

BRISTOL BAY FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL, VOLUME I

Taken at:
Borough Assembly Chambers
Naknek, Alaska
November 5, 2001

ATTENDANCE

Council Members Present:

Daniel J. O'Hara, Chair
Robert Heyano
Andrew Balluta
Peter Abraham
Harold (Robin) Samuelson
Shirley Kelly

Coordinator:

Cliff Edenshaw

Others Present:

Pat McClenahan, Office of Subsistence
Management; Larry Buklis, Office of
Subsistence Management; Richard Uberuaga,
Office of Subsistence Management; Steve Fried,
Office of Subsistence Management; Dave Fisher,
Office of Subsistence Management; Dan Dunaway,
ADF&G; Carl Jack, BIA Native Liaison; Ross
Waite, Alaska Peninsula-Becharof Refuge; Ron
Squibb, Alaska Peninsula Refuge; Jim Larson,
King Salmon Fisheries Resource Office; Kevin
Simms, King Salmon Fisheries Resource Office;
Mark Edwards, King Salmon Fisheries Resource
Office; Slim Moristad, ADF&G; Mark Kepsel,
Alaska Peninsula-King Salmon; Andy Aderman,
Togiak Refuge; Mark Leesik, Togiak Refuge; Pat
Walsh, Togiak Refuge; Orville Lind, Alaska
Peninsula Refuge; Karen Stickman, National
Park Service; Bruce Greenwood, National Park
Service; Tom O'Hara, National Park Service.

1 MR. O'HARA: I have about five
 2 minutes after 1:00, and so let's open the
 3 meeting this afternoon of the Federal Bristol
 4 Bay Subsistence Advisory Council. Before we
 5 get into the business of the day, I think we
 6 have all experienced some pretty traumatic
 7 events that have taken place in the last
 8 couple of months. And so what we'd like to do
 9 is -- gentlemen, take your hats off -- and
 10 we're going to stand and observe a moment of
 11 silence. Then Pete is going to open with an
 12 invocation.

13 (Moment of silence observed.)

14 (Invocation by Mr. Abraham.)

15 MR. O'HARA: Thank you, Pete. We
 16 do have a quorum, Secretary.

17 MS. KELLY: Do you want roll call?

18 MR. O'HARA: Okay.

19 MS. KELLY: Dan O'Hara?

20 MR. O'HARA: Here.

21 MS. KELLY: Robin Samuelson?

22 MR. SAMUELSON: Here.

23 MS. KELLY: Andrew Balluta?

24 MR. BALLUTA: Here.

25 MS. KELLY: Robert Heyano?

MR. HEYANO: Here.

MS. KELLY: Pete Abraham?

MR. ABRAHAM: Yes.

MS. KELLY: And I'm here, Shirley
 Kelly.

MR. O'HARA: All right. Just in
 the way of introductions today before we have
 the election of officers, let's go around the

1 table here starting with Robert and we'll go
2 all the way through the audience, if you'd
3 like please, introduce ourselves and then
4 we'll turn it over to Cliff and he'll handle
5 that part of the meeting today until we have
6 newly-elected officers.

7 MR. HEYANO: Robert Heyano from
8 Dillingham.

9 MR. BALLUTA: Andrew Balluta from
10 Iliamna.

11 MR. ABRAHAM: Pete Abraham from
12 Togiak.

13 MR. O'HARA: Dan O'Hara, Naknek.

14 MR. SAMUELSON: Robin Samuelson,
15 Dillingham.

16 MS. KELLY: Shirley Kelly, Egegik.

17 MR. EDENSHAW: Cliff Edenshaw, the
18 coordinator working out of Anchorage.

19 MS. KNISLEY: My name is Leslie
20 Knisley with Northern Lights Realtime and
21 Reporting.

22 MR. UBERUAGA: Richard Uberuaga
23 with the Office of Subsistence in Anchorage,
24 fisheries biologist.

25 MR. FISHER: Dave Fisher, Fish and
Wildlife Service, Anchorage.

MS. McCLENAHAN: Pat McClenahan,
Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage. I'm the
staff anthropologist and acting for Tim
Jennings.

MR. WAITE: Ross Waite, U.S. Fish
and Wildlife Service, King Salmon, with the
Alaska Peninsula Becharof Refuge.

MR. KEPSEL: Mark Kepsel, Alaska
Peninsula here in King Salmon.

MR. FRIED: Steve Fried with the

1 Office of Subsistence Management in Anchorage.

2 MR. BUKLIS: Larry Buklis, Office
3 of Subsistence Management. I'm your staff
fishery biologist.

4 MR. LEESIK: Mark Leesik. I'm a
5 fish biologist with the Togiak Refuge out in
Dillingham.

6 MR. MORISTAD: Slim Moristad with
7 Department of Fish and Game, State of Alaska,
Division of Commercial Fisheries.

8 MR. DUNAWAY: Dan Dunaway, Alaska
9 Department of Fish and Game, Sportfish,
Dillingham.

10 MR. JACK: Carl Jack, Native
liaison.

11 MR. LARSON: Jim Larson, the King
12 Salmon Fishery Resource office.

13 MR. SIMMS: Kevin Simms with King
14 Salmon Fisheries Resource office.

15 MR. EDWARDS: Mark Edwards, King
Salmon Fisheries Resource office.

16 MR. ADERMAN: Andy Aderman,
17 wildlife biologist with Togiak Refuge in
Dillingham.

18 MR. WALSH: Pat Walsh, Fish and
19 Wildlife Service, Dillingham.

20 MR. LIND: Orville Lind, Fish and
Wildlife Service, King Salmon office.

21 MS. STICKMAN: Karen Stickman, for
22 Lake Clark National Park.

23 MR. GREENWOOD: Bruce Greenwood,
National Park Service, Anchorage.

24 MR. TOM O'HARA: Tom O'Hara, SFG
25 coordinator for Aniakchak.

MR. O'HARA: Thanks. Thank you

1 for the introductions and welcome today. I
2 think, Slim, you had some handouts that the
3 Board received and Council members received,
and did you put the remaining over there on
the table?

4 MR. MORISTAD: Yes, they're on the
5 table.

6 MR. O'HARA: All right. That's
7 the welcome introduction today of the Council
and staff. We'll try to stay as close to the
mike as we can.

8 At this time we'll turn the
9 meeting over to Cliff Edenshaw for the
election of officers.

10 MR. EDENSHAW: Thank you, Mr.
Chair. Before I open the floor for
nominations for the chair, we recently
11 undertook a new time frame for nominations,
and so the individuals who are up for
12 reappointment -- normally that would have been
completed by September, this being November.
13 So the individuals from here on out will serve
until December, and that's hopefully when
14 during the nominations period that those
individuals who have submitted applications
15 for consideration to the Council as well as
incumbents, those decisions will be finalized
16 in December.

17 So aside from Dan and Pete, I
believe those two who submitted their names
for reconsideration to the Council, their
18 current terms will go until December and at
that time we hope to hear from the Secretary
19 of Interior and Agriculture regarding the
appointments to the Council. And from here on
20 out, for instance, Shirley and Robin -- I
think the most recent was Robin and Shirley, I
21 believe -- all the other appointments will
continue going through December of the
22 three-year term which you were appointed for
and for ongoing. In regards to John
23 Christensen's seat, his will be left open
until next year. The Bristol Bay Council in
24 their charter doesn't have alternates in their
charter, so that seat will remain open until
25 his term would have expired 2002. So when
that time comes, that seat will be filled at

1 that time.

2 Moving on to the position of the
3 chair. The chair serves as chair for the
4 Council for a one-year term, conducts the
5 Regional Council meetings, attends and
6 represents the Regional Council at the Federal
7 Subsistence Board Meetings which are held
8 twice a year; one for Wildlife in the spring,
9 normally in May, and at the Fisheries which
10 will be held in December, usually is a voting
11 member of the Regional Council, signs reports,
12 correspondence, meeting minutes and other
13 documents for external distribution.

14 At this moment I will open the
15 floor for nominations for chair. Mr.
16 Samuelson?

17 MR. SAMUELSON: I nominate Danny
18 O'Hara for chair.

19 MR. ABRAHAM: Second the motion.

20 MR. EDENSHAW: The motion has been
21 made to nominate Dan O'Hara for chair,
22 seconded by Pete Abraham. Are there any --
23 yes, Mr. Samuelson.

24 MR. SAMUELSON: I make a motion
25 nominations be closed.

26 MS. KELLY: Second.

27 MR. EDENSHAW: A motion has been
28 made to close the nominations for chair,
29 seconded by Shirley Kelly. Without further
30 ado, I'll go ahead and move by unanimous
31 consent that Mr. Dan O'Hara be elected chair
32 for the Bristol Bay Advisory Council.

33 MR. O'HARA: And that's it?

34 MR. EDENSHAW: That's it.

35 MR. O'HARA: Thank you, Council
36 members. I appreciate that. That's the way
37 they wanted to run the meeting in Russia, I
38 think, and it works pretty well. Thank you,
39 Council members. I appreciate you having the
40 confidence to let me run the meeting for
41 another year and we'll have to rethink this

1 again.

2 The next thing we'd like to do is
3 to open nominations for the vice-chair.

4 MR. ABRAHAM: I nominate Mr.
5 Harold Samuelson, Jr.

6 MS. KELLY: Second.

7 MR. O'HARA: Any other further
8 nominations?

9 MR. HEYANO: I would move that the
10 nominations be closed.

11 MS. KELLY: Second the motion.

12 MR. O'HARA: Do we have unanimous
13 consent on that? All right, we have unanimous
14 consent and you are the vice-chair.

15 MR. O'HARA: Secretary for the
16 Council.

17 MR. BALLUTA: I nominate Shirley
18 Kelly.

19 MR. SAMUELSON: Second the motion.

20 MR. O'HARA: Any further
21 nominations?

22 MR. HEYANO: I would move that the
23 nominations be closed, Mr. Chair.

24 MR. O'HARA: Is there a second?

25 MR. SAMUELSON: Second.

MR. O'HARA: Okay. Robin
seconded. Unanimous consent okay? You are
the secretary.

MS. KELLY: Thank you.

MR. O'HARA: We would like to
review the adoption of the agenda at this
time. Any concerns that the Council members
may have for the agenda we have before us?

1 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair?

2 MR. O'HARA: Yes.

3 MR. EDENSHAW: I would just alert
4 the Council, on Page 2 under Items H and J, H,
Bureau of Land Management, Jeff Denton, is
5 unable to attend. He included inside your
booklets under one of these tabs here, at the
6 end under our agency reports, Tab K; he did
submit to me an update in regards to field
7 work that he's been conducting this past year
for 2001. And under J, Bristol Bay Native
8 Association, Ralph Anderson and Hans
Nicholson, they both notified me that they are
9 unable to attend the meeting. So those two, H
and J, are scratched off the agenda.

10 I provided Carl Jack -- I have a
copy of some information that he'll cover that
11 they provided to me. Then I think with the
National Park Service being here, perhaps
12 Bruce or Karen would like to -- perhaps one of
them can come up here and provide me with the
13 information in regards to agenda Items E, F
and G, because earlier I was informed that Deb
14 Liggett and Mary McBurney, who normally handle
the information for these portions -- and I
15 don't see Mary here -- so perhaps Bruce could
clarify. Mary will be here at four o'clock?
16 So if you guys look at E, F and G, will those
information items be covered?

17 MR. GREENWOOD: Yes, they will.

18 MR. EDENSHAW: Okay.

19 MR. O'HARA: Now, Leslie is going
20 to have to have -- whenever the audience
speaks, you're going to have to come to the
21 table and sit down and give your name, because
the minutes are going to have to reflect what
22 we said here. So, that's fine at this time,
but from now on if you're going to address any
23 response to the coordinator or the Council, we
would really appreciate you giving Leslie your
24 name.

25 What else do you have on the
agenda there for us?

1 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair, the
2 Council, under agency reports, going up to A,
3 the Partnerships for Fisheries, Carl Jack will
4 provide the information on that. On Halibut
5 Jurisdiction, Tim Jennings was scheduled.
6 Carl Jack will also provide information on
7 that. And under the Federal and State
8 Coordination, Pat McClenahan will provide the
9 information for that.

10 MR. O'HARA: Okay.

11 MR. EDENSHAW: That's all I have
12 in regards to the agenda items.

13 MR. O'HARA: Council members, do
14 you have anything you would like to add to the
15 agenda today? Any concerns you might have,
16 Council members? Okay.

17 There's about three things that I
18 don't necessarily know exactly where they fit
19 into the agenda, but one of the concerns that
20 we have that this Council needs to address is
21 closer monitoring of what's happening on
22 Federal lands in relationship to the taking of
23 moose, basically. Where would that fit into
24 the program here on our agenda, Cliff? Could
25 it be covered under new business, I guess, as
a directive?

16 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair, we can
17 go ahead and do that, or else when -- let me
18 see. Under Section B under the Togiak Refuge,
19 Andy is going to provide some information to
20 the Council. You could also include it
21 underneath there.

22 MR. O'HARA: What number is that?

23 MR. EDENSHAW: 15C -- I mean, B,
24 15B. Is that okay, Andy?

25 MR. O'HARA: We're talking about
the whole Bristol Bay region and if he would
be -- I think we're going to have to be
talking with law enforcement, probably Tom and
Dave Cox are the people we'll have to be
talking to on that. 16?

MR. EDENSHAW: 16, then. Okay.

1
2 MR. O'HARA: That'll be good. The
3 other thing that we kind of need to keep in
4 consideration is that this Council needs to
5 address probably the issue of guided hunts for
6 non-residents on Federal land. Maybe we
7 already have that, I don't know, but we can't
8 let the non-residents loose on these animals
9 because of their lack of knowledge in being
10 able to take care of them. The State of
11 Alaska has not been able to handle that so
12 far.

13 Waterfowl migration boundaries in
14 the King Salmon area has been a concern, and I
15 don't know if we can address that issue from
16 this Council, Cliff. What are your thoughts
17 on that?

18 MR. EDENSHAW: The Migratory Bird
19 Working Group recently met in Anchorage, and
20 that's comprised of some individuals in our
21 regional office. And perhaps if Dave Fisher
22 could help me on this. I believe in the past
23 when the other regions have addressed
24 waterfowl, they have been able to submit
25 documentation memos or letters to the working
26 group in regards to the concerns they have.
27 That's one avenue that the Council may choose
28 to take. But they recently met, I think it
29 was in October in Anchorage, with the newly
30 established -- they still have management
31 working groups. And their main responsibility
32 will be addressing the new spring hunts. But
33 I think that's one avenue that the Council can
34 take. Perhaps if Dave or someone from the
35 Refuge has some other ideas on how the Council
36 can have their concerns regarding waterfowl
37 addressed. But that's one way I see from the
38 organization of this.

39 MR. O'HARA: I think we'll
40 probably just put it under new business and
41 maybe have a little information on it. It
42 won't take very long. Pete, did you have a
43 thought on that?

44 MR. ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, we are
45 part of the WCC program now, but I think
46 Hanson knows more about it than I do, and I
47 think we need the working group from this

1 group over here, because that's one of our
concerns. Thank you.

2

MR. O'HARA: The reason I brought
3 that up, Tom, was because the people in Naknek
feel like some of the areas have been taken
4 away from them around Big Creek and Smelt
Creek on some of those lakes in outlying
5 areas, probably away from the main part of the
water. And they don't mind some kind of a
6 hunt a little farther away from King Salmon
where the birds are resting, but there needs
7 to be a little address of the geographical
area that's been taken away without a public
8 hearing. So we'll probably just kind of
comment on that and see which direction we can
9 go.

What's the wishes of the Council
10 on the agenda? Do we have a motion to accept
the agenda?

11

MR. HEYANO: Mr. Chairman, I move
12 we adopt the agenda with the noted changes.

13 MR. O'HARA: Second?

14 MS. KELLY: Second.

15 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Do you want to
address your motion?

16

MR. HEYANO: My recollection of
17 the noted changes, Mr. Chairman, would be the
deletion under 15 of H and J, and under new
18 business would be monitoring of moose hunts on
Federal lands, have some discussion about
19 requiring non-residents to be guided on
Federal lands, and then an informational
20 discussion on migratory birds.

21 MR. O'HARA: Call for the
question?

22

MR. SAMUELSON: Question.

23

MR. O'HARA: All those in favor
24 say aye?

25 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

1 MR. O'HARA: Opposed? Okay. We
have an agenda. Thank you.

2 Minutes from the February 22 and
23 meeting held in Dillingham. If you've had
3 an opportunity to look at these minutes, we
would like to -- we've had the packet for
4 quite some time now. I imagine you've had a
chance to browse through them. What's the
5 wishes of the Council? Have a motion to
accept the minutes?

6 MS. KELLY: I so move.

7 MR. O'HARA: All right. A
8 motion's been made to accept the February 22
and 23 minutes of the year 2000. Is there a
9 second?

10 MR. SAMUELSON: Second.

11 MR. O'HARA: Any further
discussion? Yes?

12 MR. HEYANO: I just have two noted
13 corrections, Mr. Chairman. On Page 14,
Resource Monitoring, let's see, it's the third
14 sentence referencing a Board of Fish meeting
in Fairbanks. I believe that should be
15 Anchorage.

16 MR. O'HARA: What page is that,
Robert?

17 MR. HEYANO: Page 14.

18 MR. O'HARA: 14, okay.

19 MS. KELLY: Yeah, you're right.

20 MR. HEYANO: The other one I have
21 is on Page 17, Mr. Chairman, the second
paragraph. It's just misspelled, Nuiakuk. It
22 should be N-u-i-a-k-u-k.

23 MS. KELLY: Spell it again.

24 MR. HEYANO: N-u-i-a-k-u-k.

25 MR. O'HARA: All right. Any
further corrections or deletions from the

1 minutes, Council members? Thank you, Robert.
2 We appreciate that. Okay. All those in favor
say aye.

3 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

4 MR. O'HARA: Opposed? We have the
minutes of the February meeting.

5 I'd like to just do a little bit
of information here on the Chairs' Report
6 starting off with D in your tab. It's
summarized quite quickly, the Chairs' meeting
7 in Anchorage that I attend on a regular basis.
They have the usual concerns about
8 compensation for the Council. Some of the
problems they had was some of the Council
9 members got stuck in town, they ran out of
money and they had to call staff and staff had
10 to put it on a credit card. We've been trying
to avoid that type of a situation, because we
11 had a bad storm that took place. It's the
government's responsibility to take care of
12 these people, and we're going to have to watch
that a little more closely.

13 One of the things that we want to
make sure, Cliff, that does take place under
14 this report is that when Council members or
whoever is going to be appointed, when their
15 time is up, that it be done timely so that if
we were -- some of the Regional Councils had
16 to meet without a quorum because either the
government or somebody was not responsible for
17 making sure that these Council members were
appointed. We're going to make sure that we
18 stay with you on that, Cliff, to make sure
that the government appoints the people timely
19 so that we've got a quorum. There is really
no need for that ever to happen. Maybe there
20 was something that took place, but that was
embarrassing to have happen.

21 I brought up under the Chairs'
meeting this concern that I had that we would
22 like to try to do something about making sure
that the non-residents on Federal land have a
23 guided hunt. One of the things that we would
like to do is perhaps maybe separate ourselves
24 from Kodiak, from some of these management
areas too that we dealt with. We have a
25 letter on Page 8 from the Chair and this is in
relationship to the action that we've taken,

1 and that's very straightforward. You can see
2 what has taken place there. And you go on to
3 the last letter and that's our Annual Report.
4 I don't know if you have any concerns about
5 that or not, Council members. But one of the
6 things that is pretty high priority is ATV use
7 in the Preserve. You notice that when the
8 Feds write to us on Page 13 it says, If
9 positive finding is made, they will perhaps
10 take some action. I'm always concerned about
11 something like that when I see that in a
12 letter, and that's been mentioned several
13 times. The five-year management plan, I think
14 that was an excellent idea. The frameworking
15 was good drafted by the Bristol Bay Regional
16 team. I think that's all that we had, Council
17 members. Do you have any questions on the
18 Chairs' Report? Yes, Robert.

19 MR. HEYANO: Thank you, Mr.
20 Chairman. On Page 11 --

21 MR. O'HARA: Shoot.

22 MR. HEYANO: It says under
23 Proposal 22, the Board voted 4-1-1 in
24 rejection of this proposal. The majority felt
25 that there was a lack of substantial evidence
that the same day airborne land and shoot
method was a customary and traditional
subsistence practice.

Do we need to spend some more time
and direct staff to substantiate that same day
airborne is a traditional method in some areas
of the state for the taking of wolves?

MR. O'HARA: We certainly can. If
you feel that's something we want to follow up
on, we can certainly do that.

MR. HEYANO: Well, I think there's
been some confusion here, Mr. Chairman,
because on the report we received it was
customary and traditional. And I think that
if somehow this message didn't get to the full
board or the Federal Subsistence Board, then
that's something that needs to be clarified
with them.

MR. O'HARA: Any other comments,

1 Board members? Yes, Robin.

2 MR. SAMUELSON: I would like to
3 hear from Dave on that issue. I think he gave
4 the report, didn't he, for the Federal
5 Subsistence Board?

6 MS. McCLENAHAN: I did.

7 MR. O'HARA: You want to come up
8 to the microphone and give us your name.

9 MS. McCLENAHAN: Pat McClenahan,
10 staff anthropologist. Yes, gentlemen, I gave
11 that and I did write down that it was
12 customary and traditional in certain areas of
13 the Alaska Peninsula to use airplanes. That
14 was part of my analysis. I'm not sure what's
15 happened after that. Unfortunately, I was off
16 at Fisheries Information Services on a detail
17 for a while, so I have kind of a blank period.
18 I left my usual job, so I'm not sure of the
19 details, but I can follow up on that if you'd
20 like.

21 MR. HEYANO: Yes, please. I guess
22 I would like clarification.

23 MS. McCLENAHAN: Okay. I'll check
24 on that.

25 MR. O'HARA: Before you leave,
26 Pat, there is a meeting in Anchorage with the
27 Chairs in December.

28 MR. EDENSHAW: That's correct, Mr.
29 Chair.

30 MR. O'HARA: And the Chairs will
31 be meeting with the Federal Board on probably
32 the 11th to the 13th or something like that.

33 MR. EDENSHAW: On Monday all the
34 Chairs will meet with the Chair and then the
35 formal board meeting will convene on Tuesday
36 to address Fisheries proposals.

37 MR. O'HARA: I think, Robert, with
38 Pat's help maybe we should address the full
39 board on that to make sure that that's where

1 it was written and that customary and
2 traditional wording is in there, if that's
3 okay with you. Thank you, Pat.

4 Was there someone else that had a
5 burning issue they wanted to deal with on
6 that? Go ahead.

7 MR. SAMUELSON: Thank you, Mr.
8 Chairman. On Page 11 under Proposal 22 it
9 says, "The Federal Subsistence board has not
10 yet analyzed predator control as a policy
11 matter."

12 I think any time you're in
13 resource management you have to look at
14 predator control as one of the tools that
15 local area biologists and RACs and advisories
16 committees could work with. So I guess if
17 it's in order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to
18 make a motion that we request the Federal
19 Subsistence Board develop a policy matter on
20 predator control.

21 MR. O'HARA: All right. Are you
22 putting that in the form of a motion now?

23 MR. SAMUELSON: Yes.

24 MR. O'HARA: All right. Is here a
25 second to that?

MR. HEYANO: Second the motion.

MR. O'HARA: Would you like to
address your motion?

MR. SAMUELSON: I think, Mr.
Chairman, you have heard and I have heard
that, you know, right here in this village and
across the river that chained-up dogs are
being eaten because of wolves coming into the
village. Over lunch we were having
discussions on brown bear populations
throughout the region, and it seems like in
all areas they're increasing drastically.

It's just a matter of time before our moose
populations and caribou populations are very
important, probably the most important
subsistence resource food, are on a downhill
swing like on the North Peninsula here. And
if you have high predator rates, we should

1 have a policy in place to address it;
otherwise, we're going to end up like the
2 Alaska Board of Game dealing with a hot
political issue with no policy in place but
3 political whims.

4 MR. O'HARA: Council members, do
you have any other comments? All right.
5 There's a motion on the floor that we would
ask the Federal Subsistence Board to deal with
6 the predator issue on a policy basis. All
those in favor say aye.

7
COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

8
MR. O'HARA: Opposed? Motion
9 passed. Very good motion. Robert, is there
anything else under the Annual Report that you
10 needed to address?

11 MR. HEYANO: Not the Annual
Report, Mr. Chairman. On the -- no, that's
12 it.

13 MR. O'HARA: That's it. That's
basically, then, all we have on the Chairs'
14 Report. I had something under 16 that I
wanted to address here. Yeah. ATV thing is
15 fine. I'm satisfied with where they're going
on that. They are continuing to do research
16 on that. I have been in several meetings with
people who have handled that.

17 No. 8, we would like to leave the
floor continually open for public comments on
18 Federal Subsistence Programs. Sometimes
people come in where they may have an
19 opportunity to talk. The schedule can't
always be such that they can be here under
20 every agenda item. We would certainly like to
hear from the public.

21 Cliff, can you handle No. 9?

22 MR. EDENSHAW: Yes, Mr. Chair.
Under Tab E, October 26th was supposedly the
23 deadline for submitting proposals for
wildlife. That has been extended because this
24 Council had not met. I believe, Dave, is that
until the end of this week? Until the end of
25 the meeting today or when the Council
completes their business in regards to

1 wildlife proposals. So if the Council has any
2 wildlife proposals they would like submit for
3 2002 between now until business is completed,
4 we will take those to Anchorage and those will
5 be submitted. I'm trying to look for help
6 from Andy. Perhaps Andy would like to just --
7 or I can sit there and state that we have
8 received four proposals and those were from
9 the Togiak Refuge. I know they were mainly
housecleaning items. Perhaps if you guys have
any questions about those -- those will come
out in the analysis at our next meeting in
February or in that five-week period. So
until the meeting is done we can go ahead and
accept proposals for changes for hunting and
trapping regulations on Federal lands for
2002.

10 MR. O'HARA: Fine. I realize we
11 have staff here and various departments
12 represented here, but there comes a time when
this part of the agenda will be open for
proposals from the public as well.

13 MR. EDENSHAW: That's correct, Mr.
14 Chairman. And over on the table we have
15 booklets. Under Tab E is a proposal form. We
do have blank copies on the table for those as
well.

16 Also, Mr. Chair, when I was
17 interrupted, Bristol Bay Native Association
18 called and said they would be available this
afternoon to provide their report as well as
additional information.

19 MR. O'HARA: In other words, are
they coming over?

20 MR. EDENSHAW: They will be coming
21 over here.

22 MR. O'HARA: One more agenda item
23 back on the table. That will be fine. Any
24 other needs under wildlife proposals? Council
25 members, do you have any that you would like
to address at this time or maybe as the agenda
continues? I think we have already introduced
one of them, a policy that's going to be
looked at later on. That will be fine.

Cliff, maybe you can handle No.

1 10, Fishery Proposal and Regulation.

2 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair, this
3 here is our one fisheries proposal. It
4 actually didn't originate from this region,
5 but it's an overlapping proposal. It
6 originated with the Southcentral Region and
7 Pat McClenahan and Larry Buklis, the fisheries
8 biologist, both those two will provide the
9 analysis, and on their completion the Council
10 can make a recommendation.

7 MS. McCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman,
8 we're at Tab F. And before we start into the
9 analyses, the analyses themselves, Larry
10 Buklis would like to give you an overview.
11 I'm Pat McClenahan, staff anthropologist, and
12 I will be presenting Part A. Larry will
13 present Part B.

11 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr.
12 Chairman. My name is Larry Buklis. I'm the
13 staff fishery biologist for the Council. Mr.
14 Chairman, I think I'm going to step over to
15 the map. Before I do, I'll explain for the
16 record what I'm going to point out. There may
17 be some uncertainty why the Bristol Bay
18 Council is taking up an issue that deals with
19 the west side of Cook Inlet. It's because the
20 Cook Inlet Fishery Management area overlaps
21 into the Bristol Bay Council Region. I would
22 like to point that out on the map.

17 You may not all be able to see
18 this right now, but maybe during a break we
19 can take a closer look. In red on this map is
20 the fishery management areas, and the one
21 that's pertinent to our discussion today is
22 this boundary for the Cook Inlet area that
23 extends on up to the north and to the east
24 from here. In the dashed black line is the
25 council boundaries, the Federal Subsistence
26 Council boundaries. As you can see, the
27 Bristol Bay Council Boundary extends out into
28 the Cook Inlet area. So the west side of the
29 Cook Inlet Management Area is the far eastern
30 area of the Bristol Bay Council area of
31 interest.

32 So proposal No. 12 that we'll be
33 talking about deals with a request to allow
34 subsistence take of several different fish

1 species and shellfish in the Tuxedni Bay area.
This is an area of Federal jurisdiction
2 through the Lake Clark National Park
boundaries and the marine waters in this area,
3 shown in this circled area, are in the Federal
Subsistence jurisdiction.

4 As you know, the Federal fishery
jurisdiction is essentially more pertinent
5 primarily in fresh water systems, but this is
a small pocket of marine jurisdiction, so
6 there is some shellfish proposals for that
area. So you may want to look at that during
7 a break.

Mr. Chairman, the next part of my
8 overview, before Pat and then I go into the
analyses, is this one-page, double-sided
9 handout that was put at your desk this
morning, and it's titled Cook Inlet Area
10 Proposed Next Steps for the Federal
Subsistence Fisheries, and there are more on
11 the side table for the public.

12 MR. O'HARA: We have it.

13 MR. BUKLIS: Very good. I won't
read through all this, but the main point is
14 that we realized that we needed to define some
next steps, some direction for our recommended
15 approach to subsistence fisheries
reintroduction into the Cook Inlet fresh water
16 areas that are now under our jurisdiction. So
this was developed for the briefing of you and
17 the Southcentral Council as well as the staff
committee and the board.

18 A few things I'd just like to
highlight on this two-sided page. This deals
19 with proposed next steps for establishing
harvest regulations for the take of salmon,
20 Dolly Varden, trout, grayling, char and burbot
for subsistence purposes within Federal
21 jurisdiction of the Cook Inlet area. Those
species or fish groups are currently not
22 allowed for subsistence take in the Cook Inlet
in the Federal regulations. In no other area
23 of Alaska is the Federal subsistence program
faced with the establishment of subsistence
24 opportunity on this scope absent an ongoing
State subsistence fishery that could serve as
25 a basis and with the resources so heavily
utilized already in other fisheries.

1 On the back side under Next Steps,
2 I'll highlight a few things. The proposed
3 route to reaching the goal of reintroducing
4 subsistence fisheries in these areas is to,
5 first, gather information, much-needed
6 information through community and household
7 surveys, community meetings and round-table
8 discussions with the effected interests on the
9 Kenai Peninsula. Eventually it may involve
10 development of proposals to change regulations
11 brought before both the Federal Subsistence
12 Board and State of Alaska Board of Fisheries.
13 That information would then be the basis for
14 discussion with these affected communities and
15 user groups and the basis for developing the
16 regulation.

17 The View, at the end here. The
18 view is that at a minimum harvest regulations
19 could be under consideration in two years; at
20 the outside four years. In the meantime, some
21 harvest opportunity may be allowed through the
22 recommendations of these analyses that Pat and
23 I will review today. Also, during the course
24 of this information gathering and development,
25 there could be interim progressive steps for
liberalizing subsistence opportunity along the
way.

 So to summarize that: It's an
area of heavily utilized use of these
fisheries. There haven't been subsistence
fisheries in the fresh water areas for
decades, and the reintroduction of these
fisheries will require a process and more
information as to the level of use we'll be
dealing with.

 Four proposals were submitted that
were bundled into the analyses you have before
you. The A portion deals with C&T; the B
portion deals with the harvest regulations.
So we're treating 11, 12, 13 and 14 together
because they overlap so much in what they're
requesting.

 With that introduction, I will
turn it over to Pat, unless you want to start
with questions at this point.

24 MR. O'HARA: Council, would you
25 like to ask questions at this time or continue
with the report? Go ahead, Pat.

1 MS. McCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman.
 2 Pat McClenahan, staff anthropologist. I will
 3 begin with FP02, 11a, 12a, 13a and 14a. It
 can be found on Page 9 under Tab E. Tab F,
 I'm sorry.

4 MR. O'HARA: We have it.

5 MS. McCLENAHAN: This analysis was
 prepared by staff anthropologist Pat
 6 Petrovelli of the other region.

FP02-11a was submitted by
 7 Ninilchik Traditional Council, Steven Vanek
 and Fred Bahr. It requests a positive
 8 customary and traditional use determination
 for all fish and all shellfish in the Cook
 9 Inlet area for residents of the Kenai
 Peninsula District.

10 FP02-12a was submitted by Henry
 Kroll. He requests a positive customary and
 11 traditional use determination for herring,
 crab, smelt, whitefish, razor clams and salmon
 12 in Tuxedni Bay and this would be exclusive to
 the residents of Tuxedni Bay.

13 FP02-14a was submitted by Al Chong
 of Hawaii and requests seasons, harvest
 14 limits, and methods and means for the
 subsistence take of salmon, Dolly Varden and
 15 rainbow trout in the Kenai River consistent
 with the State of Alaska sport fishing
 16 regulations.

I skipped over 13 and I should
 17 have skipped over 14 as well because they
 address methods and means and not C&T.

18 11a and 12a are deferred proposals
 from last year that you probably recollect.
 19 They were deferred due to the Kenai Rural and
 Non-rural issue from last year that has since
 20 been settled. Map 1 on Page 10 provides you
 with the most recent determination as to which
 21 Kenai communities are non-rural. The existing
 regulation and the proposed regulation you can
 22 find on Page 11.

The proposed regulation would add
 23 salmon to all other fish and various
 proponents request restricting the C&T in the
 24 Cook Inlet area to various users.

Let me go over the existing and
 25 proposed regulations on Page 11. For the Cook
 Inlet area; fish other than salmon, Dolly

1 Varden, trout, char, grayling and burbot,
 2 residents of the Cook Inlet area. Cook Inlet
 3 area, shellfish, no subsistence. Proposed:
 4 Cook Inlet area, all fish, residents of the
 5 Kenai Peninsula District, proposed by NTC;
 6 Communities that border Cook Inlet, proposed
 7 by Vanek; Ninilchik, proposed by Bahr; salmon
 8 and halibut, residents of the Cook Inlet area;
 9 proposed by Vanek.

10 Tuxedni Bay: Herring, smelt,
 11 whitefish and salmon; Kroll. And that would
 12 be exclusive to the residents of Tuxedni Bay;
 13 also proposed by Kroll.

14 Cook Inlet area, all shellfish,
 15 residents of the Kenai Peninsula District,
 16 NTC; communities that border Cook Inlet,
 17 Vanek, Ninilchik, Bahr. Tuxedni Bay: Crab
 18 and razor claims, Kroll, residents of Tuxedni
 19 Bay.

20 We are going to not go forward
 21 with the proposal for shellfish at this time
 22 this year. We're going to defer that part of
 23 the proposal until next year based on the fact
 24 that we have very little information about it.

25 Map 2 on Page 12 provides you the
 areas with the Federal Subsistence Fisheries
 Jurisdiction. And Map 3 on Page 14 gives you
 details about the Tuxedni Bay Area. I'd also
 like to point out right now that in Proposal
 12 Mr. Kroll requested herring, crab, smelt,
 whitefish, razor clams and salmon; and
 herring, smelt and whitefish, there is already
 an existing positive customary and traditional
 use finding for those three. Even though
 there is a positive customary and traditional
 use finding for those three, their use is not
 specifically restricted in the Tuxedni Bay
 Area to those rural residents of Tuxedni Bay,
 but as it stands through the Cook Inlet rural
 residents.

I'd like to address two of the
 eight factors that we usually go through, and
 that is factor 1 and factor 4. Historically
 the Alutiiq and Dena'ina Athabaskan people use
 salmon and all other fish in the Cook Inlet
 area waters. Modern residents of the Kenai
 Peninsula and Tuxedni Bay use salmon and all
 other fish, also. Residents of Ninilchik
 historically traveled to the west Cook Inlet
 area by boat before the road was built to take

1 a variety of resources including salmon and
2 other fish. The rural residents of Seldovia
3 also used the Tuxedni Bay area regularly for
4 salmon, moose and clams.

5 I would like to refer you to Page
6 30. Staff preliminary conclusion is to
7 support the proposals with the following
8 modifications: For the Cook Inlet area, fish
9 other than salmon, Dolly Varden, trout, char,
10 grayling and burbot, residents of the Cook
11 Inlet area. Susitna-west side Cook Inlet
12 area, salmon, Dolly Varden, trout, char,
13 grayling and burbot. Residents of the
14 Susitna-west side of the Cook Inlet area,
15 Ninilchik and Seldovia. Kenai Peninsula area,
16 salmon, Dolly Varden, trout, char, grayling
17 and burbot, residents of the Kenai Peninsula
18 area except for Halibut Cove, Jakolof Bay,
19 Nanwalek and Port Graham.

20 Our justification is that data
21 from the ADF&G household surveys have shown a
22 core level of use for salmon by residents of
23 the communities and areas in the respective
24 areas. The use patterns of the non-salmon
25 species requested fit a subsistence use of the
resource where the level occurs according to
the availability and patterns of associated
subsistence activities such as moose hunting.
Although there is data showing household use
of these species -- that refers to factor 1 --
in Port Graham and Nanwalek, documentation or
testimony about their use of Federal waters --
that would be factor 4 -- those data are not
available.

Documentation of the use of these
species or the location of their use is not
available for the residents of Halibut Cove
and Jakolof Bay.

This concludes my portion of this
analysis.

MR. O'HARA: All right. Council
members, do you have any questions of Larry or
Pat? Yes, Robert.

MR. HEYANO: Thank you. So it's
the communities that are listed on Page 10
that show that their rural areas on the map,
those are the ones that you --

1 MS. McCLENAHAN: Yes.

2 MR. HEYANO: -- want to have
positive C&T findings for?

3 MS. McCLENAHAN: Yes, and also the
4 rural residents of our area on the west here,
Tuxedni Bay.

5 MR. HEYANO: Can you tell me how
6 many full-time residents are in Tuxedni Bay?

7 MS. McCLENAHAN: There's one
family that's documented and that's Mr.
8 Kroll's family, so there may be three members.

9 MR. O'HARA: Any further
questions, Robert?

10 MR. HEYANO: One more, Mr.
11 Chairman. On Page 23 you have this Per Capita
Pounds Used Yearly, and I go down through the
12 list on especially like Dolly Varden, trout.
Seems to be a small amount of poundage used,
13 and I was wondering why and how does that
compare to other areas of the state where you
14 have found a positive C&T for Dolly Varden.

15 MS. McCLENAHAN: I don't know very
much about these numbers for Dolly Varden.
16 These are numbers that we have as
documentation. There are only, as far as we
17 can tell, a few rural residents who are taking
part in customary and traditional fishing in
18 that area, especially on the west side. A
very small number of people still come over
19 from the east side, and Larry's just pointing
out some numbers. But we're not talking about
20 huge numbers. I can't give you anymore.
Maybe Larry has some information he would like
21 to --

22 MR. O'HARA: Those guys in Hope
are eating a lot of trout, 59 pounds. Cooper
23 Landing, 58. Robert, any other questions?

24 MR. HEYANO: Just so I understand
the scale right. Say Tyonek, .74, that's less
25 than a pound, right, per person?

1 MS. McCLENAHAN: Right, per
2 capita, per person.

3 MR. HEYANO: Thank you.

4 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, is this
5 an appropriate time to mention the
6 Southcentral Council's view, or is that after
7 the presentations?

8 MR. O'HARA: Let me see if there
9 are any other questions right now. Yes,
10 Robin.

11 MR. SAMUELSON: In the Cook Inlet
12 area, on Page 11, I see salmon and halibut,
13 and on Page 30 a deletion of halibut. Why is
14 that? Page 11, Cook Inlet area, all fish
15 including salmon and halibut, and then I look
16 at the preliminary conclusion proposed, Page
17 30, and there is no mention of halibut there.
18 Everything except halibut. Am I mixing things
19 up here, or is halibut all-inclusive in that?

20 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, Mr.
21 Samuelson, I'm not exactly sure where on the
22 page you are. But let me just say, first,
23 that the way this regulation reads for the
24 Cook Inlet area, fish other than the ones
25 mentioned, there is a C&T and later there are
26 harvests allowed. These fish there aren't.
27 So it's an other-than clause. So if there's a
28 species of fish like whitefish or smelt you're
29 interested in and they're not listed here,
30 then they're allowed, if I understand that
31 correctly.

32 MS. McCLENAHAN: I believe that's
33 correct.

34 MR. BUKLIS: So that's a general
35 response to what you're asking. Specifically,
36 if you're asking about halibut, there will be
37 a briefing to you later in the meeting on
38 halibut. But at this time there is sufficient
39 uncertainty of the Federal Subsistence Board
40 facility over halibut subsistence, management
41 and regulation that we are not taking action
42 on halibut subsistence regulations, if that's

1 a specific species you're interested in. But,
2 in concept, this regulation reads that fish
3 other than this, people have a C&T for. These
4 are the species groups that are of issue right
5 now.

6 MR. SAMUELSON: It's my
7 understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the only
8 people that can designate a C&T on halibut is
9 the North Pacific Fishery Management Council
10 and that's by treaty or designation.

11 MR. O'HARA: Any other questions?
12 Would you like to continue?

13 MR. BUKLIS: Okay, Mr. Chairman.
14 Larry Buklis, fishery biologist with
15 Subsistence Management.
16 My portion is the B portion of the
17 harvest regulation side of Proposals 11, 12,
18 13 and 14. Pat highlighted these proposals
19 and what is being requested. My presentation
20 deals with the harvest regulation portion.
21 Proposal 11b is the broadest of
22 the four, and the staff analysis that's in
23 your book, which begins on Page 39, focuses on
24 Proposal 11 and the related aspects of the
25 other proposals, since it's the broadest
26 request. The current state regulations allow
27 the take of salmon for subsistence purposes in
28 limited marine water locations in Cook Inlet,
29 and the State allows the take of Dolly Varden
30 in fresh water systems of the Port Graham
31 Subdistrict. Subsistence fishing has not been
32 allowed for decades in the fresh water areas
33 now also under Federal jurisdiction. The
34 current Federal regulations, as Pat has
35 commented, do not allow the take of salmon,
36 Dolly Varden, trout, grayling, char and burbot
37 for subsistence purposes in the Cook Inlet
38 area.

39 The proposed regulatory changes in
40 Proposal 11 would allow the take of these
41 species for subsistence purposes at any time
42 by qualified Federal users without specific
43 harvest limits or methods and means
44 restrictions being imposed. Salmon, Dolly
45 Varden and trout stocks are heavily utilized
46 by existing fisheries, such as commercial,
47 sport and personal use. The regulatory

1 changes proposed in 11b do not provide
2 sufficient harvest controls for stock
3 regulations. The other existing fisheries do
4 provide substantial opportunity to take fish
5 for personal use or home use; however, the
6 commercial, sport and personal use fisheries
7 do not have a priority use designation as the
8 subsistence fishery does.

9 The analysis recommends support
10 with modification to allow the take of these
11 species for subsistence, but under the methods
12 and means and harvest limits and regulations
13 imposed on the sport fishery by the State of
14 Alaska, and a subsistence fishing permit would
15 be required. This approach would open
16 subsistence opportunity, but would likely not
17 result in additional overall take since users
18 have been able to obtain these levels of
19 harvest through the existing fisheries.
20 However, a State of Alaska sport fishing
21 license would not be required to take fish in
22 this way, and the subsistence fishery would
23 have a priority if harvest needed to be
24 reduced by other user groups in times of
25 shortage. Subsistence permits would be
26 required to monitor participation and harvest
27 and for purposes of enforcement.

28 This is warranted as an interim
29 step to allow limited subsistence opportunity
30 while the process we described a few minutes
31 ago gets under way. That's the information
32 gathering and public forum process to move
33 toward specific regulations. Proposals 11 and
34 14 provide quite a range and scope of
35 potential regulatory change regarding
36 subsistence fishing management, and these
37 proposals provide a range within which to
38 conduct analyses and make further
39 recommendations.

40 Mr. Chairman, that concludes my
41 review of the harvest regulation analysis.

42 MR. O'HARA: Pat, did you have any
43 more that you were going to address on this
44 issue?

45 MS. McCLENAHAN: No, Mr. Chairman,
46 except that I want to let you know we do not
47 have a good handle on the customary and
48 traditional use of these resources in these

1 areas. That will be an ongoing effort of our
2 office. What you have in this analysis is
3 pretty much what we were able to put together.
4 Thank you.

5 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Larry, you
6 said something about something new that was
7 represented in these proposals was Federal
8 subsistence regulations on fresh water. This
9 had not happened before? This is something
10 new, or did I miss something there?

11 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, what I
12 was saying is that this action to allow
13 subsistence fishing in these areas of Federal
14 jurisdiction up in the fresh waters is an
15 opportunity for subsistence fishing in these
16 areas that hasn't been allowed under State
17 regulation since the 1950s in most cases.
18 Beginning in '51, '52, territorial days, I
19 guess, and moving into statehood, subsistence
20 fishing was increasingly restricted and
21 prohibited in these fresh water areas and
22 marine subsistence opportunities were allowed.
23 More recently there have been personal use
24 fisheries allowed in fresh water in a few
25 systems in Cook Inlet, but subsistence
26 fisheries up in the fresh waters have not been
27 allowed. Those are essentially the areas of
28 Federal jurisdiction that we're talking about,
29 except for that one small area of marine water
30 at Tuxedni Bay.

31 MR. O'HARA: That's interesting.
32 In other words, Title VIII in 1980 brought
33 about Federal jurisdiction on these fresh
34 waters. Is that right?

35 MR. BUKLIS: Title VIII of ANILCA
36 directed subsistence opportunity. It allowed
37 for protection of subsistence opportunity on
38 Federal lands, yes.

39 MR. O'HARA: Good. That's what I
40 was looking for. Thank you.

41 MR. BUKLIS: As you know, the
42 application of fisheries management was not
43 until October 1st of 1999 under Federal
44 management.

1 MR. O'HARA: That's right. We've
2 been going about an hour. Did you have any
3 more presentation that you wanted to make on
this proposal?

4 MR. BUKLIS: That's the prepared
5 material.

6 MR. O'HARA: Any questions,
7 Council members? Because we'll come back and
8 address this after the break if that's okay
with you. Any other comments before we go?
All right. Let's take a ten-minute break and
we'll come back.

9 (Short break taken.)

10 MR. O'HARA: Call the meeting back
11 to order. And if the Council members don't
12 have any further questions on this proposal --
13 what is the wishes of Council at this time?
14 We can either make no comment, or let them do
further research, or if you want to deal with
the Tuxedni Bay Area? What's the wishes of
Council?

15 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair?

16 MR. O'HARA: Yes.

17 MR. EDENSHAW: Perhaps Larry
18 Buklis could go over the Southcentral's
recommendation regarding these proposals.

19 MR. O'HARA: If you want to, you
20 can go ahead. Is there a page in our book
that deals with this or not?

21 MR. BUKLIS: No, Mr. Chairman.
22 This is your council book. Going into this
23 meeting that was scheduled for some weeks ago
24 -- just as they had a book -- and coming out
of their meeting was a recommendation from
them, but that isn't worked into your book.
Your meeting would have followed closely after
theirs with the original schedule.

25 MR. EDENSHAW: Go ahead, Larry.

1 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, I'll
2 highlight the C&T portion relative to Pat's
3 presentation. The Southcentral Council
4 recommended not including grayling and burbot,
5 but including the other four fish groups, the
6 salmon, trout, Dolly Varden and char. They
7 recommended that it seemed to be for all
8 residents of the Cook Inlet area as a whole,
9 not partitioned into the east side, west side
10 as is laid out in the analysis. They would
11 support, with modification, to not include
12 grayling and burbot and to not segregate
different parts of Cook Inlet relative to east
side and west side C&Ts. Relative to harvest
matters, they concur with the analysis and
recommendation, but they express an interest
in seeing this proposed process get under way
and they would like to be briefed on progress
at each of their meetings, not just their fish
cycle meetings, but at each of their meetings
they want a briefing on how the progress is
going on the information gathering and the
public process, Mr. Chairman.

13 MR. O'HARA: Pat, did you have any
14 more to say on this?

15 MS. McCLENAHAN: No. Larry knows
about it, but I don't.

16 MR. O'HARA: Thank you, Larry.
17 Any questions, Council members?

18 MR. SAMUELSON: It seems like the
19 only area that falls into our jurisdiction is
the Tuxedni Bay portion, right, Larry?

20 MR. BUKLIS: That's correct.
21 That's the way the Federal lands would be in
22 your area, yes. It would be the Lake Clark
area Federal lands and Tuxedni Bay is
specifically spoken to in Proposal 12, yes.

23 MR. SAMUELSON: And the
24 Southcentral Council recommended not giving a
C&T finding on grayling and what species?

25 MR. BUKLIS: Grayling and burbot,
Mr. Chairman. But the other four fish groups
would have C&T.

1 MR. SAMUELSON: Did they give any
2 justification why?

3 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, the
4 tabular data that Mr. Heyano referred to on
5 Page 23 was a part of it. There is a very
6 small per capita usage of burbot and grayling.
7 And Mr. Heyano did point out also that some of
8 the other species, I think, the char/lake
9 trout component is relatively low, certainly
10 as compared to salmon. But the Council felt
11 that there was a sufficient record of some use
12 to continue to include that group in the C&T.
13 While low, they felt that it did demonstrate
14 some use. They didn't want to exclude that
15 use, but they felt burbot and grayling were
16 very low.

17 Secondly, if I remember this
18 correctly, I think burbot and grayling are
19 introduced species and not naturally
20 occurring, whereas trout, char and the other
21 species are naturally occurring. But I think
22 grayling and burbot had their origin some time
23 ago in an introduction program.

24 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Any other
25 questions or comments?

MR. SAMUELSON: If I may. On that
Table 4 on Page 23, where do I pull out the
Tuxedni Bay component?

MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, I don't
think the Tuxedni Bay family that resides
there -- I don't think there is a per capita
use data set. There are no data presented
here for that specific group. These are
communities and what their use is, but the
small number of individuals that live in the
Tuxedni Bay Area are not listed in the table
as a use group. There aren't study data here
for them.

MR. SAMUELSON: Do we have any
data on their usage?

MS. McCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the
data we have are what Mr. Kroll put down on
his application, his request. And that is

1 only that they use those species. He did not
2 give us the information about how many they
3 took a year. We don't have those data.

3 MR. SAMUELSON: How long has that
4 family resided there? How long have people
5 been living on Tuxedni Bay?

5 MS. McCLENAHAN: Mr. Kroll and his
6 family have been using the area for a long,
7 long time, but as far as I know, they have
8 only been residents year-round for the last
9 few years. But they have had their cabin
10 there and so forth for many, many, many years.

8 MR. SAMUELSON: Do we have any
9 idea what the resource is for salmon, Dolly
10 Varden, trout, char in that area? Do you have
11 any stock status?

11 MR. BUKLIS: No, Mr. Chairman, I
12 am not aware of any stock status data.

12 MR. SAMUELSON: Okay.

13 MR. O'HARA: Robert.

14 MR. HEYANO: Well, Mr. Chairman,
15 based on our past action when we were
16 reviewing customary and traditional use of
17 other species for other folks in other areas,
18 we requested a lot more detailed information
19 than what's presented to us today. I'll have
20 an extremely difficult time finding positive
21 C&T for those folks in Tuxedni Bay. I would
22 have a difficult time finding a positive C&T
23 for these other communities, probably with the
24 exception of salmon. And I realize some of
25 these people, because of regulatory
26 restrictions didn't have subsistence access to
27 it, but I think it needs to be -- in my
28 opinion, it needs to be fleshed out in a lot
29 more detail before I feel comfortable going
30 forward with a positive C&T finding.

23 MR. O'HARA: Any other comments of
24 Council members?

25 MR. SAMUELSON: Is that a motion?

1 MR. O'HARA: Go ahead, Robert, you
2 have the floor.

3 MR. HEYANO: Mr. Chairman, is it
4 appropriate, then, that the motion be that we
5 request more information at this time?

6 MR. O'HARA: I think it's very
7 appropriate.

8 MR. HEYANO: Because with the
9 motion before -- or the information before us
10 we can't find positive C&T?

11 MR. O'HARA: Larry, did you have a
12 comment?

13 MR. BUKLIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
14 Specific to Proposal 12, if that's what we're
15 going to focus on for Tuxedni Bay, what Mr.
16 Kroll is asking for in Tuxedni Bay is a
17 positive C&T for salmon, herring, smelt,
18 whitefish, crab and razor clams. We're
19 deferring work on shellfish to the next cycle.
20 So the fin fish he is asking for specifically
21 is salmon, herring, smelt and whitefish.
22 Herring, smelt and whitefish would fall into
23 that class of other fish for which C&T is
24 already present, since those three are not the
25 six fish groups that are currently disallowed
26 for subsistence. So in fact herring, smelt
27 and whitefish, they already have C&T for. So
28 salmon within Proposal 12 is the fin fish for
29 which they don't have C&T yet. But his
30 interest in herring, smelt and whitefish is
31 already covered by current regulations. His
32 interest in crab and razor clams is deferred
33 until next cycle. It's when we're dealing
34 with the whole Cook Inlet area and the whole
35 composite for proposals that we get into
36 grayling, burbot, char, Dolly Varden. He
37 didn't specifically ask for C&T for those
38 other species as had people over on the Kenai
39 Peninsula side. So if we can focus in on No.
40 12 out of this set of four, then specifically
41 it's salmon that he doesn't have C&T for now
42 amongst the fin fish.

43 MR. O'HARA: Thank you. That
44 helps considerably.

1 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair. I think
2 -- getting back to what Robin was pointing out
3 here -- on the Executive Summary, if you look
4 on Page 1, I think it would be good for the
5 Council to -- based on the information Larry
6 has provided -- if the Council so chooses to
7 provide a recommendation for just that second
8 portion, because this was an overlapping
9 proposal for the fisheries, I think it would
10 be good for the Council to also go on record
11 to state what their recommendations are on the
12 other portions as well, even though they may
13 choose to exclude or not address those
14 portions of the proposals.

9 MR. SAMUELSON: I guess the
10 problem I'm having, Mr. Chairman, is in
11 looking at the eight factors for determining
12 the customary and traditional uses we're
13 mixing up the east side and west side of Cook
14 Inlet. Tuxedni Bay, in our jurisdiction, we
15 have no information on the subsistence
16 harvest. We have no information on stock
17 status, and that's two of the things. If you
18 tried plugging in the eight criteria, none of
19 them fit because we don't have the
20 information. So it seems premature to give
21 them any C&T finding beyond what they have
22 right now until that information comes forth
23 if we want to be consistent in C&T
24 determinations.

17 MR. O'HARA: Any other comments
18 from Council members?

19 MR. HEYANO: Was that a motion?

20 MR. SAMUELSON: I'll make a
21 motion, Mr. Chairman. I move that we do not
22 grant the C&T determination for herring,
23 smelt, whitefish or salmon, the four species.
24 Oh, that's the ones they have.

23 MR. BUKLIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
24 The only fin fish group they don't have C&T
for that they're asking for is salmon.

25 MR. SAMUELSON: That we don't make
a C&T finding for salmon until we have the

1 appropriate information in front of us so we
2 can use the customary and traditional eight
3 criteria and we have a report on the status of
4 the stocks for C&T.

5 MR. O'HARA: Is there a second to
6 the motion?

7 MR. BALLUTA: I second the motion.

8 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Andy seconds
9 the motion. Did you want to address the
10 motion, Robin?

11 MR. SAMUELSON: I don't, Mr.
12 Chairman.

13 MR. O'HARA: Are you satisfied
14 with the motion? Discussion on the motion,
15 Council members? Call for the question.

16 MR. ABRAHAM: Question.

17 MR. O'HARA: All in favor say aye.

18 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

19 MR. O'HARA: Opposed? It's
20 passed. Was there any other portion of that
21 we needed to address, or are we satisfied now
22 with dealing with that proposal? Larry?

23 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, I
24 follow everything you covered, and I don't
25 have any corrections or additions except I'm
recalling from Pat Petrovelli's analysis,
which Pat McClenahan has highlighted to you --
but Pat wasn't the analyst, it was Pat
Petrovelli -- I'm recalling that some of the
harvests over in Tuxedni were not just by that
family that lives there but by some people in
Seldovia and Ninilchik. I'm not trying to
overreach the data, but if Pat Petrovelli was
here, she might respond to your actions by
saying that some of the data entered in the
table for Seldovia and Ninilchik are fish
taken from where we don't know. But some of
that take may have been, or she might say was,
probably from over on the west side. Because
traditionally people did go over from those

1 two communities. So that doesn't give you
specific information that you're looking for,
2 I understand. There isn't a row of data for
Tuxedni Bay residents, but some of the other
3 data there for other communities may include
harvests from over on that side, and that's a
4 qualitative perspective. And I don't know
that she has any more than that. It doesn't
5 get at the data sources you want, but I wanted
that to be on the record so you're aware that
6 some of those east side communities have in
the past gone over to the west side to get
7 some fish.

8 MR. O'HARA: That should keep
about five Federal people working for about 90
9 days.

10 MR. SAMUELSON: Mr. Chairman, my
concern on the west side of Cook Inlet is that
11 when clams comes up next year that the Bristol
Bay component be not left out of it, because a
12 lot of people from Bristol Bay go over to them
beaches and harvest razor clams. So if you're
13 going to be doing the analysis for a C&T
finding for the people on Cook Inlet on the
14 beaches, I would like that expanded to include
the residents of Bristol Bay.

15 MR. O'HARA: And the reason for
16 that, Larry, is we dealt with Goodnews and
Quinhagak and the moose issue into our
17 drainages and we struggled with the C&T
finding for brown bear in the Naknek drainage
18 system, and we didn't say, is there a
possibility of this or that? We were wanting
19 numbers, and those who participated and
probably a little more conclusive type
20 information if somebody came over here and
gathered some fish or something. I think
21 we're probably as far as we're going to go on
that issue. Appreciate the comments on that,
22 though.

23 Are we done with this, Clifford,
as far as this proposal goes?

24 MR. EDENSHAW: Perhaps Larry can
just go through this just so that it's clear.
25 So 12a was the C&T for Tuxedni Bay, correct?

1 MR. O'HARA: Yes, and the Council
2 said that's what we were going to deal with.

3 MR. EDENSHAW: That's right. Okay.

4 MR. HEYANO: Mr. Chairman, just a
5 point of clarification. Since some of these
6 other communities on the Kenai Peninsula also
7 are requesting, I believe, C&T for the west
8 side of Cook Inlet, isn't that correct, some
9 like Ninilchik and Seldovia say that they went
10 over to Tuxedni Bay or some portion on the
11 west side of Cook Inlet to gather subsistence
12 fish. If we want to be consistent in dealing
13 with the west side of Cook Inlet, shouldn't
14 there be another motion addressing that issue?

15 MR. O'HARA: Well, what are you
16 driving at there? What do you want, Robert?

17 MR. HEYANO: Well, the motion we
18 just passed had to do with the resident or
19 residents of Tuxedni Bay. There's other
20 people on the Kenai Peninsula who are asking
21 for positive C&T, I believe, for Tuxedni Bay
22 also.

23 MR. O'HARA: Along those lines,
24 then, are we fairly certain that they have
25 done that? Is there some documentation? Are
26 you looking for documentation, or what would
27 you like from the staff?

28 MR. HEYANO: I guess first I want
29 clarity. Am I correct in that some of those
30 communities on the Kenai Peninsula are asking
31 for positive C&T from the west side of Cook
32 Inlet?

33 MS. McCLENAHAN: That's correct,
34 and we have some evidence that two of those
35 communities have used that area, and that was
36 included, I believe, in the staff-proposed
37 regulation at the end of the analysis --

38 MR. O'HARA: What page?

39 MS. McCLENAHAN: -- that wording.
40 On Page 30, the proposed wording, and that
41 would provide you -- it's Ninilchik and

1 Seldovia that they recommend have C&T in that
2 portion.

3 MR. O'HARA: What's your
4 recommendation on that, Pat, on Page 30?

5 MS. McCLENAHAN: This is the staff
6 recommendation. Support the proposal with the
7 following modifications: Cook Inlet area,
8 fish other than salmon, Dolly Varden, trout,
9 char, grayling and burbot, residents of the
10 Cook Inlet area. Susitna-west side of Cook
11 Inlet area, salmon, Dolly Varden, trout, char,
12 grayling and burbot, residents of the
13 Susitna-west side Cook Inlet area, Ninilchik
14 and Seldovia. Kenai Peninsula area, salmon,
15 Dolly Varden, trout, char, grayling and
16 burbot, residents of the Kenai Peninsula area
17 except for Halibut Cove, Jakolof Bay, Nanwalek
18 and Port Graham.

19 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Thank you.
20 Robin, did you have any more comment on that?

21 MR. SAMUELSON: I guess looking at
22 27, that's all we have. The best available
23 information before the Council is the random
24 telephone survey that showed that less than
25 five percent were subsistence users that fish
for salmon in the area of Tuxedni Bay. Would
it be fair for me to assume that the other 95
percent possibly could have been dual sports
fisherman and subsistence users that went over
to that area and fished?

26 MS. McCLENAHAN: That's quite
27 possible.

28 MR. SAMUELSON: Will the analysis
29 bring that out?

30 MS. McCLENAHAN: That should, if
31 they do another survey just for subsistence
32 uses.

33 MR. SAMUELSON: In the analysis or
34 in the C&T criteria is there anything to show
35 that people from the west side of Cook Inlet
went across to the east side of Cook Inlet and
fished?

1 MS. McCLENAHAN: Only what's here.
2 That's all we have.

3 MR. SAMUELSON: Just on 27?

4 MS. McCLENAHAN: Uh-huh. We have
5 two subsistence use area maps on Page 26 and
25 on Ninilchik, salmon and non-salmon.

6 MR. O'HARA: Robert, did you have
any more?

7 MR. HEYANO: No. I just think,
8 Mr. Chairman, in order to be consistent we
9 need another motion to represent the other
10 communities giving the same reasons as the
previous motion as non-sufficient data so we
can go through the eight criteria to make an
informed decision.

11 MR. O'HARA: So you would like to
12 take the east side communities listed here and
13 get some criteria that go along with the
eight-point system that we have to determine
the C&T? Is that what you would like to do,
14 Robert?

15 MR. HEYANO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I
16 guess the way that this would read is
residents of the Susitna-west side Cook Inlet
area, Ninilchik and Seldovia.

17 MR. O'HARA: Do you want to put
18 that in the form of a motion?

19 MR. HEYANO: I'm not sure I can.
I might need a little help.

20 MS. McCLENAHAN: You might just
21 say all of the other areas. I mean, we have
22 already spoken to Tuxedni Bay, so then you
could say "all other areas" since we're
dividing it up, or "residents of all other
23 areas," I guess you could say.

24 MR. O'HARA: We can either -- if
25 you would like to make a motion on that, you
certainly can do so.

1 MR. HEYANO: Can we just take a
2 two- or three-minute break so we can think
about some wording?

3 MR. O'HARA: Let's take about a
4 five-minute break, then, and come back.

(Short break taken.)

5 MR. O'HARA: Call the meeting back
6 to order. And I believe we have a motion now
7 to deal with the east side, dealing with what
might be happening in the Tuxedni Bay area.
Robert.

8 MR. HEYANO: Mr. Chairman, I would
9 move that we oppose any positive C&T findings
10 for those other communities that are seeking
positive C&T for the west side Cook Inlet.

11 MS. KELLY: Second.

12 MR. O'HARA: Second the motion,
13 Shirley. Any discussion you want to address,
Robert?

14 MR. HEYANO: Well, I think I would
15 incorporate the discussion on the previous
motion, Mr. Chairman, that the information
16 before us is inadequate, and I think we need a
lot more detailed information so we can go
17 through the eight criteria and make an
informed decision.

18 MR. O'HARA: Any other discussion,
19 Council members?

20 MR. SAMUELSON: Question.

21 MR. O'HARA: All those in favor
say aye.

22 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

23 MR. O'HARA: Opposed? That
24 passed.
What's next?

25 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair, Steve
Fried will address the 2002 Fisheries

1 Monitoring Projects.

2 MR. O'HARA: Okay.

3 MR. EDENSHAW: That is under Tab
4 G.

5 MR. O'HARA: Before we start,
6 Steve, we have a couple of gentlemen who have
7 come in to join us, Alan Asplunde and Pat
8 Patterson. It's nice to have you with us here
9 today. I just want to make sure I introduce
10 you. If there comes a time when you'd like to
11 have any comment on any of these agenda items,
12 you know, time is -- you can't wait until we
13 go farther, certainly you let us know. Thank
14 you for being here today.

15 All right. Tab G.

16 MR. EDENSHAW: Yes, Mr. Chair.

17 MR. O'HARA: Okay. G as in golf.
18 All right. Go ahead.

19 MR. FRIED: Thank you, Mr.
20 Chairman. My name is Steve Fried. I'm with
21 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of
22 Subsistence Management in the Fisheries
23 Information Services Division.

24 What I would like to speak about
25 today is the Fisheries Resource Monitoring
Program for Bristol Bay, Alaska Peninsula.
Like you said, it's under Tab G. I have
provided two handouts in addition to the
information under Tab G. One is simply for
information. It's entitled Fisheries Resource
Monitoring Program Study Status Reports for
Bristol Bay-Alaska
Peninsula/Kodiak-Aleutians. What this is is a
little summary, probably a paragraph or two,
for each of the studies that have been funded
in 2000 and 2001. So it's information to see
what's being done and where they are right
now. There's no action needed, it's just
informational. If you have questions, I could
answer them either now or later.

26 The item that the Council really
27 needs to consider and take action on is the
28 Draft Study Plan for 2002. And what's before
29 you now is a report with a -- under Tab G it's

1 got an introduction and just some background
2 information on the program, and then it has
3 information on the studies specifically for
4 Bristol Bay-Alaska Peninsula and also
5 Kodiak-Aleutians. Under that and in the
6 handout there are some tables and there's also
7 a map that might make it easier. There is a
8 map of the area, and it's got a little arrow
9 where the proposed studies are and the title
10 and the number. Also, it has whether or not
11 they were recommended for funding by the
12 review committee. Just for informational
13 purposes, when we had a meeting with the
14 Kodiak-Aleutians Council, what they decided to
15 do was only to take action on study proposals
16 within their area, and they took no action on
17 proposals within the Bristol Bay-Alaska
18 Peninsula area. It's up to this Council
19 whether or not they want to deal with this in
20 the same way or you can take action on all the
21 proposals before you. The tables are broken
22 up so that you can see the ones for Bristol
23 Bay-Alaska Peninsula and Kodiak-Aleutians.
24 They're separated in the tables.

25 So I guess I'd ask, is it the
wishes of the Council to just proceed with the
ones within this Council's area, or would you
like to hear some information on all of the
proposals?

MR. O'HARA: On all the proposals?

MR. FRIED: Right. For the
purposes of this particular program and group
this Council and Kodiak Council together. And
I realize that both Councils have asked the
Subsistence Board to separate this out, but it
hasn't been done yet. You could vote for, you
know, the entire package or, as the Kodiak
Council did, just take action on the ones just
within your area.

MR. O'HARA: All right. Council
members, do you have any questions or comments
on what you would be interested in addressing
on this? This is an action requirement on our
agenda today.

MR. SAMUELSON: I think we only
want to address the ones in our area, Mr.

1 Chairman, don't you think?

2 MR. O'HARA: All right.

3 MR. SAMUELSON: That would be my
4 recommendation.

5 MR. O'HARA: Our area would
6 include Bristol Bay and Chigniks. I don't
7 know, Robin, if that's what you're thinking of
8 or not, but those are basically I think what
9 we should be concerned with right now.

10 MR. SAMUELSON: Yes.

11 MR. O'HARA: I would certainly
12 like to separate from Kodiak, because once you
13 get below, let's say Three Hills -- I don't
14 know if you're familiar with that or not --
15 you get into Sandy and Muddy River and Bear
16 River and down around the Cold Bay area back
17 up around into the King Cove area over in Sand
18 Point. Those are the Kodiak areas, lower
19 peninsula areas. And the boundaries that we
20 have would be the Chigniks and from Port
21 Heiden on up, Moller -- no, we don't take in
22 Moller.

23 MR. FRIED: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
24 Chairman. I won't mention the ones in the
25 Kodiak-Aleutians projects. I'll just focus on
the other ones.

Before you now, if you go to Table
1, which is on Page 13, and it's also in your
handout, there are four stock status studies
that are before you that are requesting
funding. We have investigation plans for
them. Out of these four, the technical review
committee has recommended that two of them be
funded.

One of these would look at
estimating coho production, or at least
carrying capacity on the Kametalook River on
the Alaska Peninsula Refuge. The other one
would look at an estimate of late sockeye
salmon and coho salmon -- late run sockeye and
coho salmon in the Clark River which is a
tributary of the Chignik. Those are studies
02-098 and 02-099.

There were two other stock status

1 studies that weren't recommended by the TRC.
One of them would look at coho salmon
2 escapement in the Upper Egegik River. This is
similar to a study that's already being funded
3 in Ugashik in which the investigator proposed
a counting tower for sockeye and later in the
4 season to count coho. The other study is one
on Bristol Bay Dolly Varden genetic baseline
5 development, which would actually expand on a
study that was done in 2000 in Togiak on
6 genetics of Dolly Varden and expanded out to
more areas within Bristol Bay.

7 So these four studies are before
the Council. The TRC recommendation was to
8 just fund two of them. You could either
accept that recommendation or choose other
9 studies. That's up to you. There's actually
descriptions of these studies within this
10 report and they start on Page 24. They're in
numerical order. That would be the Dolly
11 Varden study, 065, that's first. And as you
go through it, it presents what issues the
12 study would focus on and what the objectives
are, what the products and methods would be,
13 who the investigators are and what experience
they have, how much it costs, whether or not
14 there is significant partnerships and
consultation, and the justification for the
15 technical review committee's recommendation.
So that would provide additional information
16 on these.

17 MR. O'HARA: When you say you're
going to provide a U.S. Fish and Wildlife --
18 are you U.S. Fish and Wildlife?

19 MR. FRIED: That's correct.

20 MR. O'HARA: U.S. Fish and
Wildlife on Page 25, under Experience of
21 Investigators, it says that, U.S. Fish and
Wildlife Service would provide a staff with a
22 broad range of fisheries knowledge within the
Bristol Bay-Alaska Peninsula area. Who is
23 that going to be?

24 MR. FRIED: Well, for this
particular one on Dolly Varden?

25 MR. O'HARA: On this one, yeah.

1

MR. FRIED: This would be the Fish Genetics Laboratory in Anchorage, the King Salmon Fisheries Research Office and also Togiak National Wildlife Refuge staff.

4

MR. O'HARA: That is what you call a wide range of knowledge for the Dolly Varden?

6

MR. FRIED: Right. And also Alaska Department of Fish and Game Sport Fish Division will have an investigator on this one also.

8

MR. O'HARA: That doesn't necessarily mean I want that. I just had that question. Council members, you've got four things in front of you, two yeses and two nos. What are your thoughts on this? Do you have a recommendation? Robin.

12

MR. SAMUELSON: Mr. Chairman, I would move to recommend that this Advisory Board recommend 02-098 and 02-099 for projects for 2002.

14

MR. O'HARA: What page is that?

15

MR. SAMUELSON: 13.

16

MS. KELLY: Second.

17

MR. ABRAHAM: 02-098?

18

MR. SAMUELSON: 02-098 and 02-099, escapement and carrying capacity in the Kametalook River and late run sockeye and coho salmon escapement in the Clark River.

20

MR. O'HARA: Okay. Was that a motion?

22

MS. KELLY: And I seconded it.

23

MR. O'HARA: You seconded it, okay. Discussion, Council members? Do you want to address your motion?

25

MR. SAMUELSON: Well, it's just,

1 you know, staff used their criteria. On these
2 two I have personal knowledge, Mr. Chairman,
3 attending the Board of Fish and networking
4 with people from Chignik and people from
5 Perryville that these two river systems are
6 very important to the subsistence needs. The
7 Board of Fish convened or adopted a Board of
8 Fish proposal after they heard some testimony
9 from the people of Perryville on the
10 Kametolook; things were that bad. Boris
11 Cogsburg was up giving testimony. I didn't
12 participate, but I listened very closely
13 because it's an area within this board's
14 jurisdiction. And I think both of them
15 warrant the dollars that are expressed to
16 spend here because of the impact on
17 subsistence.

18 MR. O'HARA: This is on Federal
19 lands too?

20 MR. SAMUELSON: I believe it is,
21 yeah.

22 MR. FRIED: Yes, they are.

23 MR. O'HARA: Council members, any
24 other comments you might have? Call for the
25 question?

26 MR. ABRAHAM: Question.

27 MR. O'HARA: All those in favor
28 say aye.

29 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

30 MR. O'HARA: Opposed? Okay.
31 Steve, you have anything else?

32 MR. FRIED: A little bit more. In
33 addition to that, these are classified as
34 stock status and trend investigations. On
35 Table 2 on Page 14 there are harvest
36 monitoring and traditional ecological
37 knowledge studies, and basically there's two
38 here that would concern your area. One is
39 02-034, which is called Subsistence Fisheries
40 Assessment Kvichak River Watershed Resident
41 Species. And the other one would be 02-032,

1 which is Subsistence Fisheries Harvest
2 Assessment and Traditional Ecological
3 Knowledge, Lower Alaska Peninsula and Aleutian
4 Islands. So that's part of this area and part
5 of the Kodiak-Aleutians area.

6 The recommendation by the
7 technical review committee was to fund 02-032.
8 As I said, there's 02-034 also within this
9 area, and it would be up to the Council to
10 decide whether or not they were interested in
11 funding this study instead of the other one
12 or, you know, try to find money for both.

13 MR. O'HARA: Steve, do you have
14 any specifics on what the Lower Peninsula
15 represents as far as what they're targeting?

16 MR. FRIED: 032, which you can
17 find some information on Page 41, is put forth
18 by the Idaho State University and the Aleutian
19 Pribilof Islands Association. It's a two-year
20 study, and it would look at estimating
21 subsistence harvest of salmon and other fresh
22 water fish from Cold Bay, False Pass, King
23 Cove, Nelson Lagoon, Sand Point, Adak, Akutan,
24 Atka, Nikolski and Unalaska. I guess Alaska
25 Department of Fish and Game would be a
co-investigator in this one, too.

Basically what they would be doing
is taking a look at documenting the TEK
information on salmon and other fishes,
creating a surgical database and they're
basically focusing on problems of fish stocks
in Western Alaska that have actually been
declining and how this is affecting
communities down there and their abilities to
take subsistence fish.

MR. O'HARA: Did you say Western
Alaska?

MR. FRIED: They call it Western
Alaska, but it's basically the peninsula and
some Aleutians.

MR. O'HARA: Western starts above
Goodnews. Do you have any comments, Council
members?

MR. SAMUELSON: I have a comment

1 on everything, Mr. Chairman. You want to know
about the weather?

2 I think it's classic, this is
classic, lumping us with the Alaska Peninsula
3 Villages. You look at 032 and it deals with
King Cove, Nelson Lagoon, Sand Point. And you
4 look at 034, and it's dealing with Levelock,
Igiugig, Kakhonak, et cetera. I look at the
5 two justifications and, to me, I could flip a
coin either way, because it's -- but I think
6 that, you know, 02-034 -- I recently received,
Mr. Chairman, an e-mail that the Alaska
7 Department of Fish and Game Sport Fish
Division was doing a strategic planning
8 session on sport fisheries in the State of
Alaska. And you look at harvest surveys for
9 Dolly Varden, which is a very important
subsistence food, whitefish, northern pike,
10 grayling, lake trout, rainbow trout, all these
fresh water species, are very important to the
11 upper lakes. I also know that there was some
talk amongst the -- wait until Mr. Dunaway
12 gets up here and we'll find out more about it
-- but the Board of Fish, I think a
13 subcommittee was called together to look at
rainbow trout and grayling as catch and
14 release in all Bristol Bay. And I don't know
if that proposal had any effect on subsistence
15 or not, but if we're going to study the two
areas, I'm kind of leaning towards 034 as a
16 priority because we have a limited resource,
we have competing users and very little
17 knowledge. And I think down in the Sand Point
area, you know, Akutan, there's a fish plant
18 there, Trident Seafoods plant. There's a
small village there, but not that many
19 residents. I think there's about 500, last
time I looked about 550 year-round residents
20 in all these communities put together versus
how many residents in the impact of sport
21 fisheries in the communities of the Kvichak
watershed area. Seems like we need to know
22 more about what's happening in the Kvichak
than we need to know what's down in the
23 peninsula because there hasn't been the
impact. That's the way I'm thinking.

24
25 MR. O'HARA: Any other comments,
Council members? Steve, when you go a little
bit south, right across from Port Heiden on

1 down the peninsula -- I imagine Tom would
probably know more about this, too, since he's
2 flown over there -- the Clark River, I think,
is a river that's impacted some by the sport
3 guys in the falltime by silvers, but other
than that you take Sandy, Muddy and all those
4 places, there really are no local residents
that come to these places. It's just outside
5 people fishing on very, very -- wilderness
areas of Alaska; whereas Togiak is impacted by
6 the sport guys and every drainage is probably
going to be impacted. I'm just speaking in
7 favor of our area. I would think 034 would be
the one that would have to --

8
MR. FRIED: All I can say too is
9 that technically there is nothing wrong with
34. It was just that the TRC decided that 32
10 to them was more important. It's certainly
under the Council's prerogative to decide to
11 fund, recommend funding 34 instead of 32. I
mean, that's whatever the board agrees on.

12
MR. O'HARA: Sure. Is this all
13 the information you're going to be putting out
on these two sections? Should we act on this
14 now?

15 MR. FRIED: You can if you'd like,
unless you don't feel you have enough
16 information.

17 MR. O'HARA: Robert.

18 MR. HEYANO: I have just a
question, I guess. I see this investigative
19 plan as a resubmission and it wasn't funded
last year either. Is there something
20 basically wrong with the way the request is
put together?

21
MR. FRIED: No. I think what
22 happened in 2001, there were, you know, the
advance proposal for investigation plans and
23 there wasn't enough money to fund them all, so
what they did just for this year, 2002, was
24 anything that wasn't funded in 2001 related to
the investigation plan stage, they forwarded
25 for another shot at funding this year. And if
there was anything that the reviewers thought

1 could be fixed, I think they would have gotten
2 ahold of the proposers to do that for this
3 go-around. So I think it's just a question of
4 -- obviously it made it to the investigation
5 plan stage, so I think it's technically sound.
6 It's just a matter of how much money there is
7 and what the priorities happen to be. If
8 there was only enough money to fund the top
9 three and this was fourth, then it wasn't
10 funded. But obviously there's nothing wrong
11 with the study and there is justification for
12 it to be funded. It's worthy of funding if
13 the money is available. It's just that
14 group's decision on how to prioritize the
15 projects and how much money there is
16 available.

17 MR. O'HARA: What's the wishes,
18 Council, on 34 or 32? Did you want to make a
19 decision on that? Either say we accept it
20 like it's been presented to us by the team or
21 --

22

23 MR. ABRAHAM: 34 and what?

24 MR. O'HARA: On Page 14 there's a
25 recommendation of either that one or that one.
26 Which one of those two would you like to have?

27 MR. ABRAHAM: I would take 34,
28 too. I make a motion that we accept 02-034
29 Bristol Bay Subsistence Fisheries Assessment
30 Kvichak River Watershed Resident Species.

31

32 MR. O'HARA: Second?

33

34 MR. SAMUELSON: Second.

35

36 MR. O'HARA: Do you want to talk
37 to your motion?

38 MR. ABRAHAM: Well, like you said,
39 there are hardly any residents out there,
40 while Kvichak over here, there is a lot of
41 questions that need to be answered in our area
42 why the species in the area are not there when
43 they have been expected to arrive. I think we
44 need to study here more for subsistence use.

1 MR. O'HARA: Any other comments on
2 the motion from Council members? Hearing
none, I'll call for the question.

3 MR. ABRAHAM: Question.

4 MR. O'HARA: All those in favor
say aye.

5 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

6 MR. O'HARA: Opposed? Steve.

7 MR. FRIED: Okay. Another matter
8 that you might want to consider is that there
9 are interregional studies, studies that go
beyond one region or cover statewide issues.
10 If you look at Tables 1 and 2 on Page 51,
there are actually three stock status
11 proposals in the interregional category and
two harvest monitoring TEK studies. On the
12 three stock status ones there is 02-035, which
is called Development of General Method for
Calculation of Sustainable Subsistence
13 Harvest. And the next one is 02-069, Develop
Shared AYK Fishery Database. 02-071, which is
14 Strategy for Assessing Mortality of
Sport-Caught Fish in Western and Interior
15 Alaska. Actually the first two, 02-025 and
069, were recommended for funding by the TRC.
16 The only one that really would directly affect
this area would be the first one, 02-025. 069
17 is for the Arctic Yukon Kuskokwim, and also
071, which wasn't recommended for funding, is
18 for Western Interior Alaska, not for Bristol
Bay necessarily.

19 Similar to the descriptions for
the Bristol Bay Region ones, you can find
20 these beginning on Page 56 in your book.
02-025, the investigators would be the
21 University of Washington, University of
Alaska, Department of Fish and Game, and I
22 believe there also would be a Federal agency
involved in this, also. What this addresses
23 is the fact that the state uses salmon
escapement goals as the cornerstone of their
24 management for salmon fisheries, and these
goals are based on maximum sustained yield.
25 Maximum sustained yield is not something that
needs to be considered in sustaining

1 subsistence fisheries. In other words,
2 maximum sustained yield is over time the
3 greatest average yield would come out of a
4 certain escapement from the system. But
5 there's a lot of questions about what happens
6 at lower population sizes. In other words,
7 you know, what do you really need to sustain
8 subsistence needs, not to sustain a commercial
9 fishery. And these investigators are going to
10 take a look, or are proposing to take a look
11 at developing, you know, a better definition
12 of what subsistence fisheries management
13 objectives are by going to the users and
14 finding out some information from them and
15 then they would work with the state and
16 Federal managers to develop some models to
17 look at salmon escapements and populations.
18 It would be similar to what's being done now
19 when the state does its salmon escapement
20 goals, not looking at maximum sustained yield,
21 but actually looking at how populations react
22 on the lower end of the scale.

23 So they would develop some
24 computer software and take a look at things
25 that aren't looked at now, such as the input
of nutrients from salmon carcasses and how
that affects production and try to develop
some protocols on how to use this information
to manage fisheries. And this was recommended
for funding by the TRC. Various Councils had
different problems or support for this
particular study.

26 The final project would actually
27 be a computer software package and a set of
28 protocols that organizations and the agencies
29 could use that would hopefully help them
30 manage fisheries in a different way than
31 they're managed nowadays, because now the
32 focus is basically on getting maximum
33 sustained yield and this would look at it in a
34 little bit different format. When this
35 proposal first came in, it was actually
36 focused on Bristol Bay and Kodiak sockeye
37 salmon. The reviewers said that they would
38 like to see it broadened out a little bit to
39 include other species in other areas, just as
40 a test phase, to see how the models worked and
41 verify that they were at least tracking how
42 the runs -- how the salmon production runs
43 really operate.

1 MR. O'HARA: Well, Council
2 members, what do you think? Do you have any
3 thoughts on this? Yes, Robert.

4 MR. HEYANO: I guess, Mr.
5 Chairman, I'm having a hard time, I guess,
6 following the justification that, you know --
7 I could see new methods for establishing
8 salmon escapement goals, but then how does
9 that tie in with subsistence harvest
10 strategies or --

11 MR. O'HARA: Or even a commercial
12 harvest.

13 MR. HEYANO: Yeah. I think that
14 here in Bristol Bay they manage for MSY and
15 most subsistence fisheries, at least
16 pertaining to sockeye salmon, are allowed to
17 fish seven days a week. How much better can
18 you get than that?

19 MR. FRIED: Is that a question?

20 MR. HEYANO: Well, I don't
21 understand the justification. We're going to
22 be spending this money to do something that's
23 going to provide what? A better sustainable
24 subsistence harvest, or what are we getting at
25 here?

MR. FRIED: I guess the question
is, when do you really need to start
regulating a subsistence harvest? When do you
need to get worried about how big the
escapement goal should be for subsistence
fisheries? I think they're facing that
already in the Yukon-Kuskokwim. They have
actually shut down the commercial fishery and
on top of that they're regulating the take in
some of the subsistence fisheries. It's not
gotten to that point in Bristol Bay.

But there's questions on when do
you have to be concerned about -- when do you
have to worry about not having
seven-day-a-week subsistence fisheries? Maybe
the population has to get really low, but
nobody really has a formal way of looking at
that. So these people want to come in and

1 take a harder look at things and try to figure
out how to manage things better.

2 Some of the same people --
actually it's Professor Ray Hillborn from the
3 University of Washington. I think people have
worked with him before. And Milo Atkinson
4 would be the person from the University of
Alaska Fairbanks, and I think they get a
5 post-doctoral student to do a lot of the
programming work. They would be working with
6 somebody from one of the Federal agencies to
make sure that whatever they do is actually
7 going to be used by the agencies and it's not
just something to do and then throw in the
8 garbage when you're done with it.

9 MR. O'HARA: Robert, did you have
another comment?

10
MR. HEYANO: In follow-up to my
11 previous comment, Mr. Chairman, I think that
-- I'll speak directly to the bay here, is
12 that the escapements we put in the river
systems and the subsistence harvest that takes
13 place, nobody has the tools even to monitor
the runs that closely. So maybe it's
14 applicable in AYK, but to spend the money out
here to do this -- I think we ought to take
15 part of that funding and stick it into the
Kvichak study myself.

16
MR. O'HARA: Any other comments,
17 Council members? Robin.

18 MR. SAMUELSON: I think of the
three on Page 51 I would support funding for
19 02-071, Strategy for Assessing Release
Mortality of Sport-Caught Fish in Western and
20 Interior Alaska. Ever since the Federal
Subsistence Board and us RACs were created out
21 here in Bristol Bay we have had concerns for
the Alagnak River and a number of different
22 rivers. And the only study that I'm currently
aware of that the Division of Sport Fish uses
23 are studies that were done in Cook Inlet and I
think a couple in Southeast Alaska quite a
24 while ago. Steve might refresh my memory. We
don't have any catch and release mortalities
25 of sport-caught fish in Bristol Bay, but I
know that industry has grown to -- 25 years

1 ago there was probably, or 30 years ago there
2 was probably 20 operators in the bay, and now
3 there's probably over 300 operators in the
4 bay.

5 We hear complaints from people in
6 Igiugig and Levelock about rainbow trout with
7 eyes removed and lips ripped off and fish
8 laying on the bottom of a highly-fished river
9 system. Whether they're there from catch and
10 release, I don't know, but I think that we
11 need a study of this area with our high
12 mandates in the sport fishing district, not
13 only for our fresh water fish but also for
14 some of our salmon species. Like coho salmon,
15 when they're leaving salt water for a fresh
16 water estuary, their mortality rate is
17 probably going to run about 70 percent. I
18 don't know what that does over the Togiak
19 area, like Kiyukluk. That's a heavily fished
20 sport fish area. And coho are -- I heard from
21 one guy over there that -- he told me that
22 it's easy to catch 125 coho in one afternoon.
23 If you're running a 70 or 80 percent mortality
24 rate, you're talking about quite a few fish.
25 So I would like to see the result of this. I
26 think it would be an excellent tool both for
27 our management and the Board of Fisheries
28 management.

29 MR. O'HARA: Any comments, Council
30 members? It's buying a video versus funding
31 mortality rate, isn't it?

32 MR. SAMUELSON: I concur with Mr.
33 Heyano's statements. Currently in our
34 subsistence fisheries we're quite fortunate
35 throughout Bristol Bay. Sure we have some
36 problems, but by and large our people are
37 meeting their subsistence needs on salmon.

38 MR. O'HARA: It's pretty obvious
39 that, you know, there wasn't anything that
40 restricted the Kvichak fish from Tokyo to the
41 headwaters of Lake Clark and they didn't
42 return. We know when they're not coming back
43 that it's going to be the commercial guys, the
44 sports guys and then the subsistence guys and
45 it's going to be in that order. And the
46 in-season fishery that Slim and others do,
47 they'll tell us immediately whether we're

1 going to be dealing with a commercial run or a
2 subsistence run. I think that 71 is
3 definitely something I could support.
Probably benefit the most. What's the wishes
of the Council? Excuse me, Steve.

4 MR. FRIED: If the Council does
5 like 71, right now 71, the first year would be
6 a literature search and synthesis of the
7 available information, and the second year
8 would be taking this information and setting
9 up a work area and going out to the different
10 communities to discuss whether or not there's
11 enough available information so that people
12 feel comfortable about catch and release, or
13 if they don't, what sort of study should be
14 done and where. Right now this study is
directed towards Arctic Alaska and also the
Yukon-Kuskokwim and not Bristol Bay. Arctic
is very interested in doing this. The
Yukon-Kuskokwim people are not. So if you're
going to vote for this, what you might want to
do is suggest that you would like to be
included in that group in that second-year
study. Because otherwise it might end up just
being directed towards the Northwest Arctic
and not Bristol Bay.

15 MR. O'HARA: Steve, why so many
16 steps before you find out when you kill that
17 coho? You say the first year is literature
and then another year with --

18 MR. FRIED: Actually this does not
19 fund a field study. One of the things that
20 happened was there's a lot of concern in
21 different parts of the state about
22 sport-fishing mortality. And there was a lot
23 of discussion as to whether or not it should
24 be a concern because there are studies
25 available in areas that show, at least in
short term, there doesn't seem to be a lot of
mortality and tagging studies that show that
rainbow trout in a lot of areas are there for
years and years even though they're caught
several times. Most sports fisherman think
that if they do catch and release properly
that it's not a problem, whereas other people
say, well, that's fine, but most people don't
do it properly. So is it an education problem

1 or what? And how does this affect different
2 species? Is a sheefish more prone to hooking
3 mortality than a rainbow trout or a grayling,
4 on and on?

5 Before the technical review
6 committee really wanted to sit down and fund a
7 whole bunch of different studies in a bunch of
8 different areas, they thought it would be more
9 important to sit down and have somebody
10 synthesize what's already been done and then
11 sit down with data from all these areas and
12 decide how to proceed. Sort of more like a
13 strategic planning on where studies needed to
14 be done and what sort of studies needed to be
15 done. Sometime a study is done and people
16 turn around and say, well, that's fine, but a
17 fish and game biologist did the study, they
18 know how to handle the fish. This really is
19 not applicable. This shows what can happen in
20 the best of all possible worlds. This isn't
21 what's happening, and we don't accept the
22 results. This won't really do a study in the
23 field; it would actually set the stage for
24 doing field studies in the future.

25 MR. O'HARA: Council members, what
do you think? Do you just want to pass over
this one or do you want to address it? Robin.

MR. SAMUELSON: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. I move that we support 02-071 as
our preferred alternative of the three and
interregional will include the Bristol Bay
Region.

MR. O'HARA: Is there a second to
that motion?

MS. KELLY: Second.

MR. O'HARA: All right. Do you
want to address your motion?

MR. SAMUELSON: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. I think Steve pretty well summed it
up. You know, it starts the process and
through that process I think that
recommendations come forth to do a catch and
release study.

1 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Any other
2 discussion, Council members? Before we vote,
3 Carl, would you want to come up and say
4 something?

5 MR. JACK: Carl Jack, Native
6 Liaison. Just passing on information. I have
7 my certain biases aside from Western Alaska,
8 and I am basically an advocate for the tribal
9 groups in my position.

10 So having said that, for your
11 information, on the 02-025, during the
12 tri-council meeting there was a considerable
13 discussion on this, mainly because of the
14 principal investigator and because of that the
15 tri-council voted not to support that.

16 And, secondly, on 02-071 you will
17 note in the proposal that the study will be
18 done by the sport fish division by the ADF&G.
19 Again, there was considerable discussion by
20 the tri-council members on that. And since
21 they will be looking at sports release
22 mortality, looking toward enhancing
23 subsistence, what the tri-council did was to
24 put safeguards in that. And that was to put
25 the Subsistence Division of ADF&G and the OSM
personnel could provide oversight to the
principal investigators on that. That's all.
Thank you.

16 MR. O'HARA: On 71 what was the
17 bottom line?

18 MR. JACK: While we finally
19 supported the proposal, they wanted the
20 Subsistence Division of ADF&G and also the OSM
21 staff to provide oversight to the way the
22 study was being done, mainly because their
23 perception was, you know, an analogy might be
24 throwing a wolf into a seapen or whatever,
25 something along that line.

22 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Thank you. I
23 appreciate that. A fox in a henhouse type
24 thing. All right. What else? Any other
25 Council member comments? We do have a motion
on the floor.

25 MR. SAMUELSON: I guess, Steve,
the proposal under investigators, investigator

1 or investigators, that this was a proposal put
2 in by sport fish division?

3 MR. FRIED: That's correct.

4 MR. SAMUELSON: That's how that
works.

5 MR. O'HARA: I'm fairly happy with
that. I don't see that's a problem to me.
6 Any other comments before we call for the
question? Call for the question.

7 MR. BALLUTA: Question.

8 MR. O'HARA: All those in favor
9 say aye.

10 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

11 MR. O'HARA: Opposed?
How much longer do you have,
12 Steve?

13 MR. FRIED: Not much longer.
There's actually just two more studies you
14 might want to take a look at.

15 MR. O'HARA: We're not in any
hurry. We just thought we'd have a break.

16 MR. FRIED: Would you like to just
17 finish this up?

18 MR. O'HARA: Go ahead.

19 MR. FRIED: There's two
interregional harvest monitoring ecological
20 studies. 02-043 is called Alaska Subsistence
Fisheries Database GIS Integration. And what
21 that would do would take the Alaska Department
of Fish and Game subsistence database and put
22 it together with their habitat restoration
division's anadromous stream database. The
23 anadromous stream database is a GIS database.
It's based on maps and you can pull up
24 information by a specific stream. This would
allow you to do the same thing, not only to
25 find the anadromous streams on the map, but
also pull up all the subsistence information

1 in the subsistence fisheries database on
harvest and uses for that particular area.
2 The other one -- this was proposed by the
Subsistence Division of Alaska Department of
3 Fish and Game.

The other study was also proposed
4 by the Subsistence Division of Alaska
Department of Fish and Game, 02-047. It's
5 called Alaska Subsistence Salmon Harvest
Timing. And it would be done for Bristol Bay,
6 Chignik, Cook Inlet and Kuskokwim. What this
does, it would automate their ability to
7 develop timing curves of subsistence catches.
I guess now every once in a while during the
8 season they have to manually pull out data so
they can do a timing curve so you can tell how
9 much of the catch, on average, is available on
a certain date, so they can tell whether or
10 not the subsistence fisheries look like
they're going to meet their needs for that
11 season. What this would do would allow to
develop some programming so they could just do
12 that automatically and it would be less
time-consuming for them. The TRC recommended
13 that the Alaska Subsistence Fishery Database
GIS Integration be funded and the other one
14 not, just based on importance and availability
of funds. So those are the two harvest
15 monitoring TEK -- harvest monitoring studies
that are before you.

16
MR. O'HARA: What page is that
17 recommendation made on?

18 MR. FRIED: It's Table 2 on Page
51, and then there's descriptions beginning on
19 Page 65.

20 MR. O'HARA: Good. I got it.
That's 43 and 47?

21
MR. FRIED: That's correct.

22
MR. O'HARA: Is there anyone from
23 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game that
wanted to make a comment on this? No takers?
24 All right. Council members, what's your
wishes? We've got the database GIS or you've
25 got the time frame harvest in Bristol Bay. Do
you want to make any comments on those,

1 Council members?

2 MS. KELLY: I want to know who's
going to be using this information on the GIS
3 study? Who's going to use this information?

4 MR. FRIED: Well, the agencies
would use it, and I'm assuming that any
5 regional organization or anybody can use the
anadromous fish database. So if you're
6 concerned about what sort of information would
be available to the public, I don't believe
7 that subsistence information makes, you know,
catches by a certain individual -- that sort
8 of information available to the public. I
think it's summarized data, so I think it
9 would be more like if you clicked on a stream,
it would tell you whether or not it was an
10 anadromous stream in this case, and then it
would tell you what the subsistence catch
11 might be for a year or a five-year period, you
know, what sort of information might be
12 available TEK or otherwise for that system.
They basically have two databases they're
13 already using. They wanted to put them
together because they thought it would be
14 easier for people to use something that was
based on a map rather than just typing in a
15 question.

16 MR. O'HARA: What's a definition
of anadromous stream?

17 MR. FRIED: It's any stream in
18 which, you know, anadromous -- a salmon or a
Dolly Varden that goes to sea, spawns and
19 rears. So basically what you need to do is
show that they're either rearing juveniles or
20 spawning adults and that's in an anadromous
stream, why habitat division is interested in
21 that is there's certain permitting
requirements to do things in that stream that
22 are more stringent than if it was not an
anadromous stream.

23 MR. O'HARA: So an anadromous
24 stream is one that goes out to the ocean and
comes back and an unanadromous stream is one
25 that doesn't?

1 MR. FRIED: Right. It just has
2 fish that go out to the sea as far as their
3 life cycle and then use the stream as a
4 rearing or over winter as a spawning area.

5 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Good. Any
6 comments, Council members? Yeah, Robert.

7 MR. HEYANO: I think, Mr.
8 Chairman, this is an attempt to provide
9 information to those folks who are probably
10 unfamiliar with subsistence harvests of
11 fisheries, because I can see us sitting around
12 this table -- it would be of very little use,
13 in my mind anyway, since we pretty much know
14 in our respective areas where the bulk of the
15 subsistence harvest takes place and at what
16 particular time of the year.

17 MR. O'HARA: We seem to be getting
18 more and more of that, too, I would imagine.
19 People who haven't a clue of what end goes
20 forward.

21 MR. FRIED: You mean concerns
22 about who uses the database and how they use
23 it?

24 MR. O'HARA: Well, you take
25 somebody who just came from Perdue and moved
26 to King Salmon with U.S. Fish and Wildlife and
27 they've never been out of the city limits
28 before and you send them down to one of the
29 streams to tell us about subsistence. It's
30 pretty obvious he's not going to know much
31 about subsistence. Now, you send Slim down
32 there and he might have an idea what's going
33 on at the river. Is that what you're talking
34 about, Robert?

35 MR. HEYANO: Yeah, I think so.
36 Since we're familiar with all the information,
37 to me, it's going to be providing information
38 for those people who are not familiar with it.
39 And I guess I got to run it through my mind;
40 is that to our advantage or to our
41 disadvantage?

42 MR. O'HARA: Steve, did you have a
43 little more information to give us, or is this

1 the last part of your report?

2 MR. FRIED: This is basically the
3 last of the report.

4 MR. O'HARA: We appreciate you
5 explaining that to us. How about if we take a
6 ten-minute break, since we've been going for
7 an hour, and come back and see what we'll do
8 on this.

9 MR. FRIED: Okay.

10 (Short break taken.)

11 MR. O'HARA: The meeting is back
12 on record. We're dealing with 043 and 071 on
13 what the Council will make a recommendation
14 on.

15 MS. KELLY: I think it's 047.

16 MR. O'HARA: 47, sorry. 02-043
17 and 02-047. What are the wishes of the
18 Council? Do you want to take it back and give
19 it to AYK? They need more money and fish than
20 anyone.

21 MR. SAMUELSON: I'd make a motion,
22 Mr. Chairman, but I don't know, it seems like
23 this is one of them interdepartmental fluff
24 studies. I don't know. I'm having a hard
25 time with either one of them studies. I'll
26 defer to the other Council members' comments.

27 MR. ABRAHAM: Can we combine these
28 two here?

29 MS. KELLY: I make a motion that
30 we recommend neither one be funded.

31 MR. O'HARA: There's a motion made
32 that neither one of these be funded. Is there
33 a second?

34 MR. HEYANO: Second.

35 MR. O'HARA: Motion's been
36 seconded. Do you want to address your motion,
37 Shirley?

1
2 MS. KELLY: I'm really frustrated,
3 because we've been asking for a five-year
4 comprehensive plan and they're throwing
5 studies at us like this. I mean, it's really
6 kind of frustrating.

7 MR. O'HARA: Any other concerns,
8 Council members? Any comments you might have?
9 Question?

10 MR. SAMUELSON: Question.

11 MR. O'HARA: All those in favor
12 say aye.

13 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

14 MR. O'HARA: Opposed? Okay.
15 Steve, do you have anything else you need to
16 talk about today?

17 MR. FRIED: Not on this topic.

18 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Robert?

19 MR. HEYANO: I have one question
20 for Steve concerning this topic on the report
21 on Page 3, 2002 Fishery Resource Monitoring
22 Program, the second paragraph there where they
23 say that the program goes into two-thirds
24 funding will be targeted for stock status and
25 trend studies and one-third on harvest
monitoring and traditional economic knowledge.
Seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that
the last motion had something to do with that.
What's the chances of getting that funding,
even if it is by region, changed if we think
that more funding should be put into stock
status and trend studies? It appears that the
budget dollars available are getting severely
limited.

MR. FRIED: I don't think -- my
understanding is it's not a hard and fast
rule; it's kind of a guideline. And there are
instances where a Council would decide to take
just about most of the money and fund harvest
monitoring and TEK studies instead of stock
status because they felt that there was better

1 information that they would get out of that.
2 So I think it's just a guideline. You could
3 write a letter to the Board, I guess, and ask
that that be changed. But like I say, I don't
really think it's that hard and fast.

4 MR. O'HARA: Okay.

5 MR. HEYANO: Thank you.

6 MR. O'HARA: What else do you
7 have, Steve?

8 MR. FRIED: That finishes with
9 that tab. I don't know if you want to let
10 Cliff go on to the next tab. No? Tab H gets
into the strategic planning, the five-year
plan and that sort of thing.

11 MR. O'HARA: That's next on the
agenda.

12 MR. FRIED: Right.

13 MR. O'HARA: Go for it.

14 MR. FRIED: Well, the Council has
15 asked for a strategic plan or a five-year
plan, some kind of long-term plan so that they
16 felt better about the money being spent in
some coherent manner, so five or ten years
17 down the road hopefully we had answers to the
important issues in this region. And the
18 management team and OSM sat down and tried to
draft out at least some kind of a framework to
help the Council develop a five-year plan.
19 And Tab H is what we came up with and sent out
to the Council for their comments and use.

20 Basically what it has, starting on
Page 2 -- I mean, it lines out the Federal
21 conservation units within this region. It
lines out all the C&T use determinations that
22 have been made in the table. It lines out the
existing Federal subsistence fisheries in the
23 other table. It indicates that there's three
areas that the Federal Subsistence Board
24 decided that we're not eligible for funding
under the Fishery Resource Monitoring Program.
25 It includes things like hatchery propagation
and restoration, habitat protection and

1 restoration, and contaminant assessment
2 evaluation monitoring. Because there have
3 been several requests by investigators and
4 also some interest from Councils that would
5 fund these sorts of activities and the Federal
6 Subsistence Board felt that due to the limited
7 amount of money available in this program and
8 the fact that there are other programs out
9 there that would fund these kind of
10 activities, that they didn't want to fund
11 studies that would -- on these sorts of
12 things.

13 Then, something I had been doing
14 on my own, I thought the council would be
15 interested in is kind of a report card on how
16 well we're doing. It lists all the issues
17 that the Councils have developed and these
18 issues here are just what the Council
19 developed for this region. Underneath each
20 one that I tried to do is decide -- try to
21 find out whether or not there was a proposal
22 that was ever sent in that would address this
23 issue, whether or not this issue even fits in
24 with this program, whether or not there have
25 been studies that have been funded for that
issue.

1 And if you take a look through
2 these several pages on this, you can actually
3 see that the studies that have been funded
4 actually have been directed at issues that
5 have been published that have gone out in 2000
6 and 2001 and again in 2002 the issues that the
7 Council identified. So it looks like for the
8 most part the studies are at least trying to
9 hit the mark or trying to hit the issues.
10 Really, there's only been a few cases -- and
11 if we look at Page 9, there's been some
12 studies that have been put in and actually one
13 that's already been funded that didn't
14 directly speak to an issue that the Council
15 had identified. One of these was the stock
16 identification of Dolly Varden in Togiak that
17 was funded in 2000. That really didn't
18 address a published issue of the Council, but
19 it appears from discussions since then that it
20 is an issue that has quite a bit of local
21 interest.

22 Also, these two issues that have
23 just come up on the committal of coho and also
24 on the Clark River. These don't address an

1 issue that has previously been identified, but
I think it's an important issue that as the
2 program develops issues come up and I think
these are two issues that have come up. So,
3 given how the program has gone to date, I
think that the technical review committee and
4 the reviewers have tried to make sure that
these proposals and the studies that are
5 funded -- the board has been trying to do that
too -- actually hit issues that the Council
6 has already identified.

Whether or not this still is a
7 focused enough approach, I don't know. I
guess it's for the Council to decide. But on
8 Pages 10 through 12 there are some suggestions
on how a five-year plan might be developed.
9 You'd probably have to set up some goals and
guided principles, then you'd have to focus it
10 on probably systems or species to reach those
goals, and then you'd have to have some
11 specific objectives that you could actually
measure year by year after five years to
12 decide whether or not you're actually hitting
those goals.

13 So these objectives aren't really
ones that necessarily fit this region. It's
14 just an example. It's someplace to start work
with. So really until Page 10, it's just a
15 lot of background information, which I think
is needed to try to develop a planning process
16 for this region. So I'm not sure how the
Council wants to proceed. Whether or not this
17 is useful and where we want to go from here.
We would like to help you as much as we can,
18 but we need to have some more give and take at
this point to figure out where to go from
19 here.

20 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Council
members, what are your thoughts on this plan
21 that we have before us, this five-year plan?
This happened in the February meeting, I
22 believe.

23 MR. FRIED: That's correct.

24 MR. O'HARA: I was sunning myself
in Mexico and you guys decided to take on the
25 strategic plan, which is fine. I think it's a
great idea. I really do think a strategic

1 plan is very, very important. Now we've got
2 to start filling in some gaps here. What are
your thoughts, Council members? Robin.

3 MR. SAMUELSON: Yeah. In Bristol
4 Bay probably the river system that is in the
5 worse shape and concern under the Board of
6 Fisheries' guidelines is the Kvichak River
7 system. The Board decided that following
8 activities were not eligible: Hatchery
9 enhancement, restoration, supplementation. I
10 think that those issues should be looked at in
11 a different light once you develop stock
12 concerns like the sockeye in the Kvichak River
13 system. We fund studies into Lake Clark and
14 those fish that are passing through the
15 Kvichak are headed for Lake Clark.

16 So I think that a drastic
17 situation needs drastic action, and surely the
18 Kvichak at one time was the biggest sockeye
19 river producing system in the world, and now
20 it can't meet its escapement. So I think we
21 need to look at alternative methods and means
22 to bring that river system back. If that
23 includes some kind of enhancement or possibly
24 a hatchery component, it should be included in
25 the mix. In the mouth of the Kvichak, the
river system -- I came over here and I fished
the first time in 1968, or somewhere in there.

1 And that whole -- you're a
2 resident over here, Mr. Chairman. That mud
3 flat is really filling in. Albert's Channel
4 is only a dimple. I have heard from long-time
5 local residents that the beluga population now
6 comes in and parks itself at the low water
7 waiting for the smoke to come out. A lot of
8 locals are blaming the problems on the beluga
9 population. It's affecting the subsistence
10 users.

11 I don't know if belugas are a
12 problem or not, but I think that we should
13 look at establishing projects in collaboration
14 with the National Marine Fishery Service.
15 Although it's out of our league, we may be
16 able to contribute a small portion of our U.S.
17 Fish and Wildlife dollars to the National
18 Marine Fisheries Service and together we may
19 be able to develop a study to say that belugas
20 are not affecting the subsistence take on Lake
21 Iliamna or Lake Clark.

1 I think we're playing ostrich.
2 I'm not saying that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
3 Service needs to fund the whole program, but I
4 think we need to do our part in these
5 collaborative projects, such as maybe a beluga
study. We ought to be allowed to participate
in that in some limited form, because it is
having a direct or an indirect affect on
subsistence in the upper end of the lake.

6 MR. O'HARA: Council members, any
other comment? Steve, it says here, The
7 Federal Subsistence Board during the February
2001 work session decided the following
8 activities were not eligible for funding under
Federal Subsistence Fishery Resource
9 Monitoring Program.
Were you at that meeting?

10
MR. FRIED: Yes, I was.

11
MR. O'HARA: What was their
12 reasoning for not putting this into a copy of
the five-year plan?

13
MR. FRIED: Basically -- I think
14 it was Steve Klein who was looking for
guidance and he mentioned some topics and how
15 the Board felt about funding them. The Board
decided they didn't want to fund these things,
16 one, because they thought there were other
programs and other agencies that probably
17 should fund this. They want to direct this
money more at subsistence, something that
18 would more directly affect subsistence
management decisions. And that was just their
19 decision at that point. Doesn't mean they
won't change their mind later on, but when
20 they were asked at that point, they said they
weren't interested in seeing money spent on
21 this.

Something I thought about too was
22 that in 2003, not this cycle but this next
one, there's going to be very little money
23 available for new studies. Most of the money
is going to be tied up in finishing up 2001
24 studies and in funding 2002 studies. By not a
lot of money, I mean there might only be about
25 a million dollars statewide available for
studies. What we have been talking about in

1 OSM is maybe taking 2003 to fund some studies
2 that need to continue; in other words, there's
3 a lot of weir studies, a lot of tower studies,
4 these kind of studies. Fund three years of
5 counts doesn't really do very much good. It
6 might be a good idea to just take one more
7 year and sit down and do some strategic
8 planning for the whole program to see where
9 we're going, you know, in 2004 once some more
10 money is available, because a lot of these
11 studies will be winding up. This could be a
12 very good year, you know, coming up to do some
13 strategic planning within each region and
14 statewide as a whole.

15 MR. O'HARA: When you deal with
16 the Federal Board, we're advisory to them, and
17 you've got a beluga population that's maybe as
18 high as 2500 and perhaps as many as 500 in
19 fresh water from Ekwok on up to the lower
20 Kaskanak, because you can see them in the
21 water. I fly over them every day in the
22 springtime. We have 500 animals in there
23 eating migration of smolt and the Feds just
24 sit there and say that they might not want to
25 deal with this issue, where do we go from
there on that?

15 MR. FRIED: I think, as Robin
16 pointed out, there might be some possibility
17 for matching funds. That would be a good way
18 to make your money go farther too. Just the
19 fact that it's the National Marine Fishery
20 Service that really has regulatory authority
21 over marine mammals --

19 MR. O'HARA: In real life we've
20 got to get those fish back, whether the marine
21 mammal people like it or the Park Service
22 people like it or whether anybody else likes
23 it. That's the reality. That's where we sit.
24 The Federal people sit there, they don't want
25 to offend anybody. The way I see them
operating is that they -- if you've got a
level of belugas here, we're not going to take
one more beluga away. But as far as they're
concerned, there is not a commercial fishery
anymore, there may not be a sports fishery
anymore, there will not be a subsistence
fishery anymore, but there may be a fishery in

1 Lake Clark, in the park. This is the way I
see the Federal Board looking at things.
2 And, as a Council member, that isn't the area
I'm going to deal in. There has to be a
3 balance here of less belugas, then we better
start dealing with less belugas and the Feds
4 don't like doing things like that. So you see
this kind of stuff in print, which to me
5 doesn't make any sense at all. Something has
to be done here to bring back the river
6 system. We're going to bring that river
system back.

7
MR. FRIED: I don't know. I mean,
8 there's so many different agencies that are
involved in fisheries it does make it very
9 difficult. But there really isn't -- I mean,
we can't go in there and do much with belugas
10 without getting permits probably through the
National Marine Fishery Service, you know.

11
MR. O'HARA: Well, then maybe we
12 should go to National Marine Fisheries and get
permits.

13
MR. FRIED: Maybe there's some way
14 where we could fund some kind of a tagging
program on fish, and they could look at
15 belugas to get some idea about how many --
what the problem is and see where fish are
16 going. I don't know. I'm just -- off the top
of my head -- but there's got to be some way
17 to get these agencies working together, you
know, and maybe leveraging some of the money
18 we have to do some of that stuff.

19 MR. SAMUELSON: I think what we're
talking about here, Mr. Chairman, is
20 leveraging some dollars and surely U.S. Fish
and Wildlife Service, the National Marine
21 Fishery Service and ADF&G have stakes in it.
The tribes also have stakes and access to
22 additional money. We've been talking in
Bristol Bay for a number of years that the day
23 when Ted Stevens dies or retires -- I don't
know how your budget is affected by Mr.
24 Stevens, but coming from a tribal perspective
our dollars are very crucial for Senator
25 Stevens, and we're grateful.

And compounded with three of the

1 last five years we have been declared a
2 disaster area. I look at the money that's
3 going to Norton Sound with their disaster
4 fund. I look at the monies that are pouring
5 into Southeast Alaska for research because of
6 the U.S.-Canadian salmon feud. I think
7 Southeast got somewhere around \$13 million for
8 research. We need to start working in
9 cooperation with these other organizations to
10 figure out these big-picture problems. Maybe
11 as the dollars are shrinking, collaboration is
12 going to be very important between different
13 agencies, whether they're state, Federal or
14 the tribes. The tribes have access to a lot
15 of money also.

16 And also it's usually when you
17 hire local you're not paying the big moving
18 expenses and all that type of stuff, so I
19 could see them interacting in a big way with
20 this. I just don't think we should preclude
21 it, because we're looking at either a hundred
22 percent funding for a project or nothing. I
23 think instead of spending \$100,000 of U.S.
24 Fish and Wildlife funds, we could spend 25-
25 and the state will come in with 25-, and maybe
someone with 50- and the tribes will come in
with 10-, and we've got our project. But
under this scenario we're precluding it. I
don't think it's prudent. Part of our
strategic planning should include all the user
groups.

17 MR. FRIED: I don't disagree with
18 that at all.

19 MR. O'HARA: I think it's a good
20 idea. Along with the strategic plan, if we're
21 to deal with belugas, we're not going to go
22 out and get rid of belugas. The day is gone
23 where we can go out and kill something. A lot
24 of things are changing. But to have a
25 scientific research program on what these
creatures are doing, to have dollars put into
it to find out what is the stomach content.
Can people use this animal for subsistence? I
think that's a very practical thing to put
into a strategic plan to find out exactly
what's going on. The people probably would
not say this would be a bad use of dollars to
find out. If you were to get 50 permits of

1 people who wanted to use belugas for
2 subsistence at the same time you find out the
3 stomach contents of what they're doing in
4 fresh water and salt water. Maybe that
5 doesn't fit into a strategic plan. I was
6 waiting for Steve to answer.

7 MR. FRIED: It should be a Council
8 plan. So, you know, we can do what we can to
9 try to see how to make it work.

10 MR. O'HARA: We'll take Robert and
11 then we'll take Carl.

12 MR. HEYANO: I think, Mr.
13 Chairman, getting to the strategic plan, it
14 appears to me is that that's what we're trying
15 to develop so we're not piecemealing this
16 together. If we determine hypothetically that
17 the sockeye in the Kvichak is a high priority,
18 because as Steve has mentioned, to maintain
19 healthy subsistence fishery resources in the
20 Bristol Bay Alaska Peninsula Region, then we
21 ought to focus all our money and all our
22 energies in trying to determine why, what's
23 the problem. Right now we have the state
24 spending disaster money up there doing some
25 work. We have projects up in Lake Clark and
26 we have projects in Branch River and et
27 cetera, and it all seems to be piecemealing,
28 but it isn't getting that real critical,
29 crucial information that we need. Somebody
30 needs to -- we need to determine what the
31 cause of the salmon leaving the Kvichak so we
32 can start getting some solutions.

33 MR. O'HARA: Carl, you want to
34 come on up.
35 Let's just say, for instance,
36 Steve, we're dealing with the strategic plan
37 and we put a counting station in the Branch
38 this year, isn't that right? Wasn't there a
39 counting station put on the Branch this year?

40 MR. FRIED: Yeah, there was a
41 tower on the Branch.

42 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. And I would
43 venture to say the amount of money spent on
44 that tower to go into the Branch is one thing,

1 and yet when Slim pulled up there with his
2 fish counting -- I assume he counted fish up
3 there this fall -- he probably saw 600- to a
4 million fish up the Branch again without the
5 counting tower there. Yet we didn't get
6 anymore up the Kvichak because we had a
7 counting station in the Branch. I guess
8 that's looking at it from a practical sense.
9 If we're going to put our dollars where we
10 really have to have the return, the strategic
11 plan also has to deal with other species in
12 the area too as far as what needs to come back
13 every year.

14 Carl, did you have something you
15 want to say there?

16 MR. JACK: I was going to mention,
17 along the same lines, the need for
18 collaboration between the Federal agencies.
19 Right now -- you know, in '72, Congress
20 adopted the Marine Mammal Protection Act,
21 which is basically a moratorium on the taking
22 of marine mammals with a few exceptions. And
23 one of those is Native take exemption, which
24 allows Alaska Natives to be able to take
25 marine mammals with no restrictions at all.
26 There's no regulations; it's self-regulating.
27 The taking of marine mammals within the
28 jurisdiction of United States waters, that is.
29 And, again, we're dealing with jurisdictional,
30 I guess what you might call barriers, between
31 the federal agencies. But there is that
32 Native take exemption for marine mammals. And
33 I think there's probably a way whereby the
34 subsistence users, you know, when they take
35 marine belugas, some kind of program can be
36 developed that would link into what you're
37 talking about. The exemption is there
38 already. Thank you.

39 MR. O'HARA: Thank you. Any other
40 comments? Shirley.

41 MS. KELLY: And I really want to
42 see this comprehensive plan done, because you
43 guys need direction in where the studies -- or
44 what studies to do. I mean, I don't want to
45 see any foo-foo studies like the last two that
46 were presented to us, because whether the
47 Federal agency wants to acknowledge this or

1 not the Kvichak River is the driving force of
2 Bristol Bay. It's affected the Ugashik. It's
3 going to affect the Egegik. They're both
4 within tribal jurisdiction and it's going to
5 affect the Nushagak. We're talking about a
6 large group of people. That's why we're
7 pushing so hard to get some of these Federal
8 dollars into the Kvichak because it's coming
9 down the pipeline. It's going to affect all
of us. Whether it's within Federal waters or
not, we're asking you guys to do studies on
the Kvichak, because we know. I mean, I see
the effects of it already in Egegik and what's
happened in the Ugashik. So this is why we're
pushing to have this money go towards the
Kvichak, because we need to help that system
to save our systems.

10 MR. O'HARA: Any other comments
11 from Council members? Anyone have any more
input on the strategic plan? Robin.

12 MR. SAMUELSON: You know, Mr.
13 Chairman, salmon drive everything, and in the
14 Kvichak there's a major fresh water sport
15 fishery up there. Dwindling numbers into the
16 Kvichak, that's going to have an affect on
17 fresh water fish, which in turn could have an
18 affect not only on sport fishing, but could
19 have an affect on subsistence users. Talking
20 to folks over in the AYK Region with their
mode of transportation changing so greatly,
where before a hundred-mile trip by dog team
was considered a pretty expensive trip, now
they have snow machine travel. When the AYK
Region started developing problems with their
salmon runs and they weren't able to meet
their subsistence needs through salmon, they
turned really hard towards fresh water fish.
The thing just starts compounding.

21 I think we're going to see the day
22 that our fresh water fish are going to start
dropping off. If we had a monitoring program,
I bet they're dropping off already. When you
23 put 10 million fish up that river to spawn,
that fresh water component -- that population
24 must just explode with all the abundance of
food. When you can't take a million -- I bet
25 there's fierce competition for that food by
the fresh water fish. We could see a real

1 ripple effect. If we had the monitoring
 programs in place, I think we'd be seeing it.
 2 Fish size, fresh water fish size will start
 declining, populations will start declining,
 3 and I really think that we need to start
 paying more attention, not only as regulators,
 4 but we need to seek the National Marine
 Fishery Service out. We need to seek the
 5 Department of Fish and Game out. And we've
 got to collaborate together on a river system
 6 such as the Kvichak.

To me, it's very important to
 7 bring that river system back to its historical
 levels. Not only will it benefit the local
 8 economy, but it will benefit subsistence users
 in salt water and fresh water subsistence.
 9 Nobody seems to have the answer, but we all
 want to look at little slivers. This Council
 10 has recognized it very early on. Our worry
 was that in ten years we may spend \$30 million
 11 in the region for research, but at the end of
 ten years we've got \$30 million worth of
 12 studies done and we're still scratching our
 heads. Well, what did we accomplish with \$30
 13 million? Everybody got their little pet peeve
 project funded. The scientific community
 14 cannot tell us any of the missing pieces of
 the puzzle. We don't mind spending money; we
 15 just want some bang for our buck. That's why
 we requested a comprehensive study be done.
 16 We've seen too many times that the academic
 world has been given X amount of dollars to do
 17 all this research, and in the end we're all
 scratching our heads again.

18 MR. O'HARA: Council comments?
 19 Steve, we know that probably every
 river system for the last two years -- and I
 20 know the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is
 sitting there and they've counted them -- have
 21 received their escapement goals pretty much.
 I would venture to say Naknek maybe, 600-,
 22 800-, more than a million this year in Naknek.
 Egegik probably more than 800,000; Ugashik,
 23 600,000, 700,000; Nushagak -- Robert, you guys
 have your escapement over there? And the
 24 Kvichak did not have anything to touch the
 system at all. Maybe a little bit of early
 25 weak fishing down there north of -- and those
 are basically Naknek fish that came in, I

1 think. They were pouring in there. They
2 never stopped. And then the Kvichak just did
not.

For you to ask me as a layman to
3 put something down here and make a strategic
plan, that's why you have the degree and why
4 we give you the money. That strategic plan
has got to represent -- a five-year plan has
5 got to move the needle somewhere. It's either
going to stay the same and all the systems are
6 going to make their escapement, or the Kvichak
is going to come back or we're going to keep
7 the status quo. We are not going to buy off
on that status quo. That needle has to move
8 somewhere on the Kvichak. Granted, weather,
other conditions, we have no control over.
9 Maybe the weather and these type of things
that have happened have just completely --
10 what about the somlt? Are they different when
they migrate from the Kvichak? Maybe the
11 Department of Fish and Game or the University
of Washington has done that study and can tell
12 us that. But somewhere along the line -- I
guess our bottom line is that river system has
13 got to come back. There's a whole bunch of
agencies sitting here on the floor today that
14 probably can help us do that, other than
giving me a stick of dynamite and saying go
15 out and do something. That's probably not a
good idea.

16 Any more on the strategic plan? I
don't think we've moved the needle very much,
17 to be honest with you. Shirley.

18 MS. KELLY: On the systems and
species, I would like to do a couple of
19 additions for the Egegik River. I would like
to add chinook salmon and Arctic grayling to
20 it and to the Ushagak River, chinook salmon.

21 MR. O'HARA: What page are you on,
Shirley?

22 MS. KELLY: Page 10 under Tab H.

23 MR. EDENSHAW: Shirley, could you
24 repeat those, please?

25 MS. KELLY: Under the Egegik
River, add chinook salmon and Arctic grayling.

1 Under the Ushagak River, add chinook salmon.

2 MR. O'HARA: The second one was
what?

3 Anything else, Council members?
4 Steve, anything else? Robert.

5 MR. HEYANO: Mr. Chairman, I
looked at this maybe in a little different
light than the rest of the Council members.
6 This is just a suggestion to develop a
five-year plan and it probably can be longer.
7 But, you know -- did you do this, Steve?

8 MR. FRIED: I sat down with a few
other people. It's just a suggestion. You
9 can take this and throw it in the garbage if
you want.

10 MR. HEYANO: No, no, we don't want
11 to throw it in the garbage.

12 MR. FRIED: I mean, it's just a
start.

13 MR. HEYANO: It is, but I think
14 now what we need to do is go through and
identify or agree to rules and guiding
15 principles, you know, and some of this other
stuff that he has for us to consider and then
16 once we do that, then I think these systems
and species will fall out as a result of that.
17 Somebody will raise the issue of the Lake
Clark sockeye salmon, we'll go through our
18 goals and guiding principles and our
objectives and things we want to do and we'll
19 see if in our own mind it meets the criteria.
That's what's going to keep us focused on how
20 we make recommendations for spending our money
on specific projects.

21 MR. O'HARA: Go for it.

22 MR. HEYANO: Well, Mr. Chairman,
23 if I might suggest, I think that to do a plan
like this you probably need to appoint some
24 Council members to further work with Steve to
flesh it out using this as the base document
25 to go through. Other than that, we can spend
a whole heck of a lot of time here tonight

1 trying to get -- trying to establish a plan.

2 MR. O'HARA: Okay.

3 MR. HEYANO: I throw that out for
4 consideration to the other board members.

5 MR. O'HARA: Let's think about
6 maybe a group from the Council that would kind
7 of represent us geographically. We don't want
8 all the Council on there, but maybe three or
9 four members -- three, four members. If we
10 had four and three could meet, because not all
11 of us can meet all the time because of our
12 schedules, we might have a working group of
13 three. Any other comment, Council members?
14 Robin.

15 MR. SAMUELSON: I'm just
16 brainstorming here, Steve. Why wasn't the
17 Kvichak included? It's not in Federal waters?

18 MR. FRIED: I think that's the
19 only reason we did that. I mean, Lake Clark
20 is a hook into the whole Kvichak system. It
21 sits at the top of the system. Like I said,
22 you can use monies to match, maybe monies from
23 other agencies or other programs to get the
24 whole thing. I think the keys is that once
25 there is a plan, you can focus your call for
26 proposals so people would know what you're
27 looking for. It's not just having a call for
28 proposals, having them come in and just kind
29 of sorting them and say, yeah, this goes with
30 our plan or not. We can ask, you know, the
31 people that are going to propose these things
32 -- we can tell them what we're looking for and
33 we're telling them that we don't really want
34 to see anything else. This is what we're
35 looking for. I think that would really help
36 as to how the money was spent. Right now we
37 just send them a list of issues and they're
38 not even prioritized; they're just issues.
39 We've been hitting them, but I think what the
40 Council is looking for is something even more
41 focused. I think once we had a good plan, we
42 could tell the investigators, hey, we want to
43 do a study on whatever, Lake Clark or Kvichak,
44 and then you'd get hopefully a bunch of
45 proposals that would hit that and you could

1 sit there and pick out the best ones that
2 would hit that issue, instead of sorting
3 through a whole laundry list of who knows how
many, and maybe two even hit it and they're
not really what you want anyway.

4 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Any other
5 comments? Robin.

6 MR. SAMUELSON: Well, it just
7 seems that if Lake Clark cannot -- the salmon
8 runs cannot be sustained in Lake Clark as our
9 studies show, there is an array of people that
10 are harvesting them fish, subsistence users
11 that don't reside in Lake Clark or reside
12 around the lake. Iliamna is maybe harvesting
13 20 percent of them. Then we're going to look
14 at the commercial fisheries and the first
15 commercial fishery would be the Kvichak
16 commercial fishermen and the sport fishermen
17 that harvest in that river. So if that run
18 cannot be sustainable we'll probably do away
19 with the sport fisheries, we'll cut back on
all other subsistence fisheries in Lake Clark
and then we get down to the commercial fishing
district in the Kvichak. We'll knock out the
commercial fishery. And then the secretary
will use his extra-territorial jurisdiction --
he needs a petition to use it -- but he'll go
down to the North Peninsula and to Egegik and
them places that have known interceptions, but
we're prohibited from spending money in
Iliamna Lake to protect Lake Clark and we're
only going to spend it in Lake Clark? I think
we ought to be spending money in Iliamna Lake
to protect Lake Clark fish.

19 MR. FRIED: I would think, you
20 know, that Lake Clark fish, I mean, they're
21 traveling through Lake Iliamna, they're
22 traveling down the Kvichak. I mean, I think
23 that's the link, and you can't ignore all
that. So I think as long as you just keep
that link in there, I don't think that would
be a big problem.

24 MR. SAMUELSON: I think this
25 Council said one time along the migratory
path, so we should look realistically at the
whole picture.

1
2 MR. FRIED: I know there's been
3 resistance too about going out into marine
4 waters, because we've had studies that would
5 do that. But, like you said before, there's
6 no reason why you couldn't use your funds to
7 leverage these other studies and see that
8 they're all being coordinated.

9 MS. KELLY: I would also like to
10 see that the plan be ecosystem based, you
11 know, from whether it's in fresh water,
12 whether it's in salt water, whether it's in
13 marine waters. Because all those affect the
14 species of fish, all three systems, not just,
15 you know, nearest to the Federal management
16 areas, but it needs to be ecosystem based and
17 that takes all three.

18 MR. FRIED: I agree. You have to
19 understand what's happening in all those
20 places. It's just that I'm not sure this
21 program is going to be able to do it all by
22 itself.

23 MR. HEYANO: I don't think it has
24 to. I think if we can identify it and
25 obviously there isn't enough money to do all
the studying, but if we could agree to at
least identify it and then try to convince the
other agencies involved that this is extremely
important, and we're willing to put up X
amount of dollars and if they are willing to
put up so many dollars and wherever you could
get the money from, hopefully we can do what
we want to do and get it completed. I
recognize there's very little money left for
some of these projects, so it's going have to
be multi-agency to get the results we're
looking for.

21 MR. O'HARA: Why was the Chignik
22 left out of this list?

23 MR. SAMUELSON: They're not.

24 MR. FRIED: They weren't. Clark
25 River is --

MR. O'HARA: Okay. Well, I don't

1 know if we have any more comments or not from
the board members. At the break we'll go
2 ahead and see what we can come up with in the
way of a committee to work with you, Steve, to
3 kind of put a little meat on this. So that
takes care of 12.

4 Let's take a little break and come
back and finish up the program.

5
(Short break taken.)

6
MR. O'HARA: From the way we're
7 going, we'll probably be done about 6:00
tonight it looks like. We just have a couple
8 more items and reports to take care of.
Granted, when we had to reschedule the
9 program, we lost people who needed to be
elsewhere and we had to reschedule Phil.
10 We'll be finishing up tonight. However, we do
have -- under new business we still have a few
11 questions to ask the Park Service and Fish and
Wildlife on want and waste for moose.

12 Gentlemen, let's have your name.
You're on No. 12.

13
MR. UBERUAGA: Good afternoon. My
14 name is Richard Uberuaga. I'm with the Office
of Subsistence in Anchorage. I'm a fisheries
15 biologist representing the North Slope,
Northwest Arctic, Seward Pen and the
16 Kodiak-Aleutians.

I'm going to briefly address
17 customary trade with you today. I've been
attending all of the customary trade meetings
18 and helping Pete Probasco, the chairman there,
work on that with the other council members.
19 I've got a little summary of customary trade
from the meeting last week of what key
20 decisions were made, key language they came up
with concerning the draft regulatory language.

21 We'll go over that briefly. So if you'll look
in your Council book under Tab I, you'll see a
22 written briefing on customary trade, on the
background of the customary trade issue.

23 Really, the important things I
want to say, I'm going to make it brief,
24 because I know we are in a hurry. The
important thing I want to remind you of is
25 that the customary trade as we are dealing
with it from the Federal Subsistence Board is

1 dealing with the cash sales of fish only, only
2 deals with fish. So with that said, I'll
3 reiterate, bartering is not included in this
4 language. It's just the cash sales of fish.
5 Current Federal law allows customary trade.
6 The problem being that customary trade is not
7 defined very well at all. It's not clear in
8 current Federal regulations what customary
9 trade is, because of the wording, "cash
10 transactions that do not constitute
11 significant commercial enterprises." So that
12 definition is what is unclear. The task force
13 was created to provide regulations that are
14 definable, that clearly defines what is meant
15 by customary trade of fish, to address
16 potential abuses or whatever.

17 The task force was created by
18 members from each of the Councils and with
19 participation by representatives from each
20 agency. The goal, again, was to develop clear
21 regulatory language. The task force has met
22 four times, with the last meeting occurring
23 last Friday, where they looked at the draft
24 regulatory language which you find on Page 3,
25 Tab I, and fine-tuned it a little bit. What I
handed out to you was the fine-tuning that
occurred last Friday.

I would like to go over the time
lines on the development of this draft
language with you. The time lines that we're
working under are on Page 5. The customary
trade task force has met several times and has
brought this issue to each Council meeting
this fall. So each Council meeting has been
providing input back to the task force.
You're the last Council to meet this fall and
we're addressing your input into the proposed
regulations that the task force has come up
with. There's still a lot of time left in the
time line to receive your final and formal
comments. As I said, the task force just met
last Friday. The next step is that the staff
committee, the interagency staff committee for
the Federal Subsistence Board is going to
address all of the recommendations from each
Council so far, that's not to say that all the
Councils have made formal written
recommendations. Some of the Councils still
have yet to provide written formal
recommendations. But the interagency task

1 force is going to get together and work on the
2 proposed regulatory language, what the task
3 force has come up with. That's going to go
4 before the Federal Subsistence Board in
5 December. The task force chairman will
6 provide a committee report to the board in
7 December, and the board is going to work at
8 developing draft language for a proposed rule,
9 a proposed rule to change the Federal
10 regulations. That will be -- that draft
11 language will end up in the Federal register
12 in early January of 2002 as a proposed rule.
13 That proposed rule will be out to the public,
14 the entire public across the entire United
15 States, for comments. During the winter, the
16 Regional Councils can continue to address this
17 topic and develop more formal comments for
18 consideration by the Federal Board later on.
19 Again, in March of 2002 the staff committees
20 again are going to work on developing
21 recommendations to the proposed rule language.
22 In May of 2002 the board will meet for their
23 final meeting, they'll review all comments,
24 all the Regional Council comments, staff
25 committee recommendations, and they will take
a final action on the proposed rule. That
publication of the final rule will occur in
May 2002. And in this time line there's a lot
of time built in still for comment from
tribes, and Carl is going to talk to you in a
moment about the tribal consultation process.

So, with that, I would like to
have Carl talk to you about the tribal
consultation process and then we can look at
the proposed language as it stands today with
the changes that were recommended last Friday,
that little sheet I just handed out to you.
So I think that's all I've got. Carl, you
want to get to tribal consultation?

MR. JACK: Mr. Chair, members of
the Council. On tribal consultation, last
February I gave a briefing on the new Federal
policy on tribal consultation. And in summary
it's a policy that was signed by five Federal
agencies along with a special assistant to the
secretary on about January 20, 2001, that
spells out the protocols for tribal
consultation. And since this proposed
regulation will affect all Natives, all tribal

1 members, all qualified subsistence users,
tribal consultation was initiated using the
2 procedure that was agreed between OSM and
AITC, and that was to send the proposed
3 regulation to all of the 229 tribes, along
with a comment that if there is unanswered
4 questions by the tribes, that we would be more
than willing to sit down with them and further
5 discuss the specifics on the proposed
regulations.

6 We specified the tribal comment
period from August 30 up to the end of
7 October. We received -- out of the 19
comments that were submitted, and those 19
8 comments were the ones that were reviewed by
the customary trade task force last week --
9 out of the 19 we received three comments from
the tribes, and all of those comments did not
10 depart from the proposed regulatory language.
For example, Egegik Tribal Council,
11 recommendation of \$1,000 per family member,
and that's consistent with A(12), rural to
12 rural. Sitka Tribe is a departure in a way.
Their recommendation is also consistent with
13 A(12), and that is no limit between rural to
rural. So that's what had resulted from the
14 tribal consultation.

I do have a copy of all of the
15 comments that were received to date and ones
that were reviewed by the task force last
16 week. I might say, though, that October 31st
deadline will not foreclose the tribes or the
17 general public from making additional comments
on the proposed regulations. And that is
18 anyone can testify before the Federal
Subsistence Board when they take it up in
19 December. And also consistent, you know,
there's a public policy process that is used
20 by the Federal Board and that's the
Administrative Procedures Act. That will also
21 be exercised as part of the public process.

22 So, Mr. Chairman, that concludes
my presentation.

23 MR. O'HARA: Okay.

24 MR. UBERUAGA: Briefly, on Page 3
we can go through the three main sections of
25 the proposed draft language. It says "111."
It should say A(11) in your book. There are

1 three basic parts. One is trade between rural
residents, rural residents to rural residents.
2 Basically trade between rural residents is
unrestricted. There are no limits placed on
3 trade between federally-qualified rural
residents.

4 A(12) deals with trade between a
rural resident and others or non-qualified
5 Federal users. The proposal there is a cash
cap, deals with salmon only, and limits it to
6 \$1,000 per household member.

And then A(13) is the third part
7 and it deals with trade between fisheries
businesses. A(13) basically says, no purchase
8 by fisheries businesses as defined in the
State of Alaska regulations.

9 So that brings us to last week's
task force changes or amendments that they
10 made and most of the comments dealt with
A(12). And what was brought up there at the
11 task force meeting was, they would like to see
some language in A(12) that would provide an
12 enforcement mechanism to prevent trade or to
be able to enforce the intent of A(12). So
13 this is what they came up with.

This is in addition to the A(12)
14 language, but they wanted to add this first
part in. The final language will be something
15 like this. It'll probably be a little bit
different because the lawyers are going to
16 massage it a little bit. But it says,
"Subsistence harvested salmon sold to others
17 may not be sold under a Federal -- may only be
sold under a Federal permit that requires the
18 transaction to be recorded immediately." In
other words, it's an accounting system, a way
19 to keep track of somebody selling salmon to
others. The changes are, they wanted to
20 define "family" and they wanted to define
"others." The reason for family was they
21 wanted to keep the ability for each person to
sell \$1,000 worth of salmon as part of the
22 family that lived in the household, not the
extended family living all over the state, but
23 they wanted it to apply to people living in
the household. The word "others" was meant to
24 include commercial enterprises other than
fisheries businesses and individuals other
25 than rural residents. They wanted to allow
some sale to small stores, things of that

1 nature. Fisheries businesses defined by State
2 law, there would be no commercial sales
allowed.

3 That in a nutshell is the changes
and recommendations that are going to go
4 forward from the task force last Friday.
There are still a lot of recommendations from
5 each individual Council on minor things that
will be brought up and presented to the
6 Federal board in December. Each region, I
believe, had a variation upon what they did
want, what they didn't want, some suggestions
7 to make implementing customary trade easier or
better. But at the December meeting, the
8 federal board meeting, this will all come
before the board for action by the board.
9 With that, any questions, Pete worked on this
Council, or task force. I think if you've got
10 questions, you know, between Pete, Carl and
myself, we could try to address them.

11
12 MR. O'HARA: Thank you. Pete, did
you have any comments?

13 MR. ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, when
we got to the recording of the sales between
14 -- I thought about this sometime ago -- we
need to make some kind of form that the person
15 or the family or the household can fill and
make available to them from the tribal
16 Councils for them to obtain at a time of
transaction or before the transaction. That's
17 the only thing I've got to add to this over
here, because I missed that meeting last
18 Friday.

19 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Any questions,
Council members? Robert.

20
21 MR. HEYANO: Didn't they also say
that each Regional Council can have different
limits?

22
23 MR. UBERUAGA: Yes. The Regional
Council can recommend -- my understanding is
they can recommend any limit they would like
24 to recommend for any species, including
salmon, at this time up through the May
25 meeting of the Federal Subsistence Board. So
if this Council feels that \$1,000 per family

1 member for salmon is too high or too low, the
2 Council can recommend a specific amount. For
3 other species, I know the Northwest Arctic is
4 dealing with sheefish and whitefish, and at
5 some point they're looking at proposing a
6 limit on transaction for sheefish and
7 whitefish. Again, keep in mind that's
8 transactions only between rural and non-rural
9 users, between federally-qualified users and
10 others as we would define others in the
11 language.

12 MR. O'HARA: Robert.

13 MR. HEYANO: I should ask my
14 question in this light, that each region can
15 have a different variant on customary trade.
16 It isn't one policy that would apply
17 statewide. Is that correct?

18 MR. JACK: Mr. Chairman, that is
19 what's coming out from the nine Regional
20 Councils that have made comments so far. For
21 example, in Southeast, they just said, let's
22 just do away with the proposed regulatory
23 language and have just one sentence that
24 covers customary trade. The exchange forecast
25 of subsistence-harvested fish, their parts or
26 their eggs legally taken under Federal
27 subsistence management regulations. That's an
28 example. Southcentral, they further defined
29 rural to federally-qualified subsistence user
30 and further added that at least 50 percent of
31 what is harvested will be retained for
32 subsistence use within that family. That's
33 Southcentral.

34 The Tri-council Meeting, Western
35 Interior supported the A(11) and A(13) where
36 they made different recommendations on A(12).
37 But, for example, Western Interior supports
38 the 1,000 cap; where Eastern Interior did not
39 make any recommendations. Seward Peninsula
40 wanted to renew the cast limit. And the North
41 Slope did not make any -- did not take any
42 formal action. Northwest, they're not so much
43 concerned about salmon, but they're concerned
44 about other species and may put some limits,
45 for example, on sheefish and Dolly Varden. So
46 these different comments are focusing on
47 A(12), not so much on rural to rural, but

1 focusing on A(12). Kodiak-Aleutians, for
2 example, wanted to have an ongoing review of
3 the proposed regulation and put a sunset
4 clause of two years. So that will allow them
5 to make further review by having that sunset
6 clause.

7 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 MR. O'HARA: Council members?
9 Richard, you said that you wanted written
10 comments to the Federal board by December from
11 this Council?

12 MR. UBERUAGA: I believe we would
13 like to have them as soon as you can get them,
14 but in the timetable that I have it says that
15 we will be soliciting comments through May, or
16 through the spring meeting of next spring's
17 Regional Council meeting. It would be nice to
18 have written comments right before the board
19 meets this winter, so we can present them
20 really -- we understand exactly what you would
21 like to recommend. But if you don't get them,
22 we'll carry that through until the spring
23 meeting because the board will be meeting on
24 it again. It's better to have the comments
25 before a proposed rule is developed. We have
26 heard a lot of different suggestions from
27 every Council, and I think it's going to be a
28 real job for the board to listen carefully to
29 all of the different suggestions and craft a
30 good language out of this. We've got a pretty
31 good framework, but there's a lot of good
32 suggestions out there from the different
33 Councils. Carl just mentioned a lot of them
34 and there are a few more. So if you can get
35 something in writing, great. If you've got a
36 recommendation that we can take back today in
37 terms of a cap amount, or you're satisfied, or
38 -- we'll gladly take it back.

39 MR. O'HARA: What are the wishes
40 of the Council?

41 MR. ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman. The
42 salmon does not exceed \$1,000. I had called
43 around from Togiak, calling Northway,
44 Quinhagak, Eek, Tuntutuliak. They been doing
45 that for years and years. When I talked to
46 the people, I never did find anybody exceeding

1 \$1,000 anywhere over there. I think the most
2 highest money transaction they had was about
3 \$400 -- \$300 or \$400. So on this side, the
4 section over here, I haven't contacted anybody
5 because I don't think the salmon is a problem
6 in this area because everybody has salmon
7 around here. But some people prepare the
8 salmon better than the other one a little bit,
9 or a little different from the other, so we
10 like to trade a little but not much. But
11 Yukon area has a different way of doing things
12 over there because they eat a lot of salmon
13 strips. Those people up there exceed \$1,000
14 up there in their transactions. But it's not
15 affecting us over here a lot. Thank you, Mr.
16 Chairman.

17 MR. O'HARA: Did any Council
18 member or does the Council as a whole want to
19 make a statement that they'd like to take to
20 the Federal board in December, or do you want
21 to wait until the February meeting? What are
22 your thoughts? Egegik has come up with a
23 thousand bucks.

24 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair? The
25 staff committee starts meeting tomorrow,
26 Tuesday, Wednesday -- or actually Wednesday,
27 Thursday, Friday. On their agenda they're
28 going to address the customary trade and they
29 were hoping that the Council would submit
30 their comments or recommendations regarding
31 this draft regulatory language, so the staff
32 committee is also going to address the FYS
33 proposals and fisheries proposals that the
34 Council makes recommendations, so they have a
35 full agenda this week. And those
36 recommendations and information that they
37 collect will be taken to the board starting in
38 December at the board meeting on the 10th. So
39 I think it would be good for the Council to
40 provide some kind of recommendation regarding
41 customary trade.

42 MR. O'HARA: Yes, Robin.

43 MR. SAMUELSON: Thank you, Mr.
44 Chairman. I want to clarify one thing. This
45 does not limit a qualified subsistence user
46 from Naknek who trades with qualified a

1 qualified subsistence user in the Chigniks.

2 MR. UBERUAGA: That's correct.

3 MR. SAMUELSON: They could trade
4 10,000 pounds of fish and octopus back and
5 forth if they wanted to. We're only talking
6 about the monetary aspect. Is that right?

7 MR. UBERUAGA: That's correct. It
8 does not limit trade between rural users for
9 fish at all.

10 MR. O'HARA: Robert.

11 MR. HEYANO: Another
12 clarification, then, the definition of trade
13 as it is applied here is cash money, right?

14 MR. UBERUAGA: Cash exchange.

15 MR. HEYANO: Barter is when they
16 trade for like species, different species,
17 fuel, that kind of thing is barter.

18 MR. UBERUAGA: Right. This is a
19 cash exchange for fish.

20 MR. O'HARA: Would the Council
21 like to put a dollar amount on here? Yes,
22 Robert.

23 MR. HEYANO: Well, Mr. Chairman,
24 if you're looking for opinions, you know, I
25 have several. I think I go back and on this
customary trade I tried to fit what I know
have been existing policy or practices, and I
think not having a limit on the amount of
customary trade between rural residents is
something I can't support. The way I read
this is, I can trade with any
federally-qualified rural resident in the
state of Alaska.

MR. O'HARA: Does that give you
heartburn?

MR. HEYANO: Yes, it does, Mr.
Chairman and I'll tell you why. There are
some areas in the state of Alaska that have

1 substantially large portions of population and
2 not all of those are what I would consider to
3 be long-term traditional users. A lot of them
4 are new people coming into the area and don't
5 necessarily have the knowledge or the skills
6 in subsistence harvesting. So I think we need
7 to be awful careful and I think we need to put
8 a limit on there. What I'm concerned with is
9 establishing a new industry under the disguise
10 of subsistence. As it's proposed to us, you
11 can have \$1,000 per household member. So if
12 you have six people in the house, you're
13 eligible to generate \$6,000 to
14 nonfederally-qualified users and no limit if
15 you're trading between here and Bethel or here
16 and Kotzebue or here and whatever other -- you
17 look at the basic economy today of Bristol Bay
18 and you add those figures together, you're
19 going to have a hard time convincing me that
20 we're not developing a new industry here. So
21 that's one issue. I think there needs to be a
22 limit. I think we need -- that \$1,000 per
23 household member trading to
24 nonfederally-qualified users is too high.

25 I don't have any knowledge of
people taking their product and selling it in
Anchorage in a small store or anything like
that. My experience has been that if you have
extended family members in those areas and you
send them some and they in turn would send you
something else in return. But to take your
subsistence-caught fish and actually market it
is something that I'm not aware of.

MR. O'HARA: Any other Council
member comments?

MR. ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman. From
experience, you know, I trade a lot or I buy a
little, because I like Kuskokwim and Yukon
salmon because they're a lot richer than from
this area. Anywhere, any time I travel and
when I do bartering or trading I never had
exceeded \$1,000 anywhere. And I do not know
anybody, one family exceeds or spends \$1,000.
If you do that, if the household sells their
customary trade -- \$6,000 you say, well,
they're going to go hungry before the winter
is over, because you cannot buy with \$6,000
what will last you -- if there's six families,

1 for the winter use, unless you buy ten bags of
2 beans, dried beans or something. I never seen
3 it anywhere. Let's see if they are aware of
4 it now that they can do it, maybe that will
5 spark up the fire like what happened when
permits first came out. Before that everybody
kind of fished out there when they would have
time. When the permit system came out,
everybody wanted it, everybody.

6 MR. O'HARA: Thank you. Robin.

7 MR. SAMUELSON: Under 12(A) I
would like to amend the \$1,000 to read \$400.
8 On Page 3, A(12).

9 MR. O'HARA: 400.

10 MR. SAMUELSON: 400.

11 MS. KELLY: May I ask why 400?

12 MR. O'HARA: Is that a motion?

13 MR. SAMUELSON: Yeah.

14 MR. O'HARA: Is there a second to
15 the motion?

16 MR. HEYANO: Second it.

17 MR. O'HARA: Do you want to speak
to your motion?

18 MR. SAMUELSON: Sure, Mr.
Chairman. Under Tab K, the North Pacific
19 Fishery Management Council developed a Halibut
Subsistence Management Program, and on Page 2
20 of that there is a maximum of \$400. I sit on
the North Pacific Fishery Management Council
21 and I was chairman of the subsistence halibut
group. That was a group of people from
22 Western Alaska all the way down to Southeast
Alaska and covered Southcentral Alaska. A
23 number of tribes were involved in it. At any
time a half-dozen attorneys -- and the numbers
24 were just like we're looking at. The numbers
were all over the table. And through
25 consensus we agreed on \$400, Mr. Chairman.
Being a qualified subsistence user and member

1 of the Native community, I was able to extract
 2 out of them guys exactly what are we trying to
 3 do here? Are we trying to protect
 4 subsistence? Are we trying to develop a
 5 cottage industry for subsistence? Let's be
 6 realists here. When it all came down, we were
 7 going to vote for, I believe it was \$300, but
 8 the Yukon guys brought up the price of gas and
 9 \$400 was agreeable for halibut by Southeast
 10 fishermen, Southcentral subsistence users and
 11 the people from Bristol Bay and the AYK region
 12 after extensive testimony. I think that 400
 13 is plenty adequate.

14 I was raised, born and raised in
 15 Dillingham. Here in Bristol Bay I have spent
 16 extensive time on the Kuskokwim River up and
 17 down that river. My grandmother had a store
 18 in Akhiok and I have never seen people get
 19 thousands and thousands and thousands of
 20 dollars. A long time ago there used to be a
 21 seal boat that used to come from the coastline
 22 and sell seal oil and seal oil pokes. And
 23 that person, that was his specialty, gathering
 24 seal oil from different communities along the
 25 coastline and rendering the seal oil and
 bringing it and selling it. It was a valuable
 commodity.

My wife puts up all the fish we
 need, but when we go to Ekwok, the fish
 upriver in fresh water taste a little
 different than the ones caught in salt water.
 We buy a little bit of salmon up in Akwok.
 But I don't think that family relies on that
 as income. They don't advertise. They do it
 to their friends and extended family, like
 myself. They're not into a wholesale fish
 business. It helps them offset their
 subsistence activities. I think, you know,
 what we need to do is protect subsistence.

Let's face it, there's people out
 here -- there's subsistence users in this
 state that will take Federal regulations, our
 state regulations that are designated to
 protect subsistence users, and turn them
 around and use them not to the advantage of
 subsistence users. I think what we're trying
 to do is recognize the historical factors
 here. In Southeast Alaska there was three
 gentlemen that took a bunch of herring eggs
 valued at \$9,000, took them through Canada and

1 tried to sell them in the state of Washington.
 The judge let them off the hook because there
 2 was no regulation on the book. The judge
 ruled that \$9,000 was not excessive absent a
 3 number. I think that's the kind of loophole
 we're trying to address here with the
 4 differentiation of opinions between the Alaska
 legislature and the reason why we're all
 5 sitting here.

Subsistence is a very
 6 controversial item in this state. Our own
 legislative body is not supportive of a
 7 constitutional amendment. That's why all
 these Federal employees are sitting here. I
 8 think that we need to protect subsistence; by
 having it unlimited will open Pandora's box.
 9 I think by having it at \$1,000 is excessive in
 my book and would be opening Pandora's box. I
 10 think what we're trying to do is recognize the
 traditional aspect of it. If \$400 is
 11 inadequate, let them Regional Councils who
 feel it is inadequate re-petition the
 12 Federal Subsistence Board. We will be allowed
 to comment at that time, whether we feel as a
 13 Regional Council that that's excessive or not.
 I think this is a starting point and it's
 14 consistent with the work that North Pacific
 Fishery Management Council did on halibut. I
 15 think that work should not go unnoticed by any
 judge or any Regional Council or Federal
 16 Subsistence Board. There was a lot of work
 put in by that regulatory agency. That's all
 17 I have, Mr. Chairman.

18 MR. O'HARA: Any other comment by
 Council members? All right. No other
 19 comment. Call for the question.

20 MR. BALLUTA: Question.

21 MR. O'HARA: All those in favor
 say aye.

22 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

23 MR. O'HARA: Opposed? The ayes
 24 have it. Thank you, gentlemen. Pete, we
 appreciate your work.

25 MR. HEYANO: Mr. Chairman, are we

1 going to act on the rest of this proposal?

2 MR. O'HARA: Sure. We can.

3 MR. HEYANO: Is it my
4 understanding that this motion just applied to
A(12)?

5 MR. O'HARA: It was the dollar
6 amount.

7 MR. SAMUELSON: We've got to go to
A(13).

8 MR. HEYANO: Or A(11)?

9 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. What are your
10 wishes on A(11)?

11 MR. HEYANO: Mr. Chairman, I think
there needs to be a dollar amount there also.

12 MR. O'HARA: You going to stick
13 with the \$400?

14 MR. HEYANO: Between rural
residents? No, I think it could be a little
15 higher.

16 MR. O'HARA: You think it should
be higher for rural residents?

17 MR. HEYANO: I don't have much
18 other than what Peter has referenced, Mr.
Chairman. I would propose \$1,000.

19 MR. O'HARA: Is that a motion?

20 MR. HEYANO: Yes.

21 MR. O'HARA: Second?

22 MR. ABRAHAM: Second the motion.

23 MR. O'HARA: Do you want to
24 address the motion?

25 MR. HEYANO: Well, my previous
comments, Mr. Chairman, I think that we should
try to establish what has been customary in

1 this area. And my knowledge is that customary
2 trade for subsistence-caught fish for cash has
3 been very rare, and the limit or the amount
4 has not been that great. Most of my knowledge
5 is to do with barter where people would
6 exchange either fuel or other stuff or
7 different species.

8 MR. O'HARA: To eat?

9 MR. HEYANO: Exactly. My intent
10 here is similar to Robin's previous comments
11 as to protection of subsistence and not
12 establish a new industry.

13 MR. ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman. There
14 really haven't been any study other than I
15 made phone calls and run up my telephone bill
16 and my wife threatened me to cut the telephone
17 off. There haven't been really a study on
18 these things, but from my experience I never
19 seen anybody exceed \$1,000 with the salmon.
20 Like Robin mentioned, seal oil and everything,
21 my dad used to run that boat up to Aniak and
22 come home with 6-, \$7,000 with a seal boat,
23 but that was their only income they were
24 looking for, other than fur bearer in the
25 wintertime. Those days there was no
26 regulation or whatever, you know, around here.

27 MR. O'HARA: Any other comments,
28 Council members? Shirley.

29 MS. KELLY: I'll make a comment.
30 In talking with the folks in Clarks Point and
31 Nushagak, just to speak up for them, they did
32 not want to see a dollar amount in limiting
33 rural residents.

34 MR. O'HARA: My thoughts are
35 exactly like Robin's. I think I spend about
36 \$400 buying smoked salmon from other people,
37 and I believe that's fine. And if I spend up
38 to a thousand, that's fine. It's not
39 beginning a cottage industry. So I think it's
40 okay. Anybody want to call for a motion?

41 MR. SAMUELSON: Question.

42 MR. O'HARA: All those in favor

1 say aye.

2 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

3 MR. O'HARA: Opposed? Robert,
4 you're on.

5 MR. HEYANO: I don't have --

6 MR. ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, this
7 is under state regulation already, that you
8 cannot sell your fish to licensed people
9 anyway. You can't go to the store and buy
10 them anymore.

11 MR. O'HARA: Are we happy with
12 this? Is the Council happy with this?

13 MR. ABRAHAM: I'm happy. I'm
14 happy all the time.

15 MR. O'HARA: Robert, are you
16 happy?

17 MR. HEYANO: Mr. Chairman, do we
18 want to substitute the word "household" for
19 family in A(12) and further define what
20 "other" is? Is that what this new task force
21 meeting did, Richard?

22 MR. UBERUAGA: What that did was
23 basically address sales outside of the
24 household. Before, if you had an extended
25 family member living in another town, that
26 person could sell \$1,000 worth of fish and by
27 proxy you could also sell fish for a family
28 member living outside of your house. The task
29 force felt they did not want the proxy sales
30 or sales for other people living outside of
31 your house to occur. So they said, we'll make
32 sure to define family in the household.

33 MR. ABRAHAM: Maybe head of the
34 household.

35 MR. UBERUAGA: Proxy sales are
36 allowed; in other words, the head of the
37 household has six family members, he sells
38 \$6,000 worth of fish. If he had extended
39 family, 30 to 50 extended family members

1 living in other villages, they didn't want
2 that to occur, so that's why they made these
3 changes in the language. The word "others"
4 wanted to clearly define that fisheries
5 businesses could not sell to fisheries
6 businesses, and sales to others would include
7 non-rural residents. In other words, the
8 people you're going to sell to are the
9 non-rural residents when the money cap
10 applies.

11 Your Council has recommended that
12 the cap apply to rural to rural, which is
13 fine, and we'll take that back. On A(13)
14 virtually everyone was in agreement with
15 A(13), all of the Councils were pretty much in
16 agreement on A(13), and there was very little
17 discussion over allowing a sale to a fisheries
18 business. There was some discussion about
19 allowing sales to stores, and they felt that
20 this language would allow a sale to a store in
21 certain cases. But recognizing that state
22 health laws come into play in those cases,
23 that's still a fairly gray area, sale to a
24 store, you know, for resale or distribution to
25 community members. A store, by law, is not
defined as a fisheries business, but it is
still regulated under state laws, other health
laws.

MR. O'HARA: Robin.

MR. SAMUELSON: If I lived in
Anchorage right now, I can go to the Native
store and, I think, buy beluga. Am I right,
Carl? How does that guy do it?

MR. UBERUAGA: The answer to that
is that technically it's likely illegal;
however, since it's a small scale and not a
significant commercial enterprise by somebody
out trying to commercialize and profit from
it, it's being allowed, even though it's
technically illegal. Just like you were in
Kotzebue and wanted to buy some dried
whitefish in the store. It's occurring, it's
being allowed, but technically it's not legal.
No one up there is trying to make a million
dollars selling whitefish or sheefish. So the
state has certain unwritten leeways to allow
things to occur. I mean, it's not legal, but

1 DEC is not going to make a big case out of it
2 if it's not being abused. At least that's
3 kind of what we've been hearing in every
4 meeting, that on a small scale certain things
5 can occur. Technically, it's not legal. And
6 if it becomes a problem in their eyes, it will
7 be enforced and you will be arrested and
8 cited. That's the way it informally operates.

9 MR. O'HARA: I didn't hear any
10 comment on 13. Are we okay on 13? Robert,
11 what was your concern? Hearing no objection,
12 I guess we're okay.

13 MR. HEYANO: Mr. Chairman, I would
14 move that in A(12) we go with the task force
15 recommendation and substitute the word
16 "household" for "family."

17 MR. SAMUELSON: Second.

18 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Any other
19 discussion on that?

20 MR. SAMUELSON: Question.

21 MR. O'HARA: All those in favor
22 say aye.

23 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

24 MR. O'HARA: Opposed? We're done
25 with customary trade.

MR. UBERUAGA: One point of
clarification. Pete, on the first section, if
a sale occurs to a nonfederally-qualified
user, there would be a permit that tracks
sales, that allows you to enforce sales. And
Pete had mentioned that that permit be
administered through the tribes?

MR. ABRAHAM: Yeah.

MR. UBERUAGA: And you would like
that to go forward to the board, that
recommendation?

MR. ABRAHAM: Yes. You said you
got to report it, right? You need some kind

1 of a form to report it with.

2 MR. UBERUAGA: Some kind of permit
3 or some kind of ticket or some kind of
reporting system.

4 MR. O'HARA: I'm a little confused
5 on that issue. I don't know if I follow that
or not.

6 MR. UBERUAGA: If, for example, I
7 were a rural resident and I wanted to sell
\$1,000 worth of fish, as I sold those fish, I
8 would have to fill out a ticket and say, I
sold these fish, and turn it in at some point.

9 MR. O'HARA: To who?

10 MR. UBERUAGA: To the governing
11 body, which would be probably the Federal
Subsistence Board or the tribes or whoever
12 administered the program. Pete's suggesting
that it be the tribe or the village council or
13 whatever. I just want to be clear on what we
take forward to the board.

14 MR. O'HARA: Robert.

15 MR. HEYANO: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. I'm not very clear on that issue
16 either, because I hear we want a local entity
to issue the permits or the transaction, then
17 I hear accountability. I guess my question to
you is: Who is going to be enforcing these
18 regulations to make sure that the people stop
at the limit, and how is that going to be
19 determined? Or are we providing regulations
where the honest people will and the people
20 who choose not to have an open door?

21 MR. UBERUAGA: What I think this
permit system would do is it would give a
22 mechanism for law enforcement to enforce the
law. If someone were violating that and not
23 reporting it and they discovered that, and
they had knowledge that \$5,000 worth of fish
24 was sold when only in fact \$1,000 was allowed,
the permit system allows you to enforce that
25 law and apply the law. How that Federal
permit system is administered is yet to be

1 decided. Again, this is a recommendation
2 that's going to go forward, but that was what
3 basically the task force came up with last
4 Friday. They would like to see some form of
5 permit system that would allow people -- that
6 would allow law enforcement to track sales,
7 because otherwise you could say, well, I
8 didn't sell any fish, and you could have sold
9 \$10,000 worth.

10 MR. ABRAHAM: It's not going to
11 happen.

12 MR. O'HARA: It could happen.
13 Robert, go ahead.

14 MR. HEYANO: Well, then, I guess
15 this permitting system is similar to a harvest
16 ticket?

17 MR. UBERUAGA: That would be my
18 assumption. I'll let Carl say some more on
19 that. He was there.

20 MR. JACK: I wasn't there at the
21 time when they discussed this. You know,
22 there is regulations for customary trade. One
23 thing that is not defined is significant
24 commercial enterprise. And rather than
25 tiptoeing around the subject and being nice to
26 everyone, this whole thing is driven by the
27 enforcement section of Fish and Wildlife
28 Service, mainly because of what happened in
29 Yukon. A person making strips and starts
30 selling to Cabela's in large quantities. And
31 the intent to refine the regulation is what
32 the customary trade task force was charged to
33 do, so that the law enforcement can be able to
34 make their citation stick in a court of law
35 for these large quantities that is going
36 outside of the state in significant amounts.
37 So the idea of putting forth this proposal,
38 the concept is, let's make a proposal that can
39 put -- let the people put their arm around,
40 rather than getting to the nitty-gritty of
41 talking, for example, about permits, because
42 that can blow this whole thing away. So
43 that's what the basics of A(11), 12 and 13 is
44 about, is to let the users put their arm
45 around it. And once they do that, then you

1 can start refining it. At least, that is how
I perceive this to be.

2 Now, let me tell you, people in
Kipnuk is not going to go for permits because
3 they're not used to it, because their world
view and their values are totally different
4 from him, who is from Los Angeles. Our value
system up here in some villages is different
5 and they will continue to resist that. So I'm
just expressing my own opinion on that. So
6 that's how I see this whole process
proceeding.

7

MR. O'HARA: Robin.

8

MR. SAMUELSON: But I think, Carl,
9 the people in Kipnuk would have a different
perspective if they had cruise lines, three of
10 them anchored, and a bunch of them Normandy
invasion boats coming ashore and thousands of
11 people walking through their community.
They're pretty resourceful out there and
12 creative. In some areas of the state we have
that. I think that when I mentioned
13 accountability a minute ago, is that in all of
Western Alaska -- Norton Sound is probably the
14 worst. They have been declared a disaster.
Some of their streams are not even making
15 sustained yield. They're in a tier two
situation on subsistence. You know, people
16 got to pay for lights, people got to buy their
kids clothes. People are going to do whatever
17 they can to get the dollars they need to
create a transaction for the necessities of
18 life, I guess. In those areas, as well as our
area here, Mr. Chairman -- in Yukon-Kuskokwim
19 and in other areas of the state where you have
a low abundance of resource but you still have
20 a subsistence priority in play, if you shut
down the commercial fishery, it's going to
21 hurt the people there. We have now created a
dollar amount of \$400 or whatever, we've got a
22 disaster declared, then a bunch of us decide
to become subsistence entrepreneurs. As
23 resource managers, they need to do them
removals as quickly as possible. So there's
24 got to be some kind of mechanism. And I don't
mind the tribes issuing the permit, but
25 there's got to be a higher-up that needs to
get back to the Feds and to the Alaska

1 Department of Fish and Game to show them
2 removals. Because as the runs drop, them
3 removals become an important part of the
4 overall equation, just as well as subsistence
5 removals. Subsistence, we've got to fill out
6 subsistence permits to show them how many
7 removals -- not only show how much we removed,
8 but you document the removals for future
9 generations. And I think that's a very
10 important concept. I don't mind the tribes
11 letting the permits out, but there's got to be
12 a time period that those permits are turned
13 into either the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
14 or Department of Fish and Game so they can
15 enter them removals in their book.

9 MR. ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, to
10 answer Robin's question on the tribe level.
11 The tribe is a tool right there for U.S. Fish
12 and Wildlife, because the U.S. Fish and
13 Wildlife are working with the tribes
14 constantly because they're recognized people.
15 The U.S. Fish and Wildlife is not going to
16 work with the city. So the tribe is the tool
17 right there for reporting the transactions
18 happening, because the tribe knows the people
19 right there. Like, for instance, take Togiak,
20 everybody knows everybody there.

15 MR. SAMUELSON: I have no problems
16 with that, Pete. Togiak, they're issued a
17 permit and they get filled out and --

17 MR. O'HARA: The bottom line is
18 somebody is going to be accountable.

19 MR. SAMUELSON: Once the
20 traditional Council gets it back, they either
21 ship it in to Fish and Game or ship it to U.S.
22 Fish and Wildlife Service so there is a
23 regulatory body that's keeping track of that.

22 MR. O'HARA: Somebody has to be
23 accountable for that fish and know where it's
24 gone and what's happened to it. Can you put
25 that in the report to the board? The board
may come up with something that's even more
workable than we have. Robert.

MR. HEYANO: The other concern I

1 have, Mr. Chairman, whatever system they come
2 up with, somebody needs to make sure that it
is enforceable.

3 MR. O'HARA: That it is
4 enforceable?

5 MR. HEYANO: It is enforceable.

6 MR. O'HARA: Absolutely.
Anything else? Okay. No. 14.

7 MR. EDENSHAW: Yes, Mr. Chair.
Under Tab J, this is the Regional Council
8 Charter. This is mainly the bylaws or how
this Council is run, and this is -- what is
9 this -- this is November 2001. At the next
meeting, if the Council has no changes, then
10 this will just be pushed forward and renewed
for 2002. This will be sent to the Secretary
11 of Interior just as you see on this past one.
The charter is renewed biannually, every two
12 years. So any changes that the Council so
desires can be made on this, and if there
13 aren't any, then that recommendation I will
push through the office and they will go ahead
14 and forward the charter to the packet when we
give those to the Secretary. So if you would
15 like to go through Pages 1, 2 or 3, if you
have any changes regarding those, we can do
16 that. And if there aren't any, then I'll go
ahead and push that through, as I said.

17 MR. O'HARA: Okay. What's the
18 wishes of the Council? Do you have any
concerns or changes that should take place
19 under Tab J? Yes, Robert.

20 MR. HEYANO: Mr. Chairman, I have
reviewed the existing charter and I didn't
21 have any suggestion for changes.

22 MR. O'HARA: Is that a motion?

23 MS. KELLY: Second.

24 MR. HEYANO: It is, yes.

25 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Second?

1 MS. KELLY: Second.

2 MR. O'HARA: Any more discussion?
One time we talked about adding two more
3 Council members, I believe.
Question?

4 MR. BALLUTA: Question.

5 MR. O'HARA: All those in favor
6 say aye.

7 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

8 MR. O'HARA: Agency reports.
Togiak National Wildlife Refuge, Aaron and
9 Mark, come forth.

10 MR. LEESIK: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. I'm Mark Leesik, fisheries
11 biologist, Togiak Refuge. Since fish projects
are on the handout, first I will just run down
12 a couple quick things. I won't go into detail
on all these so I don't get thrown out in the
13 cold.

14 MR. O'HARA: It doesn't look like
we're going to finish tonight anyway. We have
15 to quit at 6:00 because the Borough Assembly
meets here at 7:30. So go ahead.

16 MR. LEESIK: So I have lots of
17 time, then. Andy is handing out something the
whole staff put together on projects we had
18 going this last year, so I guess if you guys
want to look at that -- if you have any
19 questions. You are always free to call us or
stop in the office, whatever the case may be.
20 But just, I guess in the fish world here, I'll
talk about a couple of real brief things. Our
21 current projects that we have going are, as I
said, listed here. I primarily work with
22 anadromous fish. We have anadromous and a
resident fish program. The focus of that
23 anadromous program has always been to try to
document escapement into the river systems
24 throughout the entire Refuge. We do that
through a lot of cooperative projects. You
25 guys talked about leveraging money to get
projects done, and that's the way we have

1 always operated, cooperating with the State
2 and Bering Sea fishermen and coastal villages
3 out of Bethel and Native Village of Quinhagak,
4 different projects.

5 One of the main programs we have
6 going is our aerial survey of salmon spawning
7 grounds. That's in cooperation with the
8 State. Anadromous fish is also Dolly Varden,
9 which most people don't consider anadromous,
10 but we're finding out that they are and we
11 have spent a lot of time in the last few years
12 gathering life history information on dollies.

13 One of the projects that Steve had spoke about
14 earlier was a subsistence-funded project to
15 gather genetic information on dollies. And,
16 again, there was a proposal to continue that
17 work, and it's possible if you guys determine
18 it to be an issue here in the future, we'll
19 put together another proposal, keep that
20 going. This last year we moved over to the
21 Goodnews drainage to work on Dolly Varden over
22 there. Another big part of our program is
23 just doing baseline inventory in the Refuge,
24 just documenting what species we have out
25 there and where they're at, presence and
absence sort of stuff, documenting life and
age distribution on those. We mentioned
briefly already the co-op projects and how we
are leveraging money. And there's more, I
guess, a better description of them in your
handout there. But we have worked with the
City of Dillingham off the Refuge site to
replace the culverts there in Dillingham on
the Squaw Creek Drainage. We have, with
subsistence funding and leveraging that money,
got a weir now in the Kanaktok (ph) River,
which I know is out of you guys' range -- or
out of your region -- but just to let you know
some of the projects we are involved in and
the potential for these cooperative projects.

21 We've also been successful getting subsistence
22 money to count cohos in the Goodnews River.

23 It's one of the few projects out in Southwest
24 Alaska where cohos are being counted. The
25 King Salmon FRO guys will address the Togiak
video program, an enumeration program using a
video program, that we were also instrumental
in getting subsistence dollars to put that
project in the water. The guys from BBNA
aren't here. I wasn't planning to talk about

1 the subsistence harvest survey program over
2 there in Togiak that BBNA is leading, but
3 we're part of that as well as Fish and Game,
4 another big cooperative effort funded with
5 subsistence dollars to get at some of these
6 questions. And I appreciate the discussion on
7 the strategic planning and identifying what
8 information is needed, because what we view
9 as, I guess, paramount in the subsistence
10 realm, the information we need is, what is the
11 subsistence harvest that's occurring out there
12 by river system, by species, not just with
13 salmon, and then documenting the traditional
14 ecological knowledge. We view that as another
15 very important aspect of dealing with
16 subsistence issues as they come up. If we
17 don't start to gather that information now and
18 you guys have issues to deal with it, we won't
19 be able to provide that to you.

Our future subsistence project
20 proposals. Again, we've got one in for the
21 Dolly Varden genetics baseline continuation.
22 Just to put a plug in for that. What we found
23 in our Dolly Varden research is that those
24 fish are not only anadromous, but they move
25 between river systems. We have fish that were
26 tagged in the Togiak River that ended up over
27 here in Egegik and all the way up to the Yukon
28 River in subsistence and commercial fisheries.
29 The way it looks is that these Dolly Varden
30 ice fisheries or these winter fisheries are
31 probably targeting fish from mixed stocks from
32 who knows, all over the Bering Sea. And we're
33 hoping that eventually through these tagging
34 programs and through genetics work we'll be
35 able to better determine how many different
36 stocks might be in one of the rivers like the
37 Togiak or the Goodnews.

Then, we're going to start this
38 year in gathering this TEK information in the
39 Refuge, but in the future you'll probably see
40 a proposal from us to expand that and to do a
41 more complete job throughout the Refuge. I
42 guess that's it in the fish world. If you
43 have any questions --

MR. ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman. All
44 through my time in Togiak a lot of the elders
45 have been opposing U.S. Fish and Wildlife and
ADF&G going over there in a lot of ways. But

1 not too long ago an old man over there was
2 defending U.S. Fish and Wildlife and their
3 work, because another old man was criticizing,
4 again, U.S. Fish and Wildlife about Dolly
5 Varden because the numbers are getting low
6 over there. The other old fellow defended
7 U.S. Fish and Wildlife. He says, because the
8 study for learning -- U.S. Fish and Wildlife
9 put transmitters on those fish over there.
10 Now we know they travel all the way to the
11 Egegik and Yukon River. The fish are not
12 declining; they're going out. The old man
13 says, we are learning. And this is the first
14 time I seen an elder fighting about U.S. Fish
15 and Wildlife.

16 I'm very pleased with what Mark is
17 doing and I'm very pleased that the people are
18 starting to understand what U.S. Fish and
19 Wildlife is doing, which I've been trying to
20 communicate and translate. And they're like
21 an old ox; you can't train them new tricks,
22 but I think they're learning.

23 MR. SAMUELSON: That's good, yeah.
24 Any other comment from Mark?

25 MR. O'HARA: Don't think your
hat's too big just because they like you over
there.

MR. LEESIK: Yeah. I think what
Pete said there, that's been real important,
especially in this Dolly work. Designing the
studies we have to start with that TEK and
we've been real lucky to have folks in Togiak,
especially like Pete and other folks tell us
where to look first and save us some of the
heartaches there at the beginning.

MR. ABRAHAM: He asked me one
time, where do the people fish most in the
wintertime? I point those places over there.
Remember?

MR. LEESIK: Yeah.

MR. ABRAHAM: And there's where
the most fish are.

MR. LEESIK: That's right where

1 all the radio-tagged fish were.

2 MR. SAMUELSON: Thank you,
3 gentlemen. Andy.

4 MR. ADERMAN: Thank you, Mr.
5 Chairman. Andy Aderman, Togiak National
6 Wildlife Refuge. I just wanted to speak
7 briefly on Nushagak caribou and Togiak moose.

8 With Nushagak caribou, if you
9 recall last year in February, or actually this
10 year in February, we estimated just over a
11 thousand animals. Our reported harvest for
12 last year was 126. Most of that occurred
13 after the count. That 126 animals harvested
14 is more than twice the average reported in the
15 past five years, and I think it was probably
16 due to two factors. One, people, especially
17 in Dillingham, had limited access to other
18 resources and, secondly, the Refuge did quite
19 an extensive outreach effort in the villages
20 and also law enforcement on the ground. We
21 had pretty good calf production in the spring.
22 The recruitment, though, is down from previous
23 years right now. We're looking at 35 calves
24 per hundred cows. And also in the fall
25 composition survey our bull count ratio was 46
bulls to a hundred cows. That's in the
ballpark with previous years.

We had a planning committee
meeting scheduled for last Wednesday. We got
weathered out, and we're anticipating having
that in early December. As far as the hunt
this fall, I know of four caribou that were
taken, and that's consistent with previous
fall hunts. Not a lot of hunting in the fall
time.

Moving on to moose. If you
recall, we just finished up a population
survey there at your last meeting where we
counted a minimum of 470. We continue to
monitor the radio collars that we have down
there. Again, they had above average calf
production. It worked out to 141 calves per
hundred cows. That's based on radio-collared
animals. We'll make a -- we'll check those
calves later this month and see how many are
alive. I can tell you, I was out last week
and calf survival does look pretty good over
there. We had five animals this spring die. I

1 believe all of them were associated with brown
2 bear predation. It was four cows and one
3 bull. And we had one bull harvested in the
4 fall hunt. And I talked with Jim Willington
5 at Fish and Game this morning regarding the
6 fall hunt. He said that there was 56 permits
7 issued. To date, seven moose have been
8 reported taken, and that's based on 35 of
9 those hunt reports being returned. And I
10 think that's about it.

11 MR. O'HARA: Are the predators
12 moving? One of the things that helped that
13 herd considerably was the predators really
14 hadn't moved into that area yet, brown bear or
15 wolves.

16 MR. LEESIK: The incidental
17 information suggests both are increasing. I
18 know it seems to be we're seeing more brown
19 bears when we're out radio-tracking caribou.
20 I didn't see any wolves down there from '94
21 until 2000, not that they weren't down there.
22 But in 2000 I saw a pair and last spring I saw
23 a pair. That's consistent with what local
24 folks have been telling me.

25 MR. SAMUELSON: Any other
26 questions from Council? That's it? Okay.
27 Thank you. We are going to take some public
28 testimony from Pat Patterson, Jr. Pat, come
29 on up. State your name for the record.

30 MR. PATTERSON: My name is Pat
31 Patterson, Jr. I'm a member of the Naknek
32 Native Village, and I listened to you guys
33 talk about stock, and I don't hear anybody
34 talking about the Naknek River pink salmon.
35 There hasn't been a run that I know of since
36 the early '80s. My other concern was -- this
37 is the only river I know in this area that has
38 a limit to where you can subsistence fish from
39 Savonoski down with a net. You can't use a
40 net above Savonoski, except I think there's
41 two other areas, one by Shufont's Cabin and in
42 the lake itself. I was wondering why we're
43 not allowed to subsist the whitefish, the
44 rainbows. Third, is the spring hunt, they got
45 a boundary from Paul's Creek this way for
46 hunting birds. If you hunt above Paul's Creek

1 -- where traditionally we usually hunted from
2 King Salmon this way. And I was wondering how
3 they came up with boundaries on that. That's
all I have. What I really want is the
subistence above Savonoski.

4 MR. SAMUELSON: Does that include
5 for red fish?

6 MS. McCLENAHAN: For red fish. I
7 believe if you're a descendant of Savonoski,
you're allowed to do it.

8 MR. SAMUELSON: Okay. We'll get
9 the folks up here. I don't have the answer
10 for from Savonoski on down. Does anybody have
an explanation why they can't -- why they're
limited to that area?

11 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not
12 exactly sure of the landmark, but I think
13 we're probably talking about not on Federal
lands, so it's probably not under your
jurisdiction in this forum.

14 MR. SAMUELSON: It's on Park
Service land, right?

15 MR. BUKLIS: I didn't mean that.
16 I was questioning whether it was on Federal
lands.

17 MR. O'HARA: It's all Federal
18 land.

19 MR. SAMUELSON: Steve.

20 MR. FRIED: The only
21 federally-regulated subsistence fishing is for
red fish and spawning or spawned-out salmon in
22 specific areas of Naknek Lake. That's by
regulation. I think when they created that
23 park, I think that was the only subsistence
fishing allowed, so I don't think there's any
24 Federal -- to my knowledge, when I looked into
it. Somebody can correct me if they know
25 otherwise, but I think that's the only Federal
subsistence fishery in that area. That's a
state subsistence, a state-regulated
subsistence within the river at Savonoski.

1 That's just the way the regulation is.

2 MR. SAMUELSON: But if I'm a
3 sports fisherman, I can go anywhere in the
lake and fish, right?

4 MR. FRIED: Under sport fish
5 regulations, yeah. When I looked into that,
and speaking to some of the regulations
6 specialists, it's only the red fish fishery in
the lake that's under Federal jurisdiction and
that's permitted under Federal law.

7
8 MR. SAMUELSON: His other question
was -- maybe we can show Pat, after a while,
9 the regulation. Why is it that they can only
-- I don't know who has expertise on birds,
10 spring waterfowl -- why is it from Paul's
Creek down?

11 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair, they
12 don't have any, at least to my knowledge -- to
my knowledge, I haven't seen any new spring,
13 legal spring hunt, so until that's been --
that's why they're starting a migratory bird
14 working group, and that will probably be a
good proposal for them to submit.

15 MR. KEPSEL: Mark Kepsel, deputy
16 director and manager, Alaska Peninsula
Becharof Refuge.

17 MR. SQUIBB: Ron Squibb, biologist
18 with Alaska Peninsula Refuge.

19 MR. KEPSEL: I think, and I'm not
sure what's being reached here, but I think
20 Ron Hood, the previous Refuge manager, a
number of years ago had a recommendation for
21 areas to hunt in the springtime until we got a
legal Federal season for hunting. And because
22 the Naknek River is so important for being one
of the first rivers to open up and waterfowl
really concentrate in that area in the
23 springtime, he was just suggesting that that
area be left alone so birds could rest and not
24 be disturbed at that time. But, again, this
happened before I got here and before Darrel
25 got here, and I'm not a hundred percent sure
that that was what was going on. But it was

1 just a recommendation from the previous Refuge
2 manager. And that hasn't changed since that
3 was made, and I'm not sure when -- do you
4 know, Ron, when he made that?

5 MR. SQUIBB: It occurred when I
6 first transferred over here from Kodiak. The
7 first spring I was here that issue came up.
8 That's, again, where we still are right now in
9 the days of discretionary enforcement. I
10 cannot cite the reason. I understand there
11 was some abuse of, at that time, the local
12 rural interpretation for spring waterfowl
13 hunting that occurred. I believe it was at
14 Grassy Point, but I can't recall. We could
15 run that down. But Ron Hood at that time
16 chose where he would tend to enforce a
17 violation of the spring waterfowl hunting. At
18 that time it was thought of as an interim
19 issue. In '97, '98 we thought it would be two
20 or three years, and it hasn't been. I don't
21 know what the schedule is now, but at that
22 time we weren't looking at it as a five- or
23 six-year interim enforcement solution for the
24 situation.

25 MR. SAMUELSON: I guess we would
probably entertain a proposal once the
Migratory Bird Act is ratified, amended and
ratified.

MR. SQUIBB: Again, I can't state
what Ron Hood was thinking at the time. But
my impression was that we would hold that
position for two or three years, and then it
would be open to who was -- at that time we
didn't know whether it was going to be local
or rural residents or if it was going to be
local Native or what the call would be for the
Naknek River. But thereafter it be a
regulated process and we wouldn't worry about
abuse of the situation.

MR. KEPSEL: The two years that
I've been here -- I am one of Refuge officers
along with Dave Cox -- there has been no
enforcement action keeping anybody from
hunting in that area.

MR. SAMUELSON: Third question was

1 pink salmon, but I think we could bring them
up with Slim. He manages the pinks.

2 We're going to do one more and
then we're going to break for the night.

3 Alaska Peninsula, Becharof.

4 For planning purposes, we're going
to start at 8:00 and be done about 9:15
tomorrow morning, because that's when the
5 plane leaves. Condense your speeches down
tonight.

6

MR. SQUIBB: Ron Squibb with U.S.
7 Fish and Wildlife Service, Alaska Peninsula
Becharof Refuge. Our report is under Tab K,
8 beginning on Page 5 of the book. I'll keep it
brief.

9 As we have said in previous
meetings, we're in the process of revising our
10 comprehensive management plan for the Refuge
complex and the draft for public review is
11 scheduled for release in late winter. That's
where we receive all the formal public
12 comments about -- and public preferences for
the options described in the plan. I just
13 wanted to mention that so that I could perhaps
get as much public input as possible on that
14 plan. That's very important to get public
input at that stage.

15 Just to hit the highlights in the
report and not spend too much time on them.
16 Data for the Northern Alaska Pen caribou herd,
as we all know, it's been declining. The herd
17 count, post-calving count, this last June and
July declined again 1,000 animals from the
18 2000 count, so we're down to 6,000 animals as
of mid-summer this year. The good news is in
19 the composition surveys completed during the
22nd to the 24th of October, we worked closely
20 with the State on that.

We flew fixed-wing aircraft in
21 order to find animals and radio collars for
the State. Dick Sellers was in the helicopter
22 and did composition of the animals. The
calf-cow ratios are up. We had this year 28
23 calves per 100 cows. In 2000, last year, in
October we observed only 18 calves per 100
24 cows. Again, this is the same as we spoke of
or as we found last spring when we collared
25 calves in April. Their weights were up
compared to previous years, and all of this

1 may be just a consequence of the very, very
2 mild winter we had last year but it still is
3 good news.

4 Also, in the composition counts
5 the bull-cow ratios also went up from last
6 year. We observed 49 bulls for 100 cows
7 compared to 38 last year in 2000. The bull
8 ratios are important in terms of determining
9 the number of Tier II permits that Dick
10 Sellers and Fish and Game come up with. So
11 the bull ratios there contribute to the hunt.
12 Also, on the hunt this summer the Fish and
13 Wildlife Service issued 40 or 10 percent of
14 the number of the Tier II permits. And they
15 distributed those at the beginning of August
16 in cooperation with the Park Service office
17 here. The permits were distributed on a
18 community basis as the Federal permits. We
19 had two criteria that guided us. One was
20 access to alternative resources; the other was
21 considering communities that had received
22 below average the number of Tier II permits
23 that the State issued. We looked at it on a
24 per capita basis.

25 Sort of saying that in another
way, King Salmon and Naknek have access to the
Mulchatna herd going through Alagnak and get
out of the Tier II area, therefore, they
received fewer permits. The villages south of
the Naknek River had permits, the numbers
preferentially given; in other words, a few
more permits were given to the villages that
came out below average on a per capita basis
in the distribution of Tier II permits.

There's a table in the report. It's Table 1
on Page 9 shows the patterns over the years of
the permit distribution, Federal and state.

Then, on moose, we're working
towards a density estimate of moose on the
Northern Alaska Peninsula. We hope to have
some preliminary work done this coming winter,
and we are also looking at the possibility of
some habitat work, potentially working with
University of Alaska Fairbanks Cooperative
Fish and Wildlife Research Unit on a graduate
program. We haven't come to a conclusion on
how we're going to work that part out. That's
sort of the highlights. If you have questions
on the report, I would be glad to entertain
them.

1
2 MR. O'HARA: Moose population
3 doing pretty good on the Refuge south?

4 MR. SQUIBB: As I said, in the
5 February meeting -- Pages 10 and 11 in the
6 report give all of the recent moose surveys
7 that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has
8 done in terms of trend area counts. This, of
9 course, does not include the longer period the
10 U.S. Fish and Game has been covering in these
11 areas or the Park Service efforts. But the
12 most recent surveys we did were last November
13 29th, 30th and December 1st. You can see on
14 the table they were on -- let's see, November
15 29th we did the Kejulik area, and I haven't
16 looked at these for a while, but if you look
17 on the 30th of November and 1st of December we
18 did the Black Lake area and then on the 1st of
19 December we did the Dog Salmon area. As in
20 previous years, the calf-cow ratios seem
21 adequate to maintain the herd's level and
22 bull-cow ratios don't seem to indicate
23 excessive hunting. That's sort of the
24 interpretation of the data to date. The data
25 we saw last year, in other words, fell into
the pattern of the previous winters.

MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chairman. Maybe
half a dozen moose south and six, seven moose
from Meshik on up to Becharof Lake by the
non-residents and the guides?

MR. SQUIBB: I'm sorry, Mr.
Chairman, I'm not following.

MR. O'HARA: You see, we take like
Keene has 18 head of bulls coming out of
there. You've got to have an idea of how many
bulls are coming off your Refuge.

MR. SQUIBB: Actually those data
go to Cox, the coordinator for the guide
permits, and I'm not on top of those data.
Dave Cox handles the permits. Perhaps Mark
would have a handle on that.

MR. KEPSEL: Mark Kepsel again.
Their reporting requirement is at the end of

1 the year, so we haven't gotten the reports in
2 from the guides yet. Tentatively, Dave called
3 the air taxi operators just to get a general
4 feel. The air taxi operators took 40 hunters
5 out with 14 moose harvested, but we don't have
6 the guide information as of yet.

7 MR. O'HARA: I'm talking about
8 Pumice, Cinder, Meshik.

9 MR. KEPSEL: A lot of that is
10 state land, too, that we don't have any
11 information. This is just permitted air taxi
12 on Federal land.

13 MR. O'HARA: All those names are
14 Federal people. In February we'll talk to you
15 again. We really do want a good moose count.
16 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

17 MR. SAMUELSON: Yeah, I think what
18 we'd like to see is a realistic snapshot both
19 on federal and state lands. Judging by the
20 report here, we've got about a 15 percent
21 decline in caribou that's been dropping, so
22 the importance of moose meat becomes more
23 important to the subsistence users around that
24 area. We do have a pretty substantial both on
25 state and Federal land where there's a
substantial active, guided hunt. So I would
like for us in our spring meeting to take a
real comprehensive look at it.

MR. O'HARA: The want and waste
issue. We always kind of wonder about the
amount of meat coming out with the horns, et
cetera, and the only possible way to find out
if the meat is coming out with the horns and
on the bone and what's being legally taken is
if you are in the field. If Dave Cox is in
the field with whoever else, that's the only
possible we're going to find that out. If
that doesn't work, a citation goes along with
it. How much time did you spend, say, the
moose season was September 10th through, what,
the 20th? How many camps did you visit with
law enforcement to check on the amount of meat
coming out with horns?

MR. KEPSEL: I only spent one day.

1 Dave Cox was out there whenever weather
2 permitted. I don't have a total number of
3 days. But Dave sat down with the Fish and
4 Wildlife protection officers, the two guys
5 over there, and they kind of went over to see
6 who they checked. And out of the 14 moose
7 that were harvested on Federal land from air
8 taxis, Dave Cox or one of the State officers
9 had contacted those people, every one of those
10 people in the field.

11 MR. O'HARA: Every day?

12 MR. KEPSEL: No, just once during
13 their hunt period.

14 MR. O'HARA: Once is not
15 sufficient. And when you see -- when they
16 visit these camps every day and they're seeing
17 what's happening every day and the amount of
18 meat coming out, and I am not very happy about
19 the amount of monitoring, I think, from the
20 Federal side what's taking place with the
21 moose hunts in that area as the amount of meat
22 coming out. Even the brown shirts, with Scott
23 trying to break in some guy with 200 hours --
24 they just did not get to the camps, they could
25 not. So I guess as a Council member dealing
26 with this issue, since we have a declining
27 caribou herd, we really next year would like
28 to work a little more closely with you guys to
29 see if we can have -- granted, the World Trade
30 Center fell down on the 11th, 25 percent, Mr.
31 Chairman, of the hunters couldn't make it in
32 because they couldn't fly. They just couldn't
33 get here. It was a big loss for the guides.
34 You guys -- and we're going to ask the Park
35 Service the same thing tomorrow -- couldn't
36 fly either. That was three or four days where
37 you couldn't do anything. I don't know what
38 they did. But I think we're certainly going
39 to be more actively involved in making sure
40 that when they get those horns that that
41 proper percentage of meat comes out with it.
42 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

43 MR. SQUIBB: Mr. Chairman, earlier
44 there was a comment on moose population
45 estimates. For the record, these moose trend
46 surveys we do give you a trend of counts in

1 specific areas that are visited every few
2 years, and that gives us a trend of the
3 population shift over a long time. The
4 important thing is we look at the ratios of
5 bulls to calves and cows. What we're looking
6 at doing in the next few winters is a density
7 estimate. We'll work closely with Fish and
8 Game and also get off Refuge lands and get a
9 density estimate from several locales with
10 which we can extrapolate and hopefully come up
11 with an estimate of moose for the entire
12 Northern Peninsula. That will be comparable
13 to the surveys done, but with a different
14 method, in '83 or '84.

15 MR. SAMUELSON: Robert.

16 MR. HEYANO: Two questions. Under
17 the alternative management scenarios, if I
18 read the report correctly, the public won't
19 have any input as to whether you will do
20 predator control.

21 MR. SQUIBB: What that was, we had
22 -- in the draft we had four alternative
23 scenarios, one of which had the option to
24 permanently remove predator control as an
25 option for fish and wildlife on the Refuge for
26 anything except endangered species. The other
27 three would have allowed predator control as
28 an option for other than an endangered species
29 situation. That hit the regional directorate
30 in Anchorage. They considered that and
31 decided that it was inappropriate for us to
32 have any alternative that would permanently
33 remove predator control as a tool that could
34 be used in any situation in short of an
35 endangered species; in other words, the
36 option in the plan to prohibit predator
37 control for anything but an endangered species
38 situation for the life of this plan was
39 eliminated. In other words, so that can't
40 happen. There could be a decision to
41 eliminate predator control as a tool to use on
42 the Refuges for the life of this plan. Does
43 that makes sense?

44 MR. HEYANO: So you retained that
45 tool?

1 MR. SQUIBB: We retained the tool.
2 The regional director did not want an option
3 that would allow us to not retain that tool.

4 MR. HEYANO: The other one I had
5 on this caribou report, the plant communities.
6 When you did the vegetation and habitat study,
7 there was no difference between the White Bay
8 area and the Bristol Bay drainage as far as
9 caribou habitat? Is that how I read that?

10 MR. SQUIBB: Well, there was no
11 difference in habitat that kind of jumped out
12 and grabbed you. Our botanist, this year was
13 a real quick visit. He only got 16 plots
14 done. He has hundreds of these things and
15 it's such a mountain of data. We keep trying
16 to drag him out here so we can go in the
17 field, so it's going to be a while before he
18 gets the data analyzed. For instance, the
19 obvious things like lichen cover, none of it
20 appeared strikingly different. Now, that
21 doesn't mean there might be subtle differences
22 there. One of the things that sort of came
23 out on time in the mountains on the Pacific
24 side -- to back up. Our counts on the Refuge
25 count area, which is more or less the
26 mountains and the Pacific Coast down to past
27 Aniakchak to Kejulik Bay. The area that we
28 count compared to the area that Dick Sellers
29 and the State count, our counts have remained
30 stable more or less since we started helping
31 Dick with the surveys in 1994, and Dick's
32 counts have gone down. So we were looking for
33 why that might be the case. We put some
34 satellite collars out there to see where these
35 animals move around, where they might have a
36 wandering range, whether there was mixing
37 patterns we're not aware of. Habitat was
38 something we were looking at. So towards that
39 end of understanding why our counts haven't
40 gone down and the counts out on the Bristol
41 Bay coastal plane have, it's not a dramatic
42 difference in composition of forage plants on
43 the ground.

44 The one thing that does jump out
45 in the mountains in the summertime is you've
46 got melting snow fields up in the high country
47 that caribou are often real high in the
48 summer. As the snow fields melt back, we get

1 new growth, which is the most nutritious
2 period for the forage, the new plants. And
3 there's more of that in the mountains.
4 Whether that's pulling animals off the coastal
5 plane or whether it helps our animals have a
6 slightly better overall survival or what, we
7 don't know.

8 That's something that's been in
9 the literature since '69. Up on the Arctic
10 snow fields the caribou find good forage.
11 Short of that, we haven't seen any obvious
12 reason why our counts are stable and the ones
13 on the Bristol Bay coastal plane have
14 declined.

15 MR. HEYANO: Then some of the
16 thoughts as to maybe the reason why Bristol
17 Bay drainage was seeing such a decline was
18 because of the range condition for the
19 caribou?

20 MR. SQUIBB: Well, in general the
21 conclusion of the whole herd decline. What
22 had happened in terms of calf weights when
23 they collared the animals in the spring and
24 the year of first reproduction of females,
25 which is postponed a year as compared to the
Nushagak herd where they have great forage.
Disease was more prevalent in newborn calves.

Those things all point to poor
body condition and poor body condition is a
result of poor forage somewhere along the
road. So that's why we were looking at
forage. It's more subtle, I guess.

MR. HEYANO: This study, although
it was a very limited time, showed no
significant difference or striking difference?

MR. SQUIBB: Yes, to the observer
on the ground. He hasn't taken the data and
analyzed it for fine details, but it's not
like night and day.

MR. HEYANO: Thank you.

MR. SAMUELSON: Any other
questions?

We're in recess until 8:00 in the

1 morning.

2 (Bristol Bay Federal Subsistence
3 Regional Advisory Council adjourned at 6:30
p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 I, Leslie J. Knisley, Shorthand
2 Reporter, do hereby certify that the above and
3 foregoing contains a true and correct
4 transcription of the Bristol Bay Federal
5 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting
6 reported by me on the 5th day of November,
7 2001.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
Leslie J. Knisley
Shorthand Reporter