
37 all the way toward the mouth of the Buskin River. That
38 would have a drastic effect on the movement of the
39 river, on the movement of fish in that area, and as
40 they themselves admit, probably a negative effect on
41 salmon runs in the area. Because the Buskin River is
42 such a tenuous it seems like place right now for red
43 salmon, I think it's important that we not do anything
44 that might have any potential for sort of negative
45 effect on the salmon runs in that area.

46

47 There is a very easy alternative to the
48 proposal to move the -- to extend the runway toward the
49 Buskin and that is one of the other alternatives in
50 their draft EIS which is to extend the runway toward

1 the area known as Jewel Beach. So rather than
2 extending it 1,200 feet north toward the mouth of the
3 Buskin River with the potential for negative impacts,
4 the runway could be extended to the south toward the
5 area known as Jewel Beach on the Coast Guard base.
6 That's not an area that's known for subsistence or
7 sportfishing. It's not an area that really has a
8 salmon run. There's not a particular stream right
9 there, so it seems like from the fishery and
10 subsistence fishing point of view, that would be a good
11 idea.

12
13 So I guess what we're asking -- the
14 Citizen Advisory Board is asking you, the Council, to
15 do is to please take a look at this issue, to please
16 examine the EIS when it comes out and if you feel it
17 appropriate, to take whatever action you would feel is
18 appropriate for you as a Council to deal with this
19 issue then from a subsistence fishing point of view.

20
21 Thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you for
24 that. When you said they were going to extend north,
25 how far into the Buskin would that take it?

26
27 MR. SIROCHUCK: Without -- it would not
28 quite reach the mouth of the Buskin as it is right now,
29 but it would be 1,200 feet which is approximately 12
30 football fields. There's kind of a berm at the mouth
31 of the Buskin right now. If you go out to the mouth
32 and you stand and look at the mouth out toward the
33 ocean there, there's kind of a berm here and what
34 they're talking about would be higher than that berm
35 and just basically filling in with gravel and extending
36 the runway 1,200 feet.

37
38 And the runway extension is not part of
39 landing or taking off. It won't be used for that.
40 It's simply kind of a -- the idea is that it allows
41 more room in the case that an airplane can't stop when
42 it's landing. And -- in the EIS, there really weren't
43 any indications of actual perceived safety problems.
44 This seems to be arising from something that's been
45 going on in the lower 48 of doing runway improvements
46 all around the nation.

47
48 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

49
50 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. If I could

1 add a little clarification on that north-south runway
2 extension. In my work as a consultant with the three
3 Kodiak tribes, I was able to read the State comments on
4 it as well as the comments from the tribes. And the
5 problem with putting that fill north across the spit is
6 that it -- I guess picture if you would a big football
7 stadium that you filled up with rocks and gravel and
8 just flipped it over down on the spit and that would
9 tend to make -- change the whole dynamics of that
10 estuary at the mouth and so it could affect returning
11 adults because if that area behind it filled, then it
12 would reduce the area for adults to get used to
13 changing over from saltwater to fresh water as well as
14 fry and smolt that migrate out could have the same
15 problems having less of a place to prepare themselves
16 to go to sea.

17
18 And then on the other runway proposals,
19 the main runway, that goes out where I would guess
20 probably 30, 40 percent of the subsistence harvest
21 takes place at that point and like Pete pointed out
22 when I presented this -- talked about this before, it
23 would make for real hot fishing right off the end of
24 that extension, but the amount of area where people
25 traditionally fish would be reduced considerably.

26
27 And so the combination of the two, you
28 could end up with one sticking out and then the other
29 one across the spit with that whole area behind it
30 gradually filling up and making a very long slope on
31 the beach and so at low tide, our next -- once we get
32 into the daylight low tide series, you can go down and
33 just watch the birds and the eagles feeding on the
34 smolt as they come out. So the longer the beach, then
35 the more predation on smolt.

36
37 And so it's sort of a two-pronged
38 effect, one on the fish and then one displacing
39 fishermen and the Agencies must have had 12 or 14 pages
40 of comments asking them well, why are you even doing
41 this. And so it has some really direct and indirect
42 effects on subsistence for local users.

43
44 And as I pointed out earlier, we have
45 about 2,000 permits here I Kodiak and the vast bulk of
46 them fish there at the Buskin. And so there are
47 alternatives for them that they can do to provide
48 safety areas without impacting the fisheries.

49
50 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you. Any
2 other public testimony. If you'd like to testify,
3 would you sign the paper over there, please.

4
5 MS. ELLANAK: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair
6 and Council. I'd like to add on to what this.....

7
8 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I'm sorry. Could
9 you state your name, please.

10
11 MS. ELLANAK: Oh, I'm sorry. My name
12 is Katherine Ellanak. I'm the Environmental and
13 Natural Resource Director for the Sunaq Tribe of Kodiak
14 and on this opposition, this gentleman just talked
15 about, the other thing that we don't see what FAA is
16 proposing to be cost efficient and effective is that
17 they want to build towards the Buskin River because
18 it's going to cost more to build towards Jewel Beach
19 because they're saying it's deeper.

20
21 But on our comments that we made, if
22 the Buskin River is built onto, there's going to be
23 indefinite permanent damage to the ecology and that
24 Jewel Beach is an old dump site that the military and
25 the Coast Guard used to use. So in preserving the
26 environment and our way of life, we -- I would suggest
27 that -- also that Jewel Beach be developed more and not
28 only that, what has been environmentally damaged that
29 -- you know, the government doesn't have any money to
30 clean up anymore. With the fill that they put in
31 there, they could bury damage that they did before.

32
33 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you for
34 that. Anyone else like to make testimony on the FAA
35 project.

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: If not, then that
40 closes this portion of our agenda. Brings us to next
41 meeting, but I guess Michelle had something before
42 that.

43
44 MS. CHIVERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We
45 did have some awards to give out at our last meeting,
46 but we didn't have a meeting, so at this time, I'd like
47 to go ahead and present those awards to Council members
48 with some length of service here. And there'll be some
49 more awards coming in the fall.

50

1 Currently at this time, we would like
2 to present an award to Sam Rohrer for his length of
3 service beginning in 2004. So at this point, we have a
4 certificate and a mug for you.

5
6 MR. ROHRER: Why, thank you.

7
8 (Applause)

9
10 MS. CHIVERS: And then the second
11 person that we have an award for is for Pat Holmes. He
12 has been on the Council since 2001.

13
14 (Applause)

15
16 MS. CHIVERS: And then the next award
17 that we have is for Mitch Simeonoff who has been on the
18 Council since 2000.

19
20 (Applause)

21
22 MS. CHIVERS: And we'll have another
23 awards ceremony probably this fall. Since Della's
24 back, we'll have to acknowledge her years. We have to
25 figure out exactly how long she's been on and how long
26 the space was, but we'll be doing some more. This is
27 going to become something that we're going to try to do
28 each fall of each season so that -- you know, sometimes
29 we get new members or they reach five years or ten
30 years of service. That's what we're trying to
31 acknowledge here.

32
33 Thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Could have did
36 that this morning when we had fresh coffee. Pat.

37
38 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. As a
39 follow-up on the FAA thing, I have a draft letter from
40 the Airport Tribal Committee that they didn't get into
41 the record and basically the context of it would be
42 asking the RAC -- and I'm going to hopefully at future
43 meetings do a whole lot less proposals and resolutions.

44
45 But would be asking the RAC for a
46 resolution to the FAA. We did one two years ago asking
47 that there be no impacts on subsistence and it's
48 interesting to note that that never showed up on their
49 Website and it didn't show up in their preliminary EIS.
50 I looked all over on their Website for it and so it

1 might be appropriate for this Council to make a
2 stronger statement.

3
4 And basically it would be a resolution
5 that would, one, oppose any extension of 1836 -- that's
6 the north-south runway -- in the direction of the
7 Buskin River and then in parentheses, the extension of
8 the runway in the opposite direction towards Jewel
9 Beach and the Coast Guard based would have negligible
10 impact on salmon production and subsistence harvest.

11
12 And then two, we would urge you to
13 oppose the extension of Runway 725 into Chiniak Bay.
14 Support the no action option and if it can be proven
15 that an extension must be done, they have an
16 alternative that would -- they call an EMAS system
17 which is kind of a crushable runway. It's sort of like
18 resting gear and they could do one of those that would
19 only be 425 feet long.

20
21 And so that would have considerably
22 less impact on the fishing area and probably have less
23 change to the mouth of the Buskin. So I'd like to make
24 a motion that the RAC support that resolution. Mr.
25 Chairman.

26
27 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: That resolution is
28 -- you're proposing that resolution from the RAC?

29
30 MR. HOLMES: Yes, sir.

31
32 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. You'll get
33 the wording corrected and give it to Michelle and she
34 can get it back to the two of us for signatures, but
35 for right now, that -- your motion would need a second.

36
37
38 MR. ROHRER: Second.

39
40 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Moved and
41 seconded. Any discussion.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no
46 discussion, is there any objections.

47
48 (No objections)

49
50 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Before I close

1 that, do you want a letter to accompany that
2 resolution?

3

4 MR. HOLMES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That
5 would be nice. They could just take the verbiage off
6 of this one.

7

8 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. That'll be
9 put into that. Okay.

10 MS. TRUMBLE: Do you have to approve a
11 resolution? Does this body have to approve a
12 resolution supporting that?

13

14 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah. His motion
15 is to approve this resolution. My suggestion to submit
16 a letter might be a separate deal.

17

18 MR. HOLMES: Okay. Would you like me
19 to draft a letter for you?

20

21 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No. Well, let's
22 do this resolution.....

23

24 MR. HOLMES: Okay.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: and then
27 we'll get into the letter. My last question was there
28 any objection.

29

30 (No objections)

31

32 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Seeing no
33 objections, then the motion carries. Give the
34 resolution to Michelle and we'll get the wording
35 straight. We can do that. I guess since this is going
36 to be a resolution, I can just ask you to draft up the
37 letter that will go with it and might mention that we
38 looked through their Website and stuff and we didn't
39 find out previous letter. They didn't include it in
40 any of their reports. I guess we can work through fax
41 since I'll be down there and you'll be up -- okay.

42

43 That -- if there's no other public
44 comments, then this concludes our FAA public testimony
45 and -- well, we did that. We went to this -- we're
46 getting into the calendar. Calendar for our ext
47 meeting. Confirm September 21st, 2010.

48

49 MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair, at this time
50 we have September 21st set up for the meeting, but we

1 don't -- we need to confirm that date and also select a
2 location. We'll leave it up to the Council to decide
3 where they would like to meet.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Della.

6

7 MS. TRUMBLE: I'd like to recommend
8 that we meet in King Cove and I'll work out the issue
9 with the housing and September 21st works good I think
10 for that and an alternative in Cold Bay.

11

12 MR. HOLMES: I'd like to second the
13 motion, Mr. Chairman.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Moved and
16 seconded. Any discussion.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 MS. CHIVERS: There's also another
21 calendar in your packet or in your book. It's the last
22 page in the book, Page 91. What we're looking at is
23 projecting a year out for next winter's meeting, so we
24 need to select a date and a location for that meeting
25 as well.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 MR. ROHRER: Mr. Chair, for winter, the
30 later the better in March for me.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Window closes on
33 the 24th. So we're looking at 21st, 22nd, and 23rd.

34

35 MS. CHIVERS: So, Mr. Chair, are you
36 suggesting the travel day be Monday the 21st, to meet
37 on the 22nd, and travel day on the 23rd?

38

39 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes.

40

41 MS. CHIVERS: And actually I think that
42 works best for Rick as well because he's -- there's
43 only two flights a week coming out of Adak. Okay. And
44 location?

45

46 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Next March's
47 meeting.

48

49 MS. CHIVERS: Location.

50

1 MR. KOSO: Adak.
2
3 MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. As much as
4 we tried meeting to other exotic places like Adak and
5 St. Paul, which I'd certainly agree to go to, perhaps
6 meeting in Kodiak would help balance the budget because
7 more of the members are from the island. So I'd like
8 to suggest March 22nd for the meeting and travel on
9 March 21 and 23rd and meet in Kodiak.
10
11 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Anybody object.
12
13 (No objections)
14
15 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay.
16
17 MS. TRUMBLE: I do have a comment.
18
19 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Go ahead.
20
21 MS. TRUMBLE: I just have a comment as
22 a returning Advisory Council member. I notice that
23 it's been kind of tough for a quorum for this group and
24 I think -- and all due respect. I realize having to
25 come all the way to King Cove and Cold Bay doesn't
26 quite be as thrilling for you, but we hope you make
27 that effort when we're meeting in respective regions --
28 educate each other on some of these issues.
29
30 MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair.
31
32 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes.
33
34 MS. CHIVERS: Since we will be taking
35 up the caribou issue, that would be good justification
36 for us to come out here. That was -- when you're
37 talking about budget, that's not necessarily the
38 reasoning behind -- I mean it is part of it, but we
39 also need to make sure if we're going to some other
40 location other than a hub, we need to have a good
41 justification. So we have the justification to head
42 out that direction, so -- thank you.
43
44 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. That takes
45 care of our next two meetings. Now you can move to
46 adjourn. If there's no other further business, then
47 I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
48
49 Yes, George.
50

1 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Not
2 to drag this out. Generally I'm 11E, 1 and 2, we do
3 have staff here to answer questions about the Buskin
4 River weir project update or the Afognak Lake project
5 update. The report is in your books, so it's only for
6 your information. You can read it there. So if you
7 want to have some folks answer some questions, great.
8 If not, both of them are happy just to attend.

9

10 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, George.

13 Okay. Pat.

14

15 MR. HOLMES: I guess briefly on both
16 those reports -- we can read them, but I guess the most
17 important bottom line is what does it look like for
18 next year -- for this year's harvest at the Buskin and
19 what does it look like for Litnik. That's an important
20 question there. And I think you folks do wonderful
21 reports when it comes to giving us information and I'm
22 sorry that we've kind of run out of steam here.

23

24 MS. SCHMIDT: That's okay. My name is
25 Suzanne Schmidt and I sportfish and I work on the
26 Buskin. This year we do not have a formal forecast as
27 of yet for the Buskin, but based off of the H Comp and
28 what it looks like, it looks as though we will be
29 reaching probably the lower end of the escapement goal.
30 Last year we reached 7,757 fish which the escapement
31 goal is 8,000, so we almost hit it.

32

33 We are anticipating reaching the lower
34 escapement goal and are not currently expecting to have
35 to have any closures to either the sportfishery or the
36 subsistence fishery. We'll keep a close eye on it. We
37 do have the weir thanks to your funding which we
38 greatly appreciate. And if it looks like we're getting
39 close, we will close the subsistence fishery -- sorry
40 -- we will close the sportfishery first and we will go
41 -- instead of being a step down, since the Buskin is a
42 meat fishery, we'll be starting off with a bag limit of
43 two and two in possession and going to a complete
44 closure.

45

46 And then depending on how numbers look,
47 then we would act later on the subsistence fishery.
48 But currently we're not expecting to have any
49 restrictions at this point.

50

1 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes, Pat.
2
3 MR. HOLMES: I think an important point
4 for the Council is I think James is going to address
5 that in the June management plan for the Buskin.
6
7 MR. JACKSON: Through the Chair. Mr.
8 Holmes. I actually was coming up here to give the
9 report on Litnik, but as for the subsistence fishery on
10 the Buskin, we're going to play -- basically do the
11 same thing as last year which is look at the weir
12 counts early on and then if we have to close down the
13 subsistence fishery again. We're not hoping to do that
14 right now.
15
16 MR. WADLEY: I just wanted to also add
17 that we do this in collaboration with the Fish and
18 Wildlife Service too, so there you go.
19
20 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay.
21
22 MR. JACKSON: And actually when it
23 comes to Litnik, Afognak Litnik, Rob Bayer, the
24 biologist actually that runs that project was
25 unfortunately not able to come, but he did want me to
26 let you know that the unofficial forecast for Litnik
27 was 36,000 sockeye.
28
29 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: That's good.
30 People in Port Lions and Ouzinkie will be happy to know
31 that they can fish. Cool. Okay.
32
33 Any other questions.
34
35 (No comments)
36
37 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Anything else.
38 Anything at all.
39
40 (No comments)
41
42 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you all for
43 coming. I didn't expect this, but thank you. Then I
44 guess a motion is in order.
45
46 MR. KOSO: I make a motion to adjourn.
47
48 MR. ROHRER: I second.
49
50 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: We're adjourned.

1 4:40. Thanks again. If there's anyone on line, thank
2 you. Bye.

3

4

(Off record)

5

6

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

