

00001

1 KODIAK/ALEUTIANS FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL  
2 ADVISORY COUNCIL PUBLIC MEETING

3

4

5 VOLUME I

6

7 September 18, 2002

8 City Building

9 Cold Bay, Alaska

10

11 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

12

13 Della Trumble, Chairman

14 Alfred Cratty

15 Paul Gundersen

16 Patrick Holmes

17 Ivan Lukin

18 Speridon Simeonoff

19 Pete Squartsoff

20 Vincent Tutiakoff

21

22 Regional Coordinator, Michelle Chivers

00002

1 PROCEEDINGS

2

3 (Cold Bay, Alaska - 9/18/2002)

4

5 (On record)

6

7 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: I'd like to welcome  
8 everybody and I know we're a little crowded in here. If we  
9 could have a roll call at this time.

10

11 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Alfred Cratty.

12

13 MR. CRATTY: Here.

14

15 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Ivan Lukin.

16

17 MR. LUKIN: Here.

18

19 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Vince Tutiakoff.

20

21 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Here.

22

23 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Pete Squartsoff. Here.  
24 Patrick Holmes.

25

26 MR. HOLMES: Here.

27

28 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Paul Gundersen.

29

30 MR. GUNDERSEN: Here.

31

32 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Speridon Simeonoff.

33

34 MR. SIMEONOFF: Here.

35

36 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Chair Della Trumble.

37

38 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Here.

39

40 MR. SQUARTSOFF: John Foster. And we lost  
41 our alternate. A quorum is established.

42

43 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Okay, please your mikes.  
44 I'd like to welcome everybody. If we can go ahead and go  
45 around the table and also through the audience with your  
46 name and who you represent, we'd appreciate it at this  
47 time. I'd start down at the end here Speridon.

48

49 MR. SIMEONOFF: I'm Speridon Simeonoff from  
50 Kodiak Island, Village of Akhiok.

00003

1 MR. LUKIN: My name is Ivan Lukin from Port  
2 Lions.

3  
4 MR. HOLMES: I'm Pat Holmes from Kodiak.

5  
6 MR. CRATTY: Al Cratty, Old Harbor.

7  
8 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Vince Tutiakoff,  
9 Unalaska/Adak.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Della Trumble, King  
12 Cove.

13  
14 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Pete Squartsoff, Port  
15 Lions.

16  
17 MR. GUNDERSEN: Paul Gundersen, Nelson  
18 Lagoon.

19  
20 MR. CHEN: Glenn Chen, Staff Committee  
21 member for Bureau of Indian Affairs.

22  
23 MS. FOX: Peggy Fox, Office of Subsistence  
24 Management.

25  
26 MS. JURGENSEN: Laura Jurgensen, Fish and  
27 Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management,  
28 Fisheries Information Service.

29  
30 MS. BROCKMAN: Tonya Brockman, RIT for  
31 Kodiak Refuge.

32  
33 MR. EDWARDS: Mike Edwards, King Salmon  
34 Fisheries Office.

35  
36 MR. FISHER: Dave Fisher, Fish and Wildlife  
37 Service, Office of Subsistence Management.

38  
39 MR. BOS: Greg Bos, Fish and Wildlife  
40 Service, Staff Committee member.

41  
42 MR. SHAUL: Arnie Shaul, Alaska Department  
43 of Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries Division, Cold Bay.

44  
45 MR. KLEIN: Steve Klein with Subsistence  
46 Management.

47  
48 MR. HONNARD: Steve Honnald with the Alaska  
49 Department of Fish and Game in Kodiak.

50

00004

1 MR. UBERUAGA: Richard Uberuaga,  
2 Subsistence in Anchorage.

3  
4 MS. PETRIVELLI: Pat Petrivelli with  
5 Subsistence in Anchorage.

6  
7 MR. POETTER: Rick Poetter with Izembek  
8 Wildlife Refuge.

9  
10 MS. CHIVERS: I'm Michelle Chivers, Council  
11 Coordinator for the Kodiak/Aleutians.

12  
13 REPORTER: And I'm Nathan Hile and I  
14 represent Computer Matrix and I'm doing the recording.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you and welcome,  
17 everybody. Good morning. We have review and adoption of  
18 minutes -- excuse me review and adoption of agenda at this  
19 time. We were going to, at 1:00 o'clock have on  
20 teleconference, a couple of people from Kodiak to discuss  
21 the issues of the goats so we will, at 1:00 o'clock when we  
22 come back we will do that.

23  
24 Are there any other items that would like  
25 to be added to the agenda at this time?

26  
27 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chairman.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

30  
31 MR. HOLMES: If you would like, I could  
32 give you an update on the joint RAC and Fish and Game  
33 Advisory Committee study group on the goat proposal.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pat, if we can maybe  
36 talk about that shortly after 1:00 o'clock with the  
37 teleconference on the goats.

38  
39 MR. HOLMES: Yeah.

40  
41 MS. PETRIVELLI: I think that at 1:00 when  
42 Pat does that, I think Larry VanDaele, really just wanted  
43 to hear what me and Pat had to say, thank you.

44  
45 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Vince.

48  
49 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Vince. I'd like to ask  
50 that the Council recess at 3:00 for a special purpose, work

00005

1 session between 3:00 and 4:00 with our advisor.

2

3 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. Hearing no  
4 other items, do I hear a motion to accept the agenda as  
5 amended?

6

7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: So moved.

8

9 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Motion made by Pete  
10 Squartsoff.

11

12 MR. HOLMES: Second.

13

14 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Second by Pat. All in  
15 favor signify by saying aye.

16

17 IN UNISON: Aye.

18

19 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

20

21 (No opposing votes)

22

23 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried. And  
24 maybe just for the purpose of the recorder, please do state  
25 your name before you start talking, that would help him.

26

27 The next item on the agenda is the review  
28 and adoption of minutes, March 18 through the 19th, 2002 in  
29 Kodiak. It's Tab C in your book.

30

31 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Move to adopt March 18, 19,  
32 2002.

33

34 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

35

36 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: There's a motion made  
37 and seconded on the floor, is there any discussion?

38

39 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chairman, it seems to  
40 be pretty accurate but I notice that on Page 15 and 16  
41 there on the customary and traditional trade is that some  
42 of the discussions there, I was looking for some of Pete's  
43 comments and some of mine and some of the other members and  
44 it doesn't seem to have a complete coverage of the  
45 discussion. I'm getting old and I can't really remember  
46 who said what but it seems like it doesn't quite give a  
47 complete coverage of those comments but I may be mistaken.

48

49 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Pat, do you have any  
50 wording that you'd particularly like to put in there, I

00006

1 mean, this is the time to do it.

2

3 MR. HOLMES: Well, I remember Pete made a  
4 really good comment and Al Cratty's discussions also on  
5 that subsistence is just a really important cultural value  
6 and that the sale of it is something that really requires  
7 a lot of thought. I can't quite paraphrase what the  
8 discussions were but, you know, I think the Council was  
9 bringing quite a bit there on the sale and I know I had  
10 some questions on the sale outside of the community. I  
11 know within a community that's existed for many years and  
12 on the first motion I voted in the affirmative but on the  
13 second motion I know Al and I had some questions on it. I  
14 guess maybe I'd ask Al if he could recall what some of the  
15 discussions were to the negatives on that whole -- because  
16 I think he and I voted against the second motion.

17

18 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Michelle, what is the  
19 process if we needed to go back to the tapes to figure out  
20 what was discussed in that section?

21

22 MS. CHIVERS: Well, we have transcripts.

23

24 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Does the Council want to  
25 leave this set of minutes until our next meeting and  
26 hopefully get a better draft from the tapes to find out  
27 what exactly was recorded?

28

29 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair.

30

31 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Vince.

32

33 MR. TUTIAKOFF: On a roll call vote on Page  
34 17 it says roll call and the vote was six and three, six  
35 yes and three no, I think this is where Pat is saying that  
36 when you do a roll call you list the individual names.

37

38 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Uh-huh.

39

40 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I think it's proper to do  
41 that. I'd like these minutes to reflect that the names  
42 should be listed on the roll call and it's requested. I  
43 think that's important, not only for us to know what we  
44 voted on two months, six months or a year later than argue  
45 about what we.....

46

47 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: We do have a motion on  
48 the floor at this time. Does the Council want to rescind  
49 that motion and have these minutes brought back to the next  
50 meeting?

00007

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I would move to adopt with  
2 amendments to be added that the roll call votes names be  
3 added and the comments by Mr. Holmes be inserted under  
4 discussion on Page, I believe 16 -- 15 and 16 -- 16, I  
5 think for -- and with that I'd approve the rest of the  
6 minutes. Is there a second?

7

8 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

9

10 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pat, is that sufficient?

11

12 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, all I was searching for  
13 was just like a majority and minority opinions when we have  
14 a difference of view. And I'm not just searching for my  
15 comments because I thought that Pete raised some good  
16 comments even though he voted in the affirmative and, you  
17 know, just to reflect that the Council put a great deal of  
18 heart and soul into their thoughts on those questions.

19

20 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: And also for the record  
21 in the future for roll call votes, that they be listed by  
22 name and the way the person voted.

23

24 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Question on the amendment.

25

26 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Question called. All in  
27 favor -- oh, I'm sorry.

28

29 MR. TUTIAKOFF: On the amendment.

30

31 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Question on the  
32 amendment. Okay, all in favor signify by saying aye.

33

34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35

36 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

37

38 (No opposing votes)

39

40 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried. And  
41 then we have a motion on the main motion, was to accept the  
42 minutes.

43

44 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Question.

45

46 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Question's been called.  
47 All in favor signify by saying aye.

48

49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

00008

1 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

2

3 (No opposing votes)

4

5 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried. The  
6 next item on the agenda is the Chair's report and I was not  
7 able to attend this meeting so therefore I will turn this  
8 over to Paul Gundersen who attended on my behalf. And that  
9 is on Tab D.

10

11 MR. GUNDERSEN: Okay, good morning. My  
12 name is Paul Gundersen. I attended this meeting on May  
13 12th, 2002 in Anchorage for Della. I've looked over the  
14 minutes of this meeting and everything was pretty much  
15 spelled out. There was some issues that were brought up  
16 that brought up some questions being different user groups,  
17 in fact, everything is pretty much spelled out in the  
18 minutes so if you get a chance to go over those they'll  
19 fill you in to pretty much what happened.

20

21 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Are there any questions  
22 for Paul.

23

24 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Pete Squartsoff,  
25 Madame Chair. Paul, was there a lot more discussion on  
26 these issues than what's listed here or is everything  
27 listed?

28

29 MR. GUNDERSEN: From what I looked at and  
30 remember, just about anything that had any significance  
31 that we touched on was reflected in these minutes.

32

33 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Any other questions or  
34 discussions. Pat.

35

36 MR. HOLMES: I thought there were some  
37 pretty weighty comments in here and it gave me a lot to  
38 think about. And one thing, when I brought a copy of this  
39 over to the tribal council, you know, they had some  
40 difficulty wading some of these abbreviations and I  
41 suggested to some of the Staff when we had coffee yesterday  
42 that maybe the first time they have an abbreviation in a  
43 report, if they could list it out in full that would make  
44 it easier for lay people and folks who aren't familiar with  
45 the RAC process to understand who the players are and what  
46 some of these abbreviations mean.

47

48 I'm kind of a freshman in this and I'm kind  
49 of getting an idea now, but just to make it easier for the  
50 general public when they're trying to see what happens in

00009

1 the process so they know what some of these abbreviations  
2 are.

3

4 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'd like to make a  
5 comment, right from the very beginning on number 1, got me  
6 concerned right away, under Council nominations and  
7 membership balance, the very first one, Chair concerns,  
8 what Bill Thomas considered -- that was just one of the  
9 ones I checked and then I went to the next page and number  
10 4, late information from ADF&G. Then number 7, Grace  
11 Cross, some of the issues resolved locally. But that was  
12 some of -- and then I went all the way through -- no, this  
13 one doesn't even have a page number, I guess just joint  
14 Chairs meeting, Page 35 and then after that the next page,  
15 item number 2, 3 and 4. And then I am very concerned about  
16 what the Chair or Bill was saying about a lot of this  
17 stuff, we have noticed that the role of the RACs appears to  
18 be getting diluted with much more attention given to ADF&G.  
19 RAC continues to be central to this program. ADF&G has  
20 continued to challenge the info that RACs bring to the  
21 table during their meetings. RAC members are key sources  
22 for getting the subsistence info from the communities.

23

24 So I mean it just goes on with stuff ADF&G  
25 and we have very little ADF&G representation at our  
26 meetings, nobody that we can really question about some of  
27 these issues.

28

29 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pete. Any  
30 other comments or discussion. Vince.

31

32 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I think that these are all  
33 very comments and I think these get right to the heart of  
34 what the RACs are having to debate amongst themselves and  
35 in public. And some of our discussions earlier this  
36 morning, prior to our meeting, were a direct relationship  
37 of how the RACs are being utilized. I have a concern that  
38 a majority of our discussions, our opinions and our  
39 directions and motions to the Federal Subsistence Board  
40 itself are being watered down by outside influences. And  
41 I get right to the point that we, I think that as a Board  
42 need to write a letter to Mr. Tom....

43

44 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: It's in the agenda, too.

45

46 MR. TUTIAKOFF: It is. Okay, well, when we  
47 get to that one. But these comments that Bill Thomas and  
48 some of the others have made, I think that we have to  
49 evaluate and I think that it would be a good idea to take  
50 this whole discussion regarding the Council Chair's meeting

00010

1 and get it to the village councils and ask them to give us  
2 input on what they feel our direction should be in regard  
3 to some of these comments. Because if we don't, in two to  
4 three years, we won't have input. We'll be just a  
5 governing body with no authority to do anything but sitting  
6 at two meetings a year because we've been directed to by  
7 the Office of Subsistence Management.

8

9 I think these are all good comments. And  
10 I'd ask that the Chair send copies of these to all the  
11 village council members, presidents and also AFN.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pete.

16

17 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, there was one more  
18 that I just wanted to -- number 19, I checked off a couple  
19 of them. Like the third paragraph there, next week there's  
20 a collaborative meeting in Juneau concerning interaction  
21 with RACs but no RACs were invited from the State.

22

23 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Is there any other  
24 discussion.

25

26 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Move to approve the report  
27 of the RAC Council Chairs.

28

29 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Motion on the floor by  
30 Vince Tutiakoff to approve the Chair's report, is there a  
31 second.

32

33 MR. LUKIN: I got....

34

35 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Second by Ivan  
36 Lukin....

37

38 MR. LUKIN: I got one question.

39

40 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Oh, I'm sorry, Ivan, go  
41 ahead.

42

43 MR. LUKIN: Okay. There's a comment by  
44 Judy and I was trying to look to see in the front to see  
45 who she -- oh, Judy Gottlieb, something like that -- change  
46 is coming, we should do what we can to ease this change.  
47 We should encourage RAC Chairs to make sure that  
48 subsistence uses are heard -- now the comment that Pete  
49 just made is, you know, nobody's listening to us.

50

00011

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: What page are you on?

2

3 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Okay, the third page  
4 past that tab.

5

6 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Oh, I see.

7

8 MR. LUKIN: Nobody wants to hear. What I'm  
9 getting here from some of this is nobody wants to hear some  
10 of the stuff that we have to say. So I think this group  
11 needs to be heard.

12

13 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: We do have a motion on  
14 the floor at this time.

15

16 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Council Chair report.

17

18 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: To accept the Council  
19 Chair report as presented.

20

21 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Question.

22

23 MR. GUNDERSEN: Did you make a motion?

24

25 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yes, I did.

26

27 MR. HOLMES: Second.

28

29 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Question.

30

31 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Second by Pat Holmes,  
32 call for question, question's been called. All in favor  
33 signify by saying aye.

34

35 IN UNISON: Aye.

36

37 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

38

39 (No opposing votes)

40

41 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried.

42

43 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, is a  
44 directive in order rather than a motion that these get out  
45 to the tribal and AFN.

46

47 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Maybe for the record, a  
48 Council consensus.

49

50 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Okay. I'd ask the Council

00012

1 consensus that these go to the tribal governments and AFN  
2 for review and information.

3

4 (No opposing votes)

5

6 MR. TUTIAKOFF: No objections.

7

8 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Also, Vince, maybe we  
9 can add, when we get this letter together and we finalize  
10 that tomorrow it can be added to that.

11

12 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Right.

13

14 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

17

18 MR. HOLMES: I was wondering if you might  
19 get a broader distribution and maybe once you have your  
20 information proposed that you also consider having the  
21 Staff maybe -- I know a lot of small communities like Port  
22 Lions, the library is sort of an important place for people  
23 to gather information and maybe go for a broader  
24 distribution because I know there's a lot of folks in  
25 Kodiak with tribal background and long-term subsistence use  
26 and that might be another point where they could get  
27 information. Just so you have a little broader  
28 distribution.

29

30 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, maybe it  
31 would be appropriate to discuss who we're going to send  
32 this between the 3:00 and 4:00 working session and we can  
33 throw a list together.

34

35 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Okay. We are on Item  
36 No. 7, Council member reports. Are there any reports?  
37 That is the letter from the last -- statewide subsistence  
38 meeting and the action taken at that meeting and, Paul also  
39 attended that on my behalf. And correct me, Paul, I think  
40 everything on our proposals were on consent agenda; is that  
41 correct? Where we're at is on the very back of Tab D,  
42 there's a letter.

43

44 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Page 43.

45

46 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Page 43.

47

48 MR. GUNDERSEN: Let me look at this for a  
49 second to jog my memory.

50

00013

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, this is a  
2 report from the Federal Subsistence Board Chair in regards  
3 to our proposals. Proposal 02-47 (A) and (B) was a  
4 deferred proposal so is that going to come up again here  
5 for discussion later?

6  
7 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Are there any questions,  
8 discussions for Paul? Hearing none, we will move on.

9  
10 The next item on the agenda is Item No. 8,  
11 election of officers.

12  
13 MR. TUTIAKOFF: What about Council member  
14 reports?

15  
16 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: That was that one.

17  
18 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Okay.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: We just did that.

21  
22 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Okay.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: At this time I'd like to  
25 open the floor.....

26  
27 MR. TUTIAKOFF: No.....

28  
29 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Oh, I'm sorry.

30  
31 MR. TUTIAKOFF: .....the coordinator takes  
32 over.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Oh, I'm sorry, okay.

35  
36 MS. CHIVERS: Thank you, Madame Chair. At  
37 this time I'd like to open the floor for nominations for  
38 the Chair for the Council.

39  
40 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I nominate Della Trumble.

41  
42 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Second. Move to close.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Is there a second?

45  
46 MR. LUKIN: Second.

47  
48 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Second by Ivan. All in  
49 favor signify by saying aye.

50

00014

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you.

4

5 MR. TUTIAKOFF: 10 seconds of fame.

6

7 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: 10 seconds of fame.

8

9 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Once a year.

10

11 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: At this time I'd like to  
12 open the floor to vice chair.

13

14 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, I'd like to  
15 move that all -- the vice chair and the secretary currently  
16 in position remain and move.

17

18 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

19

20 MS. CHIVERS: Who seconded that?

21

22 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Question.

23

24 MR. HOLMES: I'd like to concur with the  
25 motion maker and the second, both Ms. Trumble and the  
26 current Board of officers here, I think they've done a  
27 really swell job and I'd sure like to see them continue.

28

29 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I concur and being on the  
30 rope to be reappointed this next round, I guess we won't  
31 know for another, what, seven or eight months -- who are  
32 the other members that are up for.....

33

34 MR. CRATTY: Me.

35

36 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Al.

37

38 MR. LUKIN: I am.

39

40 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Ivan and myself. So if we  
41 are not here for the next meeting, good luck.

42

43 MR. CRATTY: Yeah.

44

45 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Question.

46

47 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Question, all in favor  
48 signify by saying aye.

49

50 IN UNISON: Aye.

00015

1 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

2

3 (No opposing votes)

4

5 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried. One  
6 more year.

7

8 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Vince.

11

12 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I see on maybe during our  
13 working session the question about members missing  
14 meetings, maybe you can give us some advice for that  
15 working session so we can come out tomorrow with a  
16 directive for our members who have not attended the  
17 meeting. That would resolve it rather than discuss it  
18 here.

19

20 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Any other items or  
21 discussion. Hearing none, we will move on. We have public  
22 testimony, open floor to public comments of the Federal  
23 Subsistence Program. Is there anyone in the audience at  
24 this time that would like to speak to the Council? I  
25 believe for the most part we have Fish and Wildlife Staff  
26 and ADF&G.

27

28 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, I'd ask that  
29 the Board give consideration for any public comment any  
30 time during the process until we adjourn. Because I know  
31 we may have people flying in from other communities that  
32 haven't made it here due to weather. I think if they do  
33 make it here and they do sit down that we give an  
34 opportunity to make comment.

35

36 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. Moving right  
37 along here, we're at Item No. 10, fishery proposal review  
38 and Regional Council recommendation, Tab F [sic].  
39 Introduction of proposal and analysis. Pat. These tabs in  
40 here, you've got some of them that are right across and  
41 some of them that are on top where the item is and some of  
42 them on the bottom so it is a bit confusing. Yeah, it's  
43 Tab E.

44

45 MS. PETRIVELLI: My name's Pat Petrivelli  
46 and I'm the anthropologist for the Kodiak/Aleutians region.  
47 I'm not the author of this proposal but it is  
48 anthropological in nature. George Sherrod was the author.  
49 And it's in Tab E on Page 55 it starts and it's Proposal  
50 27. And actually the actual analysis starts on Page 57.

00016

1           This proposal was submitted by the Office  
2 of Subsistence Management in a request that the Board  
3 establish a statewide regulation allowing the taking of  
4 fish for religious and ceremonial potlatch purposes while  
5 Federal Subsistence regulations allow for the taking of  
6 wildlife for outside of proposed seasons and harvest limits  
7 for ceremonial purposes. Currently no such provisions  
8 exist for the taking of fish. And it should be noted that  
9 for most fish species, existing open seasons and harvest  
10 limits already provide an opportunity to take fish that may  
11 be used in ceremonial and religious activities but this is  
12 just for the taking of fish outside of those established  
13 seasons or limits.

14  
15           George went through the existing  
16 regulations with the different provisions for ceremonial  
17 usage and that's on Page 58. Just for like wildlife  
18 provisions there's special provisions in 13 of the 26  
19 wildlife management units and in those instances, those  
20 harvesting outside, the provisions that have been provided  
21 or required is information about the activity and then in  
22 case of a funerary or mortuary ceremony, the name of the  
23 decedent, reporting of the species, sex, number, location  
24 and timing of harvest and then the name and address of  
25 harvester. So that's basically all the similarities of the  
26 things that have been required for ceremonial purposes.

27  
28           George went through the background of when  
29 subsistence foods are provided and it's mostly in the  
30 literature, the best description is in Rifles, Blankets and  
31 Beads because usually we just describe the nature of their  
32 ceremony he didn't describe what was actually provided.

33  
34           The biological portion, George discussed  
35 how there's liberal fishing harvest and season limits and  
36 the only restrictions that would be recommended are for  
37 salmon and steelhead trout and, he states a proposed limit  
38 on salmon and steelhead trout would not equally effect  
39 subsistence uses in all parts of the state because of  
40 temporal and geographic distributions but steelhead trout  
41 has been documented along the Aleutian Chain but data,  
42 distribution in the Bering Sea is limited. Salmon are rare  
43 more at the Kotzebue Sound but both are only available in  
44 freshwater seasonally.

45  
46           And then he goes on for the effect of the  
47 proposal. Adoption of this regulation would have minimal  
48 impacts upon the salmon and steelhead populations. And  
49 then he recommends adoption of the proposal. He's made one  
50 change since then and it was a change brought up from the

00017

1 North Slope meeting and it's on Page 60. And it's changing  
2 an and to an or and it's the and in the very first  
3 sentence. And it would read the taking of fish from  
4 Federal waters is authorized outside of published open  
5 seasons or harvest limits if the harvested fish will be  
6 used for fish in traditional religious ceremonies which are  
7 part of a funerary or mortuary cycles including memorial  
8 potlatches provided that, and then of course it goes on to  
9 list the restrictions. So it would just change the and to  
10 an or. And the North Slope Council supported adoption of  
11 this proposal as modified with the or.

12

13 And the justification provided is adoption  
14 of the proposal would recognize the importance of fish in  
15 Alaska Native ceremonial and religious activities. The  
16 regulatory language provides for the conservation of salmon  
17 and steelhead stocks and the Federal Subsistence Program  
18 has modified regulations to allow the taking of wildlife  
19 for ceremonial and religious purposes. This regulation  
20 would extend the same opportunities for the taking of fish  
21 in those ceremonies with the same general restrictions of  
22 reporting.

23

24 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, I have a  
25 question for Pat.

26

27 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Go ahead.

28

29 MR. TUTIAKOFF: What's the purpose of  
30 requesting the name of the decedent, the parties involve,  
31 the clans involved; what's the purpose of that? That seems  
32 to me it has nothing to do with, you know, the ceremony.  
33 I mean that seems to be going back to the '60s again. Is  
34 this a State issue, I mean I've seen that before. But I  
35 just don't understand why they want to know -- it's like  
36 rounding up the Mafia or something and putting it on a  
37 list, I mean that's bologna.

38

39 MR. HOLMES: Maybe they want to write the  
40 obituary.

41

42 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Well, no, you know, I don't  
43 know if it's offensive to a lot of people but I know that  
44 the elder people really don't like to have their name  
45 splattered all over the newspaper about, well, we're having  
46 a ceremony blah, blah, blah and it might be a good report  
47 for the Fish and Wildlife Service reporting, you know, but  
48 once you give your name to a Federal agency -- you know, a  
49 lot of people don't like to do that regardless of whether  
50 it's for ceremonial purposes or not.

00018

1 I'd like to ask the question and I want to  
2 know where it came from and why it has to be reported? Who  
3 wrote this?

4  
5 MS. PETRIVELLI: I don't know exactly but  
6 I would think that it might deal with the idea of when a  
7 manager -- when you're managing it and you know someone's  
8 going to be out there illegally taking -- well, technically  
9 when they go and request the permit then they would be  
10 given permission to take it legally, but so that the  
11 manager would know who's going out there to take it. And  
12 then if there's any larger communities, in Southeast when  
13 there's a number of clans involved in different -- so that  
14 they would know that if multiple people are contacting they  
15 would know who's been in contact with the manager.

16  
17 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yeah, I don't think that's  
18 what it's referring to here. I didn't read it that way.  
19 It's read more to me like it's attempting to take the fish,  
20 period and to provide the name of the decedents, the nature  
21 of the ceremony, the parties and clans involved. I mean  
22 that goes way beyond an individual going out and setting  
23 his gillnet for 20 fish for a potlatch. I mean he's the  
24 only one involved, maybe two or three others, I don't mind  
25 that being named. But you have to name your whole  
26 individual families, the communities that may be -- you  
27 might have families coming from another community to be  
28 there. You know, I don't know if that's appropriate to  
29 name everybody who's at a potlatch.

30  
31 MS. PETRIVELLI: It might not be the  
32 members of all but just the idea that it's -- because  
33 there's like.....

34  
35 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I think it ought to be  
36 specific and say if you're attempting to take fish, provide  
37 the name of that individual or individuals involved with  
38 taking the fish and leave it at that. I don't agree with  
39 the nature of the ceremony, that's none of their business  
40 and all these other issues. I mean those are private  
41 cultural issues. And being a cultural -- having a potlatch  
42 and things like that, those should be private and held  
43 within that clan. I mean if you're giving the nature of  
44 the ceremony, why -- you know, a lot of clans and maybe in  
45 Southeast and those up in, maybe the Interior, have special  
46 ceremonies that are non-public, I mean they're private.  
47 And if you have to lay them out in writing to the district  
48 manager or whoever, the fishery manager, there then you've  
49 given it to the whole world and that's going to be -- I  
50 don't think a lot of people are going to do that. And I

00019

1 think if it's primarily written because of that purpose,  
2 people are not going to do it.

3

4 MS. PETRIVELLI: So you could recommend  
5 modifying the language and then just saying what you would  
6 think would be necessary, the person harvesting and then  
7 the species, the amount of fish that is proposed to be  
8 taken. Because I'm sure the manager would want to know --  
9 well, particularly with salmon or steelhead, you know, if  
10 there is conservation concerns.

11

12 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Well, I don't mind, you  
13 know, say myself and maybe my boys listing as the ones that  
14 are going to go out and get the fish but I'm not going to  
15 list the nature of the ceremony and what it's all about.  
16 I'm not going to list who's going to be there. I don't  
17 think it's any of their business. That's why we're having  
18 a potlatch is to commemorate those individuals that died,  
19 not to give out the whole purpose.

20

21 I think it ought to be modified and I'm  
22 waiting for members to make recommendations.

23

24 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Madame Chair. I agree  
25 with Vince on that. I feel for our region,  
26 Kodiak/Aleutians, each person in your household is allowed  
27 to take 25 salmon, the only thing different I see here is  
28 adding steelhead.

29

30 MR. LUKIN: I was going to say I got a  
31 problem with that. You could take 2,500 salmon and 500  
32 steelhead for....

33

34 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Ivan, you need your mike  
35 please and state your name.

36

37 MR. LUKIN: I'm not....

38

39 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Oh, okay. Do you want  
40 to take out the name of the decedents and the parties and  
41 clans involved and just prior to, attempt to take fish to  
42 provide the nature of the ceremony and if you're saying for  
43 purposes of a funeral or a potlatch, just basically be more  
44 generic.

45

46 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I would like to ask that  
47 the Section A, Page 60, person or designee or designees  
48 organizing the ceremony contact the appropriate Federal  
49 fisheries manager prior to attempting to take fish to -- to  
50 take fish, period.

00020

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: And just drop down to no  
2 more than 25 salmon or five steelhead may be taken.

3

4 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Right.

5

6 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Uh-huh.

7

8 MR. TUTIAKOFF: And scratch all the rest of  
9 that out because specie and the number of fish to be taken  
10 in Federal waters when the harvest will occur is addressed  
11 in that next sentence which says no more than 25 or five  
12 steelhead may be taken.

13

14 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: You know, we jumped all  
15 the way through -- we're kind of doing the Regional Council  
16 deliberations.

17

18 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Well, then we can do it  
19 later then, just remember when we get to that.

20

21 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Got it.

22

23 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I would think it would  
24 depend on the.....

25

26 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Maybe just a point of  
27 order we do have on this section, Regional Council  
28 deliberation, recommendations and justification and we can  
29 work on this wording and Vince can read it again through  
30 that process.

31

32 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Okay. We're just going  
33 through the recommendations now.

34

35 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: At this point, are there  
36 any other questions for Pat in regard to her portion of  
37 this?

38

39 Hearing none, Alaska Department of Fish and  
40 Game comments.

41

42 MS. CHIVERS: I could read those for the  
43 record.

44

45 MR. HOLMES: Well, Madame Chair, I had one  
46 question that just came to mind after you stopped, if it's  
47 okay? Never mind, I'll just ask Pat afterwards.

48

49 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Yeah.

50

00021

1 MS. CHIVERS: Madame Chair, for the record,  
2 I'll go ahead and read the ADF&G comments. They were  
3 neutral on this. The Department is neutral on this  
4 proposal and will defer most comments until the Staff  
5 analysis is available. However, we recommend that  
6 ceremonial harvest be subject to the regulatory controls  
7 for conservation purposes of a harvest limit by species,  
8 area and time along with a timely reporting mechanism. Is  
9 this really a regional Southeast proposal rather than a  
10 statewide? That was their comment.

11  
12 Thank you.

13  
14 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Michelle.  
15 Any questions or discussions for Michelle?

16  
17 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I just feel it should be  
18 more regional than statewide.

19  
20 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I read the ADF&G comments  
21 as being -- they're opposed to it only if there is  
22 regulatory -- State regulatory guidelines in place. So  
23 basically I think I read their comment as they're being  
24 opposed to any ceremonial taking of fish.

25  
26 MR. LUKIN: I would like to say something.  
27 I do have a little problem with the numbers and it comes  
28 because of the size of the community. You know, you can  
29 get some of these communities that have got a lot more  
30 people than some of us in these smaller villages and you  
31 know, you look at 25 fish or 30 fish and you got 600 people  
32 that are going to get involved in this thing, you know, you  
33 got a problem with 30 fish, I would think.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Any other discussion.  
36 Pat.

37  
38 MR. HOLMES: Well, I think this is a really  
39 great concept to get a system set up. I know in this neck  
40 of the woods if somebody needed fish for something or if I  
41 were to croak, I'd sure like Pete to go out and catch me a  
42 fresh king if he came to my memorial service. But I know  
43 that one really only needs at least -- the folks I know to  
44 call in and say, hey we need to get some fish and they say,  
45 well, go for it Pete and we'll just give you an extra fish  
46 for your permit or whatever, just because I think it's  
47 really important. So I think it's great to get this down  
48 as an attempted program.

49  
50 To go along with Pete's question, if this

00022

1 is something more regional or statewide, either way I'd go  
2 for it.

3

4 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pat, maybe we could add  
5 that to the Regional Council deliberations, that question.

6

7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, to answer what Pat  
8 said. You know, like I have been requested to get king  
9 salmon in the wintertime for different things but now the  
10 State went and made it a five annual limit. So I think it  
11 would have to be a State thing because where we live we're  
12 not on Federal.

13

14 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Okay, we're going to  
15 move on to other Federal, State and tribal agency comments.  
16 Michelle.

17

18 MS. CHIVERS: At this time I don't know of  
19 any other comments from other Federal agency Staff.  
20 Nobody's coming up to the microphone to speak and there are  
21 no written comments as well. Oh, I'm sorry, Glenn.

22

23 MR. CHEN: Yes, my name is Glenn Chen, BIA  
24 Staff committee member. I would like to follow up on a  
25 comment that Mr. Ivan Lukin brought up earlier and that is  
26 his question about the necessity of having a 25 salmon or  
27 a five steelhead limit specified. If you looked in Section  
28 B, there is a provision there to restricted number of fish  
29 already designated in that section. And so it's either  
30 redundant, A and B would either be redundant or in contrast  
31 to each other. But there is provision in Section B for the  
32 manager to specify how many fish to be taken.

33

34 So I just wanted to point that out. Thank  
35 you.

36

37 MS. FOX: Madame Chair, I also wanted to  
38 offer a couple of comments.

39

40 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Peggy.

41

42 MS. FOX: Thank you, Madame Chair, Council  
43 members. I wanted to offer a couple of comments on the  
44 discussion. That is to say that first of all this whole  
45 idea is to kind of provide a parallel regulation under  
46 fisheries that already exists under wildlife, and it is for  
47 the taking of fish outside the season or beyond the harvest  
48 limit. So you know it would be in addition to any fish  
49 you've already taken or any household or any individual has  
50 already taken.

00023

1           And the reason then for tracking the  
2 purpose of the ceremony and it is intended to be generic,  
3 it was never intended to try to find out in detail exactly  
4 what's going on for any purposes of questioning it or, you  
5 know, sharing that information with anyone else. It's  
6 strictly for the purposes of legitimizing the taking  
7 outside of the season or beyond the harvest limits and to  
8 protect the people that are doing this from being cited by  
9 somebody else, by enforcement who doesn't have that  
10 information -- the only persons then that would have this  
11 information would be the local manager plus any enforcement  
12 people that might be in the area so that's the whole  
13 reason for reporting who is taking the fish and why and  
14 indicating, you know, the numbers that are allowable and so  
15 on.

16  
17           If you will note, this gives the local  
18 manager the authority to issue or approve this taking up to  
19 25 salmon or five steelhead.

20  
21           Now, if the request is for 50 or 100 or  
22 150, all that means is it goes to the Board. And it does  
23 not say that you cannot take anymore than 25 or five or  
24 that you're restricted to salmon or steelhead. Perhaps  
25 there's some other species of interest that is under  
26 Federal jurisdiction. All this does is give the local  
27 manager limited delegated authority to deal within the  
28 framework of 25 salmon, five steelhead and monitor the  
29 permit as needed for conservation reasons or other reasons.

30  
31  
32           So I wanted to just try to offer a little  
33 bit of perspective there, if that helps the Council.

34  
35           CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pete.

36  
37           MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Madame Chair, like  
38 I mentioned before, like Kodiak we have a subsistence  
39 permit for 25 salmon from January 1 until December 31 and  
40 if that's filled you can renew it and get another one. So  
41 that's why I think this should be more regional than  
42 statewide because we already have a set program for Kodiak.

43  
44           MR. GUNDERSEN: It doesn't just address the  
45 ceremonial -- well, it's just for subsistence?

46  
47           MR. SQUARTSOFF: You could just get it on  
48 your own permit. What's the difference and if you fill  
49 that you can get another one.

50

00024

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Vince.

4

5 MR. SQUARTSOFF: It seems to me like this  
6 is trying to -- so you're limited to 25 fish.

7

8 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, under this  
9 whole process there is no permit required for taking of  
10 fish for the traditional ceremonies. This is just for a  
11 request, it does not affect the permit system and maybe  
12 that's the problem, everybody looks at it like it's a  
13 permit. And I think if Fish and Wildlife fisheries  
14 managers are going to somehow keep track and as Peggy says,  
15 you know, to keep track of what's going on, how are they  
16 going to do that without a permit or some kind of written  
17 authorization of the individual in hand? You know, when  
18 you go out subsistence fishing with a net, you got to have  
19 this permit on you and that would stop the enforcement  
20 problem. If he's not aware of it then, you know, how is he  
21 going to become aware? You don't have something and he's  
22 out there 10 miles from the community getting the salmon,  
23 how is he going to tell this guy that this is what he's  
24 doing?

25

26 It's kind of contradictory but I'm not  
27 supportive of having a permit. I'm just saying, how are  
28 you going to tell individuals and enforcement guy who  
29 follows you out there and doesn't know what you're doing,  
30 how are you going to stop them from -- stopping you to get  
31 the fish and, you know, creating all the problems you  
32 already have by having a -- you know, having to have a  
33 ceremony and then have this on top of it? I mean other  
34 than -- that's why I say I'm opposed to all this other  
35 information being out there because it's going to get to  
36 the people who don't need to have it, people who write the  
37 books about how this Native culture is being run.

38

39 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pete.

40

41 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, I guess I see it as  
42 the Federal people just want to have a permitting system  
43 like the State, is that what this is after?

44

45 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Peggy.

46

47 MS. FOX: We have every intent of trying to  
48 minimize the amount of permits that are issued. It is,  
49 from an administration, a nightmare to think about issuing  
50 permits all over the state every time somebody wants to do

00025

1 something. No. And I don't think that even Fish and Game  
2 is interested in doing that. We only do that when it's  
3 absolutely necessary because it's just an administrative  
4 nightmare to, you know, get the permits to people on time,  
5 to administer them, you know, get the information back.  
6 Like I say, if there's a conservation concern, that would  
7 be the primary reason we would issue a permit because we  
8 want to track how many fish are being taken for  
9 conservation reasons. Or, you know, if there's a bunch of  
10 enforcement problems in a particular area. But no, it's  
11 not our intent to expand permitting or restricting, if you  
12 will, because that's an additional restriction as the way  
13 we see it as well and we don't want to do that.

14

15 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Peggy. I  
16 guess I look at this and I recognize the concerns, I think,  
17 where it's asking for too much information and it needs to  
18 be made more generic. But I also look at this from the  
19 regions that are limited to a certain amount of subsistence  
20 permits and various times of the year and there are times  
21 of the year that they do need over and above that and I  
22 think this allows them without too much trouble being able  
23 to access that and also keep them within the guidelines.

24

25 Michelle, were there any written -- you  
26 said there were not any written public comments?

27

28 MS. CHIVERS: Thank you, Madame Chair,  
29 there are no written public comments at this time.

30

31 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Public testimony. Okay,  
32 now we can continue with the Regional Council  
33 deliberations. Pat.

34

35 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, I assume I'm  
36 hardly in agreement with the comments that have been made  
37 with this concept, this proposal. But I would assume that  
38 this would provide direction to the North Pacific Fisheries  
39 Management Council for their species and the international  
40 species like halibut that, you know, those things would be  
41 included in -- you know, if they modify their regulations  
42 or this regulation would supersede the Federal one; is that  
43 correct?

44

45 MR. GUNDERSEN: Yeah, I think so.

46

47 MR. HOLMES: I was wondering about that  
48 because at my ceremony, I want 200,000 pounds of king crab.

49

50 (Laughter)

00026

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I think where it effects  
2 the halibut issue, you'd have to write up a separate  
3 proposal identifying just halibut because this only refers  
4 to salmon, it does not refer to any other specie.

5  
6 MS. PETRIVELLI: I don't think we regulate  
7 halibut.

8  
9 MR. TUTIAKOFF: That's what I'm saying. It  
10 would have to come out as a proposal to the Halibut  
11 Commission itself.

12  
13 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, I guess going  
14 along with that line of logic, I'd like to see that, you  
15 know, we probably will pass this proposal but perhaps a  
16 letter of intent go to the Federal Subsistence Board asking  
17 them to develop, you know, similar things for halibut and  
18 other Federal species like that that are bound up in  
19 treaties and things. Because I know some communities out  
20 west here, you know, halibut, Atka or Nikolski or something  
21 like that, at certain times of the year are, you know, more  
22 accessible species and would probably be used for a funeral  
23 ceremony or things of that sort. So I think those, what  
24 other species that are covered under treaty rights or  
25 Federal management should also be addressed in a similar  
26 proposal if that's necessary.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. Is there any  
29 other discussion. Maybe looking at this proposal and if we  
30 took Section -- Item A, we had some discussion there  
31 earlier, maybe if we could look at that section at this  
32 time, on Page 53.

33  
34 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, I'd ask that  
35 the proposal FP03-27 be amended and I ask that the Section  
36 A to read person or persons, designee, organizing the  
37 ceremony contacts the appropriate Federal fisheries manager  
38 prior to attempting to taking fish and that no more than 25  
39 or five steelhead be taken.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: So at this time.....

42  
43 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

44  
45 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: .....you want to take  
46 out the sections to provide the name of the decedent and  
47 nature?

48  
49 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Let me reread that. Where  
50 I -- fisheries manager prior to attempting to take fish --

00027

1 to be take -- and to be taken from the Federal waters from  
2 which the harvest will occur, no more than 25 -- I guess I  
3 got to write it out for you. What I wanted to strike is  
4 everything between to provide to.....

5  
6 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: You want to strike out  
7 to provide the name of the decedents, the nature of the  
8 ceremony and the parties and/or clans involved.

9  
10 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Right. Scratch all that  
11 out, that'd be a lot easier. And leave the rest.

12  
13 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: So you basically want a  
14 period after fish attempting to take fish and then continue  
15 on the next sentence, species, number of fish taken and the  
16 Federal -- from the Federal.....

17  
18 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Right.

19  
20 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

21  
22 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: We have a motion made by  
23 Vince to amend Section (A) on 27, and a second by Pete  
24 Squartsoff. Discussion.

25  
26 MR. CRATTY: Call the question.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Question's been called.  
29 Speridon. That microphone, please.

30  
31 MR. SIMEONOFF: Would this change reflect  
32 on all areas in the proposal that mentions ceremonial  
33 purposes?

34  
35 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yes.

36  
37 MR. SIMEONOFF: Okay, thank you.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Any other discussion.  
40 Question's been called. All in favor of the amendment to  
41 Section (A) signify by saying aye.

42  
43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44  
45 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

46  
47 (No opposing votes)

48  
49 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: We'll continue on to  
50 Section (B).

00028

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I have no changes myself on  
2 (B), maybe somebody else does.

3  
4 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Hearing no discussion,  
5 Section (C).

6  
7 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I don't know, I'll ask the  
8 same question here, what is the purpose to have the  
9 decedent for whom the -- is that just for -- I don't  
10 understand -- well, I guess I wouldn't have a problem as  
11 long as -- if you're having a ceremony it better be  
12 somebody that's dead and not your dog or something. I mean  
13 if you have a pet or something and you named that -- I  
14 don't have a problem with it I guess, it's more that it has  
15 to do with another region -- other regions, I guess.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: You might want to just  
18 strike that out, the name of decedent, because we've taken  
19 it out on Section (A).

20  
21 MR. GUNDERSEN: Yeah, take it out on the  
22 top one so we'd want to realign it.

23  
24 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Move it then.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Do I hear a motion to  
27 that effect?

28  
29 MR. SIMEONOFF: So moved.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Motion made by Speridon.

32 Second.

33  
34 MR. GUNDERSEN: Second.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Paul Gundersen. To  
37 remove the last section of Section (C) and the name of the  
38 decedent for whom the ceremony was held. Discussion.  
39 Question. All in favor signify by saying aye.

40  
41 IN UNISON: Aye.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

44  
45 (No opposing votes)

46  
47 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried. We'll  
48 move on to Section (D) of 27. Hearing no discussion or  
49 questions or comments, do I hear a motion to accept FP03-27  
50 as amended?

00029

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I thought I made a motion  
2 to approve Proposal 27 with amendments and specifically we  
3 went by section so just call for the question for the main  
4 motion to adopt the amended proposal.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Okay. Are there any  
7 questions in regards to the main motion to adopt 27 as  
8 amended?

9  
10 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, Pat Holmes. I  
11 was wondering on the question I raised earlier, on how  
12 halibut and other Federal species, if this proposal saying  
13 the harvest of fish, if we could add a Section (E) that  
14 would say that our RAC would be interested in seeing that  
15 this include halibut and other Federal species or how does  
16 that work, does that have to wait another year or could  
17 that just be put in as an amendment to make sure that that  
18 gets addressed as well?

19  
20 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pat, I think this Board  
21 can recommend that the Federal Subsistence Board request  
22 the North Pacific Management Council address that issue  
23 because we don't have any authority to do that, if I'm  
24 correct; is that correct?

25  
26 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, Al is poking  
27 me saying it's out of our jurisdiction. Anyhow, I think it  
28 is not an issue, I mean it is an issue and it's a good idea  
29 Pat, but I think we have to come out of here with a  
30 recommendation to the Federal Subsistence Board for them to  
31 appeal the North Pacific Management Council with a petition  
32 to allow ceremonial halibut catch and other fisheries and  
33 then it would go to the various entities. And I would do  
34 that -- and maybe we can talk about how we can do that at  
35 our work session.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. I believe  
38 that takes care of 27. If we can take a 10 minute break at  
39 this time.

40  
41 (Off record)

42  
43 (On record)

44  
45 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: I'll call the meeting  
46 back to order. I'd like to, at this time, request to put  
47 27 back on the floor if there are no objections. There's  
48 one other item I'd like to take into consideration, Page  
49 No. 53, Section (A). If you look at Section (A) where it  
50 says Federal waters from which the harvest will occur, no

00030

1 more than 25 salmon or steelhead may be taken. I'd like to  
2 request that we review that statement and I did give Vince  
3 some.....

4

5 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, I would ask  
6 that we strike no more than 25 salmon or five steelhead may  
7 be taken and insert in that sentence the local manager and  
8 designee determine amount of species of salmon and/or  
9 steelhead to be taken. And I move to insert that.

10

11 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

12

13 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Motion made and  
14 seconded. Discussion.

15

16 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, I understand  
17 the reason this was brought up was that if more than 25 was  
18 to be requested the manager did not have the authority to  
19 go past the 25 by regulation and would have to go back to  
20 the Federal Subsistence Board for an okay. Now, that may  
21 take several months due to the fact that the Federal  
22 Subsistence Board only meets a couple times a year. This  
23 gives discretion to the manager and to the designee that  
24 the amount of fish to be taken may be less than 25 and it  
25 may be more but the opportunity to make the decision right  
26 then and there rather than waiting several months to hold  
27 the ceremony or potlatch or whatever it is that, you know,  
28 this is brought forward to do. I think it relieves the  
29 concern of maybe Ivan and Mitch about the amount of fish  
30 needed for individual communities, maybe 25 or 20 may be  
31 enough in some communities or 10. But, you know, that  
32 should be based on the Federal manager and the designee  
33 coming to an agreement on what that is.

34

35 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Vince. Any  
36 other discussion. Call for question -- excuse me.

37

38 MR. BOS: Madame Chair, Greg Bos, Fish and  
39 Wildlife Service. I think this recommendation is a good  
40 one and I think Paragraph (B) already discusses it. The  
41 last sentence in Paragraph (B) provides the local manager  
42 the opportunity to specify numbers as is necessary for  
43 conservation, so all you really need to do is strike the  
44 language about the 25 salmon and five steelhead.

45

46 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: I think this also allows  
47 for if you have a large region and a large ceremonial  
48 purpose, you're talking hundreds of people and 25 salmon  
49 may not definitely cover that purpose. So it covers both.

50

00031

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Thank you. That just  
2 further supports Article (B) there, the last sentence of  
3 Article (B).

4  
5 MR. CRATTY: Question.

6  
7 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Question's been called.  
8 All in favor signify by saying aye.

9  
10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

13  
14 (No opposing votes)

15  
16 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: And Paul, just for the  
17 record, we put 27 back on the floor and made another....

18  
19 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Added a sentence.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Added a sentence --  
22 deleted a sentence and added -- took out no more than 25  
23 salmon and five steelhead may take and inserted local  
24 manager and designee to determine amount of salmon and  
25 steelhead to be taken.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Now, we'll move on to  
28 Proposal 28.

29  
30 MR. UBERUAGA: Good morning, Madame Chair,  
31 my name is Richard Uberuaga, Office of Subsistence  
32 Management in Anchorage. I'm sure you've all had a chance  
33 to read Proposal 28 so I'll just touch on the high points  
34 here and try to make sure that we all understand, clearly,  
35 what we're asking for.

36  
37 Proposal 28 was submitted by the Office of  
38 Subsistence Management and it would streamline the Federal  
39 Subsistence Board's in-season fisheries special action  
40 process. And by that I mean -- I'm going to give you an  
41 example of what I mean. In the Yukon/Kuskokwim area in  
42 2001 there were 28 special actions taken by the Federal  
43 Subsistence Board, those were in response to emergency  
44 orders issued by the State of Alaska. The State of Alaska  
45 issued an emergency order changing some aspect of the  
46 fishing regulations or seasons or methods and means. Well,  
47 the Federal Subsistence Board would return and issue a  
48 special action mirroring that same action because they were  
49 in agreement with that action. So what they were doing was  
50 collaborating up front, agreeing but then the Feds would

00032

1 have to come back and write up a special action. So people  
2 were thinking, boy, this is redundant, you know, we agree,  
3 we've issued a joint news release, why do we need to go  
4 ahead and issue this special action. We've agreed up  
5 front.

6

7 In cases where there isn't agreement, then  
8 the Board can go ahead and issue a special action that  
9 clearly identifies how they are different from the State's  
10 proposal.

11

12 So what this proposal would do is it would  
13 streamline this process that's going on. In the Kodiak  
14 region you don't have a lot of in-season fisheries special  
15 actions but they do occur occasionally.

16

17 Originally we proposed this to occur across  
18 the state for all regions. The Federal Subsistence Board  
19 in 2001 agreed to try it on a trial basis, a streamlining  
20 in the Yukon and Kuskokwim for the 2002 season and then  
21 evaluate it at the end of the season to see how it's  
22 working and then perhaps look toward adoption statewide;  
23 but get feedback, okay.

24

25 So you see that there's some redundancy  
26 occurring in these mirroring the State actions all the  
27 time.

28

29 Let me say that also playing into this  
30 picture is an effort by the State and Federal groups to  
31 develop a process whereby a protocol is set up for how we'd  
32 handle special actions. There's a memorandum of agreement  
33 established between the State and Federal agencies that  
34 works towards developing protocols for different things  
35 like in-season special actions for other issues. That  
36 protocol has not quite been developed yet for in-season  
37 fisheries special actions but it's being worked on. So the  
38 Office of Subsistence Management, even though we proposed  
39 this to apply statewide, after an analysis and hearing some  
40 concerns from different areas, we felt that we would  
41 propose adopting this proposal at this time just for the  
42 Yukon and Kuskokwim River regions dependent upon further  
43 review this fall on how the 2002 fishing season went.

43

44 So where are we?

45

46 We feel that streamlining special actions  
47 is a good process. We feel that this may be a little  
48 premature to adopt it statewide at this time because of  
49 some concerns by some regions that -- for example, without  
50 issuing a special action we just go ahead and mirror the

00033

1 State regulations, the Federal manager may have an  
2 objection but hasn't got it in yet, there may be some delay  
3 so we would accept a special action that goes into effect  
4 before the Federal manager can respond in a timely way with  
5 his objections. So we want to develop -- we want to let  
6 the State protocol process -- State/Federal protocol  
7 process develop a way to deal with streamlining the  
8 statewide, these special actions.

9

10 And that, in effect, is the recommendation,  
11 to support with modification to adopt this proposal for the  
12 Yukon and Kuskokwim regions at this time. Allow the  
13 current Federal/State in-season protocol efforts to develop  
14 the guidelines for implementing this statewide.

15

16 So you can see the regulatory wording  
17 there, it simply says that for the Yukon/Kuskokwim regions,  
18 statewide Federal subsistence fishing schedules, openings,  
19 closings and fishing methods are the same as those issued  
20 for subsistence taking of fish under Alaska emergency  
21 orders. As you know the State manages most of their  
22 fisheries through emergency order process.

23

24 I'll point out one example that did occur  
25 in the Kodiak region, it was in Litnik, their closure,  
26 there was a State emergency order issued for the closure of  
27 the sockeye run back to the Afognak Bay, it was very low,  
28 the State went ahead and closed that. Tony Chattel was  
29 right on top of it and agreed with that closure and they  
30 developed a joint news release. But he had to go one step  
31 further and get a special action written up for approval.  
32 So it was kind of redundant. So that's how it would apply  
33 in the Kodiak area.

34

35 There's not a lot of subsistence emergency  
36 orders issued by the State but they do occur. So, you  
37 know, we feel that this is the best way to go and that's  
38 our preliminary conclusion.

39

40 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yeah, I have a question,  
41 what is the Alaska emergency order, Section 16.050.060,  
42 what does that say about -- is that a State section on  
43 subsistence only?

44

45 MR. UBERUAGA: I'm not exact sure of the  
46 number there but.....

47

48 MR. TUTIAKOFF: See, where has to be  
49 followed by this section specifically in this order.

50

00034

1 MR. UBERUAGA: Uh-huh.

2

3 MR. TUTIAKOFF: What is that section? What  
4 does it refer to? Does it refer to only subsistence? Does  
5 it refer to sportfishing? How is it, you know, as you  
6 know, we're at odds with the State of Alaska as to what  
7 subsistence should be defined as. The State of Alaska does  
8 not recognize ANILCA's response to subsistence.

9

10 MR. UBERUAGA: I believe that section is  
11 the section that refers to just the emergency -- issuance  
12 of emergency orders to manage fisheries but I may be wrong.

13

14 MR. TUTIAKOFF: See, they do not put  
15 priority on subsistence, that's my concern. ANILCA  
16 requires priority for subsistence and I would feel better  
17 if some sort of -- somebody here would, you know, make me  
18 feel better that this was an issue that goes back to why  
19 we're here. We're here to protect the ANILCA and  
20 subsistence. Now, I don't want to be drawn into saying  
21 well the RAC at Kodiak/Aleutians approved this thereby  
22 approving the State of Alaska's quote/unquote, subsistence  
23 guidelines, you know, I don't want to be put in that  
24 position.

25

26 MR. UBERUAGA: Again.....

27

28 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Just by inadvertently being  
29 put in there. Now, what does that mean?

30

31 MR. UBERUAGA: This proposal is  
32 recommending this for the Yukon and Kuskokwim areas only at  
33 this time.

34

35 MR. TUTIAKOFF: So why are we addressing it  
36 as a Council here, as a RAC?

37

38 MR. UBERUAGA: Because the original intent  
39 was to address it statewide.

40

41 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Uh-huh.

42

43 MR. UBERUAGA: And at some point it may  
44 develop as a statewide proposal but would be implemented  
45 through a protocol through the memorandum of agreement  
46 protocol process.

47

48 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Well, I have a.....

49

50 MS. FOX: Madame Chair, may I address this?

00035

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yeah, what does that mean?  
2 Yeah, I know it only addresses Kuskokwim Region but you're  
3 asking us to approve Section 16.05.060, that's all we're  
4 talking about, basically?

5  
6 MS. FOX: Actually no, we're not. Let me  
7 try to explain it a little bit further and expand on what  
8 Richard's already said. And perhaps if you looked at this  
9 section under effect of the proposal on Page 69. Our  
10 intent is not to change the deliberative process on making  
11 decisions that includes the public and Regional Advisory  
12 Councils, you'll see the second paragraph there. It says,  
13 this recommended streamlining does not effect the Councils,  
14 coordinating fisheries committee or the public's role in  
15 fisheries management decision-making. The manager will  
16 continue to consult with anyone that he or she feels is  
17 needed to be consulted with and coordinate with prior to  
18 making any decision that is either aligned with what the  
19 State is proposing or not aligned. The Federal manager has  
20 a responsibility to adhere to ANILCA and regulations and  
21 accord that subsistence priority. And if he or she feels  
22 that the decision that they are about to make is contrary  
23 to ANILCA and our regulations they will not agree with the  
24 State.

25  
26 This, in no way, effects that decision-  
27 making process.

28  
29 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Okay, I just wanted  
30 somebody to.....

31  
32 MS. FOX: What this is all about is after  
33 the decision is made, we don't want to duplicate a process  
34 that ends up confusing the public by issuing two separate  
35 news releases and two separate decisions. If we agree, we  
36 will have one news release, one announcement that is  
37 jointly issued. That's all. It's like this is all having  
38 to do with after the decision is made and in no way  
39 compromises our ability to make independent decisions if we  
40 don't agree. And that may sound -- it's a bit  
41 administrative and may be, like, why are we asking but we  
42 think it's important that we build understanding right on  
43 the subject that we're talking about right now, is that, it  
44 does not change the decision-making process and our  
45 protection of the subsistence priority. It's just when we  
46 agree and what, you know, Richard was indicating, I think,  
47 28 times out of how many 28 or something?

48  
49 MR. UBERUAGA: 27 out of 28.  
50

00036

1 MS. FOX: 27 out of 28 times our experience  
2 has been that all that negotiation has resulted in us being  
3 able to come to agreement, with everybody lining up. The  
4 Councils, any affected other interests along the way,  
5 advisory committees, YRDFA, whatever, we've all come to  
6 agreement, 27 out of 28 times and in those cases we could  
7 have only issued one news release and one announcement.  
8 And that's what we're shooting towards, but it does not  
9 effect our ability to make an independent decision. And if  
10 we need to we will issue two news releases that say what  
11 the differences are.

12  
13 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Madame Chair, I just  
14 wanted to say to Richard, on the Litnik thing, I was  
15 notified prior to that happening and, you know, my only  
16 concern was making sure that the sportfishing was shut down  
17 also when they shut down the subsistence and then when they  
18 reopened it, they opened the subsistence and did not open  
19 the sport so that was okay.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

22  
23 MR. HOLMES: Pat Holmes. I'd like to go  
24 along with what Pete commented on. They contacted me as  
25 well and the commercial fishery wasn't open, basically they  
26 left it closed. They closed the sportfishery and then they  
27 did the subsistence and so I know at least in the Kodiak  
28 office, you know, subsistence has the priority and they  
29 shut it down. I think that was very unfortunate but I  
30 think they did try to do that to the benefit, you know, of  
31 local residents who were subsisting to the maximum extent  
32 that they could.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. Vince, does  
35 that answer your questions?

36  
37 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Uh-huh.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Other questions.

40  
41 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I guess my question is now  
42 how are you going to manage the other areas other than the  
43 Yukon? Are you going to continue to follow or are you  
44 going to put into effect the proposal to take no each area  
45 then?

46  
47 MR. UBERUAGA: I think that will be  
48 developed.....

49  
50 MR. TUTIAKOFF: For next year.

00037

1 MR. UBERUAGA: .....in the upcoming year  
2 with the work that's going on on the protocol. What we  
3 expect is to hear a lot of feedback on how the process  
4 worked again in 2002 from those Yukon and Kuskokwim areas.  
5 They take a lot of actions out there. A lot of in-season  
6 management actions. And, you know, what we've heard so far  
7 is we think that it's working well but we're starting to  
8 hear also some concerns on the process. So we really want  
9 to listen closely at the fall meetings this year and, you  
10 know, if those communities or groups are not ready to  
11 adopt this then we're going to hear that and that's what  
12 will go forward to the Federal Subsistence Board, that it  
13 may not be working there. But we feel that it is working  
14 and what we've heard is, yes, that it is working.

15  
16 And again, we feel that a statewide  
17 protocol would define a lot better on how you work towards  
18 an issuance of a joint news release, you know.

19  
20 I was gratified to hear that you were  
21 contacted. I didn't know that they had contacted you Pete,  
22 and I wasn't sure if they had contacted you, I was pretty  
23 sure they contacted you before the Litnik thing, but you  
24 know when you get into a season with lots of actions and  
25 lots of fisheries going on, things happen fairly quickly  
26 and if you're issuing a special action every time, you  
27 know, one special action could be taking place and another  
28 special action has already superseding that one before the  
29 other one comes into effect. A lot of confusion results.

30  
31 So it's all based on communication between  
32 the managers and the Councils and the public but it goes  
33 beyond just the State and Federal cooperation. It has to  
34 include the Councils.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pete did call me prior  
37 to anybody else and then I was notified after and he let me  
38 know what was happening. And just for the Council, just so  
39 you know, everything that's happening on the Yukon and  
40 Kuskokwim, in all the areas, I get, by e-mail, all the news  
41 releases from ADF&G, all the Federal and the Staff reports  
42 on a daily basis, and I'm telling you just over the summer  
43 I have a binder about this thick, so it is duplic -- a lot  
44 of it is duplicating.

45  
46 MR. UBERUAGA: Uh-huh.

47  
48 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I have a question, where  
49 does this -- are there any significant changes to the  
50 wording regarding special closures, from last wording to

00038

1 this one in regards to other than adding the  
2 Yukon/Kuskokwim -- for the Yukon/Kuskokwim region?  
3

4 I mean you have an order -- you have a  
5 proposed regulation that says and all you're adding just to  
6 take care of the Yukon/Kuskokwim, right, I got to  
7 understand what you're trying to do?

8  
9 MR. UBERUAGA: Instead of adopting it  
10 statewide.....

11  
12 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Statewide.

13  
14 MR. UBERUAGA: .....at this time, we've got  
15 it on a.....

16  
17 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Statewide would continue  
18 under the old regulation which is.....

19  
20 MR. UBERUAGA: Which is every time there  
21 was an emergency order we would issue a special action.

22  
23 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Okay.

24  
25 MR. GUNDERSEN: So this is, just by  
26 streamlining, all you're doing is asking permission to  
27 rubber-stamp the State's action if there isn't.....

28  
29 MR. UBERUAGA: If there's no concerns --  
30 yes, we would, through a joint news release, usually like  
31 occurred with Litnik, there was a joint news release on  
32 Litnik, we would agree with that joint news -- we'd make  
33 our decision up front and rather than issue a special  
34 action, we'd just issue one joint news release. Because  
35 right now we issue a joint news release and a special  
36 action.

37  
38 MR. GUNDERSEN: Uh-huh.

39  
40 MR. UBERUAGA: So that's where the  
41 streamlining comes in.

42  
43 MR. GUNDERSEN: Okay, and it no way changes  
44 who the decision-makers are, the Regional Councils,  
45 villages.....

46  
47 MR. UBERUAGA: Right.

48  
49 MR. GUNDERSEN: .....they're all still  
50 participating, the same thing.

00039

1 MR. UBERUAGA: Right.

2

3 MR. GUNDERSEN: It's just giving you the  
4 okay to rubber-stamp it if there's no disagreements.

5

6 MR. UBERUAGA: Right. In the case of  
7 Litnik, if you guys wouldn't have agreed with that action  
8 we would not have taken the -- we would have went ahead and  
9 issued a special action different, you know, saying, no,  
10 we're going to do this, we're going to do that kind of  
11 approach.

12

13 We expect to hear a lot back from the Yukon  
14 and Kuskokwim on this and how it's working and then the  
15 hope is that it's still going to be viable for that area  
16 and that within a short -- within next years -- by next  
17 year's fishing season, the MOA protocol, in-season  
18 fisheries special action protocol will be developed, it  
19 spells out specifically how things occur.

20

21 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Is there a motion on the  
22 floor?

23

24 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: No, we've got to go  
25 through all this.

26

27 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Okay.

28

29 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Are there any other  
30 questions for Richard? Hearing none, we can move on to  
31 Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments. It's Page 72,  
32 I believe in here.

33

34 MS. CHIVERS: Madame Chair, I'll go ahead  
35 and read the ADF&G comments in for the record.

36

37 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Okay.

38

39 MS. CHIVERS: The Department supports  
40 streamlining the special action process whereby special  
41 actions would only be issued in-season when Federal  
42 management actions differ from the State management  
43 actions.

44

45 Under this proposal, State emergency orders  
46 would apply to Federal waters in instances where the State  
47 and Federal managers agree on subsistence fishing  
48 management actions. This would encourage a more  
49 coordinated management approach for Federal and State  
50 managers. IT would also reduce duplication of effort and

00040

1 confusion for the public by coordinating news releases and  
2 legal notices regarding identical management actions.

3

4 As a broader point, this approach should  
5 also be used in fishing regulations.

6

7 Because State regulations apply on Federal  
8 waters, we consider that it could be clearer to the public  
9 if the Federal system published only those regulations that  
10 differ from State regulations. This would create a more  
11 coordinated approach with fewer inadvertent differences in  
12 regulations between systems and clearer provisions for law  
13 enforcement, the public and fishery managers.

14

15 Presently it is very difficult for people  
16 to determine which requirements apply because they must  
17 compare the specific provisions and exact wording of  
18 Federal and State regulations.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Michelle.  
23 Any questions for Michelle. Hearing none, we'll move on to  
24 other Federal, State and tribal agency comments. Glenn.

25

26 MR. CHEN: Yes, thank you, Madame Chair.  
27 Glenn Chen with the BIA here. And as you and the Council  
28 deliberate this proposal, I would like to point out some  
29 important information with regards to the current situation  
30 in the Yukon/Kuskokwim. These areas have some extensive  
31 working groups that are involved which meet on a very  
32 regular basis. So the issue of the users being contacted  
33 and their input being considered in the decisions is in  
34 place for those regions.

35

36 This is part of the reason why some of the  
37 Staff Committee recommended that the implementation of this  
38 proposal be limited to those regions only and that further  
39 evaluation be conducted at the end of this fishing season.

40

41 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I have a question. I  
42 just want clarification and I realize I'm -- this is only  
43 in regards at this time specifically to the Yukon/Kuskokwim  
44 region and there isn't anything that would be overlapping  
45 into another region above and beyond that this can refer  
46 back to. This doesn't have an effect -- are we just  
47 specifically at this point one region and they can't  
48 overlap into another region?

49

50 MR. UBERUAGA: I'm not exactly sure I

00041

1 understand the question.

2

3 MR. GUNDERSEN: She's asking if you adopted  
4 it for one region, is it going to go over -- or can it  
5 apply to different areas, it couldn't be adopted into a  
6 statewide policy at some time?

7

8 MR. UBERUAGA: My understanding is that it  
9 applies just to the Yukon/Kuskokwim, the streamlining.

10

11 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay.

12

13 MR. CRATTY: What she's trying to say Rich  
14 is if they ain't getting the dogs up on the Yukon, is it  
15 going to affect the Aleutian Chain.

16

17 MR. UBERUAGA: Yeah.

18

19 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: That's a different  
20 process and I just want to make sure there's no hidden.

21

22 MR. UBERUAGA: I don't believe there are  
23 any hidden agendas here at all.

24

25 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I had to ask, I mean  
26 if it came up again and something happened.....

27

28 MR. UBERUAGA: Sure.

29

30 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: .....and I'm coming  
31 back to this meeting. I just want to say, is there  
32 something we should be reading between the lines and if  
33 there isn't that's what I wanted to hear.

34

35 MR. UBERUAGA: I don't detect anything like  
36 that at all. To me this is a very straightforward proposal  
37 and a good proposal or, at least, good inclusion.

38

39 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: That would be my  
40 opinion also seeing all the paperwork this summer. Fish  
41 and Game Advisory Committee comments. Summary of written  
42 public comments. Michelle.

43

44 MS. CHIVERS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
45 There are no written public comments at this time.

46

47 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Public testimony.  
48 Regional Council deliberation, recommendation and  
49 justification. Pete.

50

00042

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Madame Chair, I just have  
2 one comment maybe on this. I guess if we're going to be  
3 having these proposals for other areas such as the  
4 Yukon/Kuskokwim on our agenda, maybe we can have one member  
5 from that Council come and explain to us the reasoning for  
6 these, it would be a lot easier. It would make it a lot  
7 easier for us.

8

9 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: There's managers, I  
10 think, that work these regions.

11

12 MR. UBERUAGA: I'd like to point out that  
13 in the case of the North Slope, which has already met a  
14 week or so ago, they've deferred to the Yukon/Kuskokwim's  
15 decisions. So this was a statewide proposal initially. I  
16 mean the recommendation's narrowed it down to two areas but  
17 it was a statewide proposal and I think it's important that  
18 all statewide proposals come forward to you guys.

19

20 They said we defer this proposal to the  
21 region's -- the YK region decisions. We felt that they  
22 meant that we'll go along with what the YK said.

23

24 MR. GUNDERSEN: I feel the same way. I  
25 think they ought to make the decision for their own region  
26 first before we act on it. Sometimes somewhere down the  
27 line we may be able to apply it to different things. But  
28 I would rather they make a decision for their area first  
29 before we act on it.

30

31 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Madame Chair.

32

33 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pete.

34

35 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Once again, I'd just like  
36 to say that I'm on here representing Kodiak/Aleutians and  
37 I really hate making decisions for other areas without  
38 hearing from the people in the other areas.

39

40 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I think what Richard  
41 is saying that if you look at the initial proposal it's a  
42 statewide proposal and by Staff recommendation, they're  
43 limiting it to the YK region and what another region has  
44 done is supported that basically depending on whether the  
45 YK accepts the amendment.

46

47 MR. UBERUAGA: Yes.

48

49 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Is that correct?

50

00043

1 MR. UBERUAGA: Yes, it's my understanding  
2 that's correct.

3  
4 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: So basically what we  
5 would probably want to do is the same thing. We don't want  
6 to accept it as a statewide proposal at this time but if  
7 YK, I think, says, we agree we'll try it for this next  
8 season and see how it works then it goes back to a  
9 statewide.

10  
11 MR. UBERUAGA: Yeah. The reason we did  
12 this is because initially when we said we're going to try  
13 this on the YK, it was for a one year time period, and if  
14 we adopt this proposal it will set it in place permanently,  
15 at least until we change it again but we won't have to  
16 change it ever year. And so that's why we wanted to take  
17 advantage of the process to increase your knowledge about  
18 the proposal and where it might lead to in the future  
19 through the protocol development.

20  
21 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Is there any other  
22 comments or questions for Richard.

23  
24 MR. LUKIN: Richard, my name is Ivan Lukin.

25  
26 MR. UBERUAGA: Yes.

27  
28 MR. LUKIN: Is this going to trim down the  
29 paperwork?

30  
31 MR. UBERUAGA: I think it will trim it down  
32 a lot in places like the YK. And in areas that are  
33 starting to have increasing amounts of emergency  
34 subsistence orders by the State. I think it will -- I  
35 think the whole process is going to lead to a better  
36 communication between the public, Councils and the managing  
37 agencies. So I think -- especially with the protocol in  
38 place, I think you'll have a better formalized way to make  
39 sure you're being heard, for example. So, yeah, I think  
40 it's going to work. But again, we want to hear this fall,  
41 all through these Council meetings this fall, we want to  
42 hear more from Councils and publics how it's working, how  
43 did it work. We know how it worked well in 2001 but did it  
44 work again, well, in 2002? You know, I don't think the  
45 jury's in on that yet.

46  
47 MR. LUKIN: Thank you.

48  
49 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Does the Council have  
50 a recommendation at this time? Vince.

00044

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Well, I don't know, I guess  
2 I'm still hung up on other issues but I'll never be  
3 satisfied until I read it and it's not here so I would.....

4

5 MR. UBERUAGA: Yeah.

6

7 MR. TUTIAKOFF: You know, we're passing for  
8 the Yukon/Kuskokwim specifically, I think we've done that  
9 before for other regions in the past where we've said we  
10 support it, everything is good, you have all the RACs or  
11 whatever support it. I think the only part in here we're  
12 concerned about is that we're going to still be under the  
13 statewide Federal subsistence fishing schedules under  
14 Alaska emergency orders 16.05.060 or unless superseded by  
15 a Federal action, special action.

16

17 I am trying to figure out -- I like the  
18 streamlined approach.

19

20 MR. UBERUAGA: Uh-huh.

21

22 MR. TUTIAKOFF: IT doesn't affect us, this  
23 proposal does not affect us, our region. And we're asking  
24 to support it for the YK area, I would -- I think our  
25 action should come out that we support it, to defer to the  
26 YK for their decision. I mean if they go along with it we  
27 automatically do it, if they don't then we don't. That's  
28 the way it would come out.

29

30 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Are you looking for a  
31 second?

32

33 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Is that a motion?

34

35 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I guess that would be a  
36 motion, yeah.

37

38 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay, we have a motion  
39 on the floor made by Vince Tutiakoff.

40

41 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

42

43 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Second by Pete  
44 Squartsoff. The city office is right around the corner and  
45 they should have the Alaska Statutes in there and I've  
46 asked her to run and grab that.

47

48 MR. TUTIAKOFF: And we can review it at our  
49 work session.

50

00045

1 MR. GUNDERSEN: It should be in the fishing  
2 handbook.

3  
4 MR. UBERUAGA: I've got it right here, I  
5 can read it for you, if you'd like.

6  
7 Section 16.05.060. Emergency Orders. This  
8 chapter does not limit the power of the commissioner or his  
9 authorized designee when circumstances require to summarily  
10 open or close seasons or areas or to change weekly closed  
11 periods on fish or game by means of emergency orders.

12  
13 So that section does address exactly what  
14 I said, the emergency order process.

15  
16 The commissioner or an authorized designee  
17 may, under criteria adopted by the Board of Fisheries,  
18 summarily increase or decrease sportfish bag limits or  
19 modify methods of harvest for sportfish by means of  
20 emergency orders.

21  
22 Section (C), an emergency order has the  
23 force and effect of law after field announcement by the  
24 commissioner or an authorized designee. An emergency order  
25 adopted under this section is not subject to the A.S. 42.62  
26 Administrative Procedure Act.

27  
28 So it's essentially the emergency order  
29 process.

30  
31 MR. TUTIAKOFF: See that specifically  
32 refers to sportsfishing and doesn't mention -- it does not  
33 mention the levels of -- this refers only -- what I'm  
34 hearing, this only refers to sportsfishing and commercial  
35 fishing opening, closing emergency orders. It does not  
36 specifically talk to the issue of why we're sitting here,  
37 subsistence use and how and what priority does that follow.  
38 If you follow the State's priority there is no subsistence  
39 priority. It's a free for all game for subsistence.

40  
41 MR. CRATTY: Yeah.

42  
43 MR. UBERUAGA: Again, I think....

44  
45 MR. TUTIAKOFF: They use one definition and  
46 that's -- there is no rural or non-rural definition, such  
47 as ANILCA sets aside. That was my concern. I mean if  
48 that's what we're going to follow then we've just thrown in  
49 with the State's definition of subsistence and that's where  
50 I want to stay away from. We're not here to set that

00046

1 priority. And I see it coming down through the system  
2 here, what I talked about earlier, if we're not careful  
3 we're going to adopt the State's guidelines for subsistence  
4 and be thrown into the bunch -- into the pot.

5  
6 We're fighting for, in various levels of  
7 Alaska under AFN, under the Village Councils, under the  
8 tribal entities, are fighting the issue with the State and  
9 we should not be that entity to be that governing body, I  
10 mean we're here to protect their interests, not decide what  
11 subsistence should or shouldn't be. We've already been  
12 told that and that's under ANILCA, Section VIII.

13  
14 MR. UBERUAGA: Well, we have a cooperative  
15 management approach in place. I mean we're still working  
16 with the State also.

17  
18 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I'm not saying this is bad,  
19 I'm just saying you know, I think what happens here the YK  
20 are going to be very supportive of this kind issue. All  
21 this is good for is reporting and non-reporting or the  
22 bureaucracy of reporting a process. It does not -- but  
23 it's affecting the effect of subsistence. It has an  
24 effect. So I'm going to stick with my motion and send it  
25 to the YK. Hopefully, they're going to be smart enough to  
26 read it and maybe amend it somehow that ANILCA, Section  
27 VIII is put into this proposal. Because I see it all State  
28 right now.

29  
30 MR. UBERUAGA: Yeah, Peggy just handed me  
31 the.....

32  
33 MR. TUTIAKOFF: We'll just wait and see  
34 what comes out of.....

35  
36 MR. UBERUAGA: ....joint news release that  
37 was issued, if any of you would like to take a look at it.  
38 I think it was very well done and it does talk about.....

39  
40 MR. TUTIAKOFF: You know, like I said, I'm  
41 not opposing the process.

42  
43 MR. UBERUAGA: Okay.

44  
45 MR. TUTIAKOFF: All you're doing is  
46 eliminating a certain amount of paperwork for the  
47 Federal.....

48  
49 MR. UBERUAGA: Uh-huh.

50

00047

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: .....side of this whole  
2 thing and that is to notify and put out legal notices and  
3 that. If that's all you're asking for why don't you just  
4 say that instead of going through all these other wordings  
5 of, you know, bringing in the Alaska emergency order  
6 section, whatever that is, we're already working under it?  
7 I just feel there's something not right here. I'll leave  
8 it with YK to decide.

9  
10 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Vince, just maybe, you  
11 know, I talked a little bit about getting all the  
12 information and all the press releases, all the reports on  
13 the harvest, the harvest reports, the closures, the  
14 openings, everything from the whole YK region, all the  
15 regions that basically effect this, and there is, there's  
16 a lot of duplication is what's happening. There's actually  
17 a tremendous amount of it. And I think, I respect, I think  
18 what they're asking at this point is to.....

19  
20 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Do away with one process.

21  
22 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: But the idea, I think,  
23 too, in going back what Vince is saying, that whole process  
24 before that press release is made is the input and  
25 agreement and consensus by all the various user groups, the  
26 tribes or the villages -- or whoever is involved in that  
27 decision-making process before it is finalized and  
28 released; is that correct?

29  
30 MR. UBERUAGA: That's correct. And if  
31 we're not in agreement with, complete agreement between all  
32 groups we're still going to reserve the right to issue a  
33 special action, our own special action specifying exactly  
34 how we differ from the State's emergency order.

35  
36 MR. GUNDERSEN: And that supersedes the  
37 State?

38  
39 MR. UBERUAGA: That's right, on Federal  
40 lands. So see the safeguards are still.....

41  
42 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Well, I see.....

43  
44 MR. UBERUAGA: .....there. Because the  
45 agreements have to occur first as Peggy pointed out.

46  
47 MR. TUTIAKOFF: A motion's on the floor,  
48 right?

49  
50 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Do you want to read

00048

1 that motion?

2

3 MR. TUTIAKOFF: You want me to reread it?

4

5 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Yes, please.

6

7 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I move to defer Proposal  
8 28, I believe it is, to the Yukon/Kuskokwim with approval.

9

10 MR. GUNDERSEN: I'll second.

11

12 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I think initially Pete  
13 did second.

14

15 MR. GUNDERSEN: Okay.

16

17 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay.

18

19 MR. TUTIAKOFF: In other words, what that  
20 means, Madame Chair, is that if YK or that RAC,  
21 Yukon/Kuskokwim approves it, then we concur.

22

23 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay, any questions.  
24 Call for question. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

25

26 IN UNISON: Aye.

27

28 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

29

30 (No opposing votes)

31

32 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried. We'll  
33 continue on to 03-07. Introduction of proposal and  
34 analysis.

35

36 MR. UBERUAGA: Fisheries Proposal 03-07 was  
37 submitted by the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge and it  
38 would decrease the annual subsistence harvest limit and  
39 restrict the allowable size of male king crab in the Kodiak  
40 area.

41

42 As submitted, the proposal would partially  
43 align with the State regulations for managing subsistence  
44 king crab in the Kodiak area. As modified, this proposal  
45 would be fully aligned with the State regulations for king  
46 crab harvest in the Kodiak area.

47

48 I think you're all aware of the population  
49 status of the king crab in the Kodiak area. One thing I  
50 want to do is hand out something that was inadvertently not

00049

1 placed in the book, through probably mostly my fault and  
2 it's some data provided by the Kodiak office of Fish and  
3 Game that shows relative frequency of king crab, size and  
4 year and gives you an idea of the population status. I  
5 believe we all understand that the population has been  
6 severely -- but there's little disagreement amongst most  
7 people about the population status of king crab in the  
8 Kodiak area.

9

10 So let's start with the proposal. As I  
11 said, this would align with the State fully on king crab.  
12 So what would that do? It would reduce the harvest limit  
13 by half. It would make the same number of pots under both  
14 systems, you'd use the same number of crab pots under both  
15 systems. The size of the crab pots wouldn't matter, under  
16 the State is different from the Feds. And it would make,  
17 again, the male king crab harvest, carapace width equal  
18 with the State.

19

20 So where do we begin. Woman's Bay, that's  
21 a good spot. It's an important crab nursery area. And it  
22 has a lot of influences on Chenik Bay, the larger Chenik  
23 Bay complex. That area's been studied a lot by different  
24 groups, mainly because there is a research station right  
25 near there. They've got a lot of information. Last year,  
26 this Council, I believe declined an FIS proposal to further  
27 study red king crab in there because of the fact they'd  
28 been studied a lot. So we have a pretty good idea of  
29 what's going on in Chenik Bay.

30

31 You know at issue is the harvest of  
32 immature king crabs and enforcement of existing  
33 regulations. Right now if a crab is harvested before it  
34 reaches seven inches in carapace width, it's being,  
35 basically not reproducing, you're taking that crab before  
36 it has a chance to reproduce. A crab that's seven  
37 inches.....

38

39 MR. HOLMES: Six.

40

41 MR. UBERUAGA: .....in carapace width has  
42 had -- six, excuse me.

43

44 MR. HOLMES: I used to do crab research and  
45 they.....

46

47 MR. UBERUAGA: Yeah.

48

49 MR. HOLMES: .....they do reproduce at a  
50 smaller.....

00050

1 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

2

3 MR. HOLMES: .....size.

4

5 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat, can we cont --  
6 we'll have Richard do his report.

7

8 MR. HOLMES: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

9

10 MR. UBERUAGA: Right. But I'm saying by an  
11 allowance of seven inches, the crab will have produced  
12 maybe one or two times, that's my point there. If it's  
13 taken at five inches, it may not have reproduced at all.

14

15 And you know, there has been a proposal  
16 before the Board before to change the carapace width and it  
17 wasn't passed, I believe, in '94 or '97.

18

19 You know the population is depressed, we  
20 have a real conservation concern for the king crab in this  
21 area and we want to try to do something that will speed up  
22 the recovery of the population, if it's -- if we can  
23 increase the population at a faster rate, that means it's  
24 just that much quicker that you're going to be able to  
25 harvest more crabs in a larger area.

26

27 So again, we've based this proposal on a  
28 conservation concern, a real conservation concern. And we  
29 feel that aligning all the regulations in this area are  
30 going to lead to better enforcement and a quicker stock  
31 recovery. So that's the essence of the proposal. There's  
32 a lot of information on here on harvest by different  
33 communities in your proposal that shows the harvest, you  
34 know, through the '70s, '80s was declining after the '80s,  
35 started to decline in the early '80s and it's just been  
36 dropping and dropping and dropping. The subsistence use  
37 surveys, I think, were done up until 1983 and it shows use  
38 by communities has just steadily dropped until the point  
39 where it's not anything like it was.

40

41 The difficult problem with this proposal is  
42 there relatively are a lot of crab in Woman's Bay. They're  
43 abundant because that is a hot spot for crab reproduction.  
44 And so we all understand where those crabs are going.  
45 They're doing a lot of reproducing there but they're moving  
46 out in those big pods. Once they hit about five or six  
47 inches, they're moving out, repopulating, spreading out to  
48 different areas. And we feel that, again, by aligning with  
49 the State we've got better -- a lot better enforcement with  
50 less confusion. You have a lot of users targeting this

00051

1 area because it's so close to Kodiak, the Kodiak road  
2 system. You have Coast Guard people, who are exempt from  
3 harvesting these crabs if they live on the base and a lot  
4 of Coast Guard people don't live on the base. You have a  
5 lot of use concentrating on crab that are basically in  
6 their reproductive mode, you know, they're heading towards  
7 maturity they want to try to do their thing and they're  
8 getting taken before they've had a chance to reproduce.  
9

10 So we look at this as a conservation  
11 measure. That is the bottom line with this proposal. I  
12 know it's a very heartfelt issue by all of the Kodiak users  
13 because of the history of what's happened to the crab  
14 population in the area. But we're fully behind this  
15 alignment because we think it makes a good effort at  
16 applying a conservation measure that's going to help the  
17 population.  
18

19 So the preliminary conclusion is to support  
20 with modification to align State and Federal regulations  
21 for harvest limits and crab pot restrictions. Modified  
22 regulations would read, annual limit is three crabs per  
23 household, only male king crabs, seven inches or greater in  
24 width of shell, may be taken or possessed. You may not use  
25 more than one crab pot of any size to take king crab.  
26

27 Madame Chair.

28  
29 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. Richard,  
30 can you look at Page 87. There is a schedule there that  
31 outlines the various years and I'm assuming this schedule  
32 is referring to the subsistence take of king crab.  
33

34 MR. UBERUAGA: I'm sorry, Page 87?  
35

36 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Yes.  
37

38 MR. SQUARTSOFF: And 82 to 93.  
39

40 MR. UBERUAGA: There is a -- I'm not with  
41 you.  
42

43 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: The years in here, if  
44 you look at the study years.....  
45

46 MR. UBERUAGA: Oh, yeah, okay.  
47

48 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: .....in these various  
49 communities, it's '82 to '91.  
50

00052

1 MR. UBERUAGA: Yeah.

2

3 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: '82 to '91, '82 to '97

4 and then they've got no '91 in that one, then there's --

5 but the other parts of this is why are they cut off at '91.

6 If you're making decisions on something that happened 10,

7 11 years ago.

8

9 MR. UBERUAGA: This is the available data

10 from Alaska Fish and Game. As far as why they cut it off

11 then I don't know. I suppose it was something.....

12

13 MS. PETRIVELLI: With the table on 87, that

14 specifically is from the community profile database and

15 those are from household surveys done by the Division of

16 Subsistence, so those are the years of the surveys and so

17 those are the only years that those communities were

18 surveyed. And so the way those data work is they'll

19 interview, like for Kodiak City, they would have

20 interviewed maybe 10 percent of the households and they

21 said in 10 percent of the households they harvested this

22 much crab and so then they multiplied that amount by the

23 number of households in Kodiak. And so that's where they

24 come up with -- it's an estimated harvest.

25

26 So with the smaller communities, they have

27 the capability to interview every household and come up

28 with reasonable household estimates. But with the other

29 ones, they have to do estimates because with 13,000 people

30 -- well, 6,000 people in living in Kodiak, they don't have

31 the capability to survey every household.

32

33 So those are where those numbers come from.

34

35 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

36

37 MR. HOLMES: There is another data set that

38 commercial fisheries keeps from the subsistence permit

39 reports and I think they showed it at one of the advisory

40 committee meetings on king crab use and it just drops down

41 like any of these figures on the population size. It's

42 dropped to almost a minuscule harvest for most of the areas

43 of what's reported. About the only place that any

44 significant quality of king crab have been caught recently

45 from what I recall and maybe Mr. Cratty here, or Pete might

46 correct me has been in Woman's Bay and then down at Alatak,

47 they're about the only two populations of any significance

48 at all.

49

50 Thank you.

00053

1 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pete.

2

3 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, I just want to, you  
4 know, this research is only being done in Woman's Bay, it's  
5 the only place they're doing it. And I said some years ago  
6 that they should do some in some other areas also because  
7 it seems to me that crab are coming back in some other  
8 areas. But this is the only Federal waters that we can  
9 work with and it just happens to be a small, small area in  
10 Woman's Bay. And I don't -- I'd like to just leave it the  
11 way it is. The State can close their season if they want  
12 but leave subsistence over for our subsistence users in the  
13 area.

14

15 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Al.

16

17 MR. CRATTY: Well, I'd just like to state  
18 for the record, you know, Alatak Bay is a big rearing  
19 ground for king crab and if you want to start working with  
20 the State, I think you should start cutting the draggers  
21 down on Alatak Flats. You know, if the State and the Feds  
22 want to align things, let's start looking at that. I fish  
23 cod down there and had a pot come up three-quarters full of  
24 five inch king crab.

25

26 MR. UBERUAGA: I don't believe that's an  
27 area of Federal jurisdiction, is it?

28

29 MR. CRATTY: Yeah, but you're trying to  
30 align with the State regulations and stuff, let's start  
31 pushing them to shut some of these areas down that you got  
32 the draggers dragging in 25 or 30 fathoms of water. I mean  
33 they're tearing up the rearing grounds.....

34

35 MR. UBERUAGA: Yeah, I think that's.....

36

37 MR. CRATTY: .....if you're going to start  
38 working on.....

39

40 MR. UBERUAGA: .....a good idea and it  
41 could probably go forward through the Board of Fisheries  
42 proposal process to make those kind of proposals. But in  
43 terms of how the Feds are going to influence that in an  
44 area outside their jurisdiction, I'm not sure that's going  
45 to work.

46

47 MR. HOLMES: Well, Madame Chair.

48

49 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

50

00054

1 MR. HOLMES: Pat Holmes. If I could add a  
2 bit of historical perspective. I was secretary for the  
3 advisory committee when this proposal was discussed when we  
4 had a higher crab limit. And I think the basic reason that  
5 we dropped from six to three and wanted to maintain a size  
6 limit was because of the reproductive concerns and the size  
7 limit and also because the committee received a lot of  
8 comments from Old Harbor and Akhiok and also in town from  
9 subsistence users basically saying that there were some  
10 people that were really abusing it and quote, doing  
11 subsistence, but it was alleged that some people setnetted  
12 in Alatak were taking subsistence crab every day and  
13 freezing them and then taking them somewhere else to sell  
14 them, they were never caught. Also some similar  
15 allegations of crab being taken in Woman's Bay and  
16 undersized female crabs were being really abused and  
17 overharvested. And so we thought that it would be -- or  
18 not we, I was secretary then, the committee thought that it  
19 would be best for the long-term attempts to restore crab,  
20 that, particularly for subsistence first, was to drop the  
21 limit and that was kind of the committees reasons from  
22 going from six to three.

23

24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pete.

25

26 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yes, we have to keep in  
27 mind that king crab limit is three per household per year  
28 under State regulations.

29

30 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: What's Federal?

31

32 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Federal is six a day, I  
33 guess.

34

35 MR. UBERUAGA: No, six per year.

36

37 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Per year.

38

39 MR. UBERUAGA: So it's in half. You know  
40 we've been asked the question, if the crab population is so  
41 depressed, why are we having any season at all.

42

43 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Right.

44

45 MR. UBERUAGA: And I've asked that question  
46 several times. And I've been answered -- you know, the  
47 answer was, it provides some subsistence harvest. It keeps  
48 it low as it is now but something is better than none. It  
49 keeps people within a system of use and working with that  
50 system. In other words, we don't create a whole group of

00055

1 lawbreakers by closing it completely. But we impose  
2 limitations and we allow some harvest, I know that's not a  
3 very good answer, but I hate to use the word, token  
4 harvest, but in a sense that's what it is compared to the  
5 '80s when crab were abundant.

6  
7           You know it's a conservation measure that  
8 -- enforcement, I think is a real big issue there. And  
9 this basically puts everybody on the same playing field and  
10 it makes enforcement easier.

11  
12           MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, that's what I was  
13 going to say, Richard. I think it's just an enforcement  
14 thing. Because they don't -- they're having a hard time,  
15 who's the subsistence users and who's the State users.

16  
17           MR. UBERUAGA: Yeah. You know, there's  
18 lots of cases where in fish and wildlife management where,  
19 even though a population is depressed some harvest is still  
20 allowed for various reasons, whether to continue tradition,  
21 you know, to provide bringing in new people -- creating  
22 tradition. I know in Idaho we've got sage grouse that are  
23 on almost the verge of threatened and endangered species  
24 but we still allow a limited token harvest because we want  
25 to continue tradition, we want to bring new people, the  
26 children in into that tradition.

27  
28           So you know, this is a.....

29  
30           MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, well, my answer to  
31 that, Richard, is it should be subsistence first and then  
32 statewide after.

33  
34           MR. UBERUAGA: Without a doubt. And again,  
35 I feel that allowing some harvest is better than closing  
36 the harvest completely due to the conservation concern.  
37 Because a case can be made to close it completely for  
38 harvest.

39  
40           MR. SQUARTSOFF: Right. The State can  
41 close theirs and we can leave the subsistence open.

42  
43           MR. UBERUAGA: And we can still argue that  
44 it should not be left open because of the fact that the  
45 population is so depressed and there is such a conservation  
46 concern. So you know, what we're all hoping for is a  
47 quicker recovery of this population.

48  
49           MR. SQUARTSOFF: Request it be closed.  
50

00056

1 MR. LUKIN: Can I say something?

2

3 MR. UBERUAGA: You bet.

4

5 MR. LUKIN: My name is Ivan Lukin, Port  
6 Lions. You know, you guys are wanting to work jointly  
7 together, State and Feds, which is really good and I  
8 totally agree with Al, you know, one of the biggest  
9 problems here that I see in these smaller bays is whether  
10 it be Fed or State waters or whoever waters we want to  
11 claim them to be is we got to keep these draggers out of  
12 there, they're the problem. You can't take a dragger and  
13 a boat, 80/90 foot coming in one of those little bays and  
14 dragging one of our little crab holes let alone think about  
15 a small community of boats allowed to fish in an opener  
16 when there's probably not enough to pay a month's worth of  
17 bills in there and then let this guy drag through a whole  
18 several times. I mean what do you got, you got nothing  
19 left? I mean it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure  
20 that out. I mean we need to really keep that in mind and  
21 work together to say, hey, we got to stop this. There's  
22 three-quarters of your problem.

23

24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: If I could maybe have  
25 your attention, we have asked to have lunch ready at 12:00  
26 and we do have to be back here by 1:00 for the  
27 teleconference. If we can recess from this process but  
28 come back to this proposal, to go back to you, Richard,  
29 before we go to any other -- to go back to you before we go  
30 to the State. So at 1:00 o'clock we'll come back and we're  
31 going to have to go to the goats at 1:00 o'clock and then  
32 after that go back to this. Is that okay with everyone?

33

34 Okay, we'll go ahead and recess for lunch  
35 at this time.

36

37 (Off record)

38

39 (On record)

40

41 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: We're going to go to  
42 Item No. 11, deferred goat proposals 15a and 15b update.

43

44 MS. PETRIVELLI: Proposal 15 was submitted  
45 two years ago and then it was deferred -- it was submitted  
46 by Ivan Lukin of Port Lions to have a customary and  
47 traditional use of goats for residents of Unit 8 and to  
48 have a permit for each household.

49

50 (Teleconference joins)

00057

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: Proposal 15 was submitted  
2 two years ago asking for a customary and traditional use  
3 determination for goat in Unit 8. At that time an analysis  
4 was done with a recommendation and the Council preferred to  
5 wait until a study was carried out to get more data about  
6 the use of goats by residents of Unit 8. An attempt was  
7 made the summer of 2001 but without much success and it was  
8 decided to have contract with the Alaska Department of Fish  
9 and Game, Division of Subsistence. They started their  
10 survey work in the spring of last year and Liz Williams was  
11 the main researcher and I assisted with some follow up  
12 surveys in Old Harbor and Kodiak.

13

14 The status of that report is, the interim  
15 report that we have right now on this green sheet. Because  
16 of data processing difficulties, 151 surveys were completed  
17 and 43 of them were with the hunter interviewers so we  
18 definitely do have more data but it hasn't -- so the  
19 service work was done this spring and there's a little  
20 chart on the second page of the report.

21

22 (Teleconference difficulties)

23

24 MS. PETRIVELLI: The important things about  
25 the study is they followed the usual protocol and they  
26 contacted each community and asked for permission to do the  
27 study and one important thing was Karluk and Ouzinkie  
28 declined to participate in the study and so we received  
29 letters -- they sent letters to the Department of Fish and  
30 Game. And Liz could probably give you better data but I  
31 think it was just that they felt they didn't have goat  
32 hunters in their communities and they weren't interested in  
33 participating. Some of the introductory work carried out  
34 was by an RIT but she gave presentations showing what data  
35 we had had available from ADF&G and some people said that's  
36 accurate and everything and I think Karluk and Ouzinkie  
37 felt that that was enough information or that the  
38 information saying that they hardly used goat was accurate.

39

40 But the communities that did participate --  
41 and the way the study was designed in the villages, they  
42 surveyed Akhiok, Larsen Bay, Old Harbor and Port Lions and  
43 it was a census type survey and a census in that they tried  
44 to interview every household in the community. And the  
45 estimated households contacted, which isn't 100 percent but  
46 it was an attempt to do 100 percent.

47

48 And then in Kodiak because there's 1,996  
49 households, no attempt was made to contact each of those  
50 but we used a chain referral method and Liz worked with

00058

1 members of the Council and members of the Kodiak Advisory  
2 Committee to get referrals of goat hunters who would be  
3 knowledgeable about goat use in the Kodiak road system. So  
4 35 households were surveyed there.

5  
6 And then I guess the completion, out of the  
7 236 that were possible, 151 household surveys were  
8 completed. And then of those 151, 43 more were actual  
9 specific about intense goat hunting use.

10  
11 And that's about all we can report on now  
12 until we analyze the data. And we expect to have that done  
13 mid-November. And then our office would review the results  
14 just for clarity, you know, just to see if it makes sense.  
15 Of course, whether it makes sense to me or not but then  
16 we'll try to make it as user friendly, the information that  
17 will relate to helping making the decision and try to  
18 distribute it to the Council members as soon as possible.  
19 And I'm not sure -- I guess we could hear from Pat Holmes  
20 about the local committee.

21  
22 (Teleconference difficulties)

23  
24 MS. PETRIVELLI: So as far as how this  
25 information -- it can be used for the deferred proposal  
26 which we will be meeting on again, I guess, we meet in the  
27 upcoming winter/spring meetings -- or February and March  
28 meetings and the data could be used there, but as far as it  
29 affects the other work that the committee has been doing  
30 with the State proposals, well, it's up to the Council on  
31 how they would want to approach that. But whether you  
32 could just go ahead and prepare a proposal to the State,  
33 but Pat Holmes has information about the work done -- the  
34 subcommittee about working with the State Advisory  
35 Committee, but I'm sure everyone will feel better with more  
36 data available to make a better decision.

37  
38 If you have any questions. And Liz  
39 Williams is on the line and who else is on the line, Liz?

40  
41 MS. WILLIAMS: John Cry at the Kodiak Fish  
42 and Game office.

43  
44 MS. PETRIVELLI: Okay.

45  
46 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Does anybody have any  
47 questions.

48  
49 (Teleconference difficulties)

50

00059

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Does anybody have any  
2 questions, this is Liz

3

4 MR. LUKIN: My name is Ivan Lukin and my  
5 question is, is I think maybe in November you'll have  
6 something on there, some information?

7

8 MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah. Yeah, what it is is  
9 I interviewed a lot of people and there's about 30 hours of  
10 tape and it's almost all transcribed but we've lost a  
11 couple of our statistic people in just the last couple of  
12 weeks really. But the number are all input and we're just  
13 getting ready to crunch them out, hopefully today or this  
14 afternoon, but like all the reports we do they're numbered  
15 but then there are also other issues people brought up in  
16 their interviews and I really don't think it would be good  
17 to give people one without the other because they kind of  
18 balance each other out. And, you know, there's just some  
19 things you can't get in numbers.

20

21 So I had hoped that we could get that done  
22 like we say in mid-November, to Pat, so that she could get  
23 it ready for the next time.

24

25 MR. LUKIN: Thank you.

26

27 MS. WILLIAMS: I'm not hoping, we will.

28

29 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Is there any other  
30 questions or discussion at this time.

31

32 (Teleconference difficulties)

33

34 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Ivan, are you okay  
35 with those time lines?

36

37 MR. LUKIN: Yes.

38

39 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pete.

40

41 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, I was just, Pat,  
42 when does the proposal have to be in for the State?

43

44 MR. HOLMES: I believe it's sometime in  
45 December.

46

47 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Just so you have this  
48 information prior to that deadline for State proposals.

49

50 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, I believe that can be

00060

1 achieved, Pete.

2

3 MR. CRY: It's December 6th.

4

5 MR. HOLMES: Thanks, John.

6

7 MS. PETRIVELLI: Liz put those proposal  
8 deadlines on the back of the sheet -- well, the proposal  
9 deadlines for the Federal proposals are October 18th but  
10 for the State it's December 6th.

11

12 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: So basically based on  
13 the information then we'd review this at our winter meeting  
14 in Kodiak.

15

16 (Teleconference difficulties)

17

18 MS. WILLIAMS: Pat.

19

20 MS. PETRIVELLI: Uh-huh.

21

22 MS. WILLIAMS: I apologize for all the  
23 disruption. I'm going to try to call John back and I'll be  
24 off for just a minute unless somebody else had another  
25 question before I go.

26

27 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: There's actually no  
28 more questions. I think everybody understands what the  
29 time frame is here and what needs to be done and that's  
30 assuming that the surveys are being compiled and are  
31 available for us to meet these deadlines.

32

33 MS. PETRIVELLI: And I think the Kodiak  
34 biologists were interested just so -- and I guess Pat  
35 Holmes could also just communicate to the advisory  
36 committee what the decisions are and to the Kodiak  
37 biologists what the Council does.

38

39 MR. HOLMES: Yeah.

40

41 MS. PETRIVELLI: And the discussions  
42 relating and concerns to any further action.

43

44 MR. HOLMES: And if you'd like, Madame  
45 Chair, I could give you a summary of where the joint  
46 study.....

47

48 (Teleconference difficulties)

49

50 MS. WILLIAMS: Do you need John back on the

00061

1 line?

2

3 MS. PETRIVELLI: I don't think so. So  
4 we'll just let Pat communicate any discussions and then  
5 John doesn't have to be back on the line.

6

7 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Actually, Liz can just  
8 -- we can just get back to them if there's any other  
9 information that we need to get to them or questions.

10

11 MS. PETRIVELLI: Okay.

12

13 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Liz, I think given  
14 that you're having a problem with the phone at this time,  
15 we're just going to have Pat give us a report and I think  
16 we'll be done with this item at this time. So actually I  
17 think if you do get off the line we're okay with that at  
18 this time and if we have any other questions we can call  
19 you back if you're available for a little while longer.

20

21 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. And my phone number is  
22 on the back of the sheet.

23

24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay, thank you.

25

26 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. I apologize for  
27 the disruption.

28

29 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay, Pat.

30

31 MR. HOLMES: I'd like to briefly, lightly  
32 touch on at the start here that when we got together at the  
33 Anchorage Airport, Al Cratty and Ivan here tried to test to  
34 see whether or not I needed to have a pacemaker or not and  
35 tossed out a big around the corner sweep at me, it sort of  
36 knocked the feet out from under me and a big joke which was  
37 pretty good. I think they got about 30 or 40 points up on  
38 my blood pressure. Not that I'm trying to take any side on  
39 this, just try to facilitate some common grounds.

40

41 We continued with the discussions that we  
42 had, Ivan Lukin and myself and Al Cratty and then Mitch  
43 teleconferenced and then I also, Tom Paramantoff, the  
44 alternate was out of town and so I briefed him after our  
45 discussions.

46

47 Basically we came down to consensus on  
48 coming up with a compromise that would provide local  
49 registration hunt for goats and basically it would take  
50 goats that weren't taken during the normal drawing hunt and

00062

1 assign those to the respective villages closest to those  
2 hunt areas.

3

4           And I've recently talked with Larry and  
5 John and they've completed their data for this year on goat  
6 populations and they have a much larger population of goats  
7 on the island than they've had ever before and are hoping  
8 to use this as one way to reduce that population. So Larry  
9 felt fairly confident that they'd be able to come up with  
10 a reasonable number of goats for the respective villages  
11 adjacent to the respective goat hunt areas.

12

13           And one of the things that our joint  
14 proposal will put together will provide access for folks  
15 that aren't adjacent to the Refuge whereas on a.....

16

17           (Teleconference difficulties)

18

19           MR. HOLMES: Anyway, would provide -- would  
20 be able to give goats for people in the villages and the  
21 whole concept is to try and make it as inefficient for,  
22 quote, outside hunters as possible but still meet the  
23 requirements of State law of open access. And so everybody  
24 in the state would be eligible but in designing it where  
25 there would be no airplane access, that they'd have to  
26 register in the village, have it only open for a certain  
27 period of time on one day and then have that registration  
28 time separate from the hunt so a person couldn't bop down  
29 from Anchorage, register and then go hunting, would give  
30 the greatest advantage to local residents.

31

32           There wouldn't be a registration hunt for  
33 the Kodiak road system because those areas are over -- or  
34 not over utilized but fully utilized and anybody that's  
35 ever tried for a drawing on those, the odds are about 500  
36 to 1 and they always get the goats they want there.

37

38           Let's see, and we were discussing dates and  
39 that was the only place -- oh, a person could apply for  
40 both drawing hunt and a registration hunt but if they took  
41 a goat in the drawing hunt then they wouldn't be eligible  
42 for a second goat so that stays in with the one goat limit.

43

44           Hunters in the registration hunt would need  
45 to report within 24 hours of leaving the field so that they  
46 know what the harvest is because in some areas it would be  
47 three or four goats. And so Larry needs to know as soon as  
48 possible when that's taken to close the registration hunt.

49

50           The only point of disagreement that we had

00063

1 was one, Ivan had requested for the areas adjacent to Port  
2 Lions, if they could be opened earlier because once you get  
3 into November the north end of the island gets kind of  
4 dicey for walk-in hunts and I've been caught out overnight  
5 myself up there and probably Pete has, too, and so we were  
6 exploring the question of opening the registration hunt on  
7 that end earlier. And one gentleman that had been on the  
8 advisory committee but was there as a private person, he  
9 has left the committee a few years ago, raised a question  
10 on the part of the guides and bear in mind we're trying to  
11 compromise between all the user groups and be able to make  
12 a provision for hunting for local folks, he said that he  
13 wondered if some of the guides might have heartburn about  
14 that date. Paul Chernovak who is on our joint committee  
15 from the Fish and Game Advisory Committee as a guide, and  
16 I spoke with him when he returned this fall and he said  
17 that most of the guides now are completing their guided  
18 goat hunt by mid-October and he didn't think that they'd  
19 have a problem and that they'd probably endorse this  
20 compromise.

21

22 I mentioned that to Larry and he said that  
23 we could build it into our goat plan, would be to have an  
24 earlier opening for the north end of the island from the  
25 other part of the island and I mentioned that to Ivan and  
26 Mitch and so if -- and we're still open to tweak this and  
27 modify it some more, so I think once we can get folks  
28 together for another teleconference, maybe towards the end  
29 of this month, then we can put together a report for the  
30 advisory committee and I can type it up and e-mail it out  
31 to you and to Michelle to distribute to folks.

32

33 So I'd say we're probably, unless Ivan  
34 wants to grab my beard and bang my head on the table, we're  
35 probably getting I'd say 98 percent towards coming up with  
36 a reasonable way to provide additional access for people  
37 that live in rural areas in Kodiak for goats. And  
38 personally, when we do make this presentation to the Fish  
39 and Game Advisory Committee I'm going to personally ask  
40 people that understand what was all involved in achieving  
41 this compromise and, you know, you're always going to have  
42 somebody that's going to want to take advantage of it and  
43 I'm really going to ask people to respect the integrity of  
44 what we're trying to achieve and for folks not to go out  
45 and try and get a special deal for themselves just because  
46 there's a registration hunt in Port Lions or Old Harbor or  
47 Larsen Bay. And if we can think of other ways to, you  
48 know, make this to the greatest advantage to local folks I  
49 think that's the direction we will be taking it.

50

00064

1           So I feel pretty good that we've made quite  
2 a bit of progress and I was wondering if Ivan or Mitch or  
3 Mr. Cratty wanted to add anything. I tend to talk too.....

4

5

6           CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pete's been waiving.

7

8           MR. SQUARTSOFF: I just had a question,  
9 Pat, I missed when you were talking about registration  
10 period in the villages, wasn't there a time limit on that?

11

12           MR. HOLMES: Well, that's what we were  
13 thinking would be to come up with a limited time limit  
14 where, you know, folks in the villages would think would  
15 give them an opportunity to do that. And if you wanted to  
16 do it at 8:00 o'clock on October 22nd until 8:15, you could  
17 do that, or something, you know.

18

19           MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, that's what we  
20 talked about with John and Larry VanDaele, a couple of  
21 times that I met with them before this committee was  
22 formed, was putting a very restricted time limit.....

23

24           MR. HOLMES: Yeah.

25

26           MR. SQUARTSOFF: .....in the village to get  
27 your permit.

28

29           MR. HOLMES: Yeah. That would be all part  
30 of this compromise proposal. I did talk also with Ronnie  
31 Lind out at Karluk and also with, oh, shucks, the guy over  
32 at Ouzinkie was on the committee, the guy talks all the  
33 time, but anyway, let them know what we were trying to  
34 accomplish and then Liz Williams took out the general  
35 contacts to -- or compromise to the villages when she was  
36 doing the surveys so that everybody she talked to had an  
37 idea of what we were trying to do and we got some very good  
38 feedback along those lines that, you know, this is a good  
39 approach.

40

41           And then it also allows, with the  
42 continuing drawing hunt, there's folks that do outfitting  
43 and stuff for deer hunters and goat hunters and so that  
44 keeps them in the action on the Refuge whereas a pure  
45 subsistence hunt, if that -- that would take half the goats  
46 on the island and the whole Refuge area out of the general  
47 hunt. So one or two of those folks mentioned that, you  
48 know, they kind of thought this compromise would, you know,  
49 allow them to have a better chance to personally get a  
50 goat. But also would allow them to have their little

00065

1 businesses going and, you know, keep a status quo.

2

3 So I'll be quiet now.

4

5 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I got a couple  
6 questions. Just to clear this in my mind, basically, I  
7 know we've talked about this a couple times. The first  
8 question, what is the annual harvest limit for the goats  
9 right now, and that's under State guidelines; is that  
10 correct?

11

12 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. It's one per person.  
13 If you successfully complete.....

14

15 MR. SQUARTSOFF: It really varies on the  
16 success rate.

17

18 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. Yeah, it does. If  
19 you're asking how many are harvested, we'd have to ask  
20 John.

21

22 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I don't think it's much  
23 more than maybe 40 percent that are harvested, somewhere in  
24 that range.

25

26 MR. HOLMES: That's probably a good guess.

27

28 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: And the changes in  
29 your proposal, the recommendations, are those for State --  
30 basically coming up for State guidelines and not  
31 necessarily Federal?

32

33 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, they'll be State  
34 guidelines, you know.

35

36 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: And the reason I'm  
37 asking this is because if you look through this process,  
38 you've got the December finalizing distributing the report  
39 and then February it comes back to our Council and my guess  
40 at that point is mainly for review or comments because it's  
41 going to go to the Board of Game after that and if this  
42 Council does not need to be taking action on that proposal,  
43 I don't know why it would have to go the May Federal  
44 Subsistence Board, are we going to adopt a Federal -- see  
45 what I'm saying?

46

47 MR. HOLMES: I think it's just a matter of  
48 a courtesy of information on, you know, trying to solve one  
49 problem in one group that was a very delicate political  
50 question. And, you know, more of a courtesy and

00066

1 information thing. And then if you were to decide that,  
2 you know, when the proposal is published for the Board of  
3 Game's review, if you didn't like it then you could send in  
4 a comment to them or we could not send it in or, you know,  
5 the Federal Subsistence Board might decide to take some  
6 different action, that option would still be there.

7

8 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Madame Chair.

9

10 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pete.

11

12 MR. SQUARTSOFF: My understanding was that  
13 the committee was formed, State and Federal to come up with  
14 a proposal for State regulations to work this out locally.

15

16 MR. HOLMES: Yes.

17

18 MR. SQUARTSOFF: So it wouldn't have to  
19 come back to us, it would be done with the State proposal.

20

21 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, it's just informational,  
22 so if you folks were to decide some other direction.....

23

24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Is there any questions  
25 for Pat or Pat?

26

27 MR. HOLMES: I'd really like to thank the  
28 folks that helped on that because everybody really put in  
29 some good thoughts. And Ivan's always good at jerking my  
30 chain to get me think about things in a broader  
31 perspective.

32

33 MR. LUKIN: I think that this, what I want  
34 to say is probably going to be hashed out probably our next  
35 meeting but my concern is some of the areas that got lesser  
36 animals and they feel those areas that -- if they're around  
37 any of our communities that before this is all said and  
38 done, you know, I think being fair with the -- in my  
39 thinking, would be -- where if we got X amount of animals,  
40 that if we can take a percent of them I think it would  
41 solve a lot of problems and a lot of arguments and no good  
42 feelings.

43

44 (Teleconference difficulties)

45

46 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Ivan, the reason I ask  
47 that and I know I need to learn a little more about Kodiak  
48 but I depend on you guys for that is because we've kind of  
49 done something in the sense with moose and the reason we  
50 did it was because the smaller communities were not able to

00067

1 harvest moose nor were they, for the most part, were not  
2 even getting drawn except for -- I think we had less than  
3 20 percent and because of that we have kind of gone through  
4 a process where those -- what was allocated, those 20 moose  
5 by the State have been split by 10 to State and 10 to  
6 Federal and that's the reason I ask that. You know, if  
7 you're comfortable with this process and it sounds like you  
8 guys have done a lot of work to try to resolve it.

9

10 That is the reason that I ask if you're  
11 comfortable with what's there and I guess if we're not at  
12 a point when it comes to February we may take a look at it  
13 then.

14

15 MR. HOLMES: Somebody just handed me a  
16 report, Madame Chairman, from the Refuge and it looks like  
17 a bit above 40 percent, maybe 46 percent harvest success.  
18 So our whole thing is assuming they have a target goal for  
19 X number of goats and so if 40 or 50 percent are actually  
20 shot then that would leave the balance, 40 percent that  
21 would be available for a local registration hunt. I have  
22 the feeling that Larry would try to tweak it the best he  
23 can to make sure that, you know, all the villages have  
24 opportunity.

25

26 Thank you, Madame Chairman.

27

28 MR. LUKIN: I don't want to get in an  
29 argument match over this thing but, you know, you can get  
30 some years where you got better weather and all that plays  
31 in, you know, how the success is going to come out and then  
32 like I said, you get to these areas where there is less  
33 animals, let's say they're allowing 12 or 14 animals to be  
34 taken in one area and that would -- when that hunt is over  
35 -- the drawing hunt is over, if there was 12 permits out  
36 there, you know, we'd be excluded. You know so there's a  
37 problem.

38

39 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. Any other  
40 discussion. Speridon.

41

42 MR. SIMEONOFF: Well, Madame Chairman,  
43 mentioned having an earlier season in the north on Kodiak  
44 Island and we suffer the same weather conditions down at  
45 the south end so maybe we can extend that down for the  
46 whole island instead of just part of it.

47

48 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay. Well, from the  
49 sounds of it I think we definitely be looking at this again  
50 in the winter meeting in Kodiak and look forward to seeing

00068

1 the survey results.

2

3 MR. SQUARTSOFF: One more, can we get those  
4 results as soon as they come out Pat?

5

6 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes.

7

8 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Each member?

9

10 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah.

11

12 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Appreciate it, thank you.

13

14 MS. PETRIVELLI: We'll plan on distributing  
15 the report to the Council and then also the advisory  
16 council just so that the State will have as accurate data  
17 as possible when they make their decision, too.

18

19 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay, thank you Pat  
20 and thank you Pat. I think we'll move back to FP03-07.  
21 Richard.

22

23 MR. UBERUAGA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I  
24 believe we've discussed this issue, pretty much covered the  
25 major points. I'd like to reemphasize that there is a  
26 conservation concern. This proposal goes a long ways in  
27 demonstrating the conservation mindedness of the Council  
28 and the peoples of Kodiak. And in my mind goes a long ways  
29 in speeding the recovery if this population is to increase  
30 in our lifetimes.

31

32 With that, I'll leave it to your  
33 deliberation.

34

35 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Madame Chair, I just --  
36 we're just talking about, what is it, not even a half a  
37 mile by half a mile section on Kodiak, Woman's Bay. It's  
38 a very small portion of the whole Kodiak Island where crab  
39 is available and I just feel that the subsistence user  
40 should be able to, you know, take subsistence crab, these  
41 crab are coming in this bay from the whole Cheniak Bay and  
42 there is quite an abundance of crab in Cheniak Bay, so I  
43 really can't see where it's going to hurt the population  
44 that much by six crab per household per year for Federal  
45 subsistence users.

46

47 MR. UBERUAGA: Madame Chair, I would like  
48 to respond in that I believe the strength of this measure  
49 is in its ability to increase the effectiveness of  
50 enforcement and having everyone play by the same set of

00069

1 rules. And to me that is really the strength of this  
2 measure, it puts everyone on the same playing field. It is  
3 a small area, granted, but the ability to enforce  
4 regulations, it's imperative for this population of crab to  
5 recover.

6  
7 Recovery, you know, we ask ourselves, why  
8 haven't this population started to recover? Well, there's  
9 a lot of factors out there why it may not be recovering but  
10 we need to do everything we possibly can to get it to  
11 recover in our lives otherwise we'll be faced with never  
12 being able to use this as a subsistence resource.

13  
14 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: If you look -- you  
15 mentioned there's a decline but if you look at 77 -- if you  
16 look at '99 -- or '97, '98, '99 and 2000, it looks like '98  
17 and '99 there was a decline but in 2000 it's an increase  
18 and I don't know what the figures are for 2001. Is this an  
19 accurate.....

20  
21 MR. UBERUAGA: Where are you referring to,  
22 which table?

23  
24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: The harvest and  
25 population estimates for Kodiak.

26  
27 MR. UBERUAGA: Uh-huh. Well, again, the  
28 real issue is, is the population threatened and in decline,  
29 is there a big abundant population out there? No. You  
30 know, the Kodiak trawl surveys that are done by the Fish  
31 and Game show that the population is not there. It hasn't  
32 recovered. There might be some local recovery in small  
33 areas like Woman's Bay -- like Woman's Bay. Again, this  
34 proposal is going to strengthen the conservation  
35 enforcement for the whole area, not just this little piece  
36 of ground.

37  
38 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: This area is one half  
39 by a half a mile basically in Woman's Bay is in Federal  
40 jurisdiction?

41  
42 MR. UBERUAGA: Yes.

43  
44 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: So why is it not  
45 possible to keep it, the Federal at six and to drop the  
46 State at this time if that's the concern? Remains at six,  
47 you got one enforcement, you don't have the double and that  
48 would seem like it would make a lot more sense.

49  
50 MR. UBERUAGA: I'm not sure I followed you.

00070

1 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: You got a three and a  
2 six; is that correct?

3

4 MR. UBERUAGA: Right.

5

6 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Three under State and  
7 six under Federal?

8

9 MR. UBERUAGA: Uh-huh.

10

11 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: If the State were to  
12 drop their subsistence and the three, you've got one -- you  
13 know, one enforcement.

14

15 MR. UBERUAGA: So you're saying just allow  
16 fishing only in Woman's Bay by Federally qualified users?

17

18 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yes.

19

20 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Yes.

21

22 MR. UBERUAGA: Well, just about everyone on  
23 Kodiak Island, to my knowledge, is a Federal qualified user  
24 and you'd have everyone fishing in one little area.

25

26 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: But you do now with  
27 nine.

28

29 MR. UBERUAGA: Pardon me?

30

31 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: But you do now with  
32 the limit of nine by State and Federal.

33

34 MR. TUTIAKOFF: No.

35

36 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: You don't?

37

38 MR. UBERUAGA: No.

39

40 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay.

41

42 MR. UBERUAGA: No. You'd be closing off  
43 the entire area except for one little tiny portion and then  
44 all the users would be concentrating in that area  
45 which.....

46

47 MR. SQUARTSOFF: No, what she's saying is  
48 if the State would drop theirs in Woman's Bay only.

49

50 MR. UBERUAGA: If they would drop.....

00071

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: In Federal waters.

2

3 MR. UBERUAGA: Well, I believe again the  
4 confusion is still there in those kind of regulations and  
5 that's.....

6

7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Well, what you're trying  
8 to do then is, so in other words there will be no longer a  
9 Federal subsistence harvest?

10

11 MR. UBERUAGA: No.

12

13 MR. SQUARTSOFF: It will be just the State,  
14 three.

15

16 MR. UBERUAGA: There would be a Federal  
17 subsistence harvest that matched the State's subsistence  
18 harvest.

19

20 MR. SQUARTSOFF: That's it.

21

22 MR. UBERUAGA: Yes, that's correct.

23

24 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Then there would no longer  
25 be.....

26

27 MR. UBERUAGA: But the point is -- the  
28 point is there's a population in crises and we're trying to  
29 implement a conservation measure.

30

31 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I totally understand what  
32 you're saying about that.

33

34 MR. UBERUAGA: Okay.

35

36 MR. SQUARTSOFF: But what I'm saying is we  
37 only have a small little section that's Federal for  
38 subsistence on the whole island, all the rest of this is  
39 State, regulated by State, the rest of the island.

40

41 MR. UBERUAGA: No, there's some other  
42 Federal waters out there but.....

43

44 MR. SQUARTSOFF: But there's no crab in  
45 those Federal waters.

46

47 MR. UBERUAGA: Well, that's part.....

48

49 MR. SQUARTSOFF: There never was.

50

00072

1 MR. UBERUAGA: .....of the purpose of  
2 trying to rebuild a crab population. This is not an  
3 allocation issue because there aren't the crab there to  
4 really allocate to everyone. I mean to me it is a small  
5 token harvest being offered instead of no harvest. The  
6 strict conservation measure to take would be to eliminate  
7 all harvest in Kodiak area wide if you want to try to  
8 recover those crabs.

9  
10 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: That being one part of  
11 it. But the other part that keeps coming up is this  
12 enforcement issue.

13  
14 MR. UBERUAGA: Yes.

15  
16 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: It would be easier,  
17 for the purposes of enforcement if one had three and the  
18 other three instead of one having three and the other  
19 having six.

20  
21 MR. UBERUAGA: Correct.

22  
23 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: What is the issue with  
24 enforcement and why is it -- what is the problem with it?

25  
26 MR. UBERUAGA: The issue -- well, part of  
27 it -- how it relates to this proposal is the crab size  
28 carapace is that we would like to see the same crab  
29 harvested under both regulations because those crabs have  
30 had a chance to breed and reproduce.

31  
32 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Under Federal.....

33  
34 MR. UBERUAGA: Under Federal you're  
35 harvesting immature, you can harvest immature crabs that  
36 haven't had a chance to reproduce but they're right at that  
37 -- you know, you get a five inch crab, yeah, he probably  
38 hasn't -- but if he's six inches he probably has.

39  
40 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: AI.

41  
42 MR. CRATTY: Yeah, I'd like to say I  
43 support this and the reason is, I don't live in Kodiak and  
44 I'm only allowed three crab. And I also read on here where  
45 you got five pots out, I don't agree with that when you're  
46 trying to build a crab place back up. I support it  
47 completely.

48  
49 MR. LUKIN: I have a question, is it open  
50 365 days a year in that little area?

00073

1 MR. CRATTY: No. It closes January 1st.

2

3 MR. LUKIN: Until when?

4

5 MR. CRATTY: Until June or July. It's in  
6 the regulations.

7

8 MR. SQUARTSOFF: That's the State reg.

9

10 MR. CRATTY: I think it's a Federal reg,  
11 too.

12

13 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Is it.

14

15 MR. CRATTY: I don't know.

16

17 MR. HOLMES: It's closed for that period  
18 for mating and molting because the crab come in.....

19

20 MR. CRATTY: They come in and molt.

21

22 MR. HOLMES: .....get soft and molt and  
23 then they mate. And the reason that that's such an  
24 important nursery area is because the cod tend not to go in  
25 there where in the other areas they're more exposed. And  
26 you know, the cod just nail them when they're soft and  
27 molting.

28

29 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Oh, I see.

30

31 MR. HOLMES: And so that was the reason.  
32 And then the testimony that we got from all sorts of people  
33 at the advisory committee was that people were taking these  
34 small undersized crabs that you'd never take or I'd never  
35 take and thinking they were wonderful and what they're  
36 doing, you know, is jeopardizing reproduction for the  
37 future because that's one of the really nice places where  
38 they can reproduce and then their larvae will go out into  
39 reseed the bay.

40

41 So it's kind of like turning a snake loose  
42 in a nursery or something, just -- but the big discussion  
43 that was mentioned was to close the island and Al sat in on  
44 those talks and what we still wanted to do was provide some  
45 time of the year where folks could get, you know, some  
46 crab. Just because of the long-term cultural needs and  
47 everything else without totally shutting it off. So we  
48 dropped this limit some time back.

49

50 I think I'll probably vote in support of

00074

1 this issue when we get to it.

2

3 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Is there any more  
4 questions for Richard? Hearing none, we can go to the  
5 Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments.

6

7 MS. CHIVERS: The Alaska Department of Fish  
8 and Game supports this proposal because it seeks to align  
9 State and Federal regulations and would be clearer to the  
10 public. The Kodiak red king crab stock is depressed at  
11 approximately one percent of former levels. The State  
12 supports the minimum size limit that will ban the harvest  
13 of immature crabs to help increase the breeding stock. The  
14 site of most crab harvest activity in Federally controlled  
15 waters in Woman's Bay is known to be the king crab nursery  
16 area for the larger Cheniak Bay complex.

17

18 To align the State and Federal regulations  
19 the Federal regulation would need to be changed to reduce  
20 the number of crab pots from five to one.

21

22 That concludes the State comments.

23

24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Discussion on the  
25 Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments. Move on to  
26 other Federal and State and tribal agency comments. Glenn.

27

28 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Madame Chair. I  
29 would like to discuss some of the biological information  
30 that's been presented with regards to this proposal. As  
31 you and the Council deliberate on your recommendation and  
32 there's several things I'd like to bring up.

33

34 One is, the proposal recommendation to have  
35 a seven inch minimum size limit, in my discussions with  
36 Rich and others, this would not only ensure that some  
37 breeding occurs prior to harvesting, this also ensures that  
38 female crabs are not taken as part of this fishery. So we  
39 support the seven inch carapace minimum size limit.

40

41 I then next wanted to bring your attention  
42 to the data table that's presented on Page 77 of your book,  
43 Table 1, king crab subsistence harvest and population  
44 estimates. I think, Madame Chair, you referred to this  
45 table earlier. And a couple of things are noteworthy to  
46 bring out on this table and I'd also appreciate comments  
47 back from Pat Holmes on this, but if you look at the total  
48 crab population estimates and those would be the two  
49 columns on the right side, population estimate for Cheniak  
50 Bay, population estimate for all areas. Now, we had the

00075

1 opportunity to hear some of the comments from Dave Jackson,  
2 who is the ADF&G Kodiak area shellfish biologist, there are  
3 some problems with trying to estimate total crab numbers in  
4 this area. There are some problems with sampling. And so  
5 if you look at the numbers here, you would think, my gosh,  
6 what happened from '99 to 2000, the crab numbers went from  
7 40,000 in Cheniak Bay to 2000 [sic], this is more a  
8 reflection of not what the crab populations are doing but  
9 how the sampling is taking place.

10

11 Obviously, ADF&G is trying to work very  
12 hard in improving their sampling but right now there are  
13 problems with just trying to estimate total of crab  
14 numbers.

15

16 The other thing I wanted to bring to your  
17 attention if you go over to the left side of the table and  
18 that's looking at the column entitled number of harvested  
19 in Cheniak Bay, and in discussions with various people it  
20 is unclear how much of that total harvest in Cheniak comes  
21 specifically from that Woman's Bay area. But let's assume,  
22 for example, that all those numbers -- all those crabs come  
23 from Woman's Bay, that would be a total of 173 crab on  
24 average per year, okay, and if you see what percentage of  
25 the total crab in Cheniak Bay, that's about 1.1 percent.  
26 So those are actually some very small numbers.

27

28 I also just wanted to kind of talk about  
29 the average harvest from Cheniak Bay by subsistence users.  
30 The year 1996 stands out in particular. That shows 204  
31 crab harvested. But in '97, '98, '99 and 2000, those  
32 numbers are much lower. So that average of 173 is kind of  
33 pulled up because of that one year of really big harvest.  
34 If you take out '96 and just look at years '97 through  
35 2000, the average is more closer to 68 crab harvested per  
36 year by all subsistence users in the whole part of Cheniak  
37 Bay and that's really only about a half a percent of the  
38 total crab population that's there.

39

40 So as you continue your deliberations I  
41 want you to consider some of this biological information  
42 that's presented.

43

44 Thank you.

45

46 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Glenn. Is  
47 there any questions or discussion for Glenn at this time?  
48 Fish and Game Advisory Committee comments -- we did that.

49

50 MS. CHIVERS: There are no written public

00076

1 comments. I don't know if there are any advisory committee  
2 members that have anything to say at this time.

3

4 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Public testimony.  
5 Regional Council deliberation, recommendation and  
6 justification.

7

8 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Madame Chair.

9

10 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pete.

11

12 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, I'm all in favor of  
13 raising the size limit and dropping the pot limit but I'd  
14 still like to see it left at six for subsistence.

15

16 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Vince.

17

18 MR. TUTIAKOFF: No, I'm listening to all  
19 the discussion. The problem is trying to get a recovery  
20 for future use within the quota issues. You have to do  
21 something. I don't necessarily agree with a lot of the  
22 comments but just try to be conservative. They really  
23 ought to go to seven inch size limits and I agree that they  
24 ought to drop the pot limits to one.

25

26 I don't agree that you should, for  
27 subsistence purposes go to three. I think if you slow down  
28 the amount of pots going into an area under the guise of  
29 Federal subsistence and align it more into the State areas  
30 then you'll probably see a drop of users. Because this --  
31 I don't know how far that is from town, it looks like it's  
32 pretty close, uh, it's right off the Coast Guard station?

33

34 MR. CRATTY: Yeah, that's what it is.

35

36 MR. TUTIAKOFF: And the run way.

37

38 MR. CRATTY: Yeah, it's a very small area.

39

40 MR. TUTIAKOFF: And what I heard earlier  
41 was everybody on Kodiak is a qualified user under the State  
42 and Federal, right, and that's where I'm at. And the way  
43 it's written now I wouldn't vote for it without changes.

44

45 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Ivan, Mitch.

46

47 MR. LUKIN: I understand the concern. You  
48 know, we've had such a problem with the crab in our areas  
49 that I don't even remember when the heck was the last time  
50 I ate king crab. And in that area, in Kodiak, Richard

00077

1 mentioned or one of them said that they have no idea how  
2 many of those crab are leaving the bay and moving out to  
3 deeper waters and then, you know, I wonder how much the  
4 water temperatures are affecting their movements.

5  
6 I don't know I think in terms of -- I just  
7 can't help but think back to overharvest on the commercial  
8 side and then the draggers in the bays which I feel  
9 shouldn't be in there today, whether it's State or Federal  
10 waters. So what I'm trying to say is that I don't feel  
11 that we should be taking it on our end. I'll stick with  
12 what Pete said about reducing the pot limit to one but  
13 keeping the harvest of six.

14  
15 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Speridon.

16  
17 MR. SIMEONOFF: I agree that we should  
18 decrease the number of crab pots in use and leave the  
19 number of seven for -- or six crab per household. The  
20 important issue in south end of Kodiak Island has always  
21 been enforcement. Every summer we have people who come in  
22 from the outside who are subsistence crabbing all summer  
23 long. And, you know, subsistence users that live there  
24 year-round are the people that suffer. This summer is the  
25 first time we've had real enforcement by the state  
26 troopers, you know, cracking down on people who have crab  
27 pots out there that are not identified and are not legal  
28 pots because they don't have the escape line on there.

29  
30 But I would support it without decreasing  
31 the annual number.

32  
33 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Al.

34  
35 MR. CRATTY: I said mine, I support it all  
36 the way. I think there's too much -- you can get hurt out  
37 there there's too many people involved. Especially if  
38 you've got a crab rearing area in so small of an area.

39  
40 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Paul, do you have any  
41 comments or Pat?

42  
43 MR. GUNDERSEN: I feel pretty much the same  
44 way as the rest of the group. Increase the size, drop the  
45 pot limit but I'm rather hesitant about dropping the number  
46 of take.

47  
48 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

49  
50 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

00078

1 MR. HOLMES: I think I would stay with Al  
2 Cratty. Both of us sat through hours of hearings of, you  
3 know, the entire community wanting to just button the whole  
4 thing up and want to still provide some access to them.  
5 The question of a nursery area is really important. In the  
6 '60s and early '70s one could go out in a skiff and throw  
7 out a ring net and basically in the time it took to have a  
8 cup of coffee you could pull up 15 or 20 king crab in just  
9 five minutes and now you can put out a pot for days and not  
10 get one in there. And I would just hate to, you know,  
11 jeopardize those reproducing crab anymore than possible.

12  
13 So I'm going more with the biological  
14 concern than a social concern.

15  
16 Thank you.

17  
18 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pete.

19  
20 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Madame Chair, I  
21 think by going to that greater -- to the seven inch instead  
22 of the five is really going to help a lot on the population  
23 of the crab and harvest there, it will drop those numbers  
24 down quite substantially, I would think from the 63 average  
25 or whatever it is, probably down to 40 or so would be my  
26 guess.

27  
28 But anyway, I would like to make a motion  
29 to amend, that the annual limit is six crab per household  
30 per year, only male king crab, seven inches or greater in  
31 width of shell may be taken or possessed, you may not use  
32 more than one crab pot of any size to take king crab.

33  
34 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I'll second for discussion.

35  
36 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion made and  
37 seconded. Discussion. Question.

38  
39 MR. CRATTY: Question.

40  
41 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Roll call.

42  
43 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Call for roll call.

44  
45 MS. CHIVERS: Al.

46  
47 MR. CRATTY: What's this in favor -- I'm  
48 against.

49  
50 MS. CHIVERS: Ivan.

00079

1 MR. LUKIN: Yes.  
2  
3 MS. CHIVERS: Vince.  
4  
5 MR. TUTIAKOFF: On the motion, yes.  
6  
7 MS. CHIVERS: Pete.  
8  
9 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yes.  
10  
11 MS. CHIVERS: Pat.  
12  
13 MR. HOLMES: No.  
14  
15 MS. CHIVERS: Paul.  
16  
17 MR. GUNDERSEN: Yes.  
18  
19 MS. CHIVERS: Mitch.  
20  
21 MR. SIMEONOFF: Yes.  
22  
23 MS. CHIVERS: Della.  
24  
25 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Yes.  
26  
27 MS. CHIVERS: Madame Chair, okay, it looks  
28 like we have a total of seven yes and one no.  
29  
30 MS. PETRIVELLI: Six yes and two no.  
31  
32 MS. CHIVERS: Excuse me, six and....  
33  
34 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Six yes and two no.  
35  
36 MS. CHIVERS: Sorry.  
37  
38 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Michelle.  
39  
40 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Madame Chair.  
41  
42 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Pete.  
43  
44 MR. SQUARTSOFF: So I'd like to make a  
45 motion to accept the proposal as amended.  
46  
47 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Second.  
48  
49 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I think you basically  
50 amended the motion and made a motion.

00080

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Oh, okay.

2

3 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Yes.

4

5 MR. TUTIAKOFF: We approved the motion, the  
6 proposal, right?

7

8 MR. PETRIVELLI: The proposal as modified.

9

10 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Yeah.

11

12 MR. TUTIAKOFF: As modified.

13

14 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'll withdraw. Yeah, I'll  
15 withdraw, I just wanted to make sure.

16

17 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: The next.....

18

19 MR. HOLMES: Well, if it were still two and  
20 we were going back I'd endorse what you decided.

21

22 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair.

23

24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Vince.

25

26 MR. TUTIAKOFF: In regards to the  
27 subsistence crab, I would like the Fish and Game Staff  
28 member and our people who deal with the crab counts around  
29 this area give us a count for the next meeting that we hold  
30 in regards to this issue. I mean if the numbers are  
31 dropping down below even subsistence use, I mean it's just  
32 starting to just get worse and worse and worse, then this  
33 Board, this Council needs to take action, you know, severe  
34 action, that would mean shut it down completely.

35

36 MR. CRATTY: I think that's what's going to  
37 happen in the long run anyway.

38

39 MR. TUTIAKOFF: We don't want that to  
40 happen but, you know, there's other issues and it's not  
41 subsistence that's causing this decline, that's what I'm  
42 trying to find out. What are the other issues? Is it  
43 trawling or dragging or the water temperature or pollution  
44 from, you know, from the surrounding communities and we  
45 need to find out. There's another issue, it's not  
46 subsistence.

47

48 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Vince. I  
49 would agree. You don't have 2001 or 2002 data on this  
50 schedule.

00081

1 MR. CRATTY: I think that's because -- I'd  
2 like to say I think because there's no crab there, that's  
3 why they don't have no surveys, it's simple.

4  
5 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Well, they had to have the  
6 survey.

7  
8 MR. CRATTY: Well, then why don't they have  
9 any reports on it. I mean it's simple to come out with  
10 them.

11  
12 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I think -- well, Richard,  
13 can you -- I think because a lot of State funding cuts?

14  
15 MR. UBERUAGA: Well, I believe that there's  
16 widespread acknowledgement that the crab population is  
17 severely depressed. It isn't a question of is there enough  
18 crab, I can give some over here and if I can give some over  
19 here. If you want to take the last of the crab, you know,  
20 that's what you're -- you're looking at a really depressed  
21 population and harvesting from that.

22  
23 Again, I asked several times, why are we  
24 even allowing any crab fishing to occur under any kind of  
25 regime, subsistence or sport or anything? And the feeling  
26 is again to allow a minimal token harvest to keep some  
27 traditions alive to allow people to feel like they are a  
28 part of the management of crabbing. You know, this isn't  
29 a question of we're going to rebuild this crab population  
30 by continuing to keep a high harvest by whoever, you know,  
31 this is a severely depressed population. And for years the  
32 data has shown that and the population is not responding so  
33 we have to do something else. We have to continue to look  
34 for some kind of solutions that are going to increase the  
35 population. Again, I've heard a lot of calls for complete  
36 closure and I've heard a lot of argument against complete  
37 closure. But in terms of strict conservation measures in  
38 my mind it's pretty clear, you know, that we have to step  
39 up to the plate and really think about what we're doing.

40  
41 I applaud you on making a couple of moves.  
42 I believe more could have been done but I think you're  
43 starting to go on the right track. But the population is  
44 down, the bottom line is that crab aren't there.

45  
46 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Has there been any  
47 surveys done in 2001 and 2002, are you aware.....

48  
49 MR. UBERUAGA: Population.....

50

00082

1 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: .....are you aware of  
2 anything, just besides the fact that you're saying the  
3 population's depressed?

4  
5 MR. UBERUAGA: Yeah, I believe they survey  
6 every year. The trawl surveys.

7  
8 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay. And the thing  
9 that concerns me, Richard, when you're asking a body like  
10 this to be making decisions based on information in front  
11 of you, we do have information in front of us,  
12 unfortunately it doesn't basically say what's being said or  
13 doesn't justify it and, yet, we make decisions based on  
14 what's in front of us. And I honestly believe I've seen  
15 this numerous times at the statewide level, when you're  
16 looking at surveys and informations and documentation from  
17 the early '90s and the late '80s and we're into 2002.

18  
19 MR. UBERUAGA: Uh-huh.

20  
21 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: You know, how you  
22 justify -- you know, when we need to be making good  
23 accurate decisions we should have good accurate information  
24 in front of us.

25  
26 MR. UBERUAGA: I'll work at getting you  
27 some up to date 2002 trawl survey information. I believe  
28 it's going to show you that the population is very  
29 depressed, it has not even began to recover.

30  
31 MR. LUKIN: One question, Richard. Do you  
32 have any idea what happens to those crab when they're  
33 lifted up with a trawl?

34  
35 MR. UBERUAGA: I imagine it probably -- the  
36 same thing that happens when you drop crap pots on a pod of  
37 them, you know, they're getting crushed and getting damaged  
38 and dying and probably quickly, very quickly.

39  
40 And I agree with you, that is probably  
41 something that if we could focus on that through the  
42 Federal program we'd be right after it but.....

43  
44 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, I think that  
45 this Board would probably even look at the recommendation  
46 as it was presented if we'd seen those updated figures.  
47 And also an attempt by the State to lower their three crab  
48 limit. I mean they're asking us to cut ours in half and yet  
49 there's nothing being done on the State side permit.

50

00083

1 MR. UBERUAGA: Uh-huh. The....

2

3 MR. TUTIAKOFF: You know, I'm not going to  
4 argue the point, we seem to go right back to the user first  
5 and then go the other way. And I still say it's a  
6 commercial issue out there that needs to be addressed and  
7 we can't do it from our level, it's a Fish and Game Board  
8 level that needs to address these concerns and what are  
9 they doing to try to enhance that other than just shutting  
10 it down, you still have trawl going on and that's the  
11 biggest killer of the bottom of the ocean anywhere.

12

13 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pete.

14

15 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, I really feel that  
16 going from five inch to seven inch is going to make a great  
17 difference on that population.

18

19 MR. UBERUAGA: I believe you're correct.  
20 I believe it will be another step in rebuilding but there's  
21 several steps.

22

23 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Richard, Pete just  
24 mentioned this and I know Glenn talked a little about these  
25 figures earlier, but if you look on that schedule again on  
26 77, for the most part this population appears, in fact,  
27 overall it's increased, if you look at 2000 at the 188,026  
28 and there is the probability -- possibility of the water  
29 temperature, the feed -- you know, that these crabs move  
30 around. I mean it's a known fact, you see it over here in  
31 Leonard's Harbor and in different areas.

32

33 MR. UBERUAGA: Uh-huh.

34

35 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: And it sure would be  
36 nice, I think, to have those -- whatever information is  
37 available from 2001 and 2002 to date for our winter meeting  
38 in Kodiak so we can look at this issue again.

39

40 MR. UBERUAGA: Okay. I'll do my darndest  
41 in getting that up to date trawl information as specific to  
42 Cheniak Bay as I can and I'll get a hold of Wayne Donaldson  
43 and maybe he can even come to the meeting, too.

44

45 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

46

47 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, if I might  
48 suggest at that meeting that you request a review of which  
49 areas are closed and when because there's been a lot of  
50 areas that are closed and you know, both Pete and Al have

00084

1 mentioned places where people are cheating and that's  
2 obviously a problem. But it might be good information for  
3 the folks to know what areas are closed and when and under  
4 both State and Federal regs. And also a year or so ago  
5 they had an international symposium on king crab and it  
6 might be interesting to have a very brief review of what  
7 the conclusions were for that as to the reason for the  
8 decline of king crab in the western part of Alaska. They  
9 did reach some conclusions, I think it would be good to  
10 have maybe a little mini, very short brief summary on that.  
11 It might be educational for the folks.

12  
13 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat.  
14 Richard, we thank you very much.

15  
16 MR. UBERUAGA: Thank you for....

17  
18 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: If we can maybe go  
19 ahead and take a 10 minute break before we go to No. 12 and  
20 I think after No. 12 we're going to be close to the 3:00  
21 o'clock mark for our work session.

22  
23 (Off record)

24  
25 (On record)

26  
27 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Steve wanted to make  
28 an announcement here.

29  
30 MR. KLEIN: I guess we're not going to get  
31 into the monitoring program until tomorrow but we do have  
32 one of the monitoring program projects here in Cold Bay.

33  
34 We do have one of our monitoring projects  
35 here in Cold Bay at Mortenson Creek where they have a weir  
36 counting -- well, they're counting coho salmon now and  
37 they've already sockeye, if any of the Council members or  
38 anybody was interested in seeing that we could make those  
39 arrangements tomorrow after the meeting. And actually Rick  
40 Poetter, the Refuge manager would tack on a tour of Izembek  
41 Refuge for those that were interested. So if people are  
42 interested we could make arrangements to make that happen.

43  
44 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Steve.

45  
46 MR. KLEIN: But we need to know today.

47  
48 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Before we get started  
49 I want to -- Tonya, if you could stay with us a short while  
50 we can try to put something together for this proposal on

00085

1 Afognak for the -- I think this would come up for  
2 proposals, call for proposals.

3

4 MS. BROCKMAN: I don't quite understand the  
5 process.

6

7 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Yeah, we'll need to  
8 get that figured out so we'll have it ready for tomorrow.  
9 And there's one other comment I want to make and we will  
10 discuss this in our committee.

11

12 I have been sitting through this meeting  
13 and I am a little concerned, I get the sense as we sit here  
14 and it's my understanding our obligation is first to the  
15 subsistence user, correct me if I'm wrong, and the issue of  
16 conservation. I've looked a little bit at this issue with  
17 the goats. At our winter meeting it was my understanding  
18 that we had passed to do a C&T, customary and trade [sic],  
19 to determine a custom C&T on goats and that -- I really  
20 sincerely feel that information should have been available  
21 for us today.

22

23 And to some degree I feel that, and maybe  
24 the rest of you don't feel this way, but that we've kind of  
25 -- there's some things and ideas -- and I don't, you know,  
26 disagree with what's been done but I do feel a little  
27 uncomfortable with that process and I'm hoping, to be  
28 honest with you, that we don't do it, you know, I really  
29 wished that information was in front of us today. Because  
30 the request we had was from the subsistence users in Kodiak  
31 as far as goats are concerned and we've put them off again  
32 and it's going to be a year and it's going to come back to  
33 us and it may then still not be anything done with it. But  
34 that will be open for discussion in our committee.

35

36 I think the next item on our agenda is call  
37 for proposal to change Federal subsistence wildlife  
38 regulations, Tab G.

39

40 MS. CHIVERS: Madame Chair, it's actually  
41 Tab F. Sorry. This form is just provided to everyone so  
42 that if the public had attended the meeting or if there  
43 were other agency Staff that wanted to submit a proposal,  
44 we are accepting the call for proposals, wildlife proposals  
45 until October 18th at 5:00 p.m., and so we just wanted to  
46 make sure that everybody's aware of that if we were going  
47 to put some proposals together. And I believe you  
48 mentioned one to Tonya already so we have until October  
49 18th to get that submitted.

50

00086

1 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Do we have proposals  
2 from the public?

3  
4 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Where are we?

5  
6 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: On wildlife.

7  
8 MS. CHIVERS: No proposals were submitted  
9 to date.

10  
11 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay. Basically no  
12 agency proposal, Regional Council proposals? I got a  
13 question, Michelle, for this Afognak Lake drainage and this  
14 issue, where do we take this up to submit for a proposal on  
15 here?

16  
17 MS. CHIVERS: That would be.....

18  
19 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Is it under the  
20 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plans?

21  
22 MS. CHIVERS: That would be with our  
23 office, yes, you would talk to one of the FIS Staff and we  
24 have FIS Staff here attending the meeting.

25  
26 MR. TUTIAKOFF: We haven't seen a report on  
27 those areas or are we going to get them?

28  
29 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Well, Vince has a --  
30 that would be under Migratory Birds, isn't it?

31  
32 MR. CRATTY: Are we under Tab G?

33  
34 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: There's a little bit  
35 of confusion, I guess, where we're at.

36  
37 MS. BROCKMAN: I think the Afognak Lake  
38 thing will happen when the agency reports, when -- I just  
39 want to make sure everyone had that in their stuff.

40  
41 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I guess we'll move on  
42 to Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. Steve Klein.

43  
44 MR. KLEIN: Tab G.

45  
46 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Somebody did the tabs  
47 wrong.

48  
49 MR. KLEIN: For the record I'm Steve Klein,  
50 the Chief of Fisheries Information Services within the

00087

1 Office of Subsistence Management. And we help implement  
2 the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program and the Partners  
3 Program.

4

5 Your Staff within the monitoring program  
6 for fisheries is Steve Fried who is a fish biologist on my  
7 Staff, normally he would be here but he's up in Kotzebue  
8 today and then our anthropologist is Laura Jurgensen who's  
9 in the sweater back there. And Laura just recently joined  
10 us from the regulatory division, she'll be our  
11 anthropologist in the harvest monitoring and traditional  
12 ecological knowledge projects for the Bristol Bay and  
13 Kodiak/Aleutians region.

14

15 We got a couple of things to do for the  
16 monitoring program today. Madame Chair, I guess what I  
17 would suggest is to go over the 2003 monitoring program.  
18 That is an action item where you need to -- we have kind of  
19 the scientific recommendations for you today on what  
20 projects we think should be funded for 2003 and now it's  
21 time to get input from the Council here before the Board  
22 makes a decision.

23

24 So for 2003, this will be the fourth year  
25 of the monitoring program. I think everybody here has been  
26 through the process at least once and many of you three or  
27 four times. But we have completed the scientific review,  
28 which was a two stage review that reviewed proposals and  
29 then later investigation plans. So we've done the hard  
30 work in terms of bringing scientifically sound proposals to  
31 you for your consideration. And what we'll be presenting  
32 is those scientific sound proposals.

33

34 We're under Tab G and if first you could  
35 turn to Page 103, where there's a Table 1 and a Table 2.  
36 For 2003, we had a total of \$1.9 million available  
37 statewide. Within the Bristol Bay Kodiak/Aleutians region,  
38 if you look in Table 2, under target we have \$210,000  
39 available for projects in 2003 for the Kodiak/Aleutians and  
40 Bristol Bay region.

41

42 And we did a call for proposals last  
43 November. We received a total of 59 proposals and we  
44 reviewed them by the Technical Review Committee and they  
45 advanced 37 of those for more the detailed investigation  
46 plans where we carefully go over the objectives, the  
47 methods and sampling design. So what we have on the table  
48 statewide is a total of 37 proposals. And if you look at  
49 Table 1 for Bristol Bay, Kodiak, we have five studies for  
50 your -- where we requested investigation plans and the

00088

1 Technical Review Committee is recommending funding for four  
2 of those. And that's in Table 1 for the Bristol Bay/Kodiak  
3 line. And then the next table and this is where we get  
4 into your action item, on Page 107 is a listing of those  
5 five projects that are for your consideration for the 2003  
6 monitoring plan.

7

8           And what we have are five projects, they  
9 totaled \$288,000, we had -- it shows 140,000 there but  
10 actually there's 210,000 available because for the -- all  
11 we advanced and actually all we received was projects for  
12 stock, status and trends, the biological studies we didn't  
13 receive any proposals for harvest monitoring or traditional  
14 ecological knowledge studies. So we would include that  
15 70,000 that was set aside for the social science studies in  
16 here so there's about 210,000 available in the Bristol  
17 Bay/Kodiak/Aleutians region. And the five studies are  
18 listed there by title. And I'll just briefly summarize  
19 those and then try to answer any questions and then we need  
20 a motion by the Council on which projects they're  
21 interested in in moving forward.

22

23           The first project listed there is Alagnak  
24 River sockeye salmon. This is a project that was started  
25 in 2000 -- it's a little code we have here but the first  
26 digits of that number, under study number, that's the year  
27 it was initially submitted. So for that project it was one  
28 submitted in 2000, it was actually funded in 2000 so it's  
29 been funded for three years and they're requesting  
30 additional funding in 2003. And what they're doing is  
31 putting up counting towers and they're counting sockeye  
32 salmon as they move up within the Alagnak River drainage.  
33 It's an \$86,000 study.

34

35           As you can see we had the -- there's more  
36 studies requesting more funding than what we have. So that  
37 project, the Technical Review Committee really felt that  
38 was probably the lowest priority and they weren't  
39 recommending that for funding given the importance of the  
40 other projects. And the Alagnak River, a lot of sockeye  
41 salmon do go up there but there's very little subsistence  
42 use within the Alagnak River drainage. Levelok is the  
43 closest village and they get most of their or nearly all of  
44 their salmon out of the Kvichak River proper and not the  
45 Alagnak. So in terms of subsistence use it's not -- it's  
46 very little subsistence use and that's why we're not  
47 recommending that for funding.

48

49           The second one is the Buskin River. In  
50 your meetings last March, Don Tracy was here and did a

00089

1 presentation on that project. Unlike the Alagnak, the  
2 Buskin is very important for subsistence uses. Over, what,  
3 5,000 sockeye that are used there versus probably hundreds  
4 in the Alagnak, so given the high subsistence use of  
5 sockeye salmon in the Buskin, that project we were  
6 recommending for funding in 2003.

7

8           The third study listed there is Lake Clark  
9 sockeye salmon. This is another counting tower project.  
10 There, it is an important subsistence use of sockeye and  
11 there we did recommend funding of that project.

12

13           The next study is coho salmon escapement in  
14 streams adjacent to Perryville. And there are more  
15 detailed descriptions of these following this table. But  
16 in Perryville, there's three streams that are utilized for  
17 subsistence for about 2,000 coho salmon. Unfortunately  
18 those systems are very depressed, in fact, they're closed  
19 to use. There's several systems adjacent to it that the  
20 King Salmon Fisheries Resource Office was interested in  
21 monitoring there. We expect kind of a shift in use since  
22 those systems around Perryville are closed and it's just a  
23 check to monitor those systems and really we have no idea  
24 how many fish are going up there.

25

26           So you can use helicopter surveys to just  
27 get an index of abundance. That proposal there is to a  
28 couple of aerial surveys by helicopter, I think twice a  
29 year for six systems and that was at about 10,000 a year  
30 and the Technical Review Committee thought that would  
31 provide some valuable information to get a handle on the  
32 abundance in these other systems around Perryville.

33

34           And finally the last project is the  
35 biotechnician training. This is a Park Service project  
36 where they're training interns so that they can work in  
37 some of these monitoring projects there. And as you know,  
38 capacity building is a priority for this program.  
39 Sometimes it's very difficult to find people to work on  
40 these projects. So the Park Service has put together a  
41 training program and they did one in the Iliamna area this  
42 past summer that was very successful and they would like to  
43 continue it next year. They also have some cost sharing  
44 and it would provide a pool of applicants that we could use  
45 to get some local hires on some of the monitoring program  
46 projects.

47

48           So what we have is a total of five projects  
49 for your consideration for funding in 2003. Based upon the  
50 Technical Review Committee review of those projects, we're

00090

1 recommending that those last four be funded for a total of  
2 202,000 and that would fully utilize the funding available  
3 within the Kodiak/Bristol Bay region.

4

5 So I would ask if you have any questions  
6 I'd be pleased to answer them and we're looking for  
7 recommendation from the Council on which of these projects  
8 that you want to fund for 2003.

9

10 Madame Chair.

11

12 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Al.

13

14 MR. CRATTY: Yeah, I'd like to see this  
15 Buskin River funding keep going on. I think it's a good  
16 subsistence issue there for the people in Kodiak.

17

18 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Al. Steve,  
19 can you explain to me on this fisheries biotechnician  
20 training program, is that training one person for the  
21 Bristol Bay/Kodiak/Aleutians or is it -- what exactly is  
22 that?

23

24 MR. KLEIN: Madame Chair, actually they  
25 train, I believe this past year was about a dozen people.  
26 And they cover safety training, they cover how to collect  
27 scales, how to count fish and it was about a two week  
28 training session. So it was in the Iliamna area last year,  
29 I assume it probably would be near Park Service lands there  
30 for 2003 as well.

31

32 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I'm going to be really  
33 honest with you, I'm looking at this and I understand and  
34 realize we may have not turned in proposals and I know we  
35 talked about this issue of funding when we are basically --  
36 in reality we're actually three regions if you really --  
37 four regions if you really think about it, if you include  
38 Bristol Bay with the Chigniks, you've got the Aleutians and  
39 you've got Kodiak. But if you take this breakout of that  
40 202.3 or the -- you know, you look at the Kodiak/Aleutians  
41 54.5 and the Bristol Bay of 125.8 and this fisheries  
42 biotechnician training program, was that a proposal brought  
43 in from Bristol Bay or is that something that Fish and  
44 Wildlife is doing in general statewide?

45

46 MR. KLEIN: Madame Chair, well, the  
47 biotechnician training -- all agencies are doing that to  
48 train people to work on these projects. But this was a  
49 project submitted by the Park Service to continue a program  
50 they started this year. We didn't explicitly request a

00091

1 project on biotechnician training. In fact, that  
2 particular project it was rolled into the Lake Clark  
3 sockeye salmon project and we split it out from that.

4

5 MR. GUNDERSEN: How does the -- there may  
6 be people in a lot of these communities that are interested  
7 in getting into this program and where is it advertised and  
8 how do they get in contact with people to do it, to get  
9 signed up to take the training for the biotechnicians? I  
10 haven't seen anything in this neck of the woods.

11

12 MR. CRATTY: Nothing in Kodiak.

13

14 MR. KLEIN: I think we could have people  
15 from Kodiak or the Aleutians try to get into those  
16 trainings. They house them on-site and we have had some  
17 difficulties getting technicians in this area. So we could  
18 ensure that there's a solicitation for training applicants  
19 where it went to all the villages and Kodiak/Aleutians as  
20 well.

21

22 MR. GUNDERSEN: Well, I think a good place  
23 to start would go to the communities, to their non-profits  
24 or have that information go through the tribes, that  
25 information sent to the communities so the people in the  
26 area get a chance to apply to take the training.

27

28 The other question I would have here was  
29 the escapement estimates or the population monitoring of  
30 Lake Clark sockeye, that's, I think what they're talking  
31 about if I remember correctly. The out migration of smolt,  
32 isn't it for that project?

33

34 MR. KLEIN: No, they're counting the adults  
35 as they move into Lake Clark.

36

37 MR. GUNDERSEN: Oh, I thought they had  
38 several counting weirs on that Kvichak system feeding that.

39

40 MR. KLEIN: For Lake Clark, this is the  
41 enumeration project for sockeye going into Lake Clark for  
42 the returning adults and we're funding it.

43

44 MR. GUNDERSEN: Well, the State's operated  
45 one there for years, aren't they, on the Kvichak?

46

47 MR. KLEIN: Maybe. I think for Lake Clark,  
48 we're not -- we wouldn't be duplicating the State's effort  
49 there.

50

00092

1 MR. GUNDERSEN: Oh, okay, I'm thinking  
2 about Iliamna, they're just taking it down to the lower  
3 end, so -- so Lake Clark -- so this would be more or less  
4 on the Newhalen River?

5 MR. KLEIN: Yes.

6

7 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

8

9 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, I have two  
10 questions for Steve. What or who is the Technical Review  
11 Committee, is that all OSM folks or who is your Technical  
12 Review Committee?

13

14 MR. KLEIN: The Technical Review Committee  
15 consists of one member from each of the five Federal  
16 agencies and usually they have very strong quantitative  
17 skills, Park Service -- all the Federal agencies within the  
18 subsistence management program. And then we also -- I sit  
19 on that committee as well and then three members from the  
20 Alaska Department of Fish and Game and they're from the  
21 Subsistence Division, Sportfish and Commfish.

22

23 MR. HOLMES: And another question, I think,  
24 going off of Della's comment, you've got Bristol Bay lumped  
25 in with Kodiak/Aleutians and to be provincial, it would be  
26 nice to see those separated out because our RAC committee  
27 deals with Kodiak and Chignik and Alaska Peninsula and the  
28 Aleutians and so one can't help but feel a little bit  
29 paranoid as to, you know, when funds are allocated out, you  
30 know, what's going to our region versus Bristol Bay and it  
31 would be nice to have those two things as separate  
32 components. Because I feel reluctant to comment on the  
33 appropriateness of something for Bristol Bay but, you know,  
34 most of us have more of our experience here in our region.  
35 So I think it would be nice, in the future to see that  
36 split out somehow even if you're lumping them together for  
37 your own administrative needs, it would still be nice to  
38 know where things are going to -- I guess Della said it the  
39 best.

40

41 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. Any  
42 other questions.

43

44 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Your question was about us  
45 wanting -- which programs we wanted to continue, can we add  
46 new programs now or do we have to wait until later?

47

48 MR. KLEIN: The process we've utilize is we  
49 do the call for proposals in November and anybody who's  
50 interested can submit a proposal. They come in in early

00093

1 spring. They're reviewed by my staff and this Technical  
2 Review Committee. After we do that initial scientific  
3 review we ask for those studies we think are meeting the  
4 needs of the Councils as well as are technically sound and  
5 have partnerships and capacity building and strong  
6 applicants. We do request an investigation plan, we review  
7 that again. And then once we conclude that process that's  
8 when we bring them to you. So that's the process that the  
9 Board has laid out and we've followed that since 2000.

10

11           And for the next opportunity for new  
12 proposals under that process would be 2004 and that call  
13 will be coming out in November of this year. So in two  
14 months, I've told Steve Fried and Laura that we need to  
15 work harder to get more proposals from the Kodiak/Aleutians  
16 region. Part of it I think we need to get the call  
17 broadcast out more but Laura's here to help anybody work on  
18 proposals if you want to do that during this meeting.  
19 Steve's available. We need to get more proposals coming  
20 forward from the Kodiak/Aleutians. Della, I sympathize  
21 with your earlier comments there.

22

23           CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Well the reason I'm  
24 asking this, too, if you look at this process and there's  
25 request for the Afognak Lake drainage on Afognak Island,  
26 this proposal, if we drafted it today, will be -- it will  
27 probably be worked on but it's not going to go until the  
28 call for proposals in November. Then you go through this  
29 whole process of what, our winter meetings and we may be  
30 able to review it then. Then you go through the spring.  
31 Are these proposals going to be accepted in the spring of  
32 2003 but are they not going to go into place until 2004.  
33 And the concern I have with looking at this and what  
34 happened this summer is, I personally feel that there needs  
35 to be something done this next year if there's any way to  
36 start taking a look at this system to find out what  
37 happened.

38

39           And that's my question, what can we do to  
40 do something about that. Hopefully something can be done  
41 in 2003 and not have to wait until 2004. Like maybe  
42 putting the fisheries biotechnician program aside for a  
43 year.

44

45           MR. GUNDERSEN: But isn't that taken care  
46 of under the emergency order system?

47

48           CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: They don't have the  
49 funding to fund it.

50

00094

1 MR. KLEIN: For Afognak Lake, I know there  
2 was an idea that we could use the .809 funding and that was  
3 brought to Peggy, my boss' attention there and basically  
4 that funding is used for wildlife and unless it was really  
5 deemed a severe emergency and there was money, there was an  
6 interest in using -- if this is an issue that's very, very  
7 important to the Council you could put a proposal forward  
8 and we could try to find funding for it. Right now we have  
9 followed this process and I think it's a process that's  
10 served us well. Things do come up where you need to go  
11 outside that process and maybe somebody can dig in their  
12 pockets and find 40,000 to something for Afognak Lake.  
13

14 If you had a proposal and something that  
15 could be reviewed I think that would be the first step.  
16 Generally, I think to have scientific and technical review  
17 from like the Technical Review Committee, that would be the  
18 first step. I don't think -- I know Tom wouldn't or Peggy  
19 wouldn't even consider anything before we had that step, so  
20 that would be the first step, is to get a proposal forward.  
21

22 MR. HONNARD: My name's Steve Honnard,  
23 Department of Fish and Game. When we found out about this  
24 stock failure and the subsistence fishery was closed we  
25 began deliberating within the Department what we could do  
26 and the initial thing that we thought of was this process  
27 that Steve was describing. At the time we weren't aware  
28 that the proposal dates had passed so we prepared a  
29 proposal following the guidelines that they provided for  
30 preparing proposals but the deadline had passed. So that's  
31 why we've been trying to look at other sources of funding  
32 because we feel the same way you do that we should start  
33 something as soon as we can.  
34

35 Following the lines of the letter that you  
36 have there from the Fish and Wildlife Service, we pretty  
37 much want to do what that letter outlines as soon as we  
38 can. Look at all of the available data that's been  
39 collected to date and then also if we can, do a smolt  
40 project right away. And then if we can't get funding  
41 through this process, we would develop a proposal for the  
42 next period, next November. But I think you're right that  
43 we wouldn't be able to implement a project until the spring  
44 of 2004 following this process as it is now. So that's why  
45 we are looking at that .809 funding.  
46

47 And as it looks now, like what Steve said,  
48 that's mostly funding wildlife projects. So without an  
49 alternative source of funding we wouldn't be able to  
50 implement anything this coming year.

00095

1 And I've brought some information to  
2 present and I guess during Staff presentations I could  
3 present that regarding Afognak Lake. I can take it out of  
4 order if you want and present it some other time. It  
5 doesn't matter to me I've got it ready.

6  
7 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. Peggy and  
8 Steve Klein, last year when we went through this we ended  
9 up doing this -- and you're going to have to help me with  
10 the terminology because it's been awhile, we did a study on  
11 customary trade or historical use or what was it that we  
12 did as part of the Aleutians, on Alaska Pen -- there's two  
13 different types of funding and what were those?

14  
15 MR. KLEIN: For 2002 we did do a harvest --  
16 we started a harvest monitoring and TEK project in the  
17 Kodiak/Aleutians regions.

18  
19 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: And that basically was  
20 Alaska Penn -- Aleutians and Alaska Peninsula, it didn't  
21 include Kodiak; isn't that correct? I'm thinking so  
22 because Kodiak got left out of that. And my request at the  
23 winter meeting was if there was any funding that Kodiak be  
24 included in that however nothing has transpired from that.

25  
26 The reason I'm going back to this and I  
27 guess I don't know what the process is and whether it's  
28 been done before but if we looked at this and we see the  
29 fisheries biotechnician training program and this 22  
30 million and given that there is a concern here, whether we  
31 can ask Bristol Bay whether we can put some of this aside  
32 or push aside to come up with some figures our something to  
33 recognize that this is a problem. If you look at these  
34 studies and the amount of monies it is because of lack of  
35 fish and the concern in these river systems in Bristol Bay,  
36 this is the same concern, I think it's really important. Is  
37 there any way, our process, besides .803, that this can be  
38 addressed under this?

39  
40 MR. KLEIN: I think for the 200 -- well,  
41 the final decision on what projects are funded will rest  
42 with the Federal Subsistence Board. And if they had a  
43 project that was reviewed by the TRC that was technically  
44 sound, they might consider that. I think you would want a  
45 proposal that was reviewed by the Technical Review  
46 Committee and hope that there was support there. But,  
47 yeah, it takes a long time to go through this process and  
48 I know we could lose a year. I think just going through  
49 that process of getting a proposal forward, I mean there's  
50 a lot of agencies on that Board, there's a lot of programs

00096

1 within the Fish and Wildlife Service, really if you had a  
2 couple of agencies kick up \$10,000 it's my understanding  
3 with 40,000 you could probably do this. I think having the  
4 Technical Review Committee support for it would be crucial  
5 no matter what path you choose.

6

7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I just wanted to comment  
8 a little bit on this Afognak Lake. I didn't find out about  
9 it until last summer and I didn't even realize that they --  
10 that the numbers had declined the year before and it is a  
11 big system, a subsistence area for Kodiak. The city of  
12 Kodiak, Ouzinkie and Port Lions use it a lot plus the  
13 people living around Afognak, which has grown quite a bit  
14 with the Russian villages going up there. But it is really  
15 really important. I feel probably more subsistence fish  
16 come out of Litnik than does out of the Buskin, that would  
17 be my guess. I'm not really sure but a lot of people take  
18 a lot of fish out of Litnik. The Buskin is people that  
19 don't have the boats big enough to go over to Litnik, they  
20 get them right there at the Buskin. But a lot of people  
21 from Kodiak take boats and go over to this system here.

22

23 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: You mentioned the .803  
24 process, it's mostly been wildlife at this point; is that  
25 correct?

26

27 MR. KLEIN: Yes. And it's .809.

28

29 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Or .809, I'm getting  
30 .803 here. We're going to create a new one that's called  
31 .803.

32

33 MR. GUNDERSEN: That's the big pot of  
34 money.

35

36 (Laughter)

37

38 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: What I'd like to do is  
39 get as much assistance as we can to put some sort of draft  
40 proposal together prior to us leaving this meeting. So  
41 that means some of you can't go hunting tonight. What I'd  
42 like to do is at least be able to accept a draft proposal  
43 that we can submit -- or that we can accept tomorrow that  
44 we can forward on to hopefully go to the December meeting  
45 to the Federal Board as a special action, if possible,  
46 under the .809 as fisheries, even if it's not wildlife.  
47 I'd like to be able to present that at that meeting if at  
48 all possible.

49

50 MS. FOX: Della, the .809 funds that we're

00097

1 all referring to are cooperative funds that are set aside  
2 specifically for our working relationship with the  
3 Department of Fish and Game. This process is oriented  
4 towards developing proposals that are submitted by anybody.  
5 It's an open process. Fish and Game can submit proposals  
6 to do work, private organizations, private individuals can  
7 submit proposals to do work. And that process requires  
8 that those proposals go through a very rigorous review so  
9 that they are technically very sound, the research is  
10 something that we can depend on as being accurate and the  
11 effects of that research are going to meet the needs that  
12 drove us to the point of having to fund the project in the  
13 first place.

14

15           It's a completely different process from  
16 the Section .809 cooperative funding process that we use  
17 which is strictly administered by the Office of Subsistence  
18 Management and has to do with getting Staff support from  
19 Fish and Game to do subsistence management.

20

21           For example, we have to provide funds to  
22 Fish and Game to support their travel to our meetings, to  
23 support a number of positions within Fish and Game for them  
24 to be able to devote Staff to work with us on a weekly  
25 basis, if you will, as do these protocols, as we discuss  
26 management issues in different regions like we are spending  
27 a lot of time working with them relative to Southeast  
28 relationships, Fish and Game, subsistence users and Federal  
29 Subsistence Program. The bulk of that money goes for that  
30 purpose. It's also to provide funding for fish and game  
31 advisory committee chairs to attend these meetings.

32

33           There's just a number of things that we do  
34 but it's a whole different type of a process and it is not  
35 a public process in those terms. That funding is  
36 specifically for products that we get from Fish and Game to  
37 serve Board's needs. The Board's needs relative to the  
38 working relationships. But also when we talk about it  
39 being spent on wildlife, it's not really spent on wildlife  
40 surveys, per se, but these are projects that the Board has  
41 decided that they need to have done in cooperation with  
42 Fish and Game to answer regulatory questions. And I can  
43 give you examples of those but it's not for fisheries  
44 projects.

45

46           CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Then I guess my next  
47 question is, are there any discretionary funding -- is  
48 there any discretionary funding available that something  
49 can be put together to possibly try to address this in  
50 2003?

00098

1 MS. FOX: Within our office I'd have to say  
2 -- I'm not the decision-maker, but to my knowledge, no,  
3 there isn't any discretionary funding without going through  
4 the process.

5  
6 Now, you know, with that said, we will try  
7 to support finding funds. I mean, there's other agencies  
8 involved in this. For example, the Fish and Wildlife  
9 Service perhaps, Afognak, I'm not sure maybe the State has  
10 some funds, I don't know. But we could help facilitate  
11 getting some attention paid to that and we'll be glad to do  
12 that. But we don't have a process outside of that, you  
13 know, lengthy process where it goes through the Technical  
14 Review Committee and then it's out for public comment and  
15 it goes through the Councils and through all the agencies  
16 and to the Board for so-called emergency actions or special  
17 actions. That doesn't say we should have one, I'm not  
18 addressing that, maybe we should have one but at this time  
19 we don't.

20  
21 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: And Peggy, for the  
22 most part, maybe both you and Steve can answer this, for  
23 the most part we've been doing this for the last, what,  
24 three or four years, three years at least?

25  
26 MS. FOX: Three years, uh-huh.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Has most of the funding  
29 that's been allocated or budgeted been actually spent on  
30 these projects?

31  
32 MR. KLEIN: There are some projects that  
33 they have not been able to complete the work and the funds  
34 are deobligated. So that's something that can happen. And  
35 actually for 2003, I went back and looked at the summary  
36 table, actually there is some 30,000 -- we had 1.857  
37 million set aside for 2003 and at least the TRC  
38 recommendations would only utilize 1.827 so there's 30,000  
39 that the TRC did not recommend for funding. Unfortunately,  
40 most of these projects usually go up a little bit before  
41 the final agreements are submitted.

42  
43 But a project could get canceled or  
44 somebody couldn't do it, there is that option. I guess  
45 what I'm hearing is here's a high priority that you'd  
46 really like addressed in 2003. I think that you should  
47 look at that separately from the projects you're  
48 considering here and let's run it through the Technical  
49 Review Committee as a first step and let's see what that  
50 turns up and you could recommend that the Board consider

00099

1 that for any additional funds that might come up.

2

3 But I think it would be dead in the water  
4 unless it had the scientific review and strong support from  
5 a Regional Advisory Council.

6

7 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: I think it has strong  
8 support from the Regional Advisory Council.

9

10 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair.

11

12 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Vince.

13

14 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yeah, we're talking about  
15 the five studies, I want to get back to those and then talk  
16 a separate issue on the Afognak because it's not on the  
17 agenda necessarily.

18

19 Steve, you're recommending action to  
20 approve 202 or 210, these numbers are bouncing around for  
21 the five studies, what was it?

22

23 MR. KLEIN: The targeted amount of money  
24 that we have for the Kodiak/Bristol Bay/Aleutians region is  
25 210,000. And with the four studies that the Technical  
26 Review Committee is recommending, they would total 202,300.

27

28 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Well, 210 would include the  
29 biotech, right, is that the only difference?

30

31 MR. KLEIN: The 202 would include the  
32 biotech. The 210 is how much money we have to spend....

33

34 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Uh-huh.

35

36 MR. KLEIN: .....in this region and the 202  
37 is the sum of the four projects recommended by the T.....

38

39 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I thought there were five.

40

41 MR. KLEIN: One of them is not recommended.

42

43 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Okay. Well, to get this  
44 moving, I move that we approve the 202 for the four  
45 projects, that we approve those spending allotments.

46

47 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Do I hear a second.

48

49 MR. LUKIN: Second.

50

00100

1 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Second by Ivan.

2 Discussion.

3

4 MR. TUTIAKOFF: And I'm not including this  
5 Afognak one because I think that's going to have to --  
6 after hearing some discussion here I think what we have to  
7 do is act on it, yes or no, review it and move it. But I  
8 would like to move on.

9

10 MR. CRATTY: Call the question.

11

12 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: I do -- if I can make  
13 one comment here before we move on. I really don't support  
14 the 03-046. The other ones I do. But for the record.

15

16 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, discussion.

17

18 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

19

20 MR. HOLMES: I think Steve's made a  
21 recommendation that we deal with these as a group because  
22 they've gone through process but myself, knowing how  
23 important Afognak is, particularly to some of the elders  
24 and, you know, I think Pete's correct in that's the largest  
25 subsistence stream on -- well, it's probably a lot more  
26 than people even taken in Karluk and a lot more than Buskin  
27 and what it does, people being able to fish there, the ones  
28 in -- it's a reverse process, the old timers and the Port  
29 Lions and Ouzinkie can't really come to the Buskin to fish.  
30 There's a few what you'd call microsystems that could  
31 support one or two families around in Afognak Bay but that  
32 puts more pressure on those that are like Barbara Cove is  
33 already sucking air and it's doing poorly and that's where  
34 a lot of old timers I know have gone for ions and it puts  
35 all the pressure back on Kodiak. And in my mind unless  
36 there's enough money to do the minimal project next year  
37 for Afognak then I'd vote against the 03-046, the 22,000  
38 and I'd rather see that allocated to something that's  
39 relating directly to food that people need to have rather  
40 than training some technicians for basically political  
41 purposes.

42

43 So I will probably vote against taking this  
44 up as a unit unless there's some potential for some funding  
45 coming somewhere else.

46

47 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: See, that's basically  
48 what I understand as a problem, we really can't. If we can  
49 -- accept them as presented or don't accept them or ones  
50 you support?

00101

1 MR. KLEIN: Madame Chair, the Board is  
2 looking for the Council's recommendations on what you think  
3 should be funded. You might recommend one, you might  
4 recommend all, you might -- but generally what the Board  
5 has considered is what projects are on the table and I  
6 understand the Afognak Lake scenario, I mean you could --  
7 as part of your motion you could suggest that the Board  
8 strongly consider development and funding of Afognak Lake  
9 project in 2003.

10  
11 The Board wants your input there so the  
12 motion you have quite a range.

13  
14 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Who seconded my motion?

15  
16 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Ivan.

17  
18 MR. TUTIAKOFF: With the second's  
19 concurrence, we'll go item by item. I mean the study  
20 number by study number that way we can vote on them. I  
21 understand that there'll be two votes on 046.

22  
23 MR. LUKIN: Could I ask a question first.  
24 I'd like to address my question to Steve.

25  
26 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Turn your mike on.

27  
28 MR. LUKIN: Hey, Steve, my question is on  
29 this training, who is getting trained here?

30  
31 MR. KLEIN: Ivan it's mostly high school  
32 students and then the hope is we'll have a pool of  
33 applicants to go work on some of our projects and some of  
34 them very well could be from your village. As you know  
35 we're trying to increase local involvement in our projects,  
36 we're funding partners positions in different areas of the  
37 state. Increasing local involvement is a strong priority  
38 of this program and that project would feed into it.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you.

41  
42 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Madame Chair.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pete.

45  
46 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I have a question on the  
47 same thing for Steve, where did this amount come from, it  
48 seems to be an awful lot for training a few students?

49  
50 MR. KLEIN: I think the cost for what they

00102

1 did this last year, you're putting up a dozen students for  
2 two weeks, you're feeding them, they paid them stipends as  
3 well.

4

5 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: It's listed on 127 what  
6 that is. Page 127.

7

8 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Vince.

11

12 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Point of order. I asked  
13 the second to concur to go item -- or study by study for  
14 approval on funding and if we're going to be bogged down on  
15 who's doing what here in biotech training. I agree it  
16 needs to be done, I think the concern is where it's being  
17 done and who is handling it. So we'll probably outvote it  
18 because this is going to go to the Fisheries Council or  
19 does it go to the Federal Subsistence Board, did this come  
20 out of the Fisheries Council?

21

22 MR. KLEIN: The next step is to the Federal  
23 Subsistence Board. This will also go to the Bristol Bay  
24 Alaska Peninsula Council as well.

25

26 MR. TUTIAKOFF: And my question.....

27

28 MR. KLEIN: All Councils are providing.....

29

30 MR. TUTIAKOFF: .....here then would be  
31 then, you know, we vote it down, they're going to vote it  
32 up it's going to come back on on their RAC not ours.

33

34 MR. KLEIN: It's going to come back to the  
35 Board for.....

36

37 MR. TUTIAKOFF: It will come under Bristol  
38 Bay's RAC.....

39

40 MR. KLEIN: .....they'll see a yes and a no  
41 and.....

42

43 MR. TUTIAKOFF: .....not ours.

44

45 MR. KLEIN: But if your.....

46

47 MR. TUTIAKOFF: But any way it's going to  
48 be there.

49

50 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Let's go ahead and get

00103

1 this done. The recommendation and did the second concur to  
2 take this item by item, like 0031 was a no, do we all agree  
3 with that?

4

5 MR. GUNDERSEN: I agree.

6

7 MR. CRATTY: Yes.

8

9 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Agree.

10

11 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Yes. Okay. 0032 stock  
12 assessment sockeye salmon for Buskin River Kodiak.

13 Everyone agrees.

14

15 MR. HOLMES: Yes.

16

17 MR. CRATTY: Yes.

18

19 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yes.

20

21 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Yes.

22

23 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yes.

24

25 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: 01095 escapement  
26 estimates and population monitoring Lake Clark sockeye  
27 salmon.

28

29 MR. TUTIAKOFF: No.

30

31 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I agree.

32

33 MR. GUNDERSEN: I agree.

34

35 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Mitch, you agree.

36

37 MR. SIMEONOFF: I agree.

38

39 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Ivan.

40

41 MR. LUKIN: Yes.

42

43 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

44

45 MR. HOLMES: Emotionally I tend to go with  
46 Vince but I'll have to agree on this.

47

48 MR. CRATTY: Al, yes.

49

50 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: So noted. I do agree, I

00104

1 know they're having problems. 03043 estimation of coho  
2 salmon escapement in streams adjacent to Perryville, Alaska  
3 Peninsula National Wildlife Refuge.

4

5 MR. SQUARTSOFF: That must be a pretty  
6 small system.

7

8 MR. CRATTY: Yes, Al.

9

10 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

11

12 MR. HOLMES: I would vote in favor of this,  
13 this is a very, very stressed stream and they've been  
14 working for years trying to get it reestablished and I  
15 think this is probably some pretty critical work for --  
16 even though it's very small, I think those fish are really  
17 important to the folks in Perryville and trying to find  
18 some way to get at what's wrong and how to get it to work  
19 is really important.

20

21 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. Any other  
22 comments with regard to that one? Pete.

23

24 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yes.

25

26 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Al.

27

28 MR. CRATTY: Yes.

29

30 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Vince.

31

32 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Vince, yes. Closer to  
33 home.

34

35 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Okay. 03046 fisheries  
36 biotechnician training program. Ivan.

37

38 MR. LUKIN: Yes.

39

40 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

41

42 MR. HOLMES: Oh, I'm sorry, I have my deaf  
43 ear turned towards you. I think this is an important  
44 program but in the genre of, I think of which is really  
45 emergency for food, I'd much rather see a vote against this  
46 and see the money be allocated towards trying to find  
47 funding for Afognak.

48

49 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Okay, thank you.

50

00105

1 MR. SIMEONOFF: Yes.

2

3 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Speridon, yes. Paul.

4

5 MR. GUNDERSEN: We're voting up or down?

6

7 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Up or down, yes or no,  
8 you agree with it or don't, support it or don't.

9

10 MR. GUNDERSEN: I don't support it.

11

12 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Okay. Pete.

13

14 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Nope.

15

16 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Vince.

17

18 MR. TUTIAKOFF: No.

19

20 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Al.

21

22 MR. CRATTY: No.

23

24 CHAIRMAN TRUMBLE: Myself, no. I want you  
25 to look at something on Page 129 just -- it says issues and  
26 information needs, a number of Regional Advisory Councils  
27 have identified issues and information needs that apply to  
28 more than one region or have statewide application and they  
29 list what these issues are. However, this funding and  
30 training was done in one area. And I would support it if  
31 it was given to different areas and different schools, I'd  
32 support it every year if it went to a number of schools and  
33 regions each year. I don't support it all being spent in  
34 one region.

35

36 And that is why I don't support it.

37

38 MR. CRATTY: That's the same way I feel for  
39 the record.

40

41 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair.

42

43 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: We need to make a  
44 motion, we kind of went through this and verbally agreed  
45 with which parts we don't -- we need a motion.

46

47 MR. TUTIAKOFF: We just did that.

48

49 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: We need a motion, we  
50 just did a Council consensus.

00106

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Advisory vote.

2

3 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Advisory vote.

4

5 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I move to approve studies  
6 number 32, 95 and 43 for funding.

7

8 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

9

10 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Second. Discussion.

11

12 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Question.

13

14 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Call for question's  
15 been made. All in favor signify by saying aye.

16

17 IN UNISON: Aye.

18

19 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

20

21 (No opposing votes)

22

23 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried.

24

25 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chairman, in regards  
26 to studies number.....

27

28 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: 31.

29

30 MR. TUTIAKOFF: .....31 and.....

31

32 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: 030.....

33

34 MR. TUTIAKOFF: .....046 we do not support  
35 based on funding that could be used in other areas and our  
36 particular concerns, just for the record.

37

38 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: You understand, you're  
39 lumping us Bristol Bay and Aleutians into one region  
40 basically. That's what we're made into with regard to this  
41 funding is concerned.

42

43 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, in regards to  
44 the Afognak Island issue, the lake drainage, I would like  
45 to make a motion for discussion. I move that we support  
46 the ADF&G efforts to secure funding through the Alaska  
47 National Interests Land Conservation Act, Sections .809  
48 funding process to initiate work in 2003 to consolidate  
49 existing fishing data on the rearing environment of sockeye  
50 in Afognak Lake system and make recommendations to initiate

00107

1 technically sound investigative projects to obtain the  
2 necessary data and design a long term strategy to stabilize  
3 the fishery.

4

5 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

6

7 MR. TUTIAKOFF: The reason I do this, I  
8 heard Steve say earlier, we need to get direction to the  
9 technical -- what do you call it, technical resource.....

10

11 MR. KLEIN: Technical Review Committee.

12

13 MR. TUTIAKOFF: .....review committee, that  
14 they should make this a priority. And we as a group, you  
15 know, we support this and where we find the funds, I think  
16 with working between the Staff and the Chair, I think that  
17 those funds are available. We've made 22,000 available  
18 just by not voting for one. That doesn't necessarily mean  
19 it will be available because my concern is that Bristol Bay  
20 will bring up this training program as a priority to be  
21 subsidized through this, our whole big pie that we have.

22

23 I think that, I agree with most everyone  
24 else, we ought to be thinking about the food and then the  
25 training comes -- we need to have the food first before you  
26 can train somebody to manage it. It doesn't make any sense  
27 to train somebody and not have anything to manage.

28

29 MR. KLEIN: Madame Chair. I guess I think  
30 these different funding pots, it's confusing. It's  
31 confusing to me and I can tell it's confusing here at the  
32 table as well. The .809 funding source, I wouldn't include  
33 that as part of the motion. In fact, to get the greatest  
34 clout I would just say that explore funding options there  
35 and don't try to name a source there. And maybe agency  
36 excess money or some program -- you want it to be -- what  
37 you want is you want funding directed at this, where it  
38 comes from I don't think it is an issue.

39

40 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yeah.

41

42 MR. KLEIN: So I would strike the .809  
43 language from there.

44

45 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Okay. Well, then support  
46 the efforts of Fish and Game to get secure funding for the  
47 Afognak Lake system, blah, blah, blah whatever it is to get  
48 it done. Who seconded on that?

49

50 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Here.

00108

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Do you agree so I don't  
2 have to amend it?

3  
4 MR. SQUARTSOFF: (Nods affirmatively)

5  
6 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay. Any more  
7 discussion. Pat.

8  
9 MR. HOLMES: I was just wondering under  
10 discussion if we would have a minute to see the report on  
11 Afognak, to see what the problem is or would that fall more  
12 under Staff reports at the end?

13  
14 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I think it's Staff  
15 reports at the end, we decided it would be covered. But we  
16 all basically, I think, understand that there's a problem  
17 here.

18  
19 MR. HOLMES: Okay, thank you, Madame  
20 Chairman.

21  
22 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Ivan.

23  
24 MR. LUKIN: I'd like to say something about  
25 this funding of children. I think it's up to us as leaders  
26 to encourage our kids to move on. I've always felt that  
27 way and I raised my kids that way and I'll continue to  
28 support anything like this that will help move our kids  
29 forward. And I feel that we should trust them to be able  
30 to take that money and manage properly where our children  
31 not only just in one region but in all regions could be  
32 educated.

33  
34 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Ivan.

35  
36 MR. LUKIN: And I believe that they can  
37 handle -- they should be able to handle funding to take  
38 care of the problem that we have in front of us here, this  
39 other one here Alagnak.

40  
41 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Call for question on  
42 the motion.

43  
44 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Questions.

45  
46 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Question's been  
47 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

48  
49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

00109

1 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

2

3 (No opposing votes)

4

5 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried.

6

7 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madame Chair, I was just  
8 reading this thing here and it says -- what follows up to  
9 maybe support what we're trying to do with Afognak. But it  
10 says some projects were initiated in 2001 with the  
11 following criteria, the current FRMP, which is -- has to do  
12 with resource management funding and number 2, the project  
13 is of highest strategic priority, I think that's where  
14 we're placing Afognak by doing this. You know, put it in  
15 a high strategic so we can get the funding process moving.

16

17 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Given that, I think  
18 we'd like to recess for -- oh, I'm sorry, Peggy, go ahead.

19

20 MS. FOX: Thank you, Madame Chair. Before  
21 you recess, I did want to go back to a concern that you  
22 expressed about the timing on the goat issue. I would like  
23 to address that because I'm not sure we have a problem  
24 until I, I guess, I find out, what was your expectation?

25

26 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I think, Peggy, if you  
27 look back, this is almost -- by the time we go back to  
28 Kodiak this winter, it's going to be two years since we  
29 were in Old Harbor when this came up. That's my concern.  
30 And when we went through this process, our initial  
31 intention was the subsistence users. And when we go  
32 through this whole process, I think, we look and our last  
33 and winter meeting, which was a year later in Kodiak we  
34 agreed that we would do the customary trade determination  
35 and the spring meeting, I'm sure that was don -- you know,  
36 that was passed. Between now and then, I mean between then  
37 and now, we're looking at, you know, when I came to this  
38 meeting I was under the impression we would have that  
39 information in front of us to determine whether we needed  
40 to take any other action. I realize and understand through  
41 the process of the State and some committee work that some  
42 of that has been basically addressed but -- and then a  
43 comment is made after, you know, our initial intent, our  
44 obligation was the subsistence user and through this  
45 process I think we've recognized, the State has recognized  
46 the need for subsistence as far as the goats go, but we,  
47 again, are going to look at this again in the winter  
48 meeting and it's going to come back to us whether, you  
49 know, what those -- the information that we don't still  
50 have in front of us.

00110

1 I think what that survey in developing the  
2 C&T in front of us would have helped us determine what our  
3 actions should have been.

4  
5 MS. FOX: Okay. Because what I'm looking  
6 at is you'll have that information between now and your  
7 winter meeting. And, you know, dependent on what the  
8 timing of the Board of Game meeting is, you could have your  
9 Council meeting following that and know what kind of  
10 recommendation you want to make for a decision in May. So  
11 it would be in effect for next year given the process that  
12 we have under way right now.

13  
14 Like I say, I'm not sure we're meeting your  
15 expectations because the Board wouldn't be making a  
16 decision on it before May anyway.

17  
18 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Peggy, we were going  
19 to talk about this a little bit more in our committee.

20  
21 MS. FOX: Okay.

22  
23 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: So I think if we have  
24 anything to pass on or share from there we will do that.

25  
26 MS. FOX: Thank you.

27  
28 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: But we'd like to  
29 recess at this time and we were going to at 3:00 o'clock  
30 and it is almost 3:30 at this point until 9:00 -- is it  
31 9:00 in the morning -- we'll go at 8:30.

32  
33 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

00111

1 CERTIFICATE

2

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )

4 )ss.

5 STATE OF ALASKA )

6

7 I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for  
8 the state of Alaska and reporter of Computer Matrix Court  
9 Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

10

11 THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 110  
12 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the  
13 KODIAK/ALEUTIANS FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY  
14 COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I, taken electronically by Nathan  
15 Hile on the 18th day of September 2002, at the City  
16 Building in Cold Bay, Alaska;

17

18 THAT the transcript is a true and correct  
19 transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter  
20 transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to  
21 the best of our knowledge and ability;

22

23 THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party  
24 interested in any way in this action.

25

26 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 29th day of  
27 September 2002.

28

29

30

31

32 \_\_\_\_\_  
33 Joseph P. Kolasinski  
34 Notary Public in and for Alaska  
My Commission Expires: 4/17/04