

1 YUKON-KUSKOKWIM DELTA FEDERAL
2 SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME I

7
8 Bethel, Alaska
9 March 2, 2010
10 9:30 o'clock a.m.

11
12
13 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

14
15 Greg Roczicka, Chairman
16 Robert Aloysius
17 John Andrew
18 William Brown
19 James Charles
20 Raymond Oney
21 Harry Wilde, Sr.

22
23
24
25
26 Regional Council Coordinator, Alex Nick

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Recorded and transcribed by:

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

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Bethel - 03/02/2010)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Good morning. I'll call this meeting to order here, 9:30 for the YK-Delta Regional Subsistence Council. 9:30 a.m. And as some folks know or may have heard, Lester is unable to make it as yet so I get to sit in, you guys got to bear with me being the Chairman through this meeting.

So with that then I'd ask the Secretary here if he'd give a roll call.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob, if you could do a roll call, please.

REPORTER: Bob. Bob.

MR. ALOYSIUS: William F. Brown.

REPORTER: Bob, please.

MR. ALOYSIUS: Always with the button.

(Laughter)

MR. ALOYSIUS: Okay. William Brown.

MR. BROWN: Here.

MR. ALOYSIUS: James A. Charles.

MR. CHARLES: Here.

MR. ALOYSIUS: Ray Oney.

MR. ONEY: Here.

MR. ALOYSIUS: Paul Manumik.

(No comments)

MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Paul Manumik got sick yesterday morning so he asked to be excused.

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: So noted.
2
3 MR. ALOYSIUS: Harry Wilde.
4
5 MR. H. WILDE: Here.
6
7 MR. ALOYSIUS: Vacant.
8
9 (Laughter)
10
11 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mary M. Gregory.
12
13 (No comments)
14
15 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Mary Gregory
16 just called me, just a few minutes ago, and told me
17 that she could not be excused from work. She said she
18 wrote a letter, emailed to Lester Wilde at my email at
19 Fish and Wildlife.
20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay, so noted,
22 Mary excused along with Paul.
23
24 MR. ALOYSIUS: Elias L. Kelly.
25
26 (No comments)
27
28 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Elias Kelly
29 notified me about a couple weeks ago that he will not
30 be able to attend this meeting because he just got a
31 new job. He did not want to jepordize his new job at
32 school district at Pilot Station so he asked to be
33 excused as well.
34
35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Just clarification
36 on that, did I hear, as well, that he has actually
37 submitted a letter of resignation?
38
39 MR. NICK: He did not submit
40 resignation he just asked to be excused at this time
41 because he finally got his new job just a few weeks
42 ago.
43
44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. Elias Kelly
45 excused.
46
47 MR. ALOYSIUS: Lester Wilde.
48
49 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Lester Wilde
50 ended up in the hospital here in Bethel and then he was

1 transferred to Anchorage yesterday; he also asked to be
2 excused.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: So noted, Lester
5 Wilde excused.

6

7 MR. ALOYSIUS: Aloysius B. Unok.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Unok is a new
12 member and he was preparing to attend this meeting.
13 Unfortunately his father-in-law who has passed on, so
14 he asked to be excused. He submitted a letter of -- or
15 rather his community submitted a note that he has a
16 family emergency.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay, Aloysius Unok
19 excused.

20

21 MR. ALOYSIUS: Greg Roczicka.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Here.

24

25 MR. ALOYSIUS: Robert Aloysius. Here.
26 John Andrew.

27

28 MR. ANDREW: Here.

29

30 MR. ALOYSIUS: Is somebody keeping
31 track of the numbers?

32

33 (Laughter)

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: So we have seven in
36 attendance so we do have a quorum?

37

38 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chair. We have a
39 quorum.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: James, could you
42 provide us the invocation, please.

43

44 (Invocation)

45

46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay, next up is
47 review and adopt draft agenda. A motion would be in
48 order here.

49

50 (Pause)

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Do I hear a motion
2 to adopt the agenda.

3
4 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chair, I move -- Ray
5 Oney -- to adopt the agenda.

6
7 MR. CHARLES: Second.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Discussion.

10
11 I guess everybody's had a chance to
12 look through that and if you had any other changes. I
13 have a few items that came -- were brought forward to
14 me as the Chair that I wanted to bring out here.

15
16 Item 7, for the election of officers
17 and the Committee members. Since we are looking at
18 just a bare quorum, it's been requested we defer that
19 until we have better attendance and a more complete
20 group to make those -- to take up those issues of
21 elections and appointments.

22
23 In addition, Lester Wilde had attended
24 the meeting of the Western Interior and Eastern
25 Interior Advisory Council that took place last week and
26 there is a, evidently there's supposed to be a letter
27 that will be going forward on the Bering Sea bycatch
28 issue, and additionally a joint resolution from the
29 Western -- from both of those Councils regarding
30 protection of the first pulse of Yukon kings that they
31 wanted us to weigh in on as well. And Lester had
32 committed to bring those to us. So that would be added
33 as Item B and C under 10 for the Yukon fishery
34 proposals.

35
36 As well, under Item C, with the
37 crossover proposals, it was brought to our attention
38 that numbers 5, 6 and 7 actually don't affect our
39 region. Those are Unit 22. We don't have C&T or an
40 issue for this Council, so those would be deleted.

41
42 And then under Item 8, although it is
43 Unit 22, it's not for moose, it's actually for wolf,
44 and we do have for our region a customary and
45 traditional recognition, so would be taking that up.
46 So instead of moose it'll be wolf.

47
48 That's all I had for housekeeping.

49
50 If anybody has anything else, any

1 additions or deletions they wanted to see on the
2 agenda?

3

4 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray, go ahead.

7

8 MR. ONEY: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
9 Chairman. Item number 10, the two proposals that are
10 there, I did not find them in the booklet. I don't
11 know if that's a handout or.....

12

13 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I noticed the same
14 thing. I suspect that Staff will have those for us
15 before we get to that agenda item.

16

17 Alex.

18

19 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. I apologize for
20 -- well, some of these things that are on the agenda.
21 The copies are on the table over here, information
22 table. And one other thing on the proposals, Proposal
23 61 Togiak Refuge Staff requested that it be moved up
24 this morning because Andy Aderman is on his way to
25 present their presentation on that, and they need to go
26 back and attend Bristol Bay RAC meeting in -- over in
27 Bristol Bay area.

28

29 Mr. Chair.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Harry, you had an
32 addition here.

33

34 MR. H. WILDE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman.
35 This Yukon-Kuskokwim, the Coordinating Fishery
36 Committee, CFC, I'd like to put down in one, two,
37 three, four, Lower Salmon Working Group members
38 appointed.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I see that under
41 Item 1, but also, it's what I mentioned just at the
42 beginning of this, since we only have seven members
43 here, as far as appointments to these various
44 committees, and also to elections, we're looking to
45 defer to our next meeting, action on all those and the
46 current people would continue in their seats.

47

48 Regarding that Proposal 61 I guess we
49 can move that up to be the first wildlife proposal we
50 address to help accommodate the Togiak Staff when they

1 arrive.

2

3 Any others comments, additions.

4

5 James.

6

7 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 I see that on the proposals there's quite a few
9 identical proposals and it's going to take up a lot of
10 time working on these proposals when they are like
11 that. As many of you remember, I am a State Advisory
12 AC member too, so when we see that many proposals we
13 narrow it down to the most important proposal when they
14 are identical like that. So if we do that, it may --
15 we might work faster that way. If that's okay for
16 Staff or the members here, I'd like to do that to make
17 our time shorter.

18

19 Thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Just a comment on
22 that. I looked at that in the same way and I was
23 hoping we might be able to go there, but when I
24 actually looked at the proposals they deal with
25 different regulations and address different issues and
26 so we don't have an option here, really, even though it
27 appears under the explanation that they are the same,
28 they're actually not. They deal with a separate
29 regulatory issue.

30

31 So we don't have that option so we can
32 just try to ask people to move things along in
33 discussion and deliberations as we go through this.

34

35 Anyone else.

36

37 MR. ANDREW: Mr. Chairman.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: John Andrew.

40

41 MR. ANDREW: I'd like to comment. I
42 am.....

43

44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: On the agenda, on
45 adoption and review of the agenda.

46

47 MR. ANDREW: No, I'm sorry,.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. Alex,
50 anything else.

1 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. A couple of
2 things. First Mr. Weekley would like to be --
3 considered to be moved up in the agenda as well. He's
4 on the agenda. It's large mammal survey on the agenda.

5
6 And the second is one of the reasons
7 why some of the crossover proposals that were in
8 question, 5, 6, 7 is because these are unitwide and
9 crossover with YK. And that was one of the reasons why
10 I put them on the agenda. Because people like from
11 Lower Yukon might have some interest in 22A and Unit 22
12 for hunting and also 21E.

13
14 Mr. Chair.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. Is Mr.
17 Weekley here?

18
19 MR. WEEKLEY: Yes.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We can put him in
22 there ahead of Item 10 there before we get into
23 proposals, since we're still waiting for the Togiak
24 guys anyway on that Proposal 61. Is that okay with
25 everybody.

26
27 (Council nods affirmatively)

28
29 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. With that as
30 far as Alex's Staff notes on those Proposals 5, 6, 7,
31 the Lower Yukon reps, do you guys have any specific
32 desire to take those proposals up here?

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Well, do you agree
37 to leave them off?

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Because I'm hearing
42 conflicting information, I guess, between a couple of
43 different Staff here.

44
45 Mr. Kron, can you address that.

46
47 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. It's obviously
48 your call. Basically the Lower Yukon Kuskokwim Unit 18
49 doesn't have C&T for Unit 22 in those particular cases
50 5, 6 and 7, and, again, that was why I pointed that out

1 to you. Again, we can talk about it. You can take
2 them up, but, again, you don't have C&T and they're not
3 obviously part of Unit 18.

4
5 So it's your call.

6
7 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Well, it would be
10 my feeling here that, you know, we do have a pretty
11 heavy agenda anyway so anything we can do to maybe move
12 it along.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I think -- well,
17 we'll leave them on and just take no action or
18 something of that nature so we can deal with that later
19 down the line.

20
21 So with that I guess I'll take back
22 what I heard earlier, I want to make sure we do
23 address, if there's any concerns raised. So maybe we
24 will leave 5, 6 and 7 on the agenda.

25
26 Anybody else as far as any changes. If
27 not the Chair would hear the question.

28
29 MR. ALOYSIUS: What do you mean by 5, 6
30 and 7?

31
32 REPORTER: Bob.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Under Item C, the
35 crossover proposals, it was suggested that we could
36 take those off since we don't have C&T.

37
38 MR. ALOYSIUS: Sorry.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: But as I look at
41 the issue there as far as handicrafts we may -- I think
42 on reflection now we may want to take a look at them
43 and see if we want to weigh in on them and possible
44 effects to our region even though we don't carry the
45 C&T recognition.

46
47 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman.

48
49 MR. ANDREW: Mr. Chairman.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: John Andrew.
2
3 MR. ANDREW: I have a question. Don't
4 you have to suspend the rules to make any change on
5 your agenda.
6
7 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It's under
8 discussion for action right now.
9
10 MR. ANDREW: Thank you.
11
12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: And whatever we
13 adopt is where we go and then after that it would be a
14 suspension of the rules if there was any changes.
15
16 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman.
17
18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob Aloysius.
19
20 MR. ALOYSIUS: Yeah, I move we adopt
21 the agenda as revised.
22
23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: There's already a
24 motion on the floor to adopt the agenda, we're on
25 discussion. Are we ready for the question.
26
27 MR. ONEY: Second.
28
29 (Laughter)
30
31 MR. ALOYSIUS: Question.
32
33 MR. ANDREW: Question.
34
35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay, question's
36 called, question's heard. All in favor say aye.
37
38 IN UNISON: Aye.
39
40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Opposed, same sign.
41
42 (No opposing votes)
43
44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none, we
45 have the agenda before us.
46
47 Do we have welcome remarks from anybody
48 -- no, I don't believe.....
49
50 MR. ALOYSIUS: Tim Andrew.

1 (Laughter)
2
3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Perhaps there
4 wasn't any arrangements made for any local folk to come
5 forward.
6
7 So I guess I can say welcome to Bethel
8 everybody.
9
10 (Laughter)
11
12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I just got back
13 myself last night, so I can welcome myself back to
14 Bethel as well.
15
16 I look forward to a good meeting and we
17 can move on.
18
19 Housekeeping items and announcements.
20 Alex.
21
22 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. It's been
23 chaotic for me the last couple of days.
24
25 Mr. Chair. I would like to welcome all
26 the guests from out of town. I'm glad Mr. William
27 Brown make it in. And there's been a lot of issues in
28 the region as you know.
29
30 One of the things I wanted to mention
31 is that I'm hoping that there's sufficient copies on
32 the information table. There are copies of all the
33 proposals that's on the agenda and there's also
34 information on the windowsill over there for new guests
35 in town, taxi cab numbers, some of the restaurants and
36 a few information that maybe new people that new to
37 Bethel that might need to know about what to do, you
38 know, with respect to eating places.
39
40 And I would like to thank the Council
41 for your patience with the little SNAFU we ran into
42 this morning.
43
44 There are several exits. One where you
45 enter, one through kitchen, one on the north over here,
46 one over here. And there's two bathrooms, men's
47 bathroom on the north and women's bathroom is on the --
48 what is it, south.
49
50 I don't want to take up too much of

1 your time because we have a lot of work, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, Alex.
4 Moving on. Item 7 is deferred until our next meeting.

5

6 So onto Item 8, a motion would be in
7 order to review and adopt draft minutes from our
8 October 2009 meeting.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Is there a motion
13 to adopt the minutes.

14

15 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman. I move
16 to.....

17

18 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman. I move to
19 adopt the minutes.

20

21 MR. ONEY: Or second the motion.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. Moved by
24 James Charles, seconded by Ray Oney.

25

26 Discussion.

27

28 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob Aloysius.

31

32 MR. ALOYSIUS: I never got a chance to
33 review the minutes and I just glanced through there and
34 there's some things that are pretty disturbing to me
35 because I don't know if it's partly to blame on the
36 recording equipment or whatever.

37

38 But one of the things from the closing
39 remarks was that, "he begged to hold another meeting in
40 Bethel where it is quiet." I did not say that. I said
41 the next time we meet in Bethel that we select a quiet
42 place because the Long House is too noisy because the
43 road system is right there and there's all kinds of
44 banging and things going on in the restaurant on the
45 back side and so I asked for a place to meet where it's
46 quiet. And this is the answer to my request.

47

48 The other thing is that it says, "In a
49 nutshell Yup'ik people would stay with the daily
50 pursuit of food, shelter, and clothing..." That's not

1 what I said. I said (In Yup'ik) is the daily pursuit
2 of gathering food, shelter, clothing, comfort and
3 companionship by hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering
4 activities with respect to all of life.

5

6 Thank you.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Noted for the
9 record. Did you want to have that officially changed
10 and you could provide those comments or clarifications.

11

12 MR. ALOYSIUS: (Nods affirmatively)

13

14 Alex Nick.

15

16 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. We work off of
17 the transcripts when we write up these minutes. As you
18 know, I wasn't here during your fall meeting, I was in
19 Nome coordinating on their Council. I'm sure that the
20 court recorder did very good job. Unfortunately some
21 of the interpretations and some of the notes when
22 someone says something in Yup'ik sometimes we get
23 confused in the transcripts and we do the best we can
24 to write these minutes. Whatever you said as a member
25 is recorded in the transcripts.

26

27 Mr. Chair.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, Alex.
30 Is there any other comments, notes or changes anyone
31 want to make to the minutes.

32

33 MR. ANDREW: Mr. Chairman.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: John Andrew.

36

37 MR. ANDREW: In the minutes on Page 9
38 where I had my name in there on comments, on the second
39 line it's supposed to say people that do not have a
40 job. It says people do not have a job -- that do not
41 have a job. And on the following page I have a
42 question on the public comments of Mr. Daniel George.
43 Going on Page 11, you go down one, two, three, five
44 lines down, it states here, He opposed proposed to lift
45 restrictions on the Federal public lands on Kuskokwim
46 area. We need to check the sentence on the last two
47 lines because I don't quite remember how -- I don't
48 think he had opposition on lifting the restrictions on
49 Federal lands.

50

1 Mr. Chairman.
2
3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I do recall that
4 testimony, and that rather surprised me, actually, when
5 he did make that, but that is the recommendation that
6 he provided in his testimony; so I mean that's
7 accurate.
8
9 MR. ANDREW: Thank you.
10
11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any other changes,
12 deletions, if not, prepared to hear the question.
13
14 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman. I have a
15 question.
16
17 (Pause)
18
19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ready for the
20 question.
21
22 MR. ONEY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I have a
23 question.
24
25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray Oney.
26
27 MR. ONEY: Yeah, I know, there's one
28 issue that comes into mind. I know we invited some
29 organizations. I know one is the Yukon River
30 Intertribal Watershed Council that was invited but
31 didn't show up, and I was hoping they would be here
32 during this meeting just to hear their point of view on
33 what they're doing on the Yukon River. I don't know if
34 Staff or anyone has made any attempts to try and, you
35 know, get them back on the agenda.
36
37 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
38
39 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay, yeah, well,
40 you can address that in your comments further. I guess
41 you have now. But for right now we're just on approval
42 of minutes. And so with the changes people have
43 mentioned to be incorporated, if there's no more, I'd
44 hear the question.
45
46 MR. ALOYSIUS: Question.
47
48 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: For approval of
49 minutes, with corrections as noted, all in favor say
50 aye.

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Those opposed, same
4 sign.
5
6 (No opposing votes)
7
8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none, the
9 minutes are adopted.
10
11 And, now we'll go on to Regional
12 Advisory Council concerns and comments. We'll start
13 down at that end with Charlie Brown.
14
15 MR. BROWN: Yeah, I got no comment.
16 Good morning.
17
18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. Next, Ray.
19
20 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
21 just want to say good morning to everyone and welcome
22 to those that have been sitting on the board and
23 welcome the new members that will be coming on board
24 and those that are new to attending this meeting, I say
25 welcome, too.
26
27 Thank you.
28
29 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Harry. General
30 comments.
31
32 MR. H. WILDE: Mr. Chairman. It seems
33 to me we're lacking our organization Yukon-Kuskokwim --
34 this Subsistence Regional Council. I think the reason
35 is people -- I saw one of the man, I told him that
36 they're looking for Lower Yukon Regional Advisory
37 Committee, is there any chance that you can become a
38 member. They say no. I saw them in the newspapers all
39 right. Every time when I go down to fish camp try to
40 feed my family, they tell me not to go hunting, not to
41 go fishing, they take away some of my -- the one I
42 kept, the king salmon, two king salmon. What do they
43 expect me to do. They want me to go into the Advisory
44 Committee so they could bother me all the time when I
45 try to catch something to eat for my family and put it
46 away and they could try to put me in trouble. That's
47 the kind of attitude from the people.
48
49 It's kind of hard because I think the
50 whole area, we have the responsibility for taking care

1 of the people of subsistence. They should tell them or
2 they should let council or city or mountain or any
3 place, let them know why they're having this kind of
4 problem.

5
6 The reason is right now I think is our
7 people out there still hungry, scared to go out there.
8 We've got to let them understand that they don't have
9 to afraid, the thing is -- if the moose is open we
10 should let them know. If the fish is running, they
11 should be able to go out and subsist, we should let
12 them know. Because some of our Natives out there, they
13 don't speak English. They don't understand staying in
14 a camp, when a person come in, they don't understand
15 what they're talking about, we got to let them know, I
16 think.

17
18 Me, myself, I'm not younger anymore.
19 Maybe this is my second meeting I'm taking. I've been
20 helping my -- helping -- try to help the people, I just
21 can't, I don't want to let the children grow up the way
22 I grow up, hard time.

23
24 So, Mr. Chairman, I think it's a very
25 important thing. We should or enforcement should let
26 the people know out there why they are not -- they can
27 catch this and that.

28
29 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

30
31 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, Harry.
32 John Andrew.

33
34 MR. ANDREW: Yeah, thank you. John
35 Andrew, Kwethluk.

36
37 (In Yup'ik)

38
39 MR. ANDREW: I am saying thank you, Mr.
40 Chairman, for having me over here, for inviting me.
41 Welcome to all the Staff and Council members over here
42 attending. It's very very hard to get up here and, you
43 know, sit and work with our Regional Advisory Councils
44 because we have all kinds of regional issues that we
45 try to address every year.

46
47 My frustrations have been that we're
48 restricted down to making recommendations only. For
49 everything we do we over here, it's only -- for all the
50 proposals that come up before us we have to listen to

1 all their analyses, we have to listen to Fish and Game,
2 Fish and Wildlife, non-profits in our villages and our
3 frustration is what we want for our people most of the
4 time we don't get it. Our region is the most over-
5 regulated area in this whole state of Alaska,
6 practically all the areas.

7
8 People that have the regulating power
9 are the Boards, the Subsistence Board, the State Board.
10 We're always asking, looking up there asking can you do
11 this for us, can we have this and that. Most of the
12 time they say no, the law says you can't do that.
13 That's our frustration, working with somebody that
14 won't listen to us but we try our best.

15
16 But I'm pretty fortunate, my village
17 always asks me to come here to represent our village
18 and then we have our corporation. We have one, I'd
19 like to recognize the Chair of the Kwethluk
20 Corporation, he just came to attend. They always --
21 our corporation and our village always try to meet on
22 proposals and then they try to give us ammunition to
23 work with. At least we have the support of the
24 village to come to represent them.

25
26 And, again, I'd like to thank everybody
27 that showed up today and you can see most of our
28 members are practically all elders and nowadays it's
29 very hard to recruit young people like the way Harry
30 mentioned, recruit young people that are willing to
31 work as a volunteer on natural resource issues because
32 what we do over here will affect all the villages, our
33 children, our grandchildren and the people, and their
34 children too. And it's very important to try to
35 recruit people to work under the subsistence Councils
36 and State committees too. Like I said, it's very hard
37 to be up here and try to satisfy everybody, but then
38 there are times and it's rewarding.

39
40 If someone says a simple thank you,
41 that means very much to us.

42
43 Quyana. Thank you, again.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, John.
46 James.

47
48 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
49 My name is James Charles from Tuntutuliak. I have been
50 attending all the RAC meetings in the area and I try to

1 support what we do to let people know out there in our
2 villages. Like I mentioned this meeting yesterday on
3 KYUK in Yup'ik talk show and post signs at the post
4 office or community hall every time I get them, like
5 proposal deadlines and meeting schedule and stuff like
6 that. When I get them, I post them out there, even,
7 both Federal and State. So I try to support our work
8 here.

9

10 Like Harry said, we need more young
11 people to serve on the RAC because they have more
12 education too and they're a lot of subsistence hunters
13 out there, hunters and fishermen. Like myself, I am a
14 subsistence hunter and fishermen. I commercial fish
15 too. So we need our young people to participate, but
16 they're lacking now. I don't understand that part, but
17 we do the best we can to let them know how we are doing
18 on the Federal side.

19

20 I've attended a couple of State Board
21 of Game meetings this winter, one in Nome and one in
22 Anchorage. When I come back from those meetings I let
23 people know what has happened at those meetings. For
24 this too we need to let the people know. From last
25 fall moose hunting season I learn a lot then.

26

27 People, like Harry said, they were
28 nervous to hunt moose out here in our area last fall
29 because the State opened a 10-day season on State land
30 or corporation land and Federal was closed. They come
31 to me or they call me on the phone, what is open out
32 there, where is the open land or where is the boundary
33 for closed area. They were really scared to go out.
34 They didn't even want to hunt.

35

36 That's what we want to let the people
37 know.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, James.

42 Bob.

43

44 MR. ALOYSIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
45 Where do I start. I hope you have all morning free.
46 No, just kidding. I'm the lone voice for the Upper
47 Lower Kuskokwim. Basically I represent two villages in
48 this YK Delta area. We're always overcome by numbers.
49 We have four villages in our Central Kuskokwim AC
50 compared to the lower Kuskokwim.

1 One of the things that's really
2 upsetting to the people up there is the simple fact
3 that we're trying to get our issues up front and we get
4 shot down because of numbers. Four villages versus 15
5 for this area and that's just on the Kuskokwim River
6 and that's not counting the Yukon and the coast in 18.
7 Last month was a prime example of numbers, overwhelming
8 numbers. We are caught in a borderline and very
9 confusing boundaries that separate 18, 19 and 21.

10
11 In the old days there was such a thing
12 called cooperation. People working together to resolve
13 an issue, not ganging up on one particular person at a
14 time. What we go through up there all the time.
15 Somebody from the outside is always regulating us and
16 they never come to our village to hear our input. I
17 don't care what anybody might think about it and it's
18 the truth. We're tired of being regulated by
19 outsiders.

20
21 We have four villages and we're
22 supposed to have two members on each of our ACs. It's
23 very, very, very seldom we ever get a quorum when we
24 have a meeting because the people's attitude is what
25 the hell is the use of going, they won't listen to us
26 anyway. They'll do what they want and we'll have to go
27 by what they want.

28
29 I think it's time that we put all these
30 issues aside and start working together so that our
31 young people can look at us and say hey, they must be
32 doing something good, they're working together like in
33 the old days. Not trying to separate each other for
34 one thing or another, but to work together for the good
35 of all. Our attitude is that it's a daily pursuit of
36 gathering food, shelter, clothing, comfort and
37 companionship for our people and the only way we can do
38 that today is to hunt, fish, trap and gather in a
39 cooperative manner.

40
41 So all that out of the way, I'm also
42 having a hell of a time being here because during the
43 last three months I've lost probably a dozen family,
44 relatives and friends. Most of the time it's all young
45 people and so I'm really having a struggle right now
46 being here. Physically I'm here, but mentally,
47 emotionally, spiritually I'm somewhere else because
48 it's really hard.

49
50 Again I thank the Creator, my

1 ancestors, my grandparents, my parents and especially
2 the youth, children and infants for me being here
3 because I know that whatever I do for my people today
4 will have a lasting effect on their lives tomorrow.

5
6 I try my best and a lot of times it's
7 not good enough and I feel like I'm not worthy, but
8 it's my own people who encourage me to be here. They
9 tell me that I'm their voice. Their voice, not my
10 voice, theirs.

11
12 Hopefully some day whatever system
13 we're in will start listening to us because we're
14 sincere in our effort to make life easier for ourselves
15 and especially our young people.

16
17 Guyana.

18
19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, Bob.
20 Let me echo a lot of what folks have just said here,
21 especially the part you say about really feeling kind
22 of frustrated about just sitting in this place and
23 making these choices and recommendations that we do and
24 just hoping like heck they're the right ones and are
25 going to work best for the most people.

26
27 I also am concerned about the
28 membership and try to solicit folks and try to get
29 people who are going to be able to give the commitment
30 to be here so we get the input that's so highly desired
31 in here.

32
33 One thing that I'm actually looking at
34 now is that nominations do not have to come from the
35 person themselves. I think next time around maybe other
36 folks could look at doing this too. Just so they
37 wouldn't have to go through the process, if you can
38 identify someone that you think would make a good
39 Council member, just talk to them and say would they
40 mind being nominated and one of us could do the paper
41 submission for them. I know a lot of times people say
42 they would accept it if it was offered, but having to
43 go through that -- I don't like writing the dang thing
44 up every time it's there. I figure there's one on
45 file. Not a lot is going to change, but you have to
46 write up a whole big thing again. That's something
47 that maybe procedurally OSM or whoever is in charge of
48 that could maybe make that a bit simpler.

49
50 The other issue I really did want to

1 mention is this whole review that the Secretary of
2 Interior brought forward at the last AFN convention and
3 I participated in a couple of those meetings of the RAC
4 members and chairs with the secretaries,
5 representatives for the State, and there was a very
6 substantial list that was brought forward and there was
7 two direct face-to-face meetings that occurred. I
8 would hope that what comes out the other side, I'm a
9 little bit skeptical at present, but that a large
10 majority of those actually do be adopted and that we
11 don't just end up with lip service.

12
13 I'm also highly concerned with the
14 position now that I'm hearing from the Fish and
15 Wildlife Service coming forward with their
16 interpretations of ANILCA being wildlife legislation
17 and the whole point of managing the population is to
18 provide for subsistence being of a secondary concern.

19
20 Title VIII of ANILCA was put in
21 specifically to provide for that subsistence priority
22 and to provide for the requirement or the congressional
23 promise under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act
24 that the subsistence harvest and subsistence way of
25 life would be protected but yet we see the managers not
26 managing their populations whatsoever, not taking any
27 responsibility for that, with the exception of the BLM
28 who has opened their grounds to predator management
29 programs around the state.

30
31 What's going on down in Unimak and I'm
32 hearing some of the internal discussions that have come
33 out that the Unimak Caribou Herd is essentially to the
34 brink of extinction. The Fish and Wildlife's position
35 has been let it go extinct. Let me qualify that. They
36 haven't come out with a formal position, but statements
37 to that effect have come forward and that is absolutely
38 in direct conflict with their responsibility to manage
39 their populations to provide for subsistence needs, to
40 fulfill the purpose of Title VIII of ANILCA and to
41 fulfill United States government and congressional
42 promise that subsistence would be provided for within
43 the state of Alaska.

44
45 Those are a few of mine. That's my
46 rant for the day.

47
48 I have a request that we step down for
49 a quick break, so back in 10 minutes here, 10:30.

50

1 (Off record)

2

3 (On record)

4

5 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Let's go back on
6 record here, folks. Next we'll allow Mr. Weekley to
7 give his report on the large mammal subsistence harvest
8 survey.

9

10 Mr. Weekley, go ahead.

11

12 MR. WEEKLEY: Mr. Chair. Thank you for
13 the opportunity to speak before the Council. I know
14 you have a very busy agenda, so I'll try to be brief.
15 I just wanted to inform the Council that the company I
16 work for SWCA we've been contracted by the U.S. Fish
17 and Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management,
18 to do harvest surveys in nine communities along the
19 lower Yukon River for large land mammals. The nine
20 communities include Mountain Village, Russian Mission,
21 St. Mary's, Alakanuk, Marshall, Chevak, Scammon Bay,
22 Nunam Iqua and Kotlik.

23

24 The species that we're looking at
25 include moose, caribou, black and brown bear, muskox,
26 wolverine and wolf. We are hiring people in the
27 communities to go door to door and do the household
28 surveys. Currently we have people going door to door
29 in six of the communities and we'll be soon hiring
30 people in three additional communities and we're
31 gathering data as we speak. Hopefully by fall I'll be
32 able to come back before the Council and present the
33 results of this study.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions. Harry.

36

37 MR. H. WILDE: Mr. Chairman. We have a
38 person that's coming into our village in Mountain
39 Village asking questions and all that. It seems to me
40 he's doing okay.

41

42 MR. WEEKLEY: Yeah, one of my co-
43 workers, Omar Ramirez, has been in most of the Yukon
44 River communities and he's hired a number of people,
45 including in Mountain Village, and the data that we're
46 getting is looking very good. We're getting very
47 interesting results, very promising in terms of some of
48 the moose data that we're getting and the help that
49 that can provide to the communities.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray.

2

3 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4 George, I know where's there's moose there's always
5 wolves that are behind. Is there any intentions of
6 doing a wolf count?

7

8 MR. WEEKLEY: That's not part of this
9 study, but I would defer to the Fish and Wildlife
10 Service to determine whether or not that's a priority
11 that they want to look at. We'd be happy to do the
12 work for them if they want us to.

13

14 MR. ONEY: Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Just a question I
17 would have and this is more of a focus along the lines
18 of what's been done in the past by the State
19 Subsistence Division with their technical papers as far
20 as community surveys. Will you be comparing the data
21 that you have from those and most of them are from back
22 20 or more years ago. Looking at some comparative
23 harvesting and so forth, would that be included in your
24 report?

25

26 MR. WEEKLEY: Yes. The intention of
27 the data collection would be that the information that
28 would be collected would be consistent with the Alaska
29 Fish and Game Subsistence Division's technical papers
30 and reports that they've done in the past in many of
31 these communities and so the data can be directly
32 compared back and forth between the studies that were
33 done in the 1980s and this recent study.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. Well,
36 we look forward to seeing that at the fall meeting.

37

38 Thank you, sir.

39

40 MR. WEEKLEY: Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It was brought
43 forward to me during the break that I was remiss, not
44 being used to doing the chairman bit here, that we
45 should have had introductions. Start by just going
46 around the room and people just stand up and say who
47 you are and who you're with and then we can see who's
48 on the teleconference as well for the record.

49

50 MR. ANDREW: Jimmy Andrew, RIT with

1 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: You don't need to
4 come up to the microphone. You can just stand up and
5 speak loud enough so we all know who you are.

6

7 MR. PHILLIPS: Benjamin Phillips from
8 Alakanuk and Alakanuk Tribal Council.

9

10 MR. NICK: Alex Nick, coordinator for
11 YK, originally from Russian Mission, now living in
12 Bethel.

13

14 MR. ANDREW: Timothy Andrew with AVCP
15 natural resources.

16

17 MR. BERGSTROM: Dan Bergstrom with
18 Alaska Department of Fish and Game, commercial
19 fisheries.

20

21 MR. CANNON: Richard Cannon with the
22 Office of Subsistence Management.

23

24 MR. BUE: Fred Bue, Fish and Wildlife
25 Service. I just recently retired from the State, so
26 now I switched over.

27

28 MR. PAPPAS: George Pappas, Department
29 of Fish and Game, subsistence liaison team.

30

31 MR. ANDREW: Louie Andrew, Bethel Fish
32 and Wildlife Service, RIT supervisor, Native contact
33 representative, translator.

34

35 MS. SWANTON: Nancy Swanton, National
36 Park Service.

37

38 MR. KRON: Tom Kron, Fish and Wildlife
39 Service, OSM.

40

41 MS. KENNER: Pippa Kenner, Fish and
42 Wildlife Service, OSM.

43

44 MS. PETRIVELLI: Pat Petrivelli, BIA
45 subsistence.

46

47 CHUCK: Chuck with the Kwethluk
48 Corporation.

49

50 MR. KESSLER: Steve Kessler. I'm with

1 the U.S. Forest Service. I'm on the InterAgency Staff
2 Committee.

3

4 MR. WEEKLEY: George Weekley, SWCA
5 Consultants.

6

7 MR. OVIATT: George Oviatt, Bureau of
8 Land Management.

9

10 MR. PROBASCO: Good morning Council
11 members. I'm Pete Probasco, Office of Subsistence
12 Management.

13

14 MR. NICORI: James Nicori, Kwethluk
15 IRA.

16

17 MR. SIKORA: I'm James Sikora from
18 Toksook Bay. I work for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
19 Service as informer and educator through the village
20 that I'm assigned to.

21

22 MR. KIRSCH: David Kirsch (ph), RIT for
23 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I'm from Toksook Bay.

24

25 MR. OLSON: Thomas Olson, U.S. Fish and
26 Wildlife Service, RIT, Hooper Bay.

27

28 MR. BERG: Jerry Berg, InterAgency
29 Staff Committee. Staff committee member for Fish and
30 Wildlife Service out of Anchorage.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Who's the guy over
33 back in the corner over there.

34

35 MR. MILLER: Steve Miller, Fish and
36 Wildlife Service here in Bethel. That's Pastor
37 Clifford Jenning.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. Thank you
40 all and welcome. Again, apologies. Do we have anyone
41 online? I know there were several people earlier.
42 Perhaps we lost them.

43

44 REPORTER: There's no one on line
45 anymore. It's not plugged in.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. That brings
48 us into jumping into the meat and potatoes of why we're
49 here as far as addressing proposals. Our first one is
50 the Yukon fisheries proposals. These are hold-overs

1 from 09-12, 09-13. I'm supposed to read this, I guess,
2 about the presentation procedures, which is on the
3 agenda. We'll have the Staff give the introduction of
4 the proposal and analysis, be provided ADF&G comments,
5 then we have the opportunity for Federal, State, Tribal
6 agency comments, the InterAgency Staff Committee
7 comments and recommendations, any local Fish and Game
8 Advisory Committees, a summary of written comments and
9 the public has a chance to weigh in on each proposal
10 and then we go into deliberations and recommendations,
11 possible actions.

12
13 With that I'll turn it over to Rich
14 Cannon. You're going to be doing the presentation on
15 the Yukon proposals and the issues we have there, those
16 additional ones of the joint resolution. I believe
17 there's a joint letter on the Bering Sea bycatch that
18 we were asked to look at by Western/Eastern Interior.

19
20 MR. CANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21 My name is Richard Cannon. I work with the Office of
22 Subsistence Management. I work with the Yukon
23 fisheries, with the Yukon fisheries biologist. This
24 morning we're going to be taking up some deferred
25 proposals, fishery Proposal 09-12 and 09-13. The deal
26 with gillnet mesh size and gillnet mesh depth.

27
28 In order to provide your Council with
29 the information that we feel is needed to understand
30 and to deliberate on these proposals we wanted to make
31 sure you had information that both the Eastern and
32 Western Council had when they deliberated these
33 deferred proposals, as well as information that was
34 provided to the Board of Fisheries when they acted on
35 similar proposals in their January meeting on AYK
36 fisheries.

37
38 To begin the Staff presentations, the
39 Alaska Department of Fish and Game was kind enough to
40 come to your meeting today to present a presentation
41 that they first gave at the Board of Fisheries meeting
42 and then again gave last week at their meeting in
43 Fairbanks to the Eastern and Western Interior Councils.

44
45 So I'd like to introduce Dan Bergstrom,
46 who will give you that PowerPoint presentation. Tell
47 me, Mr. Chair, if it's easier if we turn the one light
48 out you may be able to see it better. It's your
49 preference. We'll turn it back on once Dan Bergstrom
50 is finished. I'll turn it over to Dan Bergstrom with

1 Department of Fish and Game and he'll give you this
2 first presentation.

3

4 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5

6 MR. BERGSTROM: Good morning, Mr.
7 Chairman and RAC members. My name is Dan Bergstrom. I
8 work for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game,
9 Commercial Fisheries Division. As Rich said, this is a
10 presentation that we presented to the Alaska Board of
11 Fisheries this last January and I believe both Mr. Oney
12 and Mr. Wilde, I don't know if Greg was there at the
13 time, but they were at the Board meeting in Fairbanks
14 and did see this presentation.

15

16 As most of you know, the Alaska Board
17 of Fisheries adapted a mesh size change for the
18 subsistence and commercial gillnets in the Yukon area
19 and they changed it to a maximum of 7.5 inch mesh.
20 This will go into effect in 2011. So this next summer
21 everything is normal, it doesn't change. It will be
22 the next year. There were no changes made on the depth
23 of the gillnets. We have a handout that summarizes all
24 the other changes that were made by the Board of
25 Fisheries and I think you have those.

26

27 As we go into this presentation, you do
28 have a copy, each one of you, I believe, that you can
29 kind of follow along besides just looking up there.

30

31 The Department presented data related
32 to State Proposals 89 and 90, which are similar to the
33 FP12 and FP13 '09. These proposals sought to reduce
34 the mesh size and depth of gillnets on the Yukon River.
35 So first I'll go over studies presented to the Board.
36 There was a gillnet selectivity study and a lower Yukon
37 mesh size study. The second half of the presentation I
38 will present various management options the Department
39 brought before the Board, which could increase the
40 numbers of larger fish and females to the spawning
41 grounds.

42

43 First I'll go over a net selectivity
44 model and these were created by Dr. Jeff Bromaghin with
45 Fish and Wildlife Service in 2005. When you discuss
46 selectivity of gear, this refers to the degree to which
47 that gear targets fish with certain characteristics
48 such as size. Most fishing gear is at least somewhat
49 selective for what it harvests.

50

1 Selectivity models allow us to
2 understand what biases certain gears have for certain
3 fish characteristics. In this case, we're looking at
4 gillnet mesh size as it relates to chinook salmon size.
5 Larger mesh gillnets catch larger size fish and this
6 makes sense and has been confirmed many times. Net
7 selectivity of Yukon River chinook salmon was modeled
8 with data from Pilot Station sonar test fishery, which
9 uses a broader way of gillnet mesh size. They use
10 anywhere from four inch on up to eight and a half inch.

11
12 It's important to emphasize here that
13 the age, sex and length distributions of chinook salmon
14 from the Yukon are unique so that these data are really
15 only applicable to guiding actions on the Yukon. It
16 could be difficult to use these in other areas. You'd
17 want to have specific data collected for other areas.
18 For example, historically, the Yukon has had more seven
19 year old chinook salmon returning than like the
20 Kuskokwim River.

21
22 Now we've got an interesting graph
23 here. This is a first series of slides that depict the
24 selectivity curves currently modeled for Pilot Station
25 test fishery. This shows the curves for six and a half
26 inch, seven and a half inch and eight and a half inch
27 mesh.

28
29 The way to interpret these curves is
30 that the peak shows the length of the fish the mesh is
31 most sufficient at catching. So at the top you go down
32 and you see what that length is. So eight and a half
33 inch mesh net is most effective at catching fish
34 approximately 830 millimeters or about 33 inches. The
35 way the curve decreases above and below the peak
36 reflects a degree to which the catchability decreases
37 as the size is larger or smaller than that peak
38 efficiency.

39
40 So this graph shows the length
41 distribution of chinook salmon in gray. This
42 represents the theoretical lengths of the fish in the
43 river. The solid line is the same selectivity curve
44 for the seven and a half inch mesh that was on the
45 previous slide. The dotted line is the selectivity of
46 the eight and a half inch mesh net, which is roughly
47 represented with the next sizes currently fished in the
48 unrestricted mesh size fishery. Most people use around
49 eight and a half.

50

1 It's obvious here that the eight and a
2 half inch mesh net is more selective on the larger
3 individuals. The peak selectivity or efficiency of the
4 eight and a half inch mesh net is on larger fish than
5 the most abundant size classes present in the river.
6 That's what's shown in the gray.

7
8 Also note that the right of the peak,
9 even though the selectivity drops off a little, it
10 still remains higher in the largest fish. Meanwhile
11 the seven and a half inch mesh net selectivity, the
12 solid line is slightly more selective on larger
13 individuals but overall it more closely resembles the
14 length distribution of the population.

15
16 With this graph we're looking at the
17 estimated escapement of chinook undergoing 50 percent
18 exploitation rate. That means we'd be catching half of
19 the fish available. This shows it for a seven and a
20 half inch mesh nets, the dotted line, and if it was
21 taken in eight and a half inch nets, the solid line.
22 So given the net selectivity in the previous graph
23 these lines represent what would reach the spawning
24 grounds after experiencing harvest.

25
26 The seven and a half inch mesh nets
27 produce a broader distribution of length so the second
28 peak in the dashed line would show how many larger fish
29 would be in the spawning grounds, whereas the eight and
30 a half inch nets escapement is more skewed and
31 disproportionately represented by smaller length
32 individuals, so there's a lot more smaller fish in the
33 spawning grounds than in the seven and a half.

34
35 An additional piece of information from
36 the 2005 study is the catch per unit effort. So this
37 is again looking at Pilot Station data. This graph
38 shows the catch per unit effort on the Y axis and the
39 mesh size is on the X axis at the bottom there. You
40 can see from four inch to eight and a half. The seven
41 and a half inch net actually has a greater CPUE than
42 the eight and a half. You can see it's the highest
43 bar. The six and a half inch mesh net actually caught
44 fairly good high CPUE of chinook salmon also.

45
46 The way to think of this is that the
47 eight and a half inch nets target slightly larger
48 chinook salmon but the smaller chinook salmon are a
49 little more abundant, so the catches are higher.

50

1 Next we'll go through the lower Yukon
2 mesh size study. This study was located near the
3 village of Emmonak and was a cooperative effort between
4 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, the Yukon Delta
5 Fisheries Development Association, which is the CDQ
6 group for the lower Yukon.

7
8 The purpose of the study was to better
9 understand what the fish you would target if mesh size
10 restrictions were to be enacted. A test fishery was
11 conducted with the help of local fishermen to
12 specifically look at harvest in seven inch, seven and a
13 half and eight inch nets. That was done during the
14 last three years.

15
16 To put this study in perspective, I
17 also provide data from the District 1 restricted, which
18 is mesh fisheries, which is similar to the Kuskokwim
19 when you have six inch and smaller mesh openings and
20 unrestricted mesh size commercial harvest. On the map
21 is the lower Yukon Delta. Everything downstream of
22 this line is in District 1.

23
24 Because there has been little
25 commercial fishing the last three years we also include
26 the data from the lower Yukon test fishery, which is
27 located by Emmonak and then it also covers the middle
28 of north mouths and it's shown in blue on the map.
29 This fishery also uses eight and a half inch mesh nets
30 in our test fishery and it's set gillnets. These data
31 were lumped with unrestricted commercial fishery data
32 because they'd be similar size fish. Only those data
33 from commercial fisheries in lower Yukon datasets that
34 were collected at times during the mesh size study were
35 included. So we didn't use harvest prior to the last
36 three years.

37
38 Study objectives. Particularly we were
39 interested in effects on mesh size on how well each
40 mesh size targets chinook salmon versus other species.
41 The degree to which the mesh sizes target older
42 individuals, the degree to which the mesh sizes target
43 females and the relative size of fish caught in each
44 mesh size.

45
46 This slide shows the sample sizes and
47 this is combined for the three years of the study. We
48 collected a total of 1,132 chinook salmon and 1,337
49 chum salmon using those mesh sizes in the study, seven,
50 seven and a half, eight inch.

1 So the results. We grouped the results
2 that correspond to each of the four primary objectives
3 of the study. First we'll look at how well each mesh
4 size targets chinook salmon. It looks a little
5 complicated, but what we're showing here is the chinook
6 to chum salmon ratio. So anything above -- okay, so
7 we're looking at the ratio of chinook to chum salmon.

8
9 In orange are the restricted commercial
10 fishery catches. That's on the far left. In blue are
11 the seven inch mesh catches by year and that's the next
12 group. Yellows are the seven and a half inch mesh
13 catches. Reds are the eight inch meshes and green on
14 the far right is unrestricted or chinook directed
15 commercial periods. That's when you can use any mesh
16 size and fishermen use large mesh nets. The averages
17 in each group of bars is shown in light.

18
19 The chinook to chum ratio can vary
20 substantially within a season and among seasons
21 depending upon relative abundance of chum and chinook
22 as well as the timing of the salmon runs. When we're
23 looking at this graph and thinking about catch
24 composition, what we're really looking at is whether or
25 not this ratio is exceeding one. In other words,
26 whether or not we're consistently catching more chinook
27 than chum salmon.

28
29 As you look at this shaded area now,
30 that's where you get up to one. So the seven and a
31 half, eight inch and unrestricted mesh sizes are the
32 ones where we typically get more chinook salmon, the
33 ones above that shaded area.

34
35 Obviously if we're talking about a
36 chinook directed fishery this is important to know.
37 Among the seven, seven and a half, eight inch mesh size
38 in this study on average about 40 percent of the seven
39 inch mesh catch is chinook while the 60 percent of the
40 seven and a half inch and eight inch mesh net catch is
41 chinook salmon. So they catch more chinook in larger
42 mesh.

43
44 There is a significant difference in
45 the catch between the seven inch and the larger mesh
46 sizes. So the seven inch catches more chum than the
47 others. We found in the past in restricted openings to
48 six inch and smaller during commercial fisheries that
49 we can get on average 22 chum to one chinook.

50

1 Next we'll go over the age composition
2 of the catch. This bar graph shows the harvest by age
3 in each of these mesh sizes. The middle three bars are
4 the mesh size study data and the outer bars on the left
5 and the right on the far left and right are the
6 restricted and unrestricted mesh nets.

7
8 So age seven fish are shown in peach at
9 the top of each bar just a few fish there you see. Age
10 six is in blue, which pretty much dominates most of
11 those mesh sizes. The age five is in green and age
12 four in orange. That's on the bottom. You can see the
13 percentage of age six fish and, to a lesser extent, age
14 seven fish generally increases with mesh size, while
15 age five and age four fish decrease with the mesh size.
16 There's more age four and five as you go to the left.
17 This pattern is supported statistically with the high
18 square test. All statistics are up in the right hand
19 corner if you're interested.

20
21 Next we wanted to look at the results,
22 the degree to which mesh sizes target female chinook
23 salmon. As with the previous graph, this graph shows
24 mesh sizes along the X axis and the Y axis shows the
25 percentage from 0 to 100. The middle bars are the mesh
26 size study data and the restricted again six inch and
27 smaller fishery is shown on the left and unrestricted
28 mesh data is on the right. Males are shown in blue and
29 females in red at the bottom.

30
31 The general pattern of increased
32 percentage of females with increased mesh size is
33 supported statistically for all datasets, but this
34 pattern is primarily driven by the chum directed or
35 restricted mesh size where you can see on the far left
36 the fewest number of females are caught in a six inch
37 and smaller. Finally we look at the chinook size as it
38 corresponds to mesh size. So like the length of the
39 fish.

40
41 This is called a box plot on the length
42 and it's shown on the Y axis for each mesh size study
43 nets is the length from 500 millimeters to 1,100
44 millimeters and mesh size is on the bottom of the
45 graph. The different colored boxes indicate
46 statistically significant differences among the mesh
47 sizes used. So chinook salmon length is significantly
48 different between the eight inch mesh, the red and the
49 smaller mesh sizes, seven and seven and a half. What
50 it's saying is that an eight inch will catch larger

1 fish than those other two, but the seven and seven and
2 a half are pretty similar.

3
4 For reference, these yellow boxes
5 represent the average chinook salmon length for
6 restricted, so that would be like six inch and smaller
7 commercial periods and in the far right that's where
8 the length would be in unrestricted commercial periods.

9
10 Here's, I think, one of the charts that
11 probably was the most looked at by fishermen and the
12 Board of Fisheries and it's the catch of large chinook.
13 Several studies have shown declines for large size
14 class chinook salmon. Those fish it was determined to
15 be greater than 900 millimeters or approximately
16 35 inches, so those are the big ones. We've seen a
17 decline over time.

18
19 Therefore we looked at how well each
20 mesh size targets that large size class. So on the Y
21 axis here are the different mesh sizes going from six
22 inch up to unrestricted. The size categories are on
23 the X axis, the length of the fish basically. So
24 reduction in mesh size to eight inch or less would
25 likely cut the degree to which the fishery targets the
26 largest size class by half or more. It's interesting
27 to see that just that relatively small change from
28 eight inch to probably eight and a half and higher is
29 quite a bit of difference in the length of the fish,
30 the largest fish.

31
32 So the next one we're looking at is the
33 weight of fish. Chinook salmon weight shows a
34 significant difference among each mesh size with the
35 average weight increasing with increased mesh size. I
36 think most fishermen would agree with that, that there
37 is a difference. As you get larger mesh, you get
38 larger fish. The yellow box on the right shows what
39 the average chinook salmon weight for unrestricted mesh
40 fishing periods and it's the highest one. What the
41 different colors tell you there is that there is a
42 significant difference between the average weight in
43 each one of those mesh sizes.

44
45 Compared to the current fishery, this
46 kind of summarizes the results and targeting chinook
47 salmon over summer chum salmon, the seven inch catches
48 more chum than chinook, both the seven and a half and
49 eight inch catches more chinook than chum salmon. With
50 age comp, there's younger chinook salmon caught in the

1 seven and seven and a half inch, but the eight inch is
2 similar to the current fishery. The current fishery
3 being unrestricted, which is eight and a quarter, eight
4 and a half or even bigger mesh.

5
6 Proportion of females is fewer females
7 are caught in the seven and seven and a half inch, but
8 the eight inch is still pretty close to what
9 unrestricted mesh size catch is. With the length, both
10 the seven and seven and a half inch mesh catch
11 relatively smaller fish than the current fishery and
12 the eight inch is a little bit smaller. It doesn't
13 catch those largest ones, but it's still larger than
14 the seven and seven and a half.

15
16 For chinook salmon greater than 900
17 millimeters, the largest fish, all three, as you
18 remember that one graph, indicated that you would catch
19 fewer of those compared to the current unrestricted
20 fishery. With average weight of fish, the seven inch
21 would catch quite a bit lower average weight than the
22 current fishery. The seven and a half is somewhat
23 smaller and the eight inch is still somewhat smaller
24 than the current unrestricted.

25
26 So basically the chinook salmon target
27 in the eight inch nets weigh less than the current
28 fishery and the weight differences are more pronounced
29 in the seven and a half inch and most pronounced in the
30 seven.

31
32 On the data summary, here we have -- as
33 the mesh size increases, the harvest tends to catch
34 more older fish, larger fish and females. Mesh sizes
35 equal to or smaller than seven inch failed to harvest
36 more chinook than chum and therefore cannot afford
37 protection of chum stocks than to a poor chum run.

38
39 Modeling data suggests the mesh sizes
40 of approximately seven and a half inch mesh likely
41 target the most abundant size classes of chinook salmon
42 whereas larger mesh sizes tend to catch the larger less
43 abundant older fish. The eight inch or smaller mesh
44 sizes reduce the harvest of the largest class of
45 chinook salmon. Those that are 900 millimeters and
46 bigger. Unrestricted mesh size disproportionately
47 targets larger and older fish.

48
49 We first presented all this data
50 information and then we had for the Board of Fisheries

1 management options to address the proposals. So the
2 trends in chinook salmon size noted by Yukon fishermen
3 and others indicate that salmon have been getting
4 smaller over time. Whether the changes observed that
5 resulted from environmental or fishery induced
6 selective pressures or a combination of both cannot be
7 determined with certainty. There could be some
8 environmental factors that make fish smaller also.

9
10 So there's few management options
11 available to counteract these trends to make sure
12 there's enough larger older fish. What we can
13 influence is how many fish are harvested and how they
14 are harvested in an effort to improve fresh water
15 production. For all the options I will present the
16 overall objective is to reduce exploitation on the
17 largest and oldest component of the Yukon chinook run
18 and achieve escapements that are more representative of
19 the age and size structure of the overall run. That
20 means that as the run comes in, you have a good number
21 of each size and age class of the chinook salmon in the
22 spawning grounds.

23
24 Large and older chinook salmon are
25 particularly important contributors to freshwater
26 production. That would be, as you'd probably think, is
27 that they have a larger number of eggs in the larger
28 females.

29
30 The management options. We have three
31 main options provided to the Board of Fisheries that
32 were identified as having the potential to achieve this
33 objective. We could, A, decrease the exploitation
34 rates, B, restrict the mesh size and, C, you could
35 restrict the mesh depth. Any of these options could
36 provide for spawning escapements that are more
37 representative of the age and size structure of the
38 overall run and any of these options could improve
39 freshwater productivity in the old if more larger and
40 older individuals and females do indeed reach the
41 spawning grounds.

42
43 Option A, exploitation rate. One way
44 to achieve more larger and older fish to reach the
45 spawning grounds is simply to harvest less, reduce the
46 harvest. Under this option the harvest rate would be
47 reduced beyond whatever conservation measures are
48 necessary to reach escapement goals. This would
49 achieve more individuals on the spawning grounds
50 including larger and older fish. Current gear

1 regulations could be maintained with this option.

2

3 When run abundance is poor to below
4 average, the commercial fishery would need to be closed
5 and the subsistence fishing schedule would possibly
6 have to be reduced also under this option. If there is
7 a surplus of chinook salmon beyond subsistence uses,
8 chinook salmon directed commercial periods would likely
9 be reduced in time and area or delayed using this
10 option to address larger and older chinook salmon to
11 the spawning grounds.

12

13 This option would be effective in
14 increasing escapements including larger and older fish.
15 All fish from the Yukon River mainstem would share the
16 conservation efforts under this option. Additionally,
17 there would be no direct costs incurred by fishermen as
18 they would be able to use existing gear. Those are the
19 benefits.

20

21 The costs, there's commercial and
22 possibly subsistence fishing opportunities would be
23 reduced and commercial fishery value would be affected.
24 In years of low abundance, there would be disruptions
25 to subsistence fishing harvest patterns and could
26 result in reduced harvest depending on stock
27 composition of individual runs.

28

29 Ultimately the cost of this option
30 would often result in larger escapements at or above
31 existing escapement goals and, thus, there could be
32 likely foregone harvest of chinook salmon.

33

34 Next we provided option B to the Board
35 of Fisheries. In the second option, gillnet mesh size
36 restrictions would be adopted between seven and a half
37 and eight inches. That was the recommendation. This
38 is the best available data for Yukon River chinook
39 salmon. Currently older and larger individuals are
40 harvested in higher in the unrestricted mesh size and
41 this option would make the harvest less selective of
42 those largest individuals.

43

44 A mesh size reduction could be adopted
45 only for the commercial fishery, which is a lower use
46 priority or for both commercial and subsistence. So
47 this was the options presented. Going further into the
48 gillnet mesh size option, a reduction in maximum mesh
49 size would decrease the exploitation rate of larger and
50 older chinook salmon caught in gillnets and should

1 increase the escapement of these fish while minimizing
2 the chum harvest.

3

4 It is less likely that this option
5 would affect fishing opportunity in terms of reduced
6 harvest time, therefore is less likely there would be
7 foregone harvest as under the exploitation option.
8 Additionally overall length distributions of harvest
9 would likely better reflect the length distribution of
10 the run and, therefore, escapement would likely be more
11 representative of the run.

12

13 Evidence from the Pilot Station net
14 selectivity models suggest that gear with selectivity
15 that matches the most abundant lengths of the fish in
16 the run would result in a slightly higher CPUE. This
17 suggests potential for fishermen to catch the same
18 number of chinook salmon with less effort. Those are
19 all the benefits of using that.

20

21 The cost, a gear change to a smaller
22 mesh would come at a significant cost to fishermen,
23 both subsistence and commercial, many of whom would
24 need to buy new nets. The cost to replace nets or
25 hanging new webbing could range between \$500 and
26 \$1,800. Many fishermen would likely need to replace
27 more than one net.

28

29 Additionally, larger fish are more
30 desirable in both subsistence and commercial fisheries.
31 If mesh size is reduced in the subsistence fishery,
32 fishermen may fish longer to catch more larger fish,
33 thus increasing the overall subsistence harvest. As
34 larger fish are economically more valuable in the
35 commercial fishery, a short-term economic gain could be
36 affected by having fewer larger fish.

37

38 We did want to note that fishermen have
39 also raised concerns that smaller mesh nets could
40 result in increased chinook dropouts. The degree to
41 which dropouts occur is unknown and it's really hard to
42 design a study to collect that information. The
43 Chinook Technical Committee of the Pacific Salmon
44 Commission has provided estimates of chinook dropouts,
45 but also emphasizes there's an uncertainty of these
46 estimates. They estimate it to be 2 to 8 percent.
47 However, we do not know what the dropout rate would be
48 using a seven and a half inch mesh size and smaller
49 nets.

50

 Any action that alters the nature of

1 the gillnet fishery, since we're only talking about
2 mesh size of gillnet, may also reallocate the harvest
3 opportunity of other gear types, such as fishwheels
4 used on the Yukon.

5
6 Next we have comparison of options A
7 and B to reduce the exploitation on the oldest and
8 largest components of the run. This can be compared
9 using a simple model. In this modeling exercise we
10 investigate a hypothetical run and we're going to use a
11 run size saying if it's 200,000 fish, how do these two
12 options compare.

13
14 The harvest response is examined under
15 four different exploitation rates, 30, 40, 50 and 60
16 percent, using seven and a half, eight inch and
17 unrestricted mesh sizes. What we're looking at is this
18 is kind of hypothetical, but it will illustrate the
19 trade-offs of the options.

20
21 This shows what the estimate harvest of
22 large, greater than 900 millimeter, like 35 inches of
23 chinook salmon. On the X axis are the four
24 exploitation rates; 30 percent on the left going to 60
25 percent. So the one that says 50 percent, you know it
26 would be saying you're taking half of the chinook
27 salmon that come back. On the Y axis it shows the
28 number of larger fish.

29
30 As you know, the larger the number of
31 large chinook salmon that are harvested, the fewer that
32 will be available for escapement on the spawning
33 grounds. So scenarios using the seven and a half inch
34 mesh gear are shown on bars with the orange stripes.
35 That's the first bar on each group. The eight inches
36 shown with the green dots, that's the middle bar, and
37 the unrestricted mesh size harvest is shown in the blue
38 horizontal stripes. The one on the right and the
39 higher bar.

40
41 So in this scenario we assume a
42 subsistence harvest of 50,000 fish, which is typical in
43 the Yukon River each year and any surplus over that
44 would be in the commercial harvest. Therefore at 30
45 percent exploitation rate on a 200,000 fish run there's
46 a total harvest of 60,000 fish, 50,000 would be in the
47 subsistence harvest and 10,000 in a commercial harvest.

48
49 Here we see that a decrease in
50 exploitation rate decreases the harvest of large

1 chinook salmon, so at 30 percent on the left you catch
2 fewer large chinook salmon than if you're harvesting at
3 a 60 percent harvest rate on the right side. We also
4 see that fewer larger chinook are harvested by the
5 smaller mesh sizes compared to the harvest with an
6 unrestricted fishery.

7
8 This shows here that even when the
9 exploitation rate for the smaller mesh sizes is doubled
10 from 30 percent on the left to 60, you still don't
11 increase that harvest very much of the largest fish.
12 You also see that when that happens you catch half as
13 many large fish as that unrestricted mesh size, that
14 blue bar, so it can catch a lot more fish in a smaller
15 mesh fishery without impacting the larger chinook
16 salmon. It also shows it can have a greater
17 exploitation rate and still achieve your objective of
18 allowing larger fish to spawn.

19
20 So, in summary, we find that both
21 methods can be useful in decreasing the harvest of
22 larger chinook salmon and exploitation rate would need
23 to be reduced substantially to achieve the same
24 magnitude of large chinook salmon savings that is
25 possible with the mesh size restrictions.

26
27 Next there's the option of reducing the
28 depth of commercial and subsistence gillnets and that's
29 for gillnets larger than six inch mesh to no more than
30 35 meshes in depth. It is local traditional knowledge
31 that larger chinook tend to travel deeper in the water
32 column; however, there have been no quantitative
33 studies that we are aware of documenting the fish size
34 caught by mesh depth.

35
36 Under current regulations, gillnet
37 depth is unrestricted in the subsistence fishery in the
38 Yukon and in the commercial fishery gillnets greater
39 than six inch may not be more than 45 meshes deep and
40 that's for Districts 1 through 3. And for commercial
41 fishing Districts 4 through 6 gillnets greater than six
42 inch may not be more than 60 meshes deep. That's the
43 current regs.

44
45 Now this option may reduce the harvest
46 of larger fish and reducing the depth of gillnet gear
47 is less expensive than changing gillnet mesh size.
48 It's more easy to cut your net and make it a little
49 shallower than it is to change mesh. That's one of the
50 benefits.

1 A decrease in depth gillnets may
2 require fishermen to expend more effort to harvest
3 salmon needed for subsistence, so that's a cost. There
4 will be some cost in changing your gear to reduce the
5 depth. Again, any action that alters the nature of the
6 gillnet fishery may reallocate the harvest opportunity
7 to other gear types such as fishwheels.

8
9 We did present to the Board of
10 Fisheries an option D just to have an informational on
11 other gear considerations. Options A through C may
12 result in a reallocation of harvest from gillnet
13 fisheries to other gear types or fisheries, other
14 actions such as modification of fishwheel chutes and a
15 size limit on chinook salmon harvested in the sport
16 fishery may merit consideration.

17
18 There was discussion at the Board of
19 Fisheries about fishwheels. Unfortunately we do not
20 have adequate data on these other gear types and
21 fisheries to determine the effectiveness of any
22 changes.

23
24 Finally, summarizing. They have shown
25 declines in the size and age of Yukon River chinook
26 salmon. There are few options available to address
27 these trends because many of the potential factors
28 influencing these patterns are beyond the control of
29 in-river management. That would be things such as
30 environmental conditions. However, prosecuting the
31 fishery in a manner that can increase the number of
32 larger and older individuals on the spawning grounds
33 should increase freshwater production, which is our
34 best available remedy for counteracting these trends.

35
36 The options presented here all have the
37 potential for obtaining this objective, but because the
38 fisheries and fish populations are dynamic it is
39 impossible to predict with any certainty the success of
40 any action when it translates to the actual fishery.

41
42 We had lots of people looking through
43 this report that we presented to the Board of
44 Fisheries. We also had a written report that if
45 anybody wants that we can -- I didn't bring any copies,
46 but we could always get that to interested people.

47
48 In final summing, this is what we
49 presented the Board so that there was a range of
50 options, there was a lot of discussion in Board of

1 Fisheries committee meetings and then the Board did
2 deliberations. As I said, they did take an action on
3 seven and a half inch. Thanks.

4
5 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions on the
6 presentation.

7
8 MR. H. WILDE: Mr. Chairman.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Harry Wilde.

11
12 MR. H. WILDE: Mr. Chairman. Down in
13 my area, this seven and a half is good all right. The
14 trouble is three years from now we never have a
15 commercial fishery. How are we going to pay for our
16 nets, seven and a half mesh nets? There are about 700
17 permit holders down below and we're having a hard time
18 even trying to get subsistence king salmon food for our
19 family. Somebody must have money. At least we
20 couldn't -- not able to do two years in a row. We
21 can't even buy a floater even though we're having hard
22 times to get king salmon subsistence.

23
24 If there's any way for you guys to find
25 us better information to get seven and a half mesh, I
26 think the people are willing to get. But the way we're
27 doing three years in a row, we cannot afford it.
28 Because most of the fishermen they use commercial and
29 subsistence one net. Sometimes I got two nets and I
30 use them for subsistence and commercial, but last year
31 I got only two king salmon, that's all, for all summer.
32 My family is with me, I bring them down to my camp,
33 down lower end of Tenmile. Only two king salmon.

34
35 And this chum net are six inch. We get
36 a six inch selling chums in certain areas that you
37 couldn't even afford to pay for the gas and oil. It's
38 very hard. It's good to have and say and the
39 recommendation some of us supported seven and a half,
40 but the trouble is where are we going to get seven and
41 a half when we couldn't even pay for a floater line or
42 a floater. That's the problem we're having right now.
43 Mr. Chairman.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Dan.

46
47 MR. BERGSTROM: Mr. Chairman. I
48 understand at the Board of Fisheries meeting there was
49 correspondence from the Yukon Delta Fisheries
50 Development Association and they said they were

1 planning to purchase the new seven and a half inch mesh
2 nets for the entire lower Yukon, Subdistricts 1, 2 and
3 3. It's hopeful that they can cover quite a bit of the
4 cost of the change and it's probably going to be more
5 of a problem further upriver.

6
7 One of the other things they were
8 looking at there was a disaster declaration that
9 potentially money might be used from that to cover some
10 of that cost too. But we do understand that it's a big
11 change and it is a cost for people that don't have a
12 lot of money. Certainly it's a concern, but I think
13 the CDQ group, and I talked to them recently, and they
14 were planning to buy, really soon, like 700 to 1,000
15 nets and that's before we even need them the next year,
16 but they're hoping some people would use them this year
17 to see how they work.

18
19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Other questions.
20 James and Bob.

21
22 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 Dan, I've gone through a couple mesh size restrictions
24 ever since I started fishing. One time in Quinhagak
25 and another time at Kuskokwim. Mesh size restrictions
26 are good for hard workers. They can catch any fish,
27 big or small, but not good for some lazy people who
28 catch a king salmon and after awhile it drops out and
29 goes away or escapes, but that's the way it is. I
30 learned that from what I was doing at Quinhagak and at
31 Kuskokwim. Anyway, what I said is I don't mind for
32 commercial gear restrictions.

33
34 But I mentioned at the big SSI meeting
35 a few years ago or several years now, I mentioned at
36 that time not to change the gear restrictions for
37 subsistence because a lot of subsistence fishermen does
38 not have that kind of money, like Harry said. Because
39 we work hard to get subsistence nets, so I don't mind
40 the commercial, but subsistence users would have a hard
41 time.

42
43 Thank you.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Dan.

46
47 MR. BERGSTROM: Mr. Chairman. Those
48 are good comments. We do see there have been mesh size
49 changes in other areas. There was an option in there
50 for the Board to look at whether to do just commercial

1 or subsistence and I think the issue now, as Harry had
2 said, the commercial fishery has really been knocked
3 down. We haven't had much of a harvest for three years
4 in a row and so to really have an impact, at least at
5 this time, was also to restrict the subsistence
6 fishery.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob Aloysius.

9

10 MR. ALOYSIUS: Thank you. Are the
11 Canadians following suit on the seven and a half inch
12 restriction?

13

14 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Dan.

15

16 MR. BERGSTROM: Mr. Chairman. Another
17 good questions because certainly they all, U.S. and
18 Canada, fish on these fish so it will be interesting to
19 see what they do in Canada. We're in a Joint Technical
20 Committee meeting this week in Fairbanks and they'll be
21 discussing that and then there's a Yukon Panel meeting
22 at the very end of this month and there will be
23 discussion about potentially what they will do in
24 Canada. We've already talked to DFO and the panel co-
25 chair and they said that fishermen already in Canada
26 have been talking about restricting their mesh size to
27 a smaller size also, but we'll see whether that
28 actually happens and when. They might even go smaller.

29

30 MR. ALOYSIUS: The other question is
31 who's going to enforce this; the Feds, the State or
32 who, the U.S. marshal?

33

34 MR. BERGSTROM: Well, I expect Harry to
35 be out there checking on fishermen.

36

37 (Laughter)

38

39 MR. BERGSTROM: I think -- well, it
40 depends on what the Federal Subsistence Board does also
41 because the way it is now certainly in the State waters
42 the State would -- when this goes into effect in 2011,
43 the State would be enforcing and then it depends on
44 what the Federal Subsistence Board does and how that
45 would work out.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: In the event that
48 the Federal Board for whatever reason did not adopt
49 this and 2011 come around, then the State would only
50 have jurisdiction for enforcement on the commercial

1 fishery, is that correct?

2

3 MR. BERGSTROM: Yeah, however it would
4 work that way, plus there's a patchwork of waters in
5 the Yukon. Districts 1, 2 and 3 are in the refuge, so
6 they would be under the Federal rules, but like off the
7 coast and further up the river there would be places
8 where the regs would be different, so it would be a
9 little confusing.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any questions.
12 Charlie and then Ray.

13

14 MR. BROWN: Yeah, did you guys, when
15 you decided to change these regulations, do you guys
16 work with the local tribes in the Yukon?

17

18 MR. BERGSTROM: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
19 It's kind of like how the Board of Fisheries -- I want
20 to make it clear the Board of Fisheries is the one that
21 adopted the change, not the Department. But it's
22 typical of how the Board of Fisheries is operated. In
23 recent years we had the Advisory Committees that made
24 comments and then any individual and groups can make
25 comments. We had a lot of comments written in from
26 like the village of Alakanuk and other places, so we
27 had input from tribal groups and a lot of different
28 people for the Board of Fisheries meeting. Then at the
29 meeting itself there were quite a group of people that
30 were in the committee that spoke to the change and what
31 they recommended
32 and there was a whole day spent on Yukon River
33 proposals.

34

35 MR. BROWN: Because we had declining
36 salmon one time in the Kuskokwim area, we sat down
37 together from headwaters all the way down to my area.
38 We sat down together when the Fish and Game was talking
39 about declining salmon and they couldn't do it all by
40 themselves because there's going to be some debates
41 between the tribes, so we sit down together and study
42 this factor. And then we sit down and they allow us to
43 fish probably three days a week. That was a great help
44 because they didn't completely shut the subsistence
45 fishing for the family.

46

47 This salmon, they don't stay in one
48 area during their coming back from the ocean. They
49 only stay there for two weeks at the most. When I used
50 to test fish in my area, at that time I was a

1 commercial fisher and supporter for my fishermen and
2 sometimes we waited for the Bethel test fishery
3 results. When the numbers are okay, they just opened
4 the area.

5
6 The last comment I have, you were
7 talking about reducing the mesh depth on the gear and
8 some portion I used to navigate sometimes when I'm
9 hired to navigate those tug boats, we used to watch the
10 instruments. Some areas they're pretty deep, 60, 70
11 feet and some places it's shallow. My fishing area,
12 it's pretty deep too. So when you guys are talking
13 about reducing the depth gear, it's not helping us
14 because in my area some places it's pretty deep. So I
15 don't want to hear this reduction in my area less than
16 45 mesh deep.

17
18 Thank you.

19
20 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray Oney.

21
22 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 Thanks, Dan, for your report. I also share the same
24 concerns about the Federally qualified users that are
25 going to be making the switch over to seven and a half
26 inch mesh. My question is what's the purpose of saving
27 large fish, large chinook salmon, and what will happen
28 in the future if the big fish increase in size? What's
29 the plan for that? Are we still going to be restricted
30 to seven and a half inch mesh or will that be looked at
31 in the future if the large fish rebound?

32
33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Dan.

34
35 MR. BERGSTROM: First off, there's two
36 main points. The fish have been appearing to get three
37 times smaller and fewer older ones, so the idea is to
38 get more of the larger and older ones through that
39 they'll keep producing those older and larger ones so
40 they won't continue to get smaller and younger through
41 time.

42
43 The second part is if you get those
44 larger older ones up, they should have more eggs, be
45 able to spawn in better areas and produce hopefully
46 more fish in the future and I think that's the one that
47 I would hope for would be the result, that we maintain
48 good populations in the future.

49
50 As far as I think you're asking if the

1 mesh size might change again, who knows, but I wouldn't
2 think it's going to be for a while.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead and
5 continue, Ray.

6

7 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
8 just lost my train of thought here.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We can come back to
11 you later?

12

13 MR. ONEY: Yes, maybe come back to me.
14 Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob Aloysius.

17

18 MR. ALOYSIUS: In the case that they
19 catch bigger salmon in their seven and a half, is it
20 legal for them to keep them? That's the question I get
21 from people up north. There's a lot of speculation
22 that if you catch anything bigger than that you have to
23 throw it back in the river, which is ridiculous.

24

25 MR. BERGSTROM: Yeah, whatever they
26 catch they can keep. It's kind of the same if you're
27 out with six inch and you catch a few kings that are
28 whatever size, you keep those. It would be the same
29 with this. As James said, if you work hard, you can
30 catch some of those fish. That's okay, you don't have
31 to release certain fish.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I have a couple
34 questions myself here. First off, why was that 200,000
35 used in your model? Is that the long-term average that
36 you've given? I'm trying to compare it to what you've
37 considered the failed runs the last couple years,
38 perhaps what the projection is going to be for this
39 year. Where does the 200,000 come into that?

40

41 MR. BERGSTROM: Yes, Mr. Chair. I
42 would say it was just to have a round figure. And a
43 200,000 run you would have commercial fishery, so I
44 think that was the rationale there. It's not
45 necessarily an average of any time period. The recent
46 runs would probably have been more closer to say
47 140,000, so it's not the recent average. It's a little
48 higher.

49

50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: And then I tried to

1 look for it and maybe it's in there and I just can't
2 find it, but what is your exploitation rate at that
3 seven and a half inch mesh? You've got the 30, 40, 50
4 and 60 percent exploitation rates that are used in your
5 savings or harvest of the larger kings, but I don't
6 have anything to equate that to in numbers using the
7 seven and a half inch at least that I can see.

8

9 MR. BERGSTROM: I didn't look back at
10 the graph, but I think what it's just saying in each of
11 those scenarios within the graph is that it's a 30
12 percent exploitation rate. So whether it was
13 unrestricted or seven inch, seven and a half inch or
14 eight inch, each one of those would have been at 30
15 percent. So when you look at that 30 percent each one
16 would be a fishery catching that harvest rate.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'm looking for
19 something a little easier to wrap my head around. Have
20 you done any kind of -- well, let's just say, okay,
21 with the unrestricted fishery you must have looked at
22 what your exploitation rate has been over the years for
23 the runs as they came through. Do you have an average
24 for that?

25

26 MR. BERGSTROM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We
27 have it in our written report that went to the Board of
28 Fisheries, but off the top of my head I'd say that say
29 in the 1980s we were probably running 67 percent
30 exploitation rate, so it's pretty high, but in recent
31 years since probably the year 2000 we've been at an
32 exploitation rate of probably about 45 percent, so
33 we've been a lot more conservative in our management.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Yeah, setting the
36 periods and so forth. But you haven't done anything
37 along the lines by moving to a seven and a half -- with
38 this seven and a half restriction in place, do you see
39 that 45 then dropping down to a 30? Is that where that
40 number came in at the low end of your range there?

41

42 MR. BERGSTROM: Mr. Chairman. I think
43 the idea behind the mesh size change would be at the
44 seven and a half, that you'd stay at the exploitation
45 rate you're at now and potentially could be a little
46 bit higher depending on the run size.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The last one I had
49 then is, again, I know you guys love to play with
50 numbers, or you're required to whether you like it or

1 not, but has there been some sort of retro analysis on
2 past runs? If this would have been in place, what
3 would have been the actual increased escapement on the
4 spawning ground?

5
6 MR. BERGSTROM: Mr. Chair. Not really
7 except for like running this model here. This is
8 what's saying would be the difference in larger fish
9 larger. This is basically where we went with that.
10 Not overall escapement, but escapement of the larger
11 and older ones.

12
13 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: When you have your
14 run compositions and your age classes and everything
15 from your test fisheries and commercial fisheries that
16 you've garnered over the year, it seems to me that
17 would be a logical step to take. What would your
18 actual savings have been if these restrictions would
19 have been in place in those other years? And you have
20 real numbers to work with because you know what your
21 escapement is, you know what your commercial catch was
22 and they're all there. Rich.

23
24 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman. I'll try to
25 answer that a little bit. I know you work with the
26 Kuskokwim working group and they do look at run
27 reconstruction data and have done these kind of
28 analyses, but for the Yukon there's only run
29 reconstruction that's been possible with the Canadian
30 origin fish because they have the genetic data back or
31 scale pattern analysis data back to about 1982. But a
32 total run reconstruction for the whole river, all of
33 the stocks, has not been done yet, but it is something
34 that's being funded by the Office of Subsistence
35 Management program, the Fisheries Monitoring Program.
36 But that work is just beginning. Actually they've
37 approved the funding for it, but that capability isn't
38 there yet for these stocks.

39
40 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, Rich.
43 Ray, did you get your question back? Go ahead.

44
45 MR. ONEY: Yes, thank you, Mr.
46 Chairman. I know this is a lot of information relating
47 to the Proposals 12 and 13 and I was wondering how come
48 we didn't receive them earlier. I mean there's a lot
49 of information in here that needs to be looked at
50 before making a decision rather than trying to do it

1 last minute. I don't know who's responsible for
2 providing this kind of information. It sounds like to
3 me trying to rush these two proposals through us
4 without even giving us a chance to review what's in the
5 material.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Rich, go ahead.

8

9 MR. CANNON: Through the Chair. Mr.
10 Oney. I realize that the proposed Federal analysis was
11 out fairly late in the process. Part of the reason for
12 that is we didn't complete the analysis until we had
13 the information regarding what the State Board of
14 Fisheries would do with similar proposals. We wanted
15 to wait until that decision had been made.

16

17 In fact, the Department of Fish and
18 Game requested that the Federal Subsistence Board not
19 take any actions until the Board of Fisheries had a
20 chance to evaluate these same proposals. So we did not
21 put this out until we had the benefit of the Staff
22 analysis that you see here today that was given to the
23 Board of Fisheries. So that's why the lateness on
24 this. It was provided out on the web and was mailed
25 out, but I realize how long it can take to get out to
26 the Council members, so I'd apologize for that.

27

28 One of the reasons we appreciated the
29 Department of Fish and Game being willing to come and
30 give this, it's a fairly long presentation, was because
31 of that, so that you could at least see the information
32 and ask questions about it. This is the same basic
33 information that we had to do our Federal analysis.

34

35 So all the Councils have now seen this
36 information and your Council now has seen it as well,
37 but I do apologize for how late it came to you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead and
40 continue, Ray.

41

42 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On
43 another note, this is relating into seven and a half
44 inch mesh users on the Yukon. Is there anything in
45 place for people using fishwheels? I know this is
46 mainly just addressing the mesh size.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Dan.

49

50 MR. BERGSTROM: Through the Chair. At

1 this time, there's been no changes made to fishwheels
2 on the Yukon, but there was some interest from some of
3 the public. I think potentially in the future there may
4 be some proposal. The idea behind this is that as you
5 change the mesh size so you get more larger fish, those
6 fish might get caught in wheels, so that's something
7 we'll be trying to look at too. My understanding is
8 there is a way to adjust the end of the fishwheel chute
9 that could somehow affect the size of the fish. That
10 the bigger ones might not go all the way through and
11 then go up and get spilled out. But on the other hand
12 you don't want them to lose all their large fish
13 because, as James knows, you can catch larger fish in
14 smaller mesh size nets.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Ray.

17

18 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On
19 another note, I think we need information from Canada
20 also and also the high seas fishing. If we're going to
21 talk about fish, then we need to look at the whole
22 picture, the whole cycle of the fish, rather than end
23 users on the river. I don't know how soon that could
24 be made, but I'd like to see what the spawning grounds
25 are doing. I know this came up one time during one of
26 our RAC meetings. You know, because of the global
27 warming that's occurring we don't know what's going on
28 in the spawning grounds. We're just recently getting
29 information from the catches from the high seas and if
30 we're going to talk fish, we need to look at the whole
31 picture.

32

33 Thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Well, I think at
36 this point in time it's almost noon. We'll go ahead
37 and step down for lunch and come back at 1:15 and get a
38 proposal on the table and start working our way through
39 them. Mr. Cannon.

40

41 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman. Council
42 members. This presentation is fairly detailed that
43 you've had from Dan Bergstrom from the State of Alaska.
44 What we'll take up then after we come back is the
45 specific Federal proposal. It's a separate process, as
46 you know, and we'll go through our Staff analysis of
47 these same two proposals, but it is a separate process.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We're in recess
50 until 1:15.

1 (Off record)

2

3 (On record)

4

5 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We're just waiting
6 a moment until we get the teleconference on line.

7

8 (Pause)

9

10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Back on record here
11 it's 1:17 p.m., March 2nd, YK Delta Subsistence
12 Council. Just a couple things maybe before we get into
13 the agenda. I'd like to have people think over here
14 before 3:00 or so before the next break whether we want
15 to consider meeting this evening or not. There's been
16 some concern expressed about the length of the agenda.

17

18

19 For myself at this point, we've got
20 three days scheduled and we're just getting going here,
21 but maybe later this afternoon we can take another look
22 at it and see whether we want to continue this evening
23 to take care of things. For myself, I will not be able
24 to attend if we decide to do one tomorrow. I have a
25 prior commitment with our tribal council meeting that
26 I'm required to attend, so we won't have a quorum. It
27 would be tonight or nothing.

28

29 Mr. Probasco, you had something to add
30 here.

31

32 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. Maybe you're
33 aware of this, but just so that the other Council
34 members are aware, you're right now at your quorum of
35 seven, so if any of you excuse yourself, then we can no
36 longer do any action.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I just that said. I
39 wouldn't be there for tomorrow night, so tonight would
40 be the only option for an evening session for us unless
41 we went on into Thursday evening.

42

43 I just wanted to mention for the public
44 who are here, as we do go through the recommendations
45 on the proposals there is a space on the agenda for
46 public testimony. At that time we'll ask if anybody is
47 here and you can go ahead and raise your hand when we
48 get to that point and I'll call you on up.

49

50 For other issues that aren't part of

1 actual recommendations or actions on the proposals, we
2 would ask you to fill out one of these blue cards back
3 there. Just pass it to the Staff and they'll get it to
4 us for other items on the agenda or if you had another
5 issue you wanted to bring before the Council.

6
7 Any other announcements anybody wanted
8 to make.

9
10 (No comments)

11
12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: If not, we'll get a
13 motion on the table for Proposal 09-12 and we'll
14 proceed from there. A motion is in order.

15
16 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman. I move to
17 adopt Proposal FP09-12.

18
19 MR. ALOYSIUS: Second.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. Second
22 by Bob. We had the presentation earlier, so the
23 introduction of proposal and analysis is the next step.

24
25 Mr. Cannon.

26
27 MR. CANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
28 Council members. I'm just going to give you some
29 updates. The first thing we need to do is for you to
30 locate the draft Federal Staff analysis for Proposal
31 12, which was handed out earlier.

32
33 (Pause)

34
35 MR. CANNON: I think everybody has
36 found that. There's some updates on this. The first
37 two pages basically provides you a summary and last
38 week the Eastern and Western Interior Regional Councils
39 took up these proposals. They had a joint meeting in
40 Fairbanks and both Councils basically took action on
41 the two deferred fisheries proposals. I want to let you
42 know the actions that they took.

43
44 Proposal 12 the Eastern Interior
45 Council unanimously supported and Western Interior
46 initially voted not to take an action, it was a tie
47 vote, but then two additional Council members arrived
48 the next day and they took it up under reconsideration
49 and after their discussion unanimously also supported
50 Proposal 12.

1 I'll just cover Proposal 13 with you
2 because we will be going into that one after we're done
3 with 12. At their Joint meeting, the Eastern Interior
4 Council basically decided to take no action on Proposal
5 13 during their meeting and they wanted to use their
6 time to speak to some other fisheries issues.

7
8 So that updates you, Mr. Chairman and
9 Council members, on the actions of the other Yukon
10 Councils. What I'll do now.....

11
12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Before you get past
13 that, you just said only the Eastern Interior took no
14 action? They didn't take no action as a joint Council?
15 Western Interior didn't address Proposal 13?

16
17 MR. CANNON: They did not take any
18 action either.

19
20 The two proposals submitted by the
21 Eastern Interior Advisory Council would change gillnet
22 specifications, reducing mesh size and depth for
23 commercial subsistence fisheries in Federal public
24 waters of the Yukon River. I'm just going to give you
25 a little overview on what's happened with both
26 proposals and then I'm going to just speak to Proposal
27 12. You can take action on that and then I'll go over
28 Proposal 13.

29
30 My first comments just talk about
31 what's happened. This is a very long process that
32 these two proposals have been through, so I'm going to
33 give you an update on that first.

34
35 These proposed changes have had a long
36 history of consideration and debate before the Federal
37 Subsistence Board as well as the State Board of
38 Fisheries. The purpose for both proposals is to
39 address growing concerns about declining size and
40 productivity of Yukon River chinook salmon. For the
41 Federal process, it's important to note that most
42 commercial fishing and over half of the subsistence
43 harvest on the Yukon River takes place in Federal
44 public waters. This complex history is summarized in
45 the draft Staff analyses.

46
47 It is also important to note that a
48 riverwide consensus about the scope of these concerns
49 or solutions really has not emerged yet. There's still
50 debate. The proposals were last considered by the

1 Federal Board in December 2007. Neither of the
2 proposals were adopted at that time. Both proposals
3 were resubmitted by the Eastern Council in 2008. Their
4 request was based on new information that would be
5 available to the Board at that time.

6
7 Proposal 12, as you know, would reduce
8 the maximum gillnet mesh size to seven and a half
9 inches, and Proposal 13 would reduce the depth of
10 gillnets greater than six inches to 35 meshes deep for
11 commercial and subsistence chinook salmon fisheries in
12 all Federal public waters of the Yukon River.

13
14 In 2009, the Council requested a
15 modification of Proposal 12, the Eastern Council did,
16 to reduce maximum mesh size to six inches, but they
17 were told that their initial proposal would have to be
18 considered first and a new proposal submitted on mesh
19 size would have to be offered during the next Federal
20 regulatory cycle which began in February 2010 and that
21 window for making proposals will end on March 24th.

22
23 The Federal Board met in January 2009
24 and agreed to a request made by the Alaska Department
25 of Fish and Game to delay any action on these proposals
26 until after the Alaska Board of Fisheries could
27 consider these issues of gear selectivity during its
28 January 2010 meeting.

29
30 The Council also submitted proposals to
31 the Board of Fisheries to reduce the maximum gillnet
32 mesh size to six inches and a maximum depth of 35
33 meshes for that Board of Fisheries meeting. I will
34 provide now an overview of the more detailed
35 information in the written draft analysis that you have
36 before you. I'll do 12 first, as I said, and I'll take
37 some questions and then I'll do Proposal 13.

38
39 The draft Staff analysis for Proposal
40 12 that requests a maximum mesh size of seven and a
41 half inches updates the regulatory background harvest
42 and stock status information for Yukon River chinook
43 salmon provided the Board when it considered the
44 proposal in 2007. The analysis also provides some new
45 information from studies that have been recently
46 completed.

47
48 Additional analysis of available data,
49 an update on published studies and recent actions by
50 the Alaska Board of Fisheries regarding size, selective

1 fisheries. I'll go over the Staff assessment of the
2 effect of the proposal and, finally, the OSM Staff
3 recommendation.

4
5 The Eastern Interior Council's proposal
6 would be phased in over a three-year period for
7 subsistence users and one year for commercial users to
8 reduce the economic burden and match the useful life of
9 most nets, which the Council identifies as three to
10 four years. It's important to not get confused with
11 what the Board of Fisheries did in January and what the
12 original proposal by Eastern Interior says because
13 that's what you're going to be considering here today.
14 That one had a different length of time for
15 implementation.

16
17 A summary of the recent Board of
18 Fisheries action is presented on Page 6 of your
19 analysis. The State Board was given basically the same
20 information by the Department of Fish and Game Staff
21 and they were also given a special presentation by
22 Dr. Jeff Bromaghin with USGS that was provided in the
23 analysis you have, the Federal analysis. That special
24 study that Dr. Bromaghin provided links mesh size
25 reduction and exploitation over a long period of time
26 and we'll talk about more of that here as we go through
27 the analysis.

28
29 After extensive public testimony from
30 stakeholders, Yukon River Advisory Committee and
31 Regional Councils, the State Board reduced the maximum
32 mesh size of gillnets as you heard this morning of both
33 subsistence and commercial fisheries to seven and a
34 half inch mesh. That action has already taken place.
35 However, the Board of Fisheries offered a one-year
36 phase-in period and this change will then begin in
37 2011.

38
39 In addition, the State Board adopted
40 regulatory language giving State managers emergency
41 order authority to establish fisheries closure intended
42 to pass pulses of chinook salmon through Alaskan
43 fisheries to upper river spawning areas with little or
44 no harvest. That was another action that they took at
45 the Board of Fisheries meeting.

46
47 The intent of this action is to protect
48 the first pulse of chinook salmon known to contain a
49 high percentage of upper river spawning fish. At the
50 Board of Fisheries meeting fishermen from all areas of

1 the river testified during their committee process that
2 this rolling closure protecting the first pulse as it
3 migrated upriver seemed to be effective. It seemed to
4 work last year. Upper river fishermen reported seeing
5 larger numbers and larger sized fish.

6
7 The biological background in the
8 Federal analysis begins on Page 9. The draft analysis
9 provides a summary of historic catches, exploitation
10 levels, escapement and fecundity, eggs per female,
11 information on Page 9 through 13. This information is
12 there for you to provide some basic information about
13 stock status and harvest of Yukon chinook salmon.

14
15 I'm going to focus in my presentation
16 on the new information. For the ADF&G age consistency
17 study, these findings are presented on Page 13. This
18 study was actually looking at how good the aging is on
19 the scales. So ADF&G did a study where they had labs
20 independently age scales and then they compared the
21 results with their own aging and they came up with some
22 interesting results. That's, as I said, presented on
23 Page 13.

24
25 First of all, the age eight fish, the
26 oldest age fish that we see on the Yukon, and a portion
27 of the seven year old fish, these are the largest fish,
28 were the source of the greatest inconsistency in scale
29 aging. The inconsistency was caused by reading a
30 second freshwater growth on the scales. It's important
31 to note that all age eight fish have this extra
32 freshwater age area on their scale. In some years a
33 high percentage of the seven year old fish can have it
34 as well. This means that it's difficult to
35 substantiate claims that the age eight fish have
36 actually been extirpated, eliminated.

37
38 In addition, interregional comparisons of
39 the age seven fish may not be totally reliable for time
40 periods when a high percentage of these two freshwater
41 annuli fish are observed. So you have to take that
42 into consideration when you look at these trends. Age
43 seven fish are an important though variable and usually
44 small component of the run. Most of the age seven fish
45 have only the one freshwater check. Some years there
46 can be a higher percentage.

47
48 Information documenting declining size
49 of Yukon River chinook salmon is presented on Pages 14
50 and 15 of your analysis. Although limited, time series

1 available from commercial harvests and escapements do
2 show a decline in size for the larger, older fish.
3 There is a small decline. The ADF&G analysis that
4 compared this showed what appears to be a lot of 10-
5 year fluctuation in size of larger, older fish when you
6 look across time. This kind of a fluctuation often
7 suggests environmental conditions probably are causing
8 some of these changes. However, there's also a subtle
9 overall gradual decrease in size over time.

10

11 So these two things that Dan Bergstrom
12 talked about, he said that it's hard to separate the
13 environment from possible selectivity of fisheries. So
14 science can't tell you exactly what's causing the
15 changes, but it appears environment is involved and
16 there is a slow, gradual decrease over time has also
17 been observed. We just can't say what factor, what's
18 actually causing it. However, observational data, as I
19 said, can't really tell us why.

20

21 Both Dr. Bromaghin's analysis and what
22 the Department of Fish and Game provided the State
23 Board suggests that subtle changes in the genetics of
24 the fish, like size or the age at which the fish
25 mature, probably is occurring, but they're going to be
26 mass. It's going to be hard to see these because of
27 the highly variable changes in the environment.

28

29 The State Board was also told that
30 fishery scientists have raised many concerns about size
31 selective effects of fishing gear for many years and
32 that numerous recent modeling studies were also raising
33 strong -- these are theoretical warnings to managers
34 about the long-term impact of selective removal of
35 larger, older, more fecund, more eggs in the fish, in
36 the spawning stocks and this can affect the gene pool
37 or the genetics of the fish. The Federal analysis
38 discussed this information on Pages 15 through 17.

39

40 Specific treatment of Yukon River
41 chinook salmon modeling studies were presented to the
42 State Board in a written report by the Department of
43 Fish and Game and then again, as I mentioned by Dr.
44 Bromaghin's modeling of long term changes resulting
45 from selective gillnet fishing. The analysis presents
46 this information on Pages 16 and 17. I've provided a
47 more detailed summary of Dr. Bromaghin's long term
48 modeling study and that's in Appendix A. That begins
49 on Page 30.

50

1 The ADF&G analysis presented a
2 comparison of management options employing gillnet mesh
3 size and fishery exploitation. That was the
4 presentation you just heard earlier today. The
5 comparison showed that although both reducing mesh size
6 and decreasing exploitation could effectively reduce
7 harvest of larger, older fish. The reduction in mesh
8 size would also allow more fishing opportunity.

9
10 The draft Federal analysis attempts to
11 highlight findings from Dr. Bromaghin's model of the
12 effect of long-term highly size selective gillnet mesh
13 size harvest on a model salmon population based largely
14 on parameters, on inputs, that are relevant to Yukon
15 River salmon, and he looks at various management
16 scenarios.

17
18 This study showed that a model chinook
19 salmon population would decrease in length in age at
20 maturity rapidly over a 50-year period of intensive
21 selective fishing. Then it would stabilize for 150
22 years with the age at maturity and the size of the fish
23 being much smaller and the fish being younger. As a
24 result, fecundity and stock productivity would also
25 decline.

26
27 When he then took steps in his
28 evaluation to try to rebuild the stocks to their pre-
29 fishery condition, he found that reduction of mesh size
30 in addition to reduction of harvest rates and exceeding
31 the escapement levels producing maximum sustained yield
32 where needed to restore the stocks.

33
34 Pages 17 through 23 provides an
35 analysis of gillnet mesh sizes that would optimally
36 reduce the size of chinook salmon captured that would
37 maintain harvest efficiencies for chinook salmon but
38 not dramatically increase summer chum harvest. Eight
39 and a half inch and seven and a half inch meshes were
40 compared. This analysis determined that reducing the
41 mesh size to no larger than seven and a half inches
42 would increase the size of chinook salmon reaching the
43 spawning grounds while modestly increasing summer chum
44 harvest.

45
46 The analysis is based on a large
47 dataset collected by the Department of Fish and Game at
48 Pilot Station sonar test fisheries, but these data may
49 not represent fishing methods employed by commercial
50 and subsistence fishermen. All these test fisheries,

1 as I think you know, are done by Department Staff.

2

3 Related to this information Appendix B,
4 found on Pages 35 through 37, provides a discussion of
5 gillnets, how they are measured, how they catch fish
6 and what is known about drop-out mortality of gillnets.
7 This is provided on Pages 36 and 37.

8

9 The lower river mesh size study, which
10 was presented this morning, which Dan Bergstrom
11 presented that, this employed local commercial
12 fishermen and it was conducted by the Department of
13 Fish and Game and the Yukon Delta Fisheries Development
14 Association. It was done 2007 through 2009. The
15 conclusions of this work are presented on Pages 22 and
16 23.

17

18 As Dan said, the results of this study
19 were presented to the State Board. The work
20 demonstrated that reducing gillnet mesh size to seven
21 inches would change the species composition of the
22 fisheries with many more chum salmon being caught and
23 the catch would be composed of smaller, younger chinook
24 salmon, more four and five year olds.

25

26 Changing to eight inch or seven and a
27 half inch mesh would decrease the size composition of
28 the catch compared to the present unrestricted mesh
29 fishery. However reduction to seven and a half inch
30 mesh would target somewhat younger and smaller fish and
31 fewer larger older fish without harvesting a large
32 number of chum salmon. So that was considered the best
33 option.

34

35 On Page 23, the effects of the proposal
36 were summarized. Positive effects include increasing
37 size and age at maturity of the escapement, increasing
38 the fecundity or the number of eggs that would get to
39 the spawning grounds and that would increase
40 productivity hopefully and would help protect the
41 genetic integrity of the fishery.

42

43 Negative effects would include the high
44 cost of replacing or modifying existing gear and the
45 need to find markets for increased harvest of summer
46 chums because seven and a half inch mesh will increase
47 somewhat the harvest of summer chum.

48

49 On Page 24, the Office of Subsistence
50 Management preliminary conclusion and justification is

1 to support a modification of the Eastern Interior
2 Council's proposed regulatory language and that's
3 presented there on Page 24. The modified regulatory
4 language would establish a maximum seven and a half
5 inch mesh size limit for gillnets for subsistence
6 fisheries in Federal public waters with a one-year
7 phase-in to align Federal and State regulations to take
8 affect during the 2011 Fishing season.

9

10 That concludes my overview of the
11 Federal Staff analysis and I'd be happy now to take
12 your questions.

13

14 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question. Charlie
17 Brown.

18

19 MR. BROWN: I'm just wondering about
20 those fish that got into saltwater to freshwater. How
21 long are they supposed to survive after they come in
22 from high seas saltwater to freshwater? How long are
23 they suppose to survive?

24

25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Rich.

26

27 MR. CANNON: Through the Chair to Mr.
28 Brown. Well, the fish that come in, in many cases,
29 have a very long journey to go up to the spawning
30 grounds, both in Alaska and Canada, and it can be many
31 months of moving up the river and then going on to the
32 spawning grounds to actually spawn.

33

34 MR. BROWN: I heard from those Canadian
35 people that by the time they reached their border their
36 meat is -- they're not as strong as this area. They're
37 kind of mushy meat. That's why I asked. Do they reach
38 the ground before they die?

39

40 MR. CANNON: Through the Chair to Mr.
41 Brown. The fish do have a long journey and as they're
42 going up the river they use up their body reserves and
43 so they change, as you said and as the Canadian
44 fishermen reported. The color of the flesh changes.
45 They become -- many times will get fungus on their
46 bodies as they actually reach the spawning grounds.

47

48 Again, our whole objective, you know,
49 in terms of how we try to manage the fisheries is to
50 get those fish to the spawning grounds so that they can

1 spawn. We hope that most of them that get into the
2 river can make it up to the spawning grounds. Not all
3 of them obviously do, but we hope that most of them do.

4 MR. BROWN: My last one is about the
5 water temp. What's the difference between the cold
6 water to the Canadian water temp like?

7
8 MR. CANNON: Through the Chair to Mr.
9 Brown. I think what you're referring to, as the fish
10 move from the ocean, the cold waters of the Bering Sea,
11 into the freshwater environment, especially up to the
12 smaller spawning streams, the water temperatures can
13 increase and it does have an effect on the fish. But
14 these salmon have adapted to deal with some changes in
15 water temperature.

16
17 Concerns about increased disease,
18 mortality because of warm water, issues -- I'm sure
19 you've heard presentations about the ichthyophonus
20 parasite infestation and its relationship to warm
21 water. All those things can be a concern about warming
22 water, but most of the fish, we hope, enough of them
23 get to the spawning grounds so that we can have future
24 runs.

25
26 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

27
28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Rich, you mentioned
29 Bromaghin's report several times as you were going
30 through here and it sounds to me like perhaps it's
31 getting kind of widespread acceptance within the
32 management community as far as what's brought out
33 through that model. Was there anything further
34 offered, perhaps a determination as to what stage we
35 may be in that 50-year cycle
36 that he presents?

37
38 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman. Dr.
39 Bromaghin's model does look at a number of different
40 scenarios with different ways of rebuilding the run and
41 he looks at changing mesh size to seven and a half inch
42 and then different types of management with different
43 exploitation and then subsequent escapements. Putting
44 the present fishery, our existing fishery, the real
45 fishery on that time frame is, in my analysis or the
46 OSM analysis, we can provide an indication of where
47 that may be. It really shows a general trend.

48
49 If you look at Appendix A, the analysis
50 suggests that we probably are in a scenario where we're

1 seeing a gradual reduction, but we still have seven
2 year olds, we're still making escapement. Exploitation
3 rates have been reduced. So I think that based on that
4 kind of assessment the trend that we're seeing is still
5 a positive one. That by making some changes now we
6 could avoid a lot of the dire consequences that some of
7 the scenarios in his model are making.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray, you had your
10 hand up earlier.

11

12 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13 Mr. Cannon, you mentioned that there's been long
14 history and debate on the mesh size and depth. How
15 long has this seven and a half inch gear been studied
16 for?

17

18 MR. CANNON: Through the Chair to Mr.
19 Oney. The studies where they've actually taken mesh
20 sizes out and compared them have only been done by the
21 Department in cooperation with the CDQ group in the
22 lower Yukon over just that three year period. That's
23 the only time there's actually been a direct study in
24 the Yukon River of those mesh sizes.

25

26 MR. ONEY: Thank you. The first time
27 I've heard about that seven and a half inch study was
28 during that meeting up at Fairbanks. You also
29 mentioned that you're going to be aligning the ADF&G
30 for seven and a half mesh size for both subsistence and
31 commercial?

32

33 MR. CANNON: Through the Chair. Mr.
34 Oney, that is the preliminary Staff recommendation.

35

36 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman. Thank you,
37 Mr. Cannon. I still have concerns about the Federal
38 qualified users that are going to be making this change
39 within the year. I have no problem with the commercial
40 users, but the Federally qualified users are the ones
41 that are going to be having a hard time trying to make
42 this change within a short period of time. We need
43 those fish. We need to rely on those fish for our
44 survival so I am concerned about that.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob Aloysius.

49

50 MR. ALOYSIUS: The trend, did it take

1 into consideration the commercial fishing and the
2 trawler fleet?

3

4 MR. CANNON: Through the Chair to Mr.
5 Aloysius. Are you talking about Dr. Bromaghin's study?

6

7 MR. ALOYSIUS: (Nods affirmatively)

8

9 MR. CANNON: No, it really didn't take
10 that into consideration. It was mainly looking at an
11 in-river fishery.

12

13 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: James.

14

15 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16 This morning I mentioned about gear changes that I'm
17 against, but I've gone through mesh size changes on the
18 Kuskokwim. I'm not from Yukon, but I'm from Kuskokwim
19 and I've been fishing on the Kuskokwim River. Like I
20 mentioned this morning, I didn't mind commercial
21 fishing change gear, but subsistence is hard for people
22 changing gear size. We've changed mesh size for
23 commercial fishing on Kuskokwim, but I'm not a
24 biologist and I don't know what chinook is doing on
25 Kuskokwim river, but we're doing okay. Even we're
26 doing okay. There may be smaller fish on Kuskokwim now
27 because I live down close to the mouth of Kuskokwim at
28 Tuntutuliak and people using smaller gear, smaller mesh
29 size, are catching more king salmon than me when I was
30 using eight and a half. So people are volunteering --
31 we don't push that, but people themselves, like myself,
32 change gear as time goes on, seeing other people
33 catching more fish than people using larger gear or
34 larger mesh size. So I don't like to see gear changes
35 on the Yukon for subsistence fishing because they're
36 people like us on the Kuskokwim.

37

38 Thank you.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: If nothing further
41 maybe we can move on to Department of Fish and Game
42 comments.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
47 George Pappas, Department of Fish and Game. As I
48 offered the Eastern and Western Interior RAC, a lot of
49 information was presented by both the State and Federal
50 employees here, so I'll offer you three options. I can

1 read through our Department comments, which begins on
2 Page 38, I believe, in your handout, or I can touch on
3 a few items that were not discussed today or I could
4 read you our recommendation.

5
6 Your choice, sir.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: This is your chance
9 to make the Department's case. What do you think is
10 going to be the best served?

11
12 MR. PAPPAS: I can summarize from our
13 comments here some information that wasn't touched on
14 today so far. Otherwise a lot of my information would
15 be redundant.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay.

18
19 MR. PAPPAS: If adopted or not adopted
20 by the Federal Subsistence Board, there's always the
21 challenge of differing Federal and State regulations on
22 the river. If the Federal regulations differ from the
23 State regulations, there will be a conflicting
24 patchwork of waters under State and Federal regulations
25 which will create confusion amongst subsistence users.
26 Although use of fishwheels will not be directly
27 affected, adoption of this proposal would result in
28 effectively reallocating some harvest of larger chinook
29 from gillnet users to fishwheel operators.

30
31 For conservation issues, Yukon River
32 chinook salmon stock is currently classified as a yield
33 of concern. The majority of the Yukon River drainage
34 escapement goals have been met or exceeded since 2000,
35 including the Chena and Salcha Rivers, which are the
36 largest producers of chinook salmon in the United
37 States portion of the drainage.

38
39 The agreed to escapement objectives for
40 the Canadian mainstem was met every year from 2001
41 through 2006 with 2001, 3 and 5 being the three highest
42 spawning escapements estimated on record. However, the
43 escapement objectives for the Canadian mainstem were
44 not met in 2007 and 2008. Exploitation rate on the
45 Canadian origin stock by Alaskan fishermen has changed
46 from an average of about 55 percent, from 1989 to 1998,
47 to an average of about 44 percent from the years 2004
48 through 2008.

49
50 Although the subsistence harvest

1 continues to remain stable, near 50,000 chinook salmon
2 annually, commercial harvest has decreased over 60
3 percent from an average of 100,000 annually, which was
4 from '89 to '98, to the recent five year harvest
5 average of about 23,000 fish and that's from 2005 to
6 2009. However, increasing the number of larger and
7 older chinook salmon in the spawning escapements will
8 provide for better future production potential.

9

10 Some other issues I want to mention
11 today. The Department requests that maps are needed to
12 show the specific boundaries and areas where Federal
13 regulations are claimed to apply along with providing
14 justification for those claims claiming those
15 boundaries. Also a large percentage of lands along
16 the Yukon River are State or private lands where
17 Federal subsistence users cannot use gear types illegal
18 under State regulations.

19

20 The Federal Subsistence Board does not
21 have any authority to adopt gillnet mesh size
22 regulations that would apply to State, commercial or
23 subsistence fisheries.

24

25 For the Department's recommendation,
26 the Department supports with modification to become
27 effective in 2011 for Federal subsistence fisheries.
28 The Federal Subsistence Board deferred taking action on
29 this proposal in 2008 until the Alaska Board of
30 Fisheries reviewed the results of the three year
31 comparative mesh size study. The Alaska Board of
32 Fisheries did adopt a maximum mesh size of 7.5 inches
33 for the subsistence and commercial gillnets effective
34 in 2011 in the Yukon area at its meeting January 26 to
35 31 in 2010. That's concludes my comments. Mr. Chair,
36 I can answer questions.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I've got one. You
43 mentioned kind of in passing, you reference that there
44 are State subsistence fisheries where there are not
45 Federally allowed subsistence fisheries. Can you
46 clarify a little bit more on that phrase.

47

48 MR. PAPPAS: Your question was are
49 there State subsistence fisheries where there are not
50 Federal subsistence fisheries?

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: That's kind of what
2 I heard. I mean you were running through there pretty
3 quick, but that's what I thought I heard you say.

4
5 MR. PAPPAS: Yes. As Dan had mentioned
6 earlier, there are sections of the Yukon River that are
7 not within Federal jurisdiction because they're not
8 surrounded by Federal public lands. There are sections
9 of the river where only State subsistence fisheries do
10 take place.

11
12 Mr. Chair.

13
14 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: That would be like
15 the corporation lands is essentially what you're
16 speaking of that are not immediately adjacent?

17
18 Dan Bergstrom.

19
20 MR. BERGSTROM: Yeah, Mr. Chair. It
21 would be areas that aren't along a conservation unit,
22 like a refuge, so there's sections that would be like
23 the upper portion of the Kuskokwim, like the YK Delta
24 Refuge, that goes into just State.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions. Go
27 ahead, Ray.

28
29 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
30 George, you mentioned about conservation issues earlier
31 in your comments. Like I mentioned earlier, everybody
32 needs to be in the same boat if we're going to conserve
33 any of the larger king salmon, so that involves all the
34 users up and down the Yukon, whether it be fishwheel
35 catchers or gillnet catchers, so everybody needs to be
36 in the same boat if we're going to conserve any of the
37 larger kings.

38
39 Thank you.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Anything further.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, George.
46 We're up to Federal, State and Tribal agency comments.
47 Tim Andrew.

48
49 MR. ANDREW: Good afternoon, Mr.
50 Chairman. Members of the YK Council. My name is

1 Timothy Andrew. I'm the director of natural resources
2 for AVCP. What happened during the Alaska Board of
3 Fisheries meeting, we had submitted RC No. 84, which
4 basically received widespread support as an alternative
5 from the current action that the Board took, but
6 received widespread support from the lower Yukon River
7 all the way up into the middle part of the Yukon River
8 for those people that were present. That RC basically
9 called for status quo and also to allow the Department
10 flexibility to initiate windows regulation. Also have
11 closures to protect the first run and also subsequent
12 runs from high exploitation rates.

13

14 For the people that attended the
15 meeting there at the Board of Fish meeting in Fairbanks
16 felt that this was the least cost, least invasive
17 solution to some of the conservation concerns that the
18 proponents were pursuing in these proposals that they
19 had submitted to the Board.

20

21 The thing that we were really very much
22 concerned about are the number of net users from the
23 mouth of the Yukon River, from the coastal areas of the
24 Yukon River up to perhaps all the way up to the
25 Canadian border and having to change over from their
26 normal net sizes, whatever net size they use. It might
27 be up to nine inch or eight inch, whatever it may be.
28 It would be a considerable expense for them to turn
29 back to a seven and a half inch mesh gear.

30

31 The other concern that we have is if
32 the Federal system were to reduce the mesh gear from
33 whatever it is now, like I am using eight and three-
34 quarter in my two nets that I have for the Yukon River,
35 if we were to reduce down to seven and a half inch
36 gear, we were afraid that whatever conservation
37 measures that we are taking to protect the large stocks
38 would be reallocated to perhaps the fishwheel users or
39 perhaps the limited sportfishery that is occurring or
40 into the Canadian commercial or personal use fishery.

41

42 So our best possible solution was to
43 make sure that everybody shared in the burden of
44 conservation, which had occurred this past summer.
45 Nobody benefitted. Everybody suffered basically the
46 same all the way up from the mouth of the Yukon River
47 into the Canadian waters as well. Well, no, excuse me,
48 the Canadians did have a commercial fishery. They did
49 have a very good escapement into Canada this past year,
50 so they really benefited from the suffering of the

1 Alaskan side or the conservation measures that were
2 taken this past summer.

3
4 The other thing that we were really
5 concerned about is the accounting of the salmon that
6 are going up the river. If the exploitation rate is
7 considerably decreased in the lower part of the river,
8 the exploitation rate would still continue to be the
9 same all the way in the upriver districts like the
10 customary trade subsistence fisheries.

11
12 When we're taking our conservation
13 measures to reduce our harvest and the harvest
14 basically remains the same further up the river,
15 there's really no savings at all. It just makes the
16 lower people suffer more and bearing the burden of
17 conservation while others continue the same. So the
18 customary trade must be controlled, it must be
19 accounted for. We must account for all the mortality
20 of the salmon.

21
22 The other thing is the mesh study
23 presentation, it was mentioned the causes and trends
24 are still unknown. We don't know if it's because of
25 long term mesh -- large mesh size us or is it
26 environment conditions that are occurring that's
27 causing the decline.

28
29 Bigler did a study in 1996 which
30 basically showed that all the salmon in the Pacific
31 Northwest including chinook salmon were declining in
32 age with the exception of two areas, British Columbia
33 and California, were the only two areas that were
34 showing a decline. You must also know that in many of
35 these areas they don't have any large mesh gear in
36 which they do a commercial fishery or a subsistence
37 fishery or First Nations fishery.

38
39 In the Alaska portion, Bristol Bay was
40 showing a decline and I believe there was a limited
41 large mesh gear fishery that does occur there. In the
42 Kuskokwim River there was a decline as well as James
43 had mentioned earlier. On the Kuskokwim there's no
44 large mesh gear commercial fishery, utilization for the
45 commercial fishery, but they do continue to use large
46 mesh for subsistence fishery. The Yukon River it's
47 also showing a decline as well. It's really important
48 to keep in mind there are other systems showing a
49 decline and a lot of those may not be related to large
50 mesh.

1 The other areas I'd like to mention are
2 the cautions that are in Staff analysis on Page 16,
3 third paragraph down. It says demonstrating that
4 gillnet mesh size selectivity is the primary cause for
5 decreased size of Yukon River chinook salmon, is
6 difficult with available data from the fishery for
7 several reasons. Number one, reliable long-term for
8 Yukon River fisheries are limited.

9
10 Number two, genetic changes and traits
11 such as body size or age at maturation are likely
12 subtle and expressed over many generations of salmon.

13
14 Number three, gear related decreases in
15 size may be masked by environmental factors thought to
16 be reducing the size of salmon species returning from
17 the ocean. So even in the Staff analysis there are
18 some cautions there, inherent cautions there that you
19 should take into consideration as well.

20
21 On Page 23 it would lend support or it
22 would show that the foregone harvest of the large
23 salmon on the lower part of the river. In this case
24 Staff felt that they would allow more fecund females to
25 spawn. That's not completely and totally true. That
26 could be reallocated to perhaps the fishwheel fishery
27 as Rich had mentioned earlier.

28
29 The other thing to take into
30 consideration is on the lower part of the Yukon River.
31 Our harvest of the Canadian portion is something like
32 50 percent according to some of the studies that have
33 been done. In District Y5, which is from the Tanana
34 and Yukon River confluence to the Canadian border, it's
35 anywhere from 75 to 100 percent Canadian component that
36 is being harvested in that area.

37
38 So whatever salmon that they take,
39 whatever large salmon that are heading to Canada or to
40 the upper parts of the Yukon River are being taken more
41 per fish than we are on this lower part of the Yukon
42 River. In order to achieve 75 percent harvest, we
43 would have to at least harvest two to three times more
44 salmon, while their effort is very limited and they
45 would get the 75 to 100 percent harvest.

46
47 The other concern about seven and a
48 half inches in years of extreme summer chum abundance,
49 which we have seen on the Yukon River in the past,
50 where we see millions and millions of summer chum come

1 in with the king salmon. You know, all of us have
2 limited amount of space in our smokehouses to produce
3 salmon to feed our families.

4
5 When a subsistence fisherman goes out
6 and targets king salmon with seven and a half inch gear
7 when there's a high abundance of summer chum, you will
8 likely get a whole bunch of summer chums. I don't know
9 what the ratios would be like, but what was shown by
10 the Department earlier it could possibly exponentiate
11 quite a bit in the harvest of summer chums. So it may
12 lead to an undue restriction on subsistence in our
13 subsistence harvest of king salmon on the lower part of
14 the Yukon River in times of relative high abundance of
15 chum salmon.

16
17 And that is basically my comments and
18 I'd be happy to answer any questions if you have any.

19
20 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions for AVCP.
23 James.

24
25 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
26 Has AVCP been participating in the research on the
27 Yukon like they do on Kuskokwim?

28
29 MR. ANDREW: We don't have any spawning
30 streams on the lower part of the river with the
31 exception of the Andreafsky River weir. We do
32 participate to a limited extent in providing some
33 support to the summer youth camps or summer youth
34 programs at the Andreafsky weir, but we don't have any
35 spawning streams within the lower part of the Yukon
36 River. We do provide a sonar tech at Pilot Station as
37 well. I believe that's basically it as far as our
38 participation.

39
40 MR. CHARLES: How about subsistence
41 catch research, like asking people how they're doing at
42 the lower Yukon or up in the middle or up above? I was
43 curious last fall, September, when I was at Holy Cross.
44 Something came up to my mind to ask a person how did
45 you guys do on fishing this summer and they said they
46 did okay and you downriver were not doing so good. So
47 have you asked people like that up and down the river?

48
49 MR. ANDREW: We haven't really
50 conducted any type of real scientific research to be

1 able to produce any kind of scientific report, but we
2 do ask people anecdotally how their harvests have been
3 throughout the summer.

4
5 This past June we took a press team
6 from here that consisted of a person from KTUU, Tundra
7 Drums and from the Delta Discovery and there was one
8 other person, but we took them on a press tour on the
9 lower part of the Yukon River and they basically did
10 how Harry did, two or three, maybe 10 king salmon. At
11 that time, it was June 29th. That was all the king
12 salmon that they got for the entire summer and a lot of
13 them indicated that they did not get their subsistence
14 needs for king salmon this past year. They didn't get
15 the slabs put up or the strips put up for the winter.

16
17 A lot of them had chum salmon and a lot
18 of them were saying what are we going to do. You know,
19 for years they have depended on the resource and now
20 they had scaled back so much in order to provide for
21 the Canadian escapement to be where it was this past
22 summer.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Charlie Brown.

25
26 MR. BROWN: Yeah. I'm just wondering
27 about that sonar they were talking about this morning
28 located in Pilot Station. Does the water go up and
29 down, incoming tide or from the rain?

30
31 MR. ANDREW: If you don't mind, Mr.
32 Chair, I'd like to have the Department answer that.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Dan, did you get
35 that question? Charlie was wondering the status of the
36 Pilot Station sonar and the effect on the water levels
37 that you experienced this year.

38
39 MR. BERGSTROM: Mr. Chair. I think the
40 main problems at Pilot Station this year was there was
41 high water for a long period of time and then a really
42 high silt load develops. I think probably people might
43 see that in the Kuskokwim too. When it's really high
44 the silt buildup was so great that it was hard to see
45 with the sonar. They couldn't see as far out. So that
46 was a difficulty. One of the plans now is to try and
47 look for some different locations or if we might be
48 able to get a little further downstream. Then there's
49 another idea to have a side scan sonar that would look
50 actually downward and see if that would help in those

1 type of situations.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: DIDSON wouldn't
4 work. You need clear water for that, correct?

5

6 MR. BERGSTROM: We do have a DIDSON on
7 the in-shore on at least the south bank. Even when
8 that silt gets that big it starts to affect that one
9 too.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Follow up.

12

13 MR. BROWN: Because one time they
14 weren't planning to put sonar in the mouth of the
15 Kuskokwim when I used to conduct the test fishery down
16 there and that was problem, because the water is moving
17 every day. Six hours later they go down and the next
18 six hours it goes back and that was the problem. So I
19 don't really trust that sonar system.

20

21 One time I was driving on the main
22 channel when I was looking for the number of fish, I
23 was going zigzag and I reached that point across from
24 tongue side where it's 60 feet deep, so I stretched out
25 my 45 mesh net and in the picture of the sonar it's
26 just a small portion. Couldn't reach the good number
27 of salmon running below that net. I just only caught a
28 few in my lead line. That's why it brought my concern
29 out because the sonars.....

30

31 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: That will be a
32 subject for a different part of the agenda. Right now
33 we're on agency comments. We can get back to that at
34 another time.

35

36 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any other
39 questions, comments for AVCP.

40 Ray.

41

42 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
43 Tim, thank you for bringing up that customary trade.
44 It's been ongoing for a long time ever since I've been
45 on the YK RAC. I remember the concern they had in St.
46 Mary's a couple years back and that's still ongoing and
47 that needs to be looked at and taken seriously. That
48 needs to be controlled. Also the catch ratio between
49 districts. There was a presentation that was done by
50 ADF&G during that Board of Fish meeting in Fairbanks.

1 The take on the lower end is very limited compared to
2 the whole Yukon further up, so we're done subsistence
3 fishing within a week after the fish start hitting the
4 Yukon.

5

6 Thank you.

7

8 MR. ANDREW: There were some very
9 strong comments by representatives in the Eastern
10 Interior. One of them had indicated that this past
11 year somebody had bought a pretty good size truck with
12 customary trade sales. I don't know how much the truck
13 was worth, but he mentioned the amount of sale that he
14 had to generate or how many salmon it would take to
15 generate sales to buy a pretty good sized vehicle.

16

17 The other comment that was made by the
18 other representative from the Eastern Interior RAC was
19 that it doesn't matter what kind of conservation
20 measures that we institute if we do not get control of
21 the customary trade and the harvest that is associated
22 with it, our conservation efforts wouldn't bear fruit.
23 There has been ideas of perhaps initiating a permit
24 system for people so we can know how many salmon are
25 being taken, how many salmon are being sold, who is
26 doing it just for the purpose of basically a commercial
27 fishery and who's doing it just on a limited amount.

28

29 If we develop a permit system to
30 control the trade, it would greatly provide numbers for
31 our conservation efforts as well. I'm kind of drifting
32 off the subject, Mr. Chair.

33

34 My apologies.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: No, it's part of
37 your testimony. I think it's relevant. I was actually
38 going to follow up on it if Ray hadn't. Since it's on
39 the table at the moment, is there any works in progress
40 to actually address that as far as something we'll be
41 looking at as an action before the Council sometime in
42 the future?

43

44 MR. ANDREW: I know the Federal
45 subsistence management system is really reluctant to
46 put any kind of regulation for customary trade because
47 it's so diverse and all across the state of Alaska.
48 But as far as salmon on the Yukon River it is pretty
49 diverse. It's still there. I mean there are a lot of
50 people, even on the RACs, that participate in customary

1 trade in one form or another.

2

3 At the Fairbanks meeting, between my
4 counterpart and I, the TCC director of natural
5 resources, we thought about a permit system that could
6 possibly be proposed to control customary trade and get
7 the numbers, the accurate numbers and, you know, put a
8 damper on some of the people that participate in
9 customary trade during the AFN convention and get it
10 down to something enforceable.

11

12 On the State side it's illegal to sell
13 salmon strips, it's illegal to sell salmon without
14 being processed through a licensed facility. In the
15 Federal side, it's supposed to be illegal to sell
16 salmon processed. You can only sell it under customary
17 trade regulations. I don't know why law enforcement
18 has such a hard time enforcing that law. Perhaps we
19 have to put the pressure on the regional director,
20 Office of Subsistence Management, office of law
21 enforcement, the State Troopers. Get them out there
22 and enforce the law to control customary trade.
23 Otherwise it's just going to do away with what
24 conservation measures that we take.

25

26 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Again, just
27 following up on this, you don't have anything prepared
28 or in the works that might be coming forward to the
29 Federal Subsistence Board to incorporate into this
30 whole chinook salmon concern for the Yukon River and
31 roll it into the package here and their eventual
32 action.

33

34 MR. ANDREW: Yeah, AVCP does not have
35 it at this point. We were supposed to work together to
36 develop a permitting scheme or permitting mechanism or
37 proposed permitting mechanism for customary trade. I
38 believe Gene Sandone may take a lead on that. I'm not
39 sure.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Again, you know,
42 you've mentioned you've got to approach it very
43 cautiously since it is a diversity across the state,
44 but putting it in specifically for the concerns of the
45 Yukon River chinook conservation I think might be
46 something appropriate because the Board is moving on it
47 right now. It's part of the whole large controversial
48 issue on regulatory action by these various boards.

49

50 Any other questions.

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, Tim.

4

5 MR. ANDREW: Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: InterAgency Staff
8 comments. Who presents those. Mr. Probasco.

9

10 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. My comments
11 sort of serve as a clarification and as a guideline
12 where the Council may want to go as far as it pertains
13 to customary trade. I think Mr. Andrew hit the nail on
14 the head when he said that the issue isn't the
15 customary trade regulations themselves, it's the
16 enforcement of the regs.

17

18 What we see and what we hear through
19 rumors or what you've actually seen as far as processed
20 subsistence caught fish being sold is illegal under
21 both Federal and State regs. Federal regulations,
22 customary trade, has to meet the State's laws as far as
23 processing requirements. So the key, like Mr. Andrew
24 said, is the enforcement of that.

25

26 For the Council, as far as tying it all
27 into the chinook issue is you have a couple
28 opportunities. You can make it in your comments or you
29 can actually outline that in your letter to the Board
30 that you do annually. So you have those two and you
31 can probably do them both.

32

33 Mr. Chair.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: That was
36 InterAgency comments for Proposal FP12?

37

38 MR. PROBASCO: I just wanted to clarify
39 that before we get there and I'll turn it over to Rich
40 or whoever.

41

42 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, Pete.
45 Is anybody coming forward for the InterAgency Staff
46 comments.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We'll be getting to

1 public comments here in about -- I see some hands
2 waiving back there. Local Advisory Committee comments.
3 Harry Wilde.

4

5 MR. H. WILDE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman.
6 Right now, today and last year, elders like me even we
7 are afraid to go out there and even some of them are
8 afraid to go out to fish camps. You know, I went
9 through U.S./Canada negotiations from the start and
10 looking at those people. When we get down to lower
11 Yukon, that seems to me where the trouble starts.

12

13 Like I used to be a fish collector and
14 then quite awhile back all the way up to Marshal and
15 above, people are just working together and all that,
16 but not today. You know that most of the time the
17 lower Yukon is most of the blame. Never think about
18 out in the ocean those people or fishermen and ships
19 and all that that are catching fish.

20

21 Just like looking at current issue of
22 the month, North Pacific Fisheries in 2007 threw away
23 700,000 kings. Seems to me nobody bothers them. And
24 then 2007 there was 122,000 king salmon and the study
25 shows that 140,000 somewhere around there belongs to
26 Yukon River. Nobody bothered them. U.S. Fish and
27 Wildlife, Federal people, they work here with this
28 North Pacific Fisheries. They don't talk about it.
29 Must be nothing wrong out there even though they can
30 throw away a lot of fish, Yukon king salmon.

31

32 It really bothers a lot of people.
33 Mostly elder are alert all the time and they limit what
34 they could get. It really bothers me. It really hurts
35 me the way they're saying that one family there they
36 throw away their fish in the fish camp. When they ask
37 me that's the way they're supposed to do, I didn't say
38 nothing because I don't know.

39

40 I think we have to do something as a
41 Yukon/Kuskokwim Advisory Council. Right now that
42 congressman out there is waiting for us what we have to
43 do, what the problem we have, but nobody seems to me
44 don't have no problem

45

46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We do have that
47 coming up on the agenda following these two proposals
48 under Item B and C, will be addressing one of them
49 specifically about bycatch for us to take action.

50

1 MR. H. WILDE: Okay.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Summary of written
4 public comments. Alex.

5

6 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Members of the
7 Council. I don't have a summary of public comments at
8 this moment, but we just received a packet of comments
9 from Yukon Delta Fisheries Development Association.
10 They listed comments by OSM, State of Alaska. Instead
11 of reading the OSM and State comments, I will just go
12 ahead and with your permission read this organization's
13 comments, Mr. Chair, recommendation.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Your intent is to
16 read all 13, 14 pages, 15 pages?

17

18 MR. NICK: No, no. Just the
19 recommendation from that organization, Mr. Chair.
20 Their recommendation, there is no difference between
21 the Office of Subsistence Management and the State of
22 Alaska recommendation except the wording. Therefore we
23 recommend that YK Delta RAC support a proposal with the
24 OSM modification to the proposal. Opposing the
25 proposal would allow unrestricted mesh size to be used
26 in Federal subsistence fisheries while state
27 subsistence and commercial fisheries will be restricted
28 to 7.5 inch stretch mesh gillnets.

29

30 Justification. We agree with the draft
31 Staff analysis particularly with the below paragraph.
32 Although direct evidence that mesh size has adversely
33 affected genetic traits, including size of Yukon
34 chinook salmon, it is limited. The Staff analysis
35 provides reasons for addressing this issue. A
36 reduction of mesh size allowed in Federal public waters
37 of the Yukon River from unrestricted to maximum of 7.5
38 inch should allow more larger, older females to escape
39 the fisheries and pass on desirable heritable traits
40 size of age reduction of mesh size in combination with
41 other conservation actions should enhance the
42 productivity and health of runs and continued
43 sustainability of fisheries. Given the action taken by
44 the Board of Fish to limit gillnet size to 7.5 inches
45 in commercial and State managed subsistence fisheries
46 in the Yukon River drainage, the Federal regulation
47 need only address Federally qualified subsistence
48 users.

49

50 That's the extent of their comment, Mr.

1 Chair, on Proposal 12. I'll go ahead and read the
2 comment on Proposal 13.....

3
4 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: When we get to
5 Proposal 13.

6
7 MR. NICK:when we get to that.
8 Mr. Chair.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: For the record, I
11 certainly wish everybody could have had this and it
12 could have been again something that we had before. I
13 notice this is dated January 22nd. It certainly could
14 have been made available.

15
16 MR. NICK: Mr. Chairman.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: But also just for
19 other Council members, this says it's representing the
20 communities of Alakanuk, Emmonak, Grayling, Kotlik,
21 Mountain Village and Nunam Iqua.

22
23 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. We apologize,
24 but we got this during lunch.

25
26 Mr. Chair.

27
28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Moving on for
29 general public. One gentleman wished to speak,
30 Benjamin Phillip from Alakanuk.

31
32 MR. PHILLIP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
33 for having me speak and the rest of the Council
34 members. I have resolution No. 10-02-07 from Alakanuk
35 Traditional Council. The resolution of the Alakanuk
36 Traditional Council requesting the YK Regional Advisory
37 Council make it known to the Federal Subsistence Board
38 our concern of the recent State Board's decision to
39 reduce mesh size for the Yukon River commercial and
40 Federal qualified subsistence users. Whereas the
41 Alakanuk Traditional Council is a Federally recognized
42 tribal governing body for the Native Village of
43 Alakanuk and whereas the Council represents the
44 interests of the tribal members of Alakanuk and whereas
45 the recent meeting of the State Board of Fish held in
46 Fairbanks, Alaska, has made a decision to reduce the
47 mesh size to seven and a half inches for both
48 commercial and subsistence users on the Yukon River,
49 and whereas commercial fishermen will have an
50 opportunity to work with fish processors to make the

1 mesh size change and whereas the Federally qualified
2 users will not have this opportunity to make the change
3 on a mesh size, and whereas the mesh size restrictions
4 will cause financial hardship for Federally qualified
5 users to make the switch to seven and a half inches,
6 and whereas the Board of Fish did not take into
7 consideration the fishwheels in the upper Yukon River
8 to also contribute to the conservation of the chinook
9 salmon, and whereas if we are to conserve the big
10 chinook salmon all users along the Yukon River needs to
11 contribute their share in conservation. Therefore be
12 it resolved that the Alakanuk Traditional Council is
13 requesting the YK RAC make it known to the Federal
14 Subsistence Board our concern of the recent State Board
15 of Fish decision to reduce the mesh size to seven and a
16 half inches. This was certified on the 22nd of
17 February.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you,
20 Benjamin. Any questions for Alakanuk. Bob Aloysius.

21

22 MR. ALOYSIUS: Did the council oppose
23 or accept the findings of the Board of Game?

24

25 MR. PHILLIP: We did oppose the
26 restriction of the mesh size, but after the meeting up
27 in Fairbanks I guess this came into effect to go into
28 effect next year. Our concern is that the
29 non-commercial fishermen or the subsistence fishermen
30 will have financial hardship if they try to go from
31 their eight inch king nets to seven inch nets, whereas
32 the commercial fishermen can work with the fish buyers
33 to get new nets.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The only question I
36 have, this Yukon Delta Fisheries Development
37 Association, that mentions Alakanuk as being one. Is
38 that one of the other governmental bodies or do they
39 work from your tribal council? Is that under
40 consideration, do you know?

41

42 MR. PHILLIP: I don't know.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: If you don't,
45 that's okay.

46

47 MR. PHILLIP: I just know that
48 commercial fishermen can work with them to get the nets
49 to make the changes, maybe even this year to prepare
50 for next year.

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Further questions.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Quyana. We have
6 James Nicori from Kwethluk.

7

8 MR. NICORI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9 My name is James Nicori, Kwethluk IRA. I'm not from
10 the Yukon, but from my experience of fishing on the
11 Kuskokwim. Looking over these options that were
12 submitted we're dealing only with the mesh size.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: On this proposal,
15 yes, it's mesh size only.

16

17 MR. NICORI: And you know, on the
18 Kuskokwim side we did that too. The only thing that
19 really worked on our side was fishing on windows. We
20 had three days off and four days fishing real hard. No
21 discrimination on age or anybody. Anybody went fishing
22 four days really hard and three days we took off and
23 let all the fish go by. All that time I was fishing I
24 noticed that within three years there was increased
25 amount of king salmon and the size were increasing.
26 When we had three days of laying around getting ready
27 and we fished four days, that did not dig into our
28 pockets to change the size of the mesh size of the net
29 we used. We used the same nets that we used before it
30 was restricted. So that really worked for us.

31

32 I would recommend that the Federal and
33 the State side on the fisheries from the Yukon look at
34 it and see if that would work and increase the amount
35 of king salmon that are going up the Yukon instead of
36 using only a small portion we used almost the whole
37 Kuskokwim to close for three days and fish for four
38 days. I would recommend the fishery department to look
39 into that instead of changing the king size nets and
40 let people spend more money in doing so. This way they
41 can use what they have in that window opening and save
42 more money for them.

43

44 Thank you.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions anyone.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any more public

1 want to speak to Proposal 12.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seeing none, we'll
6 move on to Regional deliberations and recommendations.
7 Who wants to lead off.

8

9 Bob.

10

11 MR. ALOYSIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12 It's a mixed bag. I have a lot of concerns. One of
13 the main concerns I have, like everything else they
14 chip away, they chip away, they chip away. Right now
15 from unrestricted to eight and a half or down to seven
16 and a half, it's to me just a beginning again of
17 restricting the people to harvest their subsistence
18 fish a little at a time, a little at a time, little at
19 a time. They won't notice it too bad. Pretty soon
20 everybody's going to be restricted to six inch mesh for
21 any kind of fish.

22

23 The other thing that concerns me is the
24 simple fact that if you restrict the chinook gear to
25 seven and a half, someone mentioned earlier, you're
26 going to get a lot of the big, big super breeders of
27 chum salmon. I don't care what anybody says. You can
28 look at the facts. Those big ones are the ones that
29 are going way the hell up there to spawn and you're
30 going to get more and more of them when they're
31 restricting the unlimited down to seven and a half. I
32 don't care if you're not targeting chum, you're going
33 to be catching the big ones.

34

35 It's been proved by scientists -- I
36 don't remember his name, but the windows did not work
37 for the Kuskokwim River. The Yukon River already has
38 windows in place which are very very restrictive.

39

40 As far as recommending or deliberating
41 or justification, I have a really hard hard time even
42 considering allowing the Feds to come in here and start
43 chipping away at what we have already. They've done it
44 long enough and I think it's time to stop.

45

46 Doi.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Other comments.

49 Ray.

50

1 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2 I've got the same feeling also. They should be the
3 ones protecting us rather than imposing more
4 restrictions on us under Title VIII. It's there
5 already. They should be protecting our subsistence way
6 of life than trying to add more restrictions to it. It
7 seems like it's going from bad to worse. Like someone
8 mentioned, it's being blamed on the lower Yukon while
9 it should have been the river wide that should be taken
10 into consideration if we're going to talk about
11 conservation.

12
13 Conservation needs to involve everyone,
14 not only in-river users but also the spawning areas and
15 also the high seas need to come into play. Once they
16 finally did, maybe about a year or two ago, about
17 putting some type of restrictions on the high seas, but
18 in the meantime it's free play right now.

19
20 The report that Mr. Wilde had received
21 in his monthly publications from the North Pacific
22 Fisheries Management Council there's a lot of bycatch
23 that are being caught out there. To my understanding,
24 there's a lot of dirty fishermen that are out there
25 that don't care about what goes on in-river. So if
26 we're going to talk about fish, we need everybody at
27 the table, not only the in-river users.

28
29 Thank you.

30
31 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any comments.
32 Charlie or William.

33
34 MR. BROWN: Thank you. I'm thinking
35 everything costs money. If we try to change the gears
36 every year it's going to cost us money. For some
37 people it will be hard for them to change their gears
38 every year. I know one time when I decide to order
39 right after they pass that deliberation Board of Fish
40 to eight inch, I was looking for eight inch king gear.
41 I couldn't find it right away because those companies
42 it's not a popular thing, so we started looking for
43 more where we could get that gear and we didn't get it
44 right away, so up to now I hardly use that gear. I
45 just spent my money for nothing. So we have to
46 consider about that.

47
48 Thank you.

49
50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Further comments.

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'm going to
4 wrestle with this one too. I see the concerns that have
5 been brought out and there's some validity to it. I
6 mean when people talk about restricting subsistence and
7 regulations and so forth that come forward. A lot of
8 that has to do -- it's not necessarily restricting
9 subsistence. It's restricting the tools or methods and
10 means that have come in from Western society and I hear
11 a lot of people talking about how Western society has
12 destroyed a lot of the traditional subsistence ways.
13 That's part of it, along with being able to -- when we
14 didn't have moose moratoriums, every one that poked its
15 nose out of the brush was in a stew pot. So it's not a
16 control of the subsistence activity per se, but the
17 methods and means that are used.

18

19 But I am really disturbed with this
20 almost the imbalance in fairness that is there at the
21 present time. I've got an issue with the ongoing and
22 increasing abuse of the customary trade. That brings
23 me back to mind of in the '90s when we had to deal with
24 the dog food issue. People were essentially putting
25 together dog farms and raising pups for the sport and
26 recreational commercial racers. One guy actually came
27 to the Fish Board and said he needed 10,000 fish a year
28 to feed his dog team and I asked him how many dogs he
29 had on a break and he told me he had about 20. I
30 observed that's probably why they weren't winning many
31 races anymore because their dogs were so fat they
32 couldn't run very fast.

33

34 (Laughter)

35

36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Anyway I'm having a
37 hard time supporting this proposal specifically along
38 those lines, that it isn't spreading it out and sharing
39 the burden across the full spectrum of the user groups
40 and to as much degree as we can address that abuse
41 that's occurring and giving subsistence a bad name.

42

43 Anybody else. If not, I'd be ready for
44 the question. We're looking for final recommendation
45 on Proposal FP09-12 to limit the mesh size to seven and
46 a half inches for subsistence and commercial on the
47 Yukon beginning in 2011. Ready for the question.

48

49 MR. CHARLES: Question, Mr. Chairman.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question called,
2 question heard. To support the gear maybe we ought to
3 do a poll. Mr. Aloysius, can you poll the board.

4
5 MR. ALOYSIUS: This is a positive
6 motion. Remember if you vote yes, you're for approving
7 or adopting, you're going for it. If you vote no, it
8 means you oppose the proposal. Any questions on that
9 before we do the roll call. When you vote yes, you're
10 for the proposal. If you vote no, you're against it.
11 All right.
12 William Brown.

13
14 MR. BROWN: No.

15
16 MR. ALOYSIUS: James Charles.

17
18 MR. CHARLES: No.

19
20 MR. ALOYSIUS: Raymond Oney.

21
22 MR. ONEY: No.

23
24 MR. ALOYSIUS: Harry Wilde.

25
26 MR. H. WILDE: No.

27
28 MR. ALOYSIUS: Greg Roczicka.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: No.

31
32 MR. ALOYSIUS: Robert Aloysius, no.
33 John Andrew.

34
35 MR. ANDREW: No.

36
37 MR. ALOYSIUS: Seven opposed the
38 proposal, so the motion fails.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: 09-12 fails. 3:00
41 o'clock, we'll step down here for 10 minutes.

42
43 (Off record)

44
45 (On record)

46
47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Back on record at
48 3:17. We next had Proposal 09-13. As we were informed
49 earlier regarding Proposal 13, both the Western
50 Interior and the Eastern Interior -- specifically the

1 Eastern Interior was a sponsor of that proposal
2 recommending no action and I did check with Staff as
3 far as the Federal Board is concerned and it's going to
4 be essentially viewed as a withdrawal of that proposal.
5 At this point in time my recommendation is that we
6 recommend no action on that as well and entertain a
7 motion to that effect if there's no objections.

8

9 Mr. Cannon.

10

11 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman. Council
12 members. I understand what you're proposing, but I
13 wanted to make sure you had all the information. There
14 is an open period for the Federal call for proposals
15 for the next cycle and during the Eastern Interior
16 Regional Council meeting they have resubmitted that
17 proposal for consideration for the next Board cycle.
18 So you have the full story now.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Correct. So the
21 issue can be back before us again at whatever meeting
22 is appropriate when it comes down the line, which even
23 lends even further to see no need to take any action at
24 this meeting I would think. Would there be a motion to
25 that effect.

26

27 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move
28 that we take no action on FP09-13.

29

30 MR. CHARLES: Second

31

32 MR. ONEY: Second.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Motion by Bob.
35 Second by Ray and James for no action. Further
36 discussion.

37

38 MR. BROWN: Question.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: All in favor say
41 aye.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

45 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Those opposed same
46 sign.

47

48 (No opposing votes)

49

50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none,

1 that's the action there. At this point I don't know if
2 the Togiak Refuge folks -- oh, we're still not done
3 with fisheries. Mr. Cannon, next on the agenda is the
4 joint resolution from the Western and Eastern Interior
5 that was requested to be brought here and I understand
6 our chairman had attended and had agreed to bring those
7 to us.

8

9 MR. CANNON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
10 Council members. I'm distributing a copy of a
11 resolution that was developed and adopted by both the
12 Eastern and Western Interior Regional Councils and your
13 chairman, Lester Wilde, was at that joint meeting. He
14 was hoping to be here, of course, to talk to you about
15 it and to let you consider it. I'm passing it out to
16 you now. You should all have a copy of it. This joint
17 resolution deals specifically with the part of what the
18 Board of Fisheries dealt with or did in addition to the
19 mesh size restriction.

20

21 This resolution has to do with
22 protecting that early pulse of fish that fishermen
23 throughout the river felt had worked well during last
24 year's season. If you look down through this
25 resolution, there's a number of whereas's. Those are
26 all reasons why they think protecting that pulse is a
27 good idea scientifically. There's also something about
28 traditional knowledge and one of the reasons for doing
29 it.

30

31 As you get to the bottom of the
32 resolution there's a paragraph, it's the third one from
33 the bottom, that says therefore be it resolved that the
34 Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council and Western
35 Interior Subsistence Regional Advisory Council hereby
36 acknowledge and support all practical measures by State
37 and Federal managers to protect the first pulse (or
38 second if the first is missed) of chinook salmon in the
39 Yukon River from the mouth to the Canadian border with
40 little or no harvest directed at the first pulse using
41 statistical area closures to provide greater protection
42 without negatively impacting conservation of other
43 stocks.

44

45 That last paragraph of the resolution
46 says, furthermore, this support is in place until such
47 time that the chinook salmon stock abundance and
48 quality is restored to a level that provides sustained
49 yields for normal commercial and subsistence fisheries
50 over two life cycles or 12-year period.

1 Now the very last paragraph about this
2 resolution deals with where it would be sent. The two
3 Councils recommended that it go to the Alaska Board of
4 Fisheries, the Federal Subsistence Board, the North
5 Pacific Fisheries Management Council and State and
6 Federal Yukon River fisheries managers. Of course,
7 they wanted you to consider it as well. It's your
8 Council meeting.

9
10 Mr. Chairman. Council members. This
11 is something that you can consider. If you agree with
12 it, you could adopt it as well and then we would change
13 basically the format a little bit and it would go to
14 the Federal Board and these other folks on the
15 distribution list as a tri-Council resolution. If you
16 don't support it or just wanted to modify it and make
17 it your own, then you could submit it as your own
18 resolution. That basically is up to your Council. Mr.
19 Chairman, thank you.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. Discussion.
22 Ray.

23
24 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As
25 long as, you know, that first pulse is protected, I'm
26 for it. But, second, I don't know because it will
27 eventually go into third and fourth. Next thing you
28 know all the fish are gone before we even have an
29 attempt to try and catch the chinook salmon. Like I
30 mentioned, I'll go with the first pulse, but second I
31 would not support.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: If I'm hearing you
34 right, then you'd look at striking that section of the
35 third sentence in that first therefore be it resolved.

36
37 MR. ONEY: Yes.

38
39 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: To remove the
40 parentheses, or second if the first is missed. That's
41 kind of my thoughts too when I first read through this,
42 was if the first is missed, then it's already been
43 protected. I would look at that as an amendment to
44 this at this time, that that change would be
45 incorporated to strike that section of the language.

46
47 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman. When we
48 subsistence fished on lower Yukon, we fish with the
49 tides and who knows we don't even know where the fish
50 are coming in. Could be middle mouth, could be south

1 mouth, could be north mouth. So at times we do miss it
2 too. Our intent is to protect the first run of the
3 chinook going up into Canada. I think that should have
4 been the first line of defense to try and conserve the
5 chinook salmon.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob Aloysius.

10

11 MR. ALOYSIUS: I have a question
12 regarding that the RAC hereby acknowledge and support
13 all practical measures by State and Federal managers to
14 protect the first pulse. Now are they protecting it
15 from the ocean to the border in each increment of time
16 because if they do in one time those guys upriver have
17 free reign.

18

19 MR. CANNON: Through the Chair to Mr.
20 Aloysius. No, the intent is to do what they did in
21 2009 and that's where the managers actually would be
22 looking for with their projects. They would be looking
23 for the fish moving up the river and then they would
24 target closures in different parts of the river to let
25 those fish go by, to put them up on the spawning
26 grounds.

27

28 There's a lot of discussion, of course,
29 about this resolution and I think the intent was to try
30 to protect the fish that are headed to Canada. I guess
31 about 70 percent of those are generally the first pulse
32 are headed to Canada and then the second pulse maybe
33 40, 50 percent are. It will vary by year.

34

35 I think the reason they put that thing
36 about the second if the first is missed because this
37 year it was hard to see the first pulse in the way that
38 the fish came in. It just depends, as you know, people
39 that fish on the Yukon, the lower Yukon is -- a lot has
40 to do with the weather as far as how the fish move in.
41 Sometimes it's hard to see actually a big build up of
42 fish. It was harder to see this year than it usually
43 is.

44

45 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Bob.

48

49 MR. ALOYSIUS: The other concern I have
50 is on the furthermore it says chinook salmon stock

1 abundance and quality is restored to a level that
2 provide sustained yield for normal. I would put
3 subsistence first before commercial and if numbers
4 allow that commercial fisheries be allowed. I don't
5 know how else to say it.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Rich.

8

9 MR. CANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10 Through the Chair to Mr. Aloysius. I understand your
11 intent. What I was told is if there wasn't any
12 substantive changes, it was just a matter of wording,
13 that Staff could make some changes and it could be
14 something all Councils could support.

15

16 I think if you firmly believe, for
17 example, on Mr. Oney's point that you really don't want
18 to even have that second pulse considered, that's a
19 substantive change and I understand that and that would
20 mean that you probably would need to submit this as
21 your own resolution. That's fine.

22

23 With regard to Mr. Aloysius's point, I
24 don't think you'd get any disagreement that subsistence
25 both under State system and the Federal system, this is
26 with the Federal Regional Council, so certainly under
27 the Federal system subsistence has a priority, and the
28 State as well. So that's not a substantive change. I
29 think everybody would agree with that.

30

31 (Council nods affirmatively)

32

33 MR. ALOYSIUS: I just want to make
34 sure. We take it for granted that it's going to be that
35 way and it never is. I want subsistence to be the
36 first priority and then if there's any chance of
37 commercial, go for it. Period.

38

39 MR. CANNON: We will make that change.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. Just
42 for the record then we'll go back just to clarify on
43 that third sentence in the first therefore be it
44 resolved that we do not want to include the statement
45 regarding the second pulse if the first is missed. Is
46 there any objection to removing that phrase.

47

48 (No objections)

49

50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none, then

1 we would want to have that removed. If that
2 necessitates this going forward as a resolution
3 specifically from our Council, so be it. Any other
4 discussion or changes in the language for this
5 resolution. James.

6

7 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman. Is that in
8 brackets where second if the first is missed, that one?

9

10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: To remove that
11 phrase.

12

13 MR. CHARLES: Thank you.

14

15 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray.

18

19 MR. ONEY: Last year being the first
20 year in protecting the chinook because it was
21 riverwide, it was all closed for the whole river, so
22 that would be the first year.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob, you had
25 anything.

26

27 MR. ALOYSIUS: No.

28

29 MR. H. WILDE: Mr. Chairman.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Harry Wilde.

32

33 MR. H. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, I do agree
34 with first pulse, but if they do across the board to
35 spawning streams, I will support it.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: That is
38 specifically included within this, that's it's all the
39 way from the mouth to the headwaters. James.

40

41 MR. CHARLES: That's what I had in mind
42 too. He said it. Thank you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Rich Cannon.

45

46 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman. Council
47 members. I do understand your intent and the changes
48 that you would like to see in this resolution. We
49 will, as a Staff, get back to you. We can take this
50 change back to the Chairman of the other Councils and

1 get their response on it and we'll get back to you with
2 regard to whatever they -- however they feel about it.
3 This resolution, 99 percent of it sounds like you agree
4 with and this is just one small part of it. It's
5 certainly something I think that either -- you know,
6 even if it was just your own resolution it certainly
7 would have value. So we understand what you want.

8

9 Thank you.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Next up then under
12 fisheries.

13

14 MR. ALOYSIUS: Are we going to act on
15 that?

16

17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Oh, that was just
18 for the removal. For the record, a motion would be in
19 order to adopt the resolution as amended. James.

20

21 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman. I move to
22 adopt the resolution number -- oh, no number, just
23 resolution.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: As amended. Is
26 there a second?

27

28 MR. ALOYSIUS: Second.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Further discussion.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: All those in favor
35 say aye.

36

37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Those opposed same
40 sign.

41

42 (No opposing votes)

43

44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none, it's
45 unanimous. We have one other issue that was brought
46 before us on fisheries. There's a joint letter
47 concerning the Bering Sea bycatch that I was informed
48 was also brought forward from Eastern/Western Interior.
49 Anybody to speak to that.

50

1 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. That particular
2 issue is on your agenda 16A and I think YRDFA wanted to
3 be here to help give an overview of what the Council
4 had done. If you want to do it now, I'll stand in and
5 do my best with Rich. If it can wait, I think Becca
6 wanted us to give her a call and let her know so she
7 could be here, but it's your all.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It was my
10 understanding that similar to this joint resolution
11 that we just dealt with that there was a joint letter
12 from Western and Eastern Interior that they had wanted
13 us to consider signing on to make it a tri-Council
14 sponsorship. Am I wrong in that regard?

15
16 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman. Council
17 members. The Eastern and Western Interior Regional
18 Councils basically have given our Staff an assignment
19 to develop a letter and if your Council wishes to join
20 in, essentially adopting that kind of a resolution for
21 all the Councils basically to put forward, then you
22 could simply add your support to that.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: If we have it
25 listed under another agenda item, then I wouldn't see
26 it necessary taking up the time to further discuss it
27 here. Tom Kron.

28
29 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. Again, just to
30 add a little bit to what Rich said. This Council and
31 Western and Eastern Interior supported a chum salmon
32 cap of 29,000 in the trawl fishery. As you know, the
33 Council went with a different number. The Federal
34 Subsistence Board Chair also supported the 29,000.
35 Again, that was a year ago.

36
37 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It was for chinook
38 not chum.

39
40 MR. KRON: Excuse me. In any case, the
41 proposal here is to reassert that 29,000 which you
42 previously supported. But, again, it's later on the
43 agenda, so it's your call. Thanks.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'll just make an
46 executive decision as far as the Chair goes. We'll
47 wait and take it up. If it's going to be covered under
48 another agenda item, we'll have more information. Do
49 we have the Togiak Refuge here? That brings us up to
50 the wildlife proposals. They had requested to move

1 Proposal 61 up.
2
3 Mr. Kron.
4
5 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. I just checked
6 with Mr. Robert Sundown and I understand that Andy
7 Aderman from Togiak was unable to make it. So hearing
8 that, if it's appropriate, maybe you could just leave
9 that. Jerry.
10
11 MR. BERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12 Jerry Berg with Fish and Wildlife Service. Yeah, I
13 just talked to Andy also. They would like to be online
14 when we address that proposal, so if we could get him
15 on the phone before we address that proposal, that
16 would be helpful.
17
18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: You don't know if
19 they're ready to go yet? I was under the impression
20 there was some conflicting meeting that they had to be
21 at tomorrow or day after.
22
23 MR. BERG: Correct. The Bristol Bay
24 Regional Council meeting starts tomorrow, so they would
25 like to go today if we can get them on the line. They
26 are ready to go if we can get this phone working.
27
28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Let's do that.
29 We'll stand down while you try to get them hooked up
30 then.
31
32 (Off record)
33
34 (On record)
35
36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Do we have Togiak
37 on the line?
38
39 REPORTER: Yes.
40
41 (Pause)
42
43 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Proposal 61
44 introduction and analysis. Jerry, you're going to lead
45 off on this.
46
47 Jerry Berg.
48
49 MR. BERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jerry
50 Berg with Fish and Wildlife Service. As you can see in

1 your book, Proposal 61 starts Page 127 in your book.
2 Proposal WP10-61 was submitted by the Native Village of
3 Quinhagak IRA Council and requests that a moose season
4 be established for that portion of Unit 18 within the
5 Kanektok River drainage and south to and including the
6 Arolik River drainage. The season dates requested are
7 September 1 to 30 with a one antlered bull harvest
8 limit by State registration permit. The proponent also
9 requests that the Board delegate the authority for any
10 needed closures in the affected area to the Togiak
11 National Wildlife Refuge manager after consultation
12 with ADF&G and the Chair of your Council.

13

14 The proponent s intent is to establish
15 a moose season on Federal public lands within the
16 affected area. The proponent feels that a season should
17 be established for the affected area because there is
18 already a moose season on State lands and establishing
19 a Federal subsistence moose season would align with
20 existing State regulations.

21

22 The proponent also states that
23 establishing a Federal moose season would allow hunters
24 to access Federal public land instead of being
25 restricted to small enclaves of State land such as
26 gravel bars. Finally, the proponent states that more
27 moose will be migrating into the area from other nearby
28 populations that have increased due to recent
29 moratoriums on moose hunting and these moose should be
30 available to Federally qualified users.

31

32 These are the recent moratoriums in the
33 lower Kusko that you guys are intimately familiar with
34 and then on the Goodnews River drainage to the south of
35 Quinhagak.

36

37 I'm not going to go into the regulatory
38 history. There's a regulatory history in the appendix
39 that's fairly detailed, but I will note that the
40 Federal regulations in this area have been closed for
41 moose hunting since 1991, so basically since the
42 establishment of the Federal program.

43

44 As far as the biological information
45 goes, I want to thank Andy Aderman from the Togiak
46 Refuge for helping me compile the biological background
47 for this analysis. The Togiak Refuge Staff have
48 completed moose surveys in the late winter, so about
49 this time of year, February to April, in the Kanektok
50 and Arolik River drainages in 13 of the past 19 years.

1 You can see in Figure 1 in your analysis that the
2 annual survey counts are basically shown on that lower
3 line on the graph that's in gray and have ranged from 0
4 to 10 moose, so pretty low counts.

5
6 By contrast, you can see how the
7 population in the Goodnews River drainage responded
8 well to the recent moratorium there with over 140 moose
9 count there last year. If you remember, there was a
10 proposal to open the Goodnews River drainage last year
11 due to this increase in population in that area. You
12 guys probably remember that proposal that was in front
13 of you last year.

14
15 However, the area under consideration
16 for this proposal, the most recent count there in April
17 of last year, was a total of four moose. So just not
18 very many moose in that area. The Refuge estimates
19 that good quality moose habitat in that area is about
20 180 square miles or 13 percent of the area being
21 considered. The area would likely support an estimated
22 180 to 360 moose using an expansion estimate of one to
23 two moose per square mile of the good quality habitat
24 in that area. It would most likely require a
25 moratorium in the area for multiple years if the local
26 residents want that moose population to grow.

27
28 The late winter moose surveys are
29 considered as post-hunt counts and reflect minimum
30 counts of the population near its lowest point during
31 the year. So even with this factored in, the moose
32 population in the Kanektok and Arolik drainages have
33 likely been less than 25 moose. If population growth
34 is the objective, harvest rates should generally be
35 less than 10 to 12 percent of the population, which
36 really only allows for a harvest of only two moose out
37 of that area to maintain the population.

38
39 So, as you can see, the reported
40 harvest in the harvest history section, the numbers
41 shown in parentheses listed in Table 1, shows that
42 there's been about three to six moose harvested there
43 in recent years.

44
45 So, with that information, adoption of
46 the proposal would establish a moose season on Federal
47 public lands within the Kanektok and Arolik River
48 drainages using a State registration permit. A State
49 general harvest moose season has been in place in this
50 area since at least 1990. However, Federal public lands

1 have remained closed to moose hunting due to the low
2 moose population and conservation concerns in the
3 affected area.

4
5 As you know, State and Federal managers
6 worked with your Council and other local residents
7 prior to establishing a moratorium in the lower Kusko.
8 They have also met with the residents of Quinhagak
9 regarding a possible moratorium in the Kanektok and
10 Arolik River drainages and will continue to work with
11 local residents there to help establish a healthy moose
12 population in their area.

13
14 The moose population in the Kanektok
15 and Arolik River drainage is likely less than 25 moose,
16 as I mentioned, and reported harvest under the State
17 season has been three to six moose annually between
18 2005 and 2007. Even though a few moose may move into
19 the area from growing populations in the lower Kusko or
20 in the Goodnews River drainage to the south, it appears
21 that a sustainable harvest rate of 10 to 12 percent is
22 already being accounted for through the existing State
23 season. Additional harvest that could occur from
24 adoption of this proposal is likely to cause
25 conservation concerns and be detrimental to the longer
26 term harvest opportunities for Federally qualified
27 subsistence users.

28
29 For those reasons, Mr. Chair, the
30 preliminary conclusion is to oppose the proposal. I'd
31 be happy to answer any questions and, of course, the
32 Refuge is online for any biological questions.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions for Jerry
35 or the Refuge folks. Ray.

36
37 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
38 Jerry, this area that you're talking about was part of
39 the Kuskokwim moose moratorium?

40
41 MR. BERG: Through the Chair, Mr. Oney.
42 No, it was not part of the moratorium. There was a
43 moratorium in the Goodnews River drainage to the south
44 and then the Kusko, but this is the area in between
45 those two areas and it was not closed.

46
47 Thank you.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: If it's not closed,
50 does that mean it remains open to this day? I don't

1 think so.

2

3 MR. BERG: It was not closed under the
4 moratorium and it is open under State regulations, but
5 the Federal public lands have always been closed since
6 the inception of the Federal program essentially.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any further
9 questions for Jerry. Charlie.

10

11 MR. BROWN: In that area, is that a
12 moose habitat area than Eek? They like to come over to
13 Eek side the way I heard from the elder people in the
14 past for habitat purpose on the moose.

15

16 MR. BERG: You're saying that the moose
17 like to come over closer to Eek for the habitat over
18 there?

19

20 MR. BROWN: Uh-huh.

21

22 MR. BERG: As I mentioned in the
23 analysis, what the Refuge has identified is about 13
24 percent of the Arolik and Kanektok River drainages is
25 good prime moose habitat and could support more moose
26 but probably needs a moratorium in that area before it
27 can really grow to be a good healthy population.

28

29 MR. BROWN: Yeah, because sometimes
30 like caribous they like to roam around from one place
31 to another where they have food. That's why I ask
32 that. Sometimes during the summertime they move to
33 elsewhere where they can have food.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Perhaps I can
36 direct that question to the Togiak Staff if they've
37 noticed any noticeable in-migration as a result of the
38 moratorium from the surrounding areas.

39

40 MR. BERG: Andy, did you hear that
41 question?

42

43 MR. ADERMAN: I heard part of it. Was
44 it asking about moose moving into the area because of
45 the moratoriums?

46

47 MR. BERG: Yes. Specifically from the
48 northern, up around Eek and that area, if you've
49 noticed moose migrating down into the Kanektok drainage
50 from the north.

1 MR. ADERMAN: I'm not aware of it
2 although I don't doubt that it is occurring. I have
3 had some animals move from the south up into that area.
4 In fact I had one that went all the way to the Eek
5 River and spent a couple summers there. So I think
6 it's occurring.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray.

9
10 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman. Jerry. So
11 there was no Federal open season in this area?

12
13 MR. BERG: That's correct. It's been
14 closed since 1991, for almost 20 years that the Federal
15 program has been in place. But the State has had an
16 open season down there. It just remains to be a low
17 population with low harvests in that area.

18
19 MR. ONEY: Another question here. If
20 they were to have an open season rather than the 30-
21 day, would you support a 10 day opening in this area?

22
23 MR. BERG: Well, it's already open
24 under the State season and our assessment was that the
25 State season is already providing for what harvestable
26 surplus is available. So if we were to open Federal
27 lands and more moose were taken, then it would be a
28 conservation concern. So that's why we're not
29 supporting opening Federal lands at this time until we
30 can work with the communities more and maybe establish
31 a moratorium for a period of time to grow that
32 population.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 MR. ONEY: Thank you.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: For that, it almost
39 begs to say that here's one of those awkward situations
40 where the State is providing for subsistence
41 opportunity and the Federal managers are not. Leave it
42 at that. Further comments on the presentation.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We'll move on to
47 State Department of Fish and Game comments.

48
49 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
50 George Pappas, Department of Fish and Game. As we go

1 into the wildlife proposals, you'll notice in your book
2 that State comments have not been provided. The
3 Department has not provided comments to the Regional
4 Advisory Councils regarding the first five statewide
5 proposals. We want to collect public testimony and
6 information provided at the RACs before finalizing the
7 State's position.

8

9 Also the C&T proposals, we also want to
10 hear the input and new information presented at the
11 RACs before we finalize our position.

12

13 On No. 61 here we don't have an
14 official position, but area manager Phillip Perry can
15 speak to the biological concerns.

16

17 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Phil, go ahead.

20

21 MR. PERRY: Hi, Greg. Good afternoon
22 to the Council. I can speak a little to the biology.
23 I think the Federal analysis here was pretty relevant.
24 It's a very low population. There is an opportunity
25 right now. Additional opportunity probably isn't
26 warranted with a population that's as low as it is
27 right now. I'd also like to add that there has been
28 efforts in the past that has some local support to a
29 moratorium or some sort of moose management plan and
30 we're going to continue to do that, but at this point
31 we're not going to recommend any changes.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any questions for
34 the State. James, go ahead.

35

36 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
37 How much State land is over there in that area?

38

39 MR. PERRY: Through the Chair. State
40 land is basically the bottom 20 miles of the river
41 closest to the village. Federal boundary of the refuge
42 is approximately 20 miles upriver and that river is, I
43 think, a little over 100 miles long. That moose
44 habitat in the Kanektok is very similar to the local
45 tributaries here. It's a narrow band along the river.
46 If you want to just use that bottom fifth of the river
47 is State managed land.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Anybody else.

50 Charlie.

1 MR. BROWN: Last year when the State
2 opens the moose after we have that five years of
3 waiting for population to pop up. There was some
4 paper. Don't know where to hunt. On public radio,
5 like that Bethel station, the announcement was -- it
6 wasn't like we planned to hunt. We are allowed only to
7 hunt on the State side, corporation side, private
8 allotment land. The question was -- the concerns was
9 about what's the rest of it, like Federal. I couldn't
10 respond to that question. So we tried to get a hold of
11 your office for more information and we didn't get any
12 response from your side, so it was kind of difficult
13 where we could legally hunt.

14
15 Some folks were talking about it was
16 too early to look for moose before they start roaming
17 around and if they can be extended or moved?

18
19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Charlie, that's
20 talking about a whole different issue. You're talking
21 about the moratorium that we just lifted. That's a
22 separate hunt. This is specifically talking about the
23 Quinhagak drainage and they want to open a hunt there.
24 Any other questions for State on this proposal.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Thank you,
29 folks. We'll move on. Federal, State, Tribal agency
30 comments.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none. Any
35 representatives from our Advisory Committees. James.

36
37 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chair. That's Bering
38 Sea Advisory Committee area. Thank you.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: All right. Any
41 written public comments. Staff is not rattling their
42 head loud enough to hear it on the record.

43
44 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. No public
45 comments.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: No public comments.
48 Any member of the public here wish to speak to this
49 proposal.

50

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none. A
4 motion would be in order to adopt this proposal.
5
6 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman, I move to
7 adopt Proposal 61.
8
9 MR. ONEY: Second.
10
11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Discussion.
12
13 MR. BROWN: Question.
14
15 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'm going to state
16 a little bit of something. We need to put something on
17 the record. That's the way I feel about it. It is
18 premature. There's a possibility if we're looking at
19 that additional level of harvest. I know that's part of
20 the pain of getting a moratorium in place and getting
21 people on board to make it happen. That's part of the
22 whole management structure. I think it's a bit
23 premature to have that open although it would be
24 preferable, I suppose, if we could get both State and
25 Federal on the same page on this one, but I don't see
26 it happening in this area yet. I'm going to probably
27 be voting against it.
28
29 Anybody else.
30
31 (No comments)
32
33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: If not, the
34 question is made, the question is heard. Bob.
35
36 MR. ALOYSIUS: The voting is for
37 approval of Proposal WP10-51.
38
39 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: WP10-61.
40
41 MR. ALOYSIUS: Sorry about that. 61.
42 James Charles.
43
44 MR. CHARLES: No.
45
46 MR. ALOYSIUS: Ray Oney.
47
48 MR. ONEY: No.
49
50 MR. ALOYSIUS: Harry Wilde.

1 MR. H. WILDE: No.
2
3 MR. ALOYSIUS: Greg Roczicka.
4
5 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: No.
6
7 MR. ALOYSIUS: Robert Aloysius. No.
8 John Andrew.
9
10 MR. ANDREW: No.
11
12 MR. ALOYSIUS: William Brown.
13
14 MR. BROWN: No.
15
16 MR. ALOYSIUS: Seven no's, the motion
17 fails.
18
19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Motion fails.
20 Thank you to the Togiak Refuge folks. We can move on
21 to the statewide proposals.
22
23 Mr. Kron, you will be addressing those
24 for the Staff?
25
26 MR. KRON: Yes, Mr. Chair. I'll have
27 the first one and Pippa Kenner will have two and three
28 and then I'll have four and five.
29
30 Mr. Chairman. Members of the Council.
31 The analysis for WP10-01 begins on Page 21 of your
32 book. Proposal WP10-01 was submitted by OSM and
33 requests the addition of a definition for drawing
34 permit to the Federal subsistence management
35 regulations. This is a statewide proposal and is being
36 reviewed by all 10 Regional Advisory Councils. The
37 analysis of this proposal, as I said begins on Page 21
38 of your book.
39
40 Existing Federal subsistence management
41 regulations do not include a definition for drawing
42 permit. However, because this term is used in the
43 hunting regulations, a definition should be provided.
44
45 The addition of this definition does
46 not affect fish and wildlife populations, subsistence
47 users or other users. The Federal Subsistence
48 Management Program has used drawings as one way to
49 distribute permits among residents of a community that
50 are similarly situated relative to customary and

1 traditional uses of those wildlife populations.

2

3 OSM's preliminary conclusion is to
4 support Proposal WP10-01 with modifications to simply
5 and clarify the definition. As noted, the proposal is
6 from us from OSM, but in working with the Solicitor's
7 Office and Staff, we thought that a more simplified
8 definition would improve understanding of all and
9 that's why we're suggesting the modification that's
10 included in your Council books.

11

12 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Pretty much a
15 housekeeping. Questions for Staff.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none. The
20 Department has notified us that they have no comments
21 on these proposals as yet, pending the recommendations
22 from the Councils and the Federal process. Federal,
23 State and Tribal agency comments.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: InterAgency Staff
28 Committee.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Local Advisory
33 Committee.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any written public
38 comments.

39

40 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. There were no
41 written public comments that I'm aware of.

42

43 Mr. Chair.

44

45 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Anyone from the
46 public wish to speak to this proposal.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. A motion

1 would be in order to adopt or support this proposal

2

3 MR. ALOYSIUS: Point of order. You
4 forgot to ask the RAC members if they had any words for
5 this proposal.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Once there's a
8 motion on the table and the proposal is before us under
9 discussion, you can make as many comments as you want
10 about the proposal.

11

12 Mr. Kron.

13

14 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. And, again, it's
15 your call how you'd like to proceed. We, after
16 consideration with Staff and the Solicitor's Office,
17 are recommending a two line definition. The original
18 proposal, as you can see, is six lines and includes
19 some regulatory gibberish, if I can say that, but in
20 any case, our recommendation is to modify the original
21 proposal as shown in your book.

22

23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Modified to the
26 language as contained on Page 24 of the book. Is there
27 a motion to support, to adopt.

28

29 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman. I move to
30 adopt Proposal 10-01

31

32 MR. ONEY: Second.

33

34 MR. ANDREW: Second.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Second by John
37 Andrew. We have Proposal 01 before us. Was it your
38 intent -- for which language, of the original proposal,
39 Mr. Charles, or the much simpler modified language on
40 Page 24.

41

42 MR. CHARLES: (Nods affirmatively)

43

44 MR. ALOYSIUS: (In Yup'ik)

45

46 MR. CHARLES: 24. Page 24.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. Again, if
49 you'd just respond to that. Your intent was to use the
50 language on Page 24, the two lines rather than the more

1 lengthy convoluted one on Page 21 of the original
2 proposal.
3
4 MR. CHARLES: (Nods affirmatively)
5
6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Discussion.
7 Deliberations. Anything from -- Mr. Aloysius.
8
9 MR. ALOYSIUS: No, I was just telling
10 him that he.....
11
12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Point of order.
13
14 MR. ALOYSIUS:had to go on
15 record.....
16
17 REPORTER: Bob.
18
19 (Laughter)
20
21 MR. ALOYSIUS:to clarify his
22 language.....
23
24 REPORTER: Bob.
25
26 MR. ALOYSIUS:he's using.
27
28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Your mic wasn't on,
29 I was just curious, you had called a point of order
30 about Council members being able to discuss and
31 deliberate or comments regarding the proposal, so
32 here's the opportunity.
33
34 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman.
35
36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: James, go ahead.
37
38 MR. CHARLES: I meant to make that --
39 to accept the change to two lines, whatever, that
40 drawing permit.
41
42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Yeah, to support it
43 with the modification as contained on Page 24.
44
45 MR. CHARLES: (Nods affirmatively)
46
47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Again, I view this
48 one pretty much as a housekeeping proposal, just
49 something to run through the mill for us.
50

1 If there is no further discussion, are
2 we ready for the question.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 MR. ALOYSIUS: Question.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question called,
9 question heard. All those in favor say aye.

10
11 IN UNISON: Aye.

12
13 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Those opposed, same
14 sign.

15
16 (No opposing votes)

17
18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none, the
19 proposal passes. Moving on then to Proposal 10-02,
20 which was deferred from somewhere, so it says.

21
22 (Pause)

23
24 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Pippa, you're going
25 to be speaking to this, go ahead.

26
27 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My
28 name is Pippa Kenner and I work with OSM in Anchorage.

29
30 This proposal WP10-02 is a deferred
31 proposal. And when it was considered by the Board and
32 by this Council in the past it was WP08-05, so during
33 the previous cycle.

34
35 It was submitted by Fish and Game, by
36 the State and it requested clarification of the
37 existing Federal subsistence management regulation
38 governing the use of brown bear claws in handicrafts
39 for sale.

40
41 The proposal specifically asks that the
42 removal of -- asks for the removal of all unit specific
43 regulations related to the statewide sale of brown bear
44 handicrafts made of skin, hide, pelt or fur, and that
45 sales of brown bear handicrafts made of claws, bones,
46 teeth, sinew, or skulls should occur only between
47 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

48
49 Well, through much discussion it came
50 about that one of the real sticking points about

1 allowing the sale and the use in handicrafts of these
2 items is the claws specifically. And so the proposal
3 was deferred by the Board in May 2008. And at the
4 suggestion of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game,
5 pending the formation of a workgroup to address the
6 issue of developing a method of tracking brown bear
7 claws made into handicrafts for sale, the Board voted
8 unanimously to defer the proposal to allow a workgroup
9 to address this issue of sale and tracking,
10 specifically whether or not it's even feasible.

11
12 The Board directed that the working
13 group include representatives from all interested RACs
14 and State and Federal Staff. Mary Gregory represented
15 this Council.

16
17 An initial scoping meeting between
18 Federal and State Staff was held in January 2009 and at
19 that meeting a draft charge was developed. A briefing
20 was provided to all Councils during the Winter 2009
21 meeting cycle on the status of the workgroup, and
22 Councils selected representatives to participate in the
23 workgroup. The workgroup, including representatives
24 from nine Councils, and Federal and State Staff met in
25 June 2009.

26
27 At that meeting, participants from the
28 Councils posed a number of questions directed at
29 whether or not bear claw tracking is a problem for
30 subsistence users, and if regulations needed to be
31 changed. These questions prompted Federal and State
32 Staff to conduct further research, and to meet as
33 agency Staff to compare notes and to follow up on
34 research questions, which they did twice during summer
35 2009. The work group attempted to meet again during the
36 summer of 2009, but this was not possible. In the
37 interim, another briefing on the status of the
38 workgroup was provided to the Councils at the Fall 2009
39 meetings.

40
41 The workgroup, including Council
42 members, will meet during spring and summer of 2010 to
43 address the questions raised at its first meeting, and
44 to begin working towards resolution of the issues.
45 This will provide ample time for the workgroups
46 findings to be presented to each Council for their
47 recommendations during the Fall 2010 meeting cycle, and
48 for a full report to be provided to the Federal
49 Subsistence Board for action at its January 2011
50 meeting. A report will also be provided to the Alaska

1 Board of Game at an appropriate meeting. This Proposal
2 10-02 will be deferred until that time.

3

4 That's the end of my presentation, Mr.
5 Chair.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, Pippa.
8 With that, unless there's some burning need from anyone
9 else that they need to get something else on the
10 record, at this point in time I would say we can just
11 move right along here. For starters, maybe it
12 shouldn't even have been on the agenda here since it's
13 already been decided to be deferred to the January 2011
14 meeting. I guess right now it would be appropriate for
15 either no action or defer this to our fall meeting. A
16 motion to that regard, either one. I'd do it, but I
17 can't make a motion.

18

19 James.

20

21 MR. CHARLES: I move to adopt Proposal
22 10-02 as deferred to 2011 meeting as directed in the
23 proposal.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I think what I
26 heard in there is you're moving to defer the proposal
27 essentially until it comes up on the agenda again,
28 which would be at our fall meeting and the Federal
29 Subsistence Board taking action at their January 2011
30 meeting. Is that the intent of your motion?

31

32 MR. CHARLES: (Nods affirmatively)

33

34 MR. ALOYSIUS: Second.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Is there a second.

37

38 MR. ONEY: Second.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seconded by Ray.
41 Further discussion. James.

42

43 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
44 The people gather these bear claws to make necklaces or
45 whatever you were saying. I didn't get when you read
46 it, but for crafts or something like that to make
47 necklaces and sell them. Do people do that on bear
48 claws?

49

50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Pippa.

1 MS. KENNER: Mr. Charles through the
2 Chair. Yes, they do. In some parts of the state more
3 than others. In some parts of the state where bear
4 claws aren't used for that, this is just an issue
5 that's informative. In other areas of the state people
6 are really tracking what's happening with this proposal
7 because it has a great importance to them.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'd look at this as
10 housekeeping since it's not even going to be taken up
11 until our next meeting cycle. It's appropriate that it
12 go to our fall meeting when we have some definite
13 action to go forward.

14
15 MR. ALOYSIUS: Question.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The question has
18 been called. All those in favor say aye.

19
20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: All opposed same
23 sign.

24
25 (No opposing votes)

26
27 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none.
28 Motion passed unanimous. That brings us to Proposal
29 10-03.

30
31 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
32 Again, this is Pippa Kenner with OSM. Proposal 10-03
33 was submitted by the Office of Subsistence Management
34 and it requests the addition of a general provision in
35 Federal subsistence management regulations to allow the
36 harvest of fish and wildlife by participants in a
37 cultural or educational program.

38
39 This proposal is a housekeeping measure
40 to clarify how these permits are currently issued.
41 Adoption of this proposal will now change how the
42 Office of Subsistence Management currently issues these
43 permits.

44
45 Most requests for these permits come
46 from culture camps sponsored by Native nonprofit
47 organizations. The permits are typically requested
48 both to teach cultural and educational activities
49 associated with harvest and to provide food for
50 participants in the program. Once a program has been

1 approved for a permit, follow-up requests, referred to
2 as repeat requests in the regulation, may be made
3 annually for up to five years by the same cultural or
4 educational program to harvest the same animal species
5 and amount.

6
7 The proposal puts into regulation the
8 guidelines the Federal program currently follows when
9 issuing these permits. The modified regulation has
10 four parts. First it defines a qualifying program. A
11 qualifying program must have instructors, enrolled
12 students, minimum attendance requirements and standards
13 for successful completion of the course.

14
15 Second, it alerts the public that the
16 Office of Subsistence Management needs time to process
17 the application, while at the same time it allows the
18 Office of Subsistence Management to accept a request
19 for a permit at any time, which is the current policy.
20 So the proposed regulation says applications must be
21 submitted to the Federal Subsistence Board through the
22 Office of Subsistence Management and should be
23 submitted 60 days prior to the earliest desired date of
24 harvest.

25
26 Third, the modified regulation gives
27 direction to the local field manager in the area where
28 the harvest will occur. Fourth, it gives direction on
29 how to issue follow-up permits.

30
31 Our preliminary conclusion is to
32 support the regulation with modification to simplify it
33 even further. That's the end of my presentation.

34
35 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

36
37 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question. James.

38
39 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
40 Does this mean that you can train the young people like
41 going out fishing catch pikes right now and get the
42 permit to do that?

43
44 MS. KENNER: Yes, Mr. Charles, through
45 the Chair. For some of these things like what you just
46 mentioned there may not be regulation prohibiting that
47 harvest anyway, but if there is, yes, you could apply
48 to our office for a special permit.

49
50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any questions. I

1 notice you say they have to apply annually for up to
2 five years. Why didn't you just give them a permit to
3 conduct a program for five years instead of having them
4 jump through a paper hoop every year?

5
6 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair. There's a
7 couple of reasons. What this regulation does is make
8 clear that every year the request doesn't need to go
9 all the way to the Board. After the first year for the
10 next five years it can go to -- it goes to the field
11 manager. The request goes through them.

12
13 One of the reasons why that is still
14 included as a requirement is that some of these
15 requests are for animals that are in short supply and
16 need to be managed more closely. Therefore, in order
17 to write a regulation that would apply in the broadest
18 range of situations and to make it simple, the
19 delegation to the field manager was kept in there.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I don't see that
22 included in your modified recommendation.

23
24 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair. Number 2 in
25 the modified regulation says request for follow-up
26 permits must be submitted to the in-season or local
27 manager and should be submitted 60 days prior to the
28 earliest desired date of harvest.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The follow-up
31 permit then is what you're referring to is the annual.
32 Okay. Other questions for Ms. Kenner.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seeing none.
37 Department of Fish and Game has no comments on this
38 awaiting Federal actions. Any Federal, State or Tribal
39 agencies.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any InterAgency
44 Staff comments.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any Advisory
49 Committee.

50

1 MR. CHARLES: No comments.
2
3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any written public
4 comments.
5
6 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. There are no
7 written public comments I'm aware of. Mr. Chair.
8
9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any member of the
10 public wish to speak to this proposal.
11
12 (No comments)
13
14 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seeing, hearing
15 none, a motion would be in order for adopting this
16 proposal or supporting.
17
18 MR. ANDREW: Mr. Chairman. I move that
19 we support Proposal WP10-03.
20
21 MR. ALOYSIUS: Not support, adopt.
22
23 MR. ANDREW: Adopt.
24
25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Is there a second.
26
27 MR. ALOYSIUS: Second.
28
29 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seconded by Bob
30 Aloysius. We have the proposal before us. There is
31 some modified language of a much simpler nature
32 contained in the Staff overview. Mr. Kron.
33
34 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. Just for
35 clarification, was it the maker of the motion's intent
36 to go with the wording on Page 31, the simplified
37 wording, or the longer version earlier that was
38 discussed?
39
40 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
41
42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We're getting
43 there. Right now we have the proposal before us. Does
44 the maker of the motion, would your recommendation be
45 the modified language?
46
47 MR. ANDREW: I move to adopt the
48 Proposal WP10-03.
49
50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: If we want to go

1 for the simplified language, we would need to amend
2 this motion to use the modified regulations as are
3 contained on Page 31 regarding this proposal.

4
5 MR. ALOYSIUS: As the second of the
6 motion, I concur.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Offer it as a
9 friendly amendment. Is there any objection.

10
11 (No objections)

12
13 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none,
14 Proposal 10-03 as amended is before us. Any further
15 discussion.

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We now have the
20 final proposal before us, so the question is in order.

21
22 MR. CHARLES: Question.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question heard.
25 All those in favor say aye.

26
27 IN UNISON: Aye.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: All those opposed
30 same sign.

31
32 (No opposing votes)

33
34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Motion carries 7-0.
35 We're on Proposal WP10-04. Mr. Kron.

36
37 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. Members of the
38 Council. The analysis for WP10-04 is found starting on
39 Page 32 of your Council book.

40 This proposal was submitted by the Office of
41 Subsistence Management and would remove a number of
42 game management units from the areas for which the
43 Assistant Regional Director for OSM has the
44 responsibility and authority to open, close or adjust
45 Federal subsistence lynx seasons and to set harvest and
46 possession limits.

47
48 Lynx trapping seasons are adjusted
49 annually based on recommendations determined using
50 Alaska Department of Fish and Game Tracking Harvest

1 Strategy for managing lynx. The Alaska Board of Game
2 removed Units 6, 12, 20A, 20B, 20C east of the
3 Teklanika River, 20D and 20E from the list of units
4 that are managed using the lynx tracking strategy. As
5 you'll note, Unit 18 is currently not in this list, but
6 we felt it had enough broad distribution that it needed
7 to be considered as a statewide proposal. Based on
8 this action these units should also be eliminated from
9 Federal regulation.

10

11 Over time the State has removed a
12 number of units from its lynx tracking strategy. If
13 this proposal is adopted, it would align Federal and
14 State regulations regarding lynx management. I would
15 say that as an aside our program has consistently
16 followed the direction of the State with regard to lynx
17 management in particular.

18

19 If this proposal is adopted, it would
20 align Federal and State regulations. Season and
21 harvest limits can still be changed through the normal
22 regulatory cycle or through special action if needed.
23 There will be no adverse impacts to subsistence users.
24 Only the authority delegated to the Assistant Regional
25 Director for the Office of Subsistence Management would
26 be affected.

27

28 The preliminary conclusion from OSM is
29 to support with modification to delete all the
30 regulatory language found in Section .25F3 and delegate
31 the authority to open, close, or adjust Federal lynx
32 seasons and to set harvest and possession limits for
33 lynx via a delegation of authority letter.

34

35 Quyana. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any questions for
38 Staff regarding this housekeeping proposal.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I did want a little
43 clarification. What was the rationale for removing
44 those areas on the State level. Do you know?

45

46 MR. KRON: I am not familiar. I'm not
47 sure if there's anybody in the audience.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. It's not
50 essentially relevant to this. Are there questions.

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'll run through
4 the list. ADF&G has informed us no comment on this
5 proposal at present pending action on the Federal
6 level. Any Federal, State or Tribal agency comments.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any InterAgency
11 Staff Committee comments. Mr. Berg.

12

13 MR. BERG: I'll just clarify. The
14 InterAgency Staff Committee did review all of your
15 wildlife proposals before you and we submitted our
16 comments and they were incorporated into the analysis
17 so we won't have any comments on any of the wildlife
18 proposals just for the record.

19

20 Mr. Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. It's
23 on my agenda so I had to say it until that point.
24 Advisory Committees.

25

26 MR. CHARLES: No comment.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any written public
29 comments.

30

31 MR. NICK: (Shakes head negatively)

32

33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Anyone from the
34 public wish to address this proposal.

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seeing none. A
39 motion would be in order to adopt this proposal and I
40 would urge that motion, when made, include the modified
41 language found on Page 35.

42

43 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chair. I move that we
44 adopt resolution WP10-04 with modifications on Page 34
45 you say?

46

47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: 35.

48

49 MR. ONEY: 35.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Motion by Ray Oney.
2 Second.
3
4 MR. CHARLES: Second.
5
6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seconded by James.
7 Further discussion.
8
9 (No comments)
10
11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ready for the
12 question.
13
14 MR. BROWN: Question.
15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question called.
17 All those in favor.
18
19 IN UNISON: Aye.
20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: All opposed same
22 sign.
23
24 (No opposing votes)
25
26 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Proposal 10-
27 04 pass 7-0. Proposal WP10-05. Mr. Kron.
28
29 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. You are
30 cruising. Proposal WP10-05 can be found beginning on
31 Page 46 in your Council book. This proposal was
32 submitted by OSM and seeks to update, clarify, and
33 simplify the regulations regarding accumulation of
34 harvest limits for both fish and wildlife.
35
36 This is a statewide proposal and like
37 the others you've just considered will be viewed by all
38 10 Councils. The wording in general Federal
39 subsistence regulations concerning accumulation of
40 harvest limits dates back to 1990 and 1994. There's a
41 need to update that wording. While the Federal
42 Subsistence Board has addressed a number of area
43 specific proposals concerning the accumulation of
44 harvest limits over the years, this part of the general
45 regulations has not been updated to reflect changes to
46 the unit and area specific regulations.
47
48 Proposal 10-05 addresses the
49 inconsistencies in the regulations. It does not affect
50 fish and wildlife populations, subsistence users or

1 other users. Rather, the proposal seeks to update,
2 clarify, and simplify the sections of the general
3 regulations which reference accumulation of harvest
4 limits.

5
6 The proposed wording change retains the
7 general prohibition of accumulation of State and
8 Federal harvest limits, and points to unit and area
9 specific regulations for details and exceptions. This
10 proposal does not change any unit or area specific
11 Federal subsistence regulations concerning accumulation
12 of harvest limits or the timeframe, daily, seasonal or
13 regulatory year, for harvest limits.

14
15 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
16 support Proposal WP10-05. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd
17 be happy to take any questions.

18
19 Quyana.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any questions
22 regarding this housekeeping proposal.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none.
27 Nothing from the Department or the State.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any Federal, State
32 or Tribal agencies wish to speak to this proposal.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any InterAgency
37 Staff Committee provided any Advisory Committee
38 comments.

39
40 MR. CHARLES: No comments.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any written public
43 comments.

44
45 (No comments)

46
47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Anyone from
48 the public wish to address this proposal.

49
50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seeing none. A
2 motion would be in order for action on this proposal to
3 adopt this proposal. I see there is no modified
4 language on this one, so it would be a straightforward
5 Proposal 10-05 for adoption.
6
7 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman.
8
9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: James.
10
11 MR. CHARLES: I move to adopt WP10-05.
12
13 MR. ALOYSIUS: Second.
14
15 MR. ANDREW: Second.
16
17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Moved by James.
18 Seconded by Bob and John. Any discussion.
19
20 (No comments)
21
22 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Are you ready for
23 the question.
24
25 MR. ANDREW: Question.
26
27 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question called,
28 question heard. All those in favor say aye.
29
30 IN UNISON: Aye.
31
32 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Those opposed same
33 sign.
34
35 (No opposing votes)
36
37 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none.
38 Proposal 10-05 pass 7-0. We'll move on into regional
39 proposals.
40
41 We're going to step down here for 10
42 minutes since we're changing areas.
43
44 (Off record)
45
46 (On record)
47
48 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We're back on
49 record 4:59. Just to let people know in discussions
50 that we had during the break we won't be doing an

1 evening session this evening. We'll probably go to
2 5:30, 6:00 at the latest and get some of the Staff
3 reports and current proposals that's coming up.
4 Probably one of the most complex that we're going to be
5 dealing with here. Whether we get through action on it
6 tonight remains to be seen. We will go forward from
7 there.

8
9 Proposal WP10-54. We have Dr.
10 Doolittle here to tell us what those animals that
11 created this thing are thinking about to help us in
12 translation.

13
14 (Laughter)

15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Staff is ready to
17 go. Proposal 10-54.

18
19 (Pause)

20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Pippa.

22
23 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm
24 Pippa Kenner again with OSM in Anchorage and with me is
25 Tom Doolittle and Robert Sundown, who are with the
26 Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge headquartered here
27 in Bethel.

28
29 Proposal 10-54 was submitted by the
30 Refuge and it requests establishing community harvest
31 quotas in a pool of Federally qualified users that are
32 eligible to hunt moose in what I'm calling the
33 moratorium area.

34
35 In submitting this proposal, the Refuge
36 hopes to limit the distribution of Federal permits to
37 harvest moose in the moratorium area due to
38 conservation concerns for the moose population. The
39 Refuge does not request an open hunting season for
40 moose, but is anticipating a hunt in the future.

41
42 When I presented my analysis for this
43 to the InterAgency Staff Committee, I was a little
44 confused and I was also trying to focus on the request
45 for the community quota system in this proposal. What
46 the InterAgency Staff Committee pointed out to me is
47 what the Refuge was also asking for, is to limit the
48 number of people who are eligible to hunt on the
49 Federal public lands of the moratorium area. That's
50 because there's 42 communities including Bethel who are

1 eligible Federally qualified to hunt in that area.

2

3 So what they said to me is they wanted
4 me to focus on that process, which is in Section .804
5 in ANILCA that allows us to limit that eligibility, to
6 focus on that and to not focus on the community harvest
7 quota system. So I did that, but we're going to talk
8 about it again at the end of the proposal.

9

10 Through ANILCA you can exclude people
11 who are in the customary and traditional use
12 determination for moose in the moratorium area. In
13 order to do that you have to look at three criteria.
14 The first criteria is customary and direct dependence
15 upon the populations as the mainstay of livelihood.
16 Number two is local residency, and number three is the
17 availability of alternative resources.

18

19 So this 804 analysis, which we call it,
20 is necessary to determine the Federally qualified users
21 who are going to be eligible to harvest moose in the
22 moratorium area in the future when the season is
23 established. We're doing this because we're
24 anticipating that the population of moose is going to
25 be too low to allow a general hunt for everybody who's
26 qualified.

27

28 I'm going to move forward. There are
29 42 widely dispersed communities, roughly 20,000 people
30 included in the customary and traditional use
31 determination for moose in the moratorium area.
32 Fourteen of these communities lie within the area that
33 is the focus of this proposal, the moratorium area, and
34 they are Tuntutuliak, Eek, Napakiak, Napaskiak,
35 Kasigluk, Nunapitchuk, Atmautluak, Oscarville, Bethel,
36 Kwethluk, Akiachak, Akiak, Tuluksak, and Lower Kalskag.

37

38 The conclusion of the analysis is that
39 the residents of communities located within the
40 boundary of the moratorium area and Upper Kalskag have
41 exhibited the highest levels of reliance on the moose
42 in the area. The distribution of permits to hunt
43 moose on Federal public lands in the moratorium area
44 should be restricted to the residents of the area and
45 Upper Kalskag.

46

47 As far as the distribution of permits,
48 within the 804 framework that we just put forth, we've
49 limited eligibility to just the people who live within
50 the moratorium area and, in general, the Federal

1 regulations have not included descriptions of how a
2 limited number of permits will be distributed between
3 communities and individuals within a community.
4 Instead, permit distribution has been the
5 responsibility of the land manager, in this case the
6 refuge, in consultation with the communities. I've put
7 a little bit more discussion in there and I'm available
8 to answer questions if you have any.

9

10 The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
11 through the Refuge would be the Federal agency
12 responsible for distributing Federal permits for the
13 moose hunt in the moratorium area. The harvestable
14 surplus is determined utilizing the results of aerial
15 surveys and balancing the sex ratio by using both bull
16 and cow harvests as appropriate. The U.S. Fish and
17 Wildlife Service would consult with Fish and Game to
18 determine the number of Federal permits to be
19 distributed each year.

20

21 Now I'm going to go on to explain a
22 little bit to reiterate what you already know but for
23 others in public who might not know how we got here.
24 In 2004, a five-year moratorium was established. There
25 was a lot of consultation between communities, Federal,
26 State managers and boards were all involved. The
27 population objective was for 1,000 moose to be in an
28 area that includes the survey units along the Kuskokwim
29 River corridor and the long-term objective set by the
30 State was to reach 2,000 moose in the survey unit.

31

32 At its March 2009 meeting, the Alaska
33 Board of Game established a registration hunt in the
34 moratorium area. The 2009 State season was September 1
35 to September 10 with a one antlered bull harvest limit
36 by registration permit and a total harvest quota of 75
37 antlered bull moose. I think at the last count about
38 36 over the quota were taken, something like that.
39 They overshot it by about 36.

40

41 At its fall 2009 meeting, this Council
42 did not opt to submit a proposal to open the moose
43 season on the Federal public lands in the moratorium
44 area, and the Federal public lands in the moratorium
45 area have remained closed to the harvest of moose
46 by non-Federally qualified users. Actually by all
47 users.

48

49 So the big picture, kind of the vision
50 of where this proposal is coming from and where it may

1 be going, is that Refuge Staff are working with ADF&G
2 in an attempt to coordinate the opening of a future
3 Federal moose season with the existing State moose
4 season in the moratorium area. A major issue that has
5 been identified by the Refuge is the need to limit the
6 distribution of moose permits in the moratorium area
7 due to the small number of moose that are available to
8 harvest. Such steps will be necessary to prevent
9 overharvest.

10
11 Another major issue is the harvest of
12 moose that occurs outside of the regulatory season that
13 is generally unreported. In recent years, increased
14 law enforcement has been used to stop the illegal
15 harvest. Enforcement officials and Refuge Staff have
16 also spoken to residents of the moratorium area about
17 their concerns. While enforcement and education are
18 important and should continue, it has been shown in
19 numerous examples in Alaska that community-based
20 management strategies, combined with reasonable
21 enforcement measures, are likely to be more effective
22 than law enforcement alone.

23
24 To this end, the Refuge is proposing to
25 continue its support of cooperative efforts with
26 villages and ADF&G that established the moose harvest
27 moratorium in 2004 in the first place. The overall
28 goal of the Refuge is to partner with ADF&G and local
29 communities to provide a community moose harvest quota
30 and reporting system in the moratorium area, and to
31 identify community-specific hunting areas. The desired
32 outcome is for each eligible community to monitor the
33 moose populations in its area, distribute harvest
34 opportunity to community members, and enforce harvest
35 limits based on a quota established by the Refuge in
36 consultation with Fish and Game and the villages.

37
38 In conclusion, in the future, when
39 Federal public lands open to moose hunting in the
40 moratorium area in Unit 18, it's going to be necessary
41 to limit the distribution of Federal permits to harvest
42 moose due to conservation concerns for the moose
43 population. Adoption of this proposal as modified
44 would be necessary to limit the pool of eligible users.

45
46 The proposal has been modified to
47 include the communities that were determined to be most
48 reliant on the moose in the moratorium area, which are
49 the communities in the moratorium area and Upper
50 Kalskag.

1 Forty-two communities are included in
2 the customary and traditional use determination for
3 moose in the moratorium area. The Section 804 analysis
4 determined that only residents of communities in the
5 moratorium area and Upper Kalskag would be eligible to
6 harvest moose in the moratorium area. The Refuge Staff
7 would work with residents of the eligible communities
8 to determine how permits would be distributed within
9 the communities.

10

11 It's hard for me to predict exactly
12 what parts of this you're going to have questions
13 about, but I'm pretty sure you're going to have
14 questions, so I'll stop now and see if there are any.

15

16 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions. Bob.

19

20 MR. ALOYSIUS: Point of clarification.
21 Lower Kalskag and Kalskag were not in the moratorium
22 area. They are in Game Management Unit 19. And that
23 brings up this thing about where is the boundary
24 separating 18 and 19. Nobody knows because on the regs
25 it just says a straight line from Paimiut to Lower
26 Kalskag. Where in Lower Kalskag? Is it at the dump,
27 the upper end, in the middle? Are you going to divide
28 Lower Kalskag into 18 on the downriver side and 19 on
29 the upriver side?

30

31 For point of clarification, there is no
32 such place as Upper Kalskag. There's Kalskag and Lower
33 Kalskag.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Other questions for
36 Staff

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Well, I certainly
41 do. First off, if this proposal passed, would it then
42 be -- well, it doesn't actually put in place a season
43 for a Federal hunt. Am I reading that correctly?

44

45 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair. I bypassed the
46 effects of the proposal, but that is true. If this
47 proposal is adopted, there will be no change and if it
48 isn't adopted there will be no change. It is to
49 establish a framework to prepare for the opening of the
50 area.

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Unless we should
2 choose to modify the proposal.....

3
4 MS. KENNER: Exactly.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA:as it's
7 suggested.

8
9 MS. KENNER: Yes.

10
11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I guess maybe Tom
12 would be the one to answer this one. If it came to
13 that, how would you determine as fa as how many permits
14 were issued to each community? I mean all that is in
15 the future. I guess just right out front what is the
16 concern, if there is a major one, on just opening the
17 season and including the season and what we have for
18 the 10-day hunt right now and including the Federal
19 lands without having to jump through that additional
20 paper chase that would be required for specific permits
21 and determinations per number of villages and then who
22 is going to administer. Through the Council, I know we
23 did it with Kilbuk Caribou in the late '80s and it
24 worked to varying degrees of success between villages
25 at the time.

26
27 Can you address some of those. What
28 are we looking at?

29
30 MR. DOOLITTLE: I'm Tom Doolittle,
31 supervisory biologist Yukon-Delta. I think you have to
32 take a look at this particular moose herd in a unique
33 way just because of the confines of the habitat that
34 the moose are in. It's very small. If you look at
35 this time of year, the moose that are coming into the
36 upper drainages, for instance, the upper Kwethluk and
37 down from the mountains actually concentrate in a small
38 amount of habitat along the river.

39
40 The amount of Federal land is small and
41 the confines of some of the habitats are smaller than
42 the State-managed lands that are associated nearby. So
43 we've always had a habitat concern. We also know that
44 from the participants and the performance of the first
45 hunt from this year that there was a lot of
46 participants in comparison to most moose hunts in Unit
47 18 with over 1300 permits that were issued and then
48 again with the hunting success being around about seven
49 percent. So there's a lot of pressure on a finite
50 resource in a finite piece of land. There's only so

1 much habitat the land can hold.

2

3 We look at the Yukon in broader
4 expanses of habitat and realize that all habitat is not
5 equal. Here we have a high proportion of alder to the
6 willow and we have smaller, narrower bands of habitat
7 in comparison to that of the Yukon, so it's likely that
8 this habitat would not be able to support some of the
9 densities that we'd see existing today up on the Yukon.

10

11 The other aspect is the density data
12 right now. We've had two bad winters for surveying.
13 This winter was exceptionally poor as far as snow
14 conditions. We have met today to look at some
15 concessions on how we can increase detectability to
16 actually get a density estimate on moose because we
17 really need that.

18

19 We were lucky that we had the snow for
20 a composition survey that we did jointly with ADF&G and
21 it showed the likely impacts of the first 10-day season
22 where almost 50 percent of the bulls were harvested in
23 the initial parts.

24

25 The question we always have is that we
26 want to be conservative with this resource because it's
27 a resource that's available that you'd want available
28 for our grandchildren and our great grandchildren.
29 It's sustainable and we don't want to bust it.

30

31 At this present harvest rate -- and
32 I'll pass these out after I'm done with my oration so
33 you can mull over this overnight so I can answer
34 additional questions in the next few days about this
35 moose population.

36

37 The last thing we are going to try to
38 do is try to still pull off a moose density survey and
39 we are in the tentative stages and the one aspect that
40 we may do if we can do it comparatively is to use
41 helicopters to try to get some sort of density estimate
42 so we're reacting off real numbers.

43

44 Our reluctance is that when we haven't
45 had real numbers for two years and especially after the
46 first year after a hunt is that we start to get into
47 the art of wildlife management rather than specifics.
48 Art is dangerous and within that I want to make sure
49 that when we open up the doors that they're opened up a
50 way that this herd will be available for harvest for

1 the long-term and that we don't bust it in a short
2 period of time.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: This is jumping
5 forward, I suspect, a ways, but I'd just like to have
6 it on the table, too, for myself, but as far as what's
7 put in your overall goal about identifying community
8 specific hunting areas. Will Kwethluk village be the
9 only one to be able to hunt on the Kwethluk River,
10 something of that nature?

11

12 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, and I think that
13 that's not part of this proposal. It's really looking
14 at that framework. Knowing our agency and the groups
15 that are involved, I'm sure that framework becomes a
16 more formalized proposal and would be well discussed
17 and well vetted through all the communities and
18 Councils that we usually do.

19

20 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman, I might be
21 able to answer that.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Robert

24

25 MR. SUNDOWN: Looking at all the
26 different legal requirements, you look at the C&T
27 determinations that are made for the Kuskokwim and if
28 those villages are determined to have C&T for the
29 Kuskokwim specific area, I think it would be difficult
30 to exclude different villages from outside of the
31 different areas of the Refuge.

32

33 MS. KENNER: This is Pippa Kenner again
34 with OSM. In consultation with a few people at the
35 Refuge, it became apparent to me that this was part of
36 the vision that there would be local use areas -- that
37 there would be some participation, for instance, in
38 enforcement by local communities within the local
39 community. For instance, if you want people to start
40 thinking about harvest in terms of allocation, I'm not
41 even talking season, just allocation, you can't be
42 expecting people from Kwethluk to be going down to
43 Tunt.

44

45 It only makes sense for people to start
46 being aware of how important to stay within the quota
47 is. People would be looking in their own environs.
48 However, that would not be part of regulation at this
49 point because of the definition of the customary and
50 traditional uses and the way we implement those

1 determinations. We couldn't put that in regulation.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Again, for
4 reference, going back to Kilbuk from back in the late
5 '80s, there was a harvestable surplus determined and
6 they just essentially meted it out with every village
7 that had that C&T, which is basically Quinhagak to
8 Kalskags, and everybody got 10 animals or eight or
9 whatever it was and as far as moose goes you could
10 figure what your success rate might be and each village
11 would get X amount of permits to be distributed through
12 their own drawings or their own designated hunters,
13 however that may be.

14

15 I don't know if you'd go to that level
16 here and how do you equate that into the State hunt as
17 well. I begin to wonder what do you see is your
18 savings. I suspect maybe I'll see some of it there,
19 but as far as why not just include it under the State
20 general hunt, the 10-day season, with the same closure
21 and effect and everybody still gets the same equal
22 opportunity if you will.

23

24 Pippa.

25

26 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair. To respond to
27 that, that could happen. At a minimum, if you adopt
28 this 804 and limit the distribution of permits, what
29 quickly follows is when you open the season what it
30 does is allow people who live within the so-called
31 moratorium are to hunt on both the State and Federal
32 land and everyone else has to stay on State land.
33 That's the most obvious consequence of it in using the
34 State season opening and closing simultaneously.
35 However there are situations, some of them that are
36 quite contemporary, where the State is now beginning to
37 look at community harvest quotas. There have been
38 places where it's been very successful. Every part of
39 the state is different. Every situation is different.

40

41 For instance, AHTNA, Inc. with the
42 State has developed a community harvest quota system
43 that may be applicable -- some parts of that may be
44 applicable and I do have a handout here that I'd be
45 more than happy to give you.

46

47 If you adopted this 804 analysis, none
48 of the rest of this would be implemented. The idea was
49 to give the Council and the Board and the public an
50 idea of what the possibilities are. However, none of

1 it is included in this proposal. It would be a
2 planning process to determine what in a couple of years
3 the Council might want to propose in a way of opening
4 harvest limit and season.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: If we wanted to go
7 to that level and have to deal with an additional layer
8 of paperwork at both the State and Federal level. I'm
9 familiar with the community harvest system that is in
10 place with the State and each village would then be
11 referred. I suppose we could do it if a regional --
12 no, you'd still require each village to go forward. If
13 it wasn't a regional consensus at the State level, each
14 village would then have to put in an application to
15 administer their own specific hunt for their community.

16
17 Go ahead, John.

18
19 MR. ANDREW: Mr. Chairman. Thank you,
20 Staff. This community harvest quota and a limited
21 number of village only 14. I met with our tribal
22 council members back on February 19. They did not like
23 the idea of setting up a quota for the community
24 because if they do that, once they harvest their quota
25 limit they won't be able to go out. The other concern
26 they had was they did not want to discriminate other
27 villages because we have relatives on the coastal side,
28 Bristol Bay on the Yukon side, or somewhere else. They
29 all try to come in and participate on their local hunts
30 if they can. That's one of the reasons they were in
31 opposition.

32
33 The other one was restricting other
34 villages. The concept is good, but then for most of
35 them they did not like it. The other things is when
36 you do random drawing, people that get their permits
37 some of them do not utilize them. People that really
38 need them are left out.

39
40 Quyana, Mr. Chairman.

41
42 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: James Charles.

45
46 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
47 I did not think we were going to have a problem like
48 this because we are the -- as Fish and Game Advisory
49 Committee are the original moratorium proposal makers
50 and I did not know we were going to have this kind of

1 problem because we talk about that proposal for a long
2 time until we finally made that proposal. At that time
3 we did not know what Federal was going to do because
4 Federal stayed back and did not propose a moratorium.
5 I mean the Federal was holding back and not propose
6 this kind of proposal.

7
8 Anyway we thought it was going to help
9 our area closing for five years or until we get 1,000
10 moose. Either way, five years or 1,000 moose. If we
11 have 1,000 moose in four years, we were going to open
12 it, but as Federal, as a RAC or Federal Subsistence
13 Board was holding back until State came in and proposed
14 for a moratorium. That was what was hard for me to
15 answer questions when we opened the season last fall
16 for 10 days. People asked me on the phone where can I
17 hunt, where can I hunt. It was not easy. So I tell
18 them you can only hunt on State land or corporation
19 land and it was not easy to answer those questions.
20 There were some other questions. Why didn't the
21 Federal close it before. Now they're closing the
22 Federal land or keep it closed.

23
24 Like I mentioned this morning, it
25 wasn't easy trying to help the people. Maybe because
26 people know me, I'm with the RAC and the Advisory
27 Committee too, that's why they keep calling me from my
28 village. Like I said, I didn't know we were going to
29 have this kind of problem.

30
31 Thank you.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Pippa.

34
35 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair. I just wanted
36 to talk a little bit about how the proposals that the
37 Federal program -- the proposals for regulation changes
38 that the Board received for this cycle, we didn't
39 receive a proposal requesting the moratorium area to
40 open. More significantly than that, this Council voted
41 not to put a proposal in. So Staff was stuck in this
42 dilemma to have a proposal generated from us that is
43 against what the Council has instructed us to do. It
44 put us in a position that we made the decisions we did
45 and we didn't put in a proposal from OSM.

46
47 MR. CHARLES: Thanks.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I guess by default
50 what happened is -- you remember this Council

1 recommended an additional one year on the moratorium
2 and that occurred this last season. Tom, I'm sure you
3 guys must have discussed it, but as far as -- I mean
4 the end of the State's recommendations, I'm sure we'll
5 hear it from them later, but part of it was to support
6 this with the modification including it in the State's
7 10 day registration hunt. To what level does that
8 raise concern about the harvest, it has a closure
9 authority with minimum reporting time, so when we start
10 getting close to that cap, granted maybe you're going
11 to be going over. Can you lay out some of the concerns
12 you have there.

13

14 Can we satisfy, do you think?

15

16 MR. DOOLITTLE: Tom Doolittle,
17 Yukon-Delta. I think that the Refuge biological Staff
18 has had concerns. I don't think we're shy about the
19 expression of the concerns about the number of moose
20 that were harvested and what we call the additional
21 take on the herd too. There's a lot of added take that
22 occurs from closed seasons, from incidental snaring and
23 so on. When you start adding it up, it's more than 110
24 animals beyond what nature takes, so we've always had
25 that concern.

26

27 As I stated before, we really want to
28 have some density information and we've been trying
29 like the dickens to get it. At least we've got one
30 segment of the information so we can start to gauge how
31 much the harvest it did have impact on the existing at
32 least bull population.

33

34 Our concern in the smaller habitats and
35 the fringe habitats, such as Eek at the edge and the
36 smaller areas where moose have just recently expanded
37 to, they probably have taken a hit in some of those
38 areas and that spreading of those moose have contracted
39 from where they were before the season. We're
40 fortunate that we've had a mild winter, so moose and
41 calf production should be good and hopefully our flood
42 waters will be down too, so both sides of the Yukon and
43 the Kusko might see added mortalities from flood
44 events.

45

46 The thing I really want to do is really
47 get this density work done and try to use the budget
48 that we have and to realize that we probably put some
49 of the largest proportion of funding in comparison to
50 any agency and to moose research and into understanding

1 this population so we can provide you with our best
2 recommendations and that requires that we get this
3 data.

4

5 So we will hopefully within the next
6 few weeks -- I lined up a pilot today. We're going to
7 go through to see whether we can get the blocks done
8 and set and see whether we can invoke better
9 sightability in these poor conditions using helicopters
10 versus fixed wing aircraft so we can provide you the
11 best information that we can get.

12

13 So then we'd know how many moose we'd
14 have in those areas and then set the quota from real
15 numbers. The only real numbers that we can compare to
16 is the change in composition and a change in calf
17 survivorship, which both declined in the last few years
18 and I'll give a more formal presentation on that
19 tomorrow.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any other Council
22 questions. Bob and then James.

23

24 MR. ALOYSIUS: When did this proposal
25 originate and why didn't Kalskag, Lower Kalskag ever
26 get a notice that this was in the mill? Is it because
27 we're in 19?

28

(Laughter)

29

30 MS. KENNER: The proposal originated
31 from the Refuge.

32

33 MR. ALOYSIUS: When?

34

35 MR. SUNDOWN: In the fall of 2009.
36 There's a regular public notification process that goes
37 on mainly at the website. A book is published with all
38 the proposals and then we're here.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: James.

41

42 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
43 Another thing I forgot to mention was that during that
44 10 day hunt we had last fall people were complaining
45 about too many enforcement airplanes flying around. Is
46 it going to be the same way if this passes?

47

48 MR. SUNDOWN: I think I can answer
49 that. Yeah. You know, until this moose population on
50

1 the Kuskokwim is very healthy I think you'll see heavy
2 enforcement presence. We probably had half a dozen
3 officers in various parts of the Kuskokwim patrolling
4 along with the State. So, yes.

5
6 I think the primary message that you're
7 hearing from us is the bigger picture is the moose
8 population is doing much better than it did five years
9 ago, but it's not great. It's not to the point where
10 we can have a free-for-all general hunt like you see on
11 the Yukon. I mean you see the fruits of the
12 conservation efforts on the lower Yukon and the middle
13 parts of the Yukon today where they enjoy 80-plus days
14 of moose hunting on any moose.

15
16 That's the direction we're trying to
17 get to and how we get there I think is the bigger
18 picture that we'd like to focus on. I think we lose
19 that detail in trying to figure out how the community
20 harvest quota is going to work for every village and
21 everybody, but we shouldn't lose sight of the bigger
22 picture that we're trying to grow this moose population
23 for the benefit of everybody.

24
25 MR. DOOLITTLE: And I think our concern
26 is that we started at a low density to initiate a hunt.
27 It was okay, but when you start to go over our concern
28 now and why we feel the density information is critical
29 is to see whether we've inhibited the actual growth of
30 this population to expand that density and that we
31 haven't taken it back, that we maintain the status quo,
32 are we gaining at the same rates that we were in the
33 past or are we not getting anywhere.

34
35 The idea is that we still have a lot of
36 growth potential in this moose population and we need
37 to get there, but we don't want to start reversing the
38 trend and that's a concern of our biologist and the
39 Refuge right now.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: You said you have
42 additional material you want to present on this
43 tomorrow?

44
45 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, just briefly. I
46 have just what would be some of the graphs here and
47 just gives you an overall view of what would be on Unit
48 18 so we can throw it up on the wall. It just kind of
49 gives you an idea of when surveys were done and some
50 surveys on the Yukon, for instance, haven't been done

1 since 2002. So it kind of will give you an overall unit
2 perspective on moose population.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray.

5

6 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As
7 long as it doesn't have any affects in my area because
8 there's a healthy population on the Lower Yukon because
9 of the moratorium that was imposed a number of years
10 ago and I don't want to sacrifice because of the
11 moratorium harvest quotas in the moratorium area. I
12 don't want to see it happen in that area because of one
13 area being affected. As long as it doesn't go into the
14 whole area. You hear what I'm trying to say?

15

16 MR. DOOLITTLE: And we've been very
17 supportive with liberalizing, especially in some areas,
18 the harvest on Federal lands. We want to maintain so
19 we can keep that population on the Yukon under control
20 but still sustainable.

21

22 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Robert.

25

26 MR. SUNDOWN: If I understand Ray's
27 concern, this would be only for the Kuskokwim. It
28 would not be for any other area.

29

30 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman. I just read
31 in Section .804 the Yukon drainage is also included in
32 that section in case there's a moratorium, that's the
33 way I understand it. In case there is a moratorium in
34 that area our village can be affected under Section
35 .804. Correct me if I'm wrong.

36

37 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman. I think
38 that analysis only speaks to who are the eligible
39 villages involved should the Kuskokwim become open
40 again.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Charlie.

43

44 MR. BROWN: Yeah, one time in my area
45 we had a problem with noise. These choppers make a lot
46 of noise when you're hunting. So a lot of those people
47 were confused, so as their Council members we met
48 together and we call who was disturbing our hunting
49 area. We understood that BLM was surveying, so we
50 talked to them and informed them and they apologized

1 and said they wouldn't survey when we had open season
2 to harvest food. In my mind, during the moose season
3 time, I want the same thing, not using those choppers.

4
5 MR. DOOLITTLE: The only proposal with
6 that would be in the next few weeks, so it's only to
7 survey this time of year and it's only because we don't
8 have the good sightability of snow conditions to be
9 able to get a density survey done. So we would not be
10 using helicopters or even fixed wings during the
11 hunting seasons to do -- for any hunting season to do
12 survey work.

13
14 MR. BROWN: Also I forgot to mention
15 that it's illegal to fly those aircraft less than 500
16 feet. Do you guys use that too?

17
18 MR. SUNDOWN: We generally don't have a
19 minimum altitude that we abide by when we do law
20 enforcement. Sometimes we can't see very well and we
21 can't determine if we can land. A lot of times we fly
22 under 500 feet to try to determine if we can safely
23 land an aircraft. That's really the only time we spend
24 any time under 500 feet.

25
26 MR. BROWN: So if anything happens like
27 that, we were advised to write down the time and day
28 and try to identify the color and number if we can see.

29
30 Thank you.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Tom, just to be
33 clear, you said you just have a handout there, you
34 didn't have an additional presentation that you're
35 looking to make?

36
37 MR. DOOLITTLE: I do. I have a
38 powerpoint presentation.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: So that would be
41 for tomorrow. I'd like to move forward with some of
42 the other comments here. If there's folks that wanted
43 to be on their way, we can go through the rest of the
44 list here on their presentations and pick up again
45 tomorrow.

46
47 The Alaska Department of Fish and Game
48 can give their comments.

49
50 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 George Pappas, Department of Fish and Game. Page 71 of
2 the RAC book contains our comments. I'll do my best to
3 summarize.

4

5 Lower Kuskokwim hunt area in Unit 18
6 was closed to hunting for a period of 5 years to allow
7 for population growth as moose expanded into previously
8 unoccupied habitat associated with the Kuskokwim River
9 drainage.

10

11 In November 2009, the Alaska Board of
12 Game made no changes to the registration permit hunt
13 based on hunter effort, which is approximately 1,100
14 applications, and total harvest approximately 105
15 moose, during the first year the hunt was reopened.
16 Continued hunting with low harvest quotas will allow
17 harvest opportunity at the same time allowing herd
18 growth and expansion.

19

20 Impact on subsistence users. Opening a
21 Federal subsistence registration permit hunt on Federal
22 public lands in the Lower Kuskokwim hunt area in Unit
23 18 allows Federal subsistence users the opportunity to
24 hunt moose in local areas rather than traveling long
25 distances to the Yukon River drainage or the Middle
26 Kuskokwim River. Approximately one-third of the moose
27 population in the hunt area is on Federal public lands,
28 mostly of the tributaries of the Kuskokwim.

29

30 Opportunity provided by the State. In
31 Unit 18, the State season in the Lower Kuskokwim River
32 hunt area is September 1 through September 10 by
33 registration permit. The bag limit is one antlered
34 bull. Permits are available at Alaska Department of
35 Fish and Game in Bethel and from village license
36 vendors during August 1 through August 25 time period.
37 Harvest quota is based on the number of moose
38 population estimates and will be announced as a hunt
39 condition on the permit.

40

41 Low harvests rates are sustainable
42 based on the current minimum population size of 1,000
43 moose and will allow for future herd growth and
44 expansion.

45

46 For enforcement issues. Emergency
47 closures based on achieving harvest quota make it
48 difficult for Federal subsistence hunters in the field
49 to learn of these announcements.

50

1 Allocation of a community harvest quota
2 by Federal delegated officials will require
3 coordination by State and Federal managers to ensure
4 that overharvest does not occur.

5
6 The Department's recommendation. The
7 Department supports with modification to establish a
8 season on Federal public lands that matches the State
9 season with State registration permit and harvest
10 quota. That would be September 1 through September 10
11 season by registration permit with a bag limit of one
12 antlered bull. The harvest quota would be based on
13 moose population estimate in the hunt area and
14 announced as a permit hunt condition. Hunt reports
15 required within three days of harvest to allow quota
16 management. This approach minimizes confusion for
17 hunters and law enforcement and recommends cooperative
18 harvest quota management among State and Federal
19 managers.

20
21 If adopted, this action would be
22 effective in the seventh year since initial closure in
23 the lower Kuskokwim hunt area and fulfills the original
24 strategy supported by both State and Federal managers
25 of closing the area for five years or reaching
26 1,000 moose.

27
28 Thank you, Mr. Chair. That concludes
29 our comments.

30
31 *****
32 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
33 *****

34
35 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
36 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

37
38 Wildlife Proposal WP10-54:
39

40 This proposal establishes community
41 harvest moose quotas for federal subsistence users
42 within the Lower Kuskokwim hunt area in Unit 18.

43
44 Introduction:

45
46 The Lower Kuskokwim hunt area in Unit
47 18 was closed to hunting for a period of 5 years to
48 allow for population growth as moose expanded into
49 previously unoccupied habitat associated with the
50 Kuskokwim River drainage. During the 2009-2010

1 regulatory year, the Alaska Board of Game approved a
2 registration permit hunt for residents only with a
3 harvest quota of 75 moose based on population estimates
4 of 1,000 moose in the hunt area. In November 2009, the
5 Alaska Board of Game made no changes to the
6 registration permit hunt based on hunter effort
7 (approximately 1,100 applications) and total harvest
8 (approximately 105 moose) during the first year the
9 hunt was reopened. Continued hunting with low harvest
10 quotas will allow harvest opportunity at the same time
11 allowing herd growth and expansion.

12

13 Impact on Subsistence Users:

14

15 Opening a federal subsistence
16 registration permit hunt on federal public lands in the
17 Lower Kuskokwim hunt area in Unit 18 allows federal
18 subsistence users the opportunity to hunt moose in
19 local areas rather than traveling long distances to the
20 Yukon River drainage or the Middle Kuskokwim River.
21 Approximately 1/3 of the moose population in the hunt
22 area is on federal public lands, mostly of the
23 tributaries of the Kuskokwim.

24

25 Opportunity Provided by State:

26

27 In Unit 18, the State season in the
28 Lower Kuskokwim River hunt area is September 1 through
29 September 10 by registration permit hunt RM615. The
30 bag limit is 1 antlered bull. Permits are available at
31 Alaska Department of Fish and Game in Bethel and from
32 village license vendors during August 1 through August
33 25. Harvest quota is based on moose population
34 estimate and will be announced as a hunt condition on
35 permit RM615. In 2009-2010 the harvest quota was 75
36 bulls.

37

38 Conservation Issues:

39

40 Low harvests rates are sustainable
41 based on the current minimum population size of 1,000
42 moose and will allow for future herd growth and
43 expansion.

44

45 Enforcement Issues:

46

47 Emergency closures based on achieving
48 harvest quota make it difficult for federal subsistence
49 hunters in the field to learn of these announcements.

50

1 Other Comments:

2

3 Allocation of a community harvest quota
4 by federal delegated officials will require
5 coordination by state and federal managers to ensure
6 that overharvest does not occur.

7

8 Recommendation:

9

10 Support, with modification to establish
11 a season on federal public lands that matches the state
12 season with state registration permit and harvest
13 quota: September 1 through September 10 season by
14 registration permit; bag limit of 1 antlered bull;
15 harvest quota based on moose population estimate in the
16 hunt area and announced as a permit hunt condition;
17 hunt reports required within 3 days of harvest to allow
18 quota management. This approach minimizes confusion
19 for hunters and law enforcement and recommends
20 cooperative harvest quota management among state and
21 federal managers. If adopted, this action would be
22 effective in the seventh year since initial closure in
23 the lower Kuskokwim hunt area and fulfills the original
24 strategy supported by both state and federal managers
25 of closing the area for 5 years or reaching 1,000
26 moose.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions for the
29 Department.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Phillip. Maybe you
34 can answer the same question I asked Mr. Doolittle.
35 Would you have significant concerns if we were to
36 recommend just opening a general hunt on the Federal
37 land -- or not the general, but the registration hunt
38 and what would you see as a danger. You said one-third
39 of the moose population is on Federal land. Would you
40 see that 105 that were taken last year turning into
41 150? Would you reduce the quota of whatever it was, 78
42 or 75 last time? Would you be knocking that one down?
43 Where are you at and how do you see that working since
44 the recommendation is to open the Federal lands under
45 the State season? And to make it as minimally
46 confusing as possible for everybody out here that would
47 be the simplest approach, but whether it's the best one
48 I don't know yet. If you could just address that,
49 please.

50

1 MR. PERRY: I think when we talk about
2 quotas we all want to set a quota based on the best
3 information we have. It appears this year that, like
4 all of you know, snow conditions have prevented any
5 sort of estimate that we would normally try to do in
6 January or February and it doesn't look like we're
7 going to get the conventional way to do it even in the
8 month of March.

9
10 So I think the prudent thing, whether
11 or not Federal managed lands are open or not this fall
12 is to look at what we did last year and to be
13 conservative and use the same number or maybe a lower
14 number for the quota in this coming year. I think the
15 only way we could justify increasing a quota would be
16 with new information that showed that we could increase
17 the quota. I don't know if that's answering all your
18 question, but crystal ball, if we get no more
19 additional information than we have right now I can't
20 imagine increasing the quota at all be it on just State
21 managed lands or on State and Federal lands.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any questions for
24 the Department.

25
26 Charlie.

27
28 MR. BROWN: Are you guys going to
29 survey this year for new numbers of moose this year?

30
31 MR. PERRY: That was the plan. We were
32 hoping to start maybe in late January, but with the
33 survey methods that we use we need approximately a foot
34 of snow in all the areas and we haven't had that. Tom
35 alluded to one of the things that is required in the
36 method we use, that we have to have very good
37 sightability. We have to count on that we see almost
38 all the moose that are in a survey unit and the only
39 way we can ensure that is if we have good snow cover.
40 Whether conditions this year and low snowfall has
41 prevented us from being able to do that. Our window of
42 opportunity is rapidly closing in the next few weeks to
43 get that done.

44
45 MR. BROWN: Yeah, because those folks
46 don't want to rely on the old numbers, old quotas, like
47 last year, so they want to go for current quota.

48
49 Thank you.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob Aloysius.
2
3 MR. ALOYSIUS: What is the actual
4 number of harvest of moose in that 10 day hunt because
5 a lot of people want to know what the real number was?
6
7 MR. PERRY: I noticed in some of this
8 it ended up being a couple numbers different but -- and
9 I don't have it straight here in front of me, but I
10 want to say the total that was reported to us was 107.
11
12 MR. ALOYSIUS: Legal numbers?
13
14 (Laughter)
15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Further questions
17 for the State.
18
19 (No comments)
20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: You'll still be
22 around tomorrow if we carry into then. I don't see us
23 getting to a point where we're going to be taking
24 action on this today. Thanks, folks.
25
26 (State nods affirmatively)
27
28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Federal, State or
29 tribal agencies. Alex.
30
31 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. I apologize for
32 overlooking this document that was distributed late
33 this afternoon. I did not realize that Kwethluk
34 Organized Village had some public comments. For
35 Proposal 54, the Organized Village of Kwethluk opposed
36 the proposal.
37
38 Mr. Chair.
39
40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: That's the only
41 written public comments you've gotten when we get down
42 to that on item 6 since this was item 3?
43
44 MR. NICK: For this proposal. There
45 were some proposals that were on the document -- rather
46 the comments on the document.
47
48 Thank you.
49
50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: InterAgency

1 comments incorporated into his presentation. Any
2 Advisory Committees.

3

4 James.

5

6 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7 Fish and Game Advisory Committee made a proposal to
8 lift the moratorium about a year and a half ago. I
9 think it was an agenda request to the Board of Game and
10 we authorized the Department to make their restrictions
11 to conserve the moose population as they like it, so we
12 did not have anything against the way they did it as a
13 permit system and 10-day hunt. Because we authorized
14 them to do that, that worked out good.

15

16 Thank you.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Anyone from the
19 public. I do have a blue card here. Chariton Epchook
20 from Kwethluk.

21

22 MR. EPCHOOK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 I'm Chariton Epchook. I'm here to represent Kwethluk,
24 Incorporated. We are in opposition of this particular
25 proposal.

26

27 If you all remember the Kilbuk Caribou
28 Management Plan, it's going by the same principal.
29 Each village was given a certain number of tickets. It
30 went good for the first two years and the following
31 years there was no way to control the other hunters
32 regarding the Kilbuk caribou.

33

34 Also I wanted you guys to think of your
35 kids, your nephews, your cousins, the younger
36 generation hunters. With this system that is being
37 proposed, we will not be able to hold them back if they
38 want to go out hunting for moose. In essence, we'll
39 send and let them go and let them get records, become
40 criminals for hunting moose, for catching moose. So I
41 come to you and say that Kwethluk, Incorporated is in
42 opposition of this particular proposal. Qu yana.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hold on. Maybe
45 there is questions.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I kind of did have
50 one actually. I just want to ask you, you guys are in

1 opposition to the community harvest quota, but this has
2 been broken out as far as limiting the hunt to the
3 Federally qualified subsistence users or did you
4 discuss or talk about whether you wanted the Federal
5 lands to stay closed under the fall hunt or did you
6 guys go there. That's what I'm wondering.

7
8 MR. EPCHOOK: We didn't talk
9 particularly about that, but I believe looking at the
10 last hunt a lot of people did not like it. Not able to
11 hunt on the upper portion of Kwethluk where we believe
12 there were a lot more moose than down at the lower end
13 of Kwethluk. We talked about that as a joint group
14 also and certain things we didn't like about the fall
15 moose hunt as well.

16
17 And the management system that was also
18 right there. All hunters were complaining about the
19 same thing, planes flying over. Seems like to me, I
20 was there, like they were trying to scare the moose
21 further away from all the hunters that were below the
22 borderline.

23
24 So I think we did not want that to
25 happen again. It would be good if it was open also on
26 Federal land as well if there was a season this coming
27 year.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay, thanks. Any
30 other member of the public here wish to speak to this.

31
32 James Nicori. And you can close this
33 out for this evening

34
35 MR. NICORI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
36 Again, my name is James Nicori from Kwethluk.

37
38 On this 10-54, on that moose survey
39 they keep telling us that the count was on the
40 Kuskokwim River and the tributaries and we invite
41 people from Fish and Game and Wildlife, both State and
42 Federal, to our village and have a meeting with them
43 every once in a while. Every time they come we ask
44 where did you count. The only answer they give us,
45 between Kalskag and Bethel, just along the Kuskokwim.
46 They didn't count the Kisaralik, Kwethluk, Napaskiak
47 Slough and all the tributaries where all the moose were
48 sitting around.

49
50 On this harvest quota, picking people

1 from certain villages to hunt, from my point of view
2 it's not right. Like if there was another person from
3 my village that put in his name and he gets picked and
4 just so happens that certain person that they picked
5 didn't have a boat, outboard motor or any camping gear
6 or a gun, he just put his name in that he might find a
7 partner to hunt and nobody wants to go out with him,
8 and there one permit is wasted.

9

10 If we want to hunt, we hunt and we hunt
11 according to regulations, but this year hunting just on
12 the State side cut us off from the other parts of the
13 land that we wanted to hunt. Some boys that weren't
14 educated about the land, a few of them were cited.

15

16 One thing that was passed around was
17 that these people are to be checking for permits,
18 hunting license and hunting permits, and that's what
19 they're hired for and here they come checking our grub
20 box. We, as Natives, are always hunting with some dry
21 fish because that's our main diet and they pulled out
22 our fish pack and asked is this a bear bait. I don't
23 think that's right. We hunt because we want meat. We
24 don't hunt and bait animals when we go hunting. We go
25 where there are plenty of them.

26

27 Quotas from each village, picking
28 numbers like I said, picking the wrong person and you
29 waste a permit right there. Like the person in front
30 of me had said, it will be good for a couple years and
31 there will be frustrated people that will want to go
32 hunt and get some meat for their families. If they
33 don't get picked or if they don't have a chance to hunt
34 in a couple years, they're just going to pack up and go
35 out. They're not going to waste time on these
36 regulations that come out and regulate us.

37

38 And just choosing 14 villages out of
39 the whole state, it's like discriminating everybody for
40 what they can do.

41

42 And Bob here has been asking about
43 Kalskag and them being in Unit 18. When I first
44 started hunting upriver, every time we're going to go
45 hunting we take a map and check it out where we can
46 load our guns. The Unit 18 line was two miles below
47 Lower Kalskag. That's where the first line was and
48 that's where we started hunting. When we go back to
49 Unit 18, that's where we unloaded our gun.

50

1 A couple years ago I went out hunting
2 and I checked out where I can start hunting. Lo and
3 behold the line had been moved up to a little ways
4 above Kalskag where we haven't known where it was.

5
6 On this moratorium I was there when we
7 debated, when we first started, what is it going to be.
8 The way the proposal was set was 1,000 moose or five
9 years, whichever comes first. Five years came and I
10 bet you there was over 1,000 moose. So we waited for
11 five years. We were working with the State and Federal
12 was nowhere in sight. They didn't want to come in and
13 talk to us.

14
15 After everything is rolling real good,
16 here comes a proposal from the Federals. And they
17 don't want to even let us hunt on their land. I kept
18 wondering when did it become Federal land when all the
19 land used to be our land. Who authorized them to
20 regulate our hunting? Who gave them permission to come
21 into our land and tell us what to do?

22
23 When we went hunting, we didn't waste
24 anything. When we got our moose or something that we
25 want to eat, we go home and use it for our winter. We
26 didn't get two or three. We abide by the rules that
27 were given to us by our forefathers and we learned from
28 them with those regulations that they had given to us.
29 We never fell short on moose or anything that we hunt.
30 We kept some for next year and next year after.

31
32 So on this 10-54 we made opposition to
33 this, but opening the Federal land along with the State
34 we would appreciate it.

35
36 Thank you.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: No. I think
43 everybody is getting kind of hungry here. We'll go
44 ahead and recess then for the evening. Back at 9:00
45 o'clock tomorrow. We can put a motion on the table and
46 hear the remaining reports from the Refuge.

47
48 I did talk to the pastor or caretaker,
49 whoever it was here earlier. He said there's no plans
50 for tonight, so I believe we can just leave our things

1 here.

2

3

4 evening.

5

6

7

8

With that we'll adjourn for the

(Off record)

(PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter of Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 2 through 145 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the YUKON-KUSKOKWIM DELTA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOL I, taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 2nd day of March 2010, in Bethel, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 14th day of March 2010.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/10