

1 YUKON KUSKOKWIM-DELTA ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE

2

3

REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

4

5

PUBLIC MEETING

6

7

VOLUME II

8

9

Bethel, Alaska

10

March 3, 2010

11

9:00 o'clock a.m.

12

13

14 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

15

16 Greg Roczicka, Chairman

17 Robert Aloysius

18 John Andrew

19 William Brown

20 James Charles

21 Raymond Oney

22 Harry Wilde, Sr.

23

24

25

26

27

28

29 Regional Council Coordinator, Alex Nick

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, Alaska - 03/03/2010)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Good morning everybody. We'll call the YK Delta Subsistence Council back in session at 9:05 a.m. on March 3, Wednesday. We do have our quorum present, all seven members that were present yesterday.

A couple announcements here I'd like to make before we get rolling again. One is that it came up yesterday and some of the presentations and something we want to be thinking about to add to the agenda before we get done is possible fisheries proposals to the Federal Subsistence Board. I understand the deadline is the 24th. So if you folks want to think about that on possible proposals we'll maybe address that before we wrap up this meeting.

Just to help move things along here, as we work our way through the regulatory action on proposals, I've appointed our secretary, Bob Aloysius, to be the official motion maker so that I won't have to look around and say anybody want to put this on and wait and wonder. Ray Oney is our designated seconder, just so folks are aware of that.

As far as timeline goes, I did receive a request yesterday. There's a National Guard activity taking place at noon today, so we'll probably break around 11:30 or quarter till so people can go participate in that.

Staff, do you have any other announcements.

(No comments)

Anybody else have anything they want to toss out before we get going.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. We were in the process of reports. Worked our way through the reports on Proposal WP10-54. The Refuge had one more presentation I guess they wanted to make that we had

1 passed over to get to public testimony from folks that
2 weren't going to be here today. I see they're not here
3 yet. They were aware of that and it's after 9:00
4 o'clock now. So, in their absence I'd be ready for a
5 motion to move on to go into our deliberations. Mr.
6 Aloysius.

7
8 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move
9 that we adopt WP10-54 as amended.

10
11 MR. CHARLES: Second.

12
13 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Moved and seconded.
14 Proposal No. 54 is before us. We're in the
15 deliberations on Proposal No. 54.

16
17 Anybody want to start it off.

18
19 James.

20
21 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22 Proposal 10-54 to lift moose hunting in Game Management
23 Unit 18 on moratorium area, this is going to be the
24 report from my village or the people I represent. When
25 I talk to the people out here, I don't mean that I
26 don't like them. It always come from the people I
27 represent. Like his proposal at Board of Game last
28 time. I wasn't against Bob because he's my good
29 friend, but who we represent is what we bring out at
30 these meetings. So that Proposal 10-54, some people
31 wanted the Federal land to be open like the State. It
32 don't come from me. They like the way the State opened
33 the 10-day moose hunt last fall. So that's what -- my
34 report is from the people, the moose hunters from my
35 area.

36
37 So that's it.

38
39 Quyana.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob.

42
43 MR. ALOYSIUS: Thank you. This
44 proposal, I didn't know it was coming. I never saw it,
45 never heard of it before and it really surprises me the
46 two villages I represent were included in the
47 moratorium when they were not. That again brings up
48 the simple fact that the boundary issue is still messed
49 up. Even the guy from Kwethluk had two different
50 locations for the boundary and neither one of them were

1 accurate, so I can't honestly vote yes or no on this
2 issue because I never brought it to the attention of
3 the people I represent. I wouldn't feel comfortable
4 voting one way or the other.

5
6 Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray Oney.

9
10 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
11 feel the same way too being from the Yukon. I wouldn't
12 know which way to vote on this one myself too.

13
14 Thank you.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: John Andrew.

17
18 MR. ANDREW: For me, when I met with
19 our tribal council up at our home village, I was
20 instructed to represent their recommendation up there.
21 They like the idea of opening the Federal lands, but
22 they were not willing to go with community harvest
23 quota.

24
25 As you remember last year, the village
26 of Akiachak and our village of Kwethluk had a similar
27 testimony. This proposal is not a boundary issue.
28 It's about a community harvest quota and the 14
29 villages.

30
31 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, John.
34 Well, the proposal as I read it, the way it's amended,
35 it still leaves a lot of questions on how, where and
36 what way a community harvest quota might be
37 implemented. The amendment that we have there would
38 just -- if we do open the hunt, would just restrict you
39 to the Federally qualified subsistence user. That's
40 all that's there right now by identifying those
41 villages and which ones would be eligible for
42 participating in some sort of a special community
43 harvest hunt if one was actually created or developed
44 through this process they're talking about.

45
46 I'm really kind of in a quandary on
47 this one too as far as which way to go. Our respective
48 Councils had spoken of when this issue was first
49 addressed, the Orutsararmiut Council had recommended
50 that two year extension on the moratorium and this

1 Council subsequently came back with a one-year
2 recommendation for that extension, which we got by
3 default because the Federal lands weren't open to some
4 degree. Just really trying to weight this.

5
6 There's certainly the desire from the
7 Kuskokwim residents to open those Federal lands. I
8 don't know to what extent people might realize that if
9 we do open the Federal lands that the managers are then
10 going to -- what we're likely going to see is the hunt
11 closing down that much earlier because our quota is
12 going to be reached. It was 75 last year and we
13 exceeded that by a bit.

14
15 There does seem to be some differing
16 opinion between the State and Federal managers to what
17 level or what extent we can continue to harvest and
18 keep up our productivity as far as the bull/cow ratio
19 goes. It makes it so awkward not having those Federal
20 lands open. I do like keeping that limitation as far
21 as passage of this proposal and making it just for
22 those C&T villages identified. I don't know where I'm
23 going with it yet either.

24
25 Pippa.

26
27 MS. KENNER: Could you ask me to come
28 up to clarify something.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: If you think you
31 have something you think you need to add.

32
33 MS. KENNER: I do. Thank you, Mr.
34 Chair. This is Pippa Kenner with OSM. The way the
35 Federal system works we know about the C&T being the
36 basis and the foundation of our program and the way we
37 manage, but there are a couple of other little steps
38 that we take. One of the provisions of ANILCA is that
39 before you restrict the distribution of permits to
40 Federally qualified users you have to close the lands
41 to other uses. Then when you open up you can limit the
42 distribution of permits.

43
44 One of the problems in the hunt right
45 now is that the State can't -- the State is having a
46 hard time limiting the distribution of permits without
47 going into a Tier II situation and the Federal side
48 can't limit who it gives permits to without closing
49 Federal public lands. So right now when we have
50 something like 1,400 people getting an unlimited amount

1 of permits when we only have a quota of 75, you're
2 probably going to have to start closing the season
3 early and the problem is in this area you can't close --
4 especially if we open Federal public lands. In this
5 area it's very hard to close the season early because
6 people are out and they're out of radio range. It's
7 just hard to make it fair.

8
9 So one of the goals of the proposal
10 that's in front of you is to find a way we can say
11 we're going to -- anybody can get a permit, but we're
12 only going to issue 500 permits or 600 permits. When
13 they're gone, they're gone. So it's first come, first
14 serve. So people who would have been on the couch
15 anyway stay on the couch. If you have a lottery or a
16 draw permit, anybody can get one then they may not use
17 it and I understand that's one of the things that has
18 been bothering you. So this way you have to make the
19 effort to get a permit first come first served.

20
21 What we're trying to devise is a season
22 where you can have the 10-day open season, have a
23 quota, distribute the permits and then not even try to
24 close it. So when you come up with something, one of
25 the things that would be very helpful is if you could
26 devise some way to allow us to limit the distribution
27 of permits. Say there will be a number of permits
28 that's based on the formula of the success rate from
29 the previous year to make sure they stay within the
30 quota within those 10 days or give some kind of
31 direction like that.

32
33 Was that clear? Whether you like the
34 .804 analysis or not, I'm getting the message that you
35 don't. So the fact of closing the lands and
36 restricting to those communities you have a couple of
37 options. One is that Federal public lands can remain
38 closed to everybody. Federal public lands can remain
39 closed only to the non-qualified uses and everybody
40 with C&T can still hunt on Federal public lands or you
41 can ask for the conclusion of the .804 analysis and
42 make it that only the people within the area can hunt
43 in the area. So you have one of those three choices.
44 Or you can not do any of them is also your fourth
45 choice.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Well, it would be
48 the equivalent -- since you're saying you would come up
49 with a restricted number of permits it would be the
50 equivalent of a Federal Tier II hunt on Federal lands

1 if I'm hearing you right.

2

3 MS. KENNER: Right. Without the Tier
4 II. Without the selection process.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: And that could be
7 incorporated into the State registration hunt. It
8 would close the season once the quota was determined to
9 be nearing?

10

11 MS. KENNER: Yes. I didn't mean to co-
12 op the authority of the local managers. Of course the
13 local manager can close a hunt whenever he or she sees
14 fit. However, a hunt can be designed that suits the
15 needs of people better where there would be a better
16 chance of it not closing early.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'm trying to reach
19 for what people are wanting and is also going to
20 recognize the limitations that we're faced with as far
21 as -- you wouldn't have to limit the number of permits
22 being issued, but just the two managers in consultation
23 with each other would both then be under the onus of
24 closing the season prior to the 10 days if they saw the
25 quota was either close to being achieved or in imminent
26 effect of being exceeded.

27

28 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair. That is true
29 except that if you distribute an unlimited number of
30 permits so many people are getting permits, the
31 potential, especially as the quota goes down, as it
32 probably very will likely this year. I mean you're
33 going to get into a situation where the hunt probably
34 should close within three days. Your distribution of
35 permits is going to stay the same. The number of
36 available animals is likely to go down. Also from an
37 administering the hunt point of view it's very unlikely
38 the managers could get the word out to everybody in a
39 short period of time.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any other
42 questions. I actually had a question not for you but
43 for perhaps Robert or someone from the Refuge. Would
44 you have any idea or have you had any discussion and I
45 know it may be premature, you're waiting to get some of
46 your density counts and what the effect of last year's
47 hunt was and so forth, but at what point in time do you
48 envision being able to recommend re-opening of Federal
49 lands if we were to leave it as it is right now, which
50 I think is what you're recommendation is kind of

1 leaning towards, to wait and work through more of a
2 planning process. I think that's what I heard Tom
3 saying yesterday. You weren't comfortable opening yet
4 for this season because you didn't have that
5 information in front of you.

6
7 MR. SUNDOWN: I don't think there is
8 any objection if there was a motion by this Council to
9 submit to the Federal Subsistence Board to open a
10 Federal season. What's clear to us is there has to be
11 a mechanism either limiting the number of people or
12 limiting the time to achieve a limited harvest. So
13 we'd like to leave that up to you guys.

14
15 The community harvest quota program
16 that we submitted is a mechanism to do that and it's a
17 mechanism that we thought would evenly distribute the
18 permits among the villages. If there's no desire among
19 the villages, we need to hear something else from you
20 guys on what you guys think would be a good way to
21 allow a harvest that is limited either in the number of
22 people that are hunting or the amount of time that
23 people have to go hunting.

24
25 What's clear to me is 1,400 people in
26 10 days does not work. It's not going to work. The
27 effort that you guys have put forth in your moratorium
28 is going to go backwards. So whatever mechanism you
29 guys want to allow a limited hunt, either limited in
30 time or limited in participants is clear.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Pippa.

33
34 MS. KENNER: Thank you. Just to add to
35 that quickly. Ultimately with clear instructions from
36 the Council what people are going to have to work on is
37 a combined State/Federal permit. There's a couple of
38 hoops to go through, but we're trying.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Maybe it should be
41 a five-day hunt with a possible extension for an
42 additional five if our quota hadn't been reached. But,
43 again, that's a brand new concept. It hasn't floated
44 at all around to anybody.

45
46 Tom, I know yesterday we had passed
47 over your final presentation to provide for opportunity
48 from other folks. If you want to go ahead and provide
49 that final information to us.

50

1 MR. DOOLITTLE: Tom Doolittle, Yukon
2 Delta. And to the Council I won't be putting up a
3 PowerPoint. Obviously got caught up in the office this
4 morning. One of the key things is to start looking at
5 the poster that I put in front of you and hopefully
6 members of the crowd have picked up some of these
7 posters too if they're interested.

8
9 One of, I think, the critical things
10 that was more -- that I'll start with would be on the
11 right side of the poster that's in front of you.
12 Essentially looking at the moose comp data that was
13 done cooperatively between Alaska wildlife troopers,
14 Alaska Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife
15 Service. It compares to the last two periods that we
16 looked at compositional information.

17
18 As you go down the tabular column, the
19 things that stand out are your calf to cow ratio with a
20 decline there from 72 percent to 49 percent, and also
21 the bull to cow ratio, which went down from 98.2 to
22 52.2 and that was the most dramatic reduction that was
23 likely the result of the 10-day harvest that we had
24 last fall.

25
26 The decline in the calf to cow ratio
27 that is likely relative to some predation up on the
28 watersheds and that's to be expected and that number is
29 actually in comparison to many areas of the state even
30 though it's not 72 percent it's still pretty good.

31
32 The bull to cow ratio, again that's
33 still for next season would be an adequate number of
34 bulls, but obviously taking down that herd at that
35 particular rate is the problem that we're seeing with
36 that many participants that Robert has suggested. So
37 there only seems to be two options to defer that rate
38 of harvest, and one would be to decrease the season
39 duration and the other would be decreasing permits.

40
41 I think the Refuge was really trying to
42 do its best to find an amenable way and a framework to
43 be able to bring out the issue to the public in a
44 substantive fashion so everybody would have a chance to
45 weigh in and look at a process of how do we sustain
46 this herd for future generations, how do we make sure
47 that's sustainable and that we're only at .7 moose per
48 square mile. How do we continue to grow that herd so
49 there's more opportunity and harvest success for people
50 of the region.

1 So I guess if there was a quick
2 summary, those are the couple of numbers to think
3 about, especially that bull to cow ratio. Part of this
4 morning I was spending on the phone with Steve Kovatch
5 at Innoko National Wildlife Refuge. We put together a
6 density survey, a line transect survey using
7 helicopters when some of these conditions are poor. So
8 really, when we set our quota, I'm on a mission to get
9 that density work done regardless of the poor
10 conditions with the best tools that we have available
11 and the best science we have available so we can set
12 quotas that are what we perceive as being real density
13 information.

14
15 So I wanted to make sure that the
16 Council and the public understand that our biological
17 program is doing our best considering the adverse
18 conditions for surveys this winter.

19
20 I think the other parts to look at in
21 the rest of Unit 18 is obviously on the lowest Yukon we
22 can see that the last survey, that would be the block
23 in the far left-hand corner of the poster that you have
24 from Mt. Village down to the coast. In 2008 we were
25 approaching that three moose per square mile.
26 Obviously there's been accommodations of liberalized
27 season frameworks there. That population was still
28 growing. I think with after a mild winter and not
29 having a severe flood like we had last year that that
30 population still should be doing very well and be able
31 to accommodate most of the liberalized harvest that has
32 occurred.

33
34 We look at one area in the middle part,
35 you know, from St. Mary's going up the east side of the
36 Andrafskys down to Mountain Village. The last time
37 that area has really been surveyed was 2002. There was
38 probably likely more moose in that country than there
39 were since the previous survey, but, again, that one is
40 a priority block since it's been so long.

41
42 These are concerns both to all of our
43 agencies when we have gaps in data over a period of
44 time to make decisions from. So this we have to be
45 careful about just simply because of the duration or
46 since the last survey was completed.

47
48 When we take a look at the area by
49 Paimiut in the middle section, again there's more
50 extensive fire history regeneration plus flood

1 conditions that actually regenerate winter forage in
2 that particular area and moose range. Again, that last
3 survey was done in 2006. So part of the concerns
4 obviously that the Refuge would have would be that
5 liberalized harvest isn't something that's permanent in
6 that area until some sort of more rigorous density data
7 is reacquired in that particular area.

8

9 I know the conditions that were set up
10 on the Yukon for the emergency measures there, so that
11 harvest was very, very important to the communities on
12 the Yukon this last winter. But, again, this would be
13 a survey. If there's further thoughts of making a more
14 liberalized harvest in that particular area, I would
15 seriously advise on restraining until a survey is
16 redone to look at how that population responds to
17 increased harvest and what the actual densities are
18 there.

19

20 Last but not least is that we have the
21 mainstem of the Kuskokwim unit. I think that one of
22 the things to always remind everybody that this was the
23 block that was surveyed. It was not the entire block.
24 Part of the moratorium was the five years and 1,000
25 moose. We didn't make the 1,000 moose in that survey
26 block. We made it up to 668, so I think that should be
27 clarified both with the public and the Council to make
28 sure that we understand that the 1,000 animals at the
29 time of that survey had not been reached and that we
30 still were at a fairly low moose density and there's
31 more potentials for this moose density to increase and
32 provide more food on the table if we'd allow this moose
33 population to increase.

34

35 I think it really comes down to we
36 really want to be conservative on the onset, so we're
37 growing this and working into liberalizing the harvest
38 as the moose population can withstand it so we can
39 optimize the amount of food that people can get
40 considering how many users there are in this area.

41

42 I'll leave it right there. I know that
43 you have a busy schedule. I'd entertain any questions
44 that you might have for us.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions for Tom.
47 Ray.

48

49 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
50 Tom, all these surveys that have been done have been on

1 Federal lands?

2

3 MR. DOOLITTLE: If you look at the
4 yellow block, we have not had density surveys done on
5 the yellow block. We just set those up last year and
6 that was one of the goals to be able to get done, was
7 to understand some of the densities on those tributary
8 blocks because those obviously have some portion of
9 Federal lands on there which we're more interested
10 jurisdictionally and then also those are where a lot of
11 users go up to use those resources and those narrow
12 bands of habitat.

13

14 Because they're such narrow bands of
15 habitat, moose are a little bit more susceptible
16 because they just don't have the habitat and cover that
17 they would have in some wider areas. You know, you go
18 up to areas in Interior Alaska or even up on the Yukon
19 and from the radiotelemetry work on a lot of those
20 moose is we've seen they've been fairly sedentary
21 staying in some of the drainages.

22

23 The Kwethluk draining just from
24 anecdotal flights when we were doing counts last winter
25 is that the Kwethluk drainage was the most -- had the
26 most moose. I think we counted about 130 moose between
27 Breast Mountain and the weir. So that area seemed to
28 be pretty good. When we flew the Kisaralik on the same
29 day and the headwaters on Federal land and on the
30 headwaters of the Eek and the Tuluksak, you could
31 essentially have counted those moose on both hands.

32

33 So all the drainages don't seem to have
34 the same proportion of moose. However, again, we'd
35 like to as a goal to have a good density information so
36 you are getting an idea of what the total population in
37 the moratorium area was for the entire subunit.

38

39 MR. ONEY: Follow-up question.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Ray.

42

43 MR. ONEY: Maybe I missed it somewhere
44 along the line. What are the reasons that the Federal
45 lands are not open?

46

47 MR. DOOLITTLE: One of the primary
48 reasons for the lack of information, lack of data to
49 actually estimate a number of animals that could be
50 harvested. Plain and simple. Also, as I remember,

1 Robert, there was no proposal formulated from any other
2 source to open Federal lands.

3

4 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Robert.

7

8 MR. SUNDOWN: Just as the five years
9 came to a close there was a good deal of discomfort by
10 our Staff given the lack of information that we had and
11 projecting from 2007 whether we've actually made that
12 1,000 moose or not. There was a lot of things that
13 took into play. That was one of them. No proposals
14 were put to open was another. There was some talk of
15 extending the moratorium on Federal lands. That was a
16 third. So there was multiple reasons why the Federal
17 side never opened. Of course, mechanically, with the
18 Federal Subsistence Board going to a two year cycle
19 that was another reason as well. So there was multiple
20 reasons it never got opened.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Further questions.
23 James.

24

25 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
26 Like I mentioned yesterday, we proposed to close the
27 area from the AC when we had low population in the
28 area. We were on conservation side at that time to
29 close the area and we made that proposal for five years
30 or 1,000 moose. So if we had 1,000 moose less than
31 five years, we could have proposed to lift the
32 moratorium again.

33

34 But when we meet that proposal to lift
35 the moratorium a year and a half ago, we authorized the
36 Department to help us with the restrictions to not to
37 clean the moose population in the area. We didn't want
38 to clean the area. That's why we authorized the
39 Department to help us make their own restrictions. I
40 mentioned that yesterday.

41

42 A lot of people, users, hunters from
43 home area or up and down the Kuskokwim here in the
44 moratorium area, they agreed. Three of us here are
45 with the AC and we talked about that. We didn't want
46 our area to be cleaned.

47

48 So we see a lot of people complain
49 about Count Area 2, this little area, and the people
50 that count the moose in that area depend on how many

1 moose there is in that little area. The moratorium is
2 big. We didn't think of that when we made that
3 proposal. We thought the moose was going to be counted
4 in the whole moratorium area. I've been with that
5 group who made that proposal.

6
7 Our hunters like to see it lifted again
8 on Federal land too. Even we didn't have that many
9 moose before it was open the whole month of September.
10 Now we have 10-day season for moose and we now get
11 stuck on that one. So I agree for not cleaning the
12 moose population in our area.

13
14 Thank you.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Well, what you're
17 touching on here, James, is also really my main worry
18 and concern on here. You know, we just had this five-
19 year moratorium. You say we don't want to clean it
20 out, but yet we get the testimony saying that people
21 are having problems with the younger generation,
22 telling them that they're anxious to go hunting.

23
24 Do we want to go back to where we
25 could have a 30-day season and we only harvest 10 or 15
26 moose for the whole area or do we continue with a five
27 or 10-day season and people could harvest 100 moose.
28 We can continue to grow that. That can grow up to 150
29 or 200 moose or 300 moose. That's the danger in the
30 balance. I don't want to go back to that.

31
32 I want to call a step-down or break
33 here to consult with some of the public members that
34 are here. We'll step down for a few minutes.

35
36 (Off record)

37
38 (On record)

39
40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Back on record here
41 at 9:55 continuing on the deliberations for Proposal
42 54. During the break here we discussed some possible
43 amendments and draft language. John Andrew, do you
44 want to go ahead and.....

45
46 MR. ANDREW: Wait just a minute.

47
48 (Pause)

49
50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'll toss out what

1 we discussed there and came up with a consensus with
2 the folks that are here to weigh in on this one. What
3 we're looking at, because of the conservation concerns
4 that have been expressed, we would recommend an
5 amendment to this proposal to put forth a five-day
6 season on Federal lands that would close unless
7 extended by emergency order by the Federal manager if
8 the quota had not been exceeded or was in danger of
9 being exceeded at that point in time.

10

11 It would also be limited to the
12 villages identified in the .804 analysis. The major
13 concern was the way the wording here was a community
14 harvest quota that's laid out that we would be falling
15 under another caribou scenario. Again, it worked well
16 for some and not so well for others. But this would be
17 a Federal permit limited to those .804 villages.
18 Hopefully everybody within those villages that had an
19 interest in hunting there.

20

21 And, again, with that additional five
22 days would match to the State season if we weren't in
23 danger of exceeding the quota at that time. If the
24 quota is going to be going down, we may well take that
25 within the five days. But it would put people on
26 notice they'd have to come back and -- they would know
27 they'd have to come back and check in rather than
28 trying to go out and contact them in the field again.
29 They would need to touch base to see if the season was
30 actually extended.

31

32 One other point that was brought up in
33 our discussion here was that different from last year's
34 hunt is that the Johnson River, within a half mile of
35 its east side here now and from what I understand
36 what's probably going to be coming out here with all
37 the recommendation is going to be falling under the
38 remainder of Unit 18 regulations and to what extent
39 that portion of the animals that were taken last year
40 might reduce that. I think there was like 15 or 20
41 came out of the Johnson River drainage. How many of
42 them were above that line I'm not sure, but that can
43 reduce as well. It may have a significant impact on
44 reducing the amount of effort in what is now the former
45 moratorium area or the remainder of the Kuskokwim, that
46 remainder of Unit 18 or the Kuskokwim area hunt.

47

48 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman.

49

50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: That, in a

1 nutshell, is what we were talking about. Go ahead,
2 Robert.

3

4 MR. SUNDOWN: So if I understand you
5 correctly and the Council correctly, the desire of the
6 Council is to limit time rather than available permits,
7 correct?

8

9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Yes. Well, it's
10 not -- that was gist of our discussion. I was going to
11 have John make a motion here so we can get it on the
12 table for discussion.

13

14 MR. ANDREW: Mr. Chairman. Before I
15 make a motion, during our little caucus over there we
16 also came up that the Staff needs to do a current moose
17 survey in the moratorium area. The other part is they
18 need to go out and have public forums in all these
19 villages and get this out to the media, radio,
20 newspaper, wherever you've got. Maybe communicate with
21 all the villages on your telephone and computers, every
22 which way you can. I don't believe they had public
23 forums on this proposal in all the villages. There's
24 some that do. Mr. Chairman, for this part only.

25

26 Can I make a motion?

27

28 MR. ALOYSIUS: Please do.

29

30 MR. ANDREW: I make a motion to amend
31 this proposal to read, to establish a community harvest
32 quota on the Kuskokwim Unit 18 and a reduction in pool
33 of the Federally-qualified users that are eligible to
34 hunt moose in the Kuskokwim drainage portion of Unit 18
35 therefore referred to as the moratorium area.

36

37 And on the permit system they'd like to
38 say for the people that are qualified and experienced
39 that choose to go out to do it on first come, first
40 served basis and to have it open on Federal lands for 5
41 days with a possible extension of another five days if
42 they don't meet the harvest quota at the time being
43 with the other condition I just mentioned earlier along
44 with the .804 requirement. Mr. Chairman.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Is there a second.

47

48 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman, second the
49 motion.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Second by James
2 Charles. Robert.

3
4 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman. Members of
5 the RAC. Before you get too far into the motion I just
6 want to clarify something. Rolling an opening in with
7 this motion might be a bit much for the intent of this
8 proposal. If you would like to have an opening, you
9 might want to make a separate motion as a special
10 action request of the Federal Subsistence Board.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Mr. Kron.

13
14 MR. KRON: Just to follow up on what
15 Robert said. Again, we're agreeing with what he just
16 told you and I think you should go ahead and proceed
17 with the motion you have on the table, do this, but
18 also, just to make sure that it can happen if we run
19 into snags because of how significant the change is,
20 submit a special action that says exactly the same
21 thing so one way or the other it can happen.

22
23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I guess we would
26 put it forward and the Staff could draft that up to
27 have that in place. Also, from my rusty memory in
28 dealing with special actions what might the limitations
29 be on that? I think they have to respond within 60
30 days. So we would not want to turn in that special
31 action so soon that the Federal Subsistence Board had
32 to deal with it prior to their regulatory meeting in
33 May when this proposal is going to be in front of them
34 as well.

35
36 Go ahead.

37
38 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. I think what
39 you could do is basically have -- the special action
40 can only be effective for 60 days, but you could just
41 tell people right now that you're submitting it and it
42 would be effective starting -- so it would cover the
43 moose season, but let people know that it's out there
44 right now and the intent would be to start it in the
45 fall when the moose would be hunting -- when you'd be
46 hunting moose.

47
48 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

49
50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Further discussion.

1 Bob Aloysius.

2

3

MR. ALOYSIUS: Where is Federal land?

4 And what are you talking about remainder 18? Those are
5 things that are totally confusing to people. There are
6 no handouts to show where Federal land is. They don't
7 know where remainder 18 is. And they're going to
8 change it again. From what I hear is the moose
9 population is low. Why make it any lower.

10

11 So I'm not going to support this
12 because of the simple fact there's too much confusion.
13 You need a permit for this area, you need a permit for
14 this area, you've got to have a Federal permit, you've
15 got to have a State permit. Can I use both of them?
16 Which one is a priority for me? It's creating more
17 confusion and trying to make more criminals out of our
18 people. If you don't have the right information to the
19 people, they're going to be more confused and pretty
20 soon they're going to be like what the heck is the use.

21

22

23 I'm not going to support anything like
24 this because it's just too -- for me, it's too
25 confusing and I know it's going to be more confusing
26 for people who don't know the difference between a
27 State, Federal land, remainder 18 and things like that.
28 Realistically, you know, common sense says that moose
29 population is low, why make it any lower or make it
30 possible to lower the density of the moose again. So
31 I'm not going to support it.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Comments. Charlie.

34

35

MR. BROWN: Sometimes I'm confused
36 because Unit 18 covers a big western area and what I'd
37 like to say in my mind is just my question. You know,
38 before we had this moose moratorium thing going on in
39 the lower portion of a certain area have more opening
40 because in my area where I'm from is not a moose
41 populated area. They just roam around to my area. It's
42 not a moose populated area down there. I wonder if we
43 have more opener in that area like we did before in
44 that portion.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Pippa.

47

48 MS. KENNER: Mr. Brown, are you asking
49 if the Eek drainage will be open? Are you asking if
50 you're going to have more opportunity in your area to

1 hunt through this proposal?

2

3 MR. BROWN: Yes. Like extension if
4 it's possible if the quota is not met.

5

6 MS. KENNER: If I understand your
7 question, yes, that if the quota is not met and the
8 five days of the Federal season have passed, it can be
9 extended.

10

11 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: For me we've had
14 overwhelming input, not just at this meeting but prior
15 to this meeting for those that were aware of it that
16 are following the process, and through last fall's
17 season, a large amount of frustration that people
18 really want to have those Federal lands open.

19

20 I believe this is a conservative step
21 towards doing that. We can still maintain our
22 productivity. We can remain within the quota that's
23 been established to keep it at a decent bull/cow ratio.

24

25 I think with the same level of effort
26 that pertains to the Lower Yukon as far as getting the
27 maps out and so forth, people know where things are at
28 if they're explained to them. I think people in this
29 area are pretty smart and they can figure it out once
30 it's laid in front of them. Confusing at first, yes,
31 it's a learning curve. I had a lot of folks coming
32 into my Council office wondering where the State lands
33 were and where the corporation lands were to be able to
34 hunt last fall. The same areas applied. I got the
35 maps and downloaded myself and put them up there for
36 people to see.

37

38 Again, you guys did the same kind of
39 overlay that you did for the Lower Yukon hunt when we
40 had the separation in the State and Federal seasons
41 with differing bag limits or total closures in one
42 instance and not open in the other. I think that would
43 go a long way towards taking care of that and getting
44 it out to every Council and having it posted up for
45 everybody in town to see.

46

47 It's a compromise towards trying to
48 address the concern that's been raised to us and
49 provide that harvest opportunity that people want to
50 get but yet still recognizing that we don't want to go

1 backwards in this whole process. I mean the only other
2 option I think we really have in front of us other than
3 something like this is to just defer it and not take
4 any action until the next cycle, which would be another
5 two to three years down the line or come up with a
6 special action next year out of cycle since we're on a
7 two-year cycle with the Federal system.

8
9 I'll be supporting it.

10
11 Any other comments. Bob.

12
13 MR. ALOYSIUS: I forgot what I was
14 going to say.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: More discussion.
17 James.

18
19 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20 The Federal people and the State people were really
21 good helping us showing where the Federal lands were
22 and the State lands and corporation lands. It was good
23 last fall and that's why I helped the people in my area
24 show them where they can hunt because I got a lot of
25 calls like Greg asking me where they could hunt. I
26 mentioned that many times already, but I even called
27 Perry over here at his office asking him if he's got a
28 map or showing where the State or Federal lands and
29 corporation lands and that helps. I'm not educated,
30 but like I told a lot of people, I'm a fourth-grader,
31 but I let them copy those maps and distribute them to
32 the hunters. That helped.

33
34 So we have a lot of people at the
35 Service. You've got RITs, you've got people working
36 for you at the office, you've got people to help show
37 us where people can hunt or where the area is closed.
38 If we work together, things would go smoother. Like
39 last fall even there's a lot of closed areas. We were
40 -- a lot of our hunters didn't get tickets, so that
41 worked out good because people were working together.

42
43 Thank you.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any other comments.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Are we ready for
50 the question. I know I am. Charlie.

1 MR. BROWN: Yes. Last year most of
2 those local people were kind of confusing on the
3 boundary lines. Most of the students they could
4 understand those modern GPS, whatever they use, but a
5 lot older folks they don't quite understand where the
6 boundaries are. So if you guys identify where your
7 boundary lines should be, maybe you should print them
8 out in a map.

9
10 Thank you, that's my comment.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ready to hear the
13 question.

14
15 MR. CHARLES: On the amendment?

16
17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question on the
18 amendment. I'm sorry. Thank you, James.

19
20 MR. CHARLES: Call for question on
21 amendment.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Mr. Aloysius, poll
24 us here.

25
26 MR. ALOYSIUS: William Brown.

27
28 MR. BROWN: Yes.

29
30 MR. ALOYSIUS: James Charles.

31
32 MR. CHARLES: Yes.

33
34 MR. ALOYSIUS: Ray Oney.

35
36 MR. ONEY: Yes on the amendment.

37
38 MR. ALOYSIUS: Harry Wilde.

39
40 MR. H. WILDE: Yes.

41
42 MR. ALOYSIUS: Greg Roczicka.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Yes.

45
46 MR. ALOYSIUS: Robert Aloysius. No.
47 John Andrew.

48
49 MR. ANDREW: Yes.

50

1 MR. ALOYSIUS: Six to one in favor.
2
3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: So the amendment
4 passes.
5
6 MR. ALOYSIUS: The amendment passes.
7
8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We have the main
9 motion before us as amended, Proposal 54.
10
11 Any further discussion.
12
13 James.
14
15 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16 So our proposal or the amendment is going to go to the
17 Federal Subsistence Board?
18
19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: (Nods
20 affirmatively)
21
22 MR. CHARLES: Before 60 days comes up.
23
24 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Further discussion.
25
26 (No comments)
27
28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: So final action on
29 Proposal 54 as amended for establishing a five-day
30 season concurrent with the State hunt beginning in the
31 fall of 2010 limited to the villages identified in the
32 .804 analysis, with the option of extending for an
33 additional five days to match with the existing season
34 if the quota is not in danger of being exceeded or has
35 been exceeded. It will be up to EO authority by
36 consultation between the State and Federal managers.
37 Call for the question.
38
39 MR. ONEY: Question.
40
41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Mr. Aloysius, poll
42 please.
43
44 MR. ALOYSIUS: Who called for the
45 question?
46
47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray Oney.
48
49 MR. ALOYSIUS: James Charles.
50

1 MR. CHARLES: Clarify the motion now.
2
3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The final action on
4 the proposal as amended with setting a five-day season
5 on Federal lands coinciding with the State hunt limited
6 to the villages identified in the .804 analysis,
7 Kalskag to Eek, I believe it is, or Quinhagak.
8
9 MR. ALOYSIUS: No. Tunt to Kalskag.
10
11 MS. KENNER: Tunt to Kalskag.
12
13 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Tunt to Kalskag.
14 I'm sorry. With the possibility of extending an
15 additional five days if the quota is not met.
16
17 MR. CHARLES: Yes.
18
19 MR. ALOYSIUS: Ray Oney.
20
21 MR. ONEY: Yes.
22
23 MR. ALOYSIUS: Harry Wilde.
24
25 MR. H. WILDE: Yes.
26
27 MR. ALOYSIUS: Greg Roczicka.
28
29 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Yes.
30
31 MR. ALOYSIUS: Robert Aloysius. No.
32 John Andrew.
33
34 MR. ANDREW: Yes.
35
36 MR. ALOYSIUS: William Brown.
37
38 MR. BROWN: Yes.
39
40 MR. ALOYSIUS: Six to one in favor.
41 Motion carries.
42
43 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. Mr. Kron, do
44 you or Staff have something to add here before we're
45 done.
46
47 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman. Just to be
48 sure we don't have any snags within the Federal
49 Subsistence Board process, if you may, introduce
50 another proposal to open the season on the Kuskokwim.

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I would look for --
2 if we want to have any further discussion on this, but
3 supplemental to this action as far as amending this
4 proposal, we can have consensus here to submit a
5 special action request timely for having this opening
6 occur during the fall of 2010 season. Is there any
7 objection? And we can state that as a notice of intent
8 and have Staff draft that up and have it prepared for
9 us so it is in the process. Is there any objection.

10

(No objections)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none.
That's direction for Staff. Thank you. So we're ready
to move on to Proposal -- we'll go ahead and go with a
10-minute break here and catch our breath.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Back on record here
at 10:34 a.m. Ready to move on to Proposal No. 10-55.
Introduction by Staff.

Mr. Kron.

MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. The analysis
for Proposal 10-55 can be found starting on Page 72 of
your Council books. This proposal was submitted by the
Yukon-Delta National Wildlife Refuge and requests a
prohibition on the possession or use of shot shells
containing size T lead shot or smaller while hunting or
trapping in Unit 18.

Two species of eider that inhabit Unit
18, the spectacled and Steller s eider, are listed as
threatened under the Endangered Species Act and are
directly affected by lead shot in their habitat. In
November 2007, at the request of the community of
Hooper Bay, the Alaska Board of Game adopted a ban on
the use of shot shells containing size T lead shot,
which is 0.20 inches in diameter, or smaller for the
taking of wildlife when hunting and trapping. The
Federal Subsistence Management Program has prohibited
the use of lead shot in Unit 18 via two special
actions, both of which this Council has reviewed and
both of which you supported unanimously. Those were
WSA08-03 and WSA09-09.

1 In the analysis before you I included
2 an appendix 1 with the most recent special action
3 WSA09-09 and it contains a lot of the historic detail,
4 so I didn't actually include it in the analysis since
5 it had already been prepared and you'd already seen it.

6
7 The effects of the proposal. The
8 adoption of the proposed restriction would provide
9 conservation benefits to threatened spectacled and
10 Steller s eiders and also to other waterfowl species by
11 reducing the possibility of ingesting lead shot and
12 the resulting exposure to lead shot in the environment
13 and its effects if ingested.

14
15 Adoption of the proposed regulatory
16 change would benefit public health by reducing the
17 chances of human consumption of waterfowl with
18 significant lead toxicity levels. Adoption of the
19 proposal would facilitate continued cooperation with
20 the community of Hooper Bay that originally requested
21 the restriction of the Alaska Board of Game.

22
23 The preliminary OSM conclusion is to
24 support Proposal WP10-55 with modification to provide a
25 clear, understandable regulation that is a little bit
26 more simple and we think it would provide for easier
27 enforcement as well. But, again, that wording is
28 provided on Page 75 and, again, in this case, the
29 recommendation is to modify as described therein on
30 Page 75 in your book.

31
32 That's all I've got. Robert Sundown
33 and Phil Perry are here to help answer questions as
34 well. I think we're all hoping that by the end of the
35 winter on the State side and our side we can end up
36 with coordinated wording and wording that the public
37 can understand and at the same time achieve these
38 conservation benefits and also I think a public health
39 benefit as support of the original request that came
40 from Hooper Bay.

41
42 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Mr. Kron, you
45 mentioned it's been before us twice already and this is
46 the third time through and it will be the charm and
47 we'll act on this issue in a couple moments. Any
48 questions on the presentation. Bob.

49
50 MR. ALOYSIUS: I thought we already

1 went through this lead shot thing. This clarifies the
2 size now? We went through this scenario before with
3 the lead shot. So the way I look at it, this is just
4 making it more clear as to what size.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Back to that
7 essential housekeeping portion again, just getting all
8 the language straightened out.

9
10 Mr. Kron.

11
12 MR. KRON: Just to follow up again, Mr.
13 Chair and Mr. Aloysius. The last cycle we didn't have
14 an actual proposal to the Federal side, so it was done
15 twice via special action. You've seen this issue twice
16 before. You voted unanimously to support it twice
17 before. This proposal submitted by the Refuge would
18 actually put it in the regulation book and essentially
19 would implement any intent of what you've done twice
20 before. So the third time is a charm and this would
21 put it in the regulation book.

22
23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: James.

26
27 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
28 So this means that we carry only steel shot in our boat
29 or snowmachine when we're hunting and trapping and no
30 lead shot. Is that right?

31
32 MR. KRON: Yes, Mr. Chair. Again, it's
33 the size issue. My understanding is some people use
34 very large lead shot when they're seal hunting, for
35 example. This doesn't apply to that situation. I'd
36 ask Robert maybe to help me with this. But, again,
37 when you're hunting or trapping, you're carrying steel
38 shot with you. The Refuge has been real helpful in
39 helping people change out the lead shot that they might
40 still have.

41
42 Robert, do you have anything to add.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Robert Sundown.

45
46 MR. SUNDOWN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47 Robert Sundown, Yukon Delta Refuge. To answer the
48 question that James has, the only time this would apply
49 is when you're out hunting wildlife. So if you were
50 out hunting specifically for seals, you can have

1 whatever shot you want with you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any further.

4 James.

5

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

7 So people, the hunters should be aware of this now
8 because Perry knows at our last AC meeting there were
9 people talking about this, that they were checked and
10 some hunters didn't like that because they were checked
11 for lead shots. People should be aware of that or the
12 hunters should be aware of that, that they were not
13 supposed to carry lead shots.

14

15 Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Charlie.

18

19 MR. BROWN: I couldn't quite understand
20 what this T means. Is it soft gun shell or smaller .22
21 or heavy rifle?

22

23 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Brown.

24 No. This would only apply to shotguns if you're
25 hunting game or furbearers. It does not apply to
26 rifles. You can still use rifles, .22's. It just
27 applies strictly to shotguns when hunting anything
28 other than marine mammals.

29

30 MR. BROWN: Is it legal to sell them in
31 the local stores, lead?

32

33 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman. Again,
34 there's certain parts of our commerce laws that would
35 still make it legal to carry lead in the stores.
36 There's nothing we could do to prevent that.

37

38 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Further questions
41 for OSM. Ray.

42

43 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
44 Again, educating the communities, especially when
45 they're not coming to meetings like this, to go out
46 there to the villages and let them know about this
47 issue that needs to be implemented and definitely
48 education would play a big role in it.

49

50 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Anybody else.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Does the State have
6 anything to add.

7

8 MR. PERRY: Through the Chair. Our
9 comments are obviously in support of this. The State
10 system has a permanent regulation in place and we'd
11 like to see a very similar if not exact same language
12 in place in the Federal system.

13

14 *****

15 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

16 *****

17

18 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
19 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

20

21 Wildlife Proposal WP10-55:

22

23 This proposal restricts the use of lead
24 shot in GMU 18 for shot shells containing shot size T
25 or smaller on federal public lands.

26

27 Introduction:

28

29 In November 2007, the Alaska Board of
30 Game adopted lead shot restrictions in Unit 18 for
31 hunting and trapping. The Federal Subsistence Board
32 enacted similar though temporary restrictions by
33 federal special action (WSA08-03 and WSA09-09). This
34 proposal seeks permanent lead shot restrictions.

35

36 Impact on Subsistence Users:

37

38 Transition to non-toxic shot may affect
39 hunters due to cost and availability of products
40 through local vendors.

41

42 Opportunity Provided by State: The
43 state regulation is found in 5 AAC 92.080 (14).

44

45 92.080. Unlawful methods of taking
46 game; exceptions:

47

48 (14) taking game in
49 Unit 18 with a shotgun
50 using any shot other

1 than nontoxic material
2 approved by the United
3 States Fish and
4 Wildlife Service, that
5 is size t, .20 caliber
6 or smaller, including
7 loose shot used in
8 muzzleloading firearms,
9 and while in immediate
10 personal possession of
11 lead shot.

12
13 Conservation Issues:

14
15 This regulation conserves wildlife by
16 reducing the impacts to health resulting from ingestion
17 of lead shot. Adoption of this proposal will
18 significantly benefit waterfowl that nest in Unit 18,
19 such as the spectacled eider.

20
21 Enforcement Issues:

22
23 Uniform regulation related to the use
24 of nontoxic shot will decrease enforcement problems and
25 risk of enforcement action for subsistence users.

26
27 Recommendation:

28
29 Adopt with modification.

30
31 The Department supports adoption of
32 this proposal but, most importantly, urges that the
33 final federal regulation be modified to match the final
34 regulations adopted by the Alaska Board of Game to
35 reduce differences for subsistence users traversing
36 mixed land ownership. In the interim before Board of
37 Game action, the Department requests modification to
38 clearly indicate:

39
40 Possession of shot
41 shells containing lead
42 size T, .20 caliber or
43 less in diameter, is
44 prohibited in Unit 18
45 while hunting,
46 trapping, or in
47 possession of game.

48
49 The Department will likely support the
50 Alaska Board of Game adopting a proposed house keeping

1 measure to clarify that a person may not be in
2 possession of shot shells containing lead shot less
3 than or equal to .20 in diameter, including loose shot
4 used in muzzleloading firearms, while taking or in
5 possession of game in Unit 18.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It's not going to
8 give you major heartburn as I look at your
9 recommendation, it's not exactly the same language, but
10 they both say the same thing.

11

12 MR. PERRY: Unfortunately, by the time
13 we -- sometimes the paperwork that's in here is kind of
14 behind what's happened, so by the time we commented and
15 then Federal comments changed, our comments don't quite
16 comment on the new Federal changes, so they don't quite
17 jive the way we would hope they would. So we're asking
18 with modification according to our comments and I think
19 at this time we wouldn't ask for any modification.
20 Their language with modification is close enough to
21 ours that it functionally is the same.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It kind of makes me
24 wonder if it might have fallen within that InterAgency
25 Staff Committee. I thought the State people were
26 involved at that level. Any questions for the
27 Department. Bob.

28

29 MR. ALOYSIUS: The wording is very
30 confusing to me. Taking of wildlife in Unit 18 while
31 in possession of lead shot, 19, 20 caliber or less in
32 diameter is prohibited. It doesn't say anything about
33 you can't -- it doesn't say that you cannot use it. It
34 just says you can't possess it.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: That's what it
37 says.

38

39 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman. To answer
40 that question, functionally what we're attempting to do
41 is make it similar to our waterfowl regulations. The
42 possession is a broad enough term legally where we
43 could -- if it was the other way around, we'd actually
44 have to see somebody take game with lead shot before we
45 could issue citations. If we based it on possession,
46 it doesn't matter if you took it or not with lead shot.
47 All it means is if you were in possession that day when
48 you got checked on a snowmachine or in a boat and you
49 possessed lead shot. Because functionally we can't be
50 everywhere at all times to actually watch somebody

1 commit a violation with lead shot is next to impossible
2 to do.

3

4 MR. ALOYSIUS: Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The discussions
7 that we had as far as when we dealt with it before is
8 that it's a matter of using something that's poison to
9 our animals and can potentially poison the people that
10 eat them too.

11

12 Any questions for the State. Harry.

13

14 MR. H. WILDE: Mr. Chairman. In some
15 villages they don't use that shotgun shells anymore.
16 Like in Mountain Village gas station they don't sell
17 them no more.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Federal, State or
20 Tribal agency comments. Tim Andrew, AVCP.

21

22 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
23 for the opportunity to comment on the proposed
24 regulation. For the record, Timothy Andrew with AVCP.
25 The AVCP Waterfowl Conservation Committee also endorses
26 the prohibition on the use of lead shot primarily to
27 protect the Stellar's and Spectacled eiders and also
28 other waterfowl because the area is host to a large
29 number of waterfowl that people depend on. The only
30 concern that I have is the wording of this regulation
31 prohibits the use of any shot that is .20 or size T or
32 smaller. The concern like for a kid from one of the
33 communities going out with an airgun going after willow
34 grouse, which is pretty common in the community that I
35 live in. They use something .177 size shot in their
36 airguns. Would that be a violation?

37

38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Do you want to
39 address that, Robert.

40

41 MR. SUNDOWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
42 Robert Sundown with Yukon Delta Refuge. Yeah, that is
43 a great question and because an airgun is a rifle the
44 ammunition does not qualify as shot, so you'd be able
45 to use a .177 or .22 caliber air rifle to take grouse
46 or ptarmigan.

47

48 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
49 Thank you, Robert, for clarifying that. Other than
50 that it is very consistent with the AVCP Waterfowl

1 Conservation Committee Goose Management Plan and
2 therefore AVCP supports the prohibition of lead shot.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. Local
5 advisory committee comments. James.

6

7 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
8 I mentioned already that when we had AC meeting, the
9 last AC meeting people were complaining about the
10 enforcement people checking their grub box for lead
11 shot, so this comes to my mind because people were
12 complaining about the enforcement people checking their
13 grub box. I did not know what they were looking for.
14 One person said yesterday if their food they carry,
15 like dry fish was bear bait. It was not bear bait, it
16 was for the food. I realize now, looking at this
17 proposal, that it was for lead shot check.

18

19 Thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any written public
22 comments.

23

24 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Organized
25 Village of Kwethluk is in support of the proposal.

26

27 Mr. Chair.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Is there anyone
30 from the public wish to speak to this proposal.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seeing, hearing
35 none. Ready for deliberations. Mr. Aloysius. We do
36 have the modification language on this one.

37

38 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move
39 that we adopt Proposal WP10-55 as amended or modified.
40 I'm sorry.

41

42 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman, I second the
43 motion.

44

45 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. The
46 motion made and seconded. Any further discussion.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 MR. ANDREW: Question.

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question called on
2 Proposal 55. All in favor say aye.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Those opposed same
7 sign.

8
9 (No opposing votes)

10
11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none,
12 proposal passes unanimous. Moving on to Proposal 56.

13
14 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. Proposal 56
15 starts on Page 84 in your proposal book. WP10-56 was
16 submitted by the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge
17 and requests that the harvest limit in the Lower Yukon
18 area of Unit 18 be changed to two moose per regulatory
19 year. Hunters would be allowed to harvest one antlered
20 bull in the fall season and one moose in the winter
21 season. Hunters that do not harvest a moose in the
22 fall would be allowed to harvest two moose during the
23 winter season. The proposal also delegates authority
24 to the Refuge manager to restrict the season, if
25 needed, after consultation with the Alaska Department
26 of Fish and Game.

27
28 Based on the 2008 survey results, it
29 appears that the affected population could support
30 additional harvest with the current population size,
31 density, and productivity.

32
33 Adoption of Proposal WP10-56 would
34 provide additional opportunity for Federally-qualified
35 subsistence users to harvest moose in the Lower Yukon
36 area of Unit 18 during the December 20th through
37 January 20th season when access is better by
38 snowmachine.

39
40 A Federal registration permit would
41 provide Federal subsistence users with documentation
42 that they are hunting under Federal regulation and
43 would provide a mechanism to monitor the Federal
44 harvest. The requested harvest limit expansion would
45 help to facilitate management of the affected moose
46 population and would provide Federally-qualified
47 subsistence users with the opportunity to harvest an
48 additional moose in the winter season.

49
50 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
support WP10-56 with modification to extend the winter

1 season and that modification is included on Page 91 in
2 your book. The proposal would be to extend it through
3 the end of February rather than just running through
4 January 20th, also extend it through the end of
5 February but again allow the two moose limit as
6 described.

7
8 Modifying the proposal to extend the
9 winter season from January 20th through February 28th
10 would align with the State winter season and provide
11 Federal subsistence users with additional opportunity.
12 The proposal must be modified to include a Federal
13 registration permit requirement because the Federal and
14 State harvest limits would be different for this hunt.

15
16 Thank you, Mr. Chair. We'd be happy to
17 take any questions and, again, Robert will be a key
18 member here in the response.

19
20 Thank you.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions of the
23 Staff. James.

24
25 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
26 Robert, is that the same proposal that was taken by
27 State or Department of Fish and Game or Board of Game
28 in Nome?

29
30 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Robert.

33
34 MR. SUNDOWN: No. Different proposal.
35 The proposals that were taken up by the Board of Game
36 were dealing with regulatory boundary changes. This
37 has to do with the two moose bag limit that the Refuge
38 proposed. I've got some preliminary numbers for you,
39 Mr. Chairman, from the special action that occurred
40 this last season that occurred for the two moose bag
41 limit that occurred from December 20th to January 20th.

42
43 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Do you want to put
44 those forward.

45
46 MR. SUNDOWN: A total of 42 permits
47 were issued for people who wanted to harvest a second
48 moose from December 20th to January 20th and we started
49 issuing permits on the week before the hunt and we flew
50 to every village within the boundaries of the Lower

1 Yukon area and then again several villages several
2 times we flew to. So that we ensure that every person
3 that wanted to get a second moose had the opportunity
4 to get a permit for a second moose and this was from
5 Mountain Village on down to Emmo.

6
7 The preliminary numbers so far and
8 we're going to request a hand tally of the counts next
9 week, but of the 42 permits that were issued we have
10 not heard back from 19 of the people yet, but of the 23
11 people that responded 8 didn't hunt, 15 hunted, and of
12 the 15 that hunted, 13 were successful with nine cows
13 and four bulls. So a very low harvest overall of the
14 -- considering the amount of concerns we had pre-season
15 how much this would actually open the effort. Right
16 off the bat we learned the effort was pretty minimal.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Even with the
19 additional month that was added onto the season. Any
20 questions.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, folks.

25
26 MR. SUNDOWN: (Nods affirmatively)

27
28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: State comments.

29
30 MR. PERRY: For this one I think I'll
31 start off answering a question I think James had about
32 the boundary change. I think the next proposal is a
33 boundary change similar to what the State did.

34
35 On this particular proposal State
36 comments are on Page 93. Obviously the population is
37 growing rapidly. The State's official stance on this
38 is to oppose with -- unless it's modified to clarify
39 the Federal manager must consult with the Department to
40 see if the harvest is too high and it needs further
41 restricted, I think those fears we have will go away
42 with new data, especially with what Robert presented.
43 Interest in a second moose was pretty low and
44 participation was pretty low and harvest was low. So
45 those fears that we kind of base that on are probably
46 lessened by new data.

47
48 Obviously we'd like to make sure the
49 Federal manager has the discretionary authority to
50 change that bag limit if at any time there's a

1 conservation concern that two moose are too many and
2 we're harvesting more than we should be, that they have
3 the authority to reduce the bag limit to reduce the
4 take if that's excessive.

5
6
7
8
9

STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

10 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
11 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

12

13 Wildlife Proposal WP10-56:

14

15 This proposal increases the federal
16 subsistence winter bag limit for moose hunting in the
17 Lower Yukon River hunt area (Unit 18). The winter
18 federal subsistence season bag limit would be 2 moose
19 per year, so a federal subsistence hunter taking a bull
20 in the fall would be eligible to take 1 additional
21 moose in the winter or a hunter with no take in the
22 fall hunt would be eligible to take 2 moose in the
23 winter hunt.

24

25 Introduction:

26

27 Moose population in the Lower Yukon
28 River hunt area has increased dramatically in recent
29 years. The population is estimated at about 3,300
30 moose, has high bull:cow ratios and productivity, which
31 supports fall and winter seasons. This proposal seeks
32 to utilize more of the harvestable surplus by federal
33 subsistence hunters.

34

35 Impact on Subsistence Users:

36

37 Increasing the winter bag limit will
38 give federal subsistence users more hunting
39 opportunity.

40

41 Opportunity Provided by State:

42

43 In Unit 18, the Lower Yukon River hunt
44 area was modified at the November 2009 Alaska Board of
45 Game meeting. The Board of Game approved changes by
46 emergency order announcement for the 2009-2010 winter
47 season to reflect: 1) change to hunt area boundary,
48 and 2) winter season. The revised state regulation
49 becomes a permanent in 2010-2011, as follows:

50

1 5 AAC 85.045 (a) (16). Hunting seasons
2 and bag limits for moose.

3
4 Resident
5 Open Season
6 (Subsistence and
7

8 Nonresident
9 Units and Bag Limits General Hunts)
10 Open Season
11

12 Unit 18 Lower Yukon Area,
13 that portion north and west
14 of the Kashunuk River including
15 the north bank from the mouth
16 of the river upstream to the old
17 village of Chakaktolik, west of a
18 line from Chakaktolik to
19 Mountain Village, and
20 excluding all Yukon River drainages
21 upriver from Mountain Village.
22

23 1 antlered bull; or Aug. 10 - Sept. 30
24 Sept. 1 -Sept. 30

25
26 1 moose Dec. 20 Feb 28
27

28 Conservation Issues:

29
30 The Lower Yukon River moose population
31 is growing rapidly and currently is not a conservation
32 concern. If the moose population continues at a high
33 rate of growth, over-browsing may result in future
34 management and conservation considerations.
35

36 Enforcement Issues:

37
38 Enforcement problems related to hunt
39 area boundary will be decreased by using the Kashunuk
40 River bank as a boundary because it is an identifiable
41 geographic feature in an area of broad featureless
42 terrain. None the less, difference in federal
43 subsistence and state regulations resulting from
44 adoption of this proposal create enforcement problems
45 in areas of mixed land ownership, especially for annual
46 bag limit accumulation issues. If adopted, a federal
47 subsistence user that harvests a moose in a federal
48 subsistence hunt may not participate in the state moose
49 hunt for the remainder of the hunt season.
50

1 Other Comments:

2

3 If adopted, the department requests the
4 Federal Subsistence Board include specific language
5 during deliberations clearly identifying the supporting
6 facts for adopting this proposal. The department has
7 continued concerns regarding past Federal Subsistence
8 Board actions which established liberal bag limits for
9 species during times of peak population conditions and
10 the Board's refusal for reductions in the bag limits
11 once the populations returned to normal levels. The
12 department is cautious of the establishment of an
13 artificially inflated bag limit as the standard
14 definition for meaningful preference for federal
15 subsistence uses when the population returns to normal
16 levels.

17

18 Recommendation:

19

20 Oppose.

21

22 If adopted, modification is needed to
23 clarify that the federal manager must consult with the
24 department to determine when to restrict further
25 harvest.

26

27 The department suggests consideration
28 be given to modification of this proposal to establish
29 a community harvest hunt under federal subsistence
30 regulations in cooperation with the State which would
31 establish harvest quotas per community. Developing a
32 community harvest program will provide additional
33 opportunity to take harvestable surplus from the
34 growing moose population to meet the needs of the
35 communities. Additionally, harvest reporting would
36 improve and harvest quotas would be sensitive to
37 biological fluctuations in the population.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Other questions or
40 comments for the State.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: As I read through
45 the comments I was just wondering pretty much all the
46 way through everything that the State is laying out is
47 supportive of -- essentially providing further
48 justification, reinforcing the justification for having
49 that two moose bag limit there. I don't think we have
50 the level of concern. It didn't sound like we're

1 looking at reaching that limit as yet in that area as
2 far as over-browsing and so forth.

3

4 It was about the only concern mentioned
5 there and establishing a bag limit that's on a peak
6 population. I don't believe there's been any browse
7 surveys done, but from the reports that I've gotten and
8 seen is that we're still not there yet. I think people
9 can well recognize folks in that area through this
10 whole process in the moratorium are well up to speed
11 and if that population drops, we can expect a bag limit
12 to follow suit and be recognized.

13

14 Ray.

15

16 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As
17 a result of that high water that we had last year was
18 there any surveys on mortality rate for calves or moose
19 in the Lower Yukon?

20

21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Phil.

22

23 MR. PERRY: I apologize for not having
24 that right in front of me. Off the top of my head
25 there was a little bit of -- we attempted to do
26 twinning surveys on the Yukon last year kind of in the
27 middle of that flood. The upriver portions from St.
28 Mary's upriver we had a difficult time finding moose,
29 so our sample size was very, very small, so we don't
30 even look at that data too much.

31

32 The sample size below Mountain Village
33 wasn't that high either, but it did appear that moose
34 were moving away from the river from the big flood and
35 twinning rates -- like I said, a small sample size you
36 don't rely on it too much, but twinning rates still
37 looking pretty good and we saw cows with calves, kind
38 of like we expected. So I think the extent of that
39 flood probably affected the moose to some extent, but I
40 don't think it was severe.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Nothing further,
43 thank you. Move on to Federal, State, Tribal agency
44 comments. Mr. Andrew.

45

46 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
47 AVCP supports this proposal as it would provide more
48 opportunity for the local residents and also residents
49 of the entire Unit 18, including the communities of
50 Stebbins, St. Michaels and the Kalskags, who also have

1 customary and traditional use determination on the use
2 of these animals for additional protein needs that they
3 require throughout the winter.

4
5 Just a further comment on this
6 proposal. This is the process that we should have used
7 prior to allowing the sport hunters to come in and
8 harvest additional animals in this area in the years
9 past. Provide maximum subsistence opportunity prior to
10 allowing other consumptive users to come out and
11 harvest the resource.

12
13 And that concludes our comments.

14
15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, Tim.
18 Local advisory committee. James.

19
20 MR. CHARLES: No comment, Mr. Chairman.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Summary of written
23 comments. Oh, I'm sorry.

24
25 MR. ALOYSIUS: Lower Yukon AC.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I don't believe --
28 are you still on there, Ray?

29
30 MR. ONEY: No.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I didn't think so.
33 Summary of written comments. Are there any?

34
35 MR. NICK: The Organized Village of
36 Kwethluk supports the proposal.

37
38 Mr. Chair.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, Alex.
41 Does anyone from the public which to speak to this
42 proposal.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seeing none. Mr.
47 Aloysius, there's the modified language on Page 91.

48
49 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move we
50 adopt Proposal WP10-56 as modified.

1 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman, I move to
2 second the motion.

3
4 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It's moved and
5 seconded. Proposal 56 is before us. Any further
6 discussion. As modified.

7
8 (No comments)

9
10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ready for the
11 question.

12
13 MR. CHARLES: Question, Mr. Chairman.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question on
16 Proposal 56 to extend the moose hunt below Mountain
17 Village on the Yukon portion and two moose bag limit,
18 one during the fall and up to two on Federal land.
19 Those in favor say aye.

20
21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: All opposed same
24 sign.

25
26 (No opposing votes)

27
28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none.
29 Proposal 56 passes unanimously.

30
31 Move to Proposal 57.

32
33 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. WP10-57 begins
34 on Page 95 of your Council book. This proposal was
35 submitted by the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge
36 and requests a change in the boundary for the Lower
37 Yukon area.

38
39 The current regulatory language
40 specific to the moose hunt boundary is not easily
41 identified on the ground, while the
42 proposed boundary change would make it easier for
43 subsistence hunters to identify the area.

44
45 This proposal would provide a
46 regulatory boundary reflecting easily identified,
47 prominent, natural geographic features found in the
48 affected area.

49
50 A proposal to change the southern

1 boundary to the Kashunuk River was adopted by the
2 Alaska Board of Game at its November 2009 meeting.
3 This proposal seeks to align the State and Federal
4 boundary.

5
6 Again, Mr. Chair, on Page 95 the OSM
7 preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal WP10-57
8 with modification to align with the recently adopted
9 Alaska Board of Game boundary description. My
10 understanding is that Robert was there at the meeting.
11 I think Phil was as well, so they can help to speak to
12 it, but it sounds like this boundary will be easier for
13 hunters to identify on the ground and will also align
14 with the State.

15
16 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions or
19 comments.

20
21 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray.

24
25 MR. ONEY: Where was the line before?

26
27 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Mr. Sundown.

28
29 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman. The
30 previous boundary was a line north and west from Cape
31 Romanzof to Kusilvak Mountain and then onto Mountain
32 Village, then following the drainage on the Yukon on
33 the north side of Mountain Village. And this seeks to
34 change that southern boundary to the Kashunuk River.

35
36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Anybody further.

37
38 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman. On Page 98
39 of your book shows you the map of the current boundary
40 and the proposed boundary.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob.

43
44 MR. ALOYSIUS: There's a little
45 confusion for me. The proposed regulation says that
46 portion north and west of a line from the mouth of the
47 Kashunuk River to Chakaktolik following the east bank
48 of the Kashunuk River, then straight to Mountain
49 Village. Then the preliminary OSM conclusion is to
50 support with the wording that portion north and west of

1 the Kashunuk River including the north bank. Where
2 does it start? That's the question I have.

3

4 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Robert.

7

8 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Aloysius, the start
9 of the boundary would be at the mouth of the Kashunuk
10 River into the Bering Sea.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Wasn't that
13 proposal put forward to the Board by Scammon Bay?

14

15 MR. ALOYSIUS: I just want to make sure
16 there's a start on the Kashunuk River. In the first
17 one it's clear. It says at the mouth and this one says
18 just Kashunuk. That's the confusion I had.

19

20 MR. SUNDOWN: The proposal seeks to
21 define the Kashunuk River and the Kashunuk River in its
22 entirety, which is from the mouth to the point of the
23 old village of Chakaktolik, which is just south of
24 Mountain Village. So, by default, specifying the
25 Kashunuk River would be from the beginning to that
26 point south of Mountain Village.

27

28 MR. ALOYSIUS: Well, you say the
29 beginning. The beginning is up in the mountain, the
30 hills, and the terminus is at the Bering Sea. You have
31 to be clear that the boundary starts at the mouth.

32

33 MR. H. WILDE: Mr. Chairman.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Harry.

36

37 MR. H. WILDE: I support this Kashunuk
38 River side because of our people from Hooper Bay,
39 Chevak they have an extended place to hunt by the
40 Kashunuk. There are some people that hunt in this
41 area, but they have to be alert all the time that they
42 might -- a plane might come around. This one will help
43 young people too that hunt in that area with their
44 moose hunting. I support that.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: And the Chakaktolik
47 area is a very well known landmark for the area. The
48 old village people use now for beaver trapping. I
49 don't know if there's any houses left there. There was
50 back in the early '70s. Robert.

1 MR. SUNDOWN: I just wanted to point
2 out, Mr. Chairman, that there is just one house left
3 there.

4
5 (Laughter)

6
7 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Oh, is there?
8 Okay.

9
10 MR. SUNDOWN: And the practical effects
11 of the proposal is mainly during the winter hunt when
12 you would see an increase of the season from -- the
13 Unit 18 remainder would shrink in that section where
14 the season is from December 20th to January 10th. The
15 season between the current boundary and the proposed
16 boundary would increase from January 10th, where the
17 current season closes in that intermediate area, and it
18 would now close on February 28th.

19
20 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: James.

23
24 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25 That takes away the confusion too when the State and
26 Federal align their boundary. I go along with that one
27 because we worked on that at Nome Board of Game meeting
28 and the people from that area knows where the
29 boundaries would be.

30
31 Thank you.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Does the State have
34 anything to add here. Phil.

35
36 MR. PERRY: The State obviously
37 supports this for a couple different reasons. One of
38 them is, you know, we're always interested in making
39 sure that if we can align boundaries and seasons and
40 all that, that's always in our interest to make it
41 easier on hunters and also having a line that's more
42 clearly defined for hunters is a benefit to everyone.
43 With the amended language to match what had happened at
44 the Board of Game meeting, we're fully in support of
45 this proposal.

46
47 *****
48 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
49 *****

50

1 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
2 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

3
4 Wildlife Proposal WP10-57:
5

6 This proposal modifies the hunt area
7 boundary for the Lower Yukon River hunt area in Unit
8 18. The proponent has since agreed to a modification
9 of this proposal to match the boundary realignment
10 adopted by the Alaska Board of Game in 2009.

11
12 Introduction:
13

14 Moose population in the Lower Yukon
15 River hunt area has increased dramatically in recent
16 years. The population is estimated at about 3,300
17 moose, has high bull:cow ratios and productivity, and
18 supports fall and winter seasons. The current federal
19 subsistence hunt boundary in the vicinity of Kusilvak
20 Mountain creates confusion among hunters, and the
21 proposal attempts to use better geographic landmarks.
22 The proposed language differs from the state hunt area
23 approved at the November 2009 State Board of Game
24 meeting.

25
26 Impact on Subsistence Users:
27

28 Improving the federal subsistence hunt
29 area boundary will make it easier for hunters to
30 determine the proper season and bag limit within the
31 Lower Yukon River hunt area and the adjoining Remainder
32 of Unit 18 hunt area.

33
34 Opportunity Provided by State:
35

36 In Unit 18, the Lower Yukon River state
37 hunt area was modified at the November 2009 Alaska
38 Board of Game meeting. The Board of Game approved
39 changes by emergency order announcement to reflect: 1)
40 change to state hunt area boundary and 2) state winter
41 season. The revised state regulation applies to the
42 state winter season in 2009-2010 and becomes a
43 permanent regulation in 2010-2011, as follows:

44
45 5 AAC 85.045 (a) (16). Hunting seasons
46 and bag limits for moose.

47
48 Resident
49 Open Season
50 (Subsistence and

1 Nonresident
2 Units and Bag Limits General Hunts)
3 Open Season

4
5 Unit 18 Lower Yukon Area,
6 that portion north and west
7 of the Kashunuk River including
8 the north bank from the mouth
9 of the river upstream to the old
10 village of Chakaktolik, west of a
11 line from Chakaktolik to
12 Mountain Village, and
13 excluding all Yukon River drainages
14 upriver from Mountain Village.

15
16 1 antlered bull; or Aug. 10 - Sept. 30
17 Sept. 1 -Sept. 30
18 1 moose Dec. 20 Feb 28

19
20 Conservation Issues:

21
22 The Lower Yukon River moose population
23 is growing rapidly and currently is not a conservation
24 concern. If the moose population continues at a high
25 rate of growth, over-browsing may result in future
26 management and conservation considerations.

27
28 Enforcement Issues:

29
30 Enforcement problems related to hunt
31 area boundary will be decreased by using the Kashunuk
32 River bank as a boundary, because it is an identifiable
33 geographic feature in an area of broad featureless
34 terrain.

35
36 Recommendation:

37
38 Support with modification to use the
39 boundary adopted by the Alaska Board of Game so there
40 is a uniform hunt area across state and federal public
41 lands associated with the Lower Yukon River hunt area.

42
43 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you.
44 Federal, State tribal agency comments.

45
46 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
47 I was also at the Board of Game meeting where the Board
48 of Game considered this proposal and I would like to
49 make reference to a comment made by Ted Spraker and
50 several of the Board members. That when hunting, they

1 like to hunt on both sides of the river. They don't
2 like to just hunt on the west side of a river or just
3 only the east side. Whenever they see an animal, they
4 like to be able to hunt on both sides of the river.

5
6 As far as I can read this proposal,
7 looking at the current boundary description that they
8 have and the language, it only opens the west side of
9 the Kashunuk River and not a portion of the east side.
10 So if you saw a moose in the fall season on the east
11 side, would you still be able to harvest that.
12 According to this regulation -- I mean if it referred
13 to the bank, it would definitely present an interesting
14 situation for the hunter and also the law enforcement
15 person as well.

16
17 What the Board of Game did in I believe
18 it's the following proposal is that they had allowed
19 for about a mile from the Johnson River. If we had
20 some kind of a language that people would be able to
21 use that buffer just to be able to harvest moose in the
22 fall on the east side of the Kashunuk River.

23
24 That concludes my comments, Mr. Chair.
25 Oh, we support the proposal.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. Robert.

28
29 MR. SUNDOWN: Just to clarify that.
30 For the fall hunt they both have nearly identical
31 seasons. It's not as distinct as the Unit 18 remainder
32 and Unit 18 Kuskokwim. So it's a non-issue as far as
33 the left bank and right bank issue because they're both
34 open at the same time in the fall and they both go for
35 a duration.

36
37 There's a small change that's been made
38 for the Lower Yukon where the Lower Yukon is going to
39 be starting 10 days later. So Unit 18 remainder, the
40 right bank of the Kashunuk would be open or the east
41 bank of the Kashunuk would be open first. So Unit 18
42 remainder is going to have a slightly longer season as
43 far as the beginning than the east bank, which is the
44 Lower Yukon, but for all practical purposes they're
45 identical.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. I was
48 trying to remember where that was. We essentially only
49 needed to address it for the winter season to get that
50 physical boundary.

1 Local Advisory Committee. James.
2
3 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman. I
4 supported that proposal back in Nome because it makes
5 things easier for the hunters, the boundary line
6 change.
7
8 Thank you.
9
10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Written public
11 comments.
12
13 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Organized
14 Village of Kwethluk supported the proposal.
15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. Anyone
17 from the public wish to address this proposal.
18
19 (No comments)
20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none. Mr.
22 Aloysius, modified language for this proposal on Page
23 99.
24
25 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move we
26 adopt Proposal WP10-57 as modified.
27
28 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman, I second the
29 motion.
30
31 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Moved and seconded.
32 Proposal 57 before us. Any further discussion.
33
34 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman.
35
36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray, go ahead.
37
38 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
39 take it that this area has been counted for a moose
40 population. Looking at your map over here on this one,
41 it doesn't say anything about moose population in that
42 area.
43
44 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman.
45
46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Robert.
47
48 MR. SUNDOWN: Quite honestly both of
49 those areas, whether it's the new boundary or the old
50 boundary, are quite a bit out of the Lower Yukon census

1 area where moose are counted. There is a seemingly
2 substantial population of moose in the upper Kashunuk
3 between the upper Kashunuk south of Pilot Station and
4 Mountain Village on west Kusilvak Mountain.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any further
7 discussion.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I saw nine of them
12 on the big line the last time I was over there on
13 Kashunuk.

14
15 MR. BROWN: Question.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The question has
18 been called. Proposal 57 final action. All in favor
19 say aye.

20
21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: All opposed same
24 sign.

25
26 (No opposing votes)

27
28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Proposal 57
29 passes unanimously. Proposal 58/62.

30
31 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. WP10-58/62
32 you can find in your books starting on Page 102. WP10-
33 58 and 62 submitted by the Native Village of
34 Nunapitchuk, requests a change in the
35 existing boundary description that separates Unit 18
36 Remainder and the Kuskokwim River drainage in Unit 18
37 relevant to the moose regulations.

38
39 The Johnson River serves as a
40 locally-known divide between the Yukon and Kuskokwim
41 River drainages in Unit 18. The intent of the proposal
42 is to provide a regulatory boundary reflecting
43 locally-known land features. The boundary change
44 should make it easier for subsistence moose hunters to
45 identify Unit 18 Remainder from the Kuskokwim River
46 Drainage. The proponent has worked with Refuge Staff
47 to develop the proposal.

48
49 At its November 2009 meeting, the
50 Alaska Board of Game adopted a boundary change that

1 mirrors the proponent s request. Again, a number of
2 people were at that meeting and they can speak to the
3 details. Staff from ADF&G proposed the boundary change
4 and worked with Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge
5 staff and the Lower Kuskokwim Fish & Game Advisory
6 Committee to finalize the recommendations.

7

8 The OSM preliminary conclusion on Page
9 106 is to support Proposal WP10-58/62 with modification
10 to align with the recently adopted Alaska Board of Game
11 boundary description.

12

13 Thank you, Mr. Chair. We'd be happy to
14 take any questions.

15

16 Quyana.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions for Mr.
19 Kron. Bob.

20

21 MR. ALOYSIUS: Instead of using the
22 high Portage Ridge as a boundary line, now you have the
23 -- is it the north bank of the Johnson River as your
24 boundary line now?

25

26 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman. The
27 boundary line would be Nunavakanukakslak Lake where
28 Johnson River spills into just north of Nunapitchuk.
29 The boundary would be a buffer zone half a mile south
30 and east of the Johnson. So you would be able to
31 harvest a moose going up the Johnson River, upriver of
32 that point on either bank of the river.

33

34 MR. ALOYSIUS: Is that because part of
35 Remainder 18?

36

37 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman. That is
38 correct, Mr. Aloysius. That portion would now be
39 considered the remainder of Unit 18. The practical
40 effects of this proposal would lengthen the season from
41 the current 10-day Kuskokwim season to an 80-day Unit
42 18 Remainder season from the fall -- I'm sorry, 50-day
43 season from the fall, including the 20-day winter hunt.

44

45 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Nothing further.

46

47 MR. ALOYSIUS: I'm smiling.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Mr. Perry. Fish
50 and Game comments.

1 MR. PERRY: Our comments are parallel
2 to what they were in the proposal before. This is
3 making a clear boundary that's hopefully going to help
4 hunters and law enforcement and to have them aligned in
5 Federal and State regulations is I think in everyone's
6 best interest.

7
8 *****
9 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
10 *****

11
12 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
13 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

14
15 Wildlife Proposals WP10-58 and WP10-
16 062:

17
18 These proposals modify the boundary of
19 the Lower Kuskokwim River federal subsistence hunt area
20 in Unit 18 by using identifiable geographic features in
21 an area with featureless terrain.

22
23 Introduction:

24
25 The Lower Kuskokwim hunt federal
26 subsistence hunt area in Unit 18 was closed to all
27 hunting for 5 years to allow for population growth as
28 moose expanded into previously unoccupied habitat
29 associated with the Kuskokwim River drainage. In 2009-
30 2010 regulatory year, the Alaska Board of Game approved
31 a registration permit state hunt for residents only
32 with a harvest quota of 75 moose based on population
33 estimates of 1,000 moose in the hunt area. In November
34 2009, the Alaska Board of Game changed the hunt area
35 boundary but made no changes to the registration permit
36 season and bag limit based on hunter effort
37 (approximately 1,100 applications) and total harvest
38 (approximately 105 moose) during the first year the
39 hunt was opened. Continued hunting with low harvest
40 quotas will allow harvest opportunity at the same time
41 allowing herd growth and expansion.

42
43 Impact on Subsistence Users:

44
45 Improving the hunt area boundary will
46 make it easier for federal subsistence hunters to
47 determine the proper season and bag limit within the
48 Lower Kuskokwim River federal subsistence hunt area and
49 the adjoining Remainder of Unit 18 hunt area.

50

1 Opportunity Provided by State:

2

3 In Unit 18, the Lower Kuskokwim River
4 state hunt area was modified at the November 2009
5 Alaska Board of Game meeting. Department staff
6 proposed the boundary change and worked with the Yukon
7 Delta refuge and Lower Kuskokwim Fish and Game Advisory
8 Committee to finalize the recommendation. The Board of
9 Game approved the hunt area boundary that will be a
10 permanent regulation in 2010-2011, as follows:

11

12 5 AAC 85.045 (a) (16). Hunting seasons
13 and bag limits for moose.

14

15 Resident
16 Open Season
17 (Subsistence and Nonresident
18 Units and Bag Limits General Hunts)

19 Open Season

20

21 (16)

22

23 Unit 18 Kuskokwim Area, that
24 portion easterly of a line from
25 the mouth of the Ishkowik River
26 to the closest point of Dall Lake,
27 then to the east bank of the
28 Johnson River at its entrance
29 into Nunavakanukakslak Lake
30 (N 60 59.41' Latitude;
31 W 162 22.14' Longitude),
32 continuing upriver along a
33 line mile south and east of, and
34 paralleling a line along the southerly
35 bank of the Johnson
36 River to the confluence of the
37 east bank of Crooked Creek,
38 then continuing upriver to the
39 outlet at Arhymot Lake, then
40 following the lake south bank
41 easterly to the Unit 18 border
42 and north of and including the
43 Eek River drainage.

44

45 1 antlered bull by
46 registration permit only Sept. 1 - Sept. 10 No
47 open season.

48

49 Conservation Issues:

50

1 Low harvests rates are sustainable
2 based on the current minimum population size of 1,000
3 moose and will allow for future herd growth and
4 expansion. The revised boundary identifies and
5 protects the Lower Kuskokwim River moose population for
6 future conservative management.

7

8 Enforcement Issues:

9

10 Enforcement problems related to hunt
11 area boundary will be decreased by using a line
12 parallel to the Johnson River along portions of the
13 hunt area to separate the Kuskokwim River drainage area
14 from the Unit 18 Remainder. Other changes to the
15 boundary use identifiable geographic feature in an area
16 of broad featureless terrain.

17

18 Recommendation:

19

20 Adopt with modification to use the
21 boundary adopted by the Alaska Board of Game so there
22 is a uniform hunt area across federal and non-federal
23 lands associated with the Lower Kuskokwim River federal
24 subsistence hunt area.

25

26 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: As I look here, the
27 proposed amended is essentially verbatim as the
28 modified language as presented on 106. Any questions
29 for Mr. Perry. James.

30

31 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
32 The boundary at Nunapitchuk or the line where it starts
33 should be clear to people up in that area because we
34 have three villages at that boundary or southern
35 boundary because the Johnson River starts at the
36 Kuskokwim, but those people up there at Kasigluk,
37 Nunapitchuk and Atmautluak should know where the line
38 starts.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 MR. PERRY: Mr. Chairman. Yeah, we've
43 consulted extensively with Nunapitchuk, meeting with
44 them at numerous points over the course of the year,
45 the last time being on the 22nd of November, and they
46 were very happy with the Board of Game results with the
47 current language as amended.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It always bears
50 repeating, there's maybe a few folks that don't

1 recognize it as yet, but it was thoroughly discussed as
2 well that the animals taken in this hunt are not going
3 to affect Kuskokwim populations. They predominantly
4 originate from the Yukon populations, so it's not going
5 to affect the continued growth or cause a concern for
6 growth of our Kuskokwim moose.

7

8 Bob.

9

10 MR. ALOYSIUS: Where did Atmautluak fit
11 into this picture?

12

13 MR. SUNDOWN: Quite honestly, you know,
14 there's a segment there from where the regulation
15 boundary starts. That's really a no-man's land. You
16 look at that whole portion west of the Kuskokwim and
17 there's not a single tree to be seen and there's not a
18 single moose to be found for the most part. That would
19 include a lot of the lower segments. The place where
20 people are going to be putting their effort is going to
21 be north of the tundra villages starting on the Johnson
22 there and going upriver. I think most of the effort
23 that we've seen takes place in the upper portion of the
24 Johnson River where it is fairly close to the Yukon.

25

26 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Phil, do you want
27 to add.

28

29 MR. PERRY: I'll just add also that if
30 we look at harvest reports from this last year and from
31 other years that where we see moose harvested on the
32 Johnson is maybe the bottom 15 or 20 miles below the
33 tundra villages and that would still be within the hunt
34 area.

35

36 The other place we see it if you look
37 on the map on Page 105 is the first, I don't know, 20,
38 30, 40 miles of the Johnson River up from the lakes
39 there is pretty wide open, basically no moose habitat,
40 but up close to where the words say proposed boundary
41 and current boundary, up in that area, there is some
42 moose habitat up there. There are moose up there. This
43 last year we had a couple moose harvested up there
44 under the registration permit.

45

46 So there are people that go hunting up
47 there and it really is difficult up in that area to
48 tell. You could walk up a ridge and walk into the
49 Yukon drainage and down the next little valley and back
50 up into the Johnson drainage. So that area being

1 consistent now under State regulations and all of that
2 is open. There's no difference, there's no line there
3 that you can't tell where you are that's going to help
4 people. In all reality, those are just kind of the
5 edge of the moose population of the Yukon River.

6
7 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. State,
8 tribal agency comments.

9
10 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11 AVCP supports the proposal as it would increase the
12 hunt area for primarily people from the tundra villages
13 and other villages that wish to travel up the Johnson
14 River to hunt moose in the fall. I must apologize to
15 the Council that my last comment I thought was a mile
16 and it was my fuzzy memory of the November Board
17 meeting, but apparently, according to the proposed
18 regulations it's half mile on the south bank of the
19 Johnson River.

20
21 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: You're not
24 suggesting an amendment to make it a mile?

25
26 (Laughter)

27
28 MR. ANDREW: No.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Local Advisory
31 Committees. James.

32
33 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
34 The local AC would support this proposal too.

35
36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. Mr.
37 Aloysius.

38
39 MR. ALOYSIUS: As the Chair of AC
40 Central Kuskokwim I will support this.

41
42 (Laughter)

43
44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: All right. Anybody
45 want to ask him about that, how come?

46
47 (Laughter)

48
49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Written public
50 comments.

1 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Organized
2 Village of Kwethluk supports Proposals 58/62.
3
4 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. Anyone
5 from the public wish to speak to this proposal.
6
7 (No comments)
8
9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none. Mr.
10 Aloysius, you have the modified language on Page 106.
11
12 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move we
13 adopt Proposal WP10-58/62 as modified.
14
15 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman. I move to
16 second the motion.
17
18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Moved and second.
19 We have Proposal 58/62 before us. Any further
20 discussion. Ready for the question.
21
22 MR. CHARLES: Question, Mr. Chairman.
23
24 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Final action on
25 Proposal 58/62 revising the boundary for the Johnson
26 River. All those in favor say aye.
27
28 IN UNISON: Aye.
29
30 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Those opposed same
31 sign.
32
33 (No opposing votes)
34
35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Motion carries
36 unanimous. It's up to Proposal 59.
37
38 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr Chairman. You made a
39 remark this morning you wanted to recess at 11:30.
40
41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: 11:30 to 11:45.
42 Can we get one more out of the way? Proposal 59.
43
44 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. Proposal
45 WP10-59, the analysis for it begins on Page 110 in your
46 books. This proposal was submitted by Byran Ulak of
47 Scammon Bay and requests that the Federal Subsistence
48 Board establish a regulatory provision for the harvest
49 of moose from a motorized boat under low or idle power
50 in the Lower Yukon area of Unit 18.

1 While statewide Federal subsistence
2 regulations do not allow the harvest of wildlife from a
3 motor-driven boat under power, exceptions are allowed
4 under special provisions.

5
6 Based on the 2008 survey results, it
7 appears that the affected population could support
8 additional harvest with the current population size,
9 density, and productivity.

10
11 Adoption of Proposal WP10-59 would
12 allow Federal subsistence users to harvest moose in the
13 lower Yukon area of Unit 18 from a motor-driven boat
14 under power. Based on biological information on moose
15 in the affected area, any additional harvest that could
16 result from adoption of Proposal WP10-59 would not
17 likely create a conservation concern. Adoption of this
18 proposal would result in differences between the State
19 and Federal regulations in the Lower Yukon area of Unit
20 18.

21
22 The OSM Preliminary conclusion begins
23 on Page 115 in your book and is to support Proposal
24 WP10-59 with modification to remove the words low or
25 idle.

26
27 The removal of these two words, low or
28 idle, from the regulation eliminates potential user
29 interpretation in law enforcement issues that could
30 arise from this language, simplifies the regulations
31 and makes it consistent with the wording that was
32 adopted for the Unit 25 wording where this type of
33 thing is allowed.

34
35 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again, we've
36 worked real closely with the Refuge on this one as
37 well. I'm sure Robert and Tom will be able to help us
38 with any questions.

39
40 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Tom, Robert, do you
43 want to add anything additional at this time.

44
45 MR. SUNDOWN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
46 Members of the RAC. The Refuges have struggled with
47 what the appropriate language might be. With an
48 expanding and growing moose population, our tendency is
49 to ease means and method regulations as well as seasons
50 and bag limits, so this proposal attempts to ease a

1 method and means rule that is in place that would
2 prevent people from shooting a moose from a moving
3 boat.

4

5 In all the years I've been doing this
6 it's a very common practice. I mean there's not a
7 single place I haven't been to in the entire refuge
8 where people aren't harvesting moose it seems from a
9 moving platform.

10

11 There's several concerns that the
12 Refuge has and I think Tom and I would like to address
13 them. I think we're generally in support of this
14 proposal with the idea that we eliminate some bad
15 practices that might come from the language as it is
16 proposed.

17

18 Our primary concern is that if a moose
19 is shot from a boat, that it's going to increase
20 wounding loss and people who drive their boats on the
21 rivers and take a shot from a high-moving platform we
22 don't think is a good practice.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Tom.

25

26 MR. DOOLITTLE: Tom Doolittle, Yukon
27 Delta. Yeah, I mean when we looked at the existing
28 language and it talked about a boat in idle and we know
29 what happens when a boat in idle is in current, is that
30 again the platform becomes unstable. We know that the
31 present use patterns and hunting patterns have
32 essentially been a boat under power, so we really
33 vacillated between really what the critical language or
34 potential amendment should be to this relative to
35 safety for the people that are in the watercraft but
36 also having a controllable platform.

37

38 Really, from the enforcement side and
39 from our perspective is that as long as the boat was
40 not on step that that would be some clarification to
41 the potential language that would, A, accommodate the
42 safety issues and then also our concern about wounding
43 loss relative to a stable platform to shoot from.
44 Also, from the biological side of the equation, that
45 moose population seems to be doing well.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any questions.

48 Bob.

49

50 MR. ALOYSIUS: I don't see where low

1 power or idling would create any kind of instability in
2 a boat because it's very stable.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any questions.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: State comments.

9

10 MR. PERRY: Thank you, Greg. The State
11 looks at this and there's a couple State exceptions in
12 northwest Alaska for swimming caribou, but for this
13 case the State opposes the change. It's not
14 necessarily the same traditional method as we're
15 talking about in other places and it does become an
16 enforcement issue when it comes to other animals, be it
17 migratory birds or black bears or whatever else. I
18 guess I'll leave it at that.

19

20 *****

21 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

22 *****

23

24 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
25 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

26

27 Wildlife Proposal WP10-59:

28

29 This proposal modifies federal
30 subsistence methods and means of taking game to allow
31 moose to be taken while under power in a boat being
32 operated within the Lower Yukon River hunt area in Unit
33 18.

34

35 Introduction:

36

37 Under federal regulations ^U 100.26 (4)
38 and (15), taking swimming wildlife from a moving boat
39 is illegal. Moose population in the Lower Yukon River
40 hunt area has increased dramatically in recent years.
41 The population is estimated at about 3,300 moose, has
42 high bull:cow ratios and productivity which supports
43 fall and winter seasons. Current federal subsistence
44 methods of take prohibit taking a moose while under
45 power in a boat or while moose are swimming.
46 Traditional method of harvesting moose from the Lower
47 Yukon River hunt area has not included pursuit and take
48 of swimming game.

49

50 Opportunity Provided by State: State

1 regulations prohibit the take of game from boats under
2 power in 5 AAC 92.080 (4), as follows:

3
4 92.080. Unlawful method
5 of taking game;
6 exceptions. The
7 following methods of
8 taking game are
9 prohibited:

10
11 (4) unless otherwise
12 provided in this
13 chapter, from a motor-
14 driven boat or a
15 motorized land vehicle,
16 unless the motor has
17 been completely shut
18 off and the progress
19 from the motor's power
20 has ceased, except that
21 a

22
23 State regulations prohibit the taking
24 big game while swimming in 5 AAC 92.085 (7), as
25 follows:

26
27 92.085. Unlawful method
28 of taking big game;
29 exceptions. The
30 following methods and
31 means of taking big
32 game are prohibited in
33 addition to the
34 prohibitions in 5 AAC
35 92.080:

36
37 (7) while a big game
38 animal is swimming,
39 except that a swimming
40 caribou may be taken in
41 Unit 23;

42
43 Enforcement Issues:

44
45 Changing the federal subsistence method
46 of take to include boats under power would contribute
47 to enforcement issues related to take of big game while
48 swimming and take of other game (e.g., waterfowl
49 hunting). Adopting methods of take regulations that
50 are divergent from the state hunting regulations will

1 increase user confusion and increase enforcement
2 problems.

3

4 Other Comments:

5

6 Federal subsistence hunting regulations
7 only apply on federal public lands; federal subsistence
8 hunting regulations do not apply on nonfederal lands
9 and waters (unlike federal subsistence fishing
10 regulations). The boat accessible waters of the Lower
11 Yukon River are state-owned and are not subject to
12 federal subsistence wildlife regulations.

13

14 Recommendation:

15

16 Oppose.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Since enforcement
19 was brought up as an issue in the State's comments, has
20 there been enforcement issues that you're aware of in
21 Unit 25. Unit 23 I think is another area where it's
22 allowed. That you're aware of.

23

24 MR. PERRY: I'm not aware of any. I'm
25 sorry.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions for the
28 State.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Thank you.
33 Tribal agency comments.

34

35 MR. ANDREW: AVCP supports this
36 proposal as we believe it's a pretty common practice
37 within the area. Many of our hunters don't know what
38 fair chase is. The fair chase concept is utilized by
39 the sport hunters. As many of you had indicated before
40 in your personal comments is that people out here are
41 in pursuit of food. So first opportunity people are
42 able to get their food source, the better.

43

44 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Written public
47 comments, if any.

48

49 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Organized
50 Village of Kwethluk, seems like they have a couple of

1 comments on Proposal 59. I'll try to summarize the
2 comment. The first comment is that it is prohibited to
3 shoot wildlife with motor under power. The second one,
4 there is an unfair change of abuse if this is allowed.
5 This is a short summary of their comments.

6

7 Mr. Chair.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I think that's
10 probably a misspelling and probably means the word
11 chance rather than change.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 Anyone from the public wish to address
16 this proposal. James Nicori.

17

18 MR. NICORI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19 This is James Nicori. We had a meeting on this and we
20 had a lengthy discussion. It came to a point that
21 opposing this 10-59 where the animal would be taken
22 while on the move. It would be a disadvantage to us
23 outside of this proposed area and it wouldn't be fair
24 for all the people that hunt taking an animal while our
25 boat or vehicle or whatever we're on is on the move.
26 For the record, the Organized Village of Kwethluk
27 opposes this 10-59.

28

29 Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions for
32 James. We're going to go ahead and think about this
33 over lunch. We'll step down at 11:45 and be back at
34 1:00.

35

36 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move we
37 recess until 1:00.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Requesting
40 unanimous consent. Any objection.

41

42 (Council nods affirmatively)

43

44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none, we're
45 recessed until 1:00.

46

47 (Off record)

48

49 (On record)

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We're back on
2 record at 1:24 p.m. We're in the process of taking
3 reports on Proposal 59. We're ready to move into
4 deliberations. Bob Aloysius, modified regulations on
5 Page 116.

6
7 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Bob.

10
11 MR. ALOYSIUS: I move we adopt Proposal
12 WP10-59 as modified.

13
14 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman. I second the
15 move.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Moved and seconded.
18 We have Proposal 10-59 as modified on Page 116 of our
19 book in front of us.

20
21 So discussion.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The one thing I
26 wanted to follow up a little bit on is when the
27 biologist Refuge guys were giving their report they
28 mentioned some concerns with that idle versus perhaps
29 being on step and things of that nature. Maybe if you
30 guys could speak a little bit more to that.

31
32 Robert.

33
34 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman. Members of
35 the RAC. Robert Sundown, Fish and Wildlife. I guess
36 our primary concern with the whole issue -- in general
37 we don't oppose the proposal, but where we do run into
38 concerns is wounding loss and mortality associated with
39 shooting a moose on step when you're in a boat. We
40 just believe it's a poor practice to be on full power
41 and shoot a moose when you're traveling that fast and
42 on step. While we don't have an issue with people at
43 low power settings or being off step, we do run into
44 concerns for safety and wounding loss when people are
45 on full power running a boat. So I don't know what the
46 Board feels about adding a provision to being not on
47 step and you guys can do as you please, of course.
48 That was our major concern.

49
50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Tom Kron.

1 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. I guess the
2 question is whether you think it's an issue. If it's
3 not an issue, then don't worry about it. The wording
4 that's in there right now is the wording that's in the
5 regs for Unit 25 and it seemed like there was some
6 merit in trying to have standard wording for different
7 parts of the State where this is allowed. But, again,
8 it's your call whether or not this is an issue to
9 address or not.

10

11 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'm thinking right
14 now it's going to apply to the whole area below
15 Mountain Village, but I'm thinking again of the
16 Kashunuk where it would almost be self-limiting in that
17 creek there at least. I've never been down to the
18 lower sections, but on the upper parts there it's
19 hairpins and horseshoes and back in on itself and tied
20 in knots. You aren't going to be on step for very long
21 anyway. I don't know. Anybody else have any thoughts
22 about that.

23

24 MR. ANDREW: Mr. Chairman. John Andrew
25 from Kwethluk. I just don't feel comfortable shooting
26 moose out of a boat under power because as you know
27 statewide prohibits it in other areas, with one
28 exception up in the northern region. In my village,
29 like earlier James said, they had a lengthy discussion
30 on this one. It just didn't seem right that there's a
31 chance of other people abusing it. I have no problem
32 using a shotgun out of a boat, but when you're shooting
33 a high-powered rifle out of the boat sometimes it's
34 iffy if you have a chance of wound and loss.

35

36 I have other issues in my mind, but I
37 won't bring it out. It might be controversial.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Other discussion.
42 James.

43

44 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
45 I don't think people hunt going fast in a little slough
46 like the Kashunuk River. With the brushes on the side,
47 you pass a limb on the side if you're going fast, but
48 going slow, looking around, it's easier. I've hunted
49 in the area where there is brush and some other time on
50 the flat country no trees, no hills, nothing. That's

1 easier to see game, but when you're in the brush area
2 like Kashunuk area, I think using a motor idling that's
3 the best way to hunt so you won't pass the game. So I
4 don't mind even shooting because the boat is more
5 sturdy when you're idling or stopped or put your motor
6 on neutral and leaving it running because hunters are
7 not all same.

8

9 Thank you.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray Oney.

12

13 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
14 support this proposal. Since I've hunted moose on the
15 river, sometimes we shoot to wound them sometimes, you
16 know, but we don't just leave them alone. We have to
17 track it down if we need that meat. Ninety-nine
18 percent times we know we hit them, then we go and track
19 them down. We just don't leave them. As far as I
20 know, the hunters that I've been with, the hunters that
21 I've hunted with, they know when they hit a moose. We
22 hurry up and go up there and track it down and kill it.
23 We don't leave it wounded out there.

24

25 On Page 111 there was a comment by
26 Robert saying there's no accidents that have been
27 reported as a result of this activity in 2009. So
28 idling is a way of hunting. Even beaver too. You're
29 out there idling, you're waiting for the game to come
30 out and that's the way to hunt, you know, when the game
31 comes out early in the morning or late in the evening.
32 But high speed, that's a different story. You have to
33 either slow down or go back to where you saw the moose
34 and then stop there and then go and see if it's still
35 there.

36

37 Thank you.

38

39 MR. H. WILDE: Mr. Chairman.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Harry and then Bob.

42

43 MR. H. WILDE: Mr. Chairman. I don't
44 support this idling. I got a couple boys that I always
45 try to train them how to hunt safer. In the nighttime,
46 if it's windy, if the wind is not towards that motor,
47 it would be hard to hear. I don't want to start
48 something that I don't have to worry about it. So I
49 cannot support it.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob.

2

3 MR. ALOYSIUS: Thank you. I think
4 there's more confusion generated by the new modified
5 part where you omit idle and low. I would support the
6 original proposal the way it is with low power or
7 idling because over 50 percent of the time that's the
8 way we hunt at home. We don't go 90 miles an hour or
9 full throttle when we hunt. The only time we go full
10 or more than half throttle is when we want to get from
11 one place to another. We don't hunt going half
12 throttle or faster. It's kind of ridiculous.

13

14 If you look at the regulation for Unit
15 23, it says while big game is swimming. That's how
16 they catch their caribou up there, while they're
17 swimming. They shoot them right there in the water.
18 The only way I would support this proposal is to use
19 the original wording, using from my boat moving under
20 low or idle power.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Other comments.
23 Charlie.

24

25 MR. BROWN: Where I'm from, further
26 upriver we have some kind of a strong current going
27 out, like a rapids, and sometimes when we're fishing we
28 let the motor idle and before we throw out our anchor
29 line we had to hold it before we set the anchor line,
30 so I don't think I support this either for safety
31 purpose. When you shut off your engine right away,
32 you're going to drift back.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Other discussion.

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: For me, I tend to
39 agree a little bit with Bob there now that he's talked
40 about it a little more. I recognize you guys are saying
41 -- I think you said incorporating something to say
42 they're not on step, but I mean that's saying the same
43 thing from the other way, to say under low or idle
44 power. I'm kind of leaning along those lines of maybe
45 to go back to that.

46

47 The other part of this is, granted, we
48 all have from village to village, from subregion to
49 subregion, and from region to region things are a
50 little different in how people do things. This does

1 come from the local village folks.

2

3 What James mentioned there too really
4 struck a cord about when you're hunting you drive
5 slower and your success rate is going to go up and
6 people figure that out anyway. I mean even when we had
7 that 40 horse limitation on Holitna on the Kuskokwim
8 for year after year after year me and my partner were
9 both catching these same boats that were coming down
10 with 90 and 150 horsepower and skunking year after
11 year after year. They'd pass me up and within 10, 15
12 minutes, three years running between Aniak and Kalskag,
13 I would see two to five moose on the bank running along
14 with my 40 horse while those 90 horse guys had just
15 filled up when we talked in Aniak that said we never
16 saw a dang thing. Zoom, they go by and I go around the
17 same bend 10 minutes behind them and there's a moose
18 standing on the bank.

19

20 I'm leaning towards supporting the
21 proposal, but I like what Bob mentioned about just
22 moving the language back to the original as proposed by
23 the village.

24

25 Bob.

26

27 MR. ALOYSIUS: Yeah, because a lot of
28 times we go up river and we float down. By floating
29 down I mean you just put your gear in forward so you
30 can steer your boat instead of going around and around
31 and around in the current. You're in power, but you're
32 in idle power and that's the way we hunt coming back
33 from wherever we went after we check out our moose hole
34 and all those 90 horse scare away. We wait until the
35 90 horses pass and then we push our boat out and idle
36 downstream and like Greg says, nine out of ten times
37 there's always a moose just waiting for a big engine to
38 pass by before they come out.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I think they're
41 probably just standing there and people didn't see them
42 because they were going too fast.

43

44 (Laughter)

45

46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: You had mentioned
47 also as far as maybe the safety issue too. When you
48 are coming down out of the swiftwater streams they've
49 got up there, you want to be under power coming down
50 and you're going a quarter throttle at a low speed, but

1 you're going faster than you were going at full
2 throttle heading upstream against that current. But
3 just to stay out of the sweepers and make the corners
4 and things like that or off the gravel bars you need to
5 be under power unless you want to be bouncing off the
6 gravel.

7

8 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob.

11

12 MR. ALOYSIUS: The other thing too,
13 people are doing it anyway. Why not make it legal.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We have the
16 language as modified before us right now. Ray, go
17 ahead.

18

19 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As
20 it specifically says, it's in the Lower Yukon area from
21 Cape Romanzof to Kusilvak Mountain to Mountain Village
22 excluding all Yukon River drainages upriver from
23 Mountain Village of Unit 18.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'd like to ask
26 you, Ray, since you're from the core villages in that
27 area, would you have a preference between the language
28 as proposed by Scammon Bay that says low or idle power
29 or the suggested change by the Staff Committee about
30 taking that out? Just a boat under power.

31

32 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
33 think I would support OSM's preliminary justification
34 to the proposal from a moving boat.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: And that's what's
37 before us right now. It just says from a boat moving
38 under power rather than the language of low or idle
39 power. I'm in support myself to just the whole concept
40 about putting it into place for that specific area,
41 especially given the status of the moose population.
42 Providing additional opportunity for folks to be able
43 to harvest, recognizing their practice, they're asking
44 for it. There's no reason not to. We've heard from
45 everybody really. I guess I'd kind of defer to their
46 wishes in this case. That's where I'm at right now. I
47 can go either way with either language. I'd like to
48 see it recognized for them though because that's what
49 they have asked for.

50

1 Bob.

2

3 MR. ALOYSIUS: Why did OSM remove the
4 words low and idle or idle?

5

6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Tom Kron.

7

8 MR. KRON: Maybe I'll start and then
9 I'll let Robert jump in. We were just trying to use
10 wording similar to what they use up in 25. Basically
11 under power people can use lower idle, so it's
12 allowable there, but it sounded to me like there was a
13 question of how it would be enforced. How would you
14 enforce lower idle. How do you define that. I guess
15 defer to Robert on specifically what to do there.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Robert.

18

19 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman. That is
20 exactly why we ended up with the language as we did.
21 It seems for as small as a problem as it is, it would
22 give the cleanest enforcement option. It basically
23 gives the house away, but given we're attempting to
24 liberalize means and methods and it doesn't seem like
25 it's a huge problem. It gave us the cleanest
26 enforcement option with a definition given we have
27 existing language in Unit 25.

28

29 Where we ran into debate is how do you
30 define lower idle. If somebody goes beyond lower idle,
31 how do you have the mechanism to enforce that. Given
32 that we don't think it's a big problem, you know, the
33 idea of allowing boat under power was palatable.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: One of the concerns
36 that I heard or identifying points, I guess, as far as
37 if it was on step was that you'd be able to see a
38 rooster tail if somebody was on step. But the same
39 argument or the same justification comes from the other
40 way around. If you don't see a rooster tail, that
41 means they're not under high power, under low power.
42 Both directions.

43

44 MR. SUNDOWN: Which is why we settled
45 on boat under power. We don't feel it's a big problem
46 and we feel it gives the hunter the maximum flexibility
47 to be able to harvest a moose. Hoping, you know, that
48 good practices are reinforced through people they hunt
49 with. Leaving it up to the population, saying please
50 don't go at full power, it's a bad practice. And

1 leaving that up to the hunters and families to
2 determine that.

3

4 Until we see that it's becoming a
5 problem, then we may propose regulations to curb that.
6 I've yet to see any issues really coming statewide from
7 Unit 25 or given that it's a common practice here that
8 it's an issue.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It brings up the
11 point that there's nothing you can ever do by
12 regulation that's going to change anybody who is going
13 to point and shoot and figures if there's lead in
14 there, there's hope to knock it down.

15

16 (Laughter)

17

18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any further
19 discussion or are we ready for the question. We do
20 have the modified language before us right now.

21

22 Bob.

23

24 MR. ALOYSIUS: After listening to
25 everybody, for the sake of enforcement I think I'll
26 just go with the modified language. I'll support that.

27

28 Thank you.

29

30 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chair.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: James.

33

34 MR. CHARLES: Is that D, the modified?

35

36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Modified language I
37 have is on the top of Page 116.

38

39 MR. ALOYSIUS: What.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The top of Page
42 116.

43

44 MR. CHARLES: That's the D.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Yeah. Ready for
47 the question.

48

49 MR. CHARLES: Question.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question is called
2 on Proposal No. 10-59 as modified on Page 116 of our
3 book. I think we had enough discussion here. Let's
4 take a roll call vote on this one.

5
6 MR. ALOYSIUS: James Charles.

7
8 MR. CHARLES: Yes.

9
10 MR. ALOYSIUS: Ray Oney.

11
12 MR. ONEY: Yes.

13
14 MR. ALOYSIUS: Harry Wilde.

15
16 MR. H. WILDE: No.

17
18 MR. ALOYSIUS: Greg Roczicka.

19
20 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Yes.

21
22 MR. ALOYSIUS: Robert Aloysius. Yes.
23 John Andrew.

24
25 MR. ANDREW: No.

26
27 MR. ALOYSIUS: Charlie Brown.

28
29 MR. BROWN: No.

30
31 MR. ALOYSIUS: Four yes, three no.
32 Motion carries.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Motion carries.
35 Proposal 59 passes amended. Proposal No. 60.

36
37 Mr. Kron.

38
39 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. I wanted to
40 let people know as we move into this one that Mr.
41 Spencer Reardon wrote this analysis that's in your
42 book. I'm sure some of you know him. He's former
43 Refuge manager Mike Reardon's son. He's now working at
44 OSM and it's great to have him there. He's prepared my
45 script so I don't mess it up and I'll just read from
46 that. Robert is going to be here to help answer
47 questions as well.

48
49 Mr. Chair. Members of the Council.
50 The analysis for WP10-60 begins on Page 119 of your

1 Council book. Proposal WP10-60 was submitted by the
2 Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge and requests that
3 the harvest of caribou in Unit 18 be reduced from three
4 to two.

5
6 The proponent states that the decline
7 of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd warrants a decrease in
8 the harvest limit. In 1991, the Mulchatna Herd was
9 estimated at 90,000 animals and grew to about 200,000
10 animals in 1996, then declined to a maximum estimate of
11 about 30,000 in 2008.

12
13 Bull/cow ratios have been estimated at
14 less than 35 bulls to 100 cows for 2001 to 2008. The
15 last bull to cow ratio was estimated at 19 bulls to 100
16 cows in 2008.

17
18 Overall caribou harvest continues to
19 decline and the majority of the harvest has occurred in
20 Unit 18 in recent years when compared to other units of
21 the Mulchatna Caribou Herd that they inhabit.

22
23 If this proposal is adopted, harvest
24 limits would be reduced, which may help reduce harvest
25 and stabilize the population.

26
27 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
28 support WP10-60 with modification to include a one bull
29 restriction and extend the one caribou restriction from
30 August 1st through November 30th to August 1st through
31 January 31st. Adoption with modification will help
32 reduce caribou harvest and help increase the bull to
33 cow ratio.

34
35 Restricting harvest so that no more
36 than one caribou may be taken from August 1st through
37 January 31st instead of August 1st through November
38 30th will help further conserve the herd and align with
39 State regulations; however, opportunity would still
40 exist for subsistence hunters that wish to harvest two
41 caribou after January 31st.

42
43 The Yukon Delta Wildlife Refuge
44 supports the modification after reviewing the latest
45 population estimates and bull to cow ratio data.

46
47 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Quyana.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions for
50 Staff. James.

1 MR. CHARLES: Is that proposal going to
2 match State regulation?

3
4 MR. PERRY: James, the proposal will
5 get close. There's a couple other proposals a little
6 later. I thought I had them right in front of me. I
7 think it's 51 and 53 that mirror State regulations
8 right now. This one would have exactly the same bag
9 limit, two caribou, but the season dates and the break
10 up of only a bull and some of those things are
11 different. So it's close. It's not quite the same.

12
13 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, James.

14
15 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16 Why I asked that question is people or the caribou
17 hunters, they like to ask me, I don't know why. I tell
18 them to call you. But they get confused with Federal
19 regulations because maybe from last moose season all
20 those regulations have been taken from the community
21 call at Tuntutuliak, so all they get is Federal
22 regulations and trying to hunt at the State land.
23 There is not much State land in our area. There is a
24 lot of Federal land, but taking caribou or hunting
25 caribou is confusing to a lot of hunters because they
26 want to look at Federal regulations and looking for
27 State regulations and they can't find them. Even I
28 tell them look at the -- check the State regulation.
29 So that's why I asked, because it's confusing to some
30 hunters how many they would catch.

31
32 Thank you.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'd just like to
35 ask right here since you brought it up and I didn't
36 catch this when I was looking through it and trying to
37 see where we might save some time and so forth, but if
38 we dealt with Proposal 51/53, it takes in 18. It's the
39 same issue discussed there as regards to 18 as far as
40 the regulations.

41
42 MR. PERRY: Yeah, I guess the only
43 difference is that for this proposal we're talking just
44 Unit 18. For the other ones it's much broader ranging.
45 It's not only 18, but it's changing regulations in Unit
46 9 and 17 also. Those are in there to try to get -- you
47 know, I think all management agencies are involved with
48 Mulchatna Caribou. I'll agree population is down and
49 we'd like to conserve. We'd also like to have
50 consistent regulations from King Salmon to Dillingham

1 to Aniak to Bethel and I think those proposals are
2 trying to get at that.

3

4 The State comments for Proposal 60 are
5 exactly that. In concept, we support what's trying to
6 be done in Proposal 60. We'd just like to use the
7 language in the other one so that we have consistent
8 Federal and State regulations in that broad geographic
9 area where Mulchatna Caribou are.

10

11 *****

12 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

13 *****

14

15 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
16 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

17

18 Wildlife Proposal WP10-60:

19

20 This proposal changes the Unit 18
21 federal subsistence caribou bag limit to the following:
22 2 caribou, however, no more than 1 caribou may be taken
23 from August 1 through November 30.

24

25 Introduction:

26

27 Recent declines in the Mulchatna herd
28 have resulted in reduced state bag limits through
29 action by the Alaska Board of Game. The state bag
30 limit is: 2 caribou; however, no more than 1 bull may
31 be taken, and no more than 1 caribou may be taken
32 August 1 through January 31. This proposal provides a
33 different federal subsistence bag limit compared to the
34 current state bag limit.

35

36 Impact on Subsistence Users:

37

38 If adopted, federal subsistence users
39 harvest limit would be reduced by one caribou.

40

41 Opportunity Provided by State:

42

43 In Unit 18, the state hunting season is
44 August 1 through March 15 for residents only with a bag
45 limit of two caribou; however, no more than 1 bull may
46 be taken, and no more than 1 caribou may be taken
47 August 1 through Jan 31. Unit 18 contributes a small
48 portion of the total Mulchatna Caribou Herd annual
49 harvest.

50

1 Conservation Issues:

2

3 Reduced harvest in the Mulchatna
4 Caribou Herd is needed to promote herd growth.
5 Limiting take of bulls is needed for herd growth.
6 Limiting take to 1 caribou prior to January 31 is
7 needed as a conservation measure to limit harvest on
8 specific segments of the herd during fall migration
9 period. This proposal does not limit the federal
10 subsistence take of bull caribou. Low bull:cow ratios
11 indicate reduction of bull harvest is needed in future
12 management of the herd. The department prefers
13 proposal WP10-53 to align caribou bag limits across the
14 range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

15

16 Enforcement Issues:

17

18 Uniform federal subsistence and state
19 bag limits would decrease the potential for enforcement
20 problems across the mixed land ownership patterns in
21 the area. In Unit 18, the proposed federal subsistence
22 bag limit would be different than the state bag limit,
23 creating confusion among hunters.

24

25 Recommendation:

26

27 Support with modification to include a
28 1 bull restriction and extend the 1 caribou restriction
29 dates to August 1 through January 31 or, preferably,
30 adopt WP10-53.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Mr. Kron.

33

34 MR. KRON: Just for clarification here,
35 we've been looking at it, and the OSM preliminary
36 conclusion, the language there on Page 124, my
37 understanding is that that language does mirror the
38 State language, so it would be the same.

39

40 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

41

42 I guess I'd look to Phil to confirm
43 that for us.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I don't want to
48 confuse myself anymore, so we'll go ahead and stick
49 with this proposal for now.

50

1 (Laughter)

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Department
4 comments. Do you have anything further to add.

5

6 MR. PERRY: Yeah. I was just telling
7 Robert it's another case where the State comments go in
8 and then the interagency coordination goes through and
9 that's what the modified comments are on Page 124 and
10 then it kind of happens so quick that we don't have the
11 chance to change our comments to fit what was talked
12 about in the coordination meeting. The modified
13 language on Page 124 mirrors State language. So I
14 think we would support that.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions for the
17 State. Ray Oney.

18

19 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20 Any reasons for the caribou decline in that area?

21

22 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Phil.

23

24 MR. PERRY: Through the Chair. That's
25 kind of the \$64,000 question. We know caribou numbers
26 have gone down. We know calf recruitment has been very
27 poor for a long period of time. Beyond that we have a
28 lot of speculation. We don't have good solid data that
29 points to one factor. When a herd is large like it
30 was, well over 100,000, predation normally has very
31 little effect on a herd. It doesn't appear that
32 disease or parasites or those other things had a large
33 effect on the Mulchatna Caribou. They're all probably
34 semi-factors, but maybe not the major factor.

35

36 I guess the short answer is we don't
37 really know why it has declined for so long. We did
38 have this last fall a much better result in our
39 composition surveys. We had a higher number of calves
40 than we had in the past and that's great. There's a
41 high enough number that if it continues over several
42 years, then we should have an increase in the
43 population, but one year is not a trend. It may be a
44 one-year bump, but if we see that trend continue, then
45 maybe we'll have more caribou in the future, but at
46 least right now this herd is quite a bit smaller than
47 it had been and is probably -- I guess in the last
48 couple years it's either stable or maybe slightly
49 declining in that 30 to 40,000 caribou range.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob Aloysius.
2
3 MR. ALOYSIUS: Is there any statistics
4 on the number of bulls that are taken by the head-
5 hunters?
6
7 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Phil.
8
9 MR. PERRY: I guess I can speak to non-
10 resident harvest. Non-resident harvest in Unit 18 is
11 basically zero. The season has been closed for non-
12 residents for several years. Harvest in the fall,
13 which is primarily large bulls, has dramatically
14 decreased kind of Mulchatna range wide.
15
16 The bull/cow ratios that we saw were
17 low the last probably seven, eight, nine years could be
18 partly explained to a large harvest of bulls, but it
19 also kind of coincides with most herds as they decline,
20 even herds that aren't harvested you see that bull/cow
21 ratio go down. Bulls have a higher natural mortality
22 and if they're not getting replaced in the population
23 you'll see that decline even in herds that have no
24 human harvest.
25
26 The best I can answer is that fall
27 harvest that's primarily big bulls is way down and
28 harvest in the winter that's I think still slightly
29 more bulls than cows has declined also, but I don't
30 know if anywhere in the Mulchatna Herd if it's still
31 open to non-residents. With that one bull in the fall
32 or one caribou in the fall, harvest has gone down for
33 that reason and for many others.
34
35 I don't know if that answers your
36 question.
37
38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any other questions
39 for State. Charlie.
40
41 MR. BROWN: When was your current
42 survey for these declining caribous?
43
44 MR. PERRY: Through the Chair.
45 Caribou, unlike moose, we try to do -- and I'm saying
46 we as management agencies. Involved in that are Fish
47 and Game, Fish and Wildlife, and to some extent the
48 Park Service over by King Salmon. We count caribou in
49 the middle of the summer, normally the last few days of
50 June, first week or two of July. We have the last two

1 summers attempted to do a photocensus, which we fly
2 around when they're in large groups and take pictures
3 with an airplane, with a high-resolution camera that's
4 mounted in the belly of an airplane. We take pictures
5 and they go back and actually hand count the caribou
6 that are in those pictures.

7

8 We were not successful last summer. The
9 summer before, 2008, there was a photocensus conducted.
10 Very poor conditions, dark, kind of rainy days that we
11 were able to do it, so the photos were not real good
12 photos. We had a minimum number of -- and caribou were
13 also spread out basically from Kagati/Pegati Lake all
14 the way over towards Lake Iliamna, so they were
15 logistically difficult to try to get pictures of
16 caribou that were that spread out.

17

18 That photocensus is probably a bear
19 minimum estimate. If you went by that number, it might
20 be close to 30,000. That's what's in this report.
21 Most people that were involved in that think we
22 probably had an underestimate, but it is the best
23 information we have. Knowing that it's probably a
24 minimum number or underestimate, none of us are
25 surprised that it's still at that level or in that
26 general area. We weren't expecting a rapid decline or
27 a rapid increase, but it's pretty high on the State's
28 priority list as caribou herds right now to get a
29 photocensus done this summer on the Mulchatna Herd.

30

31 MR. BROWN: Other thing. How about on
32 the predator wolves, do the numbers go up or down, do
33 you know, on the wolf? Have you seen?

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Phil.

36

37 MR. PERRY: I can kind of guess, but
38 wolf numbers -- basically when you look at where
39 Mulchatna Caribou are, no way do we do a wolf estimate
40 in that large of an area. Obviously there's wolves
41 present. Pilots see them, hunters see them. One of
42 the worries we had when this herd declined to the 30-
43 40,000 range is -- other herds in the state, when they
44 get in that ballpark, do start to see predation
45 problems where predators can hold a population down.

46

47 The hope is we're kind of above that
48 point right now and that if this herd stays in the same
49 ballpark that maybe just on its own it can recover and
50 increase again. You're looking at a huge area with

1 many different landowners and land managers. It's
2 difficult to think about predator control or any of
3 those sorts of things in the area the Mulchatna Herd
4 uses.

5

6 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: More questions.

9 James.

10

11 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12 Phillip, is Mulchatna Herd mixed with any other caribou
13 from different areas like -- what was that caribou herd
14 over there in Becharof area. I know Mulchatna is on
15 the Bristol Bay, Naknek area -- or not Naknek, but
16 Nushagak.

17

18 MR. PERRY: I'm not aware of extensive
19 mixing with the other herds with either the Northern
20 Alaska Peninsula Herd or the Nushagak Peninsula Herd.
21 I mean they use areas that are very close to both of
22 those herds. I think any caribou biologist would be
23 surprised if there wasn't a little interchange.
24 Adjacent herds seem to use the same area and sometimes
25 go with those guys for awhile and then go back to their
26 old cronies again. So if there's a little interchange,
27 I don't think that would surprise anybody, but it
28 doesn't appear they're combining or anything like that.

29

30

31 If anything, the Mulchatna Herd looks
32 recently to maybe be using two different calving areas.
33 Again, it's a couple years of data. It's not enough to
34 really call a trend of what's going on, but there are
35 some interesting things going on with the Mulchatna
36 Herd as far as just population dynamics and areas
37 they're using and how much the Mulchatna Herd is mixing
38 together now.

39

40 It used to be pretty -- the way we keep
41 track of this is we have animals that have radio
42 collars on. You can kind of see where they go month to
43 month and they were pretty randomly mixed, those
44 animals with collars on them, for years. Now they're
45 not as mixed. They may be acting a little differently,
46 different segments of it, but that's pretty recent and
47 pretty -- you could go back to what it was next year.
48 I don't think we're seeing anything with those other
49 herds though affecting what Mulchatna is doing.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Just to follow up.
2 You haven't seen any indication yet of re-establishment
3 of the old Kilbuk or (indiscernible) Herd calving
4 grounds up Canyon Creek way and so forth where they
5 used to be within Unit 18?

6
7 MR. PERRY: It doesn't look like -- you
8 know, there may be caribou that are spending more of
9 their winter in Unit 18 and less of their time in other
10 areas, but at least calving, it appears that most of
11 the calving is still occurring in either Unit 17 or
12 sometimes in the extreme southern part of 19B.

13
14 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Anymore questions.
15 Go ahead, James.

16
17 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman. Are those
18 the ones that used to travel from Naknek area heading
19 north? Because I never used to see them coming this
20 way. I used to see them, the tracks heading north from
21 Mulchatna area, traveling north and not this way.

22
23 MR. ALOYSIUS: This is north. East.

24
25 MR. CHARLES: Or they go around? How
26 do they travel? Thank you.

27
28 MR. PERRY: It seems to me there's a
29 trend of at least some of the caribou that calve over
30 in that Mulchatna or some of it's the extreme upper end
31 of the Hoholitna. A chunk of that population seems to
32 right after calving, post calving, early June, mid
33 June, go to the Aniak Lake, upper Tikchik Lake,
34 sometimes as far west as like Togiak Lake or
35 Kagati/Pegati by July. At least a part of that
36 population seems to be going over that direction pretty
37 rapidly right after they have calves. That seems to be
38 an area they're liking to spend the summer in. And
39 then another portion of the population that spends it
40 farther south and east.

41
42 It's hard to sometimes, especially with
43 caribou movements, to predict trends. You can kind of
44 describe what happened, but what they're going to do is
45 probably worse than predicting weather.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay, thanks Phil.
48 Moving on to tribal agency or other governmental agency
49 comments.

50

1 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 Timothy Andrew with AVCP. We do not support the
3 proposal as it is written, but would support if it were
4 to be modified to match the State season. Their
5 current season is from August 1st to March 15th and
6 this proposal, as written, would end the season on --
7 excuse me. I'm sorry. I just read it totally wrong.
8

9 We do support this proposal. In 2008,
10 we participated at the Alaska Board of Game meeting to
11 reduce the -- excuse me, close the non-resident season
12 and to reduce the resident bag limit and we advocated
13 for the closure of the non-resident primarily because
14 of a high bull harvest in that non-resident hunt.
15

16 If you look on Page 123 on the harvest
17 history, you'll see the harvest of males was as high as
18 86 percent in 1991 and 1992. Much of that was primarily
19 large bulls and we based our argument on a study that I
20 didn't bring a copy of it with me today, but it was
21 labeled somewhat like the consequences of selective
22 harvesting of ungulates and carnivores.
23

24 That study basically told a story of
25 what will happen if you focus your efforts on shooting
26 large bulls or harvesting large bulls and any kind of
27 ungulate population, which includes moose and caribou
28 and whatnot. But if you see this continuing high
29 harvest at this rate, it will dramatically affect the
30 caribou population. That's what we based our argument
31 on.
32

33 Whenever you have the absence of large
34 bulls, they're trying to do their mating thing when the
35 mating season arrives, the young bulls are harassing
36 the cows, the cows don't want the young bulls, they
37 prefer the big bulls, so they eventually mate and then
38 they mate later, the calves are born later. As the
39 calves go into the winter, they're more subject to
40 predation primarily because they're going into the
41 winter week and smaller. Therefore, when the surveys
42 come around in the summer, you'll see a whole bunch of
43 barren cows out there and that's what the Department
44 concluded, that there's a bunch of barren cows that are
45 existing in this population.
46

47 I'm glad to see that Phil had reported
48 that the bull to cow ratios are improving after we
49 closed the non-resident season. However, we still have
50 the possibility of resident non-local hunters

1 participating in this hunt. I see the numbers are
2 fairly limited as far as the -- or has gone down
3 dramatically since that restrictive regulation was put
4 into effect.

5

6 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Just a
9 clarification here before you go. You said you support
10 the proposal but you also supported matching to the
11 State, so you're looking at the modified language is
12 what you're referring to then.

13

14 MR. ANDREW: Yeah. If you look on Page
15 124, it closely matches what the State regulation is.
16 I just didn't see the August 1 to March 15th season
17 there. I thought it was going to end on January 31st.
18 That's why I was objecting to this proposal.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Whereas that
21 restriction before was only effective through the end
22 of November, now it's effective through the end of
23 January. So I wanted to make sure and clarify. Okay.

24

25 Any other questions for Tim.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you.

30

31 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Local Advisory
34 Committee. James.

35

36 MR. CHARLES: No comment, Mr. Chairman.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Written public
39 comments.

40

41 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Kwethluk
42 Organized Community opposes the proposal and, if I
43 understand their note correctly, they said it will be
44 fair only if this proposal is applied to all the Game
45 Management Units all along the Mulchatna Caribou Herd
46 migratory routes and/or range. I think Mr. Andrew
47 could explain that if you have any questions on it.

48

49 Mr. Chair.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I think that's
2 involved in the next proposal we're going to be dealing
3 with. Any member of the public wish to speak to the
4 proposal.

5
6 James.

7
8 MR. NICORI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9 Looking at this Proposal 10-60 on this modification
10 August 1 to March 15, we don't start seeing any caribou
11 in our village or up the river until the latter part of
12 August. If this modification can change their date
13 from August 15 to March 30, it still would be the same
14 range as August 1 to March 15. That would give the
15 people from our area, not only Kwethluk but the other
16 villages more time to hunt when the days get longer.
17 In looking at this modification, the caribou herd is
18 decreasing and I understand this proposal affects the
19 whole migratory route of the caribou herd. If it
20 stands so, we will support it if it would be possible
21 to change from August 1 to March 15 to August 15 to
22 March 31.

23
24 Thank you.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, James.

27 Questions.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: On to Council
32 deliberations. Mr. Aloysius.

33
34 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman.

35
36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'm sorry, was
37 there someone else in the public.

38
39 MR. EPCHOOK: Mr. Chairman. I share
40 the same concerns as James and would also add that we
41 came to a compromise on Proposal 54. Think about those
42 other people that were not selected to go out for moose
43 hunting. This may be their last chance to have meat on
44 the table. So I am recommending that you oppose
45 Proposal 60.

46
47 Quyana.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'm ready for
50 deliberations. Is there any other member of the public

1 here.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seeing none. Bob

6 Aloysius.

7

8 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move

9 that we adopt Proposal WP10-60 as modified.

10

11 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chair. I move to second

12 the motion.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Moved and second on

15 Proposal 60 as modified on Page 118 of our book is on

16 the table. Discussion. There's a question here as far

17 as the dates go that's been suggested to us that we

18 change August 15 to March 31. The same time frame --

19 or the same number of days, not the same time frame

20 specifically. It's been dealt with in the past in one

21 of the concerns and there have been recommendations

22 from local area village and so forth to back that date

23 up because it was getting too close to calving.

24

25 I'm curious if there's any thoughts

26 from the managers how they'd view that or if you say

27 there's actually no difference. I mean the animal is

28 going to be pregnant on March 15th, as pregnant as it's

29 going to be, except maybe a little fatter on March 31.

30

31 MR. SUNDOWN: Mr. Chairman. Robert

32 Sundown from the Fish and Wildlife Service. I guess

33 the only issue that we would see and we would leave

34 that up to the general public is it would create a

35 difference between the State and the Federal system. So

36 I will leave that to you guys to decide. If there is

37 confusion, it's because the Board chose to make it the

38 31st of March as opposed to the 15th.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Further discussion.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Are we ready for

45 the question.

46

47 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman. Is that

48 March 15th going to close -- that March 15th going to

49 match the State if this passes?

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Robert.
2
3 MR. SUNDOWN: If this proposal passes
4 as amended by OSM, it would match the State
5 regulations.
6
7 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay.
8
9 MR. CHARLES: Question.
10
11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Proposal No. 60 as
12 modified on Page 118 of our book is before us here.
13 I'll ask for a roll call on this one as well.
14
15 MR. ALOYSIUS: Ray Oney.
16
17 MR. ONEY: Yes.
18
19 MR. ALOYSIUS: Harry Wilde.
20
21 MR. H. WILDE: Yeah.
22
23 MR. ALOYSIUS: Greg Roczicka.
24
25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Yes.
26
27 MR. ALOYSIUS: Robert Aloysius. Yes.
28 John Andrew.
29
30 MR. ANDREW: No.
31
32 MR. ALOYSIUS: Charlie Brown -- William
33 Brown.
34
35 MR. BROWN: Yes.
36
37 MR. ALOYSIUS: James Charles.
38
39 MR. CHARLES: Yes.
40
41 MR. ALOYSIUS: Six yes, one no. Motion
42 carries.
43
44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. That does it
45 for our regional proposals. I believe we dealt with 61
46 at the outset. So that brings us to Proposal 51/53
47 that deals with the exact same issue that we just
48 discussed in Proposal 60, only incorporating Units 9,
49 17 and 19.
50

1 Mr. Kron.

2

3 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. Members of
4 the Council. The analysis for WP10-51 and 53 begins on
5 Page 137 of your Council book. These proposals were
6 submitted by the Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional
7 Advisory Council. Proposal WP10-51 requests that the
8 caribou season be established as August 1 through March
9 31 within the Mulchatna Caribou Herd range. Proposal
10 WP10-53 requests that the harvest limit for caribou be
11 made the same at two within the Mulchatna Caribou Herd
12 range.

13

14 The proponent states that the change in
15 the season date and harvest limit will provide
16 consistency for management of the herd on Federal
17 public lands. Consistency will also be provided with
18 the State regulations as for the change in the harvest
19 limit.

20

21 In 1991, the herd was estimated at
22 90,000 and grew to about 200,000 by 1996, but then
23 declined to a minimum estimate of about 30,000 in 2008.
24 Bull/cow ratios have been estimated at less than 35
25 bulls per 100 cows for 2001 through 2008, and the last
26 bull to cow ratio was estimated at 19 bulls per 100
27 cows in 2008.

28

29 Caribou harvest continues to decline.
30 Harvest within each unit has fluctuated and appears to
31 have been highest in Units 9B, 9C, 17B, and 18 for 2005
32 through 2008. The harvest of males was as high as 86
33 percent in 1991/92, but decreased to 45 percent in
34 2005/06. Most reported harvest occurs in August and
35 September. The month of March also accounts for a
36 relatively high amount of the harvest.

37

38 The effects of WP10-51 would lengthen
39 the seasons in some units and shorten the seasons in
40 others. Extending the season to the end of March when
41 weather and daylight are more favorable would likely
42 increase the harvest. Opening the season earlier will
43 likely have little effect on the amount of harvest as
44 most hunters hunt caribou after July. The effects of
45 WP10-53 would likely decrease overall harvest and help
46 conserve bulls.

47

48 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
49 support Proposal WP10-51 with modification, to make the
50 season ending date March 15 for all units. For

1 Proposal WP10-53, the OSM preliminary conclusion is to
2 support the proposal. Based on the declining Mulchatna
3 Caribou Herd population with no indication of
4 stabilization, conservation concerns necessitate a
5 reduction in harvest.

6

7 Adopting WP10-51 with the modification
8 would reduce season lengths in most units, except Unit
9 19A, thus reducing harvest. The season ending date of
10 March 15th is supported over a March 31st date to
11 reduce harvest. Extending the season to March 31st for
12 Unit 18 where the majority of the harvest has been
13 occurring in recent years may allow for increased
14 harvest.

15

16 Adopting WP10-53 would also help reduce
17 overall harvest and provide consistency with Federal
18 and State regulations for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.
19 WP10-53 may also help reduce harvest of bull caribou.

20

21 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Quyana.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any further
24 questions.

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Is there any
29 additional State comments.

30

31 MR. PERRY: Greg, I guess the only
32 State comments mirror the comments of the proposal
33 before. On this one, follow along the same way. We
34 support the modification by the proposed.

35

36 *****

37 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

38 *****

39

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

42

43 Wildlife Proposal WP10-51:

44

45 (GMU 9A, 9B, 9C, 17A, 17B, 18, 19A
46 caribou seasons)

47

48 Wildlife Proposal WP10-53:

49

50 (GMU 9A, 9B, 9C, 17A, 17B, 17C, 18, 19A

1 caribou bag limit) Proposal WP10-51 would align
2 federal subsistence opening and closing dates for
3 caribou hunting on federal public lands throughout most
4 of the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. Proposal
5 53 would align federal subsistence bag limits for
6 caribou hunting on federal public lands throughout most
7 of the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

8

9

Introduction:

10

11 Declines in the Mulchatna Caribou Herd
12 from its peak population in the mid-1990s necessitated
13 reduced season and bag limits throughout the herd's
14 range as the population changed. Earlier changes in
15 federal subsistence hunting regulations kept pace with
16 changes made by the Alaska Board of Game in response to
17 population changes. Present federal subsistence
18 hunting regulations throughout the range of the
19 Mulchatna Caribou Herd are inconsistent between Game
20 Management Units. Changing the federal subsistence
21 hunting regulations for caribou in the range of the
22 Mulchatna Herd to uniform regulations will reduce
23 confusion for hunters.

24

25

26 Impact on Subsistence Users: Proposal
27 WP10-51 would shorten the caribou hunting season in
28 those areas where the federal subsistence hunting
29 season for caribou presently closes after March 31
30 (Units 9B, 17B, and that portion of 17C east of the
31 Wood River and Wood River lakes, 19A south of the
32 Kuskokwim River, and 19B). This proposal would
33 lengthen the caribou hunting season in those areas
34 where the federal subsistence hunting season for
35 caribou presently closes before March 31 (Units 18 and
36 19A north of the Kuskokwim River). By establishing
37 consistent federal subsistence opening and closing
38 hunting season dates, confusion by hunters over what
39 federal areas are open will be reduced. Establishing
40 dates that are not aligned with present state hunting
41 season dates will create confusion because of the mixed
42 land ownership patterns throughout the range of the
43 herd. The shorter state season, ending March 15,
44 occurs during a time when travel conditions are poor so
45 would have little impact on federally-qualified
46 subsistence users and reduce risk of enforcement
47 actions.

47

48

49 Proposal 53 would reduce the caribou
50 bag limit in those areas where the federal subsistence
bag limit is presently greater than two caribou (Units

1 9A and B, 17A, B and C, 18, 19A south of the Kuskokwim
2 River, and 19B). This proposal would increase the
3 caribou bag limit in those areas where the federal
4 subsistence bag limit is presently less than two
5 caribou (Units 9C that portion in the Alagnak River
6 drainage, and 19A that portion north of the Kuskokwim
7 River). By establishing consistent federal subsistence
8 bag limits, confusion by hunters over how many caribou
9 can be taken on which federal public lands will be
10 reduced. In addition, because of the mixed land
11 ownership patterns throughout the range of the herd,
12 aligning federal subsistence caribou hunting bag limits
13 with present state caribou hunting bag limits will
14 further reduce confusion and risk of enforcement
15 actions.

16

17 Opportunity Provided by State:

18

19 Present state hunting season and bag
20 limits throughout most of the range of the Mulchatna
21 Caribou Herd are August 1 through March 15, and 2
22 caribou (no more than one bull may be taken, of which
23 no more than one caribou may be taken from August 1
24 through January 31). The exception to this is the area
25 of eastern Unit 17A and southwestern Unit 17C (that
26 area north of the Nushagak Peninsula) which may be
27 opened by Emergency Order authority with a bag limit of
28 one caribou. Recent action by the Alaska Board of Game
29 closed caribou hunting by nonresidents throughout the
30 range of the herd to assure a subsistence preference
31 for Alaska residents.

32

33 Conservation Issues:

34

35 Hunting season dates and bag limit were
36 liberalized as the Mulchatna Caribou Herd grew in size
37 and expanded in range. Similarly, reductions in season
38 and bag limits are necessary to manage declines in this
39 herd. While all the reasons for the herd's growth and
40 subsequent decline are not well understood, reductions
41 in take have been recognized as essential to reduce the
42 rate of decline.

43

44 A regulation change at this time that
45 would result in additional caribou taken during late
46 spring (i.e. in Unit 18) would be inconsistent with
47 other management actions undertaken for this herd.
48 There is no need to separate the caribou season north
49 of the Kuskokwim River in Unit 19A since this area is
50 generally unoccupied by caribou.

1 A regulation change at this time to
2 reduce the number of caribou allowed in those areas
3 with present larger bag limits, as well as to establish
4 uniform bag limits throughout the range of this herd,
5 is warranted.

6

7

Enforcement Issues:

8

9

10 Proposal WP10-51 changes in season
11 dates for federal public lands would open the same but
12 would end two weeks later than the state caribou
13 hunting season. Proposal WP10-53 changes of federal
14 subsistence bag limits for Mulchatna caribou on federal
15 public land would be consistent with present state
16 caribou bag limits. Federal public lands occur
17 throughout a great part of the herd s range and are
18 scattered and not contiguous (especially in Units 9B,
19 17B and C, and 19A and B). In addition, much of the
20 area around villages in Unit 18 is under state
21 regulations. It may be difficult for federally
22 qualified subsistence users to easily discern land
23 ownership from the ground and be sure they are hunting
24 on federal land.

24

25

Other Comments:

26

27

28 As written, the proposal appears to be
29 a substantial reduction in hunting opportunity (because
30 of the shortened season length from most of the herd's
31 range). However, the realistic effect is that the
32 proposal will likely result in additional harvest
33 because the season would be extended in Unit 18, where
34 the bulk of the reported harvest from the herd has
35 occurred for the past several years under existing
36 season dates.

36

37

Recommendation:

38

39

40 Support with modification to amend the
41 closing date to align with state hunting season dates,
42 closing the season on March 15.

42

43

44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. Ray
45 brought it up a little bit before about some of the
46 possibilities for decline. I remember when I heard it
47 tipped over its peak there around 2000, 2002, it was up
48 in the 200,000 range, and we started seeing the drops
49 from there. I'm recalling at the time they were
50 starting to notice some habitat degradation as well
51 along Iliamna and some of their summer rearing areas or

1 whatever you call them stating where they spend the
2 summer. That some of the range surveys that had been
3 done there had showed what they were considering some
4 fair signs of overbrowsing. I wondered if you're aware
5 of any follow up that's ever been done on that as far
6 as whether they did reach that peak and tip over and
7 start that decline.

8

9 MR. PERRY: Yeah, I guess there's been
10 a little bit of effort put into caribou range. The
11 difficulty with caribou compared to moose is there's
12 such an animal that moves so far. Anecdotal
13 information, especially from those eastern areas you
14 talk with some of the people that had been involved
15 with Mulchatna Caribou since the '80s where they talked
16 about areas that had six, eight inches of lichen and
17 they thought we'll never eat this off and they've gone
18 back five, ten years ago and realized there's a quarter
19 inch there now. I think that's about the depth of the
20 information we know right now.

21

22 There's been some anecdotal information
23 that, yeah, some of the range does look like it's been
24 impacted, but there has not been a range-wide survey.
25 There's been talk about it, but I think when people
26 start putting stuff together to figure out what that
27 would cost and what it would involve there's too many
28 zeroes at the end for some of those sorts of studies.
29 It's not a \$50,000 survey or something. It's probably
30 several hundred thousand dollars if not more to do a
31 real comprehensive survey that would be meaningful. So
32 I think that's one of the reasons it hasn't been done.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. Tribal
35 agency or other government agency comments.

36

37 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
38 I'd like to reference my earlier comments about the
39 previous proposal. The concern that we have is the
40 continued viability of the caribou and its current
41 population and it's current bull to cow ratio. We need
42 to think about our future generations, not only us. I
43 know we have a need right now in the villages for meat
44 and the limited opportunities to harvest moose in the
45 lowest part of the Kuskokwim River. We totally
46 understand that, but we also need to think about our
47 children and our grandchildren and great-grandchildren
48 and perhaps their dependance on the resource in the
49 future.

50

1 As indicated earlier, this population
2 being about 30,000 is really prone to predation.
3 Whatever predation occurs out there from the grizzly
4 bears or from the bulls or black bears we don't know at
5 this time. The only thing we could possibly do right
6 now to preserve and to conserve the caribou population
7 for the future is to reduce our human harvest and the
8 opportunity as well.

9

10 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you. Written
13 public comments.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We had the earlier
18 one that Alex mentioned from the Organized Village of
19 Kwethluk. One of their recommendation is dealing with
20 this issue that they wanted to ensure that it was
21 throughout the range of the herd. This proposal does,
22 I believe, encompass that, including GMUs 9, 17 and 19
23 as well as 18. That was a written comment.

24

25 Public testimony. Anybody wish to
26 speak further.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none.
31 Ready for deliberations. Mr. Aloysius.

32

33 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move we
34 adopt WP10-51 and WP10-53 as modified.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: And that would be
37 on Pages 149 through 151 of our meeting booklet.

38

39 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman. I move to
40 second the motion.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Moved and seconded.
43 Proposal is before us. Do we need any further
44 discussion. We chewed it over pretty thoroughly under
45 the last proposal. Ready for the question.

46

47 MR. BROWN: Question.

48

49 MR. CHARLES: Question, Mr. Chair.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The question has
2 been called. All those in favor say aye.
3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.
5
6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: All those opposed
7 same sign.
8
9 MR. ANDREW: Aye.
10
11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Proposal passes six
12 to one.
13
14 REPORTER: Who voted no?
15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: John Andrew voted
17 no.
18
19 REPORTER: Thank you.
20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: That brings us to
22 Proposal 65.
23
24 MR. BERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25 Jerry Berg with Fish and Wildlife Service. We're going
26 to shift our focus in the area a little bit. We're
27 going to shift over to the Western Interior Region in
28 Unit 21E. Proposal 65 starts on Page 155 in your book.
29
30 Proposal 65 was submitted by the
31 Western Interior Regional Council and requests that the
32 winter season dates for moose in Unit 21E be changed
33 from February 1 to 10 to February 15 to March 15. So
34 expand it from a 10-day season to a full month long
35 season. It requests that the harvest parameters for
36 the winter hunt be announced by Federal managers after
37 consultation with ADF&G, the Bureau of Land Management
38 and the chairs of the GASH Advisory Committee and the
39 Western Interior Council.
40
41 The proponent also requests that a
42 Federal registration permit be required for the winter
43 season, that it be issued by the Innoko National
44 Wildlife Refuge manager and that only one permit be
45 allowed per household.
46
47 The Council's proposal suggests that
48 the changes for a longer winter season would allow
49 local users to hunt moose when
50 travel conditions are more optimal and may also help

1 spread hunting pressure across a wider area. The
2 proposal also suggests that requiring a Federal permit
3 would most likely provide more accurate harvest data,
4 which could result in more informed management
5 decisions in the future. It also requests that the
6 harvest parameters identified by the Federal managers
7 align with the harvest guidelines of the Yukon-Innoko
8 Moose Management Plan. This would provide the
9 flexibility to limit the number of moose harvested or
10 the sex of the moose to be harvested when needed for
11 conservation purposes.

12
13 There were two other provisions that
14 were not included in this proposal as submitted but
15 were discussed by the Western Interior Council when
16 they developed this proposal and those are provisions
17 that would provide the Innoko Refuge manager with
18 emergency closure authority for the winter hunt and a
19 24-hour reporting requirement for this winter season.
20 This was just kind of an oversight when drafting the
21 proposal and those two items were left out of the
22 proposal.

23
24 The regulatory history, I'm not going
25 to go into the detail on it. I think most of you are
26 probably aware of the regulatory history in Unit 21E
27 for moose, but if there's questions I'd be happy to
28 address those.

29
30 More recently I know some of the
31 members of your Council were involved with the Yukon-
32 Innoko Moose Management Working Group that began in
33 January of '05 and that resulted in the planning
34 efforts by the working group that was the Yukon-Innoko
35 Moose Management Plan and that was completed in March
36 of '06.

37
38 I included a few of the key management
39 goals, objectives and recommendations from that plan on
40 Page 82 in your analysis. Is it still Page 82? One of
41 the key provisions of the Moose Management Plan was to
42 provide for up to 40 moose that could be taken during
43 the winter hunt in Unit 21E.

44
45 For the biological background I worked
46 closely with the wildlife biologist, with BLM and the
47 Innoko Refuge, who have also worked closely with ADF&G
48 in that area to get the biological information for this
49 analysis, so I want to thank them for helping me
50 develop this section of the analysis.

1 You can see that the population
2 estimates in Figure 1 on Page 161 in your analysis
3 appear to show a higher moose population in '09
4 compared to the previous surveys; however, you can also
5 see that the 90 percent confidence intervals, which are
6 the lines above and below those point estimates all
7 overlap and that really prevents any conclusive trends
8 on the status of the moose population. However, the
9 biologist are involved with monitoring that population
10 and doing those surveys have said that they do believe
11 the population is stable.

12
13 They do complete moose trend counts in
14 that area and the 2008 and 2009 survey data in Table 1
15 suggests that the bull/cow ratio and calf/cow ratios
16 have declined since '07. The most recent calf/cow
17 ratio was 18, so a little bit low in '09. It's below
18 the management objective of 30 to 40 calves per 100
19 cows identified in the plan; however, the biologist who
20 flew the surveys felt that the flooding that occurred
21 last spring is a possible explanation for the low count
22 for last year. They were also not able to complete the
23 survey for the area that typically holds more bulls,
24 which could partially explain the lower bull to cow
25 ratio that they have for 2009 as well.

26
27 There is a moose collaring study that
28 they are going to be implementing starting this month
29 actually to address some of these moose survey data
30 limitations for 21E, but of course those results won't
31 be available for some time to come.

32
33 Harvest history. The reported moose
34 harvest in household survey data for Unit 21E by
35 residents of Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk and Holy Cross
36 are shown in Table 3. If you look at the harvest from
37 the household surveys that were conducted for the '02-
38 '03 and then '03-'04 years, the estimated average
39 annual total harvest by the GASH area residents between
40 both years if you average them out was about 126 moose
41 total in Unit 21E with an annual average of 17 of those
42 moose having been taken during this winter season
43 that's the subject of this proposal.

44
45 Information reported on the harvest
46 ticket database does suggest that the GASH area hunters
47 have had a nine-year average success rate of 68
48 percent. Regardless of this relatively high success
49 rate there does seem to be a downward trend in harvest
50 success over the past ten years. You can see those

1 numbers in Table 3 in your analysis.

2

3 Adoption of the proposal would provide
4 the residents of Unit 21E and Russian Mission with
5 additional opportunity and more flexibility to harvest
6 moose during the winter season in Unit 21E.

7

8 Population data from surveys indicate
9 that the affected moose population is stable and can
10 continue to support limited moose harvests during the
11 winter season; however, hunters should be encouraged to
12 harvest bulls as much as possible to favor productivity
13 in yearling bull recruitment.

14

15 A more streamlined approach to
16 administer the hunt while also following the same
17 provisions as outlined in the proposal would be to
18 delegate the authority to the Innoko National Wildlife
19 Refuge manager to announce the permit conditions and
20 any
21 needed closures for the hunt after consulting with the
22 local Federal and State agencies and the chairs of the
23 local fish and game advisory councils and committees
24 and the Western Interior Council.

25

26 The details of which specific agency,
27 ACs and the Council are to be consulted and could be
28 spelled out in a letter of delegation from the Federal
29 Subsistence Board to the Refuge manager. This would
30 basically specify which agencies and councils and
31 committees need to be consulted without listing those
32 in regulation.

33

34 The term harvest parameters could be
35 changed to permit conditions to provide more
36 flexibility to the Federal managers to adjust permit
37 conditions that may be different than those parameters
38 related only to harvest. A Federal registration permit
39 would be established and only one permit would be
40 issued per household. These details would also be
41 stipulated in a delegation of authority letter rather
42 than putting those into regulation.

43

44 The 24-hour reporting requirement is a
45 provision that can be added to the permit without
46 stipulating it in regulation. The emergency closure
47 authority would allow the Federal manager to react more
48 quickly in season to any needed adjustments.

49

50 All of these changes will need a pretty

1 extensive outreach effort to educate and implement
2 these changes. The Innoko National Wildlife Refuge has
3 committed to working with the local area communities to
4 inform them of the Federal registration permit
5 requirement and the conditions of this hunt. Currently
6 it's just a State registration permit that folks use,
7 so this would be a pretty big change, but it would also
8 give us a lot better information.

9
10 It should be noted that the cumulative
11 effects of adopting this proposal and then the proposal
12 right after this, 66, and then 69, which is addressing
13 C&T, could result in an increase in moose harvests to
14 the degree that restrictions may needed in the future,
15 we just don't know. All three of them combined are
16 pretty big changes for this area.

17
18 So, with that, the conclusion is to
19 support the proposal with modification to change
20 harvest parameters to permit conditions, provide
21 emergency closure authority to the Innoko National
22 Wildlife Refuge manager and have the Innoko Refuge
23 manager announce the permit conditions after consulting
24 with the local area Federal and State agencies and
25 local fish and game advisory committees and the Western
26 Interior Council as stipulated in a letter of
27 delegation.

28
29 With that, Mr. Chair, that completes my
30 presentation. As you know, this analysis and this
31 proposal was presented to the Western Interior Council
32 just last week. If you want to know what they did when
33 you're ready, I can go over those details.

34
35 Mr. Chair.

36
37 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions for Jerry
38 Berg. Bob Aloysius.

39
40 MR. ALOYSIUS: I sound like a broken
41 record again. Who invited the Russian Mission
42 residents be included to hunt in 21E when they're
43 further away than anybody else? And who is the Innoko
44 National Wildlife Refuge manager and where does he
45 live?

46
47 MR. BERG: Well, those are good
48 questions. I don't know the history of how Russian
49 Mission got added to the C&T determination for Unit
50 21E. I don't know if Pippa has done any research that

1 far back. I don't know if we adopted that from the
2 State C&T determination that was established in 1990 or
3 if the Federal Board took that action.

4
5 As far as the Refuge manager, his name
6 is Bo Sloane and he's located in McGrath.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It's no longer
9 Steve Kovatch then?

10
11 MR. BERG: Steve Kovatch is the
12 wildlife biologist at the Innoko Refuge in McGrath,
13 yes.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: For the record,
16 that's what makes this a crossover proposal is that
17 Russian Mission isn't included with the C&T within our
18 region. Also they say Lower Kalskag is part of 18.

19
20 (Laughter)

21
22 MR. ALOYSIUS: Don't get me started on
23 those again, please.

24
25 (Laughter)

26
27 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Pippa Kenner, go
30 ahead.

31
32 MS. KENNER: Thank you. This is Pippa
33 Kenner with OSM. Somebody asked about the C&T
34 including Russian Mission for moose in 21E, is that
35 correct?

36
37 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The question
38 specifically was if you know the rationale for
39 including Russian Mission for C&T in 21E when there are
40 other communities that are not included that are much
41 closer to 21E.

42
43 MS. KENNER: When the C&T -- the
44 customary and traditional use determination for moose
45 was adopted from the State regulations in 1990 and
46 Mountain Village was included specifically because
47 people from Paimiut live in Russian Mission. People
48 from Paimiut live in other communities too and there
49 may have been a lot of discussion and also maybe a lot
50 of representatives from Russian Mission at the Board

1 meeting where this was discussed. There's a number of
2 reasons why Russian Mission might have been included
3 but not the other communities with Paimiut residents.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Alex Nick, are you
6 taking off your Staff hat here or do you want to wait
7 for public testimony.

8

9 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. I would like to
10 take my hat off as a Staff member and speak.....

11

12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'll have you speak
13 under public testimony then.

14

15 MR. NICK: I'm just going to try to
16 clarify why Russian Mission is in C&T for Paimiut or
17 rather the Paimiut area.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Then you are
20 speaking as Staff.

21

22 MR. NICK: One of the reasons why,
23 based on my personal recollections, Russian Mission is
24 part of 21E is because, like it was mentioned by Pippa,
25 some of the residents of Russian Mission are originally
26 from Holy Cross and originally from the old village of
27 Paimiut. Pitkas, my mother-in-law, and Nicholais
28 originated from the old village Paimiut area and when
29 Controlled Use Area was being considered we were
30 involved in dealing with the no-fly zone at the time
31 the way it was put. I'm just here just to try to
32 clarify why Russian Mission is allowed to have C&T in
33 21E.

34

35 Some of the reasons are also because
36 some of those people who originated from that area had
37 established trapline in the area.

38

39 Mr. Chair.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Bob. I'd
42 like to get back to the proposal. There will be a
43 proposal in front of us to discuss C&T at further
44 length. Number 69, I believe it is, where we'll get
45 specifically into this issue.

46

47 I was just curious about when you
48 mention about a conclusive trend. I mean I don't see
49 any problem with this at present, but why would you say
50 -- specifically you mention under the geospatial

1 population estimator that there is no conclusive trend,
2 but yet if you look at those five-year intervals that
3 are there compared with the 2009 that we have now the
4 lower end of that confidence interval only overlaps the
5 very top of those previous two 10 years.

6

7 If that's not a major indicator, I have
8 a difficult time accepting that. But, anyway, that's
9 kind of a difference of interpretation. It is how it's
10 stated, but it seems rather significant to me,
11 especially when you couple it with the twinning rates
12 still being up there in the 50 percent range
13 consistently, although we're not getting the calf
14 survival for whatever events may be causing that.

15

16 Any other questions for Staff.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: If not, we'll move
21 on to the State. Does the State have any additional
22 comments to provide here.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 *****

27 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

28 *****

29

30 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
31 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

32

33 Wildlife Proposal WP10-65:

34

35 This proposal would change the federal
36 subsistence winter moose hunt in Unit 21E from a
37 February 1 through 10 season with an any moose bag
38 limit to a February 15 through March 15 season by
39 federal registration permit with a quota and a bag
40 limit of one moose per household.

41

42 Introduction:

43

44 This proposal was submitted to lengthen
45 and delay the federal subsistence moose hunting winter
46 season in Unit 21. Federal subsistence delegated
47 official would establish a quota in consultation with
48 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and require one
49 federal subsistence registration hunt permit per
50 household.

1 Impact on Subsistence Users:

2

3 If adopted federal subsistence moose
4 hunting opportunity will be expanded by 15 days and be
5 moved later in the winter when more sunlight and
6 traveling conditions should improve opportunity for
7 success.

8

9 Opportunity Provided by State:

10

11 There is no state winter moose season
12 in Unit 21E due to conservation concerns.

13

14 Conservation Issues:

15

16 The Yukon Innoko Moose Management Plan
17 (YIMMP) was endorsed by the Federal Subsistence Board,
18 the Alaska Board of Game, and supported by the Western
19 Interior Regional Advisory Council and the Grayling-
20 Anvik-Shageluk-Holy Cross (GASH) Fish and Game Advisory
21 Committee. The YIMMP included a provision for a
22 harvest of up to 40 cow moose during a winter season,
23 and this proposal is consistent with the YIMMP. If
24 adopted, the requirement of a federal registration
25 permit could improve the quality of federal subsistence
26 harvest data by providing a mechanism for better
27 harvest reporting during the winter moose season. The
28 Alaska Board of Game closed the state winter general
29 season moose hunt in 21E because the moose population
30 could not withstand the substantial interest from Unit
31 18 hunters.

32

33 Enforcement Issues:

34

35 Adoption of this proposal results in
36 only federally qualified users hunting during the
37 winter season and only on federal public lands.
38 Adoption of this proposal could reduce harvest
39 reporting violation citations.

40

41 Recommendation:

42

43 Support with modifications to: (1)
44 assure that the harvest quota remains consistent with
45 the YIMMP, (2) due to conservation issues, require
46 reasonable permit reporting in regulation for the
47 winter hunt rather than leaving that as an optional
48 permit condition, and (3) provide emergency closure
49 authority to delegated federal official. The YIMMP
50 needs to be referenced in federal regulation; if not in

1 regulation, the Department requests the Federal
2 Subsistence Board specifically reference the harvest
3 quota and management objectives of the YIMMP in the
4 letter of delegation to the designated official.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Tribal
7 agency, other governmental.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Local
12 Advisory Committees.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Written
17 public comments.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Any member
22 of the public wish to address this proposal.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. We're ready
27 for deliberation. Mr. Aloysius.

28
29 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move
30 that we adopt Proposal WP10-65 as modified.

31
32 MR. ONEY: Second the motion.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Second by Ray Oney.
35 We do have Proposal 65 before us as modified. I
36 believe that language is contained on Page 165.
37 Discussion. Bob Aloysius.

38
39 MR. ALOYSIUS: First I apologize for my
40 -- every time I hear the word Russian Mission in 21E I
41 get all fired up. Forgive me for that. I'm going to
42 support this because it makes a lot of sense. I was at
43 the WIRAC meeting in Aniak in October and they went at
44 length about why they wanted that particular time for
45 hunting, so I'm for it.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any other
48 discussion. James, go ahead.

49
50 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman. So the

1 modification is on Page 158, is it, or.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: 165.

4

5 MR. CHARLES: Where's the modification?

6

7 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Modified regulation
8 is on Page 165.

9

10 MR. CHARLES: 165?

11

12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Correct. In my
13 book.

14

15 MR. CHARLES: Okay, I see it there.
16 Thank you.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I can't find any
19 kind of reason to not support this as well. They've
20 done their homework pretty thoroughly and can't see any
21 reason to not support their request for my part.

22

23 Further discussion. Mr. Berg.

24

25 MR. BERG: I just want to make the
26 Council aware that the Western Interior Council did
27 make a modification beyond what the modifications are
28 in your analysis. I don't know if you want to discuss
29 those before you take action or not, but I just wanted
30 to let you know they made an amendment to the
31 modifications in our Staff analysis.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I don't know how
34 anybody else feels, but I don't really think it's
35 necessary. We've got this language in front of us.
36 They're going to be working through it and I don't
37 expect there's going to be anything substantial change.
38 Maybe just tweaking that they're doing on their own
39 level. That's my feeling.

40

41 Any further discussion.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 MR. ONEY: Question.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question called on
48 Proposal 65 as modified. Those in favor say aye.

49

50 IN UNISON: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Those opposed same
2 sign.

3
4 (No opposing votes)

5
6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none.
7 Proposal 65 supported unanimous. Proposal 66.

8
9 MR. BERG: Mr. Chair. Jerry Berg with
10 Fish and Wildlife Service. Proposal 66 starts on Page
11 168 in your book. Proposal 66 was also submitted by
12 the Western Interior Regional Council and requests that
13 the fall moose season dates in Unit 21E be shifted by
14 five days, from August 20 to September 25 to August 25
15 to September 30.

16
17 The proposal suggests that moose are
18 moving around later in the season and a five-day shift
19 would provide greater opportunity to harvest moose and
20 this could even help prevent cow moose from being
21 harvested during the winter season since a successful
22 hunter who takes a bull during the fall season would
23 not be eligible to harvest a cow during the winter
24 season. The proposal also states that recent fall
25 temperatures have been warmer, so a change could help
26 reduce spoilage of meat.

27
28 Most of the background for this
29 proposal is the same as what we just covered in the
30 previous proposal, so I'm not going to go over that
31 again unless there's specific questions. Adoption of
32 the proposal would shift the fall moose season dates
33 back five days, like I mentioned. Moose will likely be
34 moving along the river corridors and thus easier to
35 locate later in September than they are in August as
36 you all are well aware.

37
38 The foliage along the river corridors
39 has usually dropped by late September, making the moose
40 easier to see. This proposed change would likely
41 result in increased hunting success for bull moose
42 during the later fall season.

43
44 Since the fall season only allows for
45 the harvest of bulls, any increased harvest during the
46 fall season may help to reduce the potential harvest of
47 cows during the winter season since hunters can only
48 harvest one moose per regulatory year. This could be a
49 benefit to the moose population in the long term
50 depending on how harvest patterns change over time.

1 Temperatures in late September are
2 usually cooler than they are in late August, so this
3 could help reduce the potential for spoilage of meat.
4 Again, as noted before, the cumulative effects of
5 adopting all three proposals 65, 66, and 69, could
6 result in an increase in moose harvests to the degree
7 that restrictions may need to be added in the future.

8
9 With that, Mr. Chair, the preliminary
10 conclusion is to support the proposal.

11
12 Thank you.

13
14 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any questions for
15 Staff.

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Does the State have
20 any additional comments.

21
22 *****
23 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
24 *****

25
26 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
27 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

28
29 Wildlife Proposal WP10-66:

30
31 This proposal would delay the federal
32 subsistence fall moose season five days in Unit 21E
33 from August 20 through September 25 to August 25
34 through September 30.

35
36 Introduction:

37
38 The Western Interior Regional Advisory
39 Council submitted this proposal and indicated delaying
40 the federal subsistence moose hunt five days would
41 increase opportunity to harvest bull moose as they
42 become more active as the breeding season approached.
43 The proponent also indicated delaying the season will
44 also reduce spoilage of meat due to cooler weather and
45 possibly will reduce the number of cow moose harvested
46 in the winter because hunters will have increased
47 success rates of fall bull harvests.

48
49 Impact on Subsistence Users:

50

1 This regulation would have minimal
2 change on subsistence opportunity.

3

4 Opportunity Provided by State:

5

6 The state resident moose hunting season
7 in Unit 21E is September 5 through September 25 with a
8 limit of one antlered bull. The state nonresident
9 moose hunting season in Unit 21E is September 5 through
10 September 25 with a limit of one bull with 50-inch
11 antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on at
12 least one side.

13

14 Conservation Issues:

15

16 If adopted, the number of bull moose
17 harvested by federal subsistence hunters is unlikely to
18 change during most years. Typically, late seasons
19 result in greater success, but late September is also a
20 time when weather can effectively prevent hunting and
21 lower water levels can limit access.

22

23 Recommendation:

24

25 No recommendation until the Department
26 evaluates additional information acquired at the
27 Regional Advisory Council meeting.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any tribal agency,
32 other governmental agency comments. Is that none or is
33 that waving your hand?

34

35 MR. ANDREW: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
36 Chairman. I was not going to comment on this proposal.
37 Even though Russian Mission is the only community with
38 a positive C&T for moose in Unit 21E, there is still a
39 large number of people from the lower part of the river
40 that still participate in the fall hunt as well under
41 the State subsistence or State hunting opportunity in
42 the general hunt.

43

44 I don't know if this proposal or the
45 enactment of this proposal in the Federal level would
46 move the State to adopt a similar proposal extending
47 the season as well if that would help as well.
48 Certainly there are people from Bethel that do go into
49 21E during the fall hunt as well and from the
50 surrounding villages as well. Those that are able to

1 fly and harvest moose in the area, it would certainly
2 help their families as well.

3

4 So, in that respect, if it were to
5 initiate the State of Alaska adopting a similar action,
6 we would support the proposal.

7

8 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any Advisory
11 Committee comments.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Written
16 public comments.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Anyone from
21 the public wish to address the Council on the proposal.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Are we ready
26 for deliberations, Mr. Aloysius. We don't have any
27 modified language on this one.

28

29 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move we
30 adopt Proposal WP10-66.

31

32 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman. I move to
33 second the motion.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Moved and seconded.
36 Any further discussion on Proposal 66.

37

38 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: James.

41

42 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
43 People have been talking about C&T in that 21E and that
44 was my first moose hunting area a long time ago even
45 though I'm way down at the mouth of Kuskokwim. If my
46 village is not on the C&T list, would I be non-resident
47 hunter in that area? Jerry.

48

49 (Laughter)

50

1 MR. BERG: Through the Chair. Mr.
2 Charles. No, you would still be hunting under State
3 regulations. Federal lands are open, so therefore State
4 regulations apply on Federal lands unless closed. So
5 if you went up to hunt in 21E, you would be hunting
6 under State regulations, which their season is August
7 20 to September 25, I believe. You would not have the
8 extra five day provision from this proposal, but you
9 would be allowed to hunt under State regulations on
10 State and Federal lands.

11
12 Mr. Chair.

13
14 MR. CHARLES: Thank you.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Further discussion.

17
18 (No comments)

19
20 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ready for the
21 question.

22
23 MR. ONEY: Question.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The question on
26 Proposal 66 is presented. All those in favor say aye.

27
28 IN UNISON: Aye.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any opposed same
31 sign.

32
33 (No opposing votes)

34
35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none.
36 Proposal 66 passes unanimous. We'll go ahead and step
37 down here for 10, 15 minute break.

38
39 (Off record)

40
41 (On record)

42
43 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Back on record
44 3:25. We'll move into Proposal 69, C&T determinations
45 in Unit 21E. And we have Pippa Kenner to address this
46 one.

47
48 Carry on.

49
50 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 Member of the Council. Proposal WP10-69 was submitted
2 by the Kuskokwim Native Association or KNA and it
3 requests the recognition of customary and traditional
4 uses of moose in Unit 21E for residents of Lower
5 Kalskag, Upper Kalskag, Aniak, and Chuathbaluk.

6
7 (Laughter)

8
9 MS. KENNER: Uh-oh. Thank you, Mr.
10 Chair. KNA is requesting the recognition of customary
11 and traditional uses of moose in Unit 21E for residents
12 of Kalskag, Lower Kalskag, Aniak, and Chuathbaluk.

13
14 You may remember a year ago a similar
15 request was submitted by KNA to the Board in 2008 in
16 the form of a special action request. The Board
17 rejected the request in part because it believed
18 additional public participation and discussion was
19 necessary and the Board encouraged KNA to submit a
20 regular cycle proposal and that regular cycle proposal
21 is the topic of this analysis.

22
23 The proposal is being submitted for all
24 of Unit 21E; however, the KNA, the proponent, states
25 that it is the Paimiut
26 Slough area that is customarily and traditionally used
27 by these communities and it encouraged the Western
28 Interior Council to consider modifying the proposal to
29 include only that area.

30
31 While caribou can be harvested in Unit
32 21E under Federal subsistence regulations by residents
33 of some of the communities in Unit 19A, currently no
34 community in Unit 19A is included in the customary and
35 traditional use determination for moose in Unit 21E.

36
37 The analysis of this request concluded
38 that Lower Kalskag, Kalskag and Aniak use only a part
39 of 21E, primarily the area that was used by residents
40 of Paimiut, the Paimiut Slough area. This hunting
41 pattern differs from that of the GASH communities in
42 Unit 21E that are known to hunt moose in areas of the
43 entire 21E subunit.

44
45 Access to Unit 21E by Lower Kalskag,
46 Kalskag and Aniak is overland in winter. Several
47 factors have been identified that influence the
48 decision to travel to Paimiut Slough to hunt moose.
49 One is a low success rate in the fall season, and
50 second is if

1 favorable travel conditions occur in February. If
2 favorable travel conditions do not exist, hunters are
3 much less likely to travel to the area.

4
5 Because of this and other
6 considerations that the OSM preliminary conclusion is
7 to support Proposal WP10-69 with modification to
8 include the Paimiut Slough area of Unit 21E only, and
9 to exclude Chuathbaluk because information to support a
10 recommendation for Chuathbaluk is very sparse.

11
12 In addition to this, last week the
13 Western Interior Council met. This is a crossover
14 proposal. Russian Mission has recognized uses of moose
15 in 21E and they are represented by your Council and
16 also Lower Kalskag. The area itself is represented by
17 the Western Interior Council and that Council also
18 supported the modified recommendation.

19
20 However, it did change the area that
21 would be included in this customary and traditional use
22 determination. It changed it to include the area
23 that's proposed; however, the northern section of the
24 proposal area from the mouth of Paimiut Slough you
25 follow the south bank of Paimiut Slough to a point
26 referred to as High Bank and then continue east to the
27 boundary of Unit 21E. So it took off the top section
28 of the area that's in the modification and that is in
29 the map in your book.

30
31 That concludes my presentation and I'm
32 prepared to answer your questions.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions for
37 Staff. Bob Aloysius.

38
39 MR. ALOYSIUS: How far up Paimiut
40 Slough did you say the Western Interior RAC wanted?

41
42 MS. KENNER: From the mouth of Paimiut
43 Slough following the south bank of Paimiut Slough to a
44 place called Upper High Bank or Second Bank and then
45 east to the 21E boundary.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Continue, Bob.

48
49 MS. KENNER: Would you like to go to
50 the.....

1 MR. ALOYSIUS: Where on the 21E
2 boundary is that.....

3
4 MS. KENNER: Depending on where High
5 Bank is, which we don't know on this map here,
6 depending on where it is, it takes you basically to the
7 point where in the modification the area to where that
8 boundary hits the boundary for 19A as it meets the
9 boundary for 21E. We may want to step away from the
10 microphone for a minute.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It looks to me like
13 if you're up above the headwaters of the -- I think
14 it's the Iditarod, about right there. Do you have
15 follow up there or continue?

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: While she's
20 thinking on that, I do have one as well. Noting your
21 exclusion of Chuathbaluk, not being real intimately
22 familiar with their patterns up there and so forth, but
23 I find it very difficult to accept that they don't use
24 it as much as their neighboring villages being again in
25 that immediate proximity.

26
27 I'm keying in perhaps just in one place
28 and you have -- I haven't read it at length, but
29 because of no reported harvest in 21E in their survey
30 years when they happen to be up there and then
31 immediately followed by the sentence that says the
32 residents of these communities were no longer eligible
33 to participate in a winter hunt, that they may have
34 otherwise done.

35
36 I don't know to what level you bring
37 that into consideration. From what I've gotten through
38 osmosis in dealing with issues in 19A, those villages
39 referenced here, Aniak, Chuathbaluk, Lower Kalskag and
40 Kalskag follow a lot of the same hunting areas and I
41 think KNA probably took that definitely into
42 consideration when they made their proposal. I have a
43 difficult time about your recommendation of excluding
44 that.

45
46 I'm just looking for more
47 justification, I guess, is a question for you as far as
48 the exclusion of Chuathbaluk.

49
50 MS. KENNER: The conversation around

1 the exclusion of Chuathbaluk focused mainly but not
2 exclusively on the survey that was done for the
3 regulatory years 2003, 4 and 5 that were done in that
4 area specifically to get an idea of -- you know, to get
5 a picture of where people were hunting, anticipating
6 issues like this coming up in the future. And that
7 survey that was done specifically to capture this type
8 of information, Chuathbaluk didn't indicate that they
9 had harvested a moose during those three surveys in
10 Unit 21E. There was a fall season that they could
11 participate in and then for some of those winter
12 seasons they were excluded from. So I think your
13 interpretation of the information from what I heard you
14 say is correct.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Questions for Staff
17 presentation on this proposal.

18
19 John and then James.

20
21 MR. ANDREW: Mr. Chairman, thank you.
22 Pippa, I remember the late Bobby Phillip and some of
23 their relatives up there where as a young man I used to
24 go up there and hunt in their area. They used to talk
25 of a time when-- he said they were originally --their
26 families were originally Yukon side or somewhere in
27 Paimiut area. That village moved about -- used to be a
28 place called the Old Crow Village. That old village
29 site I believe is across from the mouth of Aniak
30 Slough.

31
32 Bob should probably know a little bit
33 more about the history because he's from that area, but
34 I've known people from that village. We used to stop
35 by every year when we'd go hunt upriver. They'd talk
36 of a time when they used to hunt on the other side of
37 the river, I mean on the Yukon side, and it's pretty
38 hard to, you know, establish C&T if you have no
39 baseline studies or recorded history. I believe that
40 village -- I don't know what year they moved up to
41 their current village of Chuathbaluk, 10 miles upriver
42 of Aniak.

43
44 Thank you.

45
46 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: James.

47
48 MR. CHARLES: Thank you , Mr. Chairman.
49 What is this little area on 21E, part of 21E way down
50 north of YK-Delta Refuge area or northeast corner?

1 Closed area or what is that or is it proposed for C&T,
2 that little mark?

3

4 MS. KENNER: Mr. Charles, through the
5 Chair. Very good question. That appears to be the
6 boundary of the Yukon-Delta Wildlife Refuge. However
7 there are Federal public lands belonging to BLM that
8 continue past the Refuge.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Continue, James.

11

12 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13 So that overlaps the 21E right there?

14

15 MS. KENNER: Yes, that's right.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Other questions.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ready to move on to
22 the next stage here or anybody additional questions for
23 Staff.

24

25 MR. ALOYSIUS: I did.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob Aloysius.

28

29 MR. ALOYSIUS: I did want to clarify
30 something there. The abandoned village of Crow Village
31 is not Tulukaghogamiut, it's Tulukagnag and the people
32 of Tulukagnag are Tulukaghogamiut. I grew up in that
33 area, so I know the family that migrated from there to
34 Chuathbaluk and the only reason they migrated over
35 there was because they had some of their grandchildren
36 eligible for school. There was no history of them ever
37 coming from the Yukon River side.

38

39 I know we used to hunt on the north
40 side of those hills just behind Crow Village and just
41 behind Aniak in the winter time for moose because that
42 is the ridge line that runs just north of the Kuskokwim
43 River is very close -- I mean the headwaters of the
44 tributaries on the 21E side are not even four or five
45 miles from the Kuskokwim River in most cases.

46

47 I don't know of anybody ever hunting
48 from Chuathbaluk in 21E because most of the winter
49 hunting they did was in the headwaters of the Owhat,
50 which was just south of the Iditarod River drainage.

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Further questions.
2
3 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair. Can I get some
4 clarification.....
5
6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Pippa.
7
8 MS. KENNER:from Mr. Aloysius.
9 When you said hunting behind Aniak, did you mean south
10 of Aniak or north?
11
12 MR. ALOYSIUS: North. 21E is on the
13 north side of the Kuskokwim River. That's what I meant
14 by behind.
15
16 MS. KENNER: Thank you. And also you
17 remember someone from Chuathbaluk hunting in 21E in the
18 Iditarod River area?
19
20 MR. ALOYSIUS: I said I have not heard
21 of anyone hunting from Chuathbaluk into Iditarod
22 draining. They only hunted in the Owhat headwaters in
23 the wintertime.
24
25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Anything further.
26
27 (No comments)
28
29 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We'll move on. Any
30 State comments regarding this proposal.
31
32 (No comments)
33
34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Any tribal
35 agency or governmental agency comments.
36
37 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
38 Timothy Andrew with AVCP. I was looking at the
39 bibliography from the report and the report has a
40 bibliography that's dating back to 1976. I know prior
41 to that there was a large number of communities that
42 did hunt in 21E primarily during the winter hunt from
43 this area and from other areas as well, so there are
44 more than those three communities that could possibly
45 qualify for customary and traditional use determination
46 in 21E. There's a large number of Yukon River villages
47 as well. From personal comments that were made by
48 several of you, even people from Platinum and Goodnews
49 and other communities that have historically hunted in
50 that area.

1
2 One of the things I'd like to express
3 is the dangers of customary and traditional use
4 determination. There's a heavy reliance on written
5 data or written information that is derived from past
6 activities and past people that have researched
7 people's use, customary and traditional use of
8 resources in the area. A lot of that relies on hunter
9 reports that people turn in.

10
11 I must stress the importance to this
12 Council and to your constituents as well that hunter
13 reports for any of the game that we harvest as
14 subsistence resources out here is a must. We saw that
15 in Nome where the amounts necessary for subsistence
16 from moose at the Board of Game level is only
17 established between 100 and 200 moose. That was based
18 on harvest reports that were submitted to the
19 management agencies. It's very unfortunate that our
20 amounts necessary for moose is so low in Unit 18, but
21 that's as a result of the people not turning in their
22 hunter reports.

23
24 The other area that I see is a danger
25 in customary and traditional use determinations is
26 what's going to happen when muskox become abundant out
27 here. Do we have to hunt illegally for an X period of
28 time in order to qualify for customary and traditional
29 use determination? Or how do we go about taking
30 advantage of the situation? Do we fill out a sport
31 hunt and get a tag and how long do we hunt for before
32 we receive a positive customary and traditional use
33 determination for muskox?

34
35 You know, it's a double-edged sword.
36 It helps us a lot, but it also can hurt us as well.
37 I'm not sure how we can possibly address possible
38 alternatives to customary and traditional use
39 determination but to say that the Yup'ik people that
40 reside in this area and Alaska Natives throughout the
41 rest of Alaska have always been opportunistic hunters.

42
43
44 Whatever comes, like, for example,
45 moose. Moose were not historically present in the
46 area, but we did take advantage of moose when they did
47 come in. We do the same with caribou. We do it with
48 migratory birds and other food animals that come into
49 the area.

50

1 I just thought I'd say that.
2
3 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
4
5 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Fish and Game
6 Advisory Committees. Anything from the Central Kusko
7 on this one?
8
9 MR. ALOYSIUS: The Central Kusko was
10 involved in the beginning stages of this proposal
11 writing. We just backed up KNA with whatever they
12 wrote and that we'd support them, so I support them
13 with their original proposal.
14
15 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any written public
16 comments.
17
18 (No comments)
19
20 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Anyone from
21 the public wish to address this proposal.
22
23 (No comments)
24
25 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seeing none. Are
26 we ready for a motion for deliberation, Mr. Aloysius.
27 Let's move the proposal as written and we can discuss
28 if people want to modify it or make any amendments.
29
30 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move
31 that we adopt Proposal WP10-69 as it was originally
32 proposed by KNA.
33
34 MR. ONEY: I second the motion.
35
36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Moved and seconded.
37 Proposal 69 is presented in its original form.
38 Discussion.
39
40 Bob.
41
42 MR. ALOYSIUS: As far as the
43 discussion, there could be an amendment to the motion
44 to follow what the WIRAC -- how WIRAC modified it with
45 the exclusion of eliminating Chuathbaluk.
46
47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I guess maybe I
48 didn't catch that when you were making your
49 presentation. When Western Interior addressed this,
50 did they.....

1 MR. ALOYSIUS: They eliminated
2 Chuathbaluk.
3
4 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: They excluded
5 Chuathbaluk as well?
6
7 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair. They adopted
8 the proposal as modified by Staff and then additionally
9 modified the area of the C&T and that included the
10 exclusion of Chuathbaluk.
11
12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: And put a more
13 specific area in 21E. I mean, yeah, I'd certainly --
14 we can pick between those, to retain Chuathbaluk, but
15 if we want to go as far as adopting the additional C&T
16 boundary that Western Interior mentioned, we could do
17 that while retaining Chuathbaluk as one of the C&T
18 communities in our recommendation.
19
20 MR. ALOYSIUS: Do I have to change my
21 motion now?
22
23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Yeah, you need to
24 amend the motion to include that specific portion, but
25 right now we do have Chuathbaluk still there.
26
27 MR. ALOYSIUS: I thought it was.
28
29 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I'll accept it.
30
31 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I amend
32 my motion to include the customary and traditional --
33 the wording of the WIRAC beginning at the western
34 boundary of Unit 21E -- no, sorry about that. Let me
35 go back here.
36
37 (Pause)
38
39 MR. ALOYSIUS: Ray, do you mind if I
40 withdraw my original motion.
41
42 MR. ONEY: Yeah, I'll.....
43
44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Secunder concurs.
45 Motion is withdrawn. Mr. Aloysius, go ahead.
46
47 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move
48 that we adopt Proposal WP10-69 with the wording south
49 of the line beginning at the western boundary of Unit
50 21E near Tabernacle Mountain extending easterly to the

1 junction of Paimiut Slough and Innoko Slough and
2 southwesterly in the direction of Molybdenum Mountain
3 to the juncture of Units 19A, 21A, and 21E, residents
4 of Unit 21E, Aniak, Kalskag, Lower Kalskag, Chuathbaluk
5 and Russian Mission.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Second.

8

9 MR. ONEY: Second the motion.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seconded and a new
12 motion before us. Any further discussion. James.

13

14 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15 To correct Bob, that was southeasterly, not
16 southwesterly. You said southwesterly, I think.

17

18 MR. ALOYSIUS: It's Southeasterly?

19

20 MR. CHARLES: Yeah.

21

22 MR. ALOYSIUS: Okay.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Further discussion.

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: If not, ready for
29 the question.

30

31 MR. ONEY: Question.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question called.
34 All those in favor say aye.

35

36 IN UNISON: Aye.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Opposed same sign.

39

40 (No opposing votes)

41

42 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none. Our
43 proposal as amended 69 completed. Which brings us to
44 Proposal 72. I realize we talked about taking no
45 action on those, but then on further consideration I
46 thought I'd take them up and maybe we'll take no action
47 or maybe not. Address them as they come. Proposal 72,
48 Staff address that.

49

50 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. Proposal 72

1 analysis begins on Page 189. This proposal was
2 submitted by the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
3 Council and requests that the closure to harvest of
4 coyotes on Federal public lands be rescinded.

5
6 The proponent states that the closure
7 is not needed due to the limited amount of coyotes in
8 Unit 22. Rural residents of Unit 22 have a positive
9 customary and traditional use determination for coyotes
10 in Unit 22.

11
12 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
13 support the proposal.

14
15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Anybody have any
18 questions regarding this one. It's pretty
19 straightforward.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Does the
24 State have any comments regarding Proposal 72.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 *****
29 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
30 *****

31
32 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
33 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

34
35 Wildlife Proposal WP10-72:

36
37 This proposal allows for federal
38 subsistence use of incidental catch of coyotes taken by
39 federally qualified subsistence users under federal
40 regulations during the federal subsistence trapping
41 season for red fox and wolf in Unit 22.

42
43 Introduction:

44
45 Coyotes are expanding their range and
46 abundance throughout much of western Alaska. This
47 proposal allows for federal subsistence use of coyotes
48 accidentally trapped as non-target species in Unit 22.
49 The state allows hunting and trapping of coyotes in
50 Unit 22; however, federal subsistence regulations do

1 not have open seasons for either hunting or trapping.

2

3 Impact on Subsistence Users:

4

5 None. Subsistence users can already
6 harvest coyote under state regulations on federal and
7 nonfederal lands. Allowing the use of incidental catch
8 under federal subsistence trapping regulations is not
9 likely to impact the take or subsistence use of
10 coyotes.

11

12 Opportunity Provided by State:

13

14 In Unit 22, regulations for coyote are:

15

16 Hunting: (Coyotes are classed as "Fur
17 Animal"; take requires a state hunting license) the
18 season in September 1 through April 30 with a bag limit
19 of 2 coyotes.

20

21 Trapping: (Coyotes are classed as
22 "Furbearer"; take requires a state trapping license)
23 the season is November 1 through April 15 with no bag
24 limit.

25

26 Conservation Issues:

27

28 Coyotes are expanding their range, and
29 trapping or hunting take is not considered an
30 impediment or conservation concern.

31

32 Recommendation:

33

34 Neutral; hunting and trapping of
35 coyotes for subsistence use are already provided on
36 federal public lands under state regulations.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Any tribal
39 agency or.....

40

41 MR. ALOYSIUS: I got a question. Why
42 are we even dealing with something that's out of our
43 jurisdiction?

44

45 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Mr. Kron.

46

47 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. I do not
48 believe it's reasonable for you to be addressing this,
49 but you can if you'd like.

50

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2
3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The point that was
4 raised is that some of our villages on the Lower Yukon
5 do have C&T recognition within GMU 22, so that's why it
6 was before us as a crossover proposal. If the Board
7 wishes, we can run through the process and then end up
8 taking no action on it if we don't feel it's necessary.
9 It was brought forward from both sides in that regard.
10
11 Any tribal agency or other government
12 agency comments.
13
14 (No comments)
15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Local
17 Advisory Committee comments.
18
19 MR. CHARLES: No comments.
20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Written public
22 comments.
23
24 (No comments)
25
26 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Anyone from
27 the public wish to address the proposal.
28
29 (No comments)
30
31 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Council
32 deliberation. We can -- from what you've heard so far
33 we can either support or just take no action on this
34 proposal if that would be the preference.
35
36 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman.
37
38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Mr. Aloysius.
39
40 MR. ALOYSIUS: I move that we take no
41 action on Proposal WP10-72.
42
43 MR. ONEY: Second.
44
45 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Second. For no
46 action I'll just ask if there's any objection.
47
48 (No objections)
49
50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any objection.

1 (No objections)
2
3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none. No
4 action on Proposal 72. Proposal 10-76.
5
6 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. Members of
7 the Council. Proposal WP10-76 was also submitted by
8 the Seward Peninsula Subsistence Regional Advisory
9 Council. It requests the addition of Unit 22 to the
10 list of areas from which the skin, hide, pelt or fur,
11 including claws, of brown bears harvested under Federal
12 subsistence regulations may be used to make
13 handicrafts.
14
15 Rural residents of Unit 22 have a
16 positive customary and traditional use determination
17 for brown bear in Unit 22.
18
19 OSM's preliminary conclusion is to
20 support WP10-76.
21
22 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23
24 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any questions for
25 Staff.
26
27 (No comments)
28
29 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Comments from
30 State.
31
32 (No comments)
33
34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Tribal
35 agency, other governmental agency.
36
37 (No comments)
38
39 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Local
40 Advisory Committee.
41
42 MR. CHARLES: No comments.
43
44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Written public
45 comments.
46
47 (No comments)
48
49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Anyone from
50 the public wish to testify on this proposal.

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Potential
4 action or no action from the Council in deliberation.
5 Mr. Aloysius.
6
7 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. I move
8 that we take no action on WP10-76.
9
10 MR. H. WILDE: I second.
11
12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Moved and seconded
13 on Proposal 76. Even though we do have C&T in this
14 area, this is more specific to Unit 22. I think when
15 we discussed this whole thing with brown bear before,
16 we wished to be excluded on this one. So no action in
17 my mind is appropriate. Is there any objection.
18
19 (No objections)
20
21 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: No action on
22 Proposal 76. Any objection.
23
24 (No objections)
25
26 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seeing none. No
27 action on Proposal 76.
28
29 That brings us to Proposal 80.
30
31 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. Proposal WP10-80
32 was submitted by the Stebbins Community Association and
33 requests that the winter moose season in Unit 22A
34 remainder be shifted from January 1st through 31st to
35 January 15th through February 15th. The shift in
36 season timing would better allow the communities of
37 Stebbins and St. Michael to meet their subsistence
38 needs.
39
40 Rural residents of Unit 22 have a
41 customary and traditional use determination for moose
42 in Unit 22A Remainder.
43
44 OSM's preliminary conclusion is to
45 support WP10-80.
46
47 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
48
49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any questions for
50 Staff.

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seeing none.
4 State, any comments on Proposal 80.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 *****

9 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

10 *****

11

12 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
13 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

14

15 Wildlife Proposal WP10-80:

16

17 This proposal changes the federal
18 subsistence winter moose season to January 15 through
19 February 15 in Unit 22A Remainder (described as Unit
20 22A South in the proposal).

21

22 Introduction:

23

24 This proposal requests a two week delay
25 of the winter federal subsistence moose hunt in Unit
26 22A Remainder. The existing federal subsistence moose
27 hunting winter season dates are January 1 through
28 January 31. The proponent indicates delaying the
29 season by two weeks will potentially increase hunt
30 success.

31

32 Impact on Subsistence Users:

33

34 Delaying the winter season opening by 2
35 weeks later in January will have a slight negative
36 impact on available antlered bulls due to antler-drop
37 during the winter season. Winter travel conditions may
38 improve for hunters with slightly longer day-length.

39

40 Opportunity Provided by State:

41

42 In Unit 22A Remainder the following
43 moose hunting regulations were effective in 2009-2010:

44

45 One bull by harvest ticket; residents
46 only; season Aug 1-Sept 30;

47

48 Or

49

50 One antlered bull by harvest ticket;

1 residents only; season Jan 1-Jan 31;

2

3 One bull with 50-inch antlers or
4 antlers with 4 or more brow tines on at
5 least one side by harvest ticket;
6 nonresidents only; season Sept 1- Sept
7 30.

8

9 Conservation Issues:

10

11 Moose populations in Unit 22A Remainder
12 are not censused on a rotational basis by Alaska
13 Department of Fish and Game in Unit 22. However, low
14 hunting effort and probable exchange of moose between
15 local areas and the Yukon River drainage (located
16 easterly of Unit 22A) have provided stable populations
17 that allow state hunting of bulls by harvest ticket for
18 residents and nonresidents. An antlered bull bag limit
19 in the state and federal subsistence winter hunts
20 avoids the take of cows to conserve the population when
21 little is known about bull:cow ratios or total
22 population size. Although data are scant, current
23 harvests are considered to be within sustained yield of
24 the population. Adoption of this proposal will not
25 cause conservation concerns or impede the population
26 objective due to the winter bag limit of antlered bull.

27

28 Enforcement Issues:

29

30 No other moose season in Unit 22 goes
31 beyond January 31st on federal and non-federal lands
32 due to the lack of available antlered bulls. The
33 number of antlered bulls in February is very few to
34 none, and the department wants to avoid the take of
35 cows.

36

37 Recommendation:

38

39 Oppose.

40

41 The Regional Advisory Council could
42 consider modifying this proposal to pursue
43 establishment of a community harvest hunt under federal
44 subsistence regulations in cooperation with the State
45 which would establish harvest quotas per community.
46 Developing a community harvest program will provide
47 additional opportunity to take harvestable surplus from
48 the growing moose population to meet needs of the
49 communities, improve harvest reporting, and adjust
50 harvest quotas to match biological fluctuations in the

1 population.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Tribal
4 agency or other governmental agency comments.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Local Fish
9 and Game Advisory Committee.

10

11 MR. CHARLES: No comments.

12

13 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Written public
14 comments.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: No comments.
19 Anyone from the public wish to address this proposal.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: None. Mr.
24 Aloysius, do you want to put a motion on the table
25 regarding this.

26

27 MR. ALOYSIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
28 I move that we support Proposal 10-80.

29

30 MR. H. WILDE: Second.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Moved and seconded.
33 Proposal 80 before us. Discussion.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 MR. CHARLES: Question.

38

39 MR. BROWN: Question.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I think we're going
42 to have to have some justification for the record on
43 this if the proposal is actually adopted. For
44 starters, I know that 22 has C&T within 18 and that
45 portion I believe is Kotlik and some of those Lower
46 Yukon villages. They're also recognized in portions of
47 22, 22A.

48

49 MR. KRON: Do you want me to look that
50 up?

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Alex Nick.

2

3 MR. NICK: I just wanted to remind the
4 Council that you're representing the YK Delta Refuge.
5 Even though you are representing Unit 18, it just so
6 happens that Stebbins is right around the Refuge
7 boundary of Unit 18.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Thank you, Alex.
10 Mr. Kron.

11

12 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. Just for
13 clarification the customary and traditional use
14 determination for the 22A moose hunt is rural residents
15 of Unit 22, so it's basically the Seward Peninsula
16 Regional Council area.

17

18 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: And would this hunt
21 be restricted to Federal subsistence user, qualified
22 users only? I don't see that in the proposal.

23

24 MR. KRON: The hunt would be on Federal
25 lands in Unit 22A and those that would be eligible to
26 hunt would be those that have the C&T, which are the
27 residents of Unit 22 on the Federal side. Again, I
28 haven't checked the State regs, just like we talked
29 about earlier in Council member Charles' case. If
30 there was a State opportunity, people from Unit 18
31 could participate in that, but on the Federal side it's
32 the residents of Unit 22 under Federal regs.

33

34 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I didn't see that
37 in here specifically stated that it would be
38 restricted. I mean Federal hunts can open without the
39 requirement of only the recognized C&T or qualified
40 users, I believe. Many times it's done under a State
41 regulation or provided for or accommodated under a
42 State regulation, but there's nothing to preclude it
43 from going forward if it's not specifically identified
44 I would think.

45

46 I guess maybe overall we can go
47 forward. We'll just support our neighbors and it may
48 provide additional opportunity for some of our villages
49 within the area. As far as justification, we need to
50 have something on the record for that.

1 Any further discussion.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I know the question
6 was called twice already. Seeing none, the question
7 was called. All those in favor say aye to support the
8 Proposal No. 80 as requested.

9

10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Opposed same sign.

13

14 (No opposing votes)

15

16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Motion carries
17 unanimous. Proposal No. 81 for Unit 22 wolf although
18 it says moose on the proposal. I understand it was a
19 misprint.

20

21 Mr. Kron.

22

23 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. WP10-81 was
24 submitted by the Alaska Wildlife Alliance and seeks to
25 lower the wolf harvest limit in Unit 22.

26

27 The proposal requests a harvest limit
28 of wolves in Unit 22 of 10 wolves. So that would be a
29 reduction. Currently there is no limit on the wolf
30 take for hunting. Again you'll see on Page 223 the
31 regulatory information. Unit 22 is one of several in
32 the state that have a no limit for wolf hunting. The
33 current State regulation in Unit 22 is 20 wolves. So
34 the proposed reduction would essentially take the
35 Federal limit to less than the current State limit.

36

37 Kotlik has a positive customary and
38 traditional use determination to harvest wolves in Unit
39 22. So, again, this is a case where you do have a C&T
40 that is applicable.

41

42 There has been no harvest limit for
43 wolf hunters in Unit 22 since the beginning of the
44 Federal Subsistence Management Program in 1990. The
45 Unit 22 wolf harvest is not a conservation concern. It
46 appears that wolf numbers in Unit 22 have increased and
47 it is thought that the population is regulated more by
48 natural factors than by the harvest by hunters and
49 trappers.

50

1 OSM's preliminary conclusion is to
2 oppose Proposal WP10-81.

3
4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any questions for
7 Staff on that.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 *****
12 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
13 *****

14
15 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
16 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

17
18 Wildlife Proposal WP10-81:

19
20 This proposal changes the wolf hunting
21 season unlimited bag limit to 10 wolves in Unit 22.

22
23 Introduction:

24
25 Wolf populations in Unit 22 are not
26 censused; however, harvest and observation information
27 suggest that populations have increased in recent
28 years. The state bag limit for hunting wolves was set
29 at 20 wolves in 2007 by the Alaska Board of Game.
30 Current season (August 1 through April 30) allows for
31 maximum opportunity within areas that do not have
32 predator management programs. Current harvests
33 approximate 41 wolves per year based on sealing records
34 from 1997-2008 and are considered within sustained
35 yield for the population. Among hunters/trappers
36 taking wolves, no individual has reached the total bag
37 limit of 20 wolves per season. In November 2009, the
38 Alaska Board of Game rejected a proposal to change the
39 hunting season bag limit to 10 wolves (similar proposal
40 to WP10-81).

41
42 Impact on Subsistence Users:

43
44 Reducing the bag limit 10 wolves will
45 reduce opportunity for the few federal subsidence users
46 who successfully harvest more than 10 wolves by hunting
47 in Unit 22. Reducing the bag limit to 20 wolves to
48 match the state season would still provide the federal
49 subsistence opportunity but reduce the risk of
50 enforcement due to travel over mixed land ownership.

1 Opportunity Provided by State: In Unit
2 22 the following wolf hunting regulations were
3 effective in 2009-2010:

4
5 Twenty wolves; residents and
6 nonresidents; season August 1 through
7 April 30; tag required for
8 nonresidents; hide must be sealed
9 within 30 days of kill.

10
11 Conservation Issues: None.

12
13 Enforcement Issues:
14
15 Different bag limits for wolves across
16 federal land (approximately 1/3 of the unit) and non-
17 federal lands (2/3 of the unit) will create enforcement
18 problems due to differing land status in Unit 22.
19 Since the customary harvest by individuals is under 20
20 wolves, which is the state bag limit, a reduction of
21 the bag limit to match the state bag limit would reduce
22 the risk of enforcement actions if individuals are not
23 on federal lands, while continuing to provide the
24 federal opportunity for customary and traditional
25 subsistence by rural residents on federal lands.

26
27 Recommendation:
28
29 Oppose as submitted.

30
31 Support with modification to change the
32 federal subsistence bag limit from unlimited to 20
33 wolves and liberalizing the federal subsistence season
34 to match the state season in order to more closely
35 adopt customary and traditional subsistence use by
36 hunting of wolves and reduce enforcement due to mixed
37 land ownership.

38
39 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seeing none. Any
40 State comments regarding Proposal 81.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Tribal agency or
45 other governmental agency.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Local Fish and
50 Game Advisory Committees.

1 MR. CHARLES: No comments.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: No comment.

4 Written public comments. There is one in the book in
5 opposition to this from the Alaska Professional Hunters
6 Association.

7

8 We have a very high level of respect
9 for Alaska s wolf population and believe they are
10 integral to the fabric of Alaska. However, they have to
11 have population control measures that will enable prey
12 species to live within balance of what their habitats
13 will provide. Wolves have to be included into the
14 management process in an active enough manner to
15 provide maximum human benefit from the prey species.
16 This type of management provides the best stewardship
17 possible for the prey species as well as all people who
18 depend upon or enjoy the benefit of high density
19 population equilibriums. As the Federal Subsistence
20 Board is mandated with providing important subsistence
21 hunting opportunities and the scope of these proposals
22 takes away from that objective, we encourage the Board
23 not to pass these proposals.

24

25 Anyone from the public wish to address
26 this proposal to the Council.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Seeing none.

31 Motion on the table.

32

33 MR. ALOYSIUS: Mr. Chairman. Since we
34 make positive motions I have to move to adopt this
35 proposal, but keep in mind that if you want to oppose
36 it, you vote in the negative or no.

37

38 Mr. Chairman, I move that we adopt
39 Proposal WP10-81.

40

41 MR. H. WILDE: Second.

42

43 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Moved and seconded
44 Proposal No. 81 before us as presented. Discussion.

45

46 MR. ALOYSIUS: Just to make it clear,
47 if you oppose this motion, you vote no like I'm going
48 to.

49

50 (Laughter)

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Other discussion.
2
3 MR. ONEY: Question.
4
5 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Question on
6 Proposal 81 to limit the wolf harvest for subsistence
7 use in Unit 22. All those in favor say aye.
8
9 MR. BROWN: Aye.
10
11 (Laughter)
12
13 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Those opposed same
14 sign.
15
16 IN UNISON: Aye.
17
18 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I heard one aye.
19 Proposal fails six to one or one to six, intended or
20 no. Does any member wish to reconsider their vote.
21 That brings us to the end of proposals. We could take
22 care of a little bit of business here and then break
23 for the evening. I know other folks, myself at least,
24 have other commitments for the evening.
25
26 MR. ALOYSIUS: I have to step down.
27
28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We'll go ahead and
29 step down for 10 minutes.
30
31 (Off record)
32
33 (On record)
34
35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Back on record 4:26
36 p.m. We'll move through one more item of general
37 business and then go ahead and break for the evening.
38 Item 12 Regional Council business. First we have the
39 review of the draft 2009 annual report.
40
41 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Alex Nick for
42 the record. I was working off of the transcripts from
43 the fall meeting transcripts because I wasn't here when
44 you met last October. Based on the transcript there
45 was only one annual report topic, which is the
46 proactive management strategies of subsistence resource
47 populations to provide and maintain adequate resource
48 to meet subsistence harvest needs and that's on Page
49 219 of your workbook.
50

1 According to the transcript, if my
2 recollections are correct, I think the Chair directed
3 the Council members to call me or contact me if there
4 are other issues you would like included in the annual
5 report. I did not receive any calls or I was not
6 contacted by any of the members. It's on Page 219 of
7 your workbook.

8
9 Mr. Chair.

10
11 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Mr. Kron.

12
13 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. Just one
14 thing that came up yesterday was recollecting the
15 discussion and concern about customary trade on the
16 Yukon. As Mr. Probasco noted, your annual report would
17 be an opportunity to raise that issue and put in a
18 request for enforcement of the existing State and
19 Federal laws.

20
21 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Good. One of the
24 things I'd like to have noted in this issue one. Of
25 course, it's been ongoing for several years, but in the
26 response that we received from the Secretary and OSM at
27 the time said that they believed that they're already
28 providing for subsistence needs and that totally
29 avoided the whole point of the issue we were trying to
30 make and we've reasserted and not only this Council but
31 many others as well to the Federal Subsistence Board
32 where the OSM in the response said that they believed
33 that they are providing for the harvest needs already.
34 It's back to that point again that they are not
35 providing for subsistence harvest needs if you are only
36 managing the human harvest. That is the whole point
37 and that is what the Service and the management
38 agencies need to face up to.

39
40 I don't know to what level we might
41 include in here, but maybe there is the standing
42 resolution from the Alaska Federation of Natives
43 specifically asking for action from these agencies
44 within one year to come up with management plans on how
45 they're going to manage their populations, the actual
46 fish and wildlife populations, to provide for
47 subsistence needs and to do it within one year and how
48 we might amend this to perhaps request directly within
49 here that in the interim that the Federal Subsistence
50 Board amend their predator management policy or state

1 that each of their member agencies should adopt the
2 policy of the Bureau of Land Management in the interim
3 until they can come up with plans of their own.

4

5 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Is it my
6 understanding that you want to include that on your
7 annual report?

8

9 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I would like a
10 statement in there specifically saying that in their
11 response to our last year's report where they believe
12 they are providing for subsistence harvest needs
13 totally avoided the question and they are not doing so
14 and should be well aware of that by eight of the 10
15 Regional Councils coming forward with that to the
16 meetings with the Secretary. And until the managing
17 agencies of the State and the Interior Department
18 within Alaska recognizes and addresses that need in the
19 State they are going to continue to be a failure in
20 subsistence management for the State.

21

22 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. With the
23 concurrence from your remaining Council members, I
24 could work with you on that before we finalize and get
25 this sent off by the Chair.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Okay. Is there any
28 objection to including those?

29

30 (No objection)

31

32 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: How about the point
33 that Mr. Kron has raised as far as including a section
34 on concerns for enforcement on the customary trade
35 that's developing into more of a commercial concern in
36 the upper portions of the Yukon River. Is there
37 interest in including that here? We may want to
38 address it under the proposals which we'll be taking up
39 tomorrow. I've been informed that there may be some
40 draft proposals for us to consider regarding that issue
41 specifically that we can take up also. But just to
42 include in the report as far as the enforcement aspect
43 and then along with possible fisheries proposal to
44 address regulatory changes.

45

46 MR. H. WILDE: Mr. Chairman.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Harry Wilde.

49

50 MR. H. WILDE: I think we have to do

1 something because all these years and all this time
2 that customary trade we get blamed from up river. Most
3 of the king salmon that is taken away from us, but my
4 understanding that customary trade upriver they really
5 honest and sometimes we ask them not to touch the first
6 run and even when we go to AFN Convention you could see
7 outside of the convention three, four boxes of strips.
8 They're selling it and not only that from other
9 villages, other villages from up there. Even I start
10 seeing some Cabela stores they start selling strips and
11 others.

12
13 We have to do something because it
14 really bothers some people up here and Lower Yukon.
15 They've been telling us that they do it for some
16 purpose, it would be okay, but after they take all the
17 fish and even feed them for the dog feed and we get
18 blamed for it. It really bothers me really hard. I
19 try to work with them too myself. Something has to be
20 done.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: So is there any
23 objection that we -- there would be no objection to
24 including a comment or issue item in here on the
25 concern for the enforcement on the customary trade and
26 the elevating levels it's occurring on the Yukon king
27 salmon.

28
29 (No objections)

30
31 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We could work up
32 the language to include there. Bob.

33
34 MR. ALOYSIUS: Why do we have to limit
35 it to king salmon? They're doing it with other salmon
36 too.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Leave it for salmon
39 in general but maybe -- you know, the Yukon kings, of
40 course, are the stocks of concern at the moment. Of
41 yield concern, not what they call a biological concern
42 as yet. Yeah, make it generic. We can couch the
43 language to be inclusive for all salmon.

44
45 (Council nods affirmatively)

46
47 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Any other issues
48 anybody wanted to bring forward.

49
50 MR. ALOYSIUS: Beaver damns.

1 (Laughter)

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Besides beaver.

4

5 MR. ALOYSIUS: I just had to throw that
6 one out again because it still is a very, very major
7 concern of the people at home. We are practically
8 unable to do anything about eradicating a abandoned --
9 let me say that again -- abandoned beaver dams.
10 They're plugging up more and more of our streams for
11 our whitefish, pike, sheefish, lush and even salmon and
12 it really hinders for berry pickers when they go and
13 their streams are plugged up and they can't go and they
14 can't set their whitefish nets because there's no place
15 for them because beaver dams are there. The beaver are
16 there a year and they leave and go down in some other
17 part of the same creek over and over and over.

18

19 The major thing I have here is I don't
20 want anybody to respond to me by paper saying that
21 beaver dams are beneficial. We all know they are. In
22 the mainstream, yes, but not in the tributaries. They
23 are not a benefit. They are a hindrance and they
24 create a lot of bad water and they're killing some of
25 our lakes.

26

27 Even if we can't get the Fish and
28 Wildlife Service to support us in eradicating beaver
29 dams, there has to be some other means where we can do
30 it legally and I'd like to find out how that can be
31 done.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Alex.

34

35 MR. NICK: Remember, I think it was
36 last winter, the issue came up and there was a
37 recommendation by the Refuge to allow Refuge work with
38 the villages. I'm wondering if that happened over the
39 summer.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We don't have any
42 Refuge folks here to speak to that. We need to include
43 that again to continue to pursue options or what kind
44 of alternatives we can come up with to address this.

45

46 Anything else.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: We can move on to

1 the next one, Item B, confirm our meeting dates and
2 places for fall 2010 and winter 2011.

3

4 Alex.

5

6 MR. NICK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. On
7 Page 22, during your fall meeting you chose your
8 meeting date for fall of 2010 and I believe you chose
9 September 30 and October 1st. You need to confirm that
10 and the location of the meeting is to be announced.

11

12 Mr. Chair.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: The discussion we
15 had on it at the time we were looking at the following
16 week is going to be AVCP convention. If we come up
17 with anything that we wanted to address there and also
18 some of the members are involved in AVCP. Also this
19 time we'd be meeting before the Western Interior, so we
20 could bring some things to them for their support. The
21 other way around. It seems to occur quite a bit.

22

23 I'm good with that. Does anybody want
24 to make any changes.

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Hearing none.
29 We're still good with the fall meeting. How about the
30 winter then.

31

32 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. For winter 2011
33 North Slope is meeting on February 15. Northwest
34 Arctic is meeting on February 18. Eastern Interior is
35 meeting on March 1 and 2. Western Interior on March 8
36 and 9.

37

38 Mr. Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I kind of like that
41 February 23 and 24. It kind of falls before -- if we
42 do have any kind of State Board meetings that we might
43 be involved with or address those. They're generally
44 the last week of February, first part of March. The
45 Board of Game right now is meeting from the 26th
46 through the 7th. I notice you're back to two days.

47

48 MR. NICK: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. What
49 dates?

50

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: I was looking at
2 23, 24 just as a tentative.

3
4 MR. NICK: March?

5
6 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: February. The
7 dates for now. Location.

8
9 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chair. What about
10 fall where?

11
12 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It's to be
13 announced. We didn't come to a consensus on it last
14 time. I know there's still the interest -- the fall
15 meeting most people seem to want in Bethel, but the
16 winter meeting it would still be nice I think to meet
17 in one of the area villages again if we can get back to
18 that.

19
20 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. One of the
21 problems we encounter is paying vendors in the village
22 outside of a hub like Bethel is the requirement that we
23 have that a vendor is registered in Central
24 Contractor's Registration, called CCR. We can go
25 around that when a village is selected or registered,
26 but we have a hard time working with them. Like St.
27 Mary's, for example. It would take up a lot of time to
28 have them registered in CCR. Maybe Tom could clarify
29 that a little bit.

30
31 Mr. Chair.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Go ahead, Tom.

34
35 MR. KRON: There's a Federal policy,
36 it's nation wide and essentially it requires us to work
37 in situations like this with vendors that are
38 registered electronically so they can be paid
39 electronically. In the bigger communities, people are
40 more able to get everything set up. It requires some
41 computer savvy and providing information. Again there
42 are vendors here in Bethel, there are vendors in St.
43 Mary's. But again, like Alex said, for the smaller
44 villages if they aren't set up, and most of them
45 aren't, it's a challenge to get it set up.

46
47 I know there's been a request through
48 the Subsistence Review Process to be able to meet in a
49 number of more remote villages, but I guess what we
50 would like to ask is you look at St. Mary's for example

1 in the Yukon and Bethel here on the Kuskokwim as the
2 two hub villages for this region.

3

4 Again, it's your call. We'll do the
5 best we can, but just wanted to let you know kind of
6 what the situation is. The CCR thing that Alex
7 mentioned is that electronic payment process is
8 something we can't get around. So if the decision is
9 to meet in one of these smaller villages, Alex needs to
10 go through an approval process to get the okay to do
11 it. There are budget issues. It's hard because of
12 weather and then we've got to work -- Alex will need to
13 work with a vendor, the corporation or somebody, to get
14 them set up in the electronic process. That can be a
15 real challenge and difficult. It sometimes doesn't
16 happen.

17

18 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Ray.

21

22 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr.
23 Chairman. Is it possible to get a list of those
24 villages that are registered maybe before the fall
25 meeting?

26

27 MR. KRON: The answer to the question
28 is yes, we could probably find that out, but the
29 problem is they have to renew annually. So depending
30 on when they were registered and when that registration
31 is expiring. Usually we have to check with them right
32 before the meeting to confirm that they're going to be
33 registered when the meeting happens. So we could check
34 now but it wouldn't mean much. The thing would be to
35 work with wherever we're going to meet just prior to
36 the meeting, make sure they're registered in CCR so we
37 can actually make it happen.

38

39 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Continue Ray.

42

43 MR. ONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
44 You've got the whole month of January to do that, so
45 that should give you enough time to work with those
46 villages. You could almost see, you know, who's been
47 registering almost every year. But again, you know,
48 January would be a good time, beginning of January.

49

50 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob Aloysius.

2

3 MR. ALOYSIUS: Who are your qualified
4 vendors in St. Mary's?

5

6 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. We were working
7 with the (indiscernible) Corporation, which is the Old
8 Mission that we met one time. We were trying to work
9 with them on CCR registration. Unfortunately they did
10 not do that, so last winter we had to relocate the
11 meeting to Bethel.

12

13 I'll give you one good example, I
14 think. Lower Kalskag, we met up there a couple years
15 ago and I worked very closely with the tribal council
16 in Lower Kalskag and we thought they were registered
17 and we found out they weren't. When a payment was made
18 for their services, us using their facilities, what
19 happened was there was a mess-up on the payment. They
20 were paid and they were complaining they weren't paid.
21 What happened, according to what I gather from our
22 office in Anchorage, what happened was a payment was
23 made to one of their accounts, local accounts, but they
24 didn't know. So we worked closely with them trying to
25 get them paid for about over six months after the
26 meeting was over. So this kind of situations we get
27 into and it takes up a lot of Staff time on our part.

28

29 For that reason, even though I hate to
30 say that we should meet in a hub like Bethel or St.
31 Mary's, you know I strongly recommend that we do.

32

33 Mr. Chair.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Tom.

36

37 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. Again, Mr.
38 Chair, Mr. Oney, Mr. Aloysius. I have Staff working
39 for me and when we're trying to help a village get set
40 up in CCR, it sounds like it takes hours even for
41 people that are really computer savvy to do it. Again,
42 we'll have people on the phone, my staff are on the
43 phone with the people in the village helping them do it
44 each step of the way as they do it electronically.

45

46 Then there's a 24-hour period to
47 confirm that in fact they've answered all the questions
48 and we basically work with them a second day. Some
49 people throw their hands up in the air and say we don't
50 need this, it's not work the business and that's

1 happened a number of times. It sounds like that may
2 have been the case there with St. Mary's. We've had
3 that happen in a number of villages.

4
5 The bigger cities where they get a fair
6 amount of Federal business it's a different story, but
7 in some of the villages they just may decide it's not
8 worth all this hassle for the business they get. We do
9 our best to help get people set up. It's the law that
10 we have to do it.

11
12 Anyway, that's the situation.

13
14 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It was my
17 impression it was not that involved a process because
18 part of being on that CCR registry for a lot of the
19 villages is also now contingent on receiving Federal
20 funds for different projects through the EPA IGAP
21 Program and every village that I know of has an IGAP
22 coordinator. So they have to be registered somehow on
23 that CCR listing. So I'm having a little bit of
24 difficulty here.

25
26 Our accountant from Nupuskiak took care
27 of it. Well, he's good anyway. We always get really
28 good audits. Anyway, like I say, you have to be
29 already listed even to obtain -- I think OSM as well
30 even to -- some of the projects we have here. I
31 believe we have to be -- organizations that are -- we
32 have project funded through that have to have to have
33 that CCR registry. I've never physically myself gone
34 through it.

35
36 Go ahead.

37
38 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. You're exactly
39 right. My understanding for the fishery monitoring
40 projects, for example, and ONC has some, KNA has some
41 out of Aniak for example. When we've held Western
42 Interior Regional Council meetings in Aniak essentially
43 what's happened is KNA, because they've got the CCR
44 registration because of the monitoring projects,
45 they've essentially handled all the money and the
46 distribution to the various people that provided
47 lodging and food and that kind of stuff. So we've done
48 that. We try to do it as easily as we can, but it ends
49 up being a challenge.

50

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Again, I have to
4 reiterate that the IGAP, which is through the EPA and I
5 believe it's on the YK Delta, if not in every village,
6 90-plus percent would have an IGAP coordinator. I'll
7 go to somebody else. James, then Bob.

8

9 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10 What's wrong with meeting in Anchorage. Makes things
11 easier for you guys.

12

13 (Laughter)

14

15 MR. ALOYSIUS: The reason I asked for
16 St. Mary's is we haven't been there in over six years.
17 I remember the first meeting I went to in St. Mary's
18 and every couple years they ask when are you guys going
19 to meet on the Yukon again. Well, we met in Emmonak,
20 we met in Marshall and we promised two different times
21 that we're going to meet in St. Mary's because it is a
22 central location for people from downriver and upriver
23 to meet. They had a lot of concerns and yet somehow or
24 another our meetings are always in Bethel. I know one
25 time it was because of weather. That was an unforeseen
26 thing. I think we really need to consider going back
27 to St. Mary's and make them realize we're still here
28 and we're here to help them.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Why don't we go
31 ahead and put that on there tentative for our winter
32 meeting next year. I remember if we got the schedule
33 correct that would be timely as well because the
34 proposals we put in, the fisheries proposals that are
35 going to be coming forward since we're going to these
36 off-year cycle now, will they be taken up like next May
37 or do they happen next January?

38

39 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Is my
40 understanding that you want to meet next winter in St.
41 Mary's?

42

43 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: That's my
44 suggestion and Bob's suggestion. If we can go for
45 that, yeah. February 23rd and 24th in St. Mary's. Is
46 that good for folks?

47

48 (Council nods affirmatively)

49

50 MR. ALOYSIUS: Do we need a motion to

1 that affect?

2

3 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Just general
4 consent here. Any objection for St. Mary's, February
5 23 and 24, 2011. So we got that down.

6

7 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Last year I
8 worked tirelessly with St. Mary's trying to get them
9 registered in CCR. They failed, so we moved the
10 meeting to Bethel. I'm willing to go ahead and try
11 that again one more time and it's something that's not
12 very easy especially when management changes around a
13 little bit, you know.

14

15 To give you an example, if it wasn't
16 for Steve Miller, who is the US Fish and Wildlife
17 Service fishery biologist with Kenai Refuge, the
18 Moravian Church would not get a CCR registration on a
19 timely basis for this meeting. I applaud Steve Miller
20 for helping the volunteers here to get the Moravian
21 Church registered. Even though some folks say it takes
22 about a day or a couple days to do that, it took us
23 over two weeks to get this church registered in CCR.

24

25 Mr. Chair.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Bob.

28

29 MR. ALOYSIUS: There's more agencies in
30 St. Mary's than that. Andreafsky is one, the city of
31 St. Marys is another, and the tribe has, like he
32 mentioned, an IGAP program.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: It would be our
35 intent and we'd like to put forth the effort to try to
36 have the meeting in St. Mary's. I'm not questioning
37 your dedication to try to make it happen. We can put
38 it down for that. Bob.

39

40 MR. ALOYSIUS: When are we going to TBA
41 our fall meeting? I don't like to be TBA. I like to
42 have a firm date.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Alex.

45

46 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. TBA stands for
47 to be announced for a location.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: TBA is specifically
50 for the place of the meeting and we went through the

1 same round of conversation that we just got done with
2 as far as finding a.....

3

4 MR. ALOYSIUS: I know. Who's taking
5 responsibility to announce where the meeting is going
6 to be and what dates they're going to be? I like to
7 have something concrete so I can put it in my calendar.
8 I have to reserve this spot at this time.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Our choices are St.
11 Mary's and Bethel unless we get some other villages
12 confirmed on this registry.

13

14 MR. ALOYSIUS: Still September 30 and
15 October 1?

16

17 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Yeah, that's what
18 we reserved last time around.

19

20 MR. ALOYSIUS: Let's do a change of
21 pace and go for St. Mary's for the fall and Bethel in
22 the winter.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Charlie.

25

26 MR. BROWN: One time we had a meeting
27 in Emmonak. I had an experience with my connection
28 flights. That time it was kind of late evening. We
29 come here to this area from Yukon and then they
30 couldn't bring me home to my village. We still got
31 plenty of daylight to make it out, but anyhow they
32 wouldn't take me back, so I stay overnight. Should you
33 guys adjust the flights from like direct from Yukon to
34 our own villages instead of landing here first?

35

36 MR. NICK: Mr. Brown through the Chair.
37 When your travel arrangements are made, they're made --
38 the reservations are made through the travel agency and
39 if we change your flight -- if you plan to change your
40 flight, you need to tell us early in the day and we
41 could do what we can to change your flight, you know,
42 make connections. Otherwise our agency would be
43 charged a fee for changing the flights.

44

45 MR. BROWN: Also sometimes the weather
46 is the factor.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: How do people feel
49 about Bob's suggestion as far as go for St. Mary's in
50 the fall and Bethel for the winter meeting. Ray.

1 MR. ONEY: Mr. Chairman. I move that
2 we have the fall meeting in St. Mary's from 9/30 to
3 10/1 and the winter meeting here in Bethel from 2/23 to
4 2/24.

5
6 MR. ALOYSIUS: Second the motion.

7
8 MR. H. WILDE: Second.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: Further discussion.
11 Is there any objection.

12
13 (No objections)

14
15 CHAIRMAN ROCZICKA: No objection. So
16 it is written, so let it be done. With that we can
17 conclude our meeting for the evening. I know there was
18 a couple folks that had said they were intending to be
19 here for some of the agency and organization reports
20 that were upcoming. Whether they're going to make it
21 or not remains to be seen, but we can go ahead and
22 recess for the evening and come back at 9:00 tomorrow
23 morning and wrap her up by noon, mid-afternoon at the
24 latest, something of that nature.

25
26 Were done for the evening.

27
28 (Off record)

29
30 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

