

1 WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6
7 VOLUME II

8
9 Aniak, Alaska
10 February 26, 2014
11 9:00 a.m.

12
13
14 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

15
16 Jack Reakoff, Chairman
17 Ray Collins
18 Timothy Gervais
19 Carl Morgan
20 Jenny Pelkola
21 Pollock Simon
22 James Walker
23 Robert Walker

24
25
26
27
28 Regional Council Coordinator, Melinda Burke
29

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Recorded and transcribed by:
43
44 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
45 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
46 Anchorage, AK 99501
47 907-243-0668/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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Aniak, Alaska - 2/26/2014)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good morning. The Western Interior Regional Council meeting will come back to order. We usually have non-agenda items for the public for comments at the beginning of the meeting. So if we have any -- don't have any non-agenda items.

So we're on our agenda here. We're down to the customary and traditional use determination presentation. Melinda. We can forego that if the person is not here. That would be David.

MS. BURKE: I have a suggestion.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Melinda.

MS. BURKE: Folks on the line, folks in the room. We're still getting folks shuttled over here from breakfast. Dr. Jenkins is not quite here in the room yet. Since we have Jean on the phone and since we have Lisa, a tribal person here, why don't we go ahead and cover -- if it's okay with you, Jean, why don't we go ahead and cover the tribal consultation implementation guidelines that we briefly talked about yesterday and go ahead and take care of that this morning as we get some of the other presenters that are here in Aniak with us shuttled over to the building if that's okay with everybody.

Jean.

MS. GAMACHE: That works for me.

MS. BURKE: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GAMACHE: Let me pick up my handset.

MS. BURKE: I know it's completely opposite from what I just told you just a couple minutes ago.

MS. GAMACHE: That's okay. If that works for the Council, I'm fine with it.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That would be great,
2 Jean. We'll turn to Page 106 in our packet here. Let
3 the Council get on that page for a second. We have
4 other people arriving now. We're going to be doing the
5 tribal consultation presentation by Jean Gamache, so
6 she's on the line here.

7

8 Go ahead, Jean.

9

10 MS. GAMACHE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11 Thank you, Council members. My name is Jean Gamache.
12 I'm the Alaska Native Affairs liaison for the National
13 Park Service. I'm going to be describing a couple of
14 documents that are in draft form. What we're seeking
15 is comments, review and comments from tribes, from
16 corporations, from the RACs, from SRCs, basically
17 anyone who is engaged in this process. This is an
18 important process that we want to make sure that we get
19 it right, so we're seeking feedback from everyone on
20 these draft documents.

21

22 As the Chairman mentioned, on Page 106
23 there's a short report, which is what I'm going to go
24 through, and then the two documents I'm going to be
25 describing are the -- it starts on Page 108 and that's
26 the Implementation Guideline for the Tribal
27 Consultation Policy that was adopted by the Board back
28 in 2012. The second document is the draft consultation
29 policy for consulting with ANCSA corporations.

30

31 So just to start with the first
32 document -- as I mentioned, the Tribal Consultation
33 Policy was adopted in 2012. One of the things that the
34 Board recognized is the importance of having guidance
35 on how to implement the consultation policy
36 effectively. That guidance is intended to be used by
37 Federal staff as they move forward in implementing the
38 policy and consulting with tribes during the regulatory
39 cycles that go forward.

40

41 These guidelines are intended to be
42 used by Federal staff, but we want to make sure it
43 works effectively and so we want to make sure that we
44 have input and review by, as I said, everyone who is
45 engaged in this process.

46

47 The implementation guideline provides
48 direction on how the meeting should occur, when they
49 should occur, what kind of interaction will make it
50 more effective, how to basically create an effective

1 consultation process. So things like when the meeting
2 should occur, who should be present, even things like
3 how the room should be set up to make sure that we have
4 an appropriate -- just to make sure that we basically
5 recognize appropriate protocol when it's government-to-
6 government consultation.

7
8 If you look at the policy, I just want
9 to mention a couple things. Yesterday I heard that
10 there were some concerns mentioned about
11 consultation.....

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Say, Jean, your
14 phone is kind of breaking up just a little teeny bit.
15 I'm not sure what the problem is there.

16
17 MS. GAMACHE: Huh. I've got the
18 handset.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, you're on the
21 handset.

22
23 MS. GAMACHE: Yeah. Should I speak
24 louder?

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are you on a cell
27 phone?

28
29 MS. GAMACHE: No. I'm on my landline.
30 Sorry.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I'm not sure
33 if the cord is not loose or something, but it's kind of
34 breaking just a little bit, but go right ahead. I just
35 wanted to see if we could fix something there.

36
37 MS. GAMACHE: Let me try and jiggle the
38 wire here. Is that better?

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Just go ahead and
41 we'll see how it goes.

42
43 MS. GAMACHE: Okay. So a couple of
44 things I wanted to draw your attention to in the
45 guideline. Yesterday I know that there was some
46 concern expressed about consultation and it not being
47 as effective as it could be or perhaps not even
48 occurring. One of the things that we, as Federal
49 agencies, struggle with is how to get the word out, how
50 do we get information out. We recognize that tribes

1 have a lot on their plates.

2

3 We want to make sure that we get the
4 word out that these consultations are occurring. So if
5 there's feedback and guidance that you can provide to
6 us that would help us in getting the word out more
7 effectively, then we are definitely interested in
8 hearing about that. Hopefully we can implement those
9 methods of communicating so we want this to be
10 effective. We want this to be an effective process, so
11 that's the intent of developing these guidelines.

12

13 One thing I did want to draw your
14 attention to is in addition to kind of the normal cycle
15 that's going to be undertaken throughout the regulatory
16 process, the proposal process and then providing
17 opportunity for consulting as the proposals come
18 through. There's also some guidance on in-season
19 actions and in-season management.

20

21 So when emergencies come up -- which I
22 think is becoming more of an issue. When emergencies
23 come up where actions have to be taken on a very short
24 timeframe,
25 there's also a couple paragraphs included in here that
26 would guide the land managers on how to consult in that
27 sort of situation. So I just wanted to draw that to
28 your attention to make sure that that's going to be as
29 effective -- that we can make that as effective as
30 possible to make sure it works for everyone.

31

32 Then the last thing I wanted to mention
33 in terms of the implementation guidance is that the
34 Board recognizes that training for Federal staff is
35 very, very important. In addition to that training for
36 tribes, for ANCSA corporations, it could be helpful in
37 how we're engaging in this process. If you look at
38 Page 114, there's a list of training opportunities.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Say, Jean.

41

42 MS. GAMACHE: Yes.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Your phone is
45 breaking again. I'm not sure if your cord is not loose
46 or something. Are you stretching the cord? It got
47 better when you -- or maybe you're talking too fast for
48 the system here or I'm not sure what's going on, but
49 it's starting to get to where we can't quite get what
50 you're saying.

1 MS. GAMACHE: Okay. Let me try putting
2 you on speakerphone. Hold on just a second. Is that
3 better?

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll see how it
6 goes.

7
8 MS. GAMACHE: Okay. I'll wrap up here
9 in just a second. So the implementation guidelines is
10 on Page 114. It is a list of training opportunities.
11 So if you have thoughts or questions for what kind of
12 training and when training should occur, that would be
13 helpful.

14
15 So moving on to the next one is the
16 draft ANCSA consultation policy. This was --
17 consulting with ANCSA corporations was something that
18 Congress mandated that all Federal agencies have to do,
19 so the Board directed that we develop -- a small
20 workgroup develop this draft consultation policy. So
21 it was drafted -- it reflects quite a bit of the
22 national DOI policy on consulting with ANCSA
23 corporations that was adopted by DOI last year.

24
25 Again, if you could review this
26 document, provide any comments back. Those comments
27 are due back on March 21st. We'd definitely be
28 interested in hearing your views and receiving your
29 comments and suggestions. With that, I'll wrap up. If
30 anyone has any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do any Council
33 members have any questions for Jean or comments on the
34 tribal consultation process.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Lisa. We have Lisa
39 from -- Upper Kalskag or Lower Kalskag?

40
41 MS. FEYEREISEN: Chuathbaluk. Native
42 Village of Chuathbaluk. Actually I'm from Crow
43 Village, which is easier to say, but I am the tribal
44 administrator in the Native Village of Chuathbaluk, so
45 I'm speaking as a Native administrator.

46
47 I just needed some clarification. I
48 heard you refer to ANCSA corporations and tribes
49 indiscriminatory and they're clearly two different
50 organizations and there's clearly two different sets of

1 regulations that guide them. I wanted to call your
2 attention to -- I would be really careful -- and we
3 will probably, since I've seen this, now do a formal
4 response to the proposed guidelines.

5
6 There are several organizations in the
7 Kuskokwim River which carry on government-to-government
8 consultations with the red double line at BLM. So
9 we've worked out pretty good procedures on those, so
10 I'm hoping that you get feedback from a bunch of tribes
11 and I hope that this is actually sent out to tribes.

12
13 I was having a discussion with someone
14 this morning. We find out about Federal meetings
15 through the State of Alaska. We don't find out from
16 the Federal people. I found out from Bethel about
17 these meetings. We have a much better relationship
18 with BLM, with the Army Corps, with other DOI agencies.
19 They contact us, we know who their tribal liaisons are,
20 we know what policies we're being asked to review. Of
21 course, because we are overwhelmed with -- I mean we're
22 asked to review the treasury policies -- we pick and
23 choose, but something like this is extremely important
24 for us to be involved in.

25
26 I would really -- because it's such a
27 quick turnaround in March, I would really recommend
28 that you guys get the current contact list from BIA as
29 to all the tribal governments in Alaska and that this
30 gets sent out to email. Because a lot of us are in the
31 Bush, we do have up and down internet intervals, but
32 overall that tends to be quicker than the dog teams
33 that still deliver our mail at times.

34
35 Like I said, I would just be really
36 careful because many tribes have set up how they meet
37 with government-to-government. For instance, the Native
38 Village of Chuathbaluk, the Village of Lower Kalskag
39 and the Native Village of Napaimiut have been having
40 government-to-government consultation process with U.S.
41 Fish and Wildlife since August and none of our meetings
42 are public meetings. We meet privately with you as
43 Fish and Wildlife. We have a delegation, they have a
44 delegation, and these aren't public notice meetings.
45 These are ongoing negotiations about topics of concern
46 for either themselves or ourselves. There are no
47 minutes taken and no minutes are revealed for these
48 meetings.

49
50 Like I said, different tribes have been

1 pretty involved in government-to-government and each
2 tribe is a sovereign nation and, as such, we develop
3 our own protocol for meetings. So it's hard to come up
4 with general guidelines that would cover all the
5 tribes. As sovereign nation status, we're meeting just
6 like the U.S. Federal government would be meeting with
7 Canada. We are meeting with the U.S. Federal
8 government.

9

10 Thank you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for those
13 comments, Lisa. Appreciate that. Other Council
14 members have comments on this draft consultation
15 implementation guidelines.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I will make comment.

20 At this time I don't see that the system is working.
21 Things keep falling through the giant cracks in the
22 floor. I've been saying this over and over. We need a
23 process where we utilize BLM, U.S. Fish and Wildlife,
24 National Park Service and the Forest Service,
25 subsistence coordinators to do some groundwork for the
26 Native liaison regional offices of the National Park
27 Service, BLM, U.S. Fish and Wildlife and OSM and the Ag
28 Department.

29

30 We need to have all these proposals
31 divided out that affect the people of tribes for their
32 region so they don't just send out an email, here,
33 download this huge document that people may not be able
34 to download off a slow internet, break it down into
35 what proposals are going to affect those communities
36 and then call them -- email and call and get a hold of
37 the tribal administrators to get it on the tribal
38 agenda in a timely manner so that they can address the
39 issues.

40

41 Also, these coordinators need to be
42 utilized by OSM so that -- I keep hearing about this.
43 We put it on the radio, whatever, we send it to the
44 tribes, but these things are not effective. We have
45 subsistence coordinators for all these Refuges and all
46 these Federal lands and those people have to start
47 contacting the tribes. Okay, we're going to have a
48 meeting in Galena, so they better be calling Nulato,
49 Kaltag, Koyukuk, Huslia, Galena and Ruby and telling
50 people within traveling distance and call them and tell

1 them we have a meeting.

2

3 So we have to have more of an on-the-
4 ground system for feedback into the tribes and we need
5 to have reporting back by those coordinators to the
6 main regional offices, which would be Eugene and Jack
7 Lorrigan and those coordinators back in Anchorage so
8 that they can affirm that these consultation processes
9 are going forward and then you can transmit back down
10 through them.

11

12 So that would be my comment. We need
13 more of a grounds-on
14 effect. We can't just work out of the regional office
15 broadcasting all this high documentation stuff that
16 people may not be able to download and it's like
17 confusing. Who wants to get a Federal book that's like
18 got 100-some proposals in it and try to figure out
19 which ones affect different game management units and
20 customary and traditional use. That's the
21 coordinators' jobs. That's what their job is to do. I
22 don't want to hear about the tribes having to figure
23 this stuff out. I want to hear about those
24 coordinators doing that work.

25

26 Vince does it. He'll break it all down
27 for us for certain areas and there's coordinators that
28 do that, but all the coordinators -- this is your job,
29 you're going to do this. I want to see these tribes
30 informed about these proposals. I don't want to hear
31 people going like I heard about this from the State of
32 Alaska down in Bethel or somewhere else. I don't want
33 to hear that.

34

35 This highly affects the effectiveness
36 of this Council to do its work. It's on my thing here.
37 What's the report on tribal consultation. I'm getting
38 nobody -- no report. We have a blank. So I think it's
39 not working. We need to have a grounds-on effect.

40

41 So that would be my comment and I'll
42 get off my soapbox. That's probably more than you
43 wanted to hear, Jean. You've probably heard this
44 before.

45

46 MS. GAMACHE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman
47 and Council members. This is exactly the kind of
48 information and feedback that we are seeking. I've
49 taken notes on the comments that were provided today.
50 I think it's really important and we're looking forward

1 to any more formal comments that you'd like to submit.
2 I think the people who are working on this are
3 interested in making it work effectively. One way to
4 make that happen is to take the comments that are
5 provided by the people who are engaged in this process
6 and including that and incorporating that into these
7 implementation guidelines.

8

9 I want to thank you all for your
10 comments and thank you for your time. I'm looking
11 forward to perhaps hearing more comments from you
12 before the deadline.

13

14 Mr. Chairman, one last comment that I'd
15 like to make is that the Board recognizes that this is
16 a new process, relatively new process that they're
17 undertaking and that they do recognize that those
18 documents need to be living documents, that this
19 process needs to be open to change and modification as
20 we're moving forward. So the Board has recognized that
21 -- we will revisit these documents and make sure this
22 is not -- it's not going to become set in stone. So
23 hopefully we'll continue fine-tuning and we'll continue
24 trying to make this a more effective process for
25 everyone.

26

27 Thank you again, Mr. Chairman and
28 Council members.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Jean. I
31 feel that we have the staff. It's not an additional
32 burden of cost to the Federal government. We have the
33 staff. We just have to get that staff involved and
34 they have to be reporting back to the regional offices,
35 to their main Native liaison, so they can report back,
36 oh, yeah, I've broken this all down, this is what --
37 these proposals affect these communities, these
38 proposals affect those communities.

39

40 So you know what's going on in the
41 field and then we get -- I contacted this person at
42 this community and this person at that community and
43 they've said they're putting it on their agenda, so
44 that we're not just broadcasting huge documents in the
45 dark. It's like a radio station in Anchorage
46 broadcasting 50,000 watts and does anybody got the
47 radio on. It's like no. We need to -- this needs to
48 be a little more fine tuned. Yeah, I understand it's
49 in the infancy, but there's some things that need to be
50 adjusted of the bigger picture.

1 Any other comments by the Council on
2 the tribal consultation.

3

4 Go ahead, Robert.

5

6 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr.
7 Chairman. One of the questions I would have is OSM
8 here, step 1.B, Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory
9 Council meetings (winter meetings February through
10 March): During these meetings, the RACs develop
11 proposals to change subsistence regulations. The
12 Tribes have the opportunity to work with the RACs to
13 draft proposals.

14

15 One of the things that really strikes
16 me and probably our tribes is that send public notice
17 to all announcing all RAC meetings. Sometimes, you
18 know -- like you just brought this up, Jack -- we don't
19 get notifications for a lot of these things. We don't
20 get proposals in our tribe because I go down and I go
21 through the mail. I'm the second chief there whenever
22 our first chief is gone. I go down and I go through
23 the mail.

24

25 There is sometimes a lack of
26 communication here. I mean the mail service shouldn't
27 be that bad because, I mean, when you look at it, you
28 read it, only \$1 billion in the hole, the U.S. Postal
29 Service, but it still has responsibility. I didn't
30 even get my packet in the mail from Melinda.

31

32 So there are things here that you're
33 going to have to go to your office, maybe even have to
34 fire a few people. You're going to have to take the
35 solicitor aside and have a consultation with him too
36 because he's interfering into our tribes. We don't
37 need this here. We're trying to work for our people,
38 not work against them. I'm just going to say this on
39 public record. I hope this stays on public record,
40 doesn't disappear off there.

41

42 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate that
45 comment. I hear this over and over, you know, we
46 didn't get this information. I keep hearing this.
47 It's like blaring. It just keeps happening. It can't
48 be so regionalized, this tribal consultation process.

49

50 There has to be a regional feed into

1 for the regional offices, but there has to be this
2 delegated authority to the coordinators throughout all
3 of rural Alaska and they have to have responsibility to
4 report back that they have accomplished -- we have an
5 email list for all these tribal members and we
6 transmitted it by email to them and we've broken it
7 down to these certain proposals and then we've --
8 there's got to be a responsibility by these
9 coordinators that they've accomplished these tasks.

10

11 It can't be like, oh, we just
12 broadcasted -- we just sent the book out and hope they
13 got it. We didn't get -- nobody wanted to comment.
14 Yeah, because nobody got it, nobody heard about it, or
15 they got the book and looked in it, like what does this
16 mean. What Proposal WP-something affects my game
17 management. They don't understand all this game
18 management, sub-unit. Look at these lines and stuff.

19

20 I mean come on now. We've got
21 professionals. Break this down so the tribes know what
22 -- oh, this is what this is going to do to your tribe.
23 What do you want to comment about. Then you'd probably
24 get lots of feedback. I think the document is good,
25 but I think the process needs a little more fine -- has
26 to be a little broader process, a regionalized process.

27

28 I appreciate you being on the line
29 there, Jean. Did you have anything else to say.

30

31 MS. GAMACHE: Just wanted to add that
32 comments should be sent to Crystal Leonetti or they can
33 be sent to Melinda as well.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I feel that the
36 Council should transmit comments from our transcripts,
37 broken out the main points and that should be
38 transmitted to Crystal Leonetti so that she is aware of
39 the issues in rural Alaska.

40

41 I see room set-up and stuff and it's
42 like, well, I don't think there's going to be a lot of
43 room set up because that's not going to happen in rural
44 Alaska. Yeah, you'll get CIRI and stuff. Now these
45 corps people downtown, they all have real nice room
46 set-up, but the rural Alaskans, the villages, this is
47 going to have to work a lot different.

48

49 This document seems to play towards the
50 corps more than it does to the villages. That's what

1 it seems to me. So I think our Council's comments
2 could be derived from our transcripts here, which Tina
3 will probably have them done before the day is over.
4 She works night and day.

5
6 (Laughter)

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So any other
9 comments.

10
11 (No comments)

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are we going to move
14 on now. Thanks a lot, Jean.

15
16 MS. GAMACHE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17 Thank you, Council members.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So let's see. Go
20 back to the customary and traditional use determination
21 update.

22
23 David.

24
25 MS. BURKE: Mr. Chair.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead.

28
29 MS. BURKE: This is -- on this
30 customary and traditional use issue, we were going to
31 submit formal comment from the Council at the fall
32 meeting. We didn't have a quorum. We ran out of time
33 in December, but I do have the draft comments that I've
34 gathered from our past meetings when we've discussed
35 this issue. A bulk of them were formed at the meeting
36 in Galena when David and I were both there, so I want
37 to go ahead and -- while David is talking I'm going to
38 hand out these draft comments to the Council. I've got
39 this document up on my computer so we can adjust this
40 letter as necessary.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks,
43 Melinda. Go ahead, David.

44 DR. JENKINS: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
45 Council members. This briefing that some of you heard
46 at your prior meeting when you didn't have a quorum,
47 I'm not going to go through in its entirety, but I'll
48 hit some of the highlights.

49
50 If you recall, the Southeast Council

1 and the Secretary of the Interior and Agriculture asked
2 the Board to review the customary and traditional use
3 determination process with RAC input. The briefing
4 starts on Page 63 and I want to highlight three of the
5 paragraphs there right in the middle.

6
7 The first point is that ANILCA does not
8 require customary and traditional use determinations.
9 Those determinations were adopted from the State when
10 the Federal Subsistence Management Program was
11 established in 1990. In the 1992 Record of
12 Decision, the Federal Subsistence Board considered four
13 customary and traditional use options and recommended
14 to the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture that
15 State process be adopted into Federal regulations. So
16 we adopted the State's eight criteria for customary and
17 traditional use. You can see those criteria for your
18 review on Page 66, Appendix A.

19
20 So the Board initially adopted the
21 State's customary and traditional use criteria. It
22 altered them a little bit. It renamed them factors.
23 The idea was to minimize disruption to traditional
24 State regulation and management of fish and wildlife.
25 So it's clear by now that the State is not going to
26 resume subsistence management. It's pretty clear it's
27 going to be a Federal program. So the Secretaries and
28 the Southeast Council has asked all the other RACs to
29 ask the question should we continue to use the State
30 process of customary and traditional use
31 determinations.

32
33 Now remember that the Board does not
34 use customary and traditional use determinations to
35 restrict amounts of
36 harvest. The Board makes these determinations in order
37 to recognize a community or area whose residents
38 generally
39 exhibit these eight factors. The problem for the
40 Southeast Council is that the effect is to exclude
41 qualified rural residents who do not exhibit those
42 eight factors from
43 participating in subsistence harvests in particular
44 areas.

45
46 The Southeast Council has advocated
47 instead to use the scheme outlined in ANILCA, which is
48 called a Section .804 analysis, when there are
49 insufficient populations of fish or wildlife for
50 subsistence harvest. In that circumstance, then you

1 start limiting the pool of users by using three
2 criteria under Section .804 having to do with direct
3 dependence, having to do with proximity and having to
4 do with alternative resources available to people.

5
6 So the Southeast Council has asked all
7 the other Councils to ask the question should we
8 continue to use customary and traditional use as a
9 regulatory hurdle that people have to overcome before
10 they can engage in subsistence practices. So at this
11 point there are two regulatory -- there are two
12 thresholds to be a subsistence user on Federal public
13 lands. The first is rural residency and that's a
14 statutory threshold in ANILCA and the second threshold
15 is customary and traditional use, which is a regulatory
16 threshold. It's not in ANILCA, but it's in regulations
17 that the Federal government adopted from the state.

18
19 So that's the general background that
20 we talked about when you didn't have a quorum and why
21 the Southeast Council was interested in all the RACs
22 rethinking this particular issue. You have in your
23 blue packet a table showing the differences between a
24 Section .804 analysis and a C&T determination analysis.
25 It's laid out there side by side. If you like, you can
26 look through that.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Where is it in the
29 blue.....

30
31 DR. JENKINS: In your blue packet,
32 looks like this. So on Page 69 of your Council books,
33 that's the beginning of the summary of the responses
34 from the other Regional Advisory Councils on this
35 question, should we retain customary and traditional
36 use or should we do something different.

37
38 The Southeast Council has made a couple
39 recommendations. The one I just mentioned is get rid
40 of C&T and go to just a Section .804 or modify the C&T
41 language so that we're not looking at species by
42 species determination, but we're looking at areas and
43 saying people have a customary and traditional use for
44 all species within a particular area so we don't have
45 to do it on a species-by-species basis. Those are the
46 two suggestions from Southeast.

47
48 You can see on Page 69 the summary of
49 what the Southeast was interested in. They asked OSM
50 if we could come up with examples where the C&T process

1 has not been favorable to subsistence use when there
2 have been unnecessary exclusions in times of resource
3 abundance for example and we've begun to look at that
4 issue.

5
6 On the next page you can see the
7 Southcentral summary and that Council voted for this
8 language for C&T: "The Board shall determine which fish
9 and wildlife have been customarily and traditionally
10 used for subsistence. These determinations
11 shall identify the specific community's or area's use
12 of a geographic area for the harvest of fish and
13 wildlife." In other words, it wouldn't be a species-
14 by-species determination, it would be an area
15 determination that all species within that area would
16 be determined for customary and traditional use.

17
18 Kodiak-Aleutians moved to support the
19 C&T process in place as it is. They didn't want to see
20 any particular changes.

21
22 Bristol Bay is right now looking at
23 this issue again as this Council is, so they haven't
24 yet made a determination of their opinion on this.

25
26 Yukon-Kuskokwim moved and voted to
27 abandon the customary and traditional use process and
28 rely just on a Section .804 process.

29
30 As you know, Western Interior has yet
31 to determine its position here as a Council.

32
33 Seward-Pen thought that -- it
34 recognizes here Alternative 1 would be a good choice.
35 The Alternative No. 1 was the one that I just mentioned
36 where you have a community or an area that is
37 determined and not species-by-species.

38
39 Northwest Arctic has not yet taken a
40 formal action.

41
42 Eastern Interior thought C&T was
43 working well enough.

44
45 North Slope took no action and wanted
46 to hear more about the differences between an .804
47 analysis and a C&T analysis. Last week at the North
48 Slope RAC meeting that RAC asked OSM to put together
49 some sort of working group so that the North Slope
50 could better understand the differences between an .804

1 and a C&T analysis and the consequences those
2 differences would have in the North Slope.

3

4 MR. J. WALKER: Jack, I've got a
5 question if you don't mind.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, go ahead.

8

9 MR. J. WALKER: Dave, on some of these
10 determinations, is it because of the reasoning behind
11 the population in that area because the determination
12 is being looked at in a certain way? Like Southeast,
13 their determination is because of the populace in the
14 area.

15

16 DR. JENKINS: You mean the population
17 of humans. Well, that hasn't been explicitly talked
18 about, but when you deal with a Section .804 analysis
19 and you've got a large population of subsistence users
20 and you have insufficient resources, then the .804 is a
21 way to make that number of people who can harvest those
22 resources smaller relative to what's available. So I'm
23 sure in the back of the Southeast Council's mind
24 population size is of interest to them.

25

26 Their main argument has been that in
27 times of resource abundance people are being
28 unnecessarily restricted. In particular, those people
29 who do not have those eight customary and traditional
30 factors. And they're saying this is not a -- this was
31 not what Congress intended. This is what we adopted
32 from the State and their argument is we should revisit
33 that and think about whether we should continue this
34 process that we adopted from the State.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't understand
37 how they would be unreasonably restricted if they don't
38 have the eight criteria. If they're determined as
39 rural, they don't need to be determined as the eight
40 criteria unless they're talking about rural
41 determination. So how would the eight criteria affect
42 rural residents and their use of subsistence resources
43 if they're determined as rural?

44

45 DR. JENKINS: The rural determination
46 is the first threshold that subsistence users have to
47 cross in order to be qualified subsistence users, but
48 there's a second hurdle and the second hurdle is having
49 a positive customary and traditional use determination
50 for a particular species. If you don't cross both

1 those hurdles, then you cannot engage in Federally
2 qualified subsistence activities.

3

4 Now there's an exception. If the
5 Federal Subsistence Board has not made a customary and
6 traditional use determination for a particular species,
7 then all rural residents in the state of Alaska are
8 qualified to harvest that particular species.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have problems with
11 the Southeast. Go ahead, Tim.

12

13 MR. GERVAIS: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.
14 Can you repeat that last sentence again.

15

16 DR. JENKINS: If the Federal
17 Subsistence Board has not made a positive customary and
18 traditional use determination for a particular species
19 in an area, for example sheep, that means that all of
20 the rural residents in the state of Alaska have the
21 opportunity to harvest that sheep on Federal public
22 lands. All the Federally qualified rural residents
23 under those circumstances. So everybody is assumed,
24 just like it would be under an .804 or an ANILCA
25 criteria, everybody is assumed as a rural resident to
26 have the opportunity to harvest resources on Federal
27 lands.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So then you get into
30 what I foresaw on the Dalton Highway. There was no
31 customary and traditional use determination for caribou
32 in 24 and 26B, so many years ago I foresaw Delta, the
33 Nelchina villages, all these road-connected villages,
34 all being rural residents, all pouring up there and
35 pounding the tar out of these caribou off the road. I
36 foresaw that, so I felt that we needed customary and
37 traditional use determination for the people who
38 actually customarily used those resources.

39

40 The whole Southeast position is
41 actually flawed. If you determine that people have
42 customary and traditional use of moose in Southeast
43 Alaska and there is no customary and traditional use
44 areas, they can come by ferry, get on the road, drive
45 up into the Interior of Alaska and start hunting rural
46 Alaska because they have a customary and traditional
47 use -- have a determination utilizing all species,
48 including moose, so they can come and hunt in somebody
49 else's area. What I consider the customary area of
50 somebody else. So that's one flaw of Southeast's

1 position.

2

3 The other flaw is if you go to .804,
4 then you've got like hundreds of people competing with
5 local people, then you have to make these .804
6 determinations. Well, like, okay, we can use Aniak,
7 this area here. Moose population is low. Instead of
8 coming down to the three criteria in .804, they went to
9 a Federal drawing permit, so you've got to draw.

10

11 My problem with the Federal draw is the
12 school teacher can move to Aniak. Because he lives in
13 Aniak, the person lives in Aniak, they're eligible to
14 put in for the draw. They may have never shot a moose,
15 never even seen a moose in their whole life, yet here's
16 Bob Aloysius or here's Lisa here who's had a customary
17 and traditional use of that resource for decades and
18 family lineage, they don't draw the permit. That's the
19 problem with .804. It has a huge flaw. So Southeast's
20 position is they would open up more of rural Alaska
21 because they have a use of moose or some species that
22 everybody has in their area or caribou or something.

23

24 I feel that the eight criteria
25 determines -- is utilized also in the rural
26 determination process to delineate what are the
27 characteristics of a rural community, the reliance on
28 fish and game. If you look at the eight criteria, what
29 the State did, they actually expanded on what .804 is.
30 That's kind of what they did to kind of get a feel for
31 what rural people are. Longstanding use of the
32 resource, those kind of things. That's all in .804.

33

34 So I don't feel that -- I feel that
35 Southeast, yeah, okay, that might work for Southeast.
36 Maybe that's a regional thing. Look at what we've got
37 here. We have a boundary and we're talking about this
38 particular creek and this and that and 18's boundary.
39 We get into that thing all the time here in the lower
40 part of this region and the broad use of a -- we'll go
41 into .804 right away if we change the system. I don't
42 want to go to .804. I don't want to go into drawing
43 permits. I don't want to go into a long, convoluted
44 expensive process. The old saying is if the wheel's
45 not broke, don't fix it. I don't think the system is
46 broken. I don't think that -- I think the system has
47 been working for this region and I would like to know
48 what the Council members think about this process.

49

50 Ray.

1 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, there is a problem
2 that hasn't been brought up yet. We ran into it in
3 Denali SRC. In the Denali Park, they listed resident
4 communities that were eligible to hunt in the Park. If
5 they move outside that community anywhere along the
6 highway, then they become ineligible. There were
7 people living along the highway that had long-term
8 customary and traditional. We had to go after each one
9 of those individually to get them qualified.

10
11 Part of that came about because there
12 was -- in re-editing the State regs, they dropped out
13 the word individual somewhere. I don't know exactly
14 where it was. You may have people that are living
15 along the Kuskokwim or Yukon Rivers that aren't in one
16 of the communities there and under some of the
17 determination all of a sudden they couldn't because
18 they're not in a listed community.

19
20 And you'll notice that these use the
21 word area, so maybe that means a resident of the area,
22 but somewhere you need to make sure you protect
23 individuals who have customary and traditional use that
24 may not live in a community. They may be living more
25 of a subsistence lifestyle than somebody in that
26 community.

27
28 So that needs to be looked at somewhere
29 along the line. It may not be under these customary
30 and traditional, but it may be in terms of how you
31 qualify as a rural individual.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Park Service
34 eligibilities are way more defined than customary and
35 traditional use determinations.

36
37 MR. COLLINS: But they were using the
38 State regs and somewhere there -- it was in the State
39 originally and it was dropped out. That came up before
40 we went to the Federal system here back then and they
41 never corrected it. I'm sorry I can't cite the
42 reference now, but I know it's in there.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The way the
45 customary and traditional use determinations are made
46 for any of the more contentious species, the large game
47 species, most of them -- we've not made customary and
48 traditional use determinations for bears in some areas
49 because we don't feel that's been necessary in some
50 areas of this region.

1 But for moose, I feel that the
2 delineations -- we went into that 21E moose customary
3 and traditional use determination. I don't want to go
4 backwards on that one. We made a boundary line there
5 and I don't want to see this thing just throw the baby
6 out with the bath water and, okay, we've got Unit 18
7 like hunting all over the top of 21 because they've got
8 a broad determination for moose. Well, we don't want
9 to go there.

10
11 I feel that these customary and
12 traditional use determinations the Councils have worked
13 on for years. Like caribou in my area, we go over into
14 26B. North Slope Council commented on that and we
15 worked out -- everything is cool with Wiseman and
16 Coldfoot, but they're not willing to take everybody
17 else in Alaska on the North Slope. They don't want to
18 see everybody from the Nelchina Basin and Delta, the
19 Upper Tanana all going on the road over to 26B.
20 They're going to go through the roof on that one.

21
22 So people have to think. I want North
23 Slope and some of these other Councils to understand
24 what the ramifications would be.

25
26 Do you have comments on what I'm
27 saying, David? You seem to be fidgeting again.

28
29 DR. JENKINS: I do have just a couple
30 of observations about the Southeast Council and how
31 their views have evolved over the last couple of years.
32 As I've listened to that Council, one of the things
33 they're not interested in doing is imposing their
34 position on the rest of the RACs and the rest of the
35 state. What they're really interested in doing is
36 opening up the dialogue because they found the process
37 from their perspective flawed.

38
39 The first time this came up in front of
40 the RACs a couple of years ago based on Secretarial
41 recommendation, Southeast Council thought that it was
42 not given a proper airing at all the Regional Advisory
43 Councils. The Southeast Council recognizes regional
44 difference and it's not interested in sort of imposing
45 its views on other people, but opening up the dialogue,
46 recognizing all of these differences, so I think that's
47 the point you should recognize. Clearly this Council
48 has a different position than the Southeast Council
49 does.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm fully supportive
2 of Southeast if they want to go all species because,
3 you know, maybe they don't have the kind of cultural
4 boundaries that this region might have. If they feel
5 that that's adequate for them in the Southeast Council
6 area region, that's fine, I don't care, but I would not
7 like to see the Federal Board impose this on a
8 statewide -- you know, everything wants to be
9 simplified. Well, this gets into a not-so-simple issue
10 in the rest of Alaska.

11
12 I, personally -- and I would like the
13 Council to take a position on this. Do you have a
14 comment, Tim.

15
16 MR. GERVAIS: I have a question for
17 David. I'm trying to decide what -- the purpose of the
18 discussion. We're trying to provide comment to
19 Southeast on their recommendation or are we trying to
20 get a new policy for the entire state or are we trying
21 to see if the State can have different policies in
22 different regions. What's the purpose of this
23 particular discussion? What are we trying to make a
24 ruling or a comment on?

25
26 DR. JENKINS: When the Secretary of the
27 Interior and Agriculture reviewed the Federal
28 Subsistence Program, one of the directives to the Board
29 was to look at the customary and traditional use
30 determination process and with RAC input make
31 recommendations to the Secretaries for any changes, or
32 not. If you say that you don't need changes, make that
33 known to the Secretaries too. So that's the basis for
34 this discussion.

35
36 Should this be changed? If so, how?
37 And if not, the Secretaries need to know that too. So,
38 Tim, that's where that stands.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I feel that the
41 process is -- we have a letter here before us that
42 Melinda has kind of fine-tuned from our previous
43 comments.

44
45 On a side note, I have said many times
46 I do feel that OSM's .804 implementation is flawed.
47 The drawing -- what has been utilized here, the drawing
48 permit in 19A for moose I feel is a flawed process. So
49 I feel that, if anything, the Board should revisit
50 looking at an .804 process that would really truly

1 delineate .804, customary and direct dependence on
2 populations, local residency and availability of
3 alternate resources. That's what the Tier II system
4 did under the State of Alaska, the old Tier II scoring
5 system. It had some flaws, but that's where those Tier
6 II criteria came from. It was using .804. That's why
7 Tier II came about.

8

9 I feel that OSM needs to develop a Tier
10 II type scoring system so that Lisa gets a Tier II
11 permit and the new school teacher does not get a Tier
12 II permit. Direct dependence on the mainstay of
13 population livelihood and stuff like that. That needs
14 to be incorporated into an .804 allocation process, but
15 that's a different issue.

16

17 Tim.

18

19 MR. GERVAIS: I've got a question,
20 Jack. So what you just said is different than what I
21 heard you say in your prior statement where you're
22 saying you liked using the C&T analysis. Now you're
23 saying you want these three .804 criteria.....

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, I'm not saying
26 anything different.

27

28 MR. GERVAIS:and so now I'm
29 getting confused on what you're preference is.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm not saying
32 anything different. I'm saying the current process
33 works great except if a population for the customary
34 and traditional users drops below what is available,
35 then we have to go to an .804. I'm saying that the
36 customary and traditional use determination within the
37 regions and for the species is working fine. But like
38 here, 19A, the moose population crashes, then there's
39 not enough moose for all the customary and traditional
40 users in 19A, so now we have to go to an .804 process.

41

42

43 So I feel that the allocation -- it's a
44 step down for the customary and traditional users and
45 the process needs to be refined. So I would like to
46 see at a future date the Federal Subsistence Board poll
47 the Councils on an .804 process that would incorporate
48 a Tier II scoring system. That's what I would like to
49 see the Federal Board do on .804, but I said that's a
50 side issue.

1 I feel that the letter that's before us
2 -- that Melinda's third paragraph, Melinda points out
3 this Council sees no reason for a change of the process
4 that is currently taking place in the Western Interior
5 region and it would not object to individual Councils
6 making adjustments to the C&T process for their
7 traditional areas or their region. So I don't want to
8 stop Southeast from doing whatever they want to do, but
9 I don't think that this should be applied on a
10 statewide basis.

11
12 That's kind of what my opinion is. I
13 would like to know if that's the opinion of the
14 Council. Tim.

15
16 MR. GERVAIS: I thought you just said
17 you'd like to see a Tier II system implemented in
18 addition to the current system that's in place.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's a different
21 issue. The whole process is determining whether the
22 communities are rural and they use the eight criteria
23 to determine that. Then there's a customary and
24 traditional use of species and if those species
25 decline, then they will implement an .804 system and
26 what they've been doing is allocating a drawing for
27 everybody that has a customary and traditional use.

28
29 What I'm saying a Tier II system --
30 this is not on the table, but what I'm saying is the
31 Tier II system needs to be evaluated in a future date.
32 That's a different issue.

33
34 What our letter is saying is that the
35 current system of customary and traditional use
36 determination is actually integral on delineating uses
37 within cultural boundaries, so I don't want to see this
38 current system thrown out for this region. We do need
39 to refine the .804 process if in the future there's
40 populations that decline. Say the moose get shot out
41 around Ruby and so now we don't have enough moose for
42 everybody in Galena and Ruby, so now we have to come up
43 with an allocation system.

44
45 So the teacher in Ruby wants to put in
46 for a drawing permit and Tim and your little kids need
47 moose meat, so you should be scored for your use of
48 moose over the other person who is also a rural
49 resident but doesn't have a long-standing use of the
50 resource. So I feel that there needs to be a Tier II

1 type scoring system for the allocation if that occurs
2 like it has happened here in 19A.

3

4 Tim.

5

6 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. Appreciate those
7 comments. I see one other thing that's lacking in the
8 C&T use, is what if you have a species -- you're
9 talking about if there's a lack of species. What if
10 there's an increase in abundance or an introduction of
11 new species like due to climate change or something,
12 new type of fish starts showing up that would
13 reasonably be expected that a subsistence user would
14 harvest it if it was available, but for whatever reason
15 it wasn't here for the past 50 or 60 years.

16

17 What if muskox started doing really
18 well with these milder winters and started moving
19 further westward and people in Unit 21 started having
20 hunting opportunities for muskox or wood bison or
21 something like that. With this current C&T there's no
22 way to incorporate those newer species into a
23 subsistence harvest because they weren't here in the
24 past 50 or 100 years, but now they're available and
25 would be a reasonable subsistence thing.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've wondered about
28 that myself. There is no mech -- I haven't seen a mech
29 -- although they've reintroduced muskox on the North
30 Slope and then people get customary and traditional use
31 determinations. You know, down in 18, those muskox
32 over there, they get C&Ts for those. But species that
33 are introduced within a region like wood bison, I've
34 been wondering how that process would go. So do you
35 have any thoughts on that, Dave?

36

37 DR. JENKINS: There's nothing to
38 preclude the board from making a customary and
39 traditional use determination for introduced species,
40 Tim, and they've done that in the past for muskox. So
41 that would be the process right now that would be in
42 place.

43

44 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. Have you ever seen
45 anything like Southeast is more maritime. Do they have
46 maybe herring or smelt that's showing up in certain
47 areas that people are wanting to harvest that they
48 can't prove that their grandparents ate because it
49 wasn't available either because they had different
50 style boats or different style nets? Do you see any of

1 that happening around the state?

2

3 DR. JENKINS: It could well, as you
4 say, increasingly happen and if that does, then the
5 Board will have to make -- at this point, species by
6 species determinations for customary and traditional
7 use for those new species as they move in, if they do,
8 because of changing climate.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Pollock.

11

12 MR. SIMON: Yeah, my name is Pollock
13 Simon. I live in Upper Koyukuk River, the villages
14 Allakaket and Alatna. There is a concern in our area
15 of the already limited wildlife resource and there's no
16 more king salmon and we depend on the wildlife resource
17 for living. I don't think the Upper Koyukuk River
18 would support more use. It's a concern about the road
19 that's going to go to Ambler and outsiders would come
20 up the road and probably hunt in our area. The area
21 I'm talking about are in Allakaket and cannot support
22 anymore use. We want to continue protecting our
23 subsistence resource and users.

24

25 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock. I
28 would like to get kind of an idea if Southeast was to
29 have a regional implementation of what they want, they
30 would extend to all species within the game management
31 units of Southeast Alaska 1 through 5 or whatever it
32 is.

33

34 DR. JENKINS: That's one of their
35 suggestions that it become an area or community-wide
36 determination for customary and traditional use and not
37 a species by species. I was up at the North Slope and
38 they make jokes about this customary and traditional
39 use determination. They say, well, let's make a C&T
40 for mice. You know, so they find some flaws in the
41 system too. I mean at what level do you stop looking
42 at these species that people customarily and
43 traditionally use.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, I don't feel
46 that there needs to be a C&T for all species, like
47 ptarmigan or grouse or even bear, black bears. There's
48 lots of black bears. If some person from another area
49 came, we don't have an allocation problem. I feel that
50 if it's a species that's highly sought and highly

1 valued by the subsistence users of the region, that
2 they should have a priority use of that resource and
3 the customary and traditional use determination is how
4 that priority is allocated to those individuals of that
5 region.

6

7 MR. GERVAIS: I think Robert has a
8 question.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You've got a
11 question, Robert?

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray, go ahead.

16

17 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Actually we need
18 to keep the customary and traditional findings in place
19 along this pattern. As Jack has stated, for those
20 primary species that people are dependant on because if
21 you don't have that in place, then, when there is a
22 shortage, how are you going to allocate that resource.
23 I think that priority should be given to people who
24 have customarily and traditionally resided on it. So
25 there would need to be a finding in order to then fine
26 tune under, what is it, the .804 or whatever which ones
27 would be qualified.

28

29 I think you've got to look long term on
30 some of these. There's still a problem in here in a
31 community or area. Well, what if you live in an area
32 where there's a big population of influx of people from
33 outside who no longer exhibit those characteristics,
34 but yet you live in a small community within that area
35 that does, you might find yourself disallowed in terms
36 of -- and some places you may have to, in the community
37 like -- an example is Bethel with a growing population.
38 At what point will the community itself no longer
39 reflect all these.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's when they get
42 to the rural determination process and that's a
43 completely different issue.

44

45 MR. COLLINS: I know, but C&T -- you
46 still have to have the C&T in place when you decide who
47 within that -- and I think they need to move at some
48 point to individual residents or families who still
49 have those characteristics that are within that area or
50 even that community.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I see.
2
3 MR. COLLINS: You see what I mean?
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah.
6
7 MR. COLLINS: Because if you don't --
8 and that's part of the problem now. I mean there's
9 Eklutna by Anchorage which was customary and
10 traditional Athabaskan. I don't think they have --
11 they're not rural residents anymore, so they're
12 disallowed. On the Kenai, they've gone back and forth
13 on some of those communities. Ninilchik maybe more,
14 but some of the others because of growing they've had
15 to wrestle that back and forth.
16
17 So you've got to think about long term
18 what's happening in the state so that people who do
19 customary and traditionally reside on those will be
20 able to continue to do it when the nature of their
21 community area changes. That's why you have to be
22 careful on what we do put into the wording here.
23 You've got to have a little longer range view.
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's the rural
26 determination process and peripheral communities like
27 Eklutna or Ninilchik, Saxman, those can be -- they can
28 wrestle with the Board on that rural determination
29 process.
30
31 The C&T thing that's before us, this
32 should be the baseline of how the system works.
33 Robert.
34
35 MR. COLLINS: That's why I'm saying
36 that you need to keep these in place because they're
37 important and critical on those major species at least.
38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I totally
40 agree with you on that. Robert.
41
42 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43 We're talking here and we can beat a dead horse to
44 death. If we really look at it, if we had more of this
45 Proposal WP14-32, we wouldn't have to be coming to this
46 Tier II. If we would learn how to protect the land,
47 manage the game without having to kill everything,
48 shoot everything.
49
50 Another thing, have OSM stand back. I

1 mean I think you should give a directive or a letter to
2 OSM saying, hey, you don't recommend what we do. We
3 are in charge. You work for us. We don't work for
4 you. Because, I mean, look at Dave yesterday, came and
5 sat down yesterday and said, you know, what, you can't
6 do this. Like wait a minute here, you know. That's
7 where we're in charge. We make the regulations. They
8 follow it and that's the bottom line.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, OSM's
11 preliminary conclusions, I don't dis-support that. I
12 feel that they can take a position and sometimes their
13 position is what the Council's position is, but the
14 Council might have a different position, so we can
15 disagree with OSM. So I don't -- this is just --
16 that's just their opinion at that time. Once this
17 Council comments we might completely change OSM's
18 position and when we go to the Federal Subsistence
19 Board, their position might be completely different.

20

21 But, I mean, I didn't want you to be
22 offended by OSM taking positions because it's been --
23 previously there was a bottling up of the Staff. They
24 couldn't express opinions and I like to get a broader-
25 based perspective from biologists and everybody and
26 this Council then makes the final call. So I feel that
27 the Councils.....

28

29 MR. R. WALKER: Yes, but, Jack, you
30 have to understand too, you know, we don't have a
31 solicitor to tell us what to do. I mean OSM does. I
32 mean they're spending our tax dollars. That's what
33 really irritates me at times too because our tax
34 dollars at work against us. Wait a minute here.
35 There's something wrong with the program, you know.
36 Time to take a look at another angle on this because,
37 hey, I just paid a whole bunch of money to the Federal
38 government and this is what I get in return? This is
39 what our people get? We've been here. We haven't been
40 -- we haven't changed in 10,000 years.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Secretaries of
43 Agriculture and Interior have directed the Federal
44 Subsistence Board to have deference to the Councils, so
45 the Councils are the final word. I mean OSM can
46 express their opinion. Anybody can express their
47 opinion, but we have the final word to the Federal
48 Board. If we vote on an issue, that's the final word.
49 It's like any of these Board processes.

50

1 This Council actually has quite a bit
2 of weight now because of that deference to the
3 Councils. They were trying to take our opinions away
4 from us. The President and the Secretaries have told
5 the process to change. There was flaws. They wanted
6 more of the meaningful role of the Councils like in
7 .805 of ANILCA, so that's come back to this Council at
8 least at this time under this Administration.

9

10 You had a comment there, Tim.

11

12 MR. GERVAIS: No.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead,
15 Jim.

16

17 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr.
18 Chairman. I do have a problem with the wording in this
19 letter here and that's the Council sees no reason to
20 change. I don't like the wording there.

21

22 MS. BURKE: Okay.

23

24 MR. J. WALKER: I think this Council
25 should have something similar to -- I lost my train of
26 thought. It just went out the door. Sees the process
27 is adequate in our region and that we reserve the right
28 to change if the process is not working. Putting that
29 we do not see a reason to change, I don't like that
30 wording.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So something like
33 this region has culture boundaries that overlap on
34 practically every boundary that do not exist in some
35 other region such as Southeast. This Council feels the
36 process works well under the existing system or
37 something to that effect.

38

39 MR. COLLINS: And see no reason to
40 change that at this time.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And sees no reason
43 for change at this time or something to that effect.
44 Okay, Tim.

45

46 MR. GERVAIS: Why wouldn't you want at
47 this time while they're evaluating this put in our
48 opinions that they need to go to a scoring system?
49 Because I'm hearing in issues like yesterday we were
50 trying to determine what happened to the king salmon on
the Kuskokwim last year saying, well, they got caught
in the Lower River, these communities are all bigger

1 than they once were, there's bigger demand.

2

3 Now you have a situation here like
4 Aniak where if Donlin goes in, they're going to have
5 200 or 300 more people move in that will be rural
6 residents. They're going to want to catch king salmon
7 too, but it's going to hurt the original residents of
8 the community because now you've got more user groups.
9 You've got population growth in the region competing
10 for a resource that we can't really control because
11 we're fighting over the bycatch issues, so we can't
12 really control it.

13

14 We'll have complete control of the
15 management of the king salmon population and then we
16 see the state in general is just growing in population.
17 The population went up from, what, 450 to 700,000 in
18 the last census. So there's going to always be more
19 growth, more users that want these resources and the
20 technology to catch these resources is going to
21 increase, so people will be more efficient at hunting
22 and fishing.

23

24 So I think this Council should
25 recommend to the Board that they need to start getting
26 a scoring system in place to protect the users that
27 have the history and have the biggest need to harvest
28 the finite resources and not say there's no need to
29 change it or that we'll change it at a later date.
30 Say, hey, we feel that we need a scoring scheme such as
31 this three criteria of .804 or Tier II or something on
32 that lines. Because they're asking to look at it now,
33 so let's get that out in the discussion.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I very much agree
36 with you on that, so we can insert under paragraph four
37 the Western Interior Regional Council feels strongly
38 that the .804 process should be developed that scores
39 individuals that meet the .804 criteria like the first
40 State Tier II system. Wording to that effect. Short
41 and sweet. But we need to have a change. OSM has been
42 reluctant to go there. The brakes have been -- there's
43 skid marks on the floor about that one.

44

45 But I feel strongly -- and I want that
46 word strongly inserted into this letter. We feel
47 strongly that there's a real need for a scoring system
48 to delineate people that have longstanding direct
49 dependence as a mainstay of livelihood, local residency
50 and alternative of resources. So this longstanding use

1 of the resource issue is a big deal. It's not a little
2 deal, it's a big deal, so I do wholly agree with you.

3
4 Does the Council agree with inserting
5 that wording into our letter of recommendation to the
6 Federal Subsistence Board.

7
8 MR. COLLINS: I would be reluctant to
9 quote Tier II because there's a weakness in Tier II as
10 of now. In other words, we need to fine tune that
11 because the problem with Tier II is that if you or
12 someone who has hunted personally until you die you're
13 going to score higher than your grandson who has never
14 hunted under Tier II, so you can't introduce younger
15 family members into that process until that older
16 population dies and is no longer hunting or they're
17 going to score highest.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

20
21 MR. COLLINS: So there's no way to
22 introduce it and pass it down to.....

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, when they
25 develop the scoring system -- we'll eliminate the Tier
26 II word. But when they develop the scoring system --
27 Title VIII relies heavily on personal and family
28 consumption. Family is defined as for personal by
29 marriage, blood and adoption, so that's a primary of
30 Title VIII of ANILCA's language. So the scoring system
31 should be -- a baseline should be developed by OSM and
32 then the Council should adjust the exact wording. We
33 don't want to eliminate younger people that would move
34 up into the family lineage of use.

35
36 So you had a comment, David.

37
38 DR. JENKINS: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
39 Chair. Let me just remind everybody that Congress,
40 when it provided subsistence priority, it wrote broadly
41 and gave that priority to all rural residents. In
42 situations where there are limited resources, it laid
43 out a scheme under Section .804 to limit that pool of
44 users.

45
46 If you look on Page 74, that's the
47 briefing on .804. Let me point out the second to last
48 paragraph. It notes that the Federal system -- and
49 this speaks right to your point here, Mr. Chair -- has
50 not developed regulatory definitions of customary and

1 direct dependence, local residency, or alternative
2 resources. The lack of specific definitions allows
3 Section .804 analyses to remain flexible and responsive
4 to particular environmental and cultural circumstances.
5 In recent years, however, the program has treated the
6 availability of alternative resources to mean
7 alternative subsistence resources rather than resources
8 such as cash or store-bought products.

9

10 So the point of that paragraph is, I
11 think, speaking to Ray's point, is that we don't have
12 regulatory definitions, but that allows us to maintain
13 the flexibility to speak to this Tier II issue that Mr.
14 Collins is raising and speak to other local, cultural
15 and environmental issues. So there's another
16 perspective here. You may not want to have specific
17 definitions like Tier II definitions because there is
18 some adaptability to have the flexibility in the system
19 for local concerns to be raised by local RACs.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I do feel we need to
22 have a template
23 though. I mean we don't want to like come into a
24 crisis situation and then start having to develop a
25 process. We should have a template of how -- a basic
26 scoring system process that we've thought about, vetted
27 thoroughly through other Councils. So sort of have a
28 baseline. Each region should then have the ability and
29 flexibility to adjust the template to fit the needs of
30 that region. Would that be adequate?

31

32 DR. JENKINS: That's something you and
33 this Council could talk about and present, certainly.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jenny.

36

37 MS. PELKOLA: I would just like to add
38 -- I didn't know how to say this in a nice way.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Just spit it out.

41

42 (Laughter)

43

44 MS. PELKOLA: When I heard Tim say go
45 to a scoring system, I thought of the original users,
46 you know, people that lived there forever and then you
47 have all these people coming in and then they become
48 local. It seems like they overrun the original users.
49 They just sort of just sit back in awe as to what's
50 going on.

1 I was in another country a couple years
2 ago and they allocated their -- the same thing, I
3 guess, we're talking about, but if they have a shortage
4 in let's say fishing or whatever, king salmon, they
5 allocate the fish to their original users first.
6 Original meaning people that were in the country first
7 and then, if they have enough, then they allocate it to
8 somebody that's just moved in to a community.

9
10 I agree with their system and somehow
11 -- I don't know how this got away from the original
12 users. I think that we just didn't have enough
13 speakers at the time that this was going on for our
14 end, so I think we need to go to something that works
15 for the area. I don't want to beat this in the ground,
16 but I think we need to reach a consensus here.

17
18 Thank you.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I really appreciate
21 those words, Jenny. Yeah, the First Nations over in
22 Canada they have the first allocation over there.
23 Under .804 that pretty much would be what would happen.
24 If we had the scoring system, the people who utilized
25 the resource the longest would score the highest and
26 that would basically accomplish what you're talking
27 about.

28
29 I do want to move on. We have quite a
30 bit to do today. So we worked through this. I feel
31 that Southeast may be able to do whatever they want to,
32 but that should not be applied -- their process should
33 not be applied throughout the whole state of Alaska.

34
35 This region, our letter here, the fine
36 tuning that we've inserted, paragraph three, the
37 Council feels the process works well as it exists.
38 Some other regions, as Southeast Alaska, maybe -- you
39 know, I don't know how to word it at this time. Go
40 ahead, Melinda.

41
42 MS. BURKE: This Council feels the
43 process works well under the existing system at this
44 time for the Western Interior Region, but would not
45 object to individual Councils making adjustments to the
46 C&T processes for their regions.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. And then under
49 paragraph four did you capture we feel strongly --
50 would you like to read that.

1 MS. BURKE: The WIRAC feels strongly
2 that an .804 process should be developed that scores
3 individuals that meet criteria to delineate -- it's a
4 little muddled at this time, but I think the important
5 part -- and we can fine tune this a little bit after
6 lunch -- to delineate individuals with longstanding,
7 direct dependence on the resources in the area.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. Something to
10 that effect. Is that acceptable to the Council.

11

12 (Council nods affirmatively)

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we'll make final
15 adoption after Melinda has printed out the final copy.
16 So I think we've covered this issue thoroughly.
17 Melinda.

18

19 MS. BURKE: Mr. Chair. We're going to
20 hop a little bit out of order here. We have PowerPoint
21 presentations regarding both the Ambler and Donlin mine
22 status updates. I set time certain for this morning.
23 I want to check. Is Mary Ellen Tuttell on the line for
24 Ambler?

25

26 MS. TUTTELL: Yes, I am.

27

28 MS. BURKE: Good morning, Maryellen.
29 What about Mr. Keith Gordon for Donlin?

30

31 (No comment)

32

33 MS. BURKE: So we're going to go ahead
34 and go with Maryellen. Give me about two minutes and
35 I'll get the PowerPoint set up and I'll get the
36 materials handed out to the Council. Just one sec.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Should we take a
39 five-minute break?

40

41 MS. BURKE: We'll do a five-minute
42 break everyone online, please.

43

44 (Off record)

45

46 (On record)

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to come
49 back to order again. We've got a presentation on the
50 Ambler mining road. We have a sheet in our packet

1 here, which is also the presentation. It's in the
2 right side at the back.

3

4 MS. BURKE: Maryellen, thanks for your
5 patience. Maryellen is the project manager for the
6 Ambler Mining District Access Project Update. There is
7 a longer, more in-person presentation planned for your
8 fall meeting, but we wanted to -- we appreciate
9 Maryellen being willing to be pushed over to this
10 agenda. We had no quorum at the fall meeting, so we're
11 picking up a lot of agenda items making up for that.

12

13 Thanks so much for your patience,
14 Maryellen.

15

16 Please go ahead.

17

18 MS. TUTTELL: Thank you. Good morning,
19 everybody. My name is Maryellen Tuttell and I'm
20 representing Ambler's Mining District Industrial Assets
21 Road Project. I also have here with me Mark Davis, who
22 is the deputy director for infrastructure development
23 at AIDEA and Mike Catsi, who is the business
24 development and community outreach officer for AIDEA.

25

26 For those of you that aren't as
27 familiar with AIDEA, AIDEA is the Alaska Industrial
28 Development and Export Authority. AIDEA is similar to
29 an economic development bank. It helps the state
30 finance development of industrial infrastructure and
31 helps support economic development in the area and
32 providing jobs and good income to people throughout the
33 state. AIDEA has similar experience to projects like
34 the one we're going to talk about. AIDEA was the
35 entity that constructed the road between the Red Dog
36 Mine and the port at Red Dog.

37

38 So if you want to go ahead and flip to
39 the slide with the purpose of the project. So the
40 purpose of this project to date with the Governor's
41 Office is to construct surface access to the Ambler
42 Mining District and the Ambler Mining District is a
43 large area out in Northwest Alaska on the south flank
44 of the Brooks Range and it contains a lot of different
45 mineral resources. So the purpose is to construct road
46 access to that area in order to support continued
47 exploration of the different mineral resources in that
48 area and development of some of those resources
49 potentially into active mines.

50

1 If you want to go to the next slide, it
2 shows where the Ambler Mining District is. It's the
3 little yellow area there between Kotzebue and the
4 Dalton Highway just to give you an idea where it is.

5
6 The next slide we talk about the fact
7 that this is a long area of land that has a variety of
8 different mineral resources. If you look at the slide
9 that says resource rich region, all of the little
10 yellow stars on that map are different mineral
11 prospects that are known about and have been discovered
12 over the decades of exploration out in that area. The
13 dashed line shows the State lands out in that area that
14 contain mineral resources.

15
16 So there's a lot of State land out
17 there that contains highly mineralized area that was
18 selected by the State with anticipation of generating
19 revenues from developing those resources. Then it's
20 surrounded by other lands that are owned, some by
21 private entities, some by Native corporations. So
22 there's mineral prospects on both State lands and
23 privately-held lands as well.

24
25 The area has copper, zinc, lead, silver
26 and gold and we've listed the four major deposits that
27 are probably the furthest along with the most
28 exploration having been done so far at Arctic, but also
29 exploration underway on the bornite area, recent
30 exploration activity at Sun and also the Smucker
31 deposit.

32
33 As these mining companies have worked
34 on looking at the feasibility of developing these
35 mineral prospects, their feasibility studies have shown
36 that they cannot economically open and operate a mine
37 without having surface transportation.

38
39 If you go to the next slide on project
40 development to date, this gives a little bit of the
41 history of the project. The project was originally
42 with the Department of Transportation and public
43 facilities and they initiated reconnaissance work in
44 2010. They went out and did a lot of public meetings,
45 they collected a lot of baseline information, they
46 looked at potential routes from the Ambler Mining
47 District. Some going to the west to potential ports
48 and some going to the east to either the Dalton Highway
49 or down to the Parks Highway or to the railroad. So
50 they looked at a number of different alternatives.

1 They did, as I mentioned, baseline studies on biology,
2 wetlands, subsistence and collected a lot of aerial
3 photography to be able to look at potential
4 alternatives.

5
6 We go to the next slide. It talks
7 about how those preliminary corridors were evaluated.
8 They looked at how long the corridor was, how many
9 Federal conservation units might be affected. The
10 location of the Ambler Mining District is kind of right
11 in the middle of a lot of Federal conservation units.
12 So to the north you have a number of National Parks, to
13 the east you have a National Park, to the southwest you
14 have Wildlife Refuges and to the southeast you have
15 Wildlife Refuges. So there's Federal conservation
16 system units with a big issue at looking at trying to
17 find a potential route.

18
19 There's also a number of Wild and
20 Scenic Rivers designated in the area. As you're very
21 aware, there's obviously a lot of fisheries and
22 wildlife habitat. There's threatened and endangered
23 species primarily along the west coast within the study
24 area. Extensive wetlands.

25
26 We also looked at the availability
27 since the major cost of a road is is there material
28 sites where you can get access to materials to build
29 the roads easily, so that was a major criteria for
30 that. Then, of course, the cost for constructing and
31 maintaining a road.

32
33 If you go to the next slide on Brooks
34 East Corridor, based on the Department of
35 Transportation's reconnaissance studies and looking at
36 the eight different routes that I talked about, they
37 determined that the most feasible route seemed to be
38 the shortest route, which was between the mining
39 district and the Dalton Highway. Although that route
40 would go through a conservation unit, namely Gates of
41 the Arctic National Preserve, there was actually a
42 specific provision in ANILCA for that road right-of-way
43 because the value of the Ambler Mining District was
44 already known back when ANILCA was developed.

45
46 So the Brooks East Corridor goes
47 between the Ambler Mining District east to the Dalton
48 Highway. It's about 200 miles long. We estimate that
49 there would need to be about four maintenance stations
50 along the road. There are 15 large bridge structures

1 that would be required. Again, it has less impact on
2 caribou and endangered species than taking any of the
3 routes to the west. It does go through Gates of the
4 Arctic. It's primarily on State land although it does
5 have to cross BLM lands particularly near the Dalton
6 Highway and some Native corporation lands on both sides
7 of Gates of the Arctic.

8

9 The next slide is just a map that kind
10 of shows the corridor from the Dalton Highway on your
11 right to the Ambler River on your left and you can see
12 the pink line is Gates of the Arctic National Park and
13 the wilderness portion and then there's some green
14 lines that come down south of the park and that's the
15 preserved portion of Gates of the Arctic and that's
16 where this corridor would be proposed to go through.

17

18 To give you an idea of the communities
19 in the area, you have Bettles and Evansville to the far
20 right near the beginning of the corridor, you have
21 Ambler, Shungnak and Kobuk to the far left near the end
22 of the corridor and then down the Koyukuk River you
23 have Alatna, Allakaket and a little further down you
24 have Hughes and Huslia. So that just gives you an idea
25 of the proposed corridor.

26

27 If you go to the next slide, the task
28 that we currently have underway, AIDEA took the project
29 over from Department of Transportation in about June of
30 2013 and the reason was that one of the big issues that
31 came up when DOT was doing public meetings on the
32 project were concerns about public access out into
33 areas that are currently hard to get to and the
34 potential increase in hunting pressure on wildlife
35 resources if there was increased public access.

36

37 So in order to deal with that the
38 Governor transferred the project from the Department of
39 Transportation to AIDEA because AIDEA tends to build
40 non-public industrial access roads that are used
41 specifically by commercial transportation associated
42 with industrial development. AIDEA took the project
43 over in June of 2013 and we've been going out and
44 meeting with different communities along the Koyukuk
45 River Drainage and over in the Upper Kobuk area to talk
46 with them about why AIDEA is taking the project over
47 and what are the things that might change and what the
48 process is for taking the project forward.

49

50 In addition to the public meetings,

1 we've continued to do biological studies, wetlands
2 delineations, fisheries studies, raptor surveys. We
3 have done some preliminary reconnaissance work on
4 cultural resources. We've been working with Fish and
5 Game on some subsistence study updates and also looking
6 at some of the economic analysis.

7
8 We've continued to refine the proposed
9 alignment and we're trying to prepare a 20 percent
10 design so that we can submit that to the Federal
11 agencies to start the Federal National Environmental
12 Policy Act process. So we would be working with the
13 Federal agencies. We would propose a project to them
14 and then we would work with them on an environmental
15 impact statement that would look at potential
16 alternatives to the route we proposed and it would look
17 at the potential impacts of the project and what
18 mitigation might be needed to reduce the impacts. So
19 that's what we're getting ready to move into here in
20 the next few months.

21
22 So in the next slide again there has
23 been a very high level of interest in the project as
24 you can imagine throughout the region. A lot of the
25 concerns that we've heard have been centered on
26 subsistence impacts. As I mentioned, concerns about
27 public access into the area. But there's also been a
28 lot of interest from some of the communities on
29 potential ways to use this project to help their
30 community to provide jobs or employment opportunities
31 or to provide ways to do commercial transport of fuel
32 or other heavy freight that might help mitigate some of
33 the high cost of living out in these areas.

34
35 And then, of course, the other issues
36 being environmental issues. Particularly there is some
37 naturally occurring asbestos on the west end of the
38 corridor and there have been concerns about whether any
39 of that would get dragged over into the eastern area
40 and there are some concerns about the overall impacts
41 of the road and potential mine development that might
42 occur supported by the road.

43
44 So the next slide shows the proposed
45 project schedule. As I mentioned, there's DOT starting
46 the community outreach back in 2010-2011 and then AIDEA
47 has taken it over and will continue to reach out to the
48 communities as we go through the whole project
49 development process. The routing and reconnaissance
50 studies were primarily done by the Department of

1 Transportation and we are just doing some refinement on
2 those.

3

4 Baseline environmental work has been
5 underway since 2012 and it will continue for the next
6 few years as we continue to evaluate the resources that
7 are there now and any potential impacts. The same with
8 preliminary engineering. We look to submit a permit
9 application to the Federal agencies here in the spring,
10 just in the next month or two, to initiate the
11 environmental impact statement. We expect that that
12 process will take a few years and we hope that we would
13 come out of that process with a project that -- with a
14 corridor that's been approved by the Federal agencies
15 and be able to move into final design and permitting
16 sometime in 2016-2017 with a potential start of
17 construction in 2018.

18

19 So that is a quick summary of our
20 project. I'd be happy to try to answer any questions.
21 As well, as I mentioned, I have Mark Davis and Mike
22 Catsi also here with me, so we are happy to answer any
23 questions we can.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks very
26 much, Maryellen. This is Jack Reakoff, Chair of the
27 Council. I would like to open it up for Council
28 questions. I have some questions myself, but I want
29 the Council to ask questions first. Any questions from
30 the Council.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have my own
35 question, how much of the road funding will be from
36 Federal government sources?

37

38 MS. TUTTELL: Right now the road is
39 proposed as a State project. We're not using any
40 Federal funds. The road is proposed to be handled as a
41 public private partnership once we get through the
42 environmental impact statement process. Once we have
43 the corridor defined and we have a much better idea of
44 what the project will actually look like, then AIDEA
45 would work with private industry to come up for funding
46 for construction, operation and maintenance of the
47 road. Again, that's why the project was given to AIDEA
48 because AIDEA specializes in that kind of funding.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So there would never

1 be any Federal funding involved in the road.

2

3 MS. TUTTELL: There's no Federal
4 funding proposed for construction or operations or
5 maintenance.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The other question I
8 have is the Governor's Office -- I see no information
9 -- I live at Wiseman on the Dalton High -- which is
10 near the Dalton Highway, long before the road was
11 there. One of the main things that helps control the
12 impact to subsistence and the resources is the
13 statutory closure to firearms and all-terrain vehicles
14 used. So my question is, is the Governor's Office at
15 all contemplating restrictions to ORV use and firearms
16 from the road? We were told when the Haul Road was
17 built that the road would never be open to the public.
18 Well, that only lasted two years, so I don't actually
19 believe that this road will be closed forever. I don't
20 believe that in the slightest because we were lied to
21 then, why would we believe that it would be closed now.

22

23 MS. TUTTELL: Okay.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I'm wondering
26 is the Governor's Office contemplating with the
27 Legislature to assure the residents that there would be
28 a statutory closure, like the Haul Road, the Dalton
29 Highway Corridor Management Area, five miles on each
30 side of the road? Is there any discussion about that?

31

32 MS. TUTTELL: Let me address a little
33 bit on the Dalton Road and then I'm going to turn it
34 over to Mark Davis, who will discuss more on the
35 Governor's intentions. But we hear a lot about the
36 experience on the Dalton Road. I do want to highlight
37 the differences between the Dalton Highway and this
38 project.

39

40 Number one, the Dalton Highway, the
41 State bought and the BLM issued public highway rights-
42 of-way for that road and so the intent was always that
43 it would be constructed as a public highway. What we
44 are proposing to do is to seek limited access rights-
45 of-way, so the right-of-way itself would be a different
46 type of right-of-way than the right-of-way that was
47 issued for Dalton Highway.

48

49 The second thing is that the Dalton
50 Haul Road, you know, was put on the Federal list to use

1 Federal funds for reconstruction of it and once you get
2 put on the Federal highway aid list, it's really hard
3 to restrict the road from having public access.

4

5 Another issue is that the road was open
6 for public access because, again, it was billed as a
7 public highway that was under the control of the
8 Department of Transportation and the Commissioner has
9 the right under Alaska law to open and close a public
10 highway.

11

12 We're proposing that this would be a
13 privately developed road, an industrial road. It would
14 not be controlled by the Department of Transportation
15 and the Commission would not then have the authority to
16 open the road to public access. So there's a number of
17 differences between how the Dalton Highway was
18 developed and how this road is proposed to be
19 developed.

20

21 Now I'll let Mark add a little bit more
22 about the Governor's intent on this road.

23

24 MR. DAVIS: I'll introduce myself. My
25 name is Mark Davis and I'm the deputy director at
26 AIDEA. So the design here is for us to look at whether
27 we can first (indiscernible) and then finance an access
28 road. The road would be very similar to the road
29 building the Pogo Mine, which is private, and which
30 there's no hunting access and this road is probably a
31 one-way road, the way we're looking at it now with one-
32 way traffic control.

33

34 At the end of the project, the road
35 will be removed. It will be removed because, as a
36 private road, we need to insure it and we would only
37 want to insure it when it's people paying a toll. So
38 this will be a toll road, like the Red Dog Mine Road
39 that AIDEA owns but does not operate.

40

41 In this particular road, it will also
42 probably not be operated by AIDEA, but will be operated
43 by the other owners in the road, the partnership, and
44 they will be responsible for placing any restrictions
45 for safety. Those restrictions on safety are probably
46 going to include firearm restrictions.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've heard that
49 there will be as many as 400 trucks a day driving on
50 the Ambler Road. There would be no restriction on

1 those drivers. The Dalton Highway, we have lots of
2 truckers shooting wolves and all kinds of animals from
3 the road. That happens all the time. So this does not
4 assure me that -- 400 vehicles a day driving back and
5 forth, that doesn't assure me at all that they can't
6 have access to ATVs to go from the road and boats and
7 various access by the crews.

8

9 It also does not assure me that the
10 road will not be eventually conveyed to the State. I
11 can hardly believe that they will dig the whole Ambler
12 Road up and remove it at the end. I feel that the
13 State of Alaska will eventually take control of the
14 road and because it's a State road that it will go
15 under the DOT and then eventually it will be open to
16 the public.

17

18 I would like to see statutory closures
19 to assure the public from day one that there will
20 always be those means restrictions in place so that --
21 that's the only way that the Dalton Highway is brought
22 to some kind of semblance of management for an Arctic
23 environment.

24

25 The Ambler Road crosses -- transects
26 the migratory route of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd,
27 Teshekpuk Caribou Herd and sometimes the Central Arctic
28 Caribou Herd. When you have a road that transects
29 caribou migrations -- and eventually the resource will
30 be depleted to the point where the Ambler mining
31 companies won't want to maintain the road again and the
32 road will be conveyed to the state. I don't believe
33 that the State is going to make them dig this road up.
34 They'll just take control of the road and we'll have a
35 road and then we'll have to deal with all these issues.

36

37 I feel that there's not enough
38 statutory discussion on closing all-terrain vehicle use
39 and firearms for the Ambler Road. I also feel that the
40 road -- the cost as a state of Alaska resident -- I was
41 born in the territory of Alaska. As a state of Alaska
42 resident, I feel the estimate of the cost is far below
43 what it actually is going to take. There's 15 major
44 drainages and the John River and the Alatna River
45 drainages, I see where it wants to cross the -- those
46 are going to be deep piling, there's going to be lots
47 of geotextiles involved. This road is going to be
48 crosswind to the direction of the airflow. There will
49 be major drifting. So if the State of Alaska
50 eventually takes control of this road, it's going to be

1 a very expensive road to maintain. Harder than the
2 Dalton Highway. The Dalton Highway is an expensive
3 road to maintain.

4

5 So my comments are that I feel that
6 this road eventually will be conveyed to the State.
7 There's not enough discussion about mitigating the
8 impacts to the subsistence users and the resources of
9 that area.

10

11 I would like any other comments from
12 the Council. Pollock.

13

14 MR. SIMON: Hi. My name is Pollock
15 Simon, Sr. from Allakaket. I spoke my concern to you
16 peoples before and today I'm a member of the Regional
17 Council here. My concern is still the same. First,
18 fish is depleted on the Upper Koyukuk River. We've got
19 no king salmon and we have a limited resource of
20 wildlife, namely moose or reindeer.

21

22 The people of Allakaket, Alatna and
23 Bettles, Evansville has all the drafted letters
24 opposing the road because we are afraid that once the
25 road gets completed and not in use by industrial use,
26 it could open to the public and people would come up
27 the road not only just to look at the scenery but could
28 maybe fish or hunt or trap beside us.

29

30 Plus this road will traverse prime
31 hunting and trapping areas used by the residents of
32 Upper Koyukuk River. So far I've had different
33 villages oppose the road. Nobody has said they're for
34 the road yet, so my concerns stay the same.

35

36 Thank you.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock.
39 Any other comments from the Council.

40

41 Robert.

42

43 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
44 If it is ever to be tore up once this is completed,
45 which I doubt very much, but when you look at it from a
46 point of view from a guide, a transporter, this is just
47 a landing strip here, the road, that you could utilize
48 for transporting, to guiding into this region here.
49 This just opens the door up to a lot of other things
50 other than what they're going to do. That's what I'm

1 afraid of. I think that we should not support this
2 because the local people in the area are not going to
3 benefit from it anyway.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray, go ahead.

6

7 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I'm wondering why
8 the extension of the Red Dog Mine, which is already
9 industrial, wouldn't make more sense because you
10 wouldn't have connection to the Interior Alaska and if
11 you're hauling minerals out, wouldn't you want to haul
12 them out to the port, which would be a shorter run than
13 to drive them all the way down to Fairbanks or
14 somewhere where they can get on a railroad? And then
15 that route I think it would be a lot easier to control
16 or there wouldn't be the pressures to open it up to
17 other residents of Alaska to use it for sport and other
18 purposes if it was just an industrial road extension of
19 the Red Dog. So why was that route turned down?

20

21 MS. TUTTELL: This is Maryellen. We
22 did look at a possible route to the Red Dog Road. The
23 problem is there are a number of National Parks and
24 Monuments between Ambler and the Red Dog port area and
25 those national conservation units do not have any type
26 of provision in ANILCA allowing, you know, guaranteed
27 road access through those.

28

29 In addition, as we go to the west, we
30 tend to hit more caribou habitat, more fisheries
31 habitat, more wetlands and there's more endangered
32 species habitat along the west area as opposed to going
33 over to the east. Plus it's a longer route and it
34 doesn't have as good a material site availability, so
35 it becomes much more expensive.

36

37 And it's in the area that has higher
38 levels of naturally occurring asbestos, so we do look
39 at it, but there were a number of issues that made that
40 -- plus we would have to rebuild the port because the
41 port there right now is not sized sufficiently that you
42 could then add on all these additional uses to it. So
43 there were a number of reasons why that did not end up
44 being one of the preferred routes.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And a barge system
47 on the Kobuk River would not be a reasonable extraction
48 system, which would be fairly -- the least expense to
49 build for the State of Alaska, a port on the Kobuk
50 River, which is a large drainage and could support

1 barge traffic?

2

3 MS. TUTTELL: I'm not -- I haven't
4 looked at the Kobuk River. I know the Ambler River,
5 the water levels are way too low to get barges up
6 there.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm talking about
9 building a road about 40 miles to the Kobuk River,
10 which is a very large drainage, and shipping the
11 mineral out on the Kobuk River. Why didn't the State
12 look at that? Why does the State have to be involved
13 in building a huge infrastructure when there's a very
14 short route, a large drainage that goes out and they
15 haul mineral at Red Dog all summer. So they stockpile
16 and they haul these barges of minerals away. Why
17 wasn't that contemplated by the State? I never saw any
18 kind of a contemplation to that effect.

19

20 MS. TUTTELL: I haven't looked
21 specifically at the Kobuk River. There's a couple
22 things that come to mind on it. Number one would be we
23 would have to look at where you could connect with the
24 Kobuk River outside of Gates of the Arctic since I'm
25 sure that -- although we're allowed to have a road
26 access through there, I'm sure they wouldn't be real
27 interested in us building a big barge staging facility
28 within the Gates of the Arctic Preserve.

29

30 Then the other issue to look at would
31 be what type of port facility would have to be
32 constructed down at the west coast end of the Kobuk
33 River. So that's something that I will look more into
34 and can provide some additional information on that.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, I'm not talking
37 about taking the mineral all the way up to the head of
38 the Kobuk and putting it in the river. I'm talking
39 about bringing it down to the mouth of the Ambler
40 River, which is a deep water area on the Kobuk River
41 and barging the mineral down to the port on the coast.
42 AIDEA built the port down there at Kivalina for the Red
43 Dog.

44

45 That's a way cheaper endeavor than this
46 huge boondoggle of building across 15 rivers and all
47 this swamps and all this heavy piling that's going to
48 have to be put in for infrastructure across all those
49 -- like the Alatna and the John River, when there's a
50 way shorter route to the Kobuk River that could be

1 utilized to extract the mineral.

2

3 I feel that the prospectus that you're
4 giving us is not reflecting the amount of caribou
5 migrations that have historically utilized the main
6 route of this road. When I was a kid, there were
7 hundreds of thousands of caribou that came down the
8 Alatna and John River and came across this road
9 corridor. The Western Arctic Herd shifts back and
10 forth from the Western to the Central Brooks Range.

11

12 Another aspect that's not being
13 reflected is the major spawning grounds for sheefish on
14 the Koyukuk River and also in the Kobuk River drainage.
15 This comes really, really close to some major sheefish
16 spawning grounds and that's not reflecting the impacts
17 to those species which are fairly sensitive species
18 either in this perspective.

19

20 So I think that when we get into the
21 EIS, I will be making extensive comments on things that
22 are being distinctly overlooked and I feel that
23 statutory restrictions is one of the keynotes that the
24 Governor's Office should be talking about for firearms
25 and all-terrain vehicles.

26

27 MS. TUTTELL: Yeah, and I agree. I
28 think the whole purpose of us wanting to get the EIS
29 started is to bring all the Federal agencies into the
30 discussion. As you know, the first step in the EIS
31 will be scoping and that's when we will be -- you know,
32 we would be very interested in your comments and
33 knowledge of specific habitats or other areas that you
34 think are being overlooked as well as potential
35 alternatives that you think have been overlooked.

36

37 So that's really -- if we can get our
38 permit application submitted here in the next month or
39 so and start the scoping process, that would be the
40 perfect time for all those issues to be brought in so
41 that we could work with the Federal agencies to
42 identify what are the potential alternatives that need
43 to be evaluated in the EIS and what are the potential
44 impacts and data that we need to evaluate those
45 impacts. So we would look forward to getting very
46 comprehensive comments from you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You will be
49 attending our fall meeting and that will be in the
50 scoping process in October?

1 MS. TUTTELL: I don't know exactly when
2 the scoping process will be yet because obviously the
3 Federal agencies will set the
4 schedule once we submit the permit application, but I
5 would not be surprised if that was during the scoping
6 period and I would be happy to attend and hopefully
7 bring some of the Federal agency folks with me.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I would
10 appreciate it when you do attend -- whether you're in
11 the EIS process or not, when you attend our meeting if
12 you can bring further information from the Governor's
13 Office on statutory restrictions on the road, whether
14 the long-term prospectus is that the road would
15 actually be conveyed to the State of Alaska and whether
16 the State of Alaska had actually analyzed the port at
17 the mouth of the Ambler River to extract mineral to the
18 coast in a very much reduced expense to the State of
19 Alaska. I would like to have those answers at our
20 meeting.

21
22 Any further comments. Tim.

23
24 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25 This is Tim Gervais from Ruby. Could you define
26 briefly, is AIDEA like a bank or are they an offshoot
27 of some department of investment or commerce for the
28 State of Alaska or a quasi-governmental group? Then
29 the second question I had was like how many tons of
30 material or concentrate are going to be coming out of
31 this district and what's the expected mine life of
32 these projects?

33
34 MR. DAVIS: This is Mark Davis again
35 from AIDEA. First, on the financial side, AIDEA
36 finances resemble the DeLong Mountain Transportation
37 System that supports the Red Dog Mine by issuing bonds.
38 It also can invest its own funds, we have our own
39 money, into a project using private capital. You may
40 have seen an announcement on the endeavor that was in
41 Cook Inlet. That was an AIDEA partial investment with
42 a company called Envion and a few other smaller
43 companies. So what we do is we either issue bonds or
44 we put our own money into investment and then we seek
45 other investors. So that means that there are no
46 general fund. That money is actually in the investment
47 in the road and this becomes a -- it's not really a
48 State project.

49
50 MS. TUTTELL: But AIDEA was established

1 as a public corporation, so it's similar to a private
2 investment bank, but it's a public corporation founded
3 by the State and it does have the Commissioner of the
4 Department of Commerce on the board of AIDEA along with
5 a lot of private business people.

6

7 MR. GERVAIS: So you have a similar
8 structure to like CFAB?

9

10 MR. DAVIS: This is Mark Davis again
11 for the record. No, I wouldn't say CFAB. I'm very
12 familiar with CFAB. No, actually what we're similar to
13 is the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation. The
14 corporation finances houses throughout the state of
15 Alaska by issuing bonds and has an independent board,
16 but it does have also the Commissioner of Revenue on
17 the board. So AIDEA and Alaska Housing Finance are
18 very similar.

19

20 When Alaska Housing Finance Corporation
21 develops a project, those are not really State
22 projects, those are done by Alaska Housing bonds and
23 AIDEA has the right to issue bonds in a similar manner.

24

25 MS. TUTTELL: Then your second question
26 on the mines. Again, one of the things to be clear
27 about is this road project, as I showed, this goes to a
28 very long 75-mile area of mining prospects, so this is
29 not a road just to support one mine. This is intended
30 to provide access to a number of the different mining
31 companies that have prospects out in that area to view
32 exploration and possibly develop mines. So we don't
33 know what the amount of concentrates will be in the
34 long term.

35

36 The mine that is furthest along at this
37 point is the Arctic Deposit that NovaCopper has and
38 they have some preliminary studies out on that that
39 estimate the mine life for that particular site for the
40 known resources to be about 13 years, but what
41 typically happens is, you know, they have to show
42 enough resources to make it financially feasible to do
43 the mine.

44

45 Once they get there and they're
46 operating, they continue to explore and typically that
47 extends the mine life and they start exploring the
48 other -- once the road is there, then the other
49 companies would be exploring more as well, so we would
50 expect that, you know, over time there would be two or

1 three or more mines developed of various sizes. Some
2 might be smaller than the one that NovaCopper is
3 proposing, some might be more similar in size.

4
5 Again, it's to the whole mining
6 district, so the intent would be that it would support
7 development of that area over a long period, you know,
8 20, 30, 40 years and the road would not commit to any
9 specific mine, but each mining company that wanted to
10 develop out there would have to build roads to connect
11 into this road.

12
13 MR. GERVAIS: Then the last question I
14 have is what if -- is there any kind of provision that
15 the road won't be constructed if it's a situation like
16 Bristol Bay where the local communities and the tribes
17 decide they'd rather maintain the environment the way
18 it is to help with the fish and wildlife production and
19 not have a property such as Pebble Mine developed?

20
21 MS. TUTTELL: So the State is proposing
22 to take this through the environmental impact statement
23 and, again, through that process, working with the
24 Federal agencies, we will look at a number of different
25 alternatives to providing transportation access to that
26 mining district. One of the options in the EIS is
27 always what they call the no action alternative, which
28 means you don't do the project. So that will be
29 evaluated in the EIS along with the other alternatives
30 to get identified.

31
32 Once the EIS is done and we see what
33 comes out of that process and what type of project
34 could be approved, then the AIDEA board will have to
35 make a decision whether it's financially feasible to
36 finance and construct and operate the road. Again, the
37 EIS is to kind of look at all the alternatives and the
38 impacts and come up with the best possible project.
39 And then there's another decision point as to whether
40 or not that project can be financially developed and
41 operated.

42
43 MR. DAVIS: Finally, if an EIS is
44 issued and if financing can be obtained, then the AIDEA
45 board is required at least to consult with the local
46 borough to see whether there's agreement that the
47 project should go forward. You can see that in the
48 record if you look at the borough and assembly of
49 Anchorage. We recently built a new building on the
50 Joint JBER Base and we consulted with the Borough of

1 Anchorage on that construction project and that's in
2 the Anchorage Borough records. You can see how AIDEA
3 works with borough government.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But not the local
6 affected communities, just the borough.

7

8 MR. DAVIS: Well, in the unorganized
9 area, the AIDEA statutes provide that if there's
10 another mechanism for a consultation with a regional
11 committee, that would be set up in any areas of an
12 unorganized borough.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Well, I think
15 we've covered this issue quite a bit and I would like
16 to have this on our agenda for the fall meeting and I
17 would like you to come -- I want to make it clear there
18 was no evaluation of a port at like Shungnak or Ambler
19 on the Kobuk River with a very short 20-mile-long road
20 and any further extension, 75 miles to the east, would
21 be much shorter than 240 miles to the Dalton Highway
22 and crossing some major rivers. So you cross very few
23 rivers, you would transect very few caribou migration
24 routes and it would be much cheaper for the State of
25 Alaska.

26

27 AIDEA is saying, well, that's our
28 money. That's not your money. That's my money. Where
29 did that money come from? That came from our resources
30 as a state of Alaska resident. That's my money. I
31 don't know where you got it. You got it out of the
32 general fund. Somewhere you got our money and you're
33 spending my money in a way that -- I feel the best
34 economic benefit would be a much shorter road and a not
35 much different system.

36

37 So I want to see a re-evaluation at our
38 fall meeting to come up with something more reasonable.
39 I think the cost is going to be far beyond what's being
40 estimated. I know what it costs to build bridges
41 across major rivers. It's not cheap. It's not
42 \$2 million a mile, I know that. There's 15 bridges
43 that are going to be very expensive.

44

45 So these are some of the questions that
46 I would like you to bring to our fall meeting with some
47 answers about statutory restrictions and so forth, but
48 I do appreciate you and the Council -- our Council is a
49 huge area of the Western Interior, so it's good for the
50 other Council members to hear what the issues are up

1 there. I appreciate your participation on the call.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 MS. TUTTELL: Thank you. We'll look
6 forward to talking with you at the fall meeting.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Melinda.

9

10 MS. BURKE: Do we have Mr. Keith Gordon
11 on the line? I apologize earlier I identified him as
12 being with Donlin Mine, but he's actually with the U.S.
13 Army Corps of Engineers. Keith Gordon.

14

15 MR. GORDON: Yes, I'm on the line.

16

17 MS. BURKE: Good morning, Keith. Thank
18 you so much for joining us. I'm going to get the
19 materials handed out. If you'd like to go ahead and
20 start introducing yourself, that would be great.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Keith.

23

24 MR. GORDON: This is Keith Gordon with
25 the Army Corps of Engineers. I'm a regulatory project
26 manager within the Army Corps of Engineers Alaska
27 District. As you all are aware, we're here today to
28 discuss the proposed Donlin Gold Mine Project located
29 approximately 10 miles north of Crooked Creek and
30 basically we discussed the status of the environmental
31 impact statement and the NEPA processing.

32

33 As most of you are aware, the proposed
34 Donlin Gold Mine project is a joint venture of two
35 international mining companies, Barrick and NOVAGOLD.
36 The relevance to the Regional Advisory Committee
37 effectively, as I'm sure you're aware, is the potential
38 environmental, both human and natural, impacts of the
39 project as currently proposed.

40

41 It's clear from the previous
42 presentations that you all are very familiar with the
43 NEPA process, so I'm sure you're aware that the EIS is
44 a major component of the NEPA process related to the
45 proposed project and it would be followed, if it
46 successfully proceeded through the NEPA process, to
47 various Federal, State and local permitting processes
48 during which decisions will be made regarding whether
49 or not the mine could or would not be permitted.

50

1 The Corps regulatory program is not a
2 proponent for, nor a proponent of the proposed project.
3 The Corps is the lead Federal agency responsible for
4 the development of the EIS overall. Although it's to
5 conduct an independent evaluation of the proposed
6 project through the NEPA process, we're assisted
7 primarily in this process by a large technical team
8 from URS Corporation, Federal and State agency staffs,
9 affected tribal governments and all the various
10 affected public.

11
12 Between January and March of 2013, the
13 Army Corps of Engineers visited a variety of
14 communities in Western Alaska to initiate the scoping
15 process you all were discussing a few minutes ago in
16 relation to the Ambler project. We got a substantial
17 number of very valuable, very detailed comments in
18 relation to the potential impacts of the proposed
19 project.

20
21 As you can see by the packets that have
22 been handed out, the intent today is quickly walk
23 through a short overview of the project itself, provide
24 you a little bit of information on the scoping comments
25 received to date and a little bit of information on the
26 development of the environmental impact statement in
27 relation to data gaps, potential alternatives, impacts
28 potentially to the affected environment and potential
29 environmental consequences of the project.

30
31 MS. BURKE: I've got your PowerPoint
32 up, Keith. Just let me know when to go to the next
33 slide.

34
35 MR. GORDON: Okay. If we go to slide
36 number two. This slide represents the overall project
37 timeline as you can see. On the far left side we're
38 looking at Donlin's proposed project, which basically
39 they spent approximately 16 years doing baseline
40 studies, exploration, et cetera, to help establish
41 baseline information to review the project.

42
43 The middle box represents both the NEPA
44 and the permitting phase of the process, during which
45 we would go through the NEPA process, development of a
46 preliminary draft EIS for review by the various
47 cooperators, it would not go out to the general public
48 for review, development of a draft environmental impact
49 statements, which would go out to the public for review
50 and comment, followed by the development of a final

1 environmental impact statement which would also go out
2 to the public for review and comment.

3

4 If the project proceeds successfully
5 through the NEPA process, then it will, as I mentioned
6 earlier, lead into the permitting phase, during which
7 it will be evaluated and determinations will be made by
8 various entities as to whether or not the project
9 should go forward.

10

11 The right-hand box indicates the
12 project as currently proposed. Construction, if the
13 project were to be permitted, is expected to take three
14 to four years. Operation, as proposed, 27 and a half
15 years, followed by closure and reclamation and ongoing
16 monitoring. Monitoring, as it's currently being
17 discussed in relation to this project, includes
18 approximately 50 years of water quality monitoring
19 after closure of the mine site.

20

21 If we move to slide number three, this
22 is a very simple slide of the overall area as you can
23 see. The star in the middle of the map indicates the
24 proposed mine site approximately 10 miles north of
25 Crooked Creek. There's a 313-mile pipeline running
26 east toward Cook Inlet. And most supplies and
27 materials, which are all of them if the project
28 proceeded as proposed, are expected to be barged up the
29 Kuskokwim River. Specifically, most barging supplies
30 and diesel will be transported from the Seattle area to
31 Dutch Harbor and then on up the Kuskokwim River.

32

33 As you're aware, this is a remote area
34 with little development. Therefore, effectively all
35 infrastructure for the mine site would be new
36 infrastructure needing to be development.

37

38 If we could move to slide number four,
39 the pipeline proposed to supply natural gas to the
40 project is a 313-mile, 14-inch diameter, buried steel
41 pipeline that would run from Beluga/Cook Inlet to the
42 proposed mine site. The pipeline, as proposed, crosses
43 56 percent State land, 34 percent BLM land and 10
44 percent Native corporation land. There are a variety
45 of alternatives to portions of the proposed pipeline
46 development that will be taken out to the public
47 overall when the draft environmental impact statement
48 goes out.

49

50 If we flip to slide number five, you

1 can see the three orange numbered circles up there
2 representing the overall mine site. Number one are the
3 two pits, American Creek and Lewis. These two pits, if
4 the mine site were permitted and were to be developed,
5 they'll start out as separate pits and become one pit
6 as the mine developed.

7

8 Number two represents the tailings
9 storage facility. Tailings are what's left of ore
10 after it's processed through the mill. The material is
11 a combination of liquid and solids when it goes into
12 the tailings storage facility and it's de-watered to
13 turn sort of a flour-like powdery material and will
14 remain in perpetuity after the mine closed.

15

16 Number three represents the waste rock
17 facility and, again, this facility would just store
18 rock. It didn't have enough gold in it to be processed
19 as ore. The materials placed in the waste rock
20 facility would be there in perpetuity.

21

22 The pits themselves are in combination
23 2.2 miles long, one mile wide, 1,850 feet deep. The
24 tailings facility would cover approximately 3.5 square
25 miles. The waste rock facility would cover
26 approximately 3.4 square miles. As proposed, the
27 project is expected to, if permitted, process 59,000
28 tons of ore per day averaged over 27.5 years.

29

30 The third component of the project is
31 slide number six and represents the transportation
32 infrastructure. Very briefly, we discussed the barging
33 on the Kuskokwim River as well as the ocean-going
34 barging, the 313-mile proposed pipeline. Barging, as
35 proposed, would move up the Kuskokwim to a new port
36 facility constructed at Jungjuk. That port facility
37 would see the materials offloaded from river-going
38 barges, loaded on the trucks, hauled 30 miles overland
39 via a new road developed to the mine site. There's
40 also a 5,000-foot airstrip proposed west of the mine
41 site to support mine operations. And approximately
42 40 million gallons of diesel would be stored at the
43 mine site and, of course, all of that would have to be
44 barged up the Kuskokwim.

45

46 If we could move to slide number seven.
47 Very briefly, the initial scoping process gave us
48 comments in a variety of categories. The major
49 categories were barge traffic and the potential effects
50 of barging on the Kuskokwim River, species in it,

1 people living around it, et cetera. Potential impacts
2 of project development to subsistence condition and the
3 cultural lifestyle, water quality, quantity and flow
4 impacts. Potential impacts from contaminants. Mercury
5 is one of the primary topics. Obviously impacts to any
6 species in the area, individuals in the area as we
7 already discussed and various human health impacts from
8 the project as proposed.

9

10 If we move to slide number eight. The
11 alternatives development process for the proposed
12 project is the same process you typically see for any
13 project going through the NEPA process. Through the
14 scoping process the Corps of Engineers got a wide
15 variety of issues from the public that have commented
16 to date.

17

18 There was a five-step process developed
19 and that process, after step one, the identification of
20 scoping issues, involved step two, the identification
21 of screening criteria related to each resource impacted
22 by whatever that specific impact is. Step number three
23 identifies options to address the concerns raised.
24 Step number four is the application of the screening
25 criteria to all the various options. At that point,
26 we're either developing options that might be carried
27 forward or dropping these various options out at this
28 initial stage. Step five is to package the options
29 into potential alternatives.

30

31 One thing to keep in mind in relation
32 to the proposed Donlin project, many projects, for
33 instance the Deep-Draft Arctic Port on the western
34 coast of Alaska that an EIS is currently being
35 developed, for a port project in that environment you
36 have an alternative to the port project in that you can
37 move the location
38 of the port from one area to another.

39

40 For the proposed Donlin project, the
41 proposal is to develop an existing ore resource, a
42 mineral resource. Therefore, there is no real
43 alternative to the location of the mine itself. There
44 are alternatives to how portions of the mining process
45 may be done, how materials may be transported to it, et
46 cetera, so we have no single alternative in totality to
47 what the applicant is currently proposing.

48

49 As you're aware from discussion of the
50 Ambler project, we'll step through the same NEPA

1 process that I think you all are very familiar with.

2

3 If we move to slide number nine,
4 alternatives currently under development. Of course,
5 as you have just discussed in relation to Ambler, we
6 realize the no option alternative. Effectively, the
7 benefits of doing nothing -- I mean the effects of
8 doing nothing, the applicants proposed alternative. As
9 I mentioned, since there is no single alternative to
10 the project overall, some of the alternatives we're
11 looking at reduce barging impacts via various
12 alternatives to barging.

13

14 For instance, as I mentioned, one
15 component of the project is barge transportation of up
16 to 40 million gallons of diesel a year up the Kuskokwim
17 River. There are options to that. For instance, if
18 the applicant used natural gas mining trucks, which are
19 currently being developed but don't exist at this
20 particular moment, they could eliminate the need for
21 storage of 40 million gallons of diesel at the mine
22 site every year.

23

24 There was also the possibility of
25 simply replacing the proposed natural gas pipeline with
26 a diesel pipeline. That would eliminate all the
27 barging of fuel up the Kuskokwim River. However there
28 are various impacts, air quality impacts, et cetera, in
29 operating the mine site primarily off of diesel versus
30 off of natural gas.

31

32 Slide number 10 gives you another
33 alternative for reducing impacts in relation to
34 barging. The proposed project, as I mentioned, would
35 barge materials upriver to the Jungjuk, the new
36 proposed Jungjuk port site. An alternative is to
37 simply barge material to the boats true crossing,
38 develop a port site there and, as you can see, a much
39 longer road segment to transport materials via truck to
40 the mine site versus the 30 mile proposed road segment
41 for Jungjuk port site if that were actually developed.

42

43 If we flip to slide number 11, this is
44 just a representation of the proposed pipeline route.
45 As I think you all may be aware, there's the potential
46 for the proposed pipeline route to impact the Iditarod
47 Trail and so we've looked at and are currently looking
48 at and will continue to look at various alternatives to
49 not only the proposed pipeline route, but the natural
50 gas pipeline itself versus a diesel pipeline, et

1 cetera.

2

3 If we move to slide number 12, you can
4 see that -- we have a website that is available to
5 provide background information in relation to the
6 project as proposed. It contains things like
7 newsletters that are developed to provide information
8 on the project and its status to date. It contains a
9 scoping report that gives you some information on
10 comments we've received to date and provides additional
11 information on the process as we go through the NEPA
12 process.

13

14 One of our project managers and our
15 primary point of contact is Mr. Don Kuhle and you have
16 his phone number and email up there. Our tribal
17 liaison is Ms. Amanda Shearer and her contact
18 information is on the site as well.

19

20 At this point in time, if you have any
21 questions or would like clarification on this thing,
22 please let me know.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does the Council
25 have questions on the presentation. Go ahead, James.

26

27 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Jack. This
28 is James Walker, Holy Cross. I've got a general
29 question in regards to the barge traffic on the
30 Kuskokwim. We all know that river levels are
31 fluctuating over the years. How is this being looked
32 at as far as putting the infrastructure into the dock
33 on the Kuskokwim and transporting it to -- did you
34 mention the dock site in Bethel area or where are you
35 going to be storing this ore?

36

37 MR. GORDON: There is a proposal to
38 construct at Bethel facilities that would allow the
39 materials that are moved en route to the mine from
40 oceangoing barges to river barges at Bethel via
41 facilities developed at Bethel. Of course, gold
42 shipped out from the mine, bricks that are generated at
43 the mine site if the project is permitted, would expect
44 to move through that facility as it moves downstream.
45 The ore itself would actually be processed at the mine
46 site. So the ore that's excavated at the mine would be
47 processed as proposed at the mine. So the only thing
48 being shipped downstream in relation to the ore would
49 actually be the gold that's produced.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Wouldn't it be more
2 likely they'd fly it out of the 5,000 foot runway
3 though?

4
5 MR. GORDON: That's a possibility. In
6 the timeframe that I've been involved in the project,
7 I've never heard anybody specifically state how they're
8 going to get the gold out if the project is permitted.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's probably a
11 security sensitive issue. Other comments.

12
13 Tim.

14
15 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you for your
16 presentation. This is Tim Gervais from Ruby. The
17 applicants, are they proposing to do any kind of
18 cyanide heap leach on the low grade ores?

19
20 MR. GORDON: No. As proposed, there is
21 no cyanide heap leach related to this project. Cyanide
22 is used in the process to a limited degree, but cyanide
23 used is then treated to become inert after its use in
24 the process.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One question I have
27 on the gas line. I see that the gas line goes
28 basically through Farewell and over. It would seem
29 that the route is much shorter to go through -- I'm not
30 sure what these passes are, but it comes through like
31 Lime Village area. What was the reason for doing it
32 that way?

33
34 MR. GORDON: The development of the
35 proposed pipeline route in large part is simply the
36 easiest route to construct and the safest route for
37 survivability of the proposed mine and maintenance of
38 the line. So, in other words, topography was a major
39 issue in determining the proposed pipeline route as
40 well as how it's located in relation to communities, et
41 cetera.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One question I have
44 about that pipeline route. That's going to be a buried
45 pipeline with a surface road over the top of it and
46 what's going to be the access on that pipeline?

47
48 MR. GORDON: There is no proposed
49 permanent road over the pipeline route. During
50 construction there will have to be some access roads

1 along segments of the pipeline for it's construction.
2 There's a variety of airstrips proposed to be
3 constructed along the route primarily to fly materials
4 in for construction, but we had a substantial
5 discussion and the applicant is not proposing any route
6 -- any permanent road route
7 from Cook Inlet all the way to the mine site.
8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But there would be
10 basically a pad over top of that pipeline or it's just
11 going to be trenched in and then buried and then you're
12 going to go away?
13

14 MR. GORDON: The pipeline is proposed
15 to be trenched in, buried with a 100-foot corridor,
16 150-foot corridor, I don't remember which, cleared on
17 either side of it to allow maintenance. Then a large
18 percentage of the roads that are short segments of road
19 for construction, as I understand it, are expected to
20 be removed. In some areas, we now have short segments
21 of road that remain to facilitate aircraft landing and
22 maintaining pipeline facilities at a river crossing, et
23 cetera.
24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So my concern would
26 be that we would be opening up an access route for all-
27 terrain vehicle use to use this pad and portions of
28 pad. What would be the precluding mechanism to keep
29 the public from utilizing this as a road access to the
30 Interior of Alaska?
31

32 MR. GORDON: That's some of the
33 discussions we've had in the development of the EIS.
34 I'm familiar with a similar question that was raised in
35 your previous conversations. Based on the pipeline
36 construction, there isn't -- there just simply isn't
37 substantial enough road segments proposed to be
38 developed along the pipeline route that could
39 effectively be turned into an access road.
40

41 However, as it relates to the larger
42 NEPA process versus the permitted process, if there are
43 concerns in relation to access, in relation to either
44 the overall pipeline route, wherever it might be if the
45 project is permitted, or short segments of the pipeline
46 route where there might be a road that is maintained
47 for a short distance in perpetuity just to facilitate
48 maintenance of the pipeline, what would need to be
49 defined in various entities permits if the project were
50 permitted was the indication first of all that the NEPA

1 process either did or did not analyze the effects of
2 that type of access and if it did not, then an analysis
3 would need to be conducted after the fact when that
4 type of development was proposed.

5
6 Alternately, if the project were
7 permitted, it simply could be commissioned to state
8 that the road cannot be used for permanent access into
9 and out of that portion of Western Alaska. Obviously to
10 do that you're not referring to a single entity and
11 you're not referring to only Federal or State entities.
12 That's something that would have to be built into the
13 overall project as it went forward, assuming it was
14 permitted.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Ray, go
17 ahead.

18
19 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Along that line,
20 currently Farewell Airstrip is being used by hunters.
21 They fly four-wheelers in there and hunt in that local
22 area and it seems to me that they'll be using this
23 route for those four-wheelers all along. There would
24 be nothing to preclude them if there's a cleared
25 right-of-way of turning that into a four-wheel road.
26 Has that been considered in your planning?

27
28 MR. GORDON: Yes. One of the things we
29 discussed in development of an EIS is, A, that once you
30 clear 100 or 100-foot-wide-plus corridor you can land a
31 Bush plane in substantial portions of that and once
32 this corridor is cleared, whether it's ATV access from
33 folks that live in the area locally, folks flying ATVs
34 in and staging them there as part of the guide
35 operation or whether folks have access to it from a
36 local community for vehicles larger than an ATV, we've
37 noted that those potential effects need to be addressed
38 in the EIS.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.

41
42 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I have one other
43 one. When the BLM was doing scoping hearings in
44 McGrath on a management plan for the whole area, they
45 weren't even aware that Big River has a major spawning
46 area for all the sheefish in the Kuskokwim River and
47 you're going to be crossing that river. Did that come
48 up in your hearings to make sure that there isn't any
49 damage done to that sheefish spawning area by the
50 construction of a camp and everything? I know they'll

1 need gravel for the camp and airstrip there. Even in
2 tunneling under the river if there's a lot of silt or
3 something coming up, I think the spawning area is
4 downstream where they're proposing crossing. So did
5 that come up in the discussions at all?
6

7 MR. GORDON: My role in this project
8 began in July of 2013, therefore, after the various
9 scoping meetings were completed. So I cannot address
10 specifically whether or not that fishery was discussed.
11 We are looking at fisheries overall along the Kuskokwim
12 and what's available as far as available data studies,
13 et cetera, for important fisheries that may be affected
14 by the project on connected waterways, but not
15 necessarily every waterway nor every fishery. So, no,
16 I can't answer that question directly, but, yes, that's
17 exactly the kind of comment that we're looking for.
18

19 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, that one should be
20 noted because that's the only -- that's a major
21 spawning area for all the sheefish in the river. They
22 go up and down the river, but that's the major
23 identified spawning area for sheefish. In fact, the
24 name of the river in Athabaskan up there is Zidlaghe
25 Zighashno, which means sheefish harvest river. So that
26 was historically recognized as an area where sheefish
27 congregated in the fall.
28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Well, I
30 appreciate you being on here. I think we've covered
31 this subject. When the EIS options or alternatives
32 come out, I think the Council will be very interested
33 in making comments on various aspects of that,
34 especially the communities that are affected by this
35 project.
36

37 Robert.

38
39 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
40 Robert Walker. Your gas pipeline goes through the
41 Doyon region here. Has anybody talked to Doyon about
42 this in the EIS and why isn't Doyon Corporation named
43 there? Is Doyon some kind of a dark horse here?
44

45 MR. GORDON: No, not to my knowledge
46 and, no, I'm not aware of whether or not anybody has
47 specifically talked to Doyon. They have -- in the
48 drafting of EIS, they very thoroughly looked at who
49 might be affected by the proposed project. We're in
50 conversations regularly with TKC, Calista and CIRI. I

1 can ask the question about the status of potential
2 effects on the project to Doyon and make sure that they
3 have already been included in the conversation or will
4 be.

5
6 MR. R. WALKER: Yeah, I think this
7 would be proper and should let them know what the plans
8 are because they might have something to say on this
9 also.

10
11 MR. GORDON: Thank you very much.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I think we've
14 covered -- go ahead, Melinda.

15
16 MS. BURKE: Thanks so much, Keith, for
17 your patience and for all the great coordination with
18 Kim and everybody else. We really appreciate you being
19 on the line.

20
21 Chair and Council, I think we can
22 finish up one more item that we tabled yesterday. I
23 know Lisa has to leave us this afternoon. Perhaps we
24 can finish up the discussion on the proposed boundary
25 that we tabled yesterday.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That would be good.
28 Did you have a meeting last night about this or how did
29 this happen?

30
31 MS. FEYEREISEN: Yes and no. That's
32 all I'm going to answer. Really quickly, before I go
33 into this, I wanted to notify the RAC and something
34 that Keith Gordon didn't let you know. I have a 2:00
35 meeting today with Donlin. Napaimiut, Chuathbaluk, the
36 Knik Tribe and the village of Lower Kalskag have been
37 involved in the development of the EIS as cooperating
38 agencies since the very beginning of it. They've
39 reached out to all the tribes. Aniak joined within a
40 couple months ago and we've been meeting every two
41 weeks for the last year and a half.

42
43 Not only that, we have other meetings.
44 Like we have meetings the 23rd through the 26th this
45 month. Ray is coming to a couple of them. So one of
46 the things that you'll notice on the Donlin stuff is
47 they have Amanda Shearer, the tribal liaison listed
48 there. They've done a really good job, the Army Corps.

49
50 We approached them three years ago and

1 I guess I'm telling you this for Ambler and other such
2 like projects. We found out who the lead agency was,
3 we made contacts to EPA and other people saying we want
4 to be cooperating agencies in this process. We have
5 the jurisdiction through Federal regulations as a tribe
6 to do that. Army Corps said no, so we got ourselves a
7 little Alaska Trustees lawyer action and gave them some
8 documents and met personally with them and they've
9 involved tribes from the very beginning.

10

11 There has not been in the state of
12 Alaska that I'm aware of a tribe that's been involved
13 in the whole process from the beginning to the end.
14 There has been with the Red Dog parts of the process
15 that tribal health consortiums and stuff have been
16 involved in. So we didn't really have a road map to do
17 it and I would say the first year was very painful for
18 the tribes that were involved because it is an
19 overwhelming process.

20

21 I highly recommend -- there's two
22 reasons you can be cooperating agencies. One is because
23 you have an expertise and one is because you have
24 jurisdiction. So there are ways if you're right onsite
25 you would have jurisdiction even if you were a city and
26 not a tribe. So make sure that you fight to get on
27 that EIS development.

28

29 In order to be a cooperating agency you
30 also have to sign an MOU. They would kill us if we
31 told you what's going on. But you cannot be a
32 proponent nor an opponent, you must be neutral. That
33 doesn't mean you can't have opinions and it's been
34 really good for us to be able to review everything
35 along the process.

36

37 Obviously we already have over 700
38 documents on the share site and these documents are 200
39 to 300 page documents at the minimum, so we can't read
40 them all, so we break it up. Like Knik is focused more
41 on the pipeline and different people are focused more
42 on fisheries and different people on bargaining and stuff
43 like that.

44

45 So if there's any of the local tribes
46 anyway that have something to say about it, they can
47 certainly come to us and we can voice their concern.
48 So that's my 2:00 meeting today.

49

50 But back to this. What we did was we

1 -- it wasn't a very long negotiations because
2 essentially the Central Kuskokwim was not aware of what
3 the concerns were from the GASH communities. So when
4 they were highlighted, that was not -- the highlight of
5 the concern was the part -- so I've given you three
6 maps.

7
8 The first map is the map as it appears
9 in the regulation book. In that map, which is the
10 incorrect map we know, but in the map that we've always
11 been using, if you look at the line for 21E, which runs
12 east and west and not north and south, that gives a
13 major portion of 21E to the Yukon Drainage.

14
15 When we look at the second map that
16 it's not clearly marked in there where 21E would go
17 with Robert Aloysius Proposal 10, the 21E actually --
18 quite a significant amount of 21E then went into the
19 Kuskokwim Drainage and not into the Yukon Drainage.
20 Just like Lower Kalskag and Upper Kalskag wanting 19 to
21 be their hunting unit, the GASH communities want 21E to
22 be their hunting unit. Lower Kuskokwim has no problem
23 with that, Central Kuskokwim. That's fine. We clearly
24 understand that that's there.

25
26 So what we did was we took a
27 combination of the map that's in the regular book even
28 though it's not the codified language and we took
29 Proposal No. 10, because I didn't have a map of
30 Proposal 67, and I took out the straight line and made
31 the line crooked where we go over the portage and then
32 we just continued the line for 21E that goes east and
33 west. We continued it east and west instead of dipping
34 towards either river.

35
36 So the map number three is the
37 tentatively negotiated and agreed upon between the GASH
38 and the Central Kuskokwim map. I can give you language
39 that would create the new language for the Unit 19
40 part. It says the area draining into the Kuskokwim
41 River upstream from the confluence of the first slough
42 in the Kuskokwim River in the area draining into the
43 Crooked Creek south bank upstream from the northern
44 terminus of Mud Creek to Crooked Creek portage are all
45 clearly visible land marks. So north-south would
46 follow that route and then Unit 21, like I said, would
47 just travel, I don't know, 12 miles further downriver.
48 We'd just go down over here.

49
50 MR. GERVAIS: Lisa, it looks like the

1 only people that are losing here is Unit 18. Do you
2 think they're going to be on.....

3

4 MS. FEYEREISEN: We meet with them on
5 March 7th. They're flying both GASH and the Central
6 Kuskokwim down to meet with them. I did talk with the
7 State support person yesterday, Alissa Joseph, trying
8 to get her to get me these maps. It will be hard to
9 say. It's an unknown beast. She feels pretty
10 comfortable that if the GASH and the Central Kuskokwim
11 -- essentially we're just using the existing
12 boundaries. We're just changing a straight line to a
13 crooked line. So it's essentially status quo. There
14 would have to be a pretty good argument put forth from
15 19 why they need to eat into either one of our units
16 from 18.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I would like the
19 Council to take action on the preliminary map that's
20 tentatively agreed upon by the GASH and the Central
21 Kuskokwim Advisory Committee. Are these acceptable
22 now, Robert?

23

24 MR. R. WALKER: Do we make a motion of
25 agreement?

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, we would make
28 a motion to agree to this tentatively agreed upon by
29 the two advisory committees and say that the RAC is on
30 the record at the tri-advisory committee meeting in
31 Bethel, that we support this delineation of this map.
32 Tim.

33

34 MR. GERVAIS: Can we support changing
35 the name from GASH to SHAG?

36

37 (Laughter)

38

39 MR. J. WALKER: No.

40

41 MS. FEYEREISEN: I do that.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Chair will
44 entertain a motion to.....

45

46 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

49

50 MR. R. WALKER: I make a motion to

1 tentatively agree on this boundary change here at our
2 RAC meeting here in Aniak.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Do we have a
5 second.

6

7 MR. MORGAN: Second.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Carl.
10 Further discussion.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 MS. PELKOLA: Question.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
17 called. Those in favor of agreement on this tentative
18 map for the GASH, Central Kuskokwim ACs to be taken to
19 the tri-AC meeting in Bethel signify by saying aye.

20

21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
24 sign.

25

26 (No opposing votes)

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks so much on
29 your hard work.

30

31 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, James.

34

35 MR. J. WALKER: I have one -- just one
36 little issue here. It all says current map, current
37 map. Could we identify the one that we're really
38 identifying as the one we're approving?

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I was delineating it
41 as the tentatively agreed upon GASH.....

42

43 MR. J. WALKER: I see that, but it's
44 also the current that's in existence with the straight
45 line. So could we identify the proposed one that we
46 agree on with another letter, A or B or.....

47

48 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. I
49 believe Lisa said something about a 57 yesterday.

50

1 MS. FEYEREISEN: It's Proposal 67 in
2 this book. It's not Proposal 10, so hence there were
3 issues there. The current map as it's demonstrated in
4 that one is the one that comes out of the regulation
5 book. That's the incorrect map. It doesn't match the
6 wording in the regulation book. So that's the map that
7 they're going to do away with no matter what. They're
8 either going to have a map that matches the wording or
9 they're going to adopt a map that we give them.

10

11 MR. R. WALKER: Okay. That makes sense
12 too because Proposal 10 by Robert Aloysius -- and we
13 have two current maps here too.

14

15 MR. COLLINS: Just change the label on
16 this one.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: To clarify for Staff
19 that we're just going to scratch off current map here.

20

21 MS. FEYEREISEN: Oh, I see when I
22 copied it, I had my husband do it and we were fighting
23 because I can't do the white-out. I'm left handed. So
24 that's my editorial error. I'm sorry.

25

26 MR. R. WALKER: Maybe you can get this
27 straightened out after lunch and come back with it so
28 we can.....

29

30 MS. FEYEREISEN: I have an
31 afternoon.....

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll delineate to
34 the Staff that it's written on the top of the map
35 tentatively agreed upon. It's 3 of 3. That's the map
36 that we were voting on.

37

38 MS. FEYEREISEN: Yeah. I'm sorry.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that's the map
41 that the Staff will use for our agreement.

42

43 MR. R. WALKER: Okay.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Melinda.

46

47 MS. BURKE: Council and for the folks
48 on the line, the tentative plan is there's a big lunch
49 happening at the school that the participants of the
50 Youth and Elders Conference, everyone is invited to

1 lunch. It starts at about 12:15. I think if we give
2 ourselves a start time of 1:30 we can get through what
3 we need to get through this afternoon with all of our
4 fish issues.

5
6 If there's anybody with vehicles here
7 in the room, it would be really awesome to get help
8 shuttling over. It will save us a little bit of time
9 and get folks over and back a little bit quicker. So
10 everybody on the phone line, start time of 1:30 this
11 afternoon. Thanks much.

12
13 (Off record)

14
15 (On record)

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All the RAC members
18 came back. I'm not exactly sure what happened to
19 Pollock. He said he was going to the store. Where are
20 we at here, Melinda?

21
22 MS. BURKE: Mr. Chair. We are down to
23 the fish section. We'll take care of the rural
24 determination process review a little later. Why don't
25 we go ahead and -- we've had folks be real patient with
26 us. Let's jump into the fisheries issues. Do we have
27 Mr. Don Rivard from the Office of Subsistence
28 Management on the phone.

29
30 MR. RIVARD: Yes, I'm here. Can you
31 hear me okay?

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Loud and clear. Go
34 ahead, Don.

35
36 MR. RIVARD: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
37 Members of the Council. Do you want me to go into this
38 now?

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go right ahead.

41
42 MR. RIVARD: Okay. My name is Don
43 Rivard. I'm a fish biologist with the Office of
44 Subsistence Management. We're going to go through the
45 results of what was funded for the 2014 Fisheries
46 Resource Monitoring Program and then do a little bit of
47 discussion on what you might want to see in the next
48 call that's coming up for 2016.

49
50 It says in your book -- it starts on

1 Page 83, but I really want to direct you to a folder in
2 your supplemental material and in that folder is a
3 document there with a big chinook salmon on it. Does
4 everybody have that in front of them?

5
6 MS. BURKE: Yes. Go ahead, Don.

7
8 MR. RIVARD: Okay. If you go to the
9 second page there it talks about.....

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You're kind of
12 fading off a little bit, Don. Do you want to come a
13 little closer to your mic. Oh, Salena is turning the
14 dial. Go ahead.

15
16 MR. RIVARD: Just to give you a recap
17 on what's now been funded for 2014. The Federal
18 Subsistence Board met in January and they got all the
19 input from all the Councils and then they came up with
20 their own recommendations for funding. So far this is
21 the eighth -- on Page 2 you'll see the funded for the
22 Kuskokwim region. I've got them listed there in
23 numerical order. I don't know if you have any questions
24 about that.

25
26 Then if you go to Page 4, the projects
27 that were funded for the Yukon region.

28
29 REPORTER: Wait a second, Don. Are you
30 on your speakerphone or on a hand-held?

31
32 MR. RIVARD: I'm on a speaker.

33
34 REPORTER: Could you please do the
35 hand-held because it's very overmodulated.

36
37 MR. RIVARD: Okay.

38
39 REPORTER: Thank you.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.

42
43 (No comment)

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I think he got
46 himself cut off. While he comes back on, the Council
47 is looking at these figures. We were concerned about
48 the Tuluksak Weir and the Takotna Weir on the Kuskokwim
49 funding, but in the final run they still continue to
50 not fund those weir projects.

1 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair. This is Pippa
2 Kenner with OSM and working with Don on the Fisheries
3 Resource Monitoring. The Tuluksak Weir.....

4
5 MR. RIVARD: Okay, I'm back.

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, Don.

8
9 MR. RIVARD: So I mentioned the
10 Kuskokwim projects that were funded for 2014. Eight
11 out of the 11 have been approved for funding here now
12 and then for the Yukon region on Page 4 all nine
13 projects that were submitted and recommended for
14 funding by the TRC are funded for 2014.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're looking at
17 the Kuskokwim numbers here. The Tuluksak Weir is
18 funded. The Takotna Weir was not funded.

19
20 MR. RIVARD: The Takotna Weir was not
21 funded.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

24
25 MR. GERVAIS: Don, this is Tim Gervais.
26 Could you state the three that didn't get funded.

27
28 MR. RIVARD: The Takotna Weir and then
29 the Kanektok/Goodnews and I'm not sure of the other
30 one. I think it was another harvest monitoring type
31 project. I don't have that in front of me.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. The Takotna
34 Weir was -- we wanted that funded, but we do understand
35 that there's limitations on the funding. The integrity
36 of data for the upper drainage would have been nice.
37 Did the Board explore any way of funding with another
38 agency or entity the Takotna Weir?

39
40 MR. RIVARD: Well, in my discussions
41 with some of the ADF&G folks, part of it was when they
42 first got word that the TRC had not recommended funding
43 for the Takotna, they immediately switched over any
44 kind of funding that they might want to do for that
45 that they had put in in the past projects. So my
46 understanding is that even if the Federal Subsistence
47 Board had recommended funding, that the State of Alaska
48 would not be able to do it this year. There's still a
49 possibility they may try to do it next year. That's
50 what I've been told. I don't want to speak for the

1 State, but they may be trying to find other ways to
2 fund the Takotna, but it won't be done in 2014.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Does the
5 Council have any questions on what was funded on the
6 Kuskokwim and Yukon River.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This was an action
11 item on our conference call on December 10th.

12

13 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. I do remember
14 the other project that was not funded for the
15 Kuskokwim. It was going to be a project where they
16 were going to survey folks at both the Aniak and the
17 Bethel airport to see how much chinook salmon was being
18 transported out of the region.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, yeah. Okay.
21 Ray, go ahead.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: Don, I'd them to note
24 somewhere in there though that the Takotna Weir is the
25 only weir in the headwaters, so we will have no
26 concrete information about escapement in the headwaters
27 except the flyover and I'd just like that on the record
28 because that data is going to be missing now.

29

30 MR. RIVARD: Yes, Ray, I understand
31 that. It is so noted and that is what you noted in
32 your last Council meeting, I think, by teleconference.
33 What was that, November or December. So that was heard
34 before and relayed to other folks as well.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I think the Council
37 has reviewed what occurred. Do you want to continue,
38 Don.

39

40 MR. RIVARD: Yes. What I'm going to do
41 now is go to Page 7 in that handout. It talks about
42 the preliminary development of priority information
43 needs for the next call. We call it now notice of
44 funding opportunity.

45

46 These following pages they're showing
47 you what were the priority information needs in the
48 Kuskokwim region for the 2014 call and how some of
49 those priority information needs are now being
50 addressed through some of the new projects that are

1 coming online as well as one that's been ongoing.

2

3 The first one is reliable estimates of
4 chinook, chum, sockeye and coho salmon escapement and
5 that's something that's been ongoing for just about all
6 14 or 15 years of this program now. Basically those
7 are the weir projects and similar type projects.

8

9 So what we'd like to do from your
10 Council is to hear if you have any other priority
11 information needs. We're in the preliminary stage of
12 this. We will get information from you and other
13 affected Councils. We're going to be talking to Refuge
14 managers, in-season fisheries managers and putting it
15 all together and coming back to you in the fall with a
16 draft resource monitoring plan. It will list the
17 priority information needs, so you'll have a chance to
18 look at these again in the fall.

19

20 If you have some priority information
21 needs that you would like to list, we'd certainly like
22 to take them from you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One issue that I
25 continue to reiterate is there's a need for a study on
26 -- the Board of Game and the Federal Subsistence Board
27 and managers are relying on an unknown factor of
28 incidental harvest mortality with gillnet. When the
29 managers switched to six-inch net on chinook salmon for
30 conservation, the assumption is they fall out of the
31 net and they swim up the river and continue on happily
32 along the way.

33

34 We're starting to realize that injury
35 from gillnet in Bristol Bay studies actually retards
36 the fish survivorship and then there's an unknown
37 factor of the number of fish that actually fall out of
38 the net dead. They get killed in the gear, they fall
39 out of the net. You're using an inch and a half
40 smaller gear than the optimum of 7.5, so the mortality
41 factors are high. We have an unknown number.

42

43 I would like this Council to write to
44 the Board of Fish and propose that the Department of
45 Fish and Game and OSM work together on a project to
46 come up with a statistical valid indice to know how
47 many fish were dropping out of the gear. The estimate
48 is -- there is an unknown number and there's actually
49 no real calculation of what that indice actually is.
50 Nobody is using an indice in any fishery in Alaska, but

1 on the Kuskokwim and Yukon River everybody is using
2 six-inch gear as a conservation measure to conserve
3 chinook salmon, but we have an unknown mortality
4 factor.

5
6 Ask any person fishing downriver in the
7 directed chum fishery with six-inch gear how many kings
8 they've watched fall out of the net. They're going to
9 tell you that there's -- when Virgil Umphenour was
10 talking about -- Eastern Interior was talking about
11 six-inch mandatory chinook harvest with six-inch gear,
12 the people downriver started screaming we'll lose all
13 our fish. We can't catch king salmon with six-inch
14 net, they'll fall out of the net. Yeah.

15
16 There's a huge number of fish dying in
17 gear and we don't know what that number is. The Board
18 of Fish and the Federal Subsistence Board and the
19 Councils need to know what that indice is or at least a
20 close estimate of what that is so that can be
21 calculated. If the run is so poor, don't use six-inch
22 net. So this is a real problem. It's not a little
23 problem. There are hundreds of thousands of sockeye
24 salmon laying on the beaches in Bristol Bay in the
25 fishing season that have fallen out of nets and died.
26 Hundreds of thousands. Windrows of dead fish for
27 miles.

28
29 So the reality is we need to have real
30 data. We're working on a stock of concern on the
31 Kuskokwim and Yukon River chinook salmon, so I would
32 like this Council to write a letter to the Board of
33 Fish demanding an indice of study and developing an
34 indice that managers can use as the mortality factor
35 with six-inch net. Everybody wants to use the six-inch
36 net. Okay, but we've got to know how many kings we're
37 going to kill with that net.

38
39 OSM needs to prioritize -- the
40 committee needs to prioritize this information. We're
41 working with an unknown mortality, huge mortality
42 factor. So I would like to have a letter transmitted
43 to the Board of Fish and I would also like to
44 incorporate that into the request for funding proposal
45 for OSM.

46
47 So this is not to be ignored. This
48 issue cannot continue to be ignored by the fisheries
49 managers in Alaska. On the Kuskokwim and Yukon Rivers
50 it's imperative. We have to know what this number is.

1 Would the Council entertain the idea of
2 sending a letter to the Board of Fish. Tim.
3 MR. GERVAIS: So moved.
4
5 MR. J. WALKER: Seconded.
6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I basically
8 stated the context of that letter. It's on the record.
9 Any further discussion.
10
11 MR. R. WALKER: Question.
12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
14 transmitting that letter to the Board of Fish and also
15 requesting this as a priority funding source for 2014
16 focus signify by saying aye.
17
18 IN UNISON: Aye.
19
20 (No opposing votes)
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
23 presentation on the funding projects, Don?
24
25 MR. RIVARD: No, Mr. Chair. Just a
26 quick correction. This would be for 2016.
27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, correction,
29 2016. Thank you.
30
31 MR. RIVARD: Also, if you have any
32 other priority information needs, that would be
33 helpful.
34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That is a high
36 priority.
37
38 MR. RIVARD: So noted and we've got it
39 in the transcripts now as well.
40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've heard
42 discussion of using DIDSON sonar and pulling gear in
43 front of a DIDSON sonar to watch fish fall off the net.
44 I transmitted a methodology to Fred Bue on a gear type
45 that would -- actually with a basket on the bottom to
46 capture dead drop-outs. There has to be developed an
47 indice.
48
49 On our agenda here we're in the
50 Partners briefing.

1 MR. COLLINS: I'd like to see the
2 Takotna Weir re-listed in '16.
3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, we would also
5 like to see the Takotna Weir listed in '16 also, Don.
6
7 MR. RIVARD: Okay. I have it down
8 here.
9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're at Partners
11 Program.
12 MS. INGLES: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair
13 and Council members. Can you hear me okay?
14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I can hear you fine.
16
17 MS. INGLES: Okay. I explained to all
18 of you more about the Partners Program at our last
19 meeting and this is just a short briefing to tell you
20 that we will have a call for proposals that will come
21 out in November. The proposals will be due to OSM in
22 May 2015 and the new partners positions would then
23 start for January 2016.
24
25 So we invite proposals from all
26 eligible applicants out in the rural villages. The way
27 this works is that an agency or a non-governmental
28 organization, Native groups, anybody like that out in
29 the villages can apply for funding and if you end up
30 having a Partners position at your organization, they
31 would work with our different FRMP projects that Don
32 was just talking about. So you need to have an FRMP
33 project within your area that they can tag onto.
34
35 For your fall meeting I will discuss
36 more about the particulars of the call for proposals,
37 but in the meantime we do have the information listed
38 in your book and then there will be more explicit
39 directions for the fall meeting. Feel free to contact
40 me if you have any other questions.
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Council
43 members can tuck that in their back pocket and bring
44 that back to your tribal organizations. You're going
45 to give us a presentation from KNA?
46
47 MS. FRYE: Yes. This is Rebecca Frye
48 here from KNA.
49
50 MS. INGLES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 MS. FRYE: I'm the Partners fisheries
2 biologist. I would like to give a little update on
3 what our fisheries department is doing. Here's our
4 mission statement, is to actively participate in
5 managing and conserving Kuskokwim area fisheries
6 resources to ensure long-term sustainability of the
7 subsistence way of life for our members.

8
9 We have 12 member villages total and I
10 have those on a map. If you could go to the next
11 slide. So in our fisheries staff we have two full-time
12 positions, myself, the Partners biologist, and Dan
13 Gillikin is the fisheries director. We employ one
14 fisheries high school intern coordinator and she comes
15 on around May/June and stays through the field season.
16 We employ three to six seasonal technicians, three to
17 six college interns and 15 to 20 high school interns.
18 All of our internship positions and technician
19 positions are filled from the Kuskokwim area from rural
20 Alaska.

21
22 A little background. KNA was formed in
23 1978 from BIA funding, pooling funds from our 12
24 villages. We did have a natural resources director.
25 That position is not current anymore. In 2002, the
26 Partners Program was awarded to KNA by the U.S. Fish
27 and Wildlife Service and since being awarded that
28 program KNA's fisheries department has been the largest
29 with KNA.

30
31 Here you'll see our member villages.
32 So we start from Lower Kalskag, go all the way up to
33 Lime Village. We have Russian Mission, which is over
34 on the Yukon. So Lower Kalskag, Upper, Aniak,
35 Chuathbaluk, Napaimiut, Crooked, Red Devil, Georgetown,
36 Sleetmute and Stony. We have employed students from
37 all 12 member villages in our internship program.

38
39 What do we do exactly? Partners in
40 fisheries monitoring, we try to employ local
41 technicians, local students, try and get people
42 involved from the community. We represent members,
43 provide technical assistance at outreach, education and
44 communication. So we're involved in issues up and down
45 the Kuskokwim, not just in our member villages. We try
46 to get involved. This season we've attended meetings
47 in Tuntutuliak, Akiak, Napaskiak, as well as our member
48 villages focusing on the 2014 fisheries issue.

49
50 Next slide, please.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And the Kuskokwim
2 Salmon Working Group?

3
4 MS. FRYE: We do participate in the
5 Kuskokwim Working Group either in person or phone
6 calls. That's a big part of our organization.

7
8 A couple projects that we have going on
9 right now. We're doing Bering cisco. We're looking at
10 spawning locations for Bering cisco.

11
12 If you'd go to the next slide, please.
13 So Bering cisco. I think the next slide shows that
14 there's only three known spawning grounds for Bering
15 cisco on the Holitna, Susitna and -- there's one more,
16 but I don't see it up there. There's only three known
17 spawning locations. What we're focusing on is we had
18 tagged fish at the Kalskag fishwheels and this year we
19 had one in Aniak. Working on tagging those fish,
20 monitoring them in season and using a couple weir
21 platforms as well as radiotelemetry platforms all the
22 way up to Nikolai to monitor where those fish are
23 going.

24
25 This year we only got two tags out.
26 We're hoping to finish deploying all of our other tags
27 this 2014 season using the Kalskag fishwheel as a
28 platform for that.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: How many tags are
31 you trying to deploy?

32
33 MS. FRYE: Fifty. So we have 48 more
34 to go.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Why was your catch
37 rate so low?

38
39 MS. FRYE: We got a lot of least cisco,
40 not many Bering cisco this year, so I'm not sure if it
41 was just a poor year for Bering. We're not sure
42 exactly the reason. Several attempts were made.

43
44 The goal of our internships through our
45 Partners Program. We start out and visit the
46 elementary and high school here in Aniak as well as in
47 other communities, getting kids involved. We have a
48 couple schools that are doing the salmon in the
49 classroom this year. We're not as involved as we have
50 been in the past, but we still make an effort with the

1 salmon eggs. Some of the teachers are growing the eggs
2 in the classroom and incorporated that program
3 throughout their curriculum. That's a good way to get
4 students involved in learning the life cycle of a
5 salmon.

6
7 We carry that on through our high
8 school internships. We've employed almost 200 since
9 the program began, high school interns. Some of the
10 students that completed the high school internship go
11 on to complete the college internship, get interested
12 in fisheries and go to college and major in fisheries
13 or natural resources and become members of the
14 community who could be biologists in the future.

15
16 Next slide, please. So high school
17 internships 198 to date, 19 this past year. Students
18 participate in one to two week internships and we can
19 host up to four students per week. They work at
20 Kalskag fishwheel, George River and the Tatlawiksuk
21 River weir. This provides excellent opportunities for
22 the students to get out and understand what's going on
23 at the weirs. They can come back and tell that
24 information to their parents and their families and
25 kind of see what's going on in their community and how
26 the fisheries is.

27
28 Next slide. So daily activities are
29 high school intern coordinator is part of planning out
30 the curriculum that they do. At the Kalskag fishwheel
31 they participate in fish tagging and counting,
32 assisting in ASL data, complete the day's lesson, which
33 is what they plan for them, kind of learn something, do
34 something that day. At the weirs they monitor fish
35 passage, assist doing ASL and complete the day's
36 lesson.

37
38 Here's some great pictures of the kids.
39 They really get involved and actively participate the
40 whole two weeks they're there. This year we did have
41 third year returning students, so they came back three
42 years doing this internship program.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: How many of those
45 came back the third year?

46
47 MS. FRYE: I'm not sure exactly how
48 many were back for three. Up next is our college
49 internship or some more pictures. So we've got students
50 in the fish passage collecting fish, monitoring it,

1 collecting ASL data. They also collect air quality and
2 water quality while they're out at the weirs.

3

4 Next slide, please. The college
5 internship started in 2004. This year we had three
6 students and all three students were awarded a \$5,000
7 scholarship through Donlin this year. I think two of
8 the three were fisheries and there was one that was
9 unknown, but was interested in pursuing a career in
10 fisheries. We've had 29 to date and hoping to get
11 three or four more this next season. It provides on-
12 the-job training, it gets them involved to see if I
13 really want to go in this direction, what could a good
14 career path be. This is the college internship as well
15 as the high school are both funded through OSM Partners
16 Program.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are you partnering
19 quite a bit with Donlin?

20

21 MS. FRYE: We do a scholarship through
22 them and the college interns go to Ottertail, which
23 they do monitoring for Donlin and they participate in
24 that.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see.

27

28 MS. FRYE: So some of the field
29 projects that our college interns do is the Kalskag
30 fishwheels, the weirs, they do George River,
31 Tatlawiksuk and Salmon River weirs. As you see the
32 other projects, Ottertail Environmental through Donlin
33 Gold and they went down to Bethel this past season and
34 participated in the working group meetings.

35

36 Here's where our monitoring platforms
37 are located and you can see the different areas that
38 the interns and our technicians participated at down in
39 Bethel for the working group meetings. We have the
40 Kalskag fishwheel right below Aniak and right above
41 Kalskag. Donlin Creek. We have the George River weir,
42 Tatlawiksuk. Also they went to meetings at the Native
43 Village of Napaimiut this summer too.

44

45 Recruitment. We're currently working
46 on an application packet. We're hoping to get that out
47 for students to begin submitting probably around the
48 second week of March this year. We're looking for high
49 school interns. In the past, we've had 14 to 17-year-
50 olds. We could be flexible on those numbers. New

1 interns, we try to hire for one week at a time and
2 returning could be two or more weeks. College interns
3 we want them to be currently enrolled in college, be
4 interested in some aspect of the fisheries or
5 management to do that. Technicians must be interested
6 in local fisheries and motivation is needed. We do
7 hire from rural Alaska and from our member villages.

8
9 KNA is also active in the post-season
10 subsistence surveys, which is funded through OSM. This
11 year we questioned every household, we polled every
12 household in Aniak. We employed three local
13 technicians. The data collected was submitted to
14 ADF&G. They're working on the subsistence estimates
15 currently. Now we're looking at whitefish harvest by
16 species. That's a new update to the ADF&G packet.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you get funding
19 from ADF&G for that household survey?

20
21 MS. FRYE: So it comes from OSM to
22 ADF&G and then ADF&G partners with us for that money.
23 And this is just showing the three weirs we have.
24 George River, Salmon River and Tatlawiksuk. So George
25 and Tatlawiksuk are both floating river weirs whereas
26 the Salmon is a pick it.

27
28 The George and Tatlawiksuk River weirs
29 has been a cooperative project with Fish and Game since
30 1998. Our goals are to determine annual and daily
31 escapement of chinook, coho and chum salmon, monitor
32 habitat variables, collect ASL data and also provide a
33 platform for our internship students.

34
35 The Salmon River weir was operated 2006
36 to 2009 and then it began back up in 2012. We also
37 determine daily and annual chinook, coho and chum
38 escapement, monitor habitat variables, ASL data and
39 that replaced the Aniak sonar. We did receive funding
40 for all three of our weirs.

41
42 Here's some more pictures of our
43 interns and local technicians. They have a great time.
44 I think they really enjoy the program and it's great
45 for the community. It really is.

46
47 Some of our acknowledgments. U.S. Fish
48 and Wildlife, OSM, Yukon Delta National Wildlife
49 Refuge, Kenai Field Office, Department of Fish and
50 Game, ONC, Bering Sea Fishermen's Association, CVRF,

1 Donlin Gold. Lots of them. I'd like to thank all of
2 our partners.

3

4 Any questions?

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Council questions.

7 Tim.

8

9 MR. GERVAIS: Yes. The Bering Sea
10 Fishermen's Association, is that a CDQ entity or what
11 do they do?

12

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. Coastal
14 Villages -- CVRF isn't now.

15

16 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you for your
17 presentation, Rebecca. I'm interested in some
18 information on the Bering cisco because they're using
19 it as a commercial fishery at the mouth of the Yukon.
20 Is that an important subsistence species on the
21 Kuskokwim?

22

23 MS. FRYE: I'm going to default to Dan
24 for that one.

25

26 MR. GILLIKIN: Thank you. Through the
27 Chair if I may. Bering cisco, you're correct, there's
28 been a developing commercial fishery on the Yukon
29 targeting Bering cisco and we had concerns initially
30 when we submitted the proposal or when the proposal was
31 submitted that those Bering cisco may also be harvested
32 on the Yukon that are originating from the Kuskokwim.

33

34 Interestingly enough, some of the work
35 that Randy Brown has done up in Fairbanks with genetic
36 mixed stock analysis, looking at the commercial fishery
37 occurring down there, has pretty much concluded that
38 it's almost 100 percent Yukon origin fish that are
39 being harvested in that fishery on the Yukon. That
40 said, however, there is an interest on the Kuskokwim to
41 -- there is already a small whitefish fishery occurring
42 on the Kuskokwim, but it's very small at this point and
43 there's always the interest that it could expand as
44 well.

45

46 Bering cisco are an important
47 subsistence species for many people up here, but
48 they're not nearly as abundant as the least cisco are
49 here on the Kuskokwim. They seem to be much more
50 abundant on the Yukon. So you've got a small stock on

1 the Susitna, a little bit larger stock it looks like on
2 the Kuskokwim and a fairly substantial stock on the
3 Yukon.

4

5 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. When you're going
6 to these Kuskokwim working group meetings, what kind of
7 position is KNA putting forth to try to prevent a
8 situation like last summer?

9

10 MR. GILLIKIN: I'll be happy -- through
11 the Chair, if I may. I can address that in my
12 presentation if we get to it if you'd like.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any other
15 questions for Rebecca's presentation.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Appreciate all the
20 work you're doing with that and our Partners.

21

22 MS. FRYE: Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have any other
25 Partners online?

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I do not hear any.
30 So where are we at here, Melinda.

31

32 MS. BURKE: Mr. Chair. We have moved
33 down to new business with Don Rivard presenting the
34 call for fisheries regulatory proposals.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead,
37 Don.

38

39 MR. RIVARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Can
40 you hear me okay?

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, I can.

43

44 MR. RIVARD: Go to your book on Page
45 87. There's a news release for the call for proposals
46 to change Federal subsistence fish and shellfish
47 regulations. The Federal Subsistence Board is
48 accepting proposals through March 28, 2014, to change
49 Federal regulations for the subsistence harvest of fish
50 and shellfish for the 2015-2017 regulatory years.

1 That's starting April 1, 2015 through March 31, 2017.

2

3 So as part of that package if you look
4 a couple pages after that there's the actual call and
5 then also on Page 90 is the template a person can use
6 to submit a regulatory proposal change.

7

8 Sometimes at your meetings your Council
9 comes up with some of these right at the meeting, so if
10 you would have any, please let me know now.

11

12 I don't know if this got on your
13 agenda, but there's a couple special action requests
14 that I'd like to discuss too.

15

16 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Does the
19 Council have any fisheries proposals they would like to
20 submit during this round or at least ideas to be
21 floated.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't see any at
26 this time.

27

28 MR. RIVARD: Okay. This would be both
29 for the Kuskokwim and for the Yukon, of course.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. So, Melinda.

32

33 MS. BURKE: Mr. Chair. I believe Don
34 is going to stay on the line and as we're doing the
35 summary and outlook for the Kusko and the Yukon we can
36 kind of still keep this churning in Council members'
37 head and if they brought up later that's just fine.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Should we do those
40 special action requests while Don is here?

41

42 MS. BURKE: Don, were you speaking of
43 the ones with Dave?

44

45 MR. RIVARD: Yes. I think this may be
46 an appropriate time to do that seeing we're talking
47 about proposal changes.

48

49 MS. BURKE: Sounds good. We'll get
50 Dave here up to the table. Council, in your packets,

1 in the paper-clipped section where you pulled the FRMP,
2 the two first documents were the documents we're going
3 to be talking about here today. It's got Dave Cannon
4 written at the very top.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Dave.

7

8 MR. CANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9 Members of the Council. My name is Dave Cannon and I'm
10 the middle subsistence representative for the Kuskokwim
11 Salmon Management Council. We basically have submitted
12 two special action requests to the Federal Subsistence
13 Board and we've also submitted two similar emergency
14 petitions to the Board of Fish. We will submit those
15 shortly.

16

17 I guess I'll point out the first one is
18 the dipnet special action request. I think most people
19 on the Council are familiar that this last summer the
20 Yukon did allow dipnets for salmon fishing. So that's
21 basically what we would like to see here in the
22 Kuskokwim. Basically fishing for sockeye and chum and
23 if any incidental king salmon were harvested, then they
24 would have to be released alive.

25

26 Our justification -- and if you wanted
27 to maybe highlight as we look through -- I've got some
28 bulleted statements. Two through seven I think are
29 particularly pertinent to why we're submitting these
30 special action requests. I think it was mentioned
31 yesterday where 2013 was the lowest escapement that we
32 have seen in the Kuskokwim to date. Every single
33 enumeration project was the lowest on record.

34

35 Right there in number two you can see
36 our drainage-wide escapement goals between 65,000 and
37 120,000. If you go down to bullet number three,
38 basically 46,000 have been estimated to have been
39 harvested in the subsistence fishery, when in some
40 years up to 80,000 are caught, kings. So we only saw
41 an estimated 47,000 escapement.

42

43 It was asked yesterday how many years
44 did we not make escapement in the last five, so two.
45 2010 we had 49,000 estimated to return, so this year we
46 had 2,000 less than that.

47

48 If we want to look at maybe the
49 scenario that we're going to have this coming summer.
50 Basically last year the estimate for the number of fish

1 total run in the Kuskokwim was 94,000. So it seems
2 that our best forecasting tool is just to add and
3 subtract 25 percent of that. So it's possible we could
4 only have 70,000 or even less and maybe up to 117,000.
5 That's basically the forecast we're going into the
6 season with, between 70,000 and 117,000.

7
8 Now remember the lower bound of that
9 escapement goal was 65,000. So if, in fact, we had
10 that scenario play out of 70,000, we might have 5,000
11 surplus for over 2,000 households in the Kuskokwim. So
12 that's very few fish per household. Now the concern
13 there is setnets, four-inch or smaller nets, are
14 allowed for whitefish throughout the season. It's a
15 real good chance that those setnets could easily pluck
16 out that 5,000 surplus.

17
18 The bottom line is if the run is weak
19 like we've seen in the last couple years, it's going to
20 be a real interesting summer how to try and divvy up
21 any surplus that might be available.

22
23 If you go down to bullet number six, it
24 just shows that if in fact there is 5,000 available,
25 that means there's been a reduction of 94 percent in
26 the typical subsistence harvest.

27
28 As also was mentioned yesterday, one of
29 the big problems we had last summer was a great
30 disparity in the success of fishermen. The Lower River
31 people did fairly well for the most part. Maybe they
32 didn't get what they normally get, but they didn't do
33 too badly. Well, Middle River and Upper River people
34 really struggled.

35
36 One thing I guess I would just like to
37 point out, whether it's this special action or the
38 other one I'll talk about briefly here, is the last
39 paragraph. We realize that these special actions are
40 not going to be a solution to the problem we have. We
41 are, as the Chairman pointed out yesterday, possibly in
42 a grave situation with low returns.

43
44 So these would just be tools that would
45 maybe help us inch our way towards improved escapement
46 or possibly meeting escapement.

47
48 I guess just one other thing to point
49 out, the very last graph here on the second page, it
50 shows one of the preliminary schedules that have been

1 proposed just to show how possibly restrictive this
2 coming summer may need to be in the name of
3 conservation. If you can look down in the second --
4 the middle part of that graph there, only two four-hour
5 periods have been considered through the whole more or
6 less the majority of the season from late May through
7 very early July. It just goes to show that, yeah, if
8 we get 70,000 or less, people are going to have to
9 understand that there's a real need to conserve.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Let me ask a
12 question now. Your special action request, they would
13 possibly have a four-hour opening, but you would only
14 allow dipnet fishing during those four hours?

15

16 MR. CANNON: No. That four-hour period
17 would be driftnetting.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: driftnetting.

20

21 MR. CANNON: Driftnetting, yes. On
22 this schedule here. And then this proposed dipnet use
23 would be in between those driftnet openings. So people
24 would have an opportunity to put up other types of
25 salmon other than king salmon.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Okay. Do
28 you have any other.....

29

30 MR. CANNON: We will have a salmon
31 management working group here the first week in April
32 and the schedule is going to be one of the main topics
33 at this upcoming meeting.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would be more
36 inclined to use the top graph of no openings throughout
37 the whole season with dipnet selective harvest for
38 salmon and there's going to be a certain amount of fish
39 killed in that 4.5-inch gear. So I just can't see any
40 openings. Zero openings with drift gillnet. Any kind
41 of drift gillnet, 4.5 or any kind of a drift gillnet.

42

43 MR. CANNON: There's been lots of
44 discussion on schedules here over the last several
45 working group meetings and everything from a
46 moratorium, no fishing, to opportunities to allow
47 fishermen to catch sheefish and other species. So
48 that's why this coming meeting in April there will be
49 great discussion over what we really need to do going
50 into the season.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other comments on
2 that. Tim.

3
4 MR. GERVAIS: On this figure 2 graph
5 and ADF&G preliminary subsistence schedule, that's
6 what's coming out of the working group at this time?

7
8 MR. CANNON: That was put forth to the
9 working group from the Fish and Game Department as
10 their first stab at saying, okay, here's one possible
11 scenario. During our last working group meeting there
12 were several iterations of this schedule and every one
13 of them actually was a little more liberal than this
14 one, having six-hour openings, as many as three in the
15 first week, week and a half of the season.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: On the Yukon there's
18 pulse protection. The Kuskokwim has got to quit trying
19 to reinvent the wheel. There's pulse protection, so
20 those schedules, four-hour schedules, looks like it's
21 going to land right on top of pulses. If they're going
22 to have any kind of opening -- if you can't stop any
23 kind of an opening, it should avoid presence of chinook
24 salmon, is what they should be doing, and not just
25 setting a date. You don't want to land right on top of
26 a chinook pulse.

27
28 MR. CANNON: The Fish and Game did look
29 at the harvest levels and average run timing and things
30 like that and they did try to incorporate that into
31 this schedule. Now I will give Ray at every meeting,
32 you know, he harps and he talks and I'm not talking for
33 the last year, but for the last many years on front
34 loading the run and how the early fish that come into
35 the river are heading up towards McGrath and beyond. I
36 just have seen it in almost every fishery. We realize
37 river fisheries like this tend to get front loaded and
38 I don't see us doing anything to really really protect
39 those upriver runs as much as maybe we should.

40
41 MR. COLLINS: It was proposed that the
42 season start closed until they open it and now they're
43 kind of backing off and talking about allowing some in
44 the early period. We'll be meeting again in early
45 April, is it, I think.

46
47 MR. CANNON: April 2nd, 3rd and 4th.

48
49 MR. COLLINS: I'll bring that forward
50 again.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I feel this Council
2 needs to take a stand that the schedule should be
3 schedule one, red closure until the run has
4 demonstrated that it's strong enough and especially the
5 front end of the run needs to be protected because
6 that's the fattest, nicest fish that everybody wants to
7 catch and if we keep hammering away on the front end of
8 these runs, we're not going to have that kind of fish
9 anymore and everybody loses.

10

11 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair, this is Don
12 Rivard.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So there should be
15 full on protection during at least the first part of
16 the run and there should be a full on moratorium
17 closure until demonstrated but they can use set four-
18 and-a-half on the beach and dipnets possibly under
19 special action, but no drift gillnetting out in the
20 river for any kind of openings because we can't afford
21 one single front end of this run period. That's just
22 all there is to it.

23

24 So we don't want to see the Department
25 backing up into openings that possibly would harvest
26 thousands of chinook salmon. I can catch all kinds of
27 salmon in any size mesh gear if I'm drifting down the
28 river and hang the net in and I've got 50 fathoms of
29 net. I'll kill all kinds of fish.

30

31 There's somebody online. Go ahead.

32

33 MR. RIVARD: Yeah, Mr. Chair. This is
34 Don Rivard. As part of your package in that folder
35 there was also an email from me. I was forwarding what
36 the working group had recommended to the Department of
37 Fish and Game back in January. Do you guys have that
38 in front of you?

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see an email here
41 with your name on it, yes.

42

43 MR. RIVARD: Okay. If you go to the
44 second page and you look at motion 4, this is what the
45 Kuskokwim River Salmon Working Group came up with for
46 their recommendations. That might help in your
47 discussion there as to what they want to see happen.
48 There's going to be more discussion as Dave mentioned
49 in the meeting coming up in early April.

50

1 This is what the working group came up
2 with. So if you see down there on the fourth bullet it
3 says start the season on a subsistence fishing schedule
4 and starting on May 15th a subsistence salmon season
5 will be closed and then it goes on to other things as
6 well. So I just wanted to let you know that they've
7 had those discussions and here's the results of them.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But Dave is saying
10 that now the Department is talking about these four-
11 hour openings possibly again and I'm adamantly opposed
12 to that. Adamantly opposed to that. That cannot
13 happen.

14
15 MR. RIVARD: The Fish and Game, they
16 presented that schedule that you looked at at the
17 January meeting of the Kuskokwim River Salmon
18 Management Working Group and they were aware of that,
19 the working group, and this is what they came up with.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, but this
22 Council should be firm that when they go back to
23 meeting again that there should be no openings with any
24 kind of drift gillnet gear, two-inch gillnet gear of
25 drift gillnet, of any type out in the mainstem until
26 the run has demonstrated that it's going to meet the
27 escapement needs period. That's the way this has to
28 go. There can't be any messing around. They can't
29 keep -- they've screwed up twice since 2010. They
30 can't keep doing this. This has to stop.

31
32 So they have to get it on the square
33 that we're going to kill this run off if we keep
34 screwing up. So there can't be any drift gillnet
35 openings period until they've achieved escapement needs
36 and then we have to be cautious because there's going
37 to be harvest beyond with set gear and other types of
38 gear on the river.

39
40 So what is the Council's feelings on
41 this schedule. What do you think, Carl? You live over
42 here. What do you have to say?

43
44 MR. MORGAN: You know, that's a hard
45 one to swallow to have no openings. At least this
46 gives them some. I mean we won't even be able to fish
47 with a herring net. I know we can go to extremes, from
48 one extreme to the other. I know it's a depressed fish
49 and the outlook looks bleak.

50

1 I don't -- it's pretty hard for me to
2 say because I don't think -- I think you're going to
3 see more -- what would you call it, disobedience to the
4 reg, protest fishing. It's happened and it's still
5 being litigated now. I've done a lot of talking, the
6 same as Dave, to downriver people and I've heard a lot
7 of them say they're not going to cut back. I've heard
8 it all the way from Eek all the way up to below
9 Tuluksak that they're going to go for them. I think
10 it's going to be an enforcement issue again. But at
11 least this will give some people some chance to get
12 chum maybe and whitefish and shee.

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: When is the last
15 pulse normally entering into the 1B lower river? The
16 first pulse is coming in after the 22nd or all chinook
17 entering into the Kuskokwim before the 22nd of June?

18
19 MR. ELLISON: Mr. Chair. This is
20 Travis Ellison.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead.

23
24 MR. ELLISON: The Kuskokwim chinook run
25 generally ends around June 1st in the Lower Kuskokwim
26 River.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you mean July
29 1st?

30
31 MR. ELLISON: No. The chinook run
32 starts about June 1st usually and then the peak of the
33 run at Bethel is typically around the 21st or 22nd of
34 June and about the end of the first week of July,
35 around July 7th or 10th, in that area, the run is
36 almost completely over in the Bethel area.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So these four-hour
39 schedules would actually be right on the tail end of
40 the last pulse.

41
42 MR. ELLISON: Yeah, where those are
43 situated on that schedule it's beyond the peak of the
44 king run, but by that time chum and sockeye salmon
45 greatly outnumber king salmon by four or six to one.
46 And using six-inch gear is more effective at harvesting
47 the chum and sockeye. So basically -- because people
48 will be catching so many chum and sockeye so fast they
49 would reduce their ability to harvest the kings.

50

1 In late June there in the Lower River,
2 if you put out a 50-fathom gillnet for 20 minutes and
3 pull it in, you're going to have well over 100 salmon
4 in your net. Most people in that time of year will
5 only put out half their net, pull it back in and allow
6 50 to 100 salmon. Most of those will be chum and
7 sockeye.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Under emergency
10 order can you preclude one -- like if the run is late,
11 you're getting a whole bunch of kings there, we have
12 zero to give, can you pull one of those periods?

13
14 MR. ELLISON: Absolutely. And that's
15 part of the strategy with this. We want to schedule
16 these periods to give people something to plan for, but
17 if we're not seeing the numbers we need to see to
18 project meeting our escapement goals, then we'll pull
19 those periods, just like they do on the Yukon when
20 they're not seeing the numbers they need. They'll
21 actually close those scheduled periods especially with
22 that first period where there's a higher likelihood of
23 some significant king catches. We'll definitely need
24 to see good numbers in Bethel test fish to even allow
25 those periods to happen.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That helps, you
28 know, that you would be -- and I want dedication to
29 conservation on this Kuskokwim run. My position is
30 there's five species of salmon on the Kuskokwim River.
31 There's lots and lots of coho and sockeye that are
32 beautiful fish. Nobody's going to tell me they're
33 going to starve to death on coho and sockeye. They're
34 a beautiful fish, especially in the Lower River. Some
35 of the choicest -- I mean everybody knows a Copper
36 River sockeye. Well, these sockeyes on the Kuskokwim
37 are every bit as good as any Copper River sockeye and
38 they sell those for huge money. So they're not telling
39 me in the Lower River that they're going to starve to
40 death on sockeye and coho.

41
42 But we can't keep pounding these fish.
43 And there's lots of fishing time after the 1st of July.
44 There's lots and lots of time to fish for other
45 species.

46
47 So we have one special action request
48 for dipnet fishing opportunity. I would like to take
49 action on these one at a time. You've got a comment
50 there, Tim.

1 MR. GERVAIS: I have a question. What
2 was the opening schedule that happened in 2013 for the
3 Lower River so I can get an idea of how much fishing
4 time they had to catch what they caught.

5
6 MR. CANNON: Basically there were no
7 closures. When they got into late June, the
8 restriction to six-inch gear. Is that right, Travis?

9
10 MR. ELLISON: Yes, correct.

11
12 MR. GERVAIS: So they had two 12-hour
13 openings a week?

14
15 MR. CANNON: No. They were open every
16 day this last summer. There were restrictions in 2012.
17 Just to give you a little background, there were quite
18 a few restrictions compared to other years in 2012
19 which did lead to just barely making escapement that
20 year, but a lot of the fishermen felt that they didn't
21 have an opportunity to fish and then I don't know what
22 the actual subsistence harvest was, but it was
23 substantially lower than normal years. Almost
24 everybody went into last year with the mantra let's not
25 repeat last year, meaning 2012, which was a restricted
26 year.

27
28 So I think a lot of fishermen remember
29 very easily what the year before that was like. They
30 knew there were restrictions, so they fished pretty
31 heavily last year and, yeah, were very successful in
32 the Lower River where the bulk of the harvest does
33 occur.

34
35 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. This is Don
36 Rivard.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.

39
40 MR. RIVARD: I just want to add to what
41 Dave said. In 2012, the escapement goal that year to
42 try to get into the river was I think 127,000. Last
43 year the escapement goal that they were targeting was
44 65,000, I believe. Maybe a little bit higher. So
45 there was quite a bit of difference in what the
46 escapement goals were for those two years.

47
48 Thank you.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we need to move

1 on here. We've got lots of agenda still. So it's my
2 position that we need to have a special action request
3 for the dipnet proposal so that people will not feel
4 totally stressed out sitting on the beach. They can go
5 and fish dipnet and release the kings. So we need to
6 move there so that we take the pressure off the
7 managers.

8

9 I would like to entertain a motion to
10 endorse the special action request for dipnet on the
11 Kuskokwim River as a gear type on the Federal waters.

12

13 MR. GERVAIS: Why are we looking at
14 this?

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's what we've
17 been -- that's what Dave is presenting to us here.

18

19 MR. MORGAN: So moved.

20

21 MR. COLLINS: I'll second. It was
22 moved.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
25 The Council discussed this motion. We have a motion on
26 the floor. Any further discussion on the dipnet
27 special action request and a benefit to the fishery.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
32 endorsing the special action request for dipnet fishery
33 on the Kuskokwim River for 2014 signify by saying aye.

34

35 IN UNISON: Aye.

36

37 (No opposing votes)

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Continue, Dave.

40

41 MR. CANNON: Okay. Basically we have
42 one other special action request there and that is to
43 limit the size of gillnets to 50 fathom currently in
44 the subsistence regs as well as the State. The Federal
45 regs say when subsistence fishing for salmon you may
46 not use an aggregate length of set or drift gillnets in
47 excess of 50. We would like to make that 150 -- excuse
48 me, 25. 150 feet.

49

50 (Laughter)

1 MR. CANNON: I'll say that one more
2 time. 25 fathoms or a limit of 150 feet. The
3 justifications are basically the same, salmon
4 conservation. Lower River fishers tend to use 300-foot
5 nets. The majority of people up here only use 150-foot
6 nets. One of the scenarios if we do have a decent run
7 that's 100-some thousand or so where there's a
8 harvestable surplus, there still may be a need for
9 conservation. So, by limiting the length of the net it
10 may allow for more escapement upriver and that's why we
11 have this.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I also feel that
14 would be another tool for the managers to use, so I
15 also feel that that's a proper thing on the Federal
16 waters. Any discussion on that reduction in gear
17 length size. Carl.

18
19 MR. MORGAN: You know, I have nothing
20 against that because I only use about 100-foot net
21 anyway.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I don't want
24 to hear people saying, oh, I can't cut my net in half.
25 I can cut that net in half in an hour easy and tie both
26 ends and have it ready to fish. So there are maybe
27 people saying that at the meetings, but don't listen to
28 them.

29
30 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chair. We did talk
31 with the troopers and they said that they could still
32 use the 300-foot net as long as 150 was maintained and
33 stayed in the boat and there are ways to tie the nets
34 off so that they could accommodate that.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. You have to
37 tie all the lead line to the corks period and have it
38 completely wrapped. That would be the only legal way
39 to actually stop them from deploying the whole net at
40 night. If you're going to talk about this issue of how
41 to maintain 25 fathoms in the water, you've got to tie
42 the whole net, lead to the corks all the way up period.
43 You can't just let people have half the net laying in
44 the boat. Oh, here come -- we see a plane way down
45 river, we're going to pull half that net in the boat.
46 Wait a minute. No, it has to be tied up period and
47 stacked on the deck.

48
49 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman.
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.
2
3 MR. MORGAN: I'd like to make a motion
4 to support the special action to limit the net size to
5 25 fathom.
6
7 MR. J. WALKER: Second.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
10 Any further discussion.
11
12 (No comment)
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
15 special action request to limit nets to 25 fathoms on
16 the Kuskokwim River in 2014 signify by saying aye.
17
18 IN UNISON: Aye.
19
20 (No opposing votes)
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that special
23 action request is also endorsed. Thanks, Dave.
24
25 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. This is Don
26 Rivard.
27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.
29
30 MR. RIVARD: I just wanted to get on
31 record, as Dave pointed out, there's going to be
32 companion proposals to the Board of Fisheries on these
33 same two special actions. They call them emergency
34 petitions. If you are endorsing that for the State as
35 well, please put that on the record.
36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, I would like --
38 the Council is adamant about this. The Board of Fish
39 also should also hear our justification for endorsing
40 the companion proposals before the Board of Fish.
41
42 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I so move
43 that we submit these also to the State.
44
45 MR. MORGAN: Second.
46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
48 transmitting the special action request companions to
49 the Board of Fish signify by saying aye.
50

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 (No opposing votes)
4
5 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. I just wanted
6 to clarify something here.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.
9
10 MR. RIVARD: You're endorsing the
11 emergency petitions that the Kuskokwim Working Group is
12 putting forward to the Board or are you going to put in
13 your own emergency petitions on these two?
14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, we're not going
16 to put in our own. We're just endorsing the special
17 action requests to the appropriate Boards.
18
19 MR. RIVARD: Okay. Thank you for that
20 clarification.
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so.....
23
24 MS. BURKE: Mr. Chair.
25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Melinda.
27
28 MS. BURKE: We've got one other
29 presentation here that we're going to take out of order
30 today. We've got another patient person on the phone.
31 BLM will do the Central Yukon Resource Management Plan
32 status update. I've got, I believe, Erin on the line.
33
34 (No comment)
35
36 MS. BURKE: She should be calling in in
37 just a second. Let's proceed.
38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. She's not
40 online. What about the State Proposals 371, 372.
41
42 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43 This is George Pappas. I can address those for you.
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, George.
46
47 MR. PAPPAS: Good afternoon. Yes, we
48 have three proposals. Proposal No. 371 is being
49 submitted to the Alaska Board of Fisheries to modify
50 the definition of dipnets which can be used in the

1 commercial fishery in the Yukon River in areas 1, 2 and
2 3, or districts that is, during the commercial salmon
3 -- excuse me, summer chum salmon fishery. Last year
4 the Alaska Board of Fisheries adopted this proposal to
5 allow for some commercial harvest of chum salmon with
6 methods and means that could immediately return the
7 kings back into the water unharmed. The only
8 definition at the time for dipnets were under the
9 personal use regulations and they adopted those.

10

11 I believe the proponent is online. He
12 might be able to speak to this later, but the idea is
13 to have a more efficient net, maybe something larger,
14 different shapes, something outside of what's in
15 current regulation. I'd just like to take your
16 comments to the Board of Fisheries, which meets here in
17 about two or three weeks and I'm forming comments for
18 OSM and it's up for ISC review right now.

19

20 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, George. Is
23 the Yukon Delta Fisheries Development Association on
24 there, Gene?

25

26 MR. SANDONE: Yeah, I'm here, Mr.
27 Chairman. There's four proposals. I think there's
28 also one for purse seines, but the one he's talking
29 about, the dipnets, there's two types of dipnets that
30 are used on the Yukon. They're round dipnets and
31 there's triangular dipnets. The regulation specifies
32 that the straight line distance between the ends of the
33 dipnet should be five feet.

34

35 You know, I don't think people are
36 going to increase the round dipnets too much, maybe 6.5
37 feet, but I think it would become inoperable after
38 that, but the triangle dipnets, they roll along the
39 bottom and they could be much more efficient if you'd
40 increase the size there. Right now with the
41 specifications about four feet along the base. I think
42 if you increase it maybe to six, seven feet I think
43 they'd be extremely more efficient at catching fish.

44

45 George was right about the release of
46 king salmon. I could go on or you can give it back to
47 George.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So the Chair
50 will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 371, the

1 Board of Fish proposal for dipnet regulatory change
2 that basically would not delineate the size of the
3 dipnet except for the mesh size measurement of
4 4.5-inch. Do I have a motion to adopt to get the
5 proposal on the table?

6

7 MR. SIMON: So moved.

8

9 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
12 Pollock and Jenny. James, you had a question on the
13 proposal. Go ahead.

14

15 MR. J. WALKER: Yes, I've got a
16 question on the bag itself. What is the limitations on
17 the size of the bag, be it round or triangle, and the
18 length.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Gene.

21

22 MR. SANDONE: I believe it has to be at
23 least 1.5 times the diameter of the hoop. Correct me
24 if I m wrong George, but I think that's correct. It
25 doesn't really matter how long it is. The smaller the
26 bag, the easier it is to get the fish out of and get
27 back fishing, so I don't think people will want very
28 long bags.

29

30 MR. PAPPAS: I'm looking at the
31 regulations. Gene, you are correct.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions
34 on the proposal.

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Discussion on the
39 proposal.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm personally in
44 favor of the proposal because just like I was stating
45 earlier it's best to vector people's energy into
46 catching these excess summer chum salmon on the Yukon
47 River commercial fishery, so they can move them away
48 and I was very pleased with the low number of
49 incidental harvest mortalities of chinook salmon on the
50 Yukon River with dipnet this past season. There was

1 some retention problems but that can be addressed, but
2 the dipnetting, they pull the fish up. If there's a
3 king, they let it go. So I feel that there wasn't a
4 large harvestable surplus of chum salmon. So I think
5 this would be a worthwhile proposal to support.

6

7 Other comments.

8

9 Tim.

10

11 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
12 I'm going to ask the members of the council not to
13 approve this proposal because we don't have any
14 information on what these catch rates are. It's
15 basically a new fishery, a new gear type, a round and
16 -- I haven't seen any information on the catch rates
17 they're getting with these nets, so I don't see why we
18 should just give them an open criteria where they can
19 build nets any size and we don't know what rate they're
20 catching at and how it's affecting the upriver users or
21 the spawning numbers for the chum.

22

23 I'm glad they're trying different gear
24 types, but I want to see some information on how much
25 fish they're catching and what's going to be the
26 increase in catch power if they have unrestricted size
27 in their gear type. I don't think we need to get into
28 an unlimited gear size at this time. We don't have
29 hardly any information on how these folks are catching.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you have the
32 numbers of harvest on dipnet last season in comparison
33 to the run escapement?

34

35 MR. SANDONE: Yes, I do. The
36 exploitation rate was 9 percent with dipnet. If George
37 would -- if you would allow me to go through my
38 presentation, I have all this information. It might
39 answer a lot of your questions regarding the proposals.
40 Also if you would let me and George would yield to let
41 me do the proposals, I'm sure he can comment on them if
42 he wanted to.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have time for
45 the present -- we're running really, really tight on
46 time, Gene. So I don't think that we -- right now we
47 just don't have the time for it. We got really screwed
48 up with our lunch and various backed-up issues at this
49 meeting.

50

1 The reality is that the exploitation
2 rate with dipnet is far reduced over the pressure that
3 the managers would have to allow a directed chum
4 fishery with six-inch gear, which is going to have a
5 huge impact on the chinook salmon, so this is a catch
6 and release for chinook salmon and the mortality -- I
7 forget what it was. What was it, 138 chinook salmon
8 were killed in the dipnet fishery or something to that
9 effect, Jean.

10

11 MR. SANDONE: There was very, very few
12 chinook salmon killed in dipnet fishery. The only ones
13 that were killed that we knew of or that Fish and Game
14 knew of is when a protection officer stopped a boat and
15 they had two, but they were supposed to be turned in to
16 the State. So the number is very close to zero. 1,125
17 were caught and released in the dipnet fishery, which
18 lasted a lot. I mean they dipnetted 12 hours every day
19 for most of the season. In the gillnet fishery, you
20 had approximately 439 king salmon caught and killed.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I'm much more
23 inclined to have dipnet release of chinook salmon than
24 I -- because they're going to go after -- the managers
25 are going to be under pressure to fish six-inch gear if
26 we don't have a dipnet fishery. I personally will vote
27 for this proposal because I feel that the managers are
28 going to be under pressure to use with gillnet six-inch
29 gear and I'm concerned about that.

30

31 Any other discussion on the proposal.

32

33 MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. This is

34 George.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: George, go ahead.

37

38 MR. PAPPAS: Yes, the final review of
39 this proposal by the Federal Subsistence Management
40 Program is not complete, but it's leaning towards
41 opposing this proposal or not maybe this proposal, but
42 developing gear types that will increase incidental
43 contact with chinook salmon in the Yukon River during
44 times of low abundance. That's what I have so far.

45

46 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead,

49 Fred.

50

1 MR. BUE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Fred
2 Bue, Fish and Wildlife Service. I think additional to
3 your discussion YRDFA met two weeks ago at Fort Yukon.
4 In their discussion they had no consensus on this
5 proposal. Essentially it boils down to some people
6 felt that there was -- this proposal had merit. Make
7 the gear type most efficient because it's still an
8 experimental type in development. Their thought is
9 maybe they can make it better. They still had the
10 limitations on that. It had to be a hand-held piece of
11 gear. It couldn't just be mechanized or hydraulic
12 driven or something. So it's still limited by what
13 physically you can handle. Then the other concern, the
14 alternate side is unknown mortality.

15

16 Mr. Chair.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

19

20 MR. GERVAIS: So we're getting not
21 consensus from YRDFA, we're getting a non-determination
22 from OSM. Experimental gear type. Then let it proceed
23 as an experimental gear type rather than putting into
24 regulation unlimited size restriction on dip gillnets.
25 There's no -- it sounds like it's working the way it
26 is. They're catching fish, so let it stay the way it
27 is. Let them work on their experimental and get some
28 quality documented research on it and then if it's
29 determined that they need to change their shape or
30 their size, then we can approve a proposal at that time
31 when it's more developed and more tested.

32

33 MR. SANDONE: Mr. Chair.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

36

37 MR. SANDONE: I just want to point out
38 that in the Yukon last year the targeted commercial
39 harvest for the Lower Yukon was about 1.3 million. The
40 actual harvest was about 379,000 with dipnet taking
41 about half that harvest. The dipnet was used almost
42 every day throughout the season, so it's a very
43 inefficient gear type and we're just trying to increase
44 efficiency.

45

46 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Further
49 discussion on the proposal.

50

1 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead, Vince.

4

5 MR. MATHEWS: The Yukon Flats Advisory
6 Committee in January took up all these proposals. They
7 had a quorum in Fairbanks and they opposed this
8 proposal. This is not their minutes, these are my
9 notes. They opposed it because committee members
10 expressed concerns about the increase in chinook salmon
11 bycatch with the larger dipnets when the chinook salmon
12 returns are not meeting escapement and subsistence
13 needs. They had the similar concerns that Tim had of
14 how long would the dipnet be and all this other stuff,
15 so they opposed it and that would be the Yukon Flats
16 Advisory Committee.

17

18 They took up all the other proposals,
19 so if you want to know those, I can share those when
20 you take them up.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Other
23 discussion of Council members.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The way I look at
28 it, they've got this excess chum salmon, they're going
29 to go after them, and they have the ability to use
30 beach seine and if the water drops this year, they're
31 going to beat the tar out of those fish. I don't want
32 to see beach seine fishing at all. I hate beach
33 seining. Just think about landing -- you know,
34 Pollock, you fished beach seine. When you're killing
35 fish, fine. You roll those fish up on the beach,
36 you're going to have a huge mortality with king salmon
37 with beach seining.

38

39 I feel that there's going to be huge
40 pressure against the managers to have a more efficient
41 harvest and dipnetting and letting the fish go is much
42 better than beach seining and rolling around and
43 kicking them over the side of the cork line. So I feel
44 that the managers are either going to do that or
45 they're going to let six-inch gear go too early and
46 we're going to have high -- you know, we killed 400-
47 something kings last year.

48

49 So I'm inclined to support the
50 proposal. I would like to bring this to a vote now.

1 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair. Can we modify
2 that and spell out no larger than?

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, we could.

5
6 MR. COLLINS: I would like to put some
7 restriction in. If what they're using now in the round
8 one is no greater than five feet or some modification
9 that would meet -- that would put a restriction on and
10 say we would approve it that way but not unlimited.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You're going to make
13 an amendment for six-inch triangular shape dipnet.
14 They want triangle to get down on the bottom. So you
15 could set the size of the opening. This is requesting
16 an unlimited size, which could be huge, or the maximum
17 dimension perimeter or the maximum size. We could go
18 with something like that.

19
20 MR. GERVAIS: Could we hear what the
21 regulation is again.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you want to state
24 the regulation again, George.

25
26 MR. PAPPAS: The definition of dipnet.
27 It is a bag-shaped net supported on all sides, a rigid
28 frame. Maximum straight line distance between any two
29 points in the frame as measured through the net opening
30 may not exceed five feet. The depth of the bag must be
31 at least 1.5 of the greatest straight line distance as
32 measured through the net opening. No portion of the
33 bag may be constructed of webbing that exceeds
34 stretched mesh measurement of 4.5 inches. The frame
35 must be attached with a single rigid handle and be
36 operated by hand.

37
38 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

39
40 MR. COLLINS: So that will be in place
41 if we pass this?

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's the current
44 regulation. If we don't pass this, it will maintain
45 the five-inch diameter round net, which.....

46
47 MR. GERVAIS: Five foot.

48
49 MR. J. WALKER: Five foot.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:like five foot
2 diameter round net, which is not as efficient as --
3 they want an efficiency increase, so they're -- but we
4 could set no more than -- you know, basically it's the
5 triangular shape is what they want to go to, so it
6 could be no more than six or seven feet or some linear
7 distance across the triangular edge if the Council is
8 interested in modifying the proposal. Or we could just
9 vote the proposal up or down.

10

(No comments)

11

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have no motion to
14 modify the proposal. We don't have time to continue
15 deliberations. Those in favor of Proposal 371 as
16 stated signify by saying aye.

17

18 IN UNISON: Aye.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
21 sign and hold your hands up for count. Opposed hands
22 up. Tim is opposed. Who else is opposed. We've got
23 two opposition. I'll do a roll call. Pollock, are you
24 going to vote? So we're going to go roll call. Go
25 ahead, Tim.

26

27 MR. GERVAIS: No.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Pollock, yes or no
30 on Proposal 371.

31

32 MR. SIMON: Yes.

33

34 MS. PELKOLA: Yes.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes for me. Ray.

37

38 MR. COLLINS: No.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No for Ray.

41

42 MR. MORGAN: Yes.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes for Carl. Yes
45 for Robert. Yes for James. So the proposal is passed
46 as written.

47

48 MR. COLLINS: If you want a statement,
49 it would be I'd prefer some kind of size restriction.
50 Why I'm opposing.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, there's
2 concern -- the opposition's concern is that there would
3 be too large of an opening with unrestricted. The
4 justification for adoption would be that it would
5 increase efficiency and move the directed chum salmon
6 fishery to a less lethal mortality on chinook salmon
7 and it would move the fishery away from any kind of
8 gillnet when the chinook salmon are suppressed.

9
10 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
11 I'll include that in the official comments to the Board
12 of Fisheries and present that for you.

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Also Tim is stating
15 that there should be better documentation of catch
16 rates with dipnet and possibly some type of an idea of
17 mortality with contact with dipnet gear with chinook
18 salmon after being released.

19
20 Proposal 372 is Virgil Umphenour's
21 proposal. Are you going to give us an overview of that
22 one, George?

23
24 MR. PAPPAS: I have Proposal 372, the
25 commercial -- no, I do not -- we're not going to make
26 comments on that from the Federal Subsistence
27 Management Program about having leads in the back of
28 fishwheels.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you want to give
31 us an update on what YRDFA did on that one for the
32 record, Fred.

33
34 MR. BUE: Mr. Chairman. I have to
35 qualify this. I haven't seen the official minutes from
36 the meeting because they're not out yet, but when I
37 participated in the meeting their position was to
38 support. They work on a consensus, so there was
39 consensus to support that one. Mr. Chairman.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Chair will
42 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 372.

43
44 MR. R. WALKER: So moved.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Robert.

47
48 MR. SIMON: Second.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Pollock.

1 Everybody knows what a lead is for a fishwheel. Any
2 discussion on the proposal.

3

4 (No comments)

5

6 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
9 called. Those in favor of Proposal 372 signify by
10 saying aye.

11

12 IN UNISON: Aye.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.

15

16 MR. GERVAIS: Aye.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed to the
19 proposal.

20

21 MR. GERVAIS: I'm opposing this and the
22 reason I'm opposing this is we've gone in these
23 conservation measures. It's all been on the burden of
24 the drift gillnet user and here we're putting into
25 regulation language that increases the efficiency of a
26 fishwheel without any regulation on the size of the
27 length of the lead and I feel that's unjust for the
28 driftnet users. I'd rather see the harvest
29 restrictions be equally borne by all the different
30 harvesters in the system. So I can't be voting in the
31 past for gillnet restrictions and then adding
32 advantageous components to fishwheel operators.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's valid
35 reasoning.

36

37 MR. COLLINS: Question, Mr. Chair.
38 Aren't they using live box and releasing the kings in
39 this fishery?

40

41 MR. R. WALKER: Yep.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, they actually
44 have to man the wheels and they let the kings go.

45

46 MR. GERVAIS: Only in 4A, not in 4B or
47 C. Not in 5.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are the wheels
50 manned upriver?

1 MR. BUE: Mr. Chairman. This is a
2 commercial fishing proposal and so under -- commercial
3 fishery takes place in 4A around Kaltag. There's also
4 a commercial fishery around Nenana that they're doing
5 this. And also this past season for subsistence this
6 is a management tool. We employed it this year to
7 release all chinook in season by emergency order.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So by emergency
10 order, even the commercial fishery for chum.

11
12 MR. BUE: In times of conservation,
13 it's in the regulation for subsistence.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And Y6 is closed?

16
17 MR. BUE: I don't know if they did it
18 this year. I don't believe they did actually for
19 subsistence, but they did restrict it for commercial in
20 Y6.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Commercial, yeah.
23 So that was my understanding, that they would have to
24 release the chinook salmon during the directed chum
25 wheel fishery.

26
27 MR. BUE: For commercial fishing, yes.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: For commercial
30 fishing.

31
32 MR. BUE: That's what they did.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So justification is
35 that the excess chum salmon in a harvest is -- there's
36 people that use -- and especially up there around the
37 Tanana area they use some commercial fishing for chum
38 salmon and without certain efficiencies that are used
39 by subsistence fishers, they use leads for subsistence
40 fishers, they don't meet the harvest levels that's
41 desired.

42
43 So Proposal 373, who's going to give us
44 an overview on that?

45
46 MR. PAPPAS: This is George Pappas
47 again, Mr. Chair.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

50

1 MR. PAPPAS: Okay. This requests that
2 the -- a regulation was passed by Alaska Board of Fish
3 last year that accompanied the dipnet fishery and the
4 beach seine fishery commercial salmon fishery in the
5 summertime and the intent of the proposal, if a fish
6 came up, it was mortally wounded, that fish would have
7 to be turned over to the State of Alaska and be
8 forfeited and then the State would distribute the fish.

9
10
11 Now, as Gene indicated earlier from his
12 data that zero or few fish were mortally wounded in the
13 dipnet fishery, I understand someone, an enforcement
14 agent, came across a couple of kings in a boat and
15 said, well, we're on our way to go to Fish and Game.
16 The State indicates, and if someone is there they can
17 correct me if I'm wrong, that this regulation is not
18 enforceable and want to repeal it and basically require
19 every fish to be released alive.

20
21 The Federal Subsistence Management
22 Program has struggled with this proposal because if the
23 regulation is approved, in theory, the regulation says
24 if you get a dead fish in your net, you've got to throw
25 it back in the water and not retain it. If it's not
26 approved, the regulation stays in place and there's a
27 loophole.

28
29 Now the enforcement staff here has made
30 a recommendation to modify this proposal three methods.
31 One, require that a mortally wounded fish in his net,
32 which in theory should be few, should have the fin
33 clipped in a way that doesn't represent subsistence, so
34 cut the pectorals or something like that.

35
36 Two, require the commercial fishermen
37 to record the fish immediately on a fish ticket.
38 That's an issue because commercial fishermen in the
39 Yukon don't have fish tickets on, but in some areas of
40 the state fish tickets are issued to commercial
41 fishermen on the grounds, blank ones and ones that have
42 transport permits or have catcher/sellers licenses.
43 That would be for the Board of Fish and the State to
44 figure out, but that would be a recording mechanism.

45
46 And three, those mortally wounded,
47 clipped, recorded fish be delivered to -- forfeited to
48 the State and the State would have to have some type of
49 reporting mechanism or tracking mechanism so they know
50 that fish made it to the State. So if every year

1 somebody comes in with a fish ticket, run it and then
2 get the reporting from whoever received this fish and
3 match them up if there's an issue. That would make
4 this regulation enforceable. Even though it's likely
5 there'd be very low encounters in this situation, it
6 would make it enforceable.

7

8 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, George. On
11 the Copper River they have dipnetting for sockeye
12 salmon and they release king salmon all the time. They
13 don't allow retention and they have a significant
14 personal use fishery there. I mean kings are caught in
15 dipnets and let go on the Copper River all the time.
16 That just happens.

17

18 I feel that this regulation would close
19 the loophole and that it would be beneficial to moving
20 this dipnet fishery, which I'm in support of the dip --
21 I keep saying I'm in support of the dipnet fishery to
22 move away from the beach seine fishery and the directed
23 chum fishery with six-inch net. That's what I would
24 like to see the Department move away from.

25

26 So the Chair will entertain a motion to
27 adopt Proposal 373.

28

29 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Jenny.

32

33 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Second by James.

36 Any further discussion on the proposal.

37

38 MR. J. WALKER: Discussion. Are you
39 insinuating also that the beach seine is -- you're
40 agreeing on the beach seine also in this proposal?

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, this proposal
43 would also.....

44

45 MR. J. WALKER: If we could limit the
46 motion to just specify dipnetting and not include beach
47 seine.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The problem is that
50 people were retaining fish, whether they're beach

1 seining or dipnetting and then like trying to sneak
2 them home. Well, they're not allowed to have king
3 salmon at all. Under this proposal if the Board adopts
4 it, they would not be able to have a king salmon
5 period. So they're not going to be trying to kill
6 them. They'd be more inclined to let them go. So
7 whether it's beach seine or dipnetting, they can't keep
8 the fish. They can't have the fish on board, so they
9 have to get rid of the fish. They have to put them
10 back in the water, so it doesn't do them any good to
11 kill it and then throw it back in the water. They'll
12 just let it go alive and that's what we want them to
13 do, is let them go alive.

14
15 So that's what this proposal does is
16 close the loophole so they can't keep the fish if
17 they're commercial fishing. Correct?

18
19 MR. BUE: (Nods affirmatively)

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So what was YRDFA's
22 position on this proposal?

23
24 MR. BUE: Mr. Chairman. Much as your
25 discussion goes, no consensus partly because of the
26 unknown mortality and waste, but also those in favor of
27 it think it's creating a prohibited species encourages
28 conservation and stewardship of the resource. If they
29 have to return it, maybe they're less likely to handle
30 it poorly also.

31
32 Thank you.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Further
35 discussion. Tim.

36
37 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, I'd like to know if
38 there's any kind of feelings amongst the Council to
39 modify this proposal to fit in some of those concerns
40 of the fish and wildlife protection officers mentioned
41 with a recording or the fin clipping or both.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, that gets into
44 -- yeah, I mean you can go into a whole long list of
45 ways to mitigate that, but that's not in the proposal
46 and that would be kind of hard to do. I just would not
47 even want to see any dead fish, so I don't feel the
48 Board of Fish should allow beach seining. Beach
49 seining has a real high impact on fish.

50

1 MR. GERVAIS: This isn't endorsing
2 beach seining, it's just talking about what to do with
3 the mortality, the dead fish from beach seining or from
4 dipnetting.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's real hard to
7 kill a fish with a dipnet. I mean they get caught in
8 that net, you've got to let that thing go, otherwise
9 you're going to jerk your arm off. If you get a king
10 in a dipnet, you're going to let it go right now.
11 You're just going to turn the net inside out let it go.
12 So there's hardly any contact with gear.

13
14 We don't want to have any dead fish
15 because people can have the idea they may possibly be
16 able to kill a fish and bring it home, then you end up
17 with people who will do that. So I want to move away
18 from any retention. You can't have a fish.

19
20 So would you like to modify the
21 proposal for all the fin clipping for retention?

22
23 MR. GERVAIS: No. I was asking if
24 there was any other people on the Council that felt
25 that that might be a reasonable way to proceed with
26 this proposal.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, the Department
29 should have -- this is submitted by the Alaska
30 Department of Fish and Game. They could have gone that
31 way and I'm sure they thought about going that way, but
32 this is the direction they went with this proposal and
33 I don't feel comfortable with trying to enumerate all
34 the loopholes and not being in the Attorney General's
35 Office and knowing what would be prosecuted. So I
36 prefer to vote this proposal up or down.

37
38 Any further discussion on Proposal 373.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
45 called. Those in favor of Proposal 373 signify by
46 saying aye.

47
48 IN UNISON: Aye.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.

1 Robert.

2

3 MR. R. WALKER: I oppose.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oppose. Were you
6 for or against, James?

7

8 MR. J. WALKER: Against.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Against. So we've
11 got two against. We have the rest of the Council for.
12 We're on Proposal 377.

13

14 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
15 I'll be very brief. Proposal 377 requests authorize
16 use of purse seine gear for commercial harvest of Yukon
17 summer chum in Districts 1 through 3 during times of
18 king salmon conservation. It requires release of life
19 kings. The same as the other comments, the Federal
20 Subsistence Management Program is concerned about any
21 management action, regulatory action may increase Yukon
22 River salmon mortality or impacts or contact with
23 commercial gear during time of low abundance.

24

25 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What did YRDFA do on
28 this proposal, Fred?

29

30 MR. BUE: Mr. Chairman. YRDFA had no
31 consensus. Again, similar concern for increased
32 mortality. You know, the additional fishing gear out
33 there, fishing pressure. The other side of it is that
34 it was supported for conservation. It's a way to
35 harvest chum and conserve chinook. Mr. Chair.

36

37 MR. SANDONE: Mr. Chair.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Gene.

40

41 MR. SANDONE: One of the concerns -- I
42 mean there's two concerns. The Lower River is
43 definitely not getting anywhere near the harvest that
44 they're allocated for summer chum salmon. The other
45 concern is that the last three seasons the statements
46 for the Yukon have been over 2 million fish and last
47 year was 2.6 million fish.

48

49 From my analysis, and I've done
50 numerous escapement goal analysis when I was with the

1 Department, I figure that the escapement is between
2 700,000 and 1 million fish and escapements over 1.8
3 million do not replace themselves. In other words,
4 production significantly decreases when the escapement
5 goes above 1.8 million. So increasing the harvest
6 through these types of gear, like purse seines, and
7 releasing the king salmon alive and taking more chum
8 salmon would not only benefit the commercial harvesters
9 in the Lower river, but would also benefit the run
10 itself by keeping production fairly high.

11
12 I also want to note that in Washington
13 and Oregon gillnets are being banned and one of the
14 ways that they're going to continue commercial harvest
15 is through purse seines which will harvest hatchery
16 kings but allow wild kings be released.

17
18 If I may go on, I did a test fishery
19 last year with very impressive results in capturing
20 chum salmon and hand dipping them
21 out of the purse seine pool and either letting them go
22 or killing them. It was a really good operation.
23 Unfortunately we did it during the tail end of the chum
24 run. We didn't catch a lot of chum, but I think if
25 this was done during the peak of the chum run, there
26 would be substantial harvest of chum with very little
27 impact to the kings.

28
29 Thank you.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Gene. The
32 Chair will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 377 for
33 discussion.

34
35 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.

36
37 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
40 Discussion on the proposal. Tim.

41
42 MR. GERVAIS: What kind of -- was this
43 in regulation or Governor's permit? How were they
44 conducting this purse seine fishery this past season?

45
46 MR. SANDONE: Through the Chair. I
47 guess that was directed towards me. We, in conjunction
48 with ADF&G, used some modified beach seines. We just
49 used snap rings on the lead line as purse rings and ran
50 our line through that and we operated from July 2nd to

1 July 6th and then later on in August. But we operated
2 with Fish and Game. It was a cooperative test fishery
3 with only one or two boats operating.

4

5 MR. GERVAIS: Gene, why is this
6 proposal written with monofilament instead of just
7 standard purse seine web?

8

9 MR. SANDONE: Well, if you go through
10 this packet in my presentation, you'll see we're using
11 very small boats, we're using 22-25 foot, and trying to
12 move a purse seine through the water is very difficult
13 with these size boats, but monofilament is very light
14 and we could move it through the water very easily. We
15 found that there was very, very few fish that were
16 tangled in the monofilament and I think if you reduce
17 the mesh size by about two inches you wouldn't gill any
18 incidentals like Bering cisco or pink salmon. I think
19 that's the reason why we want to go to monofilament.

20

21 There is a statewide ban on purse
22 seines made with monofilament, but nobody can come up
23 with a reason why it was banned in the first place.

24

25 MR. GERVAIS: I'll give you a reason
26 why it was banned in the first place because the fish
27 can't see it. If this proposal is passed and put into
28 regulation, how many of these commercial fishers in
29 Districts 1 through 3 are going to fish with purse
30 seine gear?

31

32 MR. SANDONE: I don't know for sure,
33 but we only had I think about 120 dipnetters out there
34 and Districts 1 and 2 are very large areas. Again, it
35 can be managed very well by ADF&G. Last year -- if we
36 get a run of 3.2 million fish, the expected harvest
37 could be as high as 60 percent of that if you're trying
38 to provide for escapement and subsistence needs. The
39 harvestable surplus could be very high. Right now
40 we're not taking anything compared to what it could be.

41

42 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

45

46 MR. J. WALKER: I've got a question.
47 What's the depth limit on the purse seine?

48

49 MR. SANDONE: Well, you're fishing
50 close to shore. I think we used -- I think it was 20

1 feet. Again, that could be something the Board of Fish
2 wrestles with. We don't want it too deep because we
3 want to drag the bottom and we're close to shore.

4

5 MR. J. WALKER: So you're fishing to
6 the equivalent of about a 40 mesh net.

7

8 MR. SANDONE: It depends on the mesh
9 size, of course, but we're trying to get somewhere
10 around 20 feet. I think that's what we're trying to
11 do.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other discussion.

14 Tim.

15

16 MR. GERVAIS: To my knowledge, every
17 other purse seine fishery in the state specifies length
18 of lead, length of net, depth of net and none of that
19 information is in here. I mean you're here to put into
20 regulation a gear type with hardly any restriction on
21 it. I really encourage the folks that are conducting
22 these test fisheries to continue to do it, but I don't
23 want to see it come into regulation until we have
24 better information and we can be shown that the lengths
25 and depths are appropriate to harvest levels we're
26 trying to maintain.

27

28 MR. SANDONE: I understand what you're
29 saying, sir. If you go to my presentation again, I
30 think I make some recommendations at the very end of
31 that. I think probably a purse seine somewhere between
32 50 and 100 fathoms probably would be optimal 20 feet
33 deep. I would say two inches in the stretch mesh and I
34 don't think you'd kill any non-target fish.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
37 discussion. Tim.

38

39 MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair. I would be
40 willing to vote yes on this proposal if we would put a
41 50 fathom length with a 20-foot depth restriction with
42 two-inch web. I don't know if the monofilament web is
43 an appropriate type of web to be using for causing
44 injuries to the fish.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So you want to make
47 a motion to amend the proposal with specification for
48 two-inch gear no longer than 50 fathoms and 20 feet
49 deep.

50

1 MR. GERVAIS: Yes.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And call in question
4 monofilament gear.
5
6 MR. GERVAIS: Web.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Webbing. What does
9 the Council.....
10
11 MR. GERVAIS: Two-inch stretch web
12 size.
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Two-inch web size.
15 So do we have a second to the amended language to the
16 proposal. Go ahead, Ray.
17
18 MR. COLLINS: I'll second, but I
19 wouldn't speak on the monofilament part. I don't know.
20
21 MR. GERVAIS: Can I modify that to put
22 in to use regular seine web?
23
24 MR. COLLINS: I don't know. They were
25 talking about efficiency for dragging it through the
26 water. I don't know enough about it, I guess.
27
28 MR. GERVAIS: Well, nobody does because
29 it's just like this experimental fishery. If they get
30 it right, it's going to be an incredible amount of
31 fishing power. I support these people being able to
32 take their allocated amount of salmon in those
33 districts, but this is some pretty heavy-duty -- you're
34 introducing all these new gear types to the fishery
35 without very much information about how they're
36 operating, so that's why it's kind of dangerous
37 to put them into regulation.
38
39 MR. SANDONE: Mr. Chair.
40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Gene.
42
43 MR. SANDONE: Yes, just a point of
44 clarification with the monofilament. We're not talking
45 about a herring gillnet. We're
46 talking about old-time monofilament that everybody uses
47 with gillnets. That's what we're using. That's what
48 I'm talking about.
49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's a multi-

1 strand, 12-strand twist?

2

3 MR. SANDONE: Whatever they use in the
4 gillnets, the drift gillnets or just gillnets up and
5 down the river.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, yeah. Well,
8 that's a completely different picture. That's a mono-
9 twist, which is much softer and way less abrasive. You
10 should state that more clearly, Gene. It's called
11 mono-twist. It's usually a 12 strand.

12

13 So we have a motion and a second from
14 Ray then.

15

16 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, if you drop from
17 that amendment the monofilament statement.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is the mono-twist
20 all right then?

21

22 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, multi-strand. In
23 that modification we'll just say use multi-strand
24 webbing, specifically not monofilament.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, mono is one,
27 you know.

28

29 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I second that.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we have an
32 amendment to the main proposal. We're going to vote on
33 the amendment for a specification of 50 fathoms purse
34 seine on the Yukon River by 20 feet deep with two-inch
35 multi-strand monofilament net. Those in favor of that
36 amendment signify by saying aye.

37

38 IN UNISON: Aye.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any opposed same
41 sign.

42

43 MR. GERVAIS: Opposed.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One opposed. The
46 main Proposal 377, those in favor of Proposal 377
47 signify by saying aye in favor of the amended Proposal
48 377.

49

50 IN UNISON: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
2 sign.
3
4 MR. GERVAIS: I got lost. The first
5 vote was on the amendment?
6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: On the amendment.
8
9 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. And now this vote
10 is on the as written?
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. This proposal --
13 this vote is now on the amended proposal for 50
14 fathoms of gear. We passed that. Fifty fathoms of
15 gear, two-inch mesh, 20 feet deep. Now that's the
16 amended Proposal 377 that we're going to vote on.
17 Those in favor of the amended proposal signify by
18 saying aye.
19
20 IN UNISON: Aye.
21
22 (No opposing votes)
23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you understand
25 the amended language, Gene?
26
27 MR. SANDONE: Yes, I do.
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And then we have --
30 George, do you understand our position on that
31 proposal?
32
33 MR. PAPPAS: Yes, Mr. Chair. Thank
34 you, Mr. Chair.
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Where are we at now,
37 Melinda? My brain is hurting.
38
39 MS. BURKE: Mr. Chair. We still have
40 several items to get through. What I would suggest, if
41 it's okay with the Council, give everybody just a quick
42 break until quarter till. There's a couple presenters
43 on the line, Erin Julianus with BLM, Marcy Okada with
44 Park Service and then I would suggest we continue
45 working through the agenda with the remaining folks in
46 the room.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One question. Do we
49 have bingo tonight?
50

1 MS. BURKE: No.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So we're
4 breaking until quarter to 4:00.
5
6 (Off record)
7
8 (On record)
9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim, and
11 bring up the two proposals for reconsideration.
12
13 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14 I'd like to make a motion to reconsider two of the
15 proposals we just talked about. Proposal 377 regarding
16 the purse seine gear addition and 371 the dipnet
17 proposal and the modification I'd like to put on both
18 of those is that they sunset in two years.
19
20 MR. COLLINS: Reconsider brings it back
21 to the table. Then you can make your motion.
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I want to bring 371
24 and 377 back on the table. Do we have a second to
25 reconsider those two proposals.
26
27 MR. COLLINS: I'll second.
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the two Proposals
30 371 and 377. Go ahead, Tim, for the modification to
31 both proposals.
32
33 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. The modification
34 I'd like to put on Proposal 377 is that it has a two-
35 year sunset clause. When is the normal cycle for the
36 Yukon again?
37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: George Pappas, are
39 you still online?
40
41 (No comment)
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: He probably hung up.
44 I think they're on a two-year cycle for AYK.
45
46 MR. SANDONE: Mr. Chair.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead.
49
50 MR. BUE: It's a two-year cycle. The

1 next time it will be considered will be January 2016 if
2 I'm not mistaken.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that would be a
5 two-year sunset on the two Proposals 371 and 377.
6 That's what you stated?

7

8 MR. GERVAIS: Yes, a two-year sunset
9 clause on both of those gear types because it's a new
10 gear type for that fishery and nobody knows how they're
11 going to perform. I think they're good ideas, but I'd
12 like to have a mechanism to reevaluate them after we
13 have more harvest information.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So the
16 amendment to the two proposals. Any further discussion
17 on the sunset for 371 and 377.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Hearing none. All
22 those in favor of the amended language to the two
23 proposals signify by saying aye.

24

25 IN UNISON: Aye.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
28 sign.

29

30 MR. J. WALKER: Aye.

31

32 MR. MORGAN: Aye.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Two opposed. Carl
35 and James were opposed.

36

37 MR. J. WALKER: I'd like to state why
38 I'm opposed.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go right ahead.

41

42 MR. J. WALKER: I'm opposing this
43 because if it's on a three-year cycle, it's going to be
44 coming up for review in three years anyway. If these
45 types of gear are not going to be working, I'm sure
46 they're going to be coming back with some modification
47 to them in three years.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's a valid point
50 to be noted on the record. I also would like on this

1 fishery stuff for the Yukon River, we're writing a
2 letter to the Board of Fish regarding the drop-out rate
3 by six-inch gear. I would like to incorporate into
4 that letter for the Council's consideration that the
5 Board of Fish direct the Department of Fish and Game to
6 do a mortality study on chinook salmon that have
7 encountered dipnet and purse seine gear using a
8 telemetry study so we know what kind of impacts to
9 these chinook salmon that are caught and released with
10 dipnet or purse seine. We've got to get an indice what
11 we're actually doing to them.

12

13 The Chair will entertain a motion to
14 incorporate that into the letter to the Board of Fish
15 in the six-inch drop-out mortality letter. Go ahead,
16 Robert.

17

18 MR. R. WALKER: Which one are we on?
19 Are we still on 371?

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Maybe you were
22 out of the room. We just had a vote on incorporating a
23 sunset of two years on 371 and 377, the amended
24 language on those two proposals. We had an opposition
25 by James and Carl on that.

26

27 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. Also I'd
28 like to note on that too that -- I was talking to our
29 chief on the phone so I missed it, but if we're going
30 to go back and discuss the same thing about this three-
31 year, two-year, I'd vote no on this one two, on 371.
32 Can you make that change, Melinda?

33

34 Thank you very much.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we have three
37 oppositions to that amended sunset. On the letter of
38 incorporating data need on mortality for chinook that
39 have contacted dipnet and purse seine gear using
40 telemetry, I feel that that should be incorporated into
41 the letter. The Chair will entertain a motion to
42 incorporate that language into the letter to the Board
43 of Fish.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No motion to that
48 effect.

49

50 MR. GERVAIS: I'd so move.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Tim. Do we
2 have a second.

3
4 MS. PELKOLA: I'll second it

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny.
7 I feel that if they're going to start moving towards
8 purse seine and dipnet, then we have to know what kind
9 of impact that released chinook salmon have.

10
11 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go right ahead.

14
15 MR. J. WALKER: In regards to your
16 question, where would you be looking for specific
17 numbers to evaluate the release?

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: They come up with a
20 statistically valid method and they've done telemetry
21 on chinook salmon before. The fish in the Lower River
22 they quit eating, they stuff a transmitter down their
23 throat and then they swim up the river and then they
24 figure out where they go. These salmon that were
25 caught in a dipnet and seine, they can stuff a
26 transmitter down them and see if they actually get to
27 the spawning grounds. If they only get halfway there
28 and they die, then we know there's a mortality factor.

29
30 MR. J. WALKER: So you're suggesting
31 that more fish are tagged with telemetry? If there's
32 no tag in the fish in the dipnet, you're not going to
33 know.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, they come up
36 with a statistically valid estimate of how many would
37 be dying. This would give the Department real data on
38 seine mortality for catch and release of chinook salmon
39 on the Yukon River. Is that clear?

40
41 MR. J. WALKER: Yeah. It shows more
42 accountability.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. It shows more
45 accountability. If the Board of Fish wants to keep
46 going in this direction, then they kind of come up with
47 some statistically valid science on these methods.

48
49 Any further insertion into the Board of
50 Fish letter.

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
4 incorporating those two data lacks for chinook salmon
5 that contact dipnet and seine signify by saying aye.
6
7 IN UNISON: Aye.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.
10
11 (No opposing votes)
12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So it will be in the
14 letter. Okay. Now we're onto the main agenda.
15 Melinda.
16
17 MS. BURKE: Erin Julianus.
18
19 MR. PARKER: Mr. Chair.
20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead.
22
23 MR. PARKER: This is Dave Parker with
24 BLM in Fairbanks. I'm sitting here with Erin Julianus,
25 our wildlife biologist, and Jeanie Cole, our planning
26 coordinator. You've got us on the agenda here for a
27 little summary of the Central Yukon Resource Management
28 Plan status update and then we have some comments on
29 the letter.
30
31 What I would like to do is have Jeanie
32 just give a quick summary of what the status of the
33 plan is and then we'll move on to comments on your
34 letter.
35
36 MS. COLE: Okay. This is Jeanie. Can
37 you hear me?
38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. Go right
40 ahead.
41
42 MS. COLE: As you probably recall, the
43 BLM is doing a new land use plan for the Central Yukon
44 planning area, which includes the Dalton Highway and
45 the Middle Yukon River, about 16 million acres of BLM
46 land. We've been doing what we call our public
47 scoping, which is where we go out to the communities
48 and get initial comments on what they think the plan
49 issues are and what we should cover in the plan.
50

1 We just finished -- our formal scoping
2 period ended January 17th. We got quite a few
3 comments. We had 16 meetings in 15 different
4 communities. We've got about 600 pages of written
5 comments and about several hours of audio comment, so
6 right now we're going through all the comments and
7 consolidating them and we will put them into a scoping
8 report that will provide a summary of the comments that
9 we received and that report will be made available to
10 the public sometime this summer, I hope.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does the Council
13 have any questions on the resource management plan
14 scoping process the BLM is doing?

15
16 At our fall meeting when we didn't have
17 a full RAC quorum, I had written a letter on the BLM's
18 resource management plan because we had a meeting in
19 Wiseman and we found out that the State of Alaska had
20 selected lands around our community that they want
21 conveyed to the State of Alaska, which would basically
22 eliminate our access to Gates of the Arctic National
23 Park because there's all-terrain vehicle restrictions
24 and we're a resident zoned community that can access
25 the National Park.

26
27 It would preclude us from basically
28 harvesting wood and it would have huge subsistence
29 impacts on our community to convey the lands. Yet the
30 lands in the Dalton Highway Corridor were withdrawn by
31 the Secretary of Interior before the pipeline and are
32 not eligible for the State of Alaska to select.
33 Neither were Native corporations. A corporation sued
34 the Federal government to select lands around Wiseman
35 back in the ANCSA times and they were denied by a
36 Federal judge.

37
38 So I wanted this Council to endorse my
39 letter of opposition to the State's selections around
40 our community, but now the scoping process has passed,
41 but I wanted to register that on the record. For this
42 Council it would have a huge impact to the subsistence
43 users and we had people from Coldfoot also that were
44 registering opposition to that because it takes away
45 the subsistence abilities of local people. So Wiseman
46 and Coldfoot were unanimous in opposition to the State
47 selection. That was a huge issue for our community.

48
49 Would Council members have any other
50 questions or comments on the resource management plan

1 scoping process, which we will be hearing much of in
2 the future at our fall meeting also. Other comments.

3

4 (No comments)

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Okay. Thanks a
7 lot, Jeanie.

8

9 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead, Ray.

12

13 MR. COLLINS: Isn't the Kuskokwim group
14 -- someone in Anchorage doing the same thing for the
15 Kuskokwim? I notice we don't have anything on our
16 agenda on that. Do you know where they're at in their
17 process?

18

19 MS. COLE: Yes, the Anchorage office is
20 doing a plan. It's called the Bering Sea/Western
21 Interior Resource Management Plan. It's to the south of
22 the Central Yukon Plan. I believe, Dave, you might be
23 able to know better. Does it incorporate most of the
24 Kuskokwim watershed?

25

26 MR. PARKER: I do believe it does, yes.

27

28 MS. COLE: So they're in the same place
29 as we are. They finished their scoping on January 17th
30 and they're writing their scoping reports right now.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we look forward
33 to seeing both of those scoping reports at our fall
34 Regional Council meeting. Any other comments on the
35 RMP.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Continue the
40 education and outreach.

41

42 MR. PARKER: We had a document that I
43 don't know if, Melinda, if you were able to get a copy
44 of it, a three-page report that just gave all the
45 updates from our specialists.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, we do have that
48 report. We can go through this and look at the report
49 and the Council can make comments at this time. Has
50 the Council looked through this handout and do they

1 have any comments on the BLM report.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You could skip down
6 through and highlight the various issues on this
7 report.

8

9 MR. PARKER: Sure. We do have the
10 contact for each of these areas. If you have questions
11 that don't come to you right now, call these folks up
12 and they'll be glad to talk to you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I always like
15 to know what's going on because I live within a BLM
16 land area which surrounds our community and harvest
17 subsistence resources from BLM and Park Service lands
18 primarily.

19

20 MR. PARKER: You could have Erin just
21 go through and touch on the highlights of it if you'd
22 like.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Sure.

25

26 MS. JULIANUS: Good afternoon, Mr.
27 Chair and the Council. I'm just going to run through
28 the highlights. For education and outreach, staff are
29 regularly updating the Dalton Highway website.
30 Included on the page are tips for Dalton Highway
31 hunters which focuses on safety and hunting ethics.

32

33 The Arctic InterAgency Visitor's Center
34 will be opening May 23rd and it will run through
35 September 9th.

36

37 The BLM is once again going to partner
38 with First Alaskans Institute by offering a summer
39 internship at the visitor's center. I believe this is
40 the second year this program is running. Alaska Native
41 youth currently enrolled in college are encouraged to
42 apply for the upcoming summer season.

43

44 For fisheries in 2014, the Central
45 Yukon Field Office fisheries staff will continue its
46 effort to document reference characteristics and
47 functional status of placer mine streams within the
48 Dalton Highway Corridor. Requests received from the
49 Central Yukon Office to authorize new and modified
50 mining plans continue to be a major workload. As part

1 of authorizing the mining plans, it's BLM's
2 responsibility to ensure that fish habitat is
3 rehabilitated and Federal and State water quality
4 standards are maintained. So this is part of that
5 effort.

6
7 Currently to date work on the corridor
8 has been completed on Nugget, Gold Creek and Mini Creek
9 and 23 other streams within the corridor are candidates
10 for the project.

11
12 An in-stream full application for
13 Caribou Creek, a tributary of the Hodzana River, is
14 being completed and the application will be submitted
15 to the Alaska DNR by the end of the year.

16
17 For sand and gravel within the corridor
18 there's an increased interest in gravel sales along the
19 Dalton Highway and there have been several new
20 inquiries by private contractors for existing pits as
21 well as exploration and expansion by the Alaska
22 Department of Transportation.

23
24 ADOT has proposed expanding a couple of
25 existing mineral material pits for the next piece of
26 the Dalton Highway upgrade, which will be this summer.
27 So there will be a public scoping process and NEPA
28 analysis for those pit expansions.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Erin, I would like a
31 map of those proposed gravel extraction sites
32 transmitted to the Wiseman
33 Community Association.

34
35 MS. JULIANUS: Okay. Yes, Mr.
36 Chairman.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Continue.

39
40 MS. JULIANUS: The reauthorization for
41 the ADOT mineral pits will be complete this year.
42 Several have been reauthorized, several are closing.
43 So we'll be sure to get that to you.

44
45 For realty actions, all lands within
46 the Western Interior region have been transferred to
47 the Anchorage Field Office.

48
49 For recreation, some information on
50 updated special recreation permits. The BLM has 17

1 SRPs that expired by the end of the calendar year in
2 2012 and of those 17 expired permits 11 SRP holders
3 have submitted paperwork to renew their permits in 2015
4 and beyond. Of these permits, six applications have
5 been received from new operators and of these six new
6 applicants two are operators, two are hunting guides
7 and one is an air transporter.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The two hunting
10 guides, are they for the Dalton Highway Corridor area?

11

12 MS. JULIANUS: Yes, I believe so.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Send that
15 information to the Wiseman Community Association also.
16 I want to see those.

17

18 MS. JULIANUS: Okay. As far as the
19 commercial two operators, they'll continue to utilize
20 the BLM-managed roadside facilities along the Dalton
21 Highway as well as the Arctic InterAgency Visitor's
22 Center. Last summer the BLM and partner agencies made
23 over 20,000 visitor contacts at the Dalton Highway
24 recreation sites and delivered over 100 evening
25 interpretive programs with the AIVC. Last year there
26 was a 12.2 percent increase in visitor usage over the
27 previous year.

28

29 BLM received funds from the Alaska
30 Federal Lands Access Program to provide safe access for
31 foot travelers from the Coldfoot Camp to the nearby
32 AIVC across the road and construction and completion
33 for this is expected in summer 2014.

34

35 For wildlife and ecology, just a
36 reminder my contact information is in there. I was new
37 as of June 2013 and I've been learning a lot and having
38 a lot of fun. We did radiotelemetry study of moose in
39 Unit 24A and B. This has been ongoing since 2008. The
40 BLM is contributing to data analysis for the study and
41 a report is expected to be forthcoming.

42

43 The BLM, Fish and Game, Kanuti and the
44 University of Idaho have finalized a report which was
45 an analysis of caribou locations data for the Hodzana
46 Herd and the Ray Mountain Herd.

47

48 Melinda, I don't know if you were able
49 to print out a copy of that publication, but it was
50 just recently published, so I wanted you guys to have a

1 copy of that.

2

3 MS. BURKE: I'll make sure they get it.

4

5 MS. JULIANUS: Okay. Thank you. The
6 BLM continues to contribute to the monitoring of
7 collared caribou in the Western Arctic Caribou Herd and
8 we continue to significantly contribute to the WACH
9 working group on an annual basis. We did have a couple
10 of staff attend the meeting in Anchorage last December.

11

12 For ecology, the most recent round of
13 Western Arctic Caribou Herd winter habitat monitoring
14 has been completed as of last July and we'll be
15 monitoring again in approximately five years. Data
16 analysis for that and reporting are planned for 2014.

17

18 The Dalton Highway invasive plant
19 strategy. The record of decision for the environmental
20 analysis of a proposed invasive management plan
21 strategy for the Dalton Highway was signed in fall of
22 2013, so this is available. It should be on the NEPA
23 register. An analysis included an ANILCA .810 analysis
24 of potential impacts to subsistence resources.

25

26 The BLM is currently developing a
27 template for future cooperative weed management area,
28 which will involve interested parties, agency and
29 public and needs strategy development and action along
30 the corridor.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One point, Erin. If
33 the deployment of herbicides is to occur on the Dalton
34 Highway, I'd like the downriver communities of
35 Allakaket, Hughes and Huslia and Koyukuk to be notified
36 that those herbicides would be possibly used in the
37 watershed.

38

39 MS. JULIANUS: Okay.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Continue.

42

43 MS. JULIANUS: In 2013, last summer, a
44 large scale inventory of dominant roadside weeds along
45 the Dalton Highway was completed, so this is the first
46 time we really had a systematic, mile by mile inventory
47 of weed infestations along the highway.

48

49 Updates on the rapid ecological
50 assessments. We have

1 several out of this field office that are ongoing. One
2 REA overlaps the Central Yukon planning area for the
3 RMP and this has recently been completed. This is the
4 Seward Peninsula-Nulato Hills-Kotzebue Sound Lowlands
5 REA. Central Yukon REA is being initiated this fall
6 and this REA includes the Western Brooks Range and the
7 Dalton Highway Corridor. Participation in the REA
8 process is encouraged by all interested parties.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would like to be
11 notified in more detail about those REAs because
12 there's some areas around where I live that could
13 possibly I could comment on.

14

15 MS. JULIANUS: Okay.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So continue.

18

19 MS. JULIANUS: The BLM Central Yukon
20 Field Office is also developing a new database with the
21 purpose of tracking hunting and commercial guide
22 activity in the region to assist us with our permitting
23 of guided activity. This was initiated earlier this
24 year in 2014.

25

26 The last point here is just another
27 staff change announcement, which was also in the fall
28 report. We do have a relatively new law enforcement
29 ranger, Seth McMillan, and he has been with us since
30 last January, so a year.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks so much,
33 Erin. That was a good overview. Does the Council have
34 comments on the BLM presentation.

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. It was
39 thorough, so appreciate it. Thanks so much.

40

41 MR. PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
42 for letting us jump in on your agenda. Your request
43 for information will be sent out. If you have any
44 further questions, feel free to contact our resource
45 specialist directly.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, I will. So,
48 Marcy, are you on the call, Okada.

49

50 MS. OKADA: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Marcy.

2

3 MS. OKADA: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair
4 and Council members. If you go to Page 123 in your
5 meeting materials booklet, there's a really, really
6 brief update for Gates of the Arctic National Park and
7 Preserve.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead.

10

11 MS. OKADA: The Western Arctic Caribou
12 Herd is continuing to decline and the 2013 census
13 results are due out this spring. Adult cow mortality
14 has been higher than expected and high human
15 harvest of cows could deepen this decline. The very
16 cold spring observed in 2013 did not delay the spring
17 migration substantially.

18

19 As Vince Mathews had reported
20 yesterday, the field component of the Koyukuk Moose
21 Collaring project is over and biologists are
22 currently analyzing the data and writing up the
23 results. Almost all of the collars have been removed
24 from moose that were collared in Gates of the Arctic.

25

26 As you had mentioned yesterday, the
27 Gates of the Arctic National Park Subsistence Resource
28 Commission held a meeting on November 5 and 6, 2013 in
29 Fairbanks. SRC members provided input on Federal
30 wildlife regulatory proposals and Board of Game
31 wildlife proposals, as well as the BLM Central Yukon
32 management plan. There was ample discussion on the
33 Ambler Mining District Access Project and SRC members
34 shared their concerns about potential negative impacts
35 to subsistence resources. National Park Service staff
36 provided natural and cultural resource updates and the
37 latest information on the Park Service Native Affairs
38 program was also shared.

39

40 Lastly, Gates of the Arctic National
41 Park and Preserve recently hired Maria Berger as our
42 new education specialist. Prior to the Park Service,
43 Maria worked for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in
44 Barrow as their environmental education specialist.
45 Maria will be helping Gates of the Arctic with rural
46 school education programs, primarily educational
47 activities related to wilderness, outdoor activities,
48 and conservation.

49

50 Any questions.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions for
2 Marcy on the Gates of the Arctic presentation.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Marcy.

7
8 MS. OKADA: I also passed along to
9 Melinda an Arctic Network newsletter. This newsletter
10 pretty much covers information on Yellow-Billed Loon,
11 Dall sheep research and muskox surveys that have been
12 conducted and research that has been done. I'm not
13 going to go over the newsletter this afternoon, but if
14 you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

15
16 Lastly, I also passed along to Melinda
17 our Park Service update on the Ambler Mining District
18 access road. I just want to point out two things just
19 to add on to what Maryellen Tuttell presented this
20 morning. In 2013, the Park Service issued research
21 permits for State sponsored research activities in the
22 Park and Preserve related to resources which may impact
23 or be impacted by a road.

24
25 The research projects are centered in
26 the southern portion of Gates and include a snow
27 survey, fisheries survey, a wetlands vegetation survey,
28 hydrologic and hydraulic surveys of the Kobuk and the
29 Reed Rivers and cultural resource reconnaissance
30 surveys.

31
32 The Park Service team of Park and
33 Regional staff was formed in May 2013 to address Park
34 Service responsibilities in responding to a right-of-
35 way application. The Park Service is also teaming with
36 the Federal Highway Administration, which are agents
37 for the Secretary of Transportation.

38
39 The rest of the information that's in
40 the handout is either what Maryellen has shared or just
41 more information of Gates of the Arctic's role in the
42 road process. I think that's it.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's a good
45 overview, Marcy. Any questions for Marcy on the Gates
46 of the Arctic presentation. It's always good to know
47 what the Parks are up to.

48
49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, thanks
2 so much, Marcy.
3
4 MS. OKADA: Thanks, Mr. Chair.
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Melinda.
7
8 MS. BURKE: Let's go ahead and continue
9 on with the agenda. We're on the Kuskokwim River
10 fisheries 2013 summary.
11
12 MR. CEBRIAN: Excuse me, Melinda, Mr.
13 Chair. This is Merben from BLM in Anchorage.
14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, yeah, Merben.
16 Yes, we do want to hear from you.
17
18 MS. BURKE: I'm sorry, I forgot.
19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go right ahead,
21 Merben.
22
23 MR. CEBRIAN: Yeah, Mr. Chair and
24 members of the Council. For the record, Merben
25 Cebrian, BLM in Anchorage. This is a quick update on
26 BLM activities.
27
28 The first one I'm going to talk about
29 is the BLM's review and comments received for the
30 Bering Sea Western Interior Resource Management Plan.
31 We have over 100 comments and we're sorting through
32 them and prioritizing them.
33
34 The next item is that BLM is currently
35 receiving Donlin Gold EIS alternatives as they are
36 being developed and it's good to hear the presentation
37 that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had in front of
38 the Council to update the Council.
39
40 BLM is also hosting the ceremonial
41 start of the Iditarod sled dog race here at the
42 Cantwell Track Facility in Anchorage and that's to
43 happen this weekend.
44
45 As far as moose permitting in Unit 21E,
46 Paimiut Slough area, I issued 25 moose permits and four
47 designated hunter permits for FM2104 in that Paimiut
48 Slough area. I went to Aniak, Kalskag and Russian
49 Mission. The quota is eight moose. There are no
50 reported harvest as of yet. Jerry Hill of Innoko is

1 the coordinator of the hunt reports as they are being
2 called in.

3

4 Staying with Unit 21E, I'm also
5 coordinating with Jerry Hill and ADF&G Tom Paragai on
6 those moose collars to correlate all collar data for
7 collared moose in Unit 21E. As soon as we get a report
8 out, that will be presented to the Council as well.

9

10 That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's good,
13 Merben. In our fall meeting, I would like to know what
14 the harvest was on the 21E moose hunt and also the
15 telemetry project.

16

17 Any questions for Merben on BLM's
18 report.

19

20 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. This is
21 Ray Collins, Merben. Did my comments on the sheefish
22 spawning area in Big River make it into the report?
23 Those have significance in relation to the Donlin
24 proposals because they're going to cross Big River
25 there. I want to make sure that that was flagged and
26 that spawning area is identified so it's not disturbed.

27

28 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Collins, through the
29 Chair. Yes, I believe that was part of the comments
30 received. We're classifying them according to
31 specialty right now so that all the resource
32 specialists get to pinpoint the comments specific to
33 their resource. I believe our fisheries specialist has
34 got your report, Mr. Collins.

35

36 MR. COLLINS: Thank you. I know the
37 lady that did that study, Lisa Stuby, she could be
38 contacted to specify where that area is, I think.

39

40 MR. CEBRIAN: Okay. I have that name
41 down. Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You have a comment,
44 Robert.

45

46 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Merben.
47 That was short, beautiful, right to the point.

48

49 MR. CEBRIAN: I apologize for not being
50 there, but next time.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James.
2
3 MR. J. WALKER: Yes, Merben, I'd also
4 like to compliment you on your reporting, but I'd like
5 to ask the question weren't you supposed to let us know
6 that you're not showing up?
7
8 MR. CEBRIAN: Through the Chair. Yes.
9 I think I sent a text message and I also emailed
10 Melinda in the process.
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any other
13 comments.
14
15 (No comments)
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. Thanks
18 so much, Merben.
19
20 MR. CEBRIAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're on the
23 Kuskokwim River fisheries 2013 and 2014 outlook. Who
24 is giving that report?
25
26 MR. ELLISON: Mr. Chair. This is
27 Travis Ellison with Fish and Game.
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go right ahead.
30
31 MR. ELLISON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
32 There's already been quite a bit of discussion on
33 Kuskokwim River fisheries, so I think I can keep this
34 fairly short. I'll try to keep it to the main points.
35
36 We did just, I think, last week
37 finalized our subsistence harvest estimate for 2013 in
38 the Kuskokwim area. Chinook salmon subsistence harvest
39 was 46,500. We had a total run of 94,000. Our
40 drainage-wide escapement estimate was 47,500. That's
41 the smallest total run we've seen on record. It's the
42 second lowest subsistence harvest behind 2012 and it's
43 the lowest escapement.
44
45 Something that's come up in this
46 meeting several times is kind of the allocation of
47 harvest between Lower River and Upper River, so I did a
48 little comparison. I looked at the subsistence harvest
49 in 2013 compared to recent 10-year average, which
50 doesn't include 2012 because that was a restrictive

1 year. The Lower River harvest in 2013 was 40 percent
2 below average. The Middle River was 49 percent below
3 average. I'll define those. The Lower River is
4 Tuluksak downstream. Middle River being Lower Kalskag
5 to Chuathbaluk, then the Upper River which is Crooked
6 Creek upstream. So the Upper River was 74 percent
7 below average. So there's definitely a much greater
8 increase in what would normally be harvested in Upper
9 River compared to the Lower and Middle River. I did
10 want to point out that harvest was much lower than it
11 normally is even in the Lower River.

12

13 We kind of discussed.....

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have one question
16 there, Travis. That was the total salmon harvest or
17 chinook salmon harvest.

18

19 MR. ELLISON: Chinook salmon. I'm
20 sorry.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Chinook salmon.
23 Okay.

24

25 MR. ELLISON: Yeah, chinook salmon
26 harvest. I can give you the other species if you'd
27 like.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. I was just
30 wondering if you were incorporating other fish into
31 that total.

32

33 MR. ELLISON: Yeah, I'm trying to keep
34 it to chinook since that's the hot topic, I guess.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. It is.

37

38 MR. ELLISON: So, you know we've had
39 discussion on -- well, we're looking forward to
40 management next season of subsistence fishery for
41 conserving kings so we can meet that escapement goal. I
42 guess one thing now that we have our drainage-wide
43 estimate we do have a forecast and let me back up a
44 little bit and explain about how we've been forecasting
45 the chinook salmon run.

46

47 Up through 2013 we were using kind of a
48 standardized methodology where we look at several
49 different models, which look at average total return by
50 age class, we look at sibling relationships, which is

1 predicting how many five-year-old fish would come back
2 based on how many four-year-old fish the previous year,
3 and also looking at how many fish will return based on
4 the number of spawners in the parent year. Then we use
5 the most statistically significant estimate for each
6 age class, combine those and then come up with our
7 forecast.

8
9 What we found with that is that
10 methodology tends to estimate towards average total
11 run. Since we've been in these low run years these
12 last four years, we've kind of consistently been
13 overforecasting using that methodology. So we changed
14 gears moving into 2014 and using some further analysis
15 of hindcasting as to how accurate our forecasts are.

16
17 We decided that using the previous year
18 total run estimate for the next year as a forecast is
19 actually more precise and more accurate. In these
20 years of low abundance, forecasting based off the
21 lowest return we've ever seen, it's actually a very
22 conservative way to go.

23
24 So the midpoint of our forecast for
25 2014 chinook salmon Kuskokwim River is 94,166 with a
26 lower confidence amount of 71,700 and upper confidence
27 amount of 116,600. So our forecast basically puts us
28 right within the escapement goal and that would be with
29 zero harvest of king salmon. If the forecast came
30 back, we'd be within the goal.

31
32 So it's going to have to be a very
33 restrictive season. Commercial fishing for king salmon
34 is obviously off the table. Sportfish Division is
35 planning on closing the sport fishery for king salmon
36 the entire Kuskokwim area prior to the season starting.

37
38 For the subsistence fishery, we're not
39 planning on having any directed king salmon periods.
40 As people talked about, we're looking at closing the
41 season early on as it starts, so somewhere between May
42 15th, the 1st of June, closures will initiate in the
43 Lower River and then that will likely -- as the fish
44 move upstream, closures will hit the further up river
45 sections. So we'll be closing in the Middle and Upper
46 River towards the middle of June.

47
48 We're going to see probably around
49 three to four weeks of closure through the start of the
50 king salmon run all the way past the peak before we

1 plan on having our first subsistence periods. You guys
2 have probably seen the draft schedule that's out right
3 now. There's a lot more work to be done on this. We
4 have at least three more meetings with the working
5 group to try to come to a consensus on what the
6 schedule will look like. But at least through the peak
7 of the king salmon run we're not planning on having
8 openings.

9

10 Once we get past June 21st, 22nd there
11 in the Lower River, chum and sockeye greatly outnumber
12 king salmon, so we're planning on putting into the
13 schedule some short openings to harvest the chum and
14 sockeye with six-inch or less mesh.

15

16 Once we get towards where the king run
17 would typically fall off, we plan on going to open to
18 six-inch mesh or less 24 hours a day, seven days a week
19 through about the mid to late July when we can go back
20 to normal regulations.

21

22 Something to consider with these
23 scheduled periods is that we do have emergency order
24 authority to remove those periods and to keep it closed
25 if we're not seeing the numbers we need to meet
26 escapement. On the flip side, if we see a strong run
27 than expected, we can allow more fishing time once we
28 see those numbers in season.

29

30 So that's what I had for looking
31 forward to next season. Commercial fishing won't
32 initiate until probably mid July at the earliest as it
33 has in the last several years and we've been able to
34 keep incidental harvest in the commercial fishery very
35 low.

36

37 Any questions on that?

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My question is if
40 the special action request for dipnet is allowed, would
41 you preclude the use of gillnet in favor of using the
42 dipnet if there was no chinook salmon to give for
43 avoidance?

44

45 MR. ELLISON: Yeah. We haven't -- I
46 mean we definitely talked about how we would implement
47 a dipnet fishery in the Kuskokwim River. I think it
48 would give us the ability to allow some fishing time
49 earlier than what we have on the schedule, so maybe by
50 the 18th or 20th of June in the Lower river there's

1 probably enough chum and sockeye to make it worth
2 fishing with dipnets. I think we would have to have
3 some defined opening periods so it's not open all the
4 time, but just for certain hours on certain days so
5 that's enforceable so we can have law enforcement out
6 there making sure everybody is releasing the kings
7 alive.

8

9 We don't want to lean too much on just
10 providing dipnet gear opportunity because being a
11 brand-new gear, the cost of buying dipnets and also the
12 short notice to fishermen, we don't want to assume that
13 people are going to meet their harvest needs just with
14 dipnets, so we'll still be looking to provide
15 opportunity with gillnets. But if it's in a really bad
16 situation and we're really worried about the kings, we
17 can at least provide more opportunity, more timely for
18 chum and sockeye if we have that dipnet regulation
19 available to us.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, I would much
22 prefer to use dipnet and there's plenty of opportunity
23 later on for gillnet and so chinook avoidance should
24 be the top of the game.

25

26 Other comments from the Council on the
27 summary and outlook for 2014 Kuskokwim.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No other comments.
32 Thanks so much, Travis.

33

34 MR. ELLISON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
35 did have one more comment for you.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead.

38

39 MR. ELLISON: I did hear you talking
40 about the desire to quantify mortality of drop-outs in
41 smaller mesh gear.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

44

45 MR. ELLISON: I think every manager in
46 the state would agree with you and the need to actually
47 be able to quantify that. It would really aid in
48 management. In fact, in the last Board of Fisheries
49 meeting I was listening to one of the Board members ask
50 the Department biologist why we don't account for that.

1 We just haven't had the ability or come up with a way
2 to actually test that and measure it. It's a very
3 difficult thing to do because we don't know how many
4 fish are even dropping out. Then once they drop out
5 it's very difficult to determine whether or not that
6 fish is going to go on to spawn or not.

7

8 The only information I do know on it
9 from personal experience of counting salmon going
10 through weirs is we do see a fair number of salmon
11 swimming through weirs with net marks on them, so we
12 know that they don't all die, but I think you're right
13 in your assessment and your analogy to Bristol Bay that
14 there are a fair number that do die.

15

16 The reason we feel that six inches is a
17 good conservation measure on the Kuskokwim River and
18 the way we use it is by making sure there's so many
19 chum and sockeye. That really just reduces that
20 fishing time and the time you have the net in the water
21 and able to catch kings. If you're using large mesh
22 gear, you'll have the chum and sockeye swimming through
23 and you'll just be catching kings and you can fish for
24 kings much longer, but when you're filling up your net
25 with chum and sockeye you kind of have to give up and
26 just utilize those fish.

27

28 So we think it works pretty well, but I
29 definitely hear you. We did talk about how we're going
30 to try to assess that, but we haven't figured it out
31 yet.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I sent a schematic
34 to Fred Bue that I drew on a piece of typing paper in
35 about 15 minutes on how to enumerate that. When they
36 drop, they're dead and those are the mortalities. When
37 they drop dead, they go straight down like a rock, so
38 you can follow the gear right off the end of the lead
39 line. I drew a schematic on the downstream side of the
40 net. It would have a deployment basket that's held out
41 with like tent type stakes that held a basket that the
42 fish fell into. When you pull it back up, they're
43 going to be in that basket and there would be panels in
44 there and you would recover them.

45

46 I'll send you the schematic when I get
47 home and I have my computer, but it's not rocket
48 science. You can look on the back of Bristol Bay drift
49 gillnet boats and they've got all kinds of baskets on
50 there to catch these fish that are falling off the

1 roller, so you just do it on the net and you catch the
2 fish that drop off the gear and you come up with an
3 indice. It's not hard to do. You could test it with a
4 DIDSON to make sure that it's valid.

5
6 So I do feel that there could be valid
7 methods used with a DIDSON and recovery in front of a
8 DIDSON to actually validate the drop-outs that are
9 coming off the gear. I'll send you that. That's a
10 huge deal. Not a small deal. It's a statewide --
11 there are hundreds -- millions of pounds of fish
12 dropped every year out of gear. We have these unknown
13 numbers floating around. Every biologist knows it's
14 there, but we need to quantify it.

15
16 Any other questions or comments on the
17 Kuskokwim summary.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Hearing none.
22 Thanks so much.

23
24 MR. ELLISON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
25 look forward to seeing that.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So Yukon River. Are
28 you on here Gerald Maschmann.

29
30 MR. BUE: I'm doing it.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, you're doing it.
33 Okay. Right out of the horse's mouth so to speak.

34
35 (Laughter)

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Fred.

38
39 MR. BUE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
40 Fred Bue, Fish and Wildlife Service, Yukon Management.
41 I'm out of Fairbanks. I have to start off with
42 apologizing. I wish I would have been able to speak to
43 a lot of the Yukon issues this fall, this winter,
44 earlier, so I'm cramming a lot of stuff in here the
45 last minute. It's not really fair to this Council and
46 I apologize. So I'm going to try and do the best I can
47 just to skim over as much as this because I know you
48 have a lot of stuff still in front of us and I want
49 some information from you guys also, so I guess that's
50 the main reason I'm here.

1 Anyway, I put together this packet last
2 minute. I probably should have given it to you at the
3 beginning of the meeting so you had some time to think
4 about it. When I was going through it, I was think we
5 haven't talked much about historical levels, so if you
6 look at that first page. It's just a graph to give you
7 an idea where we stand. Commercial harvest, Yukon
8 River drainage wide. It used to be pretty strong up
9 through the mid '90s and then something happened. The
10 runs just dropped off, so commercial harvest dropped
11 off commensurate with the poor runs and that's what
12 you're seeing, the commercial fishery has gone away.

13
14 Subsistence harvest is the priority
15 use, so commercial went away for the sake of
16 maintaining as much subsistence harvest as we could.
17 You see subsistence is fairly stable up until recent
18 years. The run has progressively gotten worse, so now
19 we're digging into the subsistence harvest.

20
21 2012 is not good and we just got this
22 information. Like the Kuskokwim, we just got drainage-
23 wide subsistence harvest 12,500. Well, that's only
24 about a quarter of what their historical harvest is, so
25 it's a 75 percent reduction. We don't have the
26 information yet from the break-out by community or
27 district yet, but that's coming.

28
29 MR. GERVAIS: So could you repeat that
30 last bit, 75 percent.

31
32 MR. BUE: So it's a 75 percent
33 reduction in subsistence harvest. We just got that.
34 In-season we're thinking that -- you know, we did some
35 pretty significant restrictions on subsistence this
36 year. We essentially closed chinook subsistence
37 fishing on the Yukon River. We started the season with
38 six-inch nets from the very beginning, so not targeting
39 chinook.

40
41 Then we had our regulatory direction to
42 close the first pulse. We went into the season, we had
43 a very poor outlook, but as for our management strategy
44 we decided to manage towards the low end of that to be
45 cautious. Like I said, we've had these poor
46 production. We're always coming in at the low end of
47 our projected range, so this year we just -- a
48 precautionary approach, like you say, is to go with the
49 lowest end and so that's what we did. We held off late
50 spring. You know, a lot of things dictated that the

1 run didn't look very good, so we just kept it closed.

2

3 The first two pulses we closed. You
4 know, the chum started picking up pretty good there, so
5 we allowed a short window with six-inch nets to provide
6 some chum. In some places we had a little bit more
7 fishing time for chum than others where chum were
8 abundant, but essentially we didn't allow subsistence
9 harvest of chinook.

10

11 In fact, Middle River, some of you got
12 caught off guard. We actually told fishwheel operators
13 they could not retain subsistence chinook in their
14 fishwheels. It's been in regulation a long time, but
15 we've never enacted that. This year we actually did
16 and that was a pretty difficult thing. Fishwheel
17 operators could see somebody go out with a six-inch net
18 and target some chum, but fishwheel operators had to
19 stand on their wheel releasing kings and keep whatever
20 chum they could catch.

21

22 The other side of it is six-inch nets,
23 some people can target kings with six-inch nets, so
24 it's a fairness thing. There is some hard feelings
25 about that and we know it's not fair for everybody, but
26 that's what we did try to do.

27

28 So then this bottom graph -- I also
29 have to qualify this. This is a total run
30 reconstruction. This is a new attempt. It's very
31 preliminary. It's not a finalized report or anything.
32 The Yukon River is a very big drainage. We can't
33 conceivably count every tributary out there, so we're
34 trying to piece together and estimate what the total
35 run might be. We combine our genetic information
36 reports. We use our Eagle sonar as another component.
37 With some of those different mixed stock analyses we
38 have what we see in some of the tributaries as our
39 index areas. Fish and Game is trying to hindcast or
40 look back and try to piece together run reconstruction.
41 This is very preliminary again, but I'm just showing
42 this to you to give you some sort of reference.

43

44 So what we have is harvest stacked on
45 top of escapement. Escapement has been up and down as
46 far as we can tell. The precision of our management
47 isn't great either on such a large drainage, but it
48 does show the shift from the mid '90s to now where
49 essentially half of our fish are missing or not there.
50 So is it production, is it interception, is it

1 competition, is it pollution? We don't know, but
2 something changed and this is where we're at right now.

3
4 I followed that with a few of the
5 projects and I won't get into those. They're pretty
6 self-explanatory.

7
8 MR. GERVAIS: Can I ask a question.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

11
12 MR. GERVAIS: On page 3, the Eagle
13 sonar, that's the number that's used to determine
14 whether we met the transboundary escapement goal, isn't
15 it?

16
17 MR. BUE: Yes, it's part of it. This
18 is what the border -- when we see fish going across the
19 border, we combine that with what we estimate this
20 Eagle subsistence harvest, the community of Eagle, so
21 there is some harvest above the sonar on the Alaska
22 side. Then we also -- the Canadians give us an idea of
23 what they harvested in Canada. So, from this, we can
24 get towards the escapement goal. And Canada is the
25 escapement goal, it's not border passage. What passes
26 the border minus their harvest gives us the escapement.

27
28 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. On the Eagle
29 sonar, what are the three dotted lines there?

30
31 MR. BUE: Those are the different goals
32 in recent years. Prior to 2008 I guess is -- this is
33 another kind of a graph. I believe it was 2008 when we
34 started the sonar project. Prior to that we had a mark
35 recapture project using fishwheels. So these goals are
36 in sonar units. Prior to that we had goals in mark
37 recapture units. With this graph we tried to
38 standardize, go back and use a comparison of mark
39 recapture to the sonar and so we depicted these
40 escapements back to '82 and what we think is a
41 standardized sonar unit, but we really don't know how
42 that translated to the mark recapture escapement goal.
43 So there were goals previous years, but those units
44 don't match.....

45
46 MR. GERVAIS: Technology.

47
48 MR. BUE:technology. So, if I
49 were to say it was 29,000, well that was in mark
50 recapture numbers and we don't really know how that

1 performed.

2

3 MR. GERVAIS: And then the two dotted
4 lines to the furthest to the right, that just depends
5 whether you're managing for upper escapement level or
6 lower escapement level?

7

8 MR. BUE: Yeah, we had a threshold
9 there. More recently, since 2010, they put in a range,
10 so now we're trying to hit that range rather than just
11 a threshold or an absolute number.

12

13 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Pollock.

16

17 MR. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
18 want to comment a little bit on the net size. If he
19 had an eight-inch and 7.5-inch net for kings or a
20 setnet, that was outlawed. Everybody had to get six-
21 inch mesh nets. We had to switch our 7.5, eight-inch
22 mesh for six-inch. But I have a dog team, so me and my
23 wife got four kinds of different nets except for this
24 whitefish, but not so much the rest of the peoples that
25 just want to put a little fish in their freezer. So
26 that caused a hardship when you go from 7.5 to six, but
27 those that wanted fish got six-inch net. Now if they
28 outlaw six-inch and go to 5.5, we fishers don't have no
29 money to buy another fish net.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 MR. BUE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr.
34 Simon, at this time we're not looking at that for
35 subsistence. You know, I can't guarantee that won't
36 come up in the future. But, you're right, in 2010 we
37 were looking at matching the gear to the chinook, but
38 unfortunately chinook continued to go down. I know
39 it's really frustrating, but now we're trying to avoid
40 chinook as much as we can.

41

42 The interesting thing I guess that we
43 need to say is that we try not to close the Koyukuk
44 River very much. With these big closures, we let them
45 continue to fish with six-inch nets for a longer period
46 just because we know there's not many kings that go
47 into that area. People rely more on sheefish and chum.
48 We tried to focus where we thought the biggest catches
49 in the chinook would be and take care of that.

50

1 Moving on, I guess the next slide with
2 the Yukon River stock timing. The top chart is 2013
3 and I tried to give you a perspective on where those
4 stocks -- this is from the Pilot Station estimate.
5 First off, the timing, how chum and chinook overlap.
6 Fall chum and coho overlap. Also give you an order of
7 magnitude what we're looking at. What you can see is
8 summer chum overlap pretty solid with chinook. There's
9 a tenfold order of magnitude different there. It's
10 quite a bit different. That's our management challenge
11 is how do you catch some of those chum and avoid
12 chinook.

13
14 I have to also qualify this chart with
15 the 2013. It was a very late breakup at the mouth of
16 the river. Upriver it breaks up fairly normal, but
17 down at the mouth the ice lingers and lingers. When
18 that happens, the fish stack up and mill and stack up.
19 Like this year, when they do that, you have a
20 particularly big chum run stacked on top of that. They
21 overlap right on top of each other. Normally if it was
22 a more normal size chum run and an early breakup, then
23 the kings would come in a little bit earlier and there
24 would be a little bit more separation of time and
25 space.

26
27 I guess a few dates to point out is we
28 did have our first six-inch subsistence period to allow
29 some summer chum fishing on June 26. We had a closure
30 on the 1st. That's when we first had a period.
31 Otherwise we protected that first pulse of chinook.

32
33 MR. COLLINS: What are you looking at
34 there because all mine have is this king salmon one. I
35 don't have anything on chums in there.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: They're there. All
38 of these are.

39
40 MR. COLLINS: Oh, okay.

41
42 MR. BUE: Okay. So if you drop in on
43 June 26, that will put you past that first pulse of
44 chinook, a little bit of a trough. There was still a
45 lot of chum in that area, so we tried to take some
46 chum.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have an idea
49 of how many chinook were taken in that six-inch first
50 opening?

1 MR. BUE: Subsistence, no. I think we
2 tried to -- again, that's one of those things where we
3 have a period and we try to carry a similar timing all
4 the way up the river, so we protected that first pulse
5 of chinook all the way up and then we try to hit the
6 slot where there weren't very many chinook.

7
8 Different places, certainly in District
9 1 and 2, if you put out a six-inch net when there's
10 that many fish, it's really hard to catch a chinook
11 when there's not many in the river to begin with. You
12 know in your area, particularly some places like upper
13 4A maybe where fishermen know where kings swim and
14 where chums swim. If you put a six-inch net out there
15 -- you know, they kind of separate, so not every
16 community has that opportunity to do that and it's
17 really difficult to micromanage every community, every
18 bend in the river, so some places you can avoid some of
19 those chum and some places you can't. Overall we try
20 to do the best we can and that's the other part, is we
21 look for people's support in this sort of stuff.

22
23 As far as commercial gear in District
24 2, their first commercial period was I believe July
25 7th, so you see where that would correspond to -- you
26 know, that's at the end of the -- when the kings went
27 away, but it's also a lot of summer chum are just plain
28 gone when they have that commercial period. So that's
29 what they're talking about.

30
31 The lower chart is to give you an idea --
32 it's not only different species of fish out there, but
33 it's also stock compositions. It gives you an idea.
34 This is based on the telemetry study in 2004. We don't
35 have really precise analysis yet on a lot of this
36 stuff, but this could give you an idea.

37
38 We also know timing of these fish. The
39 Canadian fish tend to come in early. It's like 70
40 percent Canadian on the first pulse and 50 percent on
41 the second pulse and then Tanana comes in later, so
42 there's that sort of timing that we're involved in and
43 we can tailor our management a little bit to which
44 stocks to avoid based on that. So that gives you an
45 idea.

46
47 I think also for this Council's
48 reference the green patches are the Federal Management
49 Units throughout the area, so it is a patchwork.
50 There's seven management units that we're involved in.

1 Fish go in and out of State waters, Federal waters all
2 the way up, so we have to take that into account when
3 we're managing fish whose authority we're managing
4 under. So the cooperation is really important for us.

5
6 The next page was a handout. We've
7 been giving this to a number of the meetings this
8 winter. Again it reviews 2013. I think I pretty much
9 went through most of that.

10
11 I guess just to speed it up here, 2014.
12 Again, we don't have the outlook yet, but actually the
13 JTC, Joint Technical Committee, is working with the
14 Canadians this week. It's a cooperative effort. It's
15 both -- half the fish are in Canada, so those fish we
16 target ourselves, so we need their biological
17 information to form this forecast, so that's why we
18 work with the JTC.

19
20 What we've seen the last couple years,
21 our expectation is that it's going to be similar to
22 2012, 2013. We don't know why we would think it would
23 be better. We do understand 2009. That was one year
24 we had really good escapements. That first year that
25 we had a pulse closure, we had a bunch of things go on.
26 We did see fishermen thought the run upriver was a
27 little bit better. They got some bigger fish. So that
28 was one year class and they may be coming back, but
29 chinook are three or four years all combined. One out
30 of the three or four doesn't make the run, but it is
31 one of those optimistic points there.

32
33 Again, for our management goals, we're
34 looking -- of course, our escapement goals and border
35 passage are our primary objectives. Then the next
36 would be how do we allow opportunity to harvest like
37 summer chum while minimizing our chinook mortality.
38 Considering our poor escapement performance, there is a
39 need to further conserve than what we did last year.
40 We fell short of three of our five goals or so there.
41 We closed a lot, we restricted a lot, but we still fell
42 short on some of this stuff, so we're obligated to do
43 more.

44
45 How we do that, I don't know, but we're
46 looking for input from this Council. Other meetings
47 coming up is we have -- YRDFA is sponsoring another
48 pre-season meeting with the three RACs, but also YRDFA
49 and everybody else up and down the river. The tribes
50 are all going to be invited to get people in the same

1 room to discuss this. It's a shared resource and it's
2 a big decision. A lot of people have a lot of
3 different ideas of how this should go and they have a
4 lot of input that they can bring to the table.

5
6 In addition to that, they're going to
7 back up to that international meeting where they're
8 going to bring some Canadians over also and try to talk
9 about it, discuss it as fishermen on the river. Not
10 just agency telling people what to do, but to have
11 fishermen in the same room from both countries and
12 speak to it.

13
14 Some additional thoughts that we've had
15 that we haven't tried in the past is manage the coastal
16 fisheries more. We've been restricting Hooper Bay and
17 Scammon Bay to six-inch nets, but we haven't been
18 closing them. One thing that we're looking at when we
19 have a particularly late spring and the ice is tacked
20 against the beach, it seems like the ice peels off from
21 the south going north and it seems like on a real late
22 year those coastal villages the fish are stacked hard
23 on the beach, you know, running the trough between the
24 ice and the mainland. So that's a thought we're
25 bringing up and bringing to the communities.

26
27 We're also looking at Norton Sound and
28 the Kuskokwim, off those coasts, because the fish are
29 coming through. I used to live in Unalakleet. The
30 people cutting fish they could tell on their ulu. When
31 the fat builds up on the ulu, they say that's a Yukon
32 fish. So we understand there are fish that hit the
33 coast and come counter-current and come back into the
34 river. So we're thinking like a region-wide what to do
35 with those coastal communities.

36
37 This year, once we start subsistence
38 fishing schedule, this spring was really -- we planned
39 on just this calendar thing to close and when the
40 fishing period is going to start with six-inch nets and
41 stuff. Yeah, it was on the calendar, there was still
42 ice in the river and it got people pretty upset that we
43 had a closure when they couldn't go out there anyway.
44 So do we do this by calendar or do we dictate it on the
45 weather and the elements and can people live with
46 something like that. The tradeoff is knowing or not
47 knowing what you're doing from day to day. You're
48 planning for your subsistence activity.

49
50 Should gillnets be closed earlier in

1 the season to protect the start of the run. A lot of
2 people rely on sheefish early. One thing is, you know,
3 with the six-inch nets, don't allow six-inch nets until
4 the chum show up. On a normal year you'll have pinks
5 arriving before chum, so the idea is don't allow
6 six-inch nets until there's a six-inch-type fish to
7 catch, a king. What do you do with sheefish in that
8 case.

9

10 Should only gillnets with six-inch or
11 smaller mesh be allowed during subsistence periods. We
12 did that in 2013. There are people that only want to
13 fish chinook, so that doesn't work in their mind.

14

15 So it's expected that 2014 commercial
16 summer chum fish will be managed conservatively.
17 Again, we want to minimize our impact on chinook. It
18 sounds from this Council that you do think dipnets
19 work. We've gotten comments that beach seines maybe
20 aren't so good. There's concerns about mortality on
21 those.

22

23 The fishwheel was something else
24 though. Like in 4B and C, you know, there is some
25 people that only use fishwheels and some people that
26 only use gillnets and what does that do to the
27 communities there. Some people that have fishwheels,
28 if they can't keep a king, is that the issue, or would
29 they use a fishwheel to catch a chum. So that's kind
30 of one question.

31

32 Commercial 5.5-inch nets with 30 meshes
33 deep, maybe people in this Council aren't too familiar
34 with how that worked, so it may be more appropriate for
35 the Lower River Council.

36

37 Like I said, the fishwheels, do people
38 use fishwheels to catch chum. I think some of the dog
39 mushers might, but I don't know if other people would
40 when you get to the Upper River people -- from what I
41 hear is that some of the summer chum are good if you
42 can get them early, but they drop off pretty fast.
43 Quality drops off. But those early ones just happen to
44 be when we're still trying to protect chinook, so it
45 becomes kind of a quandary there if people could target
46 chum and avoid kings. If people here have any
47 suggestions on how to do that, get some of those
48 alternative fish there.

49

50 We have also should four-inch mesh

1 sizes be allowed. It sounds like some people on the
2 Kuskokwim there may have been some questions whether or
3 not that was sufficient protection for chinook. I
4 haven't heard much people on the Yukon concerned with
5 four-inch nets catching kings or using them. From what
6 I heard so far, they do seem like a reasonable way to
7 catch whitefish and other species.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That would be a
10 setnet?

11

12 MR. BUE: Yes, setnet. It's
13 restricted. It's a short net too.

14

15 I guess one additional -- I always hold
16 my breath when I ask this, but in the Kusko they just
17 talked about it too, but there is another option for us
18 to Federally restrict fishermen to Federally qualified
19 only users in the river. I've asked that a number of
20 other times and I keep on bringing it back. The Yukon
21 River is a big area. It's not all waters are adjacent
22 to Federal Management Units, so if we restrict it to
23 those Federally qualified users, it could reduce the
24 number of fishermen on the river.

25

26 I think what we've seen is that with
27 such a small amount of fishing opportunity right now
28 very few people are traveling from Fairbanks or
29 Anchorage or Bethel to come fish on the river. So I
30 think by having such small openings we've pretty much
31 gotten away from people traveling here for that
32 specific purpose.

33

34 I think the other argument we heard in
35 2009 we did do that and there was -- we did hear a lot
36 of people say that by doing that their family members
37 couldn't come out and help them fish, help them in
38 their subsistence activity. To them, it was the
39 Federal system, by doing this, further handicapped them
40 over other fishermen on the river. So we haven't done
41 it since then, but it's something to keep checking back
42 in with the Council on your feelings on that.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There were people
45 that when that happened that had family members that
46 helped them fish. The rural residents were the primary
47 fishers, but then they could not allow their family
48 members to help, so that turned out to be somewhat
49 counterproductive. For the Yukon River, that was a
50 huge can of worms and that didn't really work out.

1 Does the Council have comments?
2 Basically Fred is asking what Council member feelings
3 are on various management regimes and restrictions with
4 the different mesh sizes. If anybody feels strongly
5 about one of these eight points, they should comment on
6 that. Does anybody have any comments.

7
8 Go ahead, Robert.

9
10 MR. R. WALKER: Look at Page 5 here.
11 Looking at probably 13.2 percent. Is that like the
12 Andreafsky, Atchuelinguk, Anvik Rivers here to Innoko
13 River?

14
15 MR. BUE: Well, it also includes Anvik
16 in there, but it's really difficult to get precise
17 numbers, but based on the telemetry study. They were
18 tagging around Marshall and Russian Mission, so where
19 they're actually applying the radio tags was above like
20 Andreafsky, so they back calculated and took a pretty
21 good estimate what was going into the Andreafsky and
22 those lower places, but they do have a weir on the
23 Andreafsky, so they have a fairly good number there.

24
25 MR. R. WALKER: Okay. My second
26 question, I'd like to have the report starting from
27 probably '98 till this year of how many chinook was
28 recorded at the Anvik weir, how many chum were counted
29 at the Anvik weir over those years. We should have a
30 very high count due to the low commercial fisheries
31 down in Y1 and Y2, but it seemed like it just hangs
32 that moderate section like 500 to 400 to 700. Not a
33 lot, but we should have a lot more chum there because
34 the Anvik River is one of the biggest spawning rivers,
35 tributaries on the Yukon. I mean at one time there was
36 1.8 million chums spawned there. The numbers are just
37 not adding up to what they should be.

38
39 MR. BUE: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Walker. I
40 think you're right. That is a big question. Anvik is
41 actually a sonar and we don't have a real good
42 apportionment for chinook and summer chum.
43 Traditionally the Anvik used to produce a lot more chum
44 percentage-wise. So, when we have these really big
45 runs drainage-wide, we would expect the Anvik to be
46 bumping up higher, but it doesn't seem to be bumping up
47 higher. It seems like some of these other places like
48 Henshaw is really way up high for whatever reason.

49
50 Fish and Game is going to do a

1 telemetry study this summer, kind of going back to the
2 Russian Mission, Marshall area, apply tags and try to
3 see if they can sort out are those fish using different
4 areas. It seems like it's favoring upriver summer chum
5 over lower river for whatever reason. Production seems
6 to be shifting that way.

7

8 MR. R. WALKER: I have another
9 question, Mr. Chairman. The commercial fishermen in
10 Y5, the lower portion, Anvik and Grayling, they look at
11 this as one of the openings when they do have a
12 commercial season and there's not enough adequate
13 numbers for escapement here to give them an opening for
14 commercial fisheries, but you look at the upper portion
15 like Kaltag, Nulato and Koyukuk, they do have it
16 because the runs are actually passing Anvik and moving
17 up the river where they have this choice. I think we
18 should do something about Anvik River.

19

20 If we have to lower the horsepower on
21 the engines or the displacements on the volume of the
22 boat or something. I mean we have to look at something
23 here because I really think that these boats may be
24 doing a lot of damage to our river with these loads of
25 people that they're hauling fuel, groceries, et cetera.
26 You know, the 200 horsepower, that's a lot of thrust
27 there when you're going into shallow water. This is
28 something we have to look into, Mr. Chairman. I think
29 the Federal waters where we do have the spawning I
30 think we do have that right, do we?

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, I mean it
33 could be the Federal managers. I think that would be
34 BLM land there and the Anvik River possibly and some
35 portions of that drainage. We could request the BLM to
36 look at impacts to spawning areas if they do have
37 permitted recreational users in that area.

38

39 You had a comment, Jim.

40

41 MR. J. WALKER: Yes. It's in regard to
42 the size of the king salmon that's been increasingly
43 getting smaller over the years. I'm just guessing it's
44 got to do with the breeding abilities of the kings in
45 the ocean and the competition for food that they're up
46 against. Also with the interception of other foreign
47 fisheries.

48

49 You know, it's just like pouring water
50 out of a glass, these rivers. You conserve your flow

1 all you want, but if you don't start looking for the
2 real reason, which is probably some interception on the
3 oceans, the eating patterns of these fish. You
4 conserve the methods on the Yukon or the Kuskokwim,
5 it's not going to justify putting restrictions on the
6 people that depend on subsistence resource. There's
7 other reasons why there's being a reduction in the
8 return of these fish.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have to hold the
11 species until the ocean recovers, then they'll jump
12 back up again. So subsistence has to shift towards
13 other species, like fall chum or something in the
14 interim. When they're in the low phase, like right
15 now, is the most critical time not to overharvest,
16 especially the larger fish. You do some huge genetic
17 damage during the low phase.

18

19 So we have to kind of move along here.
20 We're getting kind of bogged down on this report. Any
21 other quick comments or questions. Pollock.

22

23 MR. SIMON: All the different agencies
24 has worked together the last several years to try to
25 save the king salmon. All the villages up and down the
26 river has quit fishing on king salmon. I talked with
27 Sidney last year and he said maybe that king salmon
28 would come back but not in full force again. I talked
29 with an elder up the Koyukuk River and he said from
30 1940 to 1945 there was hardly any salmon, but in the
31 '60s, '70s there was a lot of salmon. Maybe the king
32 salmon will make an upturn again soon.

33

34 That's my prediction anyway.

35

36 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's also
39 historical on the Yukon. Back in, when was it, 1917,
40 '18 and '19 the salmon runs on the Yukon went right in
41 the toilet, so this has happened before for marine
42 conditions, but it's critical to maintain escapements
43 during the low phase so that we can have a faster up-
44 tick on when the fish start coming back. That's what
45 has to happen biologically.

46

47 So we have to move along.

48

49 Thanks so much for your report there,

50 Fred.

1 MR. BUE: Okay.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Melinda.

4

5 MS. BURKE: Mr. Chair. One really
6 important item we still have left. If Council members
7 can please take one of these and pass them down. I'll
8 direct you to Page 97 and 98 in your books and also
9 this draft annual report that I'm passing around. I
10 believe most Council members have been present at at
11 least one meeting, both in the fall meeting where we
12 didn't have a quorum as well as the follow-up December
13 teleconference. We've developed so far a list of five
14 annual report 2013 items to submit to the Federal
15 Subsistence Board.

16

17 On Page 98 towards the end you'll see
18 that report format. I think this Council does a really
19 great job of putting all this information on the
20 record. We need a good description of the issue,
21 whether the Council seeks Board action on the matter
22 and, if so, any suggestions as to what action the
23 Council recommends, and as much evidence or explanation
24 as necessary to support the Council's request or
25 statements relating to the item of interest.

26

27 Starting with number one, which I think
28 we've covered pretty thoroughly, concerns regarding the
29 Innoko Refuge closure, we've written two and a half
30 pieces of correspondence regarding this issue and I
31 think we've done a really great job of supporting the
32 wishes of this Board when it comes to the Innoko Refuge
33 closure. The second letter we wrote to Mr. Haskett will
34 be attached to this item.

35

36 Item number two, which we still have a
37 bit of work to do on, encourage the Board to advocate
38 for Title VIII and subsistence users with regard to the
39 workings of the North Pacific Fisheries Management
40 Council. We can work on this letter in the interim.
41 We just need to get all the items down on the record.
42 We can come back to that one.

43

44 Number three, continued concern with
45 escapement level on the Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers.

46

47 Number four is the late Secretarial
48 appointments to the Councils. We've written two
49 letters to Secretary Jewell regarding this issue and I
50 have a feeling that we'll have a couple more specific

1 suggestions that I can add to this report when we cover
2 the nominations here at the end of the meeting.

3

4 The last issue is the weight of Council
5 comments at the Board of Game and Board of Fish. I
6 sent out a rough draft of this. I'm not sure how much
7 time the Council has had a chance to look at it. I
8 guess first I would see if we had any additional items
9 to add or if the Council is satisfied with these five
10 items we could bulk them up a little bit here with
11 discussion.

12

13 MS. PELKOLA: Mr. Chair. I have
14 something.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Jenny.

17

18 MS. PELKOLA: On number one there, the
19 decision was made with no local input or consultation
20 and the village councils -- I think the word council
21 should be in there -- were not informed.

22

23 MS. BURKE: Thank you, Jenny.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other Council
26 comments on the draft annual report.

27

28 MR. GERVAIS: Jack.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

31

32 MR. GERVAIS: On number three, that
33 first sentence, our continued concerns of an all-time
34 low chinook escapement goals on the Yukon and Kuskokwim
35 Rivers, I think that should be escapement levels.
36 Change the word goals to levels.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have concerns on
39 item four. This RAC appointment issue has been
40 exacerbated tremendously this round for this meeting.
41 So some of the points that need to be incorporated into
42 this is -- to the Federal Subsistence Board and the
43 special assistant for the Secretary of Interior, Pat
44 Pourchot's position -- that the delay of appointments
45 completely
46 disrupts the OSM staff to book travel or even have
47 meetings for some RACs. Our RAC had to take two
48 additional days of travel because of charter delays
49 that could not be finalized for this meeting.

50

1 The Federal Subsistence Board, the Ag
2 Department, special assistant to DOI should all
3 petition the Secretary of Interior in the Agricultural
4 Department to allow the Department of Interior's
5 special assistant in Anchorage to make the final RAC
6 appointments and notify all applicants of status
7 because the applicants have to know what they're doing.
8 So if they're not notified that yes or no they're
9 appointed, you're in limbo with your own schedule, like
10 Don Honea may be right this minute.

11
12 The change of the charters for the
13 RACs, when we go to our charter, we should have the
14 ability for the RACs, if not appointed by December 2nd,
15 to continue to serve until beyond their expiration date
16 as the Subsistence Resource Commissions do until
17 they're replaced or reappointed so that if there's a
18 conference call we have membership in place.

19
20 This issue should also have a letter
21 sent again to the Secretary of Interior and
22 Agricultural Department highlighting these issues and
23 the need to move the appointment process to Alaska so
24 that appointments can be made in a timely manner. The
25 Federal Subsistence Board agenda, this coming meeting
26 in April, should have this item on the agenda.

27
28 All RACs should be also notified by the
29 Western Interior Regional Council's letters and
30 transmissions on this action item immediately so that
31 they're aware of the issues to be brought up at the
32 April Federal Subsistence Board meeting.

33
34 Melinda.

35
36 MS. BURKE: I did want to note, Jack,
37 that the letter that's on the right-hand side of the
38 Council blue folder that was just very recently sent,
39 this letter is being carried to all of the Council
40 meetings this winter, so they should all be taking it
41 up and putting some good comments on the record. All
42 of them were cc'd and all the coordinators have been
43 instructed to take this to their meeting.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I appreciate
46 that. So those are the points I'd like to see
47 incorporated into point four on the annual report.

48
49 Tim, additional comments on point four?
50

1 MR. GERVAIS: Not on point four. Does
2 this letter need to be finished today? I mean do we
3 need to do language for number two yet?

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We want to get
6 language incorporated on point two into the annual
7 report so Melinda has transcripts to work off of. So
8 if you have language for point two, proceed.

9
10 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. You're done with
11 four?

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm done with four
14 unless the Council has additions to number four.

15
16 MR. R. WALKER: (Indiscernible).

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead with
19 number two.

20
21 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. With regard to
22 number two, we're feeling that subsistence users have
23 basically exhausted their conservation measures for the
24 conservation of the king salmon or close to exhausted
25 those measures and we're not seeing reciprocal effort
26 with the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. I
27 feel that part of the problem is North Pacific
28 Fisheries Management Council is operated through the
29 Department of Commerce and there needs to be some kind of
30 agreement or understanding between the Department of
31 Commerce and Department of Interior that the Department
32 of Commerce needs to be more responsive to the lack of
33 salmon in Interior Alaska at this time.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There needs to be a
36 Memorandum of Understanding developed between the
37 Secretary of Interior, the Ag Department and the
38 Secretary of Commerce on this issue of bycatch that the
39 Secretary of Commerce has control over with the North
40 Pacific Fisheries Management Council. We cannot
41 advocate politically, so the Federal Subsistence Board
42 has to advocate for the Councils to the Secretaries of
43 Interior and Ag to approach the Secretary of Commerce
44 on this issue. So that's appropriate language, Tim.
45 Appreciate that.

46
47 Any other comments on the annual
48 report.

49
50 DR. JENKINS: Excuse me, Mr. Chair, may

1 I make one?

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, David.

4

5 DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. Let me just
6 remind the Council that the Secretary of Interior and
7 Agriculture in their review asked that they be apprised
8 of situations where non-Departmental rulemaking affects
9 subsistence and what you've just been talking about,
10 bycatch, is one of those instances where non-
11 Departmental rulemaking affects subsistence in Interior
12 and Alaska.

13

14 So when you construct your letter to
15 the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, remind
16 them that they told you to tell them when these things
17 are going on so it doesn't come out of nowhere, but it
18 comes out of their own language. Mr. Chair.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, David. We
21 will incorporate that into the annual report. Pollock.

22

23 MR. SIMON: I just want to comment on
24 the appointments by the Secretary. I wasn't appointed --
25 I think it was just two weeks ago I was reappointed.
26 Before that I talked to Melinda to see what's going on.
27 She said if you're not reappointed I don't think I can
28 make travel arrangements for you. So I agree with
29 Jack. Maybe we could work on just a charter so that we
30 can continue to come to the meeting until reappointed.
31 Both Jack and I are on the National Park SRC board and
32 on that board they said we could come even if their
33 reappointment is not made yet. That National Park is
34 also Federal and so is Fish and Wildlife.

35

36 Thank you, Jack.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock.
39 Any other comments on the annual report.

40

41 Did you have a comment, Robert.

42

43 MR. R. WALKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Robert.

46

47 MR. R. WALKER: We're talking about the
48 Western Interior Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
49 charter?

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're talking about
2 the annual report right now, but we are going to get to
3 the charter at some point. Melinda, was that on our
4 agenda? Where did I see that?

5
6 MS. BURKE: This is the new charter
7 that was just renewed in December, so one of the
8 specific suggestions that the Council has is to amend
9 the charters so that a Council member can continue to
10 serve until someone new is appointed and I'll work with
11 my division chief and my staff to get a good idea of
12 what that process is and we can begin that right away
13 if that's what the Council is suggesting.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We would also like
16 to transmit that to all the other RACs so that they
17 will also be aware that this is a necessary step in the
18 interim before we can get a permanent remedy to the
19 appointment issue.

20
21 Other comments on the annual report.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Chair will
26 entertain a motion to adopt the annual report as
27 amended during this work session.

28
29 MR. SIMON: So moved.

30
31 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
34 Any further discussion on the annual report.

35
36 MS. BURKE: Mr. Chair.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Melinda.

39
40 MS. BURKE: I'm going to try to get
41 this letter finished up as quick as possible, so I just
42 wanted to let the Council members know what I'll be
43 doing. I'll work on this through the rest of the week
44 and by Friday you will have either in your email, if
45 you use email, or if I communicate with you by fax,
46 Pollock and Robert, I'll have a draft over to you, and
47 if we can get comments back, I'd like to get this
48 letter to the review process in OSM by next Wednesday.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate that.

1 Further discussion on the annual report.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Question.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
6 called. Those in favor of the 2014 annual report
7 signify by saying aye.

8

9 IN UNISON: Aye.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.

12

13 (No opposing votes)

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're on -- I see
16 review and approval of draft Council correspondence and
17 that's an action item. Is that on 106 or where is
18 that?

19

20 MS. BURKE: Mr. Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, Melinda.

23

24 MS. BURKE: I have a list here. I
25 added this item because the last year or so since we
26 met in Galena this Council has been in the practice of
27 trying to get these letters drafted at the meeting to
28 have as much direct input from all of the Council
29 members as possible.

30

31 My running list here that I have for
32 brand-new correspondence and we've already approved
33 this on the record, the Innoko 2 letter that's going to
34 go to Mr. Haskett very quickly here. I think we built
35 a really great draft yesterday and I'll work with
36 Raymond and with everybody else to get that finalized
37 too and move that through approval quickly to get that
38 through the review process in our office.

39

40 I've got enough notes and you've
41 already moved and approved for the Board of Fish the
42 mortality issue letter. I think we have a good record
43 of that.

44

45 Old letters. We've got the annual
46 report taken care of, we've got the C&T formal
47 comments. The rural ones are also built a draft form.
48 I'll get that out to the Council before you leave this
49 meeting.

50

1 There's just one that I've got a
2 question mark right here next to the North Pacific
3 Fisheries Management Council letter that we had spoken
4 about, Tim.

5
6 MR. GERVAIS: Uh-huh.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: As long as we
9 discuss on the record and make a motion to approve the
10 content of the letter, I can work with Tim in the
11 interim to get that letter completed as well.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you want to lay
14 out the template of the letter, Tim, go ahead.

15
16 MR. GERVAIS: Sure. Do you want me to
17 just read it?

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Read it into the
20 record so that we have a transcript. It's strictly
21 draft language, so then it will be a final review
22 process and so forth of that letter. Go ahead, Tim.

23
24 MR. GERVAIS: Dear Chairman Olson: The
25 purpose of this letter is to update the North Pacific
26 Fisheries Management Council on the current stock
27 status of king salmon in our rivers in the Western
28 Interior. Unfortunately, subsistence users are
29 experiencing declining abundance of one of our most
30 valuable subsistence resources. King salmon size is
31 declining. King salmon biomass is at its lowest level
32 of abundance in 30 years. Weir counts and traditional
33 ecological knowledge indicate the lowest level of
34 spawning aggregation in 30 years. The oldest age class
35 king salmon are increasingly rare. The oldest age
36 class is biologically extinct.

37
38 The Yukon River is continuously
39 underescaping. The Yukon River has underescaped
40 (blank) of the last (blank) years. I need to look at
41 this information we just got from Fred to make sure I
42 get the right amount there. The Kuskokwim has
43 underescaped in 2010 and 2013. 2013 was the lowest
44 recorded run ever recorded for the Kuskokwim.

45
46 Subsistence users are being restricted
47 in their harvest through management regulation and
48 additionally through voluntary harvest restrictions.
49 Subsistence households are completing only 45 to 0
50 percent of their customary harvest levels. The king

1 salmon resource is vital to subsistence users for
2 biologic, economic, nutritional, cultural, identity and
3 self-worth needs, although pollock trawl fleet promotes
4 itself as a sustainable based on low bycatch percent in
5 regards to pollock, yet potentially it has -- this
6 sentence I was just writing -- taken away 60 percent of
7 the king salmon stock.

8

9 The trawl fleets in the Bering Sea,
10 Aleutian Islands and Gulf of Alaska have most likely
11 caught at least 3 million king salmon in the past 24
12 years as prohibited species bycatch. North Pacific
13 Fisheries Management Council adoption of salmon
14 conservation measures such as Amendment 91 have been
15 too slow in implementation and too weak in magnitude.
16 Now the spawning grounds, subsistence users and all
17 Alaskans go without king salmon. The unsustainable
18 short-term economic returns of the trawl fleet are not
19 worth the biologic and social damage to the salmon
20 culture.

21

22 We request this injustice to cease.
23 The North Pacific Fisheries Management Council and
24 Department of Commerce need to implement salmon
25 rebuilding regulations to avert the king salmon from
26 being managed under endangered species regulation.
27 Subsistence users in Alaska and Canada are already
28 enduring tremendous conservation measures to bring back
29 the king salmon biomass.

30

31 We respectfully ask the North Pacific
32 Fisheries Management Council and the Department of
33 Commerce to be our partners in this huge rebuilding
34 effort.

35

36 That's it.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is that language
39 acceptable to the Council.

40

41 (Council nods affirmatively)

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Would you like to
44 insert any additions into that? Sounds good. I see an
45 affirmative of the Council members on that draft
46 language.

47

48 So that would be all of our Council
49 correspondence to date. We have Dan here, who has been
50 patiently waiting. I would like to have you come up

1 for KNA.

2

3 MR. GILLIKIN: You've taken the chair
4 away.

5

6 (Laughter)

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You can sit on the
9 little bench there. He's been sitting here patiently,
10 enduring us for two days, so I've been feeling really,
11 really bad about that. I want Dan to speak to us.
12 We've jumped up and down in this agenda. People that
13 attend meetings I really want to have input from them.

14

15 MR. GILLIKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16 I promise I'll try to keep it as brief as possible.
17 Many of the items have already been discussed by Travis
18 and Dave Cannon presented some of them.

19

20 First let me introduce myself. I'm Dan
21 Gillikin, the director of fisheries with KNA Fisheries
22 here in Aniak. In the interest of disclosure, I think
23 I should let folks know that a year ago I retired from
24 Federal service after 25 years working for the National
25 Marine Fisheries Service, the United States Coast
26 Guard, the Forest Service and the U.S. Fish and
27 Wildlife for the last six years down in Bethel as the
28 fisheries biologist for the Yukon Delta National
29 Wildlife Refuge. It took me 25 years to wise up and
30 put it all behind me, move upriver to God's country and
31 here I am now.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So you've seen both
34 side of this issue.

35

36 MR. GILLIKIN: I've seen many different
37 facets of this issue.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, that's a
40 positive thing. Glad to hear that.

41

42 MR. GILLIKIN: Hopefully I can impart
43 some of what I know or think I know at least on the
44 Council here. The question came up from the Council
45 earlier about what has KNA Fisheries been doing as far
46 as management of the fisheries on the Kuskokwim.
47 That's one of my primary responsibilities.

48

49 After seeing the obviously low numbers
50 that we saw last year in the escapement, we became very

1 concerned and it prompted me and my board to draft a
2 resolution that essentially was calling for ADF&G to
3 enact significant conservation measures in 2014 season
4 for chinook salmon conservation. That included
5 starting the season closed, heavily restricting
6 fisheries. If we did not feel that adequate
7 conservation measures were going to be taken, that we
8 would be submitting a special action request to OSM and
9 I'll elaborate on that a little bit more and that's
10 kind of where you folks would come into play with that.

11
12 After that we started having meetings
13 with the working group, ADF&G, the Federal managers to
14 try and develop some preliminary management strategies.
15 It was slow going at first and then finally at our
16 January 8th and 9th meeting I drafted up some
17 recommendations to provide to the working group to act
18 as more or less a straw man or facilitate a more
19 focused discussion on some serious recommendations that
20 we could discuss with the State.

21
22 Here's some of the assumptions here on
23 this slide here. These have been talked about. We're
24 going to have a low return again this year.
25 Restriction is going to be required in order to meet
26 any escapement objective under any scenario. Folks are
27 going to have to be restricted. The basin-wide
28 objective will be 85,000 based on the Bethel test fish
29 basin-wide relationship. That incorporates the
30 confidence interval around that number. So it gives us
31 a little bit of buffer rather than the 65, which is
32 what the basin-wide escapement is.

33
34 The available surplus is thought to be
35 somewhere between 12 and 20,000 fish, but I emphasize
36 those numbers are changing. You heard Travis actually
37 talking about no surplus fish today and that's a real
38 possibility. We're also adamant that we wanted any
39 opportunity to be equitable to all fishers up and down
40 the river. We all know what happened last summer. We
41 don't need to beat that horse to death again, but we
42 don't want to see a repeat of that. Obviously there's
43 going to be no commercial or sport fishery on chinook
44 salmon.

45
46 The opportunity that will be provided
47 is going to be for other species. It's going to be on
48 chum, sockeye, coho. Those are the species we want to
49 focus on. Some of the tools we need to utilize in
50 order to do that are going to be the Bethel test

1 fishery. We can reliably, you know, figure out the
2 species composition from the Bethel test fishery data
3 and we can use historic data to make a guess about the
4 run timing of those fish past Bethel. The Bethel test
5 fishery is reasonably accurate most years. It's a
6 fairly recent tool, so still the bugs are being worked
7 out of it, but I think it's still a reasonable tool to
8 evaluate the fishery with in season and use that to
9 help inform us about whether or not we're going to meet
10 our escapement objectives.

11
12 So this all boils down to a
13 recommendation essentially of starting the season
14 closed. We're fairly adamant about that and you heard
15 from Travis that's essentially what they're proposing
16 at this point. If you start the schedule May 15th,
17 there's no fish in the river at that point and it may
18 still be iced over. It's essentially starting closed
19 and then you would implement a schedule, so it's going
20 to be closed until opened, which is exactly the
21 opposite of the way it's typically managed.

22
23 We want to see greater than 70 percent
24 of the chinook run past Bethel before they would open
25 the fishery to even short openings. A minimum of a
26 10:1 ratio of chum/sockeye to chinook as observed at
27 the Bethel test fishery. That's using that six-inch
28 gear. You're going to basically plus that net with
29 chum and sockeye, which is going to reduce your capture
30 efficiency on chinook salmon significantly. They will
31 catch some, but they'll catch a lot fewer and it will
32 still provide adequate opportunity -- well, some
33 opportunity for people to get other species of fish.
34 The management objective will be the 85,000, not the
35 65,000, which is what the SEG is set at.

36
37 You've heard this verbally. This is a
38 representation of the table of the escapements. One
39 thing I want to point out. We keep talking about
40 escapements were not met in 2013 and 2010. Keep in
41 mind the objectives all changed in 2013. The SEG for
42 basin-wide was just established in 2013 and then the
43 individual tributary SEGs are essentially a percentage
44 of that basin-wide. So all the SEGs were reduced
45 essentially in 2013.

46
47 I can get you information. If you want
48 to go back and look at the old escapement objectives
49 and whether we met them or not, that really gives you a
50 much better -- more of a realistic picture of how we've

1 been doing management-wise on the Kuskokwim.

2

3 This is the run reconstruction, so this
4 is showing our total run, the harvest and then the
5 escapement. You can see 2013 we set a new low there.
6 That bar in the middle there, that's the escapement
7 goal range. That's well below what the average
8 escapements are if you just kind of look at it with
9 fuzzy eyes. It's significantly lower and that's very
10 concerning to people. We're managing to a new low on
11 that system currently. It's something we want to be
12 very cautious about.

13

14 Real quickly about the fishing power
15 that we have in the Lower River. Now this is just an
16 example of as late as June 18th you had 527 permits in
17 a nine-hour opening, 20,000 fish were harvested,
18 chinook. That's probably fairly comparable to what you
19 would see in a subsistence fishery. So very quickly,
20 if you only have 15,000 fish surplus, they could all be
21 sucked up in one short opener in the Lower River.
22 That's the whole point of that.

23

24 So we keep talking about the early run
25 fish are heading to the headwaters. This is an
26 interesting slide in that it shows the run timing past
27 Bethel and the harvest timing. Primarily looking at
28 the front two lines, the blue lines and not the red.
29 The red one is for the chum salmon. So you can see by
30 looking at that about 50 percent by June 22nd of the
31 harvest is completed. Now 86 percent is by the
32 communities in the Lower River, so most of the harvest
33 really in the Lower River is done by June 22nd.

34

35 What that does is that front-end loads
36 the harvest, as Ray knows well and keeps talking about.
37 That has other consequences for upriver fishermen as
38 well as your biological diversity that you're trying to
39 maintain within your basin. The interesting thing is
40 you can take that graphic and then you can start
41 looking at some numbers.

42

43 We were talking about an estimated run
44 of 100,000 and then depending on what the escapement
45 objective is that you're shooting for, if you look at
46 that table, just that top line there for instance, the
47 available harvest might be 15,000. An average
48 subsistence harvest runs around 80,000, so that's about
49 a 19 percent reduction of that 80,000. You can look at
50 that and you can transpose those lines on that chart

1 and you can see about 80 percent cumulative harvest and
2 run timing and transpose that over, you see that puts
3 you at a date somewhere around the end of June,
4 beginning of July and you can do that under different
5 scenarios. This is how I develop those criteria that
6 we suggested essentially.

7
8 We do have historical data is my point
9 that we can use for developing some strategies. The
10 strategy of using the six-inch gear -- you can see late
11 in the season we have -- by the end of June again
12 you've got a huge influx of chum salmon relative to the
13 chinook salmon. It's not uncommon to have a 10:1, 20:1
14 ratio at that point. Your six-inch gear is going to be
15 very effective. I used to fish chum down there
16 personally and I mean 30 minutes you were done. That's
17 all the fish I needed for the whole year.

18
19 So the question also comes up, people
20 ask why now. These fish are cyclic, we all know that.
21 They go up, they go down, they go up. Why are we
22 concerned about it now. Well, there's a couple
23 reasons. One of the reasons is we have a new basin-
24 wide SEG. This is a very large basin. A lot of fish
25 we're talking about. One of the largest runs of wild
26 chinook salmon anywhere in the world.

27
28 We set a new escapement objective for
29 the entire basin and it's a modeled analysis. It's
30 based on radiotelemetry work, mark recapture work, an
31 awful lot of modeling, a lot of indices from aerial
32 counts, weir counts, so there's a lot of different
33 pieces to this puzzle. There's questions about how
34 valid it really is and we're still exploring that.
35 When I was with Fish and Wildlife Service, we had some
36 concerns about it in the spawner recruit analysis that
37 resulted from those numbers. It's new. It hasn't
38 necessarily been fully tested so to speak.

39
40 Escapements have been declining for
41 more than one full chinook salmon life cycle when you
42 look at the total run and the reconstructions from that
43 to the point now we're at historic lows on the
44 Kuskokwim for chinook salmon.

45
46 Question?

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you have a
49 question there, Tim?

50

1 MR. GERVAIS: SEG is spawning.....
2
3 MR. GILLIKIN: SEG is sustainable
4 escapement goal.
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the question is,
7 is the sustainability that was calculated is in
8 question.
9
10 MR. GILLIKIN: Yes.
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. When I saw
13 the Board reduce the SEGs down to 65,000 how did I know
14 we were going to overfish this run.
15
16 MR. GILLIKIN: Mr. Chair. They didn't
17 reduce it. There was never a basin-wide goal
18 established.
19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, there never was
21 a goal.
22
23 MR. GILLIKIN: No. It was always --
24 prior to 2013, it was always individual tributary
25 goals. I can tell you from the years that I was with
26 the Fish and Wildlife Service and knowing the State
27 folks, it's essentially -- in that mixed stock fishery,
28 it's impossible to manage this system based on a
29 tributary-by-tributary basis because it is such a huge
30 mixed stock fishery that occurs at the mouth where all
31 those fish -- we don't have these nice clear-cut pulses
32 like you tend to see on the Yukon. These fish are
33 coming in, they separate a little bit up and down the
34 drainage, but it's a very difficult thing and that's
35 one reason they went to the basin-wide escapement.
36 It's a strategy.
37
38 Like I mentioned before, there's a lot
39 of uncertainty associated with the management tools and
40 the models that were all used to develop these SEGs.
41 We use for in-season the Bethel test fishery modeling
42 and the relationship to basin-wide escapement and the
43 individual weirs. Those are all very new tools, so
44 there's a lot of uncertainty associated with it.
45
46 One of the things that people keep
47 talking about too is why is this all happening. I
48 don't have a crystal ball. I don't have a hole string
49 of PhD's. I'm not sure, but I have an idea. If I'm
50 right, in my opinion, now is the time -- and I think

1 you mentioned this earlier, Mr. Chair -- now is the
2 time to conserve because we can take advantage of what
3 I believe are going to be improving conditions in the
4 Bering Sea for rearing.

5
6 A quick lesson in some of the life
7 history of chinook salmon. They're unique coming from
8 Western Alaska. They spend all of their time in the
9 Bering Sea. They're not like the chum or the coho or
10 the sockeye that migrate in and out of the Bering Sea
11 and into the North Pacific. They all spend different
12 phases of their ocean life right in the Bering Sea.
13 That means that they're very susceptible to -- well,
14 it's not really local, but it is on a global scale,
15 local environmental conditions that you have in the
16 Bering Sea. What happens is they migrate around and
17 they overwinter off the shelves there and then they
18 migrate out into the abyssal areas and when they come
19 out initially, they're near shore and then they migrate
20 back up.

21
22 There's an indice called Pacific
23 Decadal Oscillation, PDO, which is a bunch of different
24 climatic measurements such as pressure, wind direction,
25 sea surface temperatures, things like that that have
26 been developed over time and they call it the Pacific
27 Decadal Oscillation. What that does is that drives the
28 currents and the mixing of nutrients out in the Bering
29 Sea. As you mix those nutrients, what that does is
30 that increases productivity out there from the bottom
31 up so to speak, so it's an ecological response to a
32 climatic indice.

33
34 What that does essentially is that
35 increases or decreases the carrying capacity of the
36 ocean, of the Bering Sea where all these chinook salmon
37 reside. If you look at that relationship between
38 Kuskokwim chinook abundance and Pacific Decadal
39 Oscillation and this red line is PDO that is kind of a
40 smooth trend line based on a four-year, five-year kind
41 of average, you can see that for the last few decades
42 there's this pretty strong relationship. It's not
43 perfect, but it's pretty strong.

44
45 I was just looking at Fred's
46 information that he just handed out there and I thought
47 it was kind of interesting. If you look at his graphic
48 there where he shows this serious drop in productivity,
49 guess where that occurs. Right where that red line
50 crosses zero and your PDO starts becoming more negative

1 than it is positive. So there's a lot of things that I
2 think we're starting to learn more and more about and
3 people are starting to point more and more at that
4 black box out in the Bering Sea.

5
6 You can take that same plot and you can
7 plot those values of PDO and abundance against each
8 other and it generates a model, a predictive type of
9 model, which is essentially this line that's across
10 there and the equation for that line and then you can
11 use that to estimate at least what you might expect as
12 a return from a specific climatic condition. Now I'll
13 caution you all models are wrong, but some can be very
14 informative and that's exactly what I'm looking at
15 here.

16
17 Now I've already run the model for 2014
18 and I've come up with an estimate of almost 143,000
19 chinook as a return, plus or minus 25,000. Is that
20 right? No. I can tell you right now it's not going to
21 be right, but it could be in the ballpark. The bigger
22 thing that it tells me also is that if you go back and
23 you look at this graphic here or if you look at this,
24 you see typically you have higher abundance just in
25 general, higher abundance, higher returns when you have
26 positive PDO and you have lower abundance during
27 negative phase PDOs.

28
29 So we're starting to trend back up in
30 PDO. We're increasing the carrying capacity. So now
31 is the time to take advantage and fully seed that
32 Bering Sea with juvenile chinook by allowing adequate
33 escapement. So you'll get the biggest bang for your
34 buck by escaping more fish now. That will speed your
35 recovery rather than waiting and waiting and waiting
36 and driving them down below a point where it won't
37 really matter.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Insert quality
40 escapement. You've got to have quality escapement.

41
42 MR. GILLIKIN: Absolutely. This is
43 just simply one variable. It's a death of 1,000 cuts.
44 Quality of escapement plays into it too and there's an
45 analysis that Ken Harper has done with Fish and
46 Wildlife Service looking at how we're losing our older
47 age classes just like on the Yukon. Obviously on the
48 Yukon that's occurred and that changes fecundity, the
49 actual number of eggs that are being deposited. You're
50 seeing changes in composition of males and females. We

1 have a fairly high proportion of males over here on the
2 Kuskokwim. Some systems it's really high and some of
3 those are very young males. So are they really
4 contributing or not.

5
6 This is all just modeling. It's
7 environmental modeling, which is never static, it's
8 always changing and it's never any one thing. This is
9 just a very simple one. For me, it's informative. I
10 want to caution you also because I just looked this up
11 this morning. That being said, that model was
12 developed under fairly what I would call normal
13 conditions. The new normal may be anything but normal.
14 We're already seeing right now in the Arctic a new
15 record low sea ice extent for this year. It's never
16 been this low, so I suspect it will be extremely low
17 come summer.

18
19 That sea ice that forms in the Bering
20 Sea is critical for primary production in the Bering
21 Sea. The algae forms on the bottom of that sea ice and
22 depending on how far south it goes and how rapidly it
23 retreats, that actually controls the ecosystem and the
24 productivity of that ecosystem in the Bering Sea. So
25 we don't even know what this means. This could be a
26 real game changer as well as we've all experienced some
27 of the warmest temperatures we can remember in Alaska.

28
29 Okay, I'm done. Thank you.

30
31 Any questions.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One question I have.
34 If 70 percent of the fish go by in an opening, what
35 precludes Bethel from chasing those fish up the river
36 and getting out in front of that pulse? They know when
37 they went by. They think you think that they're going
38 to fish downriver. What precludes them from running as
39 far up until they start to find the king salmon?

40
41 MR. GILLIKIN: My guess would be the
42 price of gas. It's about a five-hour boat drive up
43 here. There are people that come up from Bethel and
44 they live upriver. They have summer cabins upriver.
45 But I suspect economically it won't be feasible and
46 people will do the calculus in their own head and say,
47 well, maybe we'll have to do with some chum and sockeye
48 this year.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other questions.

1 Tim.

2

3 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you for your
4 presentation. That PDO is kind of subjective, right,
5 or can all the scientists and researchers say, yeah,
6 this PDO cycle is exactly going on?

7

8 MR. GILLIKIN: No, it is absolutely not
9 subjective. It is a qualitative indice. It's based on
10 actual measured data. I think what you're asking is
11 can you play statistical games with it and do things to
12 make it fit any kind of a relationship you want. Yeah,
13 if you're a good enough statistician. I'm not that
14 good. I take it pretty straightforward. For instance,
15 I averaged that on five years based on the squiggly
16 lines you saw with an average based on five years
17 because that was essentially the average life span of
18 chinook salmon.

19

20 So I just looked at it from a
21 biological perspective. You can see that relationship.
22 Then I did different regressions and found that a
23 three-year -- if you averaged the PDO for the previous
24 three years, that's on average the amount of time that
25 most chinook salmon spend in the open Bering Sea, that
26 was the strongest relationship. So there's biological
27 reasons for -- you know, there should be when you look
28 at things like that for selecting -- cherry picking
29 what pieces of data you want.

30

31 This is nothing new, this PDO. Nathan
32 Mantua, with the University of Washington, he's written
33 many papers on this and
34 fisheries biologists have known this for decades. It's
35 really prevalent because when you look at Alaska
36 fisheries relative to Lower 48 fisheries, they flip
37 flop back and forth based on this relationship between
38 PDO.

39

40 I think we're unique here given that
41 these chinook are right in the Bering Sea and I think
42 it's a driving factor, one of possibly many.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.

45

46 MR. COLLINS: Dan, can you provide a
47 copy of that material to Melissa so she can send it to
48 us because I'd like to have some time to go through
49 that.

50

1 MR. GILLIKIN: Sure.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would like to look
4 at those drafts again. So this can be electronically
5 transmitted to us.
6
7 MR. J. WALKER: One question, Jack.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, James.
10
11 MR. J. WALKER: Is there any data that
12 would show that when these cycles are there that the
13 fish size is changing?
14
15 MR. GILLIKIN: I'm not aware of anybody
16 who has looked at condition. Well, actually there's
17 been work that's been done looking at scales and
18 interpreting growth of fish in the ocean, but I'm not
19 aware of anybody who's looked at -- and you could do it
20 -- looked at climatic indices relative to those growth
21 rates. More and more people are starting to focus on
22 this as what is really driving the abundance and not
23 necessarily freshwater, but more looking at the Bering
24 Sea for chinook salmon.
25
26 I suspect in the next -- and the State
27 is putting a lot of money towards this. I know they're
28 planning on doing coastal surveys and starting a whole
29 program where they're going to start evaluating these
30 early juvenile fish that are outmigrating and hanging
31 along the coastlines because they think that's where
32 the bottleneck actually is.
33
34 MR. J. WALKER: I've just got one more
35 question for you. These different cycles that goes
36 through on the scale, is there any other incidental
37 fishing that goes on in that area at that time?
38
39 MR. GILLIKIN: I'm not sure I
40 understood the question.
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: He was showing where
43 stocks in the Bering Sea were rearing and.....
44
45 MR. GILLIKIN: Oh, right. Yeah.
46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:the impacts by
48 the trawl fleet would be at certain times of the year.
49 Is that what you were asking?
50

1 MR. J. WALKER: (Nods affirmatively)
2
3 MR. GILLIKIN: Yeah, but you have to --
4 okay, do you want to hear my opinion on the bycatch.
5
6 MR. GERVAIS: Yes, please.
7
8 MR. GILLIKIN: I've done back of the
9 napkin calculations and you have to remember when you
10 look at the bycatch that occurs, those fish are coming
11 all from Western Alaska, correct. All the systems in
12 Western Alaska. And they've done a genetic
13 apportionment between the large systems. What you find
14 is that in the bycatch typically it's less than -- I
15 want to say it's less than one or two percent comes to
16 say the Kuskokwim because it's distributed between the
17 Yukon, the Nushagak, all these Western Alaska streams.
18
19
20 So if you have a bycatch of 20,000 fish
21 say and you've got one percent of those fish would be
22 coming back to the Kuskokwim, that, in comparison to
23 the 80,000 chinook salmon that are harvested annually
24 by subsistence fishers, to me is not the 800-pound
25 gorilla that's in the room. Certainly we should do
26 everything we can to minimize that bycatch, but is that
27 what's truly driving our stocks down? I don't believe
28 it is.
29
30 I believe it's a combination of factors
31 of environmental productivity and a carrying capacity
32 of the Bering Sea and potentially overharvest and not
33 allowing for enough escapement and things like other
34 species, biological diversity within the basin or
35 within that population, things like marine derived
36 nutrients and refocusing on other species where you're
37 driving down the productivity of freshwater. There's
38 several factors. I think to point the finger at just
39 one, and that being the bycatch issue, is really
40 ignoring a whole big, hairy, 800-pound gorilla that we
41 really need to start being honest with ourselves about.
42
43 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you. You
44 answered some of my questions, but I know we're on
45 limited time here and everybody is growling. Come on,
46 Jack.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. I
49 appreciate your present -- Pollock.
50

1 MR. SIMON: Are we moving.....
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, that's where
4 we're going. We're moving ahead.
5
6 MR. GILLIKIN: Thank you for bearing
7 with me.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So where are we at
10 here, Melinda. We're going to start wrapping up?
11
12 MS. BURKE: We are. Mr. Chair, we have
13 two more small items to take care of. We're going to
14 have Trevor come up and provide a quick overview of
15 some special actions. Very quick.
16
17 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mine
18 will be 30 seconds. There were two emergency special
19 actions approved by the Federal Subsistence Board.
20 Both of those are in Unit 18, Unit 18 Lower Yukon and
21 remainder, which there are a few communities with C&T
22 in this region. They just extended the seasons from
23 the end of February to the end of March.
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: For caribou?
26
27 MR. FOX: For moose.
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: For moose. Okay.
30 Appreciate that.
31
32 MR. FOX: That's all I have.
33
34 (Applause)
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: David.
37
38 DR. JENKINS: I can be quicker.
39
40 (Laughter)
41
42 DR. JENKINS: There's been no
43 significant changes to report on our budget. Currently
44 we have 14 vacancies in our organization chart. That's
45 about a third of the total. We began interviewing this
46 week for the next subsistence outreach coordinator. We
47 have now an announcement for the deputy assistant
48 regional director that went out over USA Jobs. The
49 application period for the lead secretary closes
50 February 24th. We have waivers for the fisheries and

1 wildlife division chiefs and a fisheries biologist that
2 are in place. The waiver for the anthropology chief
3 has not been forwarded to D.C. for approval and we're
4 preparing waivers for two additional positions. Right
5 now the acting deputy is Karen Hyer and the acting
6 fisheries division chief is George Pappas. It was my
7 pleasure to serve in that capacity for three months.

8

9 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, David. Any
12 questions on OSM.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Melinda.

17

18 MS. BURKE: One more item. Council, if
19 you would turn your attention to the colored calendars
20 in the very back. The next meeting for this Council is
21 going to be fall 2014 and that is scheduled for the
22 community of McGrath for the dates of October 28th and
23 29th. Then we need to pick dates for the winter 2015
24 meeting. I think for one of the first times in a
25 really long time we're first on the calendar. There
26 are no dates taken, so we have our pick of that window.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Council is
29 aware that we have already selected October 28 and 29
30 in McGrath. We met in Aniak. Theoretically we would
31 go to Galena, but I'm not sure about the status of
32 Galena.

33

34 MS. BURKE: Mr. Chair. I stand
35 corrected. We have Bristol Bay that has taken February
36 24, 25, but that does not exclude that week from our
37 meeting. Just an FYI. Two Councils can meet in a
38 week.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So what week
41 would the Council prefer. I prefer end of March myself.
42 What kind of dog races would be in conflict with you,
43 Pollock?

44

45 MR. SIMON: The first weekend is dog
46 race in Allakaket.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: In March?

49

50 MR. SIMON: No, in April.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, in April. Okay.
2 We're not going that far. Any preferences for the
3 meeting dates, Council. Jenny.

4
5 MS. PELKOLA: I think this week in
6 March might be taken by TCC and DOYON. I'm not too
7 sure.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So you want
10 like the week of March 2nd or the week of March 9th,
11 one of those?

12
13 MR. SIMON: That's true. The first
14 week in March.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The first week in
17 March is good with me. Is that good with the Council.

18
19 MR. COLLINS: I know we've got Iditarod
20 going through McGrath at that time.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So do we want to
23 switch up to the week of March 9th? We're not going to
24 be in McGrath though. So the week of March 9th. Let's
25 set the date and then we'll talk about location. Is
26 the March 9th week good for you guys?

27
28 (Council nods affirmatively)

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's good for me.
31 I like that week. The later the warmer, so it's just
32 easier to travel. So then location. I don't know
33 about Galena, I'm not sure about that, but I have
34 Council members that want to go back to Fairbanks that
35 didn't actually get to go there. They shut down the
36 government. What does the Council think of that?

37
38 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chair. I make a
39 motion that it be in Fairbanks.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Have we got a second
42 for Fairbanks.

43
44 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

45
46 MR. R. WALKER: Third.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded for
49 Fairbanks.

50

1 MS. PELKOLA: Question.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
4 called on Fairbanks as the location. Those in favor of
5 going to Fairbanks signify by saying aye.
6
7 IN UNISON: Aye.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.
10
11 (No opposing votes)
12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That will also help
14 on travel.
15
16 MR. COLLINS: So we'd be looking at 10
17 and 11 probably with travel on Monday?
18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Probably 10 and 11,
20 right, Melinda? Travel Monday.
21
22 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. That's
23 usually pretty close to when TCC has their convention
24 there.
25
26 MR. GERVAIS: The 3rd and 4th.
27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I thought it was
29 the 17th and 18th was the TCC. We can transpose it.
30 Whatever week it is, we can go with March 10th and 11th
31 if TCC is not there or we can transpose it to the 3rd
32 and 4th. We don't want to get in conflict with you
33 guys on the TCC. Okay. One of those two weeks.
34
35 Next, Melinda. We're pretty much done.
36
37 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.
38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead,
40 Robert.
41
42 MR. R. WALKER: Did we do nominations?
43
44 MS. BURKE: I'm sorry. Robert, thank
45 you so much. We did just a quick 15 seconds. I wanted
46 to mention to everybody that the nomination cycle is
47 open. I've got a lot of applications in the back if
48 anybody would like to carry any back to their
49 communities. I believe it closes on March the.....
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those nomination
2 papers are back there in the back of the room. Would
3 you please fill one out.

4
5 MS. BURKE: We've got lots of
6 applications for the open nomination cycle. I think
7 that was the only -- oh, and the only other thing I
8 wanted to bring up with the nominations was within the
9 last 24 hours I received an update on this year's
10 appointments. As of today, only Bristol Bay RAC has
11 the completed appointments for their full Council.
12 Four Councils have received some but not all of their
13 appointments, including you folks. Five Councils have
14 received no appointment letters. Pat Pourchot is still
15 working with D.C. to get the appointments completed.
16 So that's the update on nominations.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's appalling.
19 Tim.

20
21 MR. GERVAIS: Can we send a
22 representative to North Pacific Fisheries Management
23 Council meeting in April?

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We were told by OSM
26 that budgets are tight for travel, but we'll drag David
27 back up here to answer that one about a representative
28 being sent to the North Pacific Fisheries Management
29 Council from the WIRAC.

30
31 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead,
34 Robert.

35
36 MR. R. WALKER: Yes. I asked you about
37 Board compensation stipends. You said to put it under
38 nominations and I did and it's not.....

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay. Yeah,
41 we're going a little bit too fast. Let me answer this
42 question real quick since we've got David at the mic.
43 We'll get to the stipend thing. Is there travel
44 funding to have a representative from the WIRAC attend
45 the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. Where
46 is that at?

47
48 MR. GERVAIS: Anchorage.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: In Anchorage.

1 DR. JENKINS: If it's in Anchorage,
2 it's relatively inexpensive, but I don't know if
3 there's funding for it, but I can find out and I will
4 find out.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: If possible, the
7 WIRAC would like representation there. Thank you.
8 We're going to move to the -- Robert. We're going to
9 work on this stipend issue.

10
11 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. I looked
12 at what our charter states. It says the Board will not
13 be compensated, but we did talk in the past year where
14 we could be compensated and I do believe this is an
15 issue where it's not going to go away because I have to
16 pay somebody to do my job when I'm gone and there are
17 times that I have to pay \$400. My check plus cash to
18 the guy that did my job. I mean I'm here representing
19 our communities, this and that on good faith, but it
20 seems like our government is not giving us -- the
21 Federal Subsistence Board or the RACs are not getting
22 compensated enough to take care of their personal needs
23 that has to be done when we do leave home. I'm not the
24 only one that is doing this also. There are other
25 board members here and other board members in other
26 districts too, Mr. Chairman.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I agree with you,
29 Robert, that everybody here is sacrificing time out
30 from wood cutting, trapping. Well, that doesn't -- no.
31 A load of wood is worth a lot of money. I'm taking
32 time out and money away from our family. My wife has
33 to take extra time off of work. She's losing money to
34 watch the baby and stuff. Everybody sacrifices for the
35 Councils. The FACA for the continental United States
36 does not reflect what these Regional Councils in rural
37 Alaska the cost of living and the sacrifices that are
38 made.

39
40 The meaningful role for representing a
41 region is not reflected in what the per diem rates are.
42 I feel that the Federal Subsistence Board should
43 advocate for these Councils. I'm sure that all the
44 Council members would say the same thing throughout the
45 whole state of Alaska.

46
47 So, for the record, this Council is
48 still unhappy with the resolution of what the per diem
49 rates are for what each individual Council member is
50 doing. So some people have to pay to have their dogs

1 watches or their kids watched or their job watched or
2 something. I spend extra money checking all my traps.
3 Out of cycle on my checking regime that I'm doing so
4 that I could come to this meeting. So there's certain
5 things in the background. It just looks like, oh,
6 those people in rural Alaska they just sit around and
7 read and sit by the fire all winter. That's a common
8 misperception of rural Alaska. No, we actually have a
9 life.

10

11 I'm not complaining about anything, but
12 I do feel that the Federal Subsistence Board should be
13 aware that the per diem rates that are allocated do not
14 reflect for many of the Council members the economic
15 reduction that each individual person is sacrificing.
16 For the record, I would like the.....

17

18 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have a motion to
21 transmit a.....

22

23 MR. R. WALKER: Second.

24

25 MS. PELKOLA: We've got a motion on the
26 floor?

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, we've got a
29 motion on the floor to transmit a letter to the Chair
30 of Federal Subsistence Board and the regional directors
31 on this per diem issue for the Council members and
32 reiterating the extreme sacrifice and expense that's
33 not reflecting in the FACA per diem rates that are
34 allocated.

35

36 We have a motion on the floor. Those
37 in favor of that motion signify by saying aye.

38

39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.

42

43 (No opposing votes)

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have two letters
46 here. Let's see, this is.....

47

48 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair. On the
49 nominations, a question. If our term is up this year
50 and we apply again, what is our deadline?

1 MS. BURKE: March 21st, I believe. If
2 your seat is up, I think -- Jack, you've already
3 reapplied. I think it's Ray and Tim. If there was an
4 application in your blue folder, you're up and you need
5 to fill it out and give it to me. Just send it to me.

6
7 MR. COLLINS: But we have to do that by
8 the end of March?

9
10 MS. BURKE: Yes. Also, one thing
11 that's easy for you incumbents is if you would like me
12 to use the one from last time, you don't have to fill
13 it out again. I just need something, an email or fax,
14 something on the record that I can attach to your old
15 one and you can use the same one. I think Carl has
16 done that in the past.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The map we have is
19 not reflecting what the boundary map is. This is a map
20 of Robert s Proposal WP14-32.

21
22 MS. BURKE: We'll double check that
23 with Lisa.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Lisa gave us that
26 map this morning.

27
28 MS. FEYEREISEN: (Away from microphone)

29
30 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Robert.

33
34 MR. R. WALKER: One other thing that we
35 talked about to put on the agenda too was that -- I'm
36 just curious what our Board of Game and our Federal
37 Subsistence, their yearly wages, what is OSM wages.
38 Under the Freedom of Information Act, I mean I'm just
39 kind of curious to see where we are with these people
40 compared to what we're asking for. Just a few dollars
41 compared to what they're doing. That is my other
42 question, the one that you and I talked about.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Well, Board
45 of Game, Board of Fish, they're under a whole different
46 system. But what we're asking is that the FACA
47 analysis for per diem for Alaska do not reflect what
48 we're due compensation for what we're forgoing to
49 attend meetings. So we want quality individuals to be
50 at our meetings, so that's what our letter will be

1 entailing.

2

3 The Chair will entertain a motion to
4 adjourn the meeting.

5

6 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

7

8 MR. COLLINS: Second.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.

11 I think we've had a great meeting. Those in favor of

12 adjournment signify by saying aye.

13

14 IN UNISON: Aye.

15

16 (Off record)

17

18 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 139 through 325 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II, taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC on the 26th day of February, 2014;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 14th day of March 2014.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 9/16/14