

1 SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6
7 Aurora Inn
8 Nome, Alaska
9 October 10, 2007
10 8:15 o'clock a.m.
11

12
13 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

14
15 Mike Quinn, Chairman
16 Peter Buck
17 Thomas Gray
18 Peter Martin
19 Elizabeth Mokiuk
20 Myron Savetilik
21 Elmer Seetot
22
23 Regional Council Coordinator - Barbara Armstrong
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 Recorded and transcribed by:
45
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
47 700 W. 2nd Avenue
48 Anchorage, AK 99501
49 907-243-0668/907-227-5312
50 jpk@gci.net/sahile@gci.net

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Nome, Alaska - 10/10/2007)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN QUINN: I'm calling the meeting to order at this particular time, whatever it is.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: 8:15.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: The next order is roll call and establishment of quorum. However, our secretary is not here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I'll do the roll call.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That's the other thing we need to do is please turn your mikes on and off. Peter Martin, Sr.

MR. MARTIN: Here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Mike Quinn.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Clifford Weyiouanna is excused. Peter Buck.

MR. BUCK: Here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Myron Savetilik.

MR. SAVETILIK: Here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Elmer Seetot.

MR. SEETOT: Here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Elizabeth Mokiyuk.

(No response) (Arrives later)

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Thomas Gray.

1 MR. GRAY: Here.
2
3 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Vance is also
4 excused. He's out traveling. You have a quorum, sir.
5
6 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thanks, Barb. Well,
7 I'm supposed to welcome everybody here, so welcome to
8 our meeting. We'll have some quick introductions. Do
9 we want to go through the Council members? I'll start
10 with myself, Mike Quinn. I'm from Nome. I'm acting
11 chair and just a local resident.
12
13 MR. BUCK: Peter Buck, White Mountain.
14
15 MR. SAVETILIK: Myron of Shaktoolik.
16
17 MR. MARTIN: Peter Martin, Stebbins.
18
19 MR. SEETOT: (In Inupiat)
20
21 MR. GRAY: I'm Tom Gray. I don't
22 really know where I'm from right now.
23
24 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Do we want to
25 do everybody else, too?
26
27 MR. THOMPSON: Mike Thompson, National
28 Park Service, Nome.
29
30 MR. ADKISSON: Ken Adkisson, National
31 Park Service.
32
33 MS. PETRIVELLI: Pat Petrivelli, Bureau
34 of Indian Affairs, Anchorage.
35
36 MR. CHEN: Good morning everyone. I'm
37 Glenn Chen from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
38
39 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Helen Armstrong.
40 I'm the anthropologist that serves this Council from
41 OSM.
42
43 MR. AHMASUK: Austin Ahmasuk, Kawerak
44 subsistence.
45
46 MR. RISDAHL: Greg Risdahl, OSM
47 biologist.
48
49 MR. GORN: Tony Gorn. I'm the Unit 22
50 area biologist.

1 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Barb Armstrong,
2 coordinator for Seward Pen. Good morning.

3
4 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Now we're going
5 to review and hopefully adopt the minutes from the last
6 meeting. Again, our secretary is not here. I think
7 I'll assume that everybody has had an opportunity to
8 review these minutes since they've received these --
9 when I say everybody, I mean our RAC members here,
10 reviewed these minutes since they've received them
11 ahead of time. So, can I entertain a motion to either
12 approve or not approve the minutes from the last
13 meeting.

14
15 MR. GRAY: Move.

16
17 MR. SAVETILIK: I second.

18
19 CHAIRMAN QUINN: I'll just go ahead and
20 call the question. Motion to approve the minutes from
21 the last meeting. All those in favor say aye.

22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24
25 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Opposed.

26
27 (No opposing votes)

28
29 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Motion carries. Oh,
30 we were supposed to adopt our agenda.

31
32 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

33
34 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Add new items
35 under 15. Is that where you want to add the five
36 proposals because No. 9 is fisheries proposals.

37
38 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. We don't
39 have any -- we're just calling the proposal to change
40 subsistence wildlife regulations and we do have three
41 fish proposals that we would like to add in. And Mr.
42 Don Rivard from Anchorage is going to call us here,
43 that's why that phone is there in front of you, from
44 Anchorage to present 13, 14, 15 and 16 to you. Helen
45 Armstrong will present No. 17. This would happen this
46 morning at 10:00 if that is okay with you, starting at
47 10:00.

48
49 Thank you.

50

1 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. So that will be
2 our agenda as you see published in front of you with
3 the additions that Barb just mentioned.
4
5 MR. GRAY: So move.
6
7 CHAIRMAN QUINN: We have a motion to
8 approve.
9
10 MR. SAVETILIK: Second.
11
12 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Seconded and question.
13 All those in favor say aye.
14
15 IN UNISON: Aye.
16
17 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Opposed.
18
19 (No opposing votes)
20
21 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Motion carries. Now
22 my report as the Chair. There's an 805(c) letter from
23 Mr. Fleagle covering the action. Well, everybody can
24 read that for themselves. We had some proposals at
25 that meeting or at least we commented on some. So we
26 can all go through that on our own. Annual report
27 reply, Page 23. This is a report from Department of
28 Interior. It covers a couple studies. Includes our
29 input. That's all in here. So that's all I need to do
30 there, Barb, is mention this stuff?
31
32 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.
33
34 MR. SAVETILIK: Mr. Quinn, I've got a
35 question for you.
36
37 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.
38
39 MR. SAVETILIK: On the letter dated
40 August 6, 2007, did you respond to that letter?
41
42 CHAIRMAN QUINN: You're going to have
43 to help me out and tell me which one you're talking
44 about.
45
46 MR. SAVETILIK: The one that was
47 written to you August 6th.
48
49 CHAIRMAN QUINN: It's on Page 23. It's
50 a response from them to our annual report dated October

1 30th, 2006.

2

3 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Excuse me, Mr.
4 Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

7

8 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: The annual report
9 that you submit is always answered by the Federal
10 Subsistence Board and this is their response to your
11 annual report. You see Issue 1, Issue 2, 3, 4, 5,
12 those are what you asked and the response is what they
13 wrote back to you in responding to your issues, to your
14 concerns. That's what the annual report is.

15

16 MR. SAVETILIK: Thank you.

17

18 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You're welcome.
19 Okay, Mr. Chair.

20

21 CHAIRMAN QUINN: So now we're onto No.
22 7, election of officers. If you all remember at our
23 last meeting we tabled -- is that the correct term?

24

25 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

26

27 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Tabled the election
28 until this meeting, but we had also discussed possibly
29 waiting until the winter meeting because we would
30 hopefully have more members present at that time. Is
31 that still correct, Barb?

32

33 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yes, it is. You
34 should have a full board members this coming winter
35 meeting in February.

36

37 CHAIRMAN QUINN: There will be 10?

38

39 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: There should be 10
40 members. Right now we have 7 Council members who have
41 three vacant seats for the moment, then you should have
42 a full board coming this winter meeting in February.

43

44 CHAIRMAN QUINN: On Page 3 of your book
45 is the current list of seats and members. I see one,
46 two, three.....

47

48 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: If Cliff and Vance
49 would have come to this meeting, this would have been
50 their last meeting. We have Grace's vacant seat.

1 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Grace's seat is still
2 vacant and then also Myron's seat and Peter Buck's
3 seat, this is their last meeting as well unless they
4 reapply. Anyway, I see four seats that expire after
5 this meeting, so those four seats will either be
6 reappointed or replaced.

7
8 MR. SAVETILIK: Just for your
9 information, Mr. Chair, I reapplied for my seat.

10
11 MR. MARTIN: I have a question. If the
12 term ends '08, when that ends is the beginning of '08
13 or the end of '08?

14
15 CHAIRMAN QUINN: The end of '08.

16
17 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: The end of '08.
18 You're here until December '08, so your term -- we
19 should be sending out some new applications if you're
20 still interested to be on the Council to you. You'll
21 fill those back out and then send them back in if
22 you're still interested to be on the Council.

23
24 MR. GRAY: I'll move to table elections
25 until the winter meeting.

26
27 MR. SEETOT: Second.

28
29 MR. SAVETILIK: Question.

30
31 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Motion has been made
32 and seconded. Before we call the question, Myron, I'll
33 just ask for any discussion.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 CHAIRMAN QUINN: If there's none, then
38 question. All those in favor of tabling until the next
39 meeting say aye.

40
41 IN UNISON: Aye.

42
43 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Opposed.

44
45 (No opposing votes)

46
47 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Motion carries. Next
48 is village concerns. We'll start with Peter and then
49 move around the table. Each of you that represent a
50 village can air your concerns.

1 MR. BUCK: I have no concerns right
2 now. I'd just like to say that the moose population in
3 our area has dropped. The fishing hasn't been great
4 either. Thank you.

5
6 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Myron.

7
8 MR. SAVETILIK: I don't have any, but
9 our subsistence way of life is kind of different right
10 now because of our weather. You know, it's been like
11 we're changing into more or less warmer weather right
12 now and the changes that have come we've been trying to
13 adapt to it and with all the hunting and berry picking
14 we've kind of got used to it and just to where we need
15 to continue on what we need to do. Thank you.

16
17 MR. MARTIN: This summer bears have
18 been getting too close to our community and we've been
19 having that problem. I'd like to see more control over
20 that. It's preventing our people from going out and
21 doing their subsistence, like picking greens and
22 berries. Our moose season, I think, was successful.
23 The opening of that Yukon cultural and traditional
24 trade really helped some of our hunters too. That's
25 all I have.

26
27 MR. SEETOT: I don't really have any
28 concerns from the village of Brevig Mission concerning
29 game on Federal land. I guess over the years Federal
30 management of musk ox and also State management of musk
31 ox is not being used entirely by the residents of both
32 Brevig Mission and Teller. I think that the use of
33 musk ox is still new to our residents and they don't
34 wholly utilize the animal other than certain people
35 that have a history of harvesting and using the animal.
36 Pretty much that's all I have.

37
38 CHAIRMAN QUINN: My seat's a Nome seat.
39 I haven't heard a lot of concerns expressed at the
40 Federal level. Most of the people I know that hunt
41 around Nome are used to dealing with the State system.
42 There's not a lot of Federal land around Nome as well.
43 I guess I haven't heard too many concerns. Moose
44 populations are climbing to some extent and that's
45 making everybody happy, so I suppose when they start to
46 fall, then we'll hear more concerns.

47
48 MR. GRAY: I've represented White
49 Mountain for years. Our moose population seems to be
50 starting to come back, although we have a bad wolf

1 problem starting, getting a foothold back home and it's
2 not going to be good for the resource that our people
3 depend on. So wolves are an issue. They're an issue
4 to me as a reindeer herder. But for the moose to
5 rebound, they're an issue.

6

7 One of the guys talked about bears. We
8 have bears in our dump. For the most part, the bears
9 that we're having problems with are young bears.
10 Rubber bullets and those kind of things that the system
11 have handed out hasn't worked in the past and there
12 needs to be a solution.

13

14 Musk ox, our people are learning how to
15 hunt musk ox. White Mountain has always capitalized on
16 musk ox. Our people are learning that if we shoot
17 young musk ox, we get a better product. So we're going
18 to have an older population of bulls in that herd
19 eventually that's going to be an issue. I personally
20 have picked up quite a few skulls around the country
21 from dead musk ox. I've probably picked up half a
22 dozen skulls over the years and more of them in recent
23 years and these are big animals that have died in the
24 wintertime.

25

26 Fish, you know, I guess the silver
27 salmon back home, supposedly they're on the rebound,
28 but I'm a fishing guide, I can't say they're on the
29 rebound. You know, we have a poor silver salmon stock.
30 The pinks, there's lots of pinks. You know, that
31 fishery is not a problem. Chums have always declined
32 over the years. I think we've kind of hit bottom and I
33 don't think the chums are a big issue to the people of
34 White Mountain.

35

36 Grayling, we've got tons and tons of
37 grayling. Whether that's affecting the other
38 fisheries, I don't know, but our river system has a big
39 grayling stock and maybe we should look at some studies
40 of that fishery to see if grayling are hampering other
41 fisheries, other resources.

42

43 Other than that, you know, nothing
44 comes to mind.

45

46 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay, thanks. I want
47 to recognize Elizabeth. Liz, you get a chance to air
48 village concerns. Have at it.

49

50 MS. MOKIYUK: So far nobody complained

1 about anything. I talked to everybody, but no
2 concerns.

3

4 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. I don't even
5 know if we have any Federal seasons out on St. Lawrence
6 Island.

7

8 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No.

9

10 CHAIRMAN QUINN: But there are a lot of
11 people from Savoonga and Gambell who live here in Nome
12 and the area, so there's plenty of St. Lawrence Island
13 people who participate in our Federal hunts. It's nice
14 to have you on this RAC, Elizabeth.

15

16 All right. That's our village
17 concerns. Move on to No. 9, but we don't have any
18 fisheries proposals at this time to discuss.

19

20 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You have three fish
21 proposals that you're going to be doing at 10:00
22 o'clock.

23

24 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Oh, at 10:00 o'clock.

25

26 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Barb, we could do
27 17.

28

29 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Helen is
30 here.

31

32 CHAIRMAN QUINN: You're here, Helen.
33 We'll just go ahead and do 17.

34

35 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Did everybody get a
36 copy? My name is Helen Armstrong. I'm with the Office
37 of Subsistence Management. This proposal is what we
38 call a crossover proposal because it mostly affects
39 other regions, all of the regions that are on the Yukon
40 River, but because we have Stebbins and St. Michael,
41 who also fish down in that area, we then bring it to
42 this Council too. For most of you, this won't be as
43 much of a concern than it would be for Stebbins and St.
44 Michael. I'll probably give a shortened version
45 because of that, but if you have more questions,
46 certainly let me know.

47

48 Proposal FP08-17 was submitted by the
49 Yukon River Drainage Fisheries Association and it
50 requests that in the Yukon River drainage community

1 elders 60 years of age and older who are participating
2 in salmon fishing not be subject to the windowed
3 subsistence fishing schedules and therefore be able to
4 subsistence fish 24 hours per day, seven days per week.
5 The proposal also includes the provision that the elder
6 may be assisted by one individual less than age 60.

7
8 The proposed regulation would read:
9 Elders who are age 60 or older and are participating in
10 the fishing activity themselves are not subject to the
11 windows fishing schedule, as set out in the Alaska
12 Administrative Code (5 AA 01.210(b)). One individual
13 less than age 60 may assist one or more elders age 60
14 or older with their fishing activity.

15
16 The proposal would not apply to
17 subsistence fishing closures before, during and after
18 commercial openings. Right now the subsistence fishing
19 schedule requires fishers to stop fishing and remove
20 their gear from the water at the end of every
21 subsistence period and that the gear be re-deployed no
22 earlier than at the beginning of each subsistence
23 period. This can be a real physical hardship,
24 especially when they're setting a gillnet if they don't
25 have someone to assist them.

26
27 If there are poor weather conditions,
28 then it can also impair the ability to harvest an
29 adequate amount of salmon and then not being able to
30 fish when the fish are available in abundance increases
31 both time and associated fishing costs. Having to fish
32 on a calendar schedule is inconsistent with their
33 traditional and cultural fishing pattern of fishing
34 whenever they choose to.

35
36 When YRDFA made the proposal, they
37 didn't specifically say what kind of fishing gear they
38 were talking about. They just talked about fishing
39 activity. I did try to find out from them but I wasn't
40 able to clarify whether they had some particular gear
41 type allowed or not. The allowable gear type under
42 Federal regulations to harvest salmon in the Yukon
43 River are drift and setnet gillnets, beach seines, fish
44 wheel and rod and reel. Rod and reel they're already
45 allowed to use 24 hours a day, seven days a week, so
46 this wouldn't apply. Beach seining isn't a common
47 method anyway. Fish wheels are used primarily in the
48 middle and upper portions of the drainage above Holy
49 Cross. So this really was meant to apply to gillnets
50 and it's unclear whether set or drift gillnets.

1 I talked to a lot of people about this
2 proposal because this isn't an area I actually normally
3 do analyses in and I'll be honest, I don't really know
4 a whole lot about fishing in the Yukon River, but it
5 appeared that the biggest affect this would have would
6 be for set gillnet because drift gillnet they still
7 have to -- there is still the physical hardship of
8 putting the nets out, pulling them in, so there
9 wouldn't be an advantage to being able to fish all the
10 time. There wouldn't be that physical advantage for
11 drift gillnets. The same thing with fish wheels.

12
13 Setnet fishing is a traditional method
14 of taking salmon and is most common in the Lower Yukon
15 River. Prior to the 1970s they were the primary gear
16 that was used, but today drift gillnets are more widely
17 used.

18
19 There really aren't that many numbers
20 of productive setnet sites available and it appears
21 that the advantage would only really be in this for
22 people who are setnet fishing for a physical advantage
23 and, therefore, providing an exemption for elders 60
24 years and older to the subsistence window schedule
25 would exempt them from the requirement to stop fishing
26 and remove their setnets from the water at the end of
27 every subsistence period and reset them at the
28 beginning of every subsistence period.

29
30 Just a few little points in the
31 background. We don't actually have any age-related
32 regs in the fisheries regulations in the Federal
33 program. There is one in the State program and it's in
34 Naknek where they have an elders-only fishery. That's
35 not actually in the analysis. I found that out after
36 the YK meeting. We do have some age-related
37 regulations in the Federal program for hunting for
38 Units 11 and 12 for sheep hunt for elders who are 60
39 years of age or older, then we do have age-related
40 references for 60 or older. You can get a free
41 permanent identification card issued by ADF&G and then
42 you don't have to have a license when you're 60 years
43 of age or older or under 16.

44
45 The reason that YRDFA passed this, this
46 has been an issue that's come up quite often for quite
47 a few years that the elders should have some kind of
48 exemption. I also found out that there's some
49 consideration for getting rid of the whole windows
50 schedule entirely. It's a possibility they might do

1 that as well, so then this would be a moot point.

2

3 If this proposal is adopted, it
4 wouldn't be expected to significantly increase
5 subsistence harvest. It's expected more that the
6 harvest would be traditional for elderly participants.
7 We really don't know how many people would participate,
8 but there would be some increase in harvest, but I
9 think when you compare it to what the commercial
10 harvest is, it's not expected to be really significant.

11

12 Since the recognized practice of
13 subsistence fishing is to only harvest what's needed,
14 so it's not expected that they would take more than
15 what they already are taking. There is an unlimited
16 number of salmon that you can harvest in the Yukon
17 River. There's no limit on what they're harvesting.
18 They already can harvest as much as they need as long
19 as they're able to get that.

20

21 Eliminating the subsistence window
22 schedule for elders would be consistent with
23 traditional fishing practices. That is that people
24 would have the opportunity to continuously fish when
25 the fish are present and they could decide for
26 themselves when to fish rather than following a
27 calendar regulatory schedule. Deference would be given
28 to elders, which is a common practice amongst Alaska
29 Natives, and adopting this proposal is not expected to
30 affect commercial or sport harvest since no significant
31 increase in subsistence harvest is anticipated.

32

33 Adopting this proposal would not affect
34 Federal subsistence regulations in Districts 1 through
35 3, requiring the subsistence caught chinook salmon must
36 be marked by removing the dorsal fin. So that would
37 remain in place.

38

39 Adopting the proposal could potentially
40 increase the workload for law enforcement officers, as
41 they could not assess from the air whether nets were
42 legally or illegally in the water. There may be more
43 time spent verifying whether the fishers were elders or
44 not and/or fishing under Federal regulations. Right
45 now it's already legal to use four-inch mesh gear
46 during the windows 24/7, so they're already actually
47 allowed to be having nets out there, but only with
48 four-inch mesh gear, so that's already requiring ground
49 law enforcement effort.

50

1 If this were only applied to set
2 gillnet fishing, then there would be less of a law
3 enforcement effort that would have to occur. If it
4 were not limited to set gillnet fishing, then the law
5 enforcement would need to travel on the river to locate
6 fishers with drift gillnets, which would be a little
7 more difficult than finding a stationary setnet site.
8

9 If this proposal is adopted, then law
10 enforcement could be made easier if a modification were
11 added to require elders and the assistant to carry
12 identification to verify the age of the elder and
13 residency to determine if the fisher and the assistant
14 are Federally qualified subsistence users. Law
15 enforcement would also be made easier if the elder's
16 name and address is put on the nets.
17

18 There is no information, as I said,
19 about how many fishers this would affect, but it's
20 probable that a large percentage of extended families
21 may have at least one elder who would be exempt from the
22 windowed subsistence fishing schedule. Limiting this
23 gear to only setnets would help minimize any effects.
24

25 Adopting this proposal would likely
26 have a greater effect in Districts 1 through 3 than the
27 upriver fishing Districts 4 through 6 because the lower
28 river is restricted more by the fishing schedule.
29

30 So the OSM preliminary conclusion is to
31 support the proposal FP08-17 with modification. There
32 are a number of modifications. This is on the second
33 to last page of the analysis. The exemption may be
34 discontinued through Federal Special Action by the
35 Federal in-season manager. If there were problems, if
36 we found there was an issue happening, then by giving
37 the authority to the Federal in-season manager they
38 could deal with it right away and close the fishery or
39 close the elder exemption.
40

41 No. 1 would be the exemption may be
42 discontinued through Federal Special
43 Action by the Federal in-season
44 manager.
45

46 No. 2 Only apply to fishing with set
47 gillnets.
48

49 No. 3 Require that the elder and the
50 assistant be Federally qualified

1 subsistence users.
2
3 No. 4 The elder must be in the boat
4 when the net is being set, checked or
5 retrieved.
6
7 No. 5 Elders must have identification
8 indicating their age and residency in
9 their possession.
10
11 No. 5 Assistants must have
12 identification in their possession
13 indicating residency.
14
15 No. 7 The set gillnet must be labeled
16 with the elder's first initial, last
17 name and address.
18
19 Most of those modifications I talked
20 about we added that the elder had to be in the boat
21 when the net is being set, checked or retrieved just
22 to eliminate the possibility that somebody could be
23 down fishing for the elder, the elder could be back at
24 home, well, I'm fishing for the elder. To eliminate
25 that kind of thing from happening. And just making
26 sure people have their identification saying that
27 they're a Federally qualified subsistence user would
28 help law enforcement efforts.
29
30 Mr. Chair, that concludes my
31 presentation and I'm open to questions.
32
33 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thanks, Helen. This
34 is a Federal proposal, so it only applies on the parts
35 of the river that are managed by the Feds, right?
36
37 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Most of the river is
38 managed by the Federal government. There's not a map
39 in the proposal. Do you all have the fish books?
40
41 CHAIRMAN QUINN: We should. It's in
42 this grey binder.
43
44 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: The Yukon River
45 northern area, Page 28 and 29 -- actually, I spoke
46 wrong. In the Yukon River on Map 4 on Page 28 where it
47 is in the pink area, that's all Federally managed.
48 Those are Districts 1, 2 and 3 in the lower river.
49 That's the area where you have more setnets than the
50 rest of the river. Then the river goes on up and you

1 can see in Map 5 wherever the Yukon River goes through
2 areas where there's pink or the bluish purple color, in
3 those areas, then it's also Federally managed. So
4 there's a pretty significant portion of the Yukon River
5 that's under Federal management.

6

7 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, yeah, you look
8 at this map and there's a significant portion that
9 isn't under Federal management.

10

11 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: True. Depends on
12 where you are. But it does apply to a large percentage
13 of the river.

14

15 CHAIRMAN QUINN: And currently don't
16 the Feds allow the State to set the windows? Even
17 though it's Federal waters, the State is the one
18 setting the subsistence commercial and just plain
19 closed windows.

20

21 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I believe that's
22 correct, and Steve can tell me if I'm wrong, but I
23 think there's consultation done with the in-season
24 manager. Is that correct, Steve?

25

26 MR. KLEIN: Very much so.

27

28 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

29

30 MR. GRAY: Nobody's here that put this
31 proposal together?

32

33 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No. I don't think
34 anybody here is from YRDFA that I know of.

35

36 MR. GRAY: The only thing that I'm
37 really concerned about here is you're assuming that
38 it's setnets through your evaluation. To adopt
39 something and then come back later and this group says,
40 hey, we wanted driftnet included in this thing, so this
41 issue is going to be presented to another board down
42 somewhere else and addressed. I'm just a little bit
43 reserved about this driftnet thing.

44

45 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair.

46

47 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

48

49 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Let me read to you
50 what YRDFA -- they had a resolution, what they said,

1 boat when it's time to check the net? That's one of
2 the requirements. It was suggested that in a
3 discussion that with modification would be going on
4 with this. If a person has a disability, consider
5 that.

6
7 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I think that's a
8 valid point. It's a really good point.

9
10 MR. GRAY: Is there a copy of what the
11 Yukon adopted somewhere that we could look at?

12
13 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mark, did you bring
14 that with you? It's here on this yellow sheet. I can
15 go ahead and read it for you. It passed unanimously.
16 Their modification was elders who are age 60 or older
17 and are fishing under Federal regulations themselves,
18 and those directly assisting the elder are not subject
19 to the windows fishing schedule as set out in Alaska
20 Administrative Code (5 AA 01.210(b).

21
22 So they didn't limit it to one person
23 assisting. They didn't care for that. I went through
24 and read the transcript so I could understand what
25 their thoughts were. They didn't want it to be only
26 one assistant and they agreed totally with what you're
27 saying, Tom, that there shouldn't be any modifications,
28 it's just elders who are age 60 or older are not
29 subject to the windows fishing schedule.

30
31 So that was the Yukon-Kuskokwim Council
32 recommendation. It will still go before the Eastern
33 Interior and the Western Interior Councils, but they
34 aren't meeting until later, so we don't have the
35 opportunity to know what they're thinking as well.

36
37 CHAIRMAN QUINN: It's a pretty
38 complicated issue. I've got some experience in this
39 because I've been down on the Delta and helped harvest
40 fish and I've also lived in Ruby and fished around
41 there. The windows aren't a new thing. People on the
42 Yukon River have been dealing with fishing windows,
43 commercial openings/closings, subsistence openings and
44 closings for generations, just like this place.

45
46 At one time that was big money down
47 there, there was money to be made and things have
48 changed. There's not a lot of money to be made
49 anymore, but there's people still in areas who still
50 want to rely on commercial fishing. The government has

1 a big job to do there trying to balance people who are
2 screaming for commercial openings and people who are
3 screaming for no commercial openings. There's people
4 upriver, people downriver.

5
6 For those of us who don't live and
7 communicate with that area on a regular basis, there's
8 just so much involved in this I think it's really hard
9 for outsiders to understand it all well enough to make
10 a real informed decision. However, we have the
11 opportunity to support the original proposal, support
12 the modification, the proposal with modification, or we
13 can take no action either.

14
15 Does anybody want to make a motion.

16
17 MR. SEETOT: It's not pertaining to a
18 motion, just more on the discussion side. Some elders,
19 I guess they do have disabilities that prevent them
20 from being out -- still find it a hardship for them to
21 be physically in the boat. I consider myself young and
22 spry, but over the years, when I was growing up, my
23 parents, community members, told me do this, do that,
24 dress warm, don't get your feet wet, stuff like that.
25 We, as young children, we would have minds of our own,
26 think that, oh, that's just talk I hear a lot of times.
27 Now, over the years, I have the same physical
28 disabilities they told me. You get your feet wet,
29 you'll have achy feet when you grow older. This I
30 found out, when you don't dress warm on your lower
31 extremities, you know, your kneecaps get arthritis or
32 something. Or when the low pressure comes around, you
33 have bad aches that bother you. These are things that
34 were taught to us by our ancestors, by our parents, but
35 we, as some people sometimes think, we know a lot
36 better. I have a grade school education, I have a high
37 school education, I know more than they, but they have
38 gotten education from people before them and still
39 continues to carry on, which I hopefully will continue
40 to carry on to my children.

41
42 Elders with disabilities or handicaps,
43 I think that the discussion has been kind of discussed,
44 but I think that should also be looked at. If we, as
45 an Advisory Council for the Federal Subsistence Board,
46 act on this, then I think that, you know, oh, we did
47 that with the Yukon Fishery, maybe we could do it with
48 the other things, the other areas. Which would be
49 beneficial for our people because not everyone can deal
50 with the requirements and stuff like that. They enjoy

1 the place where they live, but the physical
2 disabilities that they incur over the years, you know,
3 sometimes make it difficult for them to actually be
4 physically in the boat.

5
6 When regulations come around, we think,
7 oh, this is set by the State and the Federal government
8 agencies, maybe we should follow it. I, myself, have a
9 salmon permit from Alaska Department of Fish and Game
10 for them to at least keep track of how many fish I
11 catch. I'm expected to catch a certain limit because
12 of my physical abilities, but other circumstances come
13 into play, like your ability to actually do these
14 things.

15
16 In my head I already had six bundles of
17 fish to dry before the season even started. Over the
18 past summer I just seined only once, so there goes my
19 six bundles of fish in my head. Just pretty much
20 subsistence use. So personal experience over the
21 years, the majority of the fish that we use in Brevig
22 Mission/Teller area is pretty much dried, but they're
23 in a drying season. It's kind of moist all the time.
24 You work on the fish, especially in the warm weather,
25 you know, you get all these bottle flies or whatever
26 they call those, deposit their eggs to continue to
27 increase. But these are some of the things we kind of
28 look at.

29
30 We go by our regulations written in the
31 book. I, myself, try to adhere to these regulations,
32 but sometimes, oh, maybe I never get my 200 fish, maybe
33 I should carry on over to next year. I should have
34 pretty close to 2,000 fish by now. I didn't fish the
35 year before that, that way, you know, the cycle goes
36 on. But we're pretty much regulated by weather and our
37 abilities sometimes to do these things or other
38 circumstances arise during the season.

39
40 So these numbers that are put by State
41 and Federal agencies, that's part of their job to at
42 least estimate or what they will predict for the coming
43 year to actually set the harvest. But individuals
44 sometime, okay, I have a requirement or quota of so
45 much fish, but the ability to fish sometimes, you know,
46 it pretty much overwhelms you. Okay, there goes
47 another 20,000 fish that pass through or there's 200
48 fish that I forgot to catch during the past summer.
49 They will go on to reproduce for the future.

50

1 I think the biologists that work for
2 these agencies think, oh, every permit will catch at
3 least 200, but what they don't look at is, oh, it's
4 been a bad season, other circumstances come into play
5 and that's -- sometimes they just kind of overlook
6 that.

7
8 But with the physical disabilities
9 sometimes I guess it's pretty hard for individual
10 elders to actually be in the boat, but this is a
11 proposal put out by someone, you know, away from our
12 area. If actions like this are taken by a RAC up here,
13 then I would that it would open other areas of interest
14 for the harvest of fish and game in our region.

15
16 MR. BUCK: On Proposal 17, with the
17 Yukon RAC passing this unanimously, I would like to
18 support this proposal.

19
20 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Can you be more
21 specific, Peter, and make an actual motion.

22
23 MR. GRAY: Are you talking about
24 supporting the proposal that they passed or the one
25 that's proposed to us?

26
27 MR. BUCK: I was thinking about the
28 proposal that they passed and I don't see any
29 difference.

30
31 CHAIRMAN QUINN: They supported the
32 original proposal, which is this right here.

33
34 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. Actually
35 they modified that as well because the original
36 proposal said that there could be one assistant and in
37 their modification they didn't limit it to one. They
38 just said those directly assisting the elder are not
39 subjected to the windows. They specifically did not
40 want to limit it to one assistant.

41
42 MR. GRAY: Now your proposal that
43 you're bringing to the table says there can be a 60
44 year old elder and only one other person in that boat?

45
46 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That was the
47 original proponent, YRDFA's proposal, was an elder plus
48 one assistant under the age of 60. We supported that
49 modification.

50

1 MR. GRAY: So if I've got five kids and
2 I'm 60 years old and I go out and set a net, I can't
3 take my five kids out and pull that net.

4
5 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's correct. You
6 can only have one assistant. That was the limitation
7 YRDFA put in it.

8
9 MR. GRAY: That's not subsistence.

10
11 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And I think that's
12 why the YK-Delta Council eliminated that restriction.
13 They modified the proposal.

14
15 MR. GRAY: Pete, you're back on the
16 table here. What was that motion you were going to do?

17
18 (Pause)

19
20 MR. GRAY: Okay. I'll make a motion
21 that we support the proposal that the Yukon RAC passed.
22 Justification, I have a belief in subsistence and I
23 think that proposal was built around what subsistence
24 really is and the proposal that was just presented to
25 us infringes on what subsistence is and I don't believe
26 in supporting something that infringes on subsistence.
27 Everybody at this table right here are subsistence
28 users. Anyway, I make that motion that we support
29 whatever this is here.

30
31 MR. MARTIN: Second.

32
33 CHAIRMAN QUINN: The motion's been made
34 and seconded. Discussion.

35
36 MR. SAVETILIK: Question.

37
38 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Not yet, Myron.
39 Helen, I just want one more clarification. The
40 proposal made by YRDFA applies to the whole river. I
41 think we're somewhat used to dealing with proposals
42 that apply to Unit 22 or Unit 18. This proposal
43 applies to the whole river, is that correct?

44
45 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's correct.

46
47 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Is that possible?
48 Isn't fishing still broken up into -- or maybe it's
49 not.

50

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It can be applied to
2 the whole river, yes. There are district-specific
3 regulations along the river, but this can be applied to
4 the whole river.

5
6 CHAIRMAN QUINN: The river's broken up
7 into Y-1, Y-2, 3, 4 and 5, I think. There's five
8 districts from the mouth to the border.

9
10 MR. KLEIN: Six.

11
12 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Oh, six. Oh, the
13 Tanana. All right. So, any other discussion.

14 (No comments)

15
16
17 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Those in favor of the
18 motion say aye.

19
20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21
22 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Opposed.

23
24 (No opposing votes)

25
26 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Motion carries. We've
27 been asked to allow our BLM person give his report.
28 I'd like to recognize Mr. Niles Cesar. He's a member
29 of the Federal Subsistence Board. Should I say that
30 you're our boss or are we your boss.

31
32 (Laughter)

33
34 CHAIRMAN QUINN: And, Mr. Cesar, your
35 name has been in the news lately. I kind of enjoyed
36 that. You're actually doing stuff that we can hear
37 about in the news instead of just sitting in your
38 office. I think that stuff should happen more often.
39 You should encourage Tom to do stuff to get his name in
40 the news. Okay, so Mr. Sparks will give a report.

41
42 MR. SPARKS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for
43 allowing me to come up a little early. I'm actually
44 supposed to do a field exam with a qualified Native
45 veteran for an alternative parcel. So thank you very
46 much. I've just got a quick written report here. I'm
47 not going to go over it in detail. You can read it at
48 your leisure. There's one type on the total musk ox
49 that Mr. Gorn pointed out. Thank you very much, Tony.
50 Instead of 2699 it should be 2,688.

1 Just a little comment about the moose
2 survey in the fall. We had intended to do a survey
3 down by Unalakleet and poor weather didn't allow us to
4 do that. Bruce Seppe, the Anchorage Field Office's
5 biologist, was there a couple days, but the weather
6 wasn't conducive. There's a Kobuk-Seward Peninsula
7 Management Plan. The final environmental impact
8 statement is out. There will be a protest period if
9 you have standing, if you've been to a meeting or if
10 one of the decisions in the plan affects you directly,
11 you would have standing. So we're going to go through
12 a protest period and then a final record of decision
13 will be out and we're anticipating that will be in
14 April or June of this next year.

15
16 There's also a new plan that BLM is
17 going to do that will affect the southern Norton Sound.
18 It's currently called the Bering Sea Western Interior
19 Resource Management Plan and we're hoping to get
20 funding for that FY09.

21
22 Just a little thing that the board may
23 be interested in is that you're all aware of the
24 cooperative Musk ox Management Plan and the allocation
25 between the State and Federal government permits.
26 There's still permits available through the Federal
27 system. Our biologist in Anchorage is the one who
28 hands out those tags. There's 10 available and two so
29 far have been passed out, so just something to keep in
30 mind. That's from Koyuk on to Nome who would qualify.
31 So Koyuk or Golovin, Elam, White Mountain or Nome, if
32 there's residents there who are interested in obtaining
33 those tags, the season will go through March just like
34 it's been in the past.

35
36 Anchorage Field Office is looking at
37 filling a subsistence coordinator position that Mr.
38 Denton held and he left the agency. Just a small
39 comment that our land transfer in the Bering Straits
40 region is going quite well. We've closed a number of
41 villages. Over half of the villages in the Bering
42 Straits region. By closed it means all their
43 entitlement under the Native Claims Settlement Act
44 that's been transferred to them under a final patent.
45 The villages that are completed so far are Solomon,
46 Wales, White Mountain, Golovin, King Island, Teller,
47 Brevig Mission and Mary's Igloo.

48
49 There are also a number of veteran
50 Native allotments in this region that are being worked

1 on and I'm doing the alternative parcels. There's 14
2 alternative parcels. Those come up when a veteran
3 qualifies for his original site but is selected by the
4 State or Native corporation and the State or Native
5 corporation does not relinquish their selected land.

6

7 That's all I have unless there's some
8 questions from the board members.

9

10 MR. GRAY: These veteran parcels, are
11 they still available to veterans that haven't applied
12 yet?

13

14 MR. SPARKS: No, they're not.

15

16 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Well, thanks
17 Tom.

18

19 MR. SPARKS: Thank you again for
20 allowing me to testify early.

21

22 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. The rest of
23 these fisheries proposals we've got to wait until
24 10:00. Is that correct, Barb?

25

26 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yes, sir.

27

28 CHAIRMAN QUINN: We can't call the man
29 early and get him going?

30

31 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No. What time is it
32 now?

33

34 CHAIRMAN QUINN: It's only 9:20. Can I
35 move on to number 10 for the time being and we'll try
36 to get that done. Call for proposals. Oh, you've got
37 to get them in by October 19th, huh?

38

39 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

40

41 CHAIRMAN QUINN: So everybody's aware
42 of that. Any entity or people or groups wanting to
43 submit proposals for wildlife regulations need to have
44 them in by October 19th. Steve, do we have time to do
45 you before 10:00? Did he disappear? I guess we'll
46 take about a 15-minute break.

47

48 (Off record)

49

50 (On record)

1 CHAIRMAN QUINN: We're going to get
2 going here. Since we've got something planned for
3 10:00, right now I'm going to start with number 12 and
4 let Barb do her guidance for writing the annual report.
5 I'm going to get you, too, Helen. We're going to do
6 both before 10:00. Page 51 in your booklet.

7
8 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: They put this out to
9 explain further to the Council members on writing
10 annual reports and how important it is to write these
11 reports. Seward Pen, since their inception in 1993,
12 have written reports. And this is where the annual
13 report gets into where you write your concerns to the
14 Federal Board. The Staff Committee reviews these, your
15 concerns, and we get them all to the agencies to get
16 responses for the concerns you submitted and then those
17 responses are as you saw earlier, the responses that
18 you got back from Mike Fleagle. They just wanted to
19 have you have a better understanding on how these
20 annual reports come about and they are written.

21
22 We need to get started on writing our
23 2007 annual report and what I usually do is listen in
24 to see what all you discuss and the concerns each
25 region has when they're talking about their regions.
26 You also have the right to call me or send me an email
27 and let me know what you would like to have as concerns
28 and then with your justification. I can go from there
29 and also talk to your chair in getting a better
30 understanding on the issue that you brought forth to me
31 and then we go from there.

32
33 That's all I have, thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Thanks, Barb.
36 We'll move on to number 13 and that starts on Page 52.
37 Helen will discuss the policy on implementation of
38 customary and traditional use determinations.

39
40 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
41 Chair. Helen Armstrong, Office of Subsistence
42 Management. This policy, as Mike said, is on Page 52.
43 This is a draft. It's out for comment from the public
44 and the councils. A little bit of history on how we
45 got to this policy. We started working on it in
46 January 2005 when we got a letter that was sent from
47 Governor Murkowski to the Secretary of Interior, Gale
48 Norton, noting that the State had concerns over
49 inconsistencies and lack of clear criteria on C&T
50 determinations from their perspective. They didn't

1 think we were doing things properly.

2

3 The State asked that the C&T
4 determinations be rigorously evaluated and only
5 provided where substantial evidence is present. In
6 responding to the State's complaint, the Deputy
7 Secretary of Interior requested that the Federal
8 Subsistence Board review and clarify its approach to
9 making C&T determinations. That's why we have this
10 draft policy.

11

12 While we were working on the draft
13 policy the State of Alaska filed a lawsuit in Federal
14 court against the Federal Board challenging its May
15 2005 decision to expand a C&T finding for moose for the
16 community of Chistochina to include all of Unit 12. At
17 the same time, the Alaska Federation of Natives
18 expressed concern that the State's efforts to influence
19 the customary and traditional determinations are made
20 by the subsistence program. These concerns were
21 expressed in AFN's 2006 resolutions and a recent letter
22 to the chairman of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee.
23 June 28th, 2007, Secretary of Interior Kempthorne
24 instructed the Board to continue its work on developing
25 C&T determination policy as expeditiously as possible.
26 On June 27th the U.S. District Court denied the State's
27 challenge to the Board decision to expand C&T finding
28 for moose for the community of Chistochina to include
29 all of Unit 12.

30

31 This is what we refer to as the
32 Chistochina decision. This was a real important
33 decision that has been made because it affirmed the
34 Board's approach in how we do C&T determinations and it
35 provided some further clarification to the Board
36 regarding C&T determinations. The Chistochina decision
37 underscored the rule of C&T determinations in the
38 Federal Subsistence Management Program, namely to
39 identify uses needing protection under ANILCA. It
40 clarified that the role of C&T determinations is not to
41 limit the pool of users to the smallest possible group,
42 but rather identify which uses need protection under
43 ANILCA.

44

45 The Federal program's procedures for
46 addressing C&T determinations, which have been utilized
47 since the inception of the program, are outlined in the
48 attached policy on Page 52. I want to make it very
49 clear that what this does is it lays out what we're
50 already doing. There's nothing new in here saying

1 we're going to do something differently than we did
2 before. What it's doing is it's putting it down on
3 paper how we do C&T.

4
5 The key elements are that it doesn't
6 represent a change. It's just clarifying the approach
7 we've been taking as the Interior Secretary requested.
8 Part of the process, you've probably heard us talk
9 about the eight factors. They are applied in a general
10 holistic way rather than a rigid manner as some have
11 requested. There are some people who want us to go
12 through like a checklist in meeting each one of the
13 eight factors.

14
15 But the Chistochina decision
16 underscored the importance of addressing the eight
17 factors in a holistic way. Specifically the decision
18 states that, quote, in making a C&T determination for a
19 specific community, the Federal Subsistence Board must
20 first consider whether the community generally exhibits
21 the eight regulatory factors which exemplify customary
22 and traditional use. That's directly from the
23 Chistochina decision.

24
25 The draft policy does not provide a new
26 way of doing C&T determinations. It does not call for
27 definitions, thresholds or benchmarks as the need for
28 such perimeters were negated by the Chistochina
29 decisions. If such perimeters are to be developed,
30 then we would have to do another rule-making.

31
32 We want to make sure you understand
33 this is just a draft and that comments from the
34 Council, from the public, from the State are being
35 welcomed. The deadline for comments is December 1st,
36 2007. Then once the comments are all received the
37 Board will meet to discuss the revised draft policy
38 accordingly. I believe the intention is to present it
39 in the final form to the Council at the next meeting,
40 the winter meeting. The goal is to complete this
41 policy with Secretarial approval by June 2008.

42
43 Just as a matter of interest, the
44 Chistochina decision is being appealed by the State, so
45 that's not over yet, but we'll see what happens.

46
47 So really what the policy does is it
48 lays out the purpose and the introduction and the
49 authorities. There are some bullets on Page 54 that
50 kind of go through the specifics. The Board shall

1 adhere to the statutory standard of C&T use in making
2 C&T determinations. Need for sustenance is not the
3 standard.

4
5 Base its determination of C&T use on
6 information of a reasonable and defensible nature
7 contained within the administrative record.

8
9 Make C&T use determinations based on a
10 holistic application of eight factors and whether a
11 community or area generally exhibits them. Together,
12 the eight factors elucidate the economic, nutritional,
13 cultural and social character of C&T resource harvest
14 and use.

15
16 Consider the knowledge, reports and
17 recommendations of the appropriate Regional Advisory
18 Council regarding C&T use of subsistence resources in
19 making its decisions.

20
21 And consider comments and
22 recommendations from the State of Alaska and the
23 public.

24
25 MR. GRAY: What is sustenance? What
26 does that mean?

27
28 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That means it's not
29 based on whether or not there's a need for the food.
30 That you're not going to say, well, this group needs
31 the food, this group doesn't need it, they have a big
32 store. That is not one of the factors.

33
34 MR. GRAY: Holistic means?

35
36 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Means looking at it
37 in a holistic way.

38
39 MR. GRAY: Realistic?

40
41 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, holistically
42 would be rather than looking at each individual factor,
43 you're looking at it in a more general way. What it
44 does is it gives flexibility to do C&T determinations
45 in different ways in different regions. That's been
46 one of the State's complaints, is that we haven't -- in
47 their view that we're not consistent in how we do them,
48 but we've allowed the Councils to make recommendations
49 and look at things in a different way. For example, in
50 an area like in Southeast where you have a lot of non-

1 Natives living there, you've got communities that are
2 not long-term, traditional communities, so you have a
3 lot of different issues going on, whereas you have a
4 place like the North Slope where you also have
5 communities that are very spread out. You know, you've
6 got differences in how people look at things and we've
7 allowed that kind of flexibility in our program by not
8 requiring there to be this definitive checklist.

9

10 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay.

11

12 MR. GRAY: We didn't need to take any
13 action on this?

14

15 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Don't need to take
16 any action. If you have any comments, we welcome them.
17 Most of the Councils have been listening. Because
18 there's no change in place, I don't think people have
19 been making very many comments.

20

21 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, it will be
22 interesting to see how the appeal from the State goes.

23

24 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It will be.

25

26 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. I think
27 we're kind of caught here. We're going to have to wait
28 for our phone call and deal with our other two
29 proposals.

30

31 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Barb, are we calling
32 Don or is he calling us?

33

34 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: He's supposed to
35 call here.

36

37 CHAIRMAN QUINN: It's a couple minutes
38 to.

39

40 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We might be able to
41 deal with the Secretary's letter. There are a couple
42 of informational items under 14, Secretary Kempthorne's
43 letter and the Regional Advisory Council Composition.
44 Those are just informational for you to read and I
45 guess if you had any comments on them. Steve Klein
46 might be able to whack out a couple more of these under
47 this section.

48

49 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead. We'll work
50 something out here.

1 MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 What's being passed out right now is the closure
3 policy. This policy is even further along than what
4 Helen just briefed you on. This policy has been
5 approved by the Secretaries of Interior and
6 Agriculture. Similar to Helen's briefing, this policy
7 basically puts into writing how we implement closures.
8 By having it in writing you do things a little more
9 consistently and look to the law for guiding closures
10 in this case.

11
12 As a little history, there is a summary
13 on Page 56 that summarizes the process we've gone
14 through for closures. And, in addition to that, you
15 have the policy. In terms of the history, the Board
16 was directed by the Secretaries to draft a policy on
17 closures to clarify when closures will be implemented
18 to close or restrict takings of fish and wildlife on
19 Federal public lands under Sections 815 and 816 of
20 ANILCA. All of the Councils, including this one, has
21 reviewed drafts of this policy. Since the winter 2006
22 meetings we've taken all the comments from Councils,
23 the State, the lawyers that guide us and have finalized
24 the policy.

25
26 The policy still recognizes the
27 importance of Councils in all of our actions, including
28 closures, and the policy doesn't diminish your role in
29 any way. It's intended to basically clarify existing
30 practices under current statute and regulations. Those
31 include that the Board will do closures on a case-by-
32 case basis using the best available information. When
33 making closures or restrictions, the Board will
34 consider the input from Councils and give deference to
35 those recommendations when appropriate under ANILCA.
36 The Board will also take comments from the State.

37
38 And decisions whether to implement or
39 closures or restrictions are controlled by Title VIII
40 of ANILCA. Those criteria within ANILCA are basically
41 when a fish or wildlife population is insufficient to
42 sustain takings for all uses, takings for non-
43 subsistence uses may be reduced or prohibited. When a
44 fish or wildlife population is insufficient to sustain
45 takings for all subsistence uses, the resources shall
46 be apportioned between Federally qualified subsistence
47 users according to ANILCA Section 804. In the worst
48 case scenario, when a fish or wildlife population is
49 insufficient to sustain takings for any uses, all
50 takings must be prohibited.

1 The one new thing in the policy is that
2 closures will be reviewed at least every three years to
3 see if they're still appropriate so we don't just leave
4 them on the books forever and ever, so the Board is
5 specifically charged within this policy to review
6 closures at least every three years to see if that
7 closure is still necessary and appropriate.
8

9 That's basically the policy we have
10 that will guide us on closures and you don't need to
11 take any action on this.

12
13 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thanks, Steve.

14
15 MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16
17 (Setting up speakerphone)

18
19 CHAIRMAN QUINN: We've got 10 minutes.
20 Steve, I guess you're going to have to do some more
21 here.

22
23 MR. KLEIN: Oh, I can fill the time.
24 Were there any comments or questions on the closure
25 policy?

26
27 MR. GRAY: Just so it doesn't
28 contradict what's been happening in the past. That's
29 my big concern. I haven't reviewed it, but as long as
30 there's no real changes in the procedures.

31
32 MR. KLEIN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Gray. The
33 only change in procedures from the way we have been
34 implementing closures is that every three years the
35 Board is charged with taking a fresh look at the
36 closure and ask the question is that still needed or is
37 that something we can drop. That's really the only
38 process change, but the policy does put in writing kind
39 of the appropriate sections of ANILCA that guide the
40 implementation of closures and how we will -- the
41 process we'll use to evaluate closures. Mr. Chair.

42
43 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. Move on to
44 the Council composition.

45
46 MR. KLEIN: Mr. Chair. Again, this is
47 Steve Klein with OSM. Status of Council composition.
48 This is strictly an informational update to inform you
49 of what's happened since your last Council meeting.
50 You don't need to take any action on Council

1 composition.

2

3

4 In terms of history, back in 2000
5 Safari Club International challenged the composition of
6 Regional Advisory Councils and in 2003 Council charters
7 were changed to stipulate that members would represent
8 either subsistence or commercial/sport users and to set
9 a goal of 30 percent commercial/sport on each Council.
10 In August 2006, the court concluded that the Board had
11 not provided a sufficient administrative record showing
12 the rationale for the 70/30 composition plan. The
13 court ordered the Board to stop using the 70/30 system
14 after the 2006 Council member appointment process and
15 told the Board to consider other ways of achieving
16 balanced membership on the Councils.

16

17 Since 2006, and to address that court's
18 order, we published a 30-day notice in the Federal
19 Register in the fall of 2006 explaining the current
20 situation and the rationale for the 70/30 rule. The
21 notice requested public comments and requested
22 alternative plans for balanced Council membership. At
23 your winter 2007 meetings, you discussed the issue.
24 This Council discussed it as well. In looking at the
25 minutes, I wasn't here at your last meeting, but it
26 seemed at least for this Council the 70/30 made sense.
27 It kind of represents the membership of communities
28 where it's mostly subsistence users. For those sport or
29 commercial users, most of them are subsistence users as
30 well. Similar to this Council, that was kind of the
31 viewpoints of the other Councils and the other comments
32 we received.

33

34 In May of this year the Board looked at
35 all the public comments and Council recommendations and
36 adopted the 70/30 goal for Council composition. So our
37 plan is to publish a notice in the Federal Register
38 describing the process and the court will need to
39 review that, but if the court views that we've
40 satisfied the court order, the recommendation will be
41 advanced to the Secretaries for review and approval.
42 We'll have a policy on this and hopefully we'll have it
43 complete by March before the new nominations are
44 concluded.

45

46 So, Mr. Chair, that's kind of a summary
47 of where we're at on Council composition and I'd be
48 happy to try to answer any questions. Mr. Chair.

49

50 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Does anybody have any

1 questions.

2

3 MR. BUCK: I'd just like to say that
4 this Board is Federal subsistence and from the
5 beginning I've been opposed to 70/30 composition and
6 it's just my opinion. Thank you.

7

8 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay, Steve, I think
9 I'll have you keep going here and have you do the two-
10 year cycles, OSM budget and reorganization.

11

12 MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
13 two-year cycles and OSM budget and OSM reorganization,
14 topic 14(A)(4), that's summarized on Page 59 of your
15 books. Again, this is an informational item for the
16 Councils. For OSM, it's been a major shift, I think.
17 Responded to changes in the budget and the number of
18 Staff we have to implement the subsistence program.
19 All of you were sent a letter back in June of this year
20 advising you of the change and the changes that we've,
21 in order to respond to budget reductions on the order
22 close to \$3 million in staffing has been reduced by 20
23 percent in OSM.

24

25 We just don't have the budget or the
26 staff to do fish and wildlife regulations every year
27 and we don't have the budget or staff to do the
28 monitoring program every year. So what the change has
29 been is to move to a two-year cycle so we'll look at
30 wildlife regulations in odd numbered years and
31 fisheries regulations in even numbered years. So
32 instead of doing fish and wildlife every year, you'll
33 do wildlife one year, fisheries the next year. When we
34 do wildlife, we'll also do the Fisheries Resource
35 Monitoring Program, which will now be a two-year
36 program as well.

37

38 The Councils are critical to fishery
39 regulations, wildlife regulations and the monitoring
40 program. You'll still have your two meetings every
41 year as long as there's sufficient business to put
42 together an agenda. All the fishery regulations, the
43 wildlife regulations and the Monitoring Program will
44 have your input before decisions are done by the
45 Federal Subsistence Board.

46

47 These changes were just really
48 necessary given the reductions in budget and staffing.
49 We're going to try to continue to be responsive. Where
50 there's special situations that do crop up, we can take

1 special actions in terms of fish and wildlife
2 populations where we can look at them sooner and out of
3 cycle. Similar for the Fisheries Monitoring Program,
4 we can look at proposals out of cycle that are critical
5 that should be reviewed and addressed sooner than the
6 next regular two-year cycle.

7
8 We're still doing the fish and wildlife
9 regulations as it always has been, but beginning next
10 year with wildlife that will move to a two-year cycle
11 and fisheries as well, as well as the Monitoring
12 Program.

13
14 Mr. Chair.

15
16 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Thanks, Steve.

17
18 MR. GRAY: Hold on. Hold on.

19
20 CHAIRMAN QUINN: I've got some
21 questions too, but, Tom, you're welcome to proceed.

22
23 MR. GRAY: I'm sorry.

24
25 CHAIRMAN QUINN: That's okay, go ahead.

26
27 MR. GRAY: The only comment I wanted to
28 make was our resources need to be addressed at certain
29 times and addressing them out of cycle will deal with
30 the issue that I wanted. The State and communities
31 such as Unalakleet closing down moose hunting in the
32 middle of the deal, you know, those issues are going to
33 crop up in different circumstances and we need to be
34 able to deal with them. So, you know, we need to be
35 open-minded enough that if we have a hunting issue
36 that's on a fish year, we've got to deal with it and
37 vice versa. That's the only -- sorry to step on you.

38
39 CHAIRMAN QUINN: That's okay. Steve,
40 on Page 59 it says that since fiscal year 2004 the
41 number of Staff at OSM has declined by 19 percent. Why
42 don't you put that into a person figure. How many
43 people have you lost since 2004?

44
45 MR. KLEIN: We are down to 40 people
46 from formerly about 50, so it's gone from 50 to 40. As
47 people have left, we're not filling the positions.

48
49 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead, Helen.

50

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I think we were
2 almost up to 60 at one point, Steve.

3
4 MR. KLEIN: At a minimum, it's 20
5 percent. So, yeah, instead of 50 people to do the job
6 or maybe 60, it's 40. We did look at other
7 alternatives. Really, the only other alternative was
8 instead of having the monitoring program, replace those
9 10 positions and reduce the monitoring program,
10 \$800,000, \$1 million, whatever that price tag would be.
11 We view the Monitoring Program as really substantial to
12 sustain your subsistence uses. If we don't have the
13 research to manage the populations.....

14
15 (Testing speakerphone)

16
17 MR. KLEIN: Go ahead, Mr. Gray.

18
19 MR. GRAY: What is the solution to
20 getting our finding back? Is that something that needs
21 to be dealt with in D.C., something like Stevens and
22 Young and that crowd can deal with?

23
24 MR. KLEIN: The Federal budget process
25 involves both the executive branch and in this case the
26 budget mostly comes from the Fish and Wildlife Service
27 and the U.S. Forest Service. We have a process every
28 year we look at the budget. That process has not been
29 very favorable to us. In 2008 right now that process
30 is saying we ought to reduce the program another
31 500,000 and address higher priorities like habitat
32 restoration or fish passage issues in the Lower 48.

33
34 The other process is senators and
35 representatives have input into reviewing the
36 President's budget and they do review the budget. So
37 input to your senators and representatives can have an
38 impact on our budget either up or down.

39
40 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Well, the
41 reason I wanted you to put that in a number that was
42 more easily felt by all of us and what I'd like to say
43 here is that this is possibly the most important issue
44 this whole subsistence program faces.

45
46 (Mr. Rivard on speakerphone)

47
48 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Don, we're going to
49 make you wait for just a minute here. I'm the chair,
50 Mike Quinn, and I'll call you to get your business done

1 here in just a second.

2

3 MR. RIVARD: Okay, Mike, I'll stand by.

4 Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thanks. So what I'm
7 saying is this is the most important issue we face. We
8 aren't going to be able to do this if we lose enough
9 money. Right now you guys are probably having problems
10 doing your job because there aren't enough people there
11 to do them. I maybe get this a little bit more than
12 the rest of you because, as the chair, they want me to
13 actually accomplish things and often in a certain
14 amount of time. Not because things aren't important,
15 but because of money. Just like any business.

16

17 So, what I want everyone to be aware of
18 is when you submit proposals, when you talk here, all
19 the things we do costs money and let's do things that
20 gives us the most bang for our buck and in a way that
21 gives us the most bang for our buck if we can. I think
22 that's something we need to consider, is what we're
23 doing and how much it costs because everything we do
24 costs these people money. And we're going to continue
25 to see it as time goes on. Budgets may be further
26 decreased and maybe less people in your offices to do
27 this job. Right here you're seeing us go to a two-year
28 cycle. That's half of what it was. That's enough for
29 me.

30

31 MR. KLEIN: Mr. Chair. You're very
32 right. Basically this probably fixes things for the
33 next two or three years, but three years down the road,
34 the costs go up, you see the cost of fuel go up, the
35 cost of travel goes up, we're going to have less
36 dollars to deal with to implement this program three or
37 four years down the road. Maybe that message isn't
38 being heard very well where it should be. I think, as
39 Barb said, your annual report is an excellent avenue to
40 get your views to the Secretaries of Interior and
41 Agriculture. Maybe the Councils need to be heard a
42 little more loudly on this.

43

44 I can assure you everyone in OSM are
45 trying to do the most they can with what we have, but
46 inflation and higher costs just will eat your program
47 if you don't have budget increases. If we have to go
48 to a four-year cycle, we're probably not being
49 responsive. So we fixed things, I think, very well and
50 it will work for the next couple years. Further down

1 the road, without a bigger budget and higher costs,
2 we'll have to look at reducing the Monitoring Program
3 or moving to a three or four-year cycle. Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. Well, then
6 we're going to let Don get started here. Don, can you
7 hear me okay?

8

9 MR. RIVARD: Yes, Mr. Chair, I can hear
10 you just fine. Can you hear me all right?

11

12 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yes, loud and clear.
13 Don, we've got four proposals here compacted into two,
14 correct?

15

16 MR. RIVARD: Yes, sir. There's
17 actually three proposals compacted into five or five
18 proposals compacted into three, excuse me.

19

20 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, Helen already
21 did No. 17, so you're stuck with 13/14 and 15/16. What
22 I think I'd like to do here -- Barb, you can correct me
23 if you don't like this -- I'm going to let you do your
24 speel on both of these proposals and then I have nine
25 steps.....

26

27 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Since there are two
28 proposals, you have to do it one at a time. One
29 proposal at a time because you have to follow these
30 right here.

31

32 CHAIRMAN QUINN: What I wanted to do
33 was let Don do his part and then I will go through each
34 of these steps on each of these, so instead of having
35 -- I'm going to try.....

36

37 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You've got to have
38 him go through 13/14 first.....

39

40 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Then do all that?

41

42 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yes. You can't do
43 both of them at the same time.

44

45 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. I got shut
46 down by my superiors. So, Don, 13 and 14, please.

47

48 MR. RIVARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My
49 name is Don Rivard. I'm with the Office of Subsistence
50 Management. I'm the fish biologist covering the Yukon

1 Region for our office. I haven't had the opportunity
2 nor the privilege to attend one of your meetings, so
3 probably most folks don't know me and I don't know you
4 guys all that well, but I'm glad I'm able to
5 participate in this way.

6

7 I want to make sure you've got hard
8 copies in front of you of this proposal. Just to
9 double check, the one I have in front of me on Page 8
10 is the map. Is that the same that you have?

11

12 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah, that will work.

13

14 MR. RIVARD: Okay, good. I wanted to
15 make sure that if I refer to pages that we're on the
16 same page. This is a rather involved issue and
17 analysis, so I'm going to do a lot of reading here. I
18 think we need to get a lot of this on the table for
19 your consideration, so I'm going to start that way. So
20 we're starting on Page 4.

21

22 Proposal FP08-13, submitted by the
23 Eastern Interior Alaska Regional Council, requests that
24 all gillnets with greater than 6-inch stretch mesh be
25 restricted to not more than 35 meshes in depth in
26 Federal public waters of the Yukon River drainage.
27 Currently, there is only one gillnet depth restriction
28 for subsistence uses in the Yukon Area; the Federal
29 drift gillnet fishery in Subdistricts 4B and 4C is
30 restricted to no more than 35 meshes in depth. Based
31 on current State of Alaska regulations, commercial
32 gillnets with greater than 6-inch mesh in District 1, 2
33 and 3, can be no more than 45 meshes deep; and in
34 Districts 4, 5 and 6 no more than 60 meshes deep.

35

36 Proposal FP08-14, also submitted by the
37 Eastern Interior Alaska Regional Advisory Council,
38 requests that the maximum gillnet mesh size be
39 restricted to 7.5-inch stretch mesh for subsistence and
40 commercial fishing in Federal public waters of the
41 Yukon River drainage. In its proposal, the Eastern
42 Interior Council points out that recent studies, as
43 well as discussions Council members have had with
44 researchers, show that 7.5-inch stretch mesh nets is
45 the most efficient net size to harvest Chinook salmon,
46 while still allowing the passage of larger fish which
47 are generally females and allowing the passage of
48 smaller fish, which are generally chum salmon. The
49 reduction in mesh size would be phased in over a three-
50 year period for subsistence users to reduce the

1 economic burden and match the useful life of most nets,
2 which the Eastern Interior Council identifies as three
3 to four years.

4
5 Long time Yukon River fishers,
6 particularly from the upper river, frequently cite
7 declining fish size, decreasing occurrence of 50-plus
8 pound Chinook salmon, extirpation of age 8 fish and the
9 lost of age 7 fish, the decreasing percentage of female
10 Chinook salmon, and more slender fish in general.
11 Although these views are not unanimous, fishers are
12 concerned about genetic impacts to Chinook salmon,
13 long-term effects to subsistence users, loss of
14 subsistence lifestyles and lack of response by State
15 and Federal managers.

16
17 Some fishers have also expressed their
18 belief, in other words traditional ecological
19 knowledge, that the larger, stronger fish migrate in
20 the deeper waters. A variety of net depths are being
21 utilized by fishers in the Yukon River with deeper mesh
22 nets used for deeper fishing sites to increase harvest
23 effectiveness.

24
25 The Eastern Interior Council is
26 requesting changes in allowable gillnet specifications
27 in the Yukon River salmon fishery to address its
28 concern that the average size of returning adult
29 Chinook salmon is declining and because of its belief
30 that the existing allowable gillnets, in other words
31 the unrestricted size and deeper than 35 meshes deep,
32 disproportionately harvest larger size female Chinook
33 salmon over males. The Eastern Interior Council's
34 intent is to apply these regulatory changes to all
35 users in Federal public waters.

36
37 Most of the commercial fishing and over
38 half of the subsistence harvest takes place in Federal
39 public waters in the Yukon River drainage. Just for
40 your information, the Federal Subsistence Board has the
41 authority to close Federal public waters to Federally
42 qualified and/or non-Federally qualified users "for the
43 conservation of healthy populations of fish and
44 wildlife resources," and also has the authority to
45 impose methods, means, time and harvest restrictions on
46 all users fishing in Federal public waters, options
47 which are less restrictive than full-out closures.

48
49 This is the fourth year that the
50 proponent, the Eastern Interior Council, has submitted

1 at least one proposal to the Federal Subsistence Board
2 to limit net depth and the third year to limit mesh
3 size to address its continuing concern with a declining
4 average size of returning adult Yukon River Chinook
5 salmon.

6
7 I'm going to pause here just to make
8 sure everyone is hearing me okay.

9
10 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah, you're doing
11 good.

12
13 MR. RIVARD: All right. Over the past
14 two years, the Board has taken active steps to address
15 the issue outside of the regulatory process, including
16 recommending and endorsing the formation of, and
17 providing support for, the Yukon River Drainage
18 Fisheries Association-led Salmon Size Working Group.
19 That group met four times in October of last year
20 through January of this year. During those meetings,
21 which participants heard presentations by fisheries
22 managers and researches, shared observations, discussed
23 possible causes of the size decline and brainstormed
24 possible solutions and strategies to address the issue.
25 However, no consensus was attained regarding whether
26 there really is a declining size, possible causes if
27 size is declining, and the possible changes to
28 management strategies and/or regulatory actions to
29 address the issues. Views, perceptions and opinions
30 differed mainly between downriver, basically Districts
31 1 through 3, and upriver, Districts 4 through 6,
32 fishers.

33
34 The working group also utilized some
35 fairly recent studies and papers addressing the
36 declining size of both Pacific and Yukon River Chinook
37 salmon, which are listed in Appendix A of your analysis
38 there.

39
40 I'd like to point out that Appendices A
41 through D are the meetings notes from the four meetings
42 that the YRDFA-led group meetings had. They're meeting
43 minutes and the notes that were taken. We thought it
44 would be really good that everybody gets a chance to
45 see all these things that were discussed at the
46 meeting, so that's why they're part of your book there.

47
48 As you can see in those appendices,
49 there were a lot of discussions. There were some
50 really good scientific presentations made and, again,

1 no real consensus came forth because of those meetings.

2

3

4 On Page 5 of the handout, you will see
5 the existing regulations and you can notice that the
6 bottom part of that is -- because it talks about 35
7 meshes deep, so we put that in there as well for
8 Districts 4, 5 and 6 regulations. It's specifically
9 the ones that deal with 4B and 4C, which will be the
10 next analysis that I'll present to you and we're going
11 to be talking about those a little bit more.

12

13 On Page 6 are the proposed Federal
14 regulations. They're actually combined, but it does
15 show the difference between the two different
16 proposals. The first part of the regulation would stay
17 the same and then there would be an (A) section that
18 would say, in the Yukon River drainage, all gillnets
19 with greater than six-inch stretch mesh may not be more
20 than 35 meshes in depth in Federal public waters.
21 That's the part for Proposal 13.

22

23 For Proposal 14, the wording would be,
24 in the Yukon River drainage, the maximum gillnet mesh
25 size is 7.5-inch stretch mesh for subsistence and
26 commercial salmon fishing in Federal public waters,
27 with a three-year phase-in period for subsistence
28 fishers and a one-year phase-in period for commercial
29 fishers to use these nets.

30

31 There's also some pertinent information
32 that comes from the Kuskokwim River and that's on Page
33 7. In the Kuskokwim River, commercial fishers have
34 been required to use gillnet mesh size of 6 inches or
35 less since 1985. The directed commercial fishery for
36 Chinook salmon was discontinued in 1987 due to depleted
37 runs and the importance of this species as subsistence
38 food. Incidental harvest of Chinook salmon continues
39 to occur during the June and July commercial fishery
40 that targets chum salmon. During its January through
41 February 2007 meeting, the Alaska Board of Fisheries
42 discontinued the Stock of Concern designations for
43 Kuskokwim River Chinook and chum salmon based on
44 Chinook and chum salmon runs being at or above the
45 historical average each year since 2002. At that same
46 meeting, the Board of Fisheries took action that now
47 allows the use of large mesh, 8.5-inch mesh, to target
48 Chinook salmon via emergency order delegation to the
49 local area manager. Even though they had that
50 authority, they didn't use it this past year 2007.

1 Page 8 has the map that shows the
2 fishing districts. It also shows the areas of Federal
3 jurisdiction, those darker colored areas. All waters
4 that are within the exterior boundaries of Federal
5 Conservation Units and in this case it's mainly the
6 National Wildlife Refuge in Unit 18. As you go
7 upriver, you'll see some other National Wildlife
8 Refuges. There's the Innoko National Wildlife Refuge
9 in Nowitna and waters adjacent to these are also
10 Federal public waters.

11
12 Again, this issue was discussed in
13 front of the State Board of Fisheries in January and
14 February and they took up a couple similar proposals.
15 If you look on Page 10, one proposal was to limit the
16 subsistence and commercial gillnets to 6-inch mesh size
17 and the ADF&G opposed the proposal and the Board of
18 Fisheries considered and rejected both proposals that
19 were before them. These proposals were also submitted
20 by the Eastern Interior Regional Council, Nos. 163 and
21 165.

22
23 I'm going to talk a little bit now
24 about current events. Now I'm on Page 11. The YRDFA-
25 led Salmon Size Working Group met four times between
26 October 2006 and January 2007. These meetings were
27 held to provide an opportunity for the people who fish
28 and/or manage Yukon River chinook salmon to discuss the
29 declining salmon size and related issues.
30 Approximately 80 people attended the first meeting from
31 the United States and Canada. Participants included
32 subsistence and commercial fishers from the length of
33 the Yukon River, fisheries scientists and
34 representatives of non-profit organizations, State of
35 Alaska Fish and Game Advisory Councils, Federal
36 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council members and
37 fishery and resource management agencies.

38
39 An immediate goal of the group was to
40 see if they could reach consensus on a proposal or a
41 number of proposals addressing the salmon size issue
42 for the Alaska Board of Fisheries to consider during
43 its January-February 2007 meeting. YRDFA had submitted
44 a placeholder proposal, which was designated as No.
45 167, to modify commercial fishery to address changing
46 size of Chinook salmon. Because no consensus was
47 reached during the working group's meeting, YRDFA was
48 unable to provide the Alaska Board of Fisheries with
49 any specific proposal to consider. Therefore, no
50 action was taken on No. 167.

1 During our analysis we found plenty of
2 evidence that there is a declining size of salmon going
3 on. Chinook salmon grow larger with age as everyone
4 knows and females are generally larger than males of
5 the same age, especially from about age five onward.
6 In the Pilot Station fishery in 2005, this was shown as
7 age seven fish averaged 100 millimeters more in length
8 than age five fish for both sexes. The average length
9 of age five females was 62 millimeters greater than age
10 five males. The average length of age seven females
11 was about 87 millimeters greater than age seven males.

12
13 So our analysis goes through a lot of
14 these studies and that shows that this declining size
15 is taking place. If you look on the top of Page 13,
16 although this is data from a few years back, it does
17 show that the Yukon River Chinook salmon passing into
18 Canada, the Joint Technical Committee found that the
19 percentage of age seven and age eight fish ranged from
20 28 to 29 percent for brood years 1979 through 1982 and
21 then declined after 1982, with percentages ranging from
22 2 percent to 16 percent for brood years 1983 to 1997.
23 You can see there were larger fish up until about 1982
24 and the size really dropped off and it hasn't rebounded
25 since.

26
27 If you look on the bottom of Page 13,
28 you'll see Jeff Bromaghin evaluated gillnet catches
29 from the lower Yukon River, collected from 1990 to
30 2003, in conjunction with the Pilot Station sonar
31 study. His results were based on a dataset of almost
32 90,000 records, of which over 7,000 were for Chinook
33 salmon. He found, among other things, that gillnets
34 with the largest mesh sizes, 6.5, 7.5 and 8.5 mesh,
35 caught the most Chinook salmon, with the 7.5 inch mesh
36 having the greatest catch and the 6.5 inch and 8.5 inch
37 mesh having smaller but similar catches. In other
38 words, 7.5 inch mesh size is the most effective size
39 for catching Chinook.

40
41 There's also evidence that large mesh
42 gillnets are highly selective for female Chinook
43 salmon. In 2004, 8.5 inch mesh gillnets used at the
44 Big Eddy test fish project captured 59 percent females,
45 whereas 7.5 inch gillnets captures 42 percent females.
46 That same year variable mesh gillnets used at the Pilot
47 Station sonar site captured 35 percent females and
48 upriver weirs, such as in the Gisasa, Henshaw Creek and
49 Tozitna Rivers, sampled for sex ratios captures 18 to
50 30 percent females. So, in other words, it's showing

1 that the higher up in the drainage you go there's less
2 percentage of females. Two test fish projects in
3 Canada captures 14 and 23 percent females.

4
5 There's also a number of current
6 studies or soon to be started studies to also look at
7 this declining salmon size issue. Several recent,
8 ongoing and proposed studies and research projects are,
9 or will be, directly addressing this issue. The
10 Federal Subsistence Board, through the Office of
11 Subsistence Management, continues to provide funding to
12 the ADF&G and other organizations for doing these
13 studies and research projects, many of which are based
14 on prioritized information needs for the Yukon Region.

15
16
17 This issue of declining salmon size has
18 been identified by the three Councils on the Yukon,
19 with input from subsistence users, the public, Alaska
20 Native organizations, the Fish and Wildlife Service,
21 ADF&G and partner agencies and organizations, as a
22 primary concern or information need. Additionally, the
23 U.S./Canada Yukon River Salmon Joint Technical
24 Committee and the Arctic-Yukon-Kuskokwim Sustainable
25 Salmon Initiative are or will be investigating the
26 declining salmon size issue.

27
28 If you go to Appendix E, which is
29 towards the back of your handout, there are a list of
30 some of the proposals and some of the studies that are
31 going to be taking place in the very near future or are
32 taking place right now. I don't know if you've got a
33 State representative there. They may comment a little
34 more on this as well.

35
36 The State is currently conducting
37 what's called the Yukon River Chinook Salmon
38 Comparative Mesh Size Study. The goal of this three-
39 year study is to gain information about catch
40 composition from 7 inch, 7.5 inch and 8 inch stretch
41 mesh drift gillnets from a fishery in District Y1 near
42 Emmonak. In particular, this study is designed to
43 determine the effects of mesh size on age, sex, length
44 and weight and girth of Chinook salmon caught and a
45 number of incidently caught species such as summer chum
46 salmon. This information may provide insight into ways
47 to implement management strategies and regulations to
48 sustain Yukon River Chinook salmon while continuing to
49 maintain subsistence and commercial fisheries.

50

1 So these are the different kind of
2 things that are taking place right now to address the
3 issue. In other words, this issue is very much in the
4 forefront for both the Federal Subsistence Board and
5 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and we're all
6 taking active steps to see if we can get as much
7 information as we can about what's going on.

8
9 As far as mesh depth selectivity, I'm
10 on the bottom of Page 14 now, many fishers have
11 expressed that the larger, stronger fish migrate in the
12 deeper waters and, therefore, nets of deeper mesh
13 harvest more of these larger fish. The scientific
14 literature is sparse on the connection between mesh
15 depth and harvest of larger fish. However, there are a
16 few studies that show Chinook salmon migration trends.
17 In the Kenai River, a study done in 1998 found that
18 most early-run Chinook salmon migrated offshore about
19 15 to 20 meters from the left bank and 40 to 45 meters
20 from the right bank. Late-run Chinook salmon migrated
21 similar distances from the banks. Fish were bottom-
22 oriented during both runs. Another study in 1999 found
23 that Chinook salmon that migrated deep, greater than
24 200 meters, were significantly larger than fish that
25 remained nearer the surface in the upper Johnstone
26 Straight, British Columbia.

27
28 Mr. Chair, I'm going to go to the
29 effects of these proposals if adopted. We're on Page
30 15. Adoption of these two proposals would follow
31 recognized principles of fish and wildlife conservation
32 by providing measures to conserve and possibly restore
33 large-sized fish in the Yukon River Chinook salmon run.
34 These proposals would standardize gillnet mesh size and
35 depth specifications throughout the Federal public
36 waters of the Yukon River where most of the commercial
37 fishing and over half of the subsistence harvest takes
38 place. The use of 7.5 inch mesh gillnets, no more than
39 35 meshes in depth, would likely result in fewer of the
40 largest and older-age female Chinook salmon being
41 harvested, with the expectation that more of these fish
42 would reach the spawning grounds to reproduce and pass
43 on to their offspring desirable genetic traits. In
44 other words, big fish beget big fish. It's unlikely
45 that small fish are going to produce large fish.

46
47 Female sex ratios would likely increase
48 as well, particularly in the Yukon River tributaries
49 where sex ratios are often two males to one female,
50 with a likely corresponding increase in fecundity and

1 productivity. Larger females are known to have more
2 eggs than smaller females. The numbers of age seven
3 and age eight Chinook salmon would likely increase,
4 thereby preserving genetic integrity and increasing
5 population resiliency, which would also help fulfill
6 the State of Alaska's Sustainable Salmon Fisheries
7 Policy by affording protection to all age classes.

8

9 Chinook salmon is the only fish species
10 listed as a stock of concern by the ADF&G in the Yukon
11 River. Stabilizing Yukon river Chinook salmon stocks
12 and preventing a further decrease in their average size
13 is consistent with sound management principles and the
14 conservation of healthy populations of fish, which is
15 what we do under ANILCA for the Federal program.

16

17 With the use of reduced mesh sizes,
18 harvest of summer chum salmon will likely increase.
19 Again, Bromaghin, in his study in 2005, found that the
20 most efficient gillnet mesh size for catching summer
21 chum salmon was 6.5 inch mesh. When gillnet mesh size
22 is decreased from 8.5 to 7.5 inch mesh, Bromaghin found
23 that the chum salmon catch would increase about 66
24 percent. When gillnet mesh size is decreased from 8.5
25 to 6.5 inch, the chum salmon catch would increase by
26 427 percent. So a 7.5 inch mesh size strikes a balance
27 between maximizing Chinook salmon harvest and
28 minimizing the incidental chum salmon harvest. In
29 2007, there was a renewed market interest in summer
30 chum salmon and nearly 200,000 summer chum salmon were
31 harvested in commercial fisheries. That's kind of a
32 side note there.

33

34 Adoption of these proposals would
35 restrict all users, both Federally qualified and
36 non-Federally qualified, in Federal public waters. The
37 Board has the authority to both close Federal public
38 waters and/or to impose methods, means, time and
39 harvest restrictions on those users. Again, these
40 options are less restrictive than outright closures.

41

42 If adopted, the proposals would likely
43 pose an additional financial burden on some, if not
44 all, affected users since they would either have to buy
45 new nets and/or modify existing gillnets to 35 meshes
46 deep. This burden is lessened somewhat by the proposed
47 phase-in period of one to three years, depending on
48 whether you're a commercial fisherman or a subsistence
49 fisherman or both. If modification includes cutting
50 the nets, there would likely be an increase in

1 maintenance time and costs because once a net has been
2 cut down in size it usually becomes more susceptible to
3 tearing on snags. Adoption would also likely reduce
4 the number of fishable locations and/or increase the
5 need to relocate to other sites.

6
7 Adoption of these proposals would
8 create greater differences between Federal and State
9 regulations. Commercial and subsistence users fishing
10 in State-managed waters under State regulations, would
11 still be able to use the larger mesh and/or deeper mesh
12 gillnets. As a result of these differences, public
13 outreach and judicious enforcement will be necessary to
14 inform all users of these regulatory changes.

15
16 Mr. Chair, the Office of Subsistence
17 Management's preliminary conclusion is to support FP08-
18 13 with modification to include wording that the nets
19 will be fishing from the surface of the water to no
20 more than 35 meshes deep in the water column and that
21 the regulations will apply to both subsistence and
22 commercial gillnets in Federal public waters. You can
23 see that modified language on Page 16.

24
25 Also, we would support Proposal 14 and
26 the language is on Page 16 there as well. So it's our
27 preliminary conclusion to support Proposal 14 as
28 written.

29
30 The justification for this is based on
31 the presentations during the YRDFA-led Salmon Size
32 Working Group meetings and the studies and projects
33 cited in this analysis, there is reliable, documented
34 evidence that the average size of returning adult Yukon
35 River Chinook salmon is declining. While there may be
36 several factors contributing to the decline,
37 restricting gillnet size to 7.5 inch mesh and 35 meshes
38 deep are appropriate actions the Federal Subsistence
39 Board can take to at least slow down, if not stop or
40 reverse, the trend. These restrictions would likely
41 result in more of the largest fish, especially the
42 older age female Chinook salmon, to reach the spawning
43 grounds to reproduce and pass on desirable genetic size
44 and fecundity traits.

45
46 Female sex ratios would also likely
47 increase, particularly in the Yukon River tributaries
48 where sex ratios are often about 2:1 males to females.
49 The numbers of age seven and eight Chinook salmon would
50 likely increase, preserving genetic integrity and

1 increasing population resiliency. Stabilizing Yukon
2 River Chinook salmon stocks and preventing a further
3 decrease in their average size is consistent with sound
4 management principles and the conservation of healthy
5 populations of fish.

6
7 Mr. Chair, we know this is an important
8 issue for the people of the Yukon River and for those
9 people in Stebbins that have C&T use determination to
10 be able to fish in the Yukon River drainage. The
11 analysis that's before you is very much a group effort
12 by the Office of Subsistence Management fisheries
13 biologist and other biologists, including the Yukon
14 River in-season manager. We believe addressing the
15 declining salmon size issue through the proposed
16 changes to legal fishing gear in Federal public waters
17 is the right action to take and the right action to
18 take right now.

19
20 We also recognize that there may be
21 alternative management measures that could be effective
22 in accomplishing and conserving more of the larger
23 Chinook salmon for passage upriver and to the spawning
24 grounds in the Yukon River drainage and we're willing
25 to hear and we encourage hearing those other
26 alternatives during your deliberations.

27
28 Thank you, Mr. Chair. That concludes
29 my presentation.

30
31 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay, thanks Don.
32 You're going to stay on the line and listen to everyone
33 else, too, right?

34
35 MR. RIVARD: Yes, I'm staying on and
36 I'll be happy to try to answer any questions you may
37 have.

38
39 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Well, that
40 covers the introduction and analysis of the proposals.
41 Next we're going to hear from ADF&G if there's anyone
42 here to speak.

43
44 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. If I may, I
45 think ADF&G's comments are attached to your hard
46 copies, is that correct?

47
48 CHAIRMAN QUINN: I'm not sure yet. I'm
49 going to say, no, they're not, Don.
50

1 MR. MAGDANZ: Jim Magdanz, Fish and
2 Game. The fishery biologists are not present here
3 today, so I'm not able to comment on this at this time,
4 but I could check and see if there were any comments we
5 could pass on to you this afternoon. Don may know what
6 the State's comments are. I don't have them with me.

7
8 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Can you help us out,
9 Don? Do you know where the ADF&G.....

10
11 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. What I can say
12 is the State had an extensive -- I don't have it in
13 front of me, but they had extensive comments on this.
14 The bottom line is that they oppose both of these.
15 Part of it is -- I don't want to speak for them, but I
16 can remember what they said at the Yukon-Kuskokwim
17 meeting at Marshall last month, is that they are doing
18 their study that I pointed out and they think at this
19 time it's best to wait a couple more years to see the
20 results of those studies. One of the reasons they say
21 so is, if there were changes made now, as a result of
22 these studies in a couple years, some more regulatory
23 changes might then be implemented and they thought it
24 would be best to wait and just do it one time and then
25 that way it would be better on the users, the fishermen
26 out there, so they don't have to keep changing net
27 sizes and all that. So that's my recollection.

28
29 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Do we have any
30 comments from any of the other agencies.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN QUINN: How about Kawerak, are
35 they going to say anything?

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Inter-Agency Staff
40 Committee.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN QUINN: The Advisory
45 Committee.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 CHAIRMAN QUINN: He's not here.
50 Summary of written public comments. Barb, go ahead.

1 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. We have
2 five opposing this proposal; Association of Village
3 Council Presidents, Native Village of Alakanuk
4 Traditional Council, Lower Yukon Fish and Game Advisory
5 Committee, Jack Schultheis in Wasilla, and also the
6 Emmonak Tribal Council opposed. There is one support
7 written in from Alaska Outdoor Council. Thank you,
8 sir.

9
10 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thanks, Barb. Anybody
11 here from the public that wants to comment.

12
13 (No comments)

14
15 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. So our
16 Regional Council can deliberate, recommend and justify.
17 It's kind of interesting because this seems to be a
18 little bit of a discussion between the people who live
19 on the lower river and the State and the people who
20 live and fish on the upper river and the Feds, which
21 seems to be the problem along that river for years and
22 years and years. Peter.

23
24 MR. MARTIN: It goes to the lower Yukon
25 opposition to this proposal due to they're having
26 unsolved research on this issue. I'm with the lower
27 Yukon opposition.

28
29 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Don, I want you to go
30 over the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta RAC's recommendations
31 from their meeting.

32
33 MR. RIVARD: That's a good idea. They
34 opposed both these proposals. They do not want to see
35 these happen, so they opposed both of them. They had
36 quite a lengthy discussion, but they opposed both of
37 them.

38
39 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Does anybody on our
40 RAC want to make a motion.

41
42 MR. GRAY: I have a question. If this
43 is enforced in the lower Yukon or wherever this is, if
44 we support it, it gets implemented, it's approved and
45 put into place, the original people that wrote this
46 thing, are they going to get a benefit of bigger fish
47 coming to them and them having the same regulations or
48 proposals to deal with or will they have opportunity to
49 take those bigger fish with different gear? I'm asking
50 that to Don, I guess.

1 MR. RIVARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 That's a good question. What this would do, these
3 regulations, if they were put into place by the Federal
4 Subsistence Board, would be for all the Yukon River
5 drainage. Larger fish that are being caught in the
6 lower river, there would probably be more of them that
7 would pass upriver so there might be more opportunity
8 to catch a larger fish than there has been in recent
9 times upriver as well, but everybody would be fishing
10 under the same regulations and the same net sizes.

11
12 MR. KLEIN: Mr. Chair. This is Steve
13 Klein from OSM. If I could add to that.

14
15 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yes.

16
17 MR. KLEIN: Our expectation would be
18 that over time there would be bigger fish going upriver
19 that would benefit lower river as well as upper river
20 fishermen. They would have the same mesh size in the
21 commercial and the subsistence fisheries. Really, the
22 big benefit would be increased production. From the
23 mesh size studies that we've seen, we would expect a
24 7.5 size mesh to catch more fish and given the weight
25 data, I mean 7.5 inch is going to catch smaller fish,
26 but you're going to catch more. The weight and the
27 yield to the fisherman would actually increase.

28
29 If I could just further add this is
30 very controversial, as you've captured, Mr. Quinn, but
31 if we look holistically as Mr. Gray wanted to, really
32 in fisheries our track record is just dismal. If you
33 look at Atlantic salmon on the East Coast, they're
34 threatened and endangered and most of those river
35 systems don't have Atlantic salmon any more. There was
36 many causes that happened there. You can look at
37 Pacific salmon off Washington, Oregon, California,
38 they've got 200 hatcheries trying to sustain those
39 fisheries and it still isn't working.

40
41 With the signs that we're seeing in the
42 Yukon River, and this is the last large mesh fishery
43 that I'm aware of. When you've got some of these
44 tributaries, you've got four males to every female. As
45 scientists, when we look at that, we would expect more
46 males since you get jacks returning, but that's not
47 something that's going to sustain that resource very
48 long and it's not going to sustain subsistence users.

49
50 When you look at the loss of age

1 classes -- if you have more age classes, if you have
2 three-year-olds, four-year-olds, five-year-olds, six-
3 year-olds, seven-year-olds and eight-year-olds
4 returning, you've got a more resilient population than
5 if you lost a seven and eight-year-old.

6

7 Your opening remarks, you talk about
8 global warming. If you have more age classes, that
9 population is going to have a better chance of
10 withstanding changes with more age classes. I'll be
11 happy to answer any other questions.

12

13 I think Don covered it very well.

14

15 Mr. Chair.

16

17 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Steve, I had no idea
18 that king salmon were seven and eight years old when
19 they returned, at least on the Yukon. I knew there's
20 big fish, but I didn't know they were that old. I
21 guess your guys' concern is that without wiping out the
22 Chinook run, what's going on could potentially wipe out
23 certain age classes of the run, is that correct?

24

25 MR. KLEIN: Mr. Chair. If you look at
26 the percentage of seven or eight-year-olds, it has
27 decreased from the limited information we have.
28 Actually, Don, do you have those percentages?

29

30 MR. RIVARD: Yeah, that's -- let's look
31 at the analysis here on Page 13. Mr. Chair, just for
32 your information, I do have a copy of the State's
33 comments in front of me and it probably would be
34 worthwhile to just read one paragraph if you want to do
35 that.

36

37 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

38

39 MR. RIVARD: Okay. This is the Alaska
40 Department of Fish and Game recommendation on Proposals
41 13 and 14. They oppose both proposals or defer for two
42 years when the Alaska Board of Fisheries reviews the
43 results of the three-year mesh size studies. They've
44 already started this past summer on that three-year
45 study. Until those studies are completed, there's
46 little hard information or specific data upon which to
47 judge the potential effects of these two proposals.

48

49 If it is determined that a gear change
50 is necessary in the future, the State would support a

1 river-wide approach and a review of data, options and
2 specific management objectives with the public to gain
3 their input and conference. Making a change in only
4 Federal regulations would be costly to subsistence
5 users, apply only in some areas and may not have the
6 desired effect. Making a gear change now may mean
7 subsistence users would have to change gear again
8 depending upon the results of the mesh size studies,
9 creating unnecessary hardship for most.

10

11 If a modification in gillnet gear is
12 necessary, the State would also work through the Yukon
13 River panel to make changes in Canadian fisheries.
14 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Don, looking at that
17 graph on Page 13 where you've got the percentage of
18 seven and eight-year-olds, you've got a big drop from
19 '82 to '83. That just seems a little odd to see things
20 drop so suddenly at a certain year. Do you have any
21 comment on that?

22

23 MR. RIVARD: No, Mr. Chair, I don't
24 have an explanation for that particular drop.

25

26 MR. GRAY: Whose information is this
27 graph here, a Federal or State program?

28

29 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. This is from
30 the Joint Technical Committee of the Yukon River
31 U.S./Canadian Panel.

32

33 MR. KLEIN: Which is Federal, State and
34 Yukon Territorial Government and Canada Department of
35 Fisheries and Oceans and private stakeholders. YRDFA
36 is involved in the JTC as well as Bering Sea
37 Fisherman's Association. So it's a multi-agency,
38 government, private entity. The data is Chinook salmon
39 passing into Canada.

40

41 MR. SAVETILIK: This is Myron. Were
42 the studies genetically sampled or were other
43 procedures done for the study that was being made?

44

45 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. It's unlikely
46 that they were genetically sampled in those years going
47 back to the late '70s, early '80s.

48

49 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, i find it kind
50 of hard to sit here so far away and make a really

1 informed decision. We've got a RAC member who lives
2 down there and we're kind of neighbors to that area.
3 Somebody want to make a motion. You can even make a
4 motion to take no action.

5

6 MR. MARTIN: I make a motion to oppose.

7

8 MR. SAVETILIK: Second.

9

10 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. A motion has
11 been made to oppose these two proposals and seconded.
12 Discussion.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN QUINN: I think I can call the
17 question. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

18

19 IN UNISON: Aye.

20

21 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Opposed.

22

23 (No opposing votes)

24

25 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Motion carries. Okay,
26 Don, you're on the stage again for 15 and 16. Go
27 ahead.

28

29 MR. RIVARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
30 This one will be quite a bit shorter. Here we go. I
31 just want to confirm we're looking at the same thing
32 here. My copy has the map on Page 6.

33

34 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah, that should do
35 it.

36

37 MR. RIVARD: This is Don Rivard with
38 the Office of Subsistence Management. Proposal FP08-
39 15, submitted by the Loudon Tribal Council of Galena,
40 requests an expansion of fishing time for the Federal
41 drift gillnet fishery in Subdistricts 4B and 4C of the
42 Yukon/Northern Federal Subsistence Fishery Management
43 Area to include the entire weekly regulatory openings
44 instead of just the last 18 hours of each, which is in
45 regulation.

46

47 Proposal FP08-16, submitted by the
48 Alaska Department of Fish and Game, requests the
49 elimination of the Federal drift gillnet fishery in
50 Subdistricts 4B and 4C of the Yukon/Northern Federal

1 Subsistence Fishery Management Area.

2

3 The proponent of No. 15 states that the
4 adoption of this proposal would reduce competition for
5 Federal subsistence drift gillnet fishing sites across
6 from the village of Koyukuk in Subdistrict 4A, allow
7 Federally qualified users from Subdistricts 4B and 4C
8 more time to explore, find and utilize viable drift
9 gillnet sites as the proponent states "the time period
10 is too short" to do that with just the current 18-hour
11 openings. It would also reduce fuel consumption costs
12 and safety concerns by allowing for shorter travel time
13 distances to fish.

14

15 The proponent of Proposal 16 claims
16 that the drift gillnet fishery in Subdistricts 4B and
17 4C is not a traditional fishery and is not consistent
18 with the definition of customary and traditional use in
19 regulations. Customary and traditional use means a
20 long-established, consistent pattern of use
21 incorporating beliefs and customs which have been
22 transmitted from generation to generation. This use
23 plays an important role in the economy of the
24 community.

25

26 Mr. Chair, the proponent on No. 16 made
27 similar claims when opposing Proposals FP05-04 three
28 years ago, claims that the Federal Subsistence Board
29 considered and rejected when it established this drift
30 gillnet fishery in Subdistricts 4B and 4C in January of
31 2005. Under the Federal Subsistence Management
32 Program, it is the use of a resource that is determined
33 to be customary and traditional, not the method or
34 means of harvest. Residents and their antecedents of
35 Subdistricts 4B and 4C have customarily and
36 traditionally used salmon for generations and this is
37 recognized through a positive customary and traditional
38 use finding for salmon by residents of the Yukon River
39 drainage and the residents of Stebbins.

40

41 At the bottom of the page on Page 4,
42 existing regulations and then proposed regulations --
43 excuse me, proposed regulations are on Page 4. For No.
44 15, the last 18-hour period of is crossed out. For the
45 proposed language for 16, the third paragraph labeled C
46 would be struck out, which means there would no longer
47 be allowed drift gillnet fishing in Subdistricts 4B and
48 4C.

49

50 I'm going to give you a little bit of

1 history of these proposals, which begins on the bottom
2 of Page 5. In March 2003, the Western Interior Alaska
3 Regional Advisory Council submitted fisheries proposal
4 FP04-05 to the Federal Subsistence Board and this
5 proposal was rejected because of some of the concerns
6 that were expressed at the time.

7
8 About a year later in March 2004 the
9 Western Interior Council submitted a similar fisheries
10 proposal to the Board, again requesting expansion of
11 the subsistence drift gillnet fishery to include
12 Subdistricts 4B and 4C, as well as District 5. At its
13 fall Council meeting, the Western Interior Council
14 recommended the proposal only apply to 4B and 4C and
15 that it be limited to Chinook salmon from June 10th
16 through July 14th and the harvest of chum after August
17 2nd.

18
19 In January 2005, the Board adopted this
20 proposal with modification to allow the harvest of only
21 Chinook salmon, not chum salmon, by drift gillnet in
22 the Federal public waters of Districts 4B and 4C during
23 the final 18 hours of the weekly regulatory openings
24 under a Federal subsistence fishing permit. In other
25 words, this drift gillnet fishery has now completed its
26 third year with the summer of 2007 season.

27
28 I've got a little bit of history here
29 regarding the harvest. For 2005, 70 permits were
30 issued and nine permit holders fished for a total of 60
31 hours. There was a total of 54 Chinook salmon
32 harvested. Feedback from Federal subsistence users
33 indicated that productive drifting spots had not yet
34 been located within the Federal public waters of
35 Subdistricts 4B and 4C, but fishing effort would likely
36 increase if productive drift sites were found.

37
38 The map of these areas is on Page 6.
39 From Galena downstream there's some of these Federal
40 public waters and then Ruby and upstream to the border
41 with Subdistricts 5A and B.

42
43 In the second year, 2006, the interest
44 in the Federal subsistence fishing opportunity declined
45 somewhat with only 18 permits issued; 16 to Galena
46 residents, one to a Ruby resident and one to a Koyukuk
47 resident. Of the 18 permittees who reported their
48 fishing activity, 13 people did not fish and five
49 fished approximately 18 hours, resulting in the harvest
50 of 19 Chinook and 11 chum salmon.

1 In this past summer in 2007, the State
2 and Federal subsistence fishery in Subdistricts 4B and
3 4C was liberalized from two 48-hour openings per week
4 to one five consecutive days opening per week beginning
5 on July 1st. In response, the Federal in-season
6 manager liberalized the Federal drift gillnet fishing
7 time, which was the final 18 hours of the weekly
8 regulatory openings, by a similar, prorated amount to
9 two 22-hour periods per opening. Effective July 6th,
10 the State and Federal regular subsistence fishery in
11 Subdistricts 4B and 4C was liberalized again, this time
12 to seven days per week, 24 hours a day. The Federal
13 drift gillnet fishing time was liberalized by a similar
14 prorated amount to two 31-hour periods for the week of
15 July 8th.

16
17 In 2007, the season that was just
18 completed, the interest in the Federal subsistence
19 fishing opportunity continued to be exploratory. A
20 total of 12 permits were issued this year, eight from
21 Galena, one from Koyukuk and three to Ruby residents,
22 with six permits returned at the end of July, with a
23 reported harvest of 13 Chinook salmon in 8.5 hours of
24 fishing by drift gillnets. The low harvest numbers and
25 the reality that all drift gillnet caught salmon are
26 bound for Canada has minimized any preconceived notions
27 about the impact of this fishery on U.S./Canada treaty
28 obligations, which is one of the concerns originally
29 expressed a couple years ago.

30
31 Just to keep this in perspective, in
32 2007 there were about 125,000 Chinook salmon
33 preliminary estimated to have passed through the Yukon
34 River. ADF&G also conducted a directed commercial
35 fishery for Yukon River Chinook salmon with a harvest
36 of approximately 33,600 fish and then, again, only 13
37 Chinook were harvested in the drift gillnet fishery in
38 4B and 4C.

39
40 I'm now onto the effects of the
41 proposals, Page 9. So adopting No. 15 would provide
42 additional harvest opportunities to Federally qualified
43 subsistence users by giving them additional time to
44 explore for, find and utilize productive drift gillnet
45 fishing sites. It would also align the subsistence
46 drift gillnet fishing time period to be the same as
47 other legal subsistence gear fishing times in
48 Subdistricts 4B and 4C.

49
50 This would result in increasing the

1 time by 60 hours per week from 36 to 96 hours. That
2 would mean in other words when the fishing season opens
3 each year for Subdistricts 4B and 4C, they have two 48-
4 hour periods under the windowed schedule. However, no
5 increase is anticipated in the combined harvest of
6 Chinook salmon in Subdistricts 4A, 4B and 4C as
7 Federally qualified users would likely only be changing
8 the locations of where they fish and not the amount of
9 fish needed and/or harvested.

10

11 Should more viable sites for drift
12 gillnet fishing be found in Subdistricts 4B and 4C,
13 fishing pressure and competition for the few desirable
14 fishing sites near and just downstream of the village
15 of Koyukuk in Subdistrict 4A may decrease. Federally
16 qualified subsistence users from, and fishing in,
17 Subdistricts 4B and 4C would be able to utilize their
18 time and resources more efficiently by being able to
19 use drift gillnets closer to their own communities and,
20 in so doing, consume less fuel due to shorter trips.
21 In addition, safety concerns of these fishers from 4B
22 and 4C associated with the time and distance required
23 traveling to productive sites in District 4A would be
24 reduced by being able to fish closer to their home
25 villages.

26

27 Aligning the drift gillnet fishing time
28 with the other legal subsistence gear fishing times
29 will likely result in less confusion by fishers and
30 less administrative actions that the Federal in-season
31 manager would need to take. As always, the Federal in-
32 season manager will continue to have the authority to
33 make in-season adjustments in fishing time and gear
34 types in response to Chinook salmon run strength.

35

36 For Proposal 16, adopting this proposal
37 would eliminate the Federal subsistence drift gillnet
38 fishery and would negate the Board's January 2005
39 action which established the fishery in the first
40 place. Federally qualified subsistence users in
41 Subdistricts 4B and 4C would no longer be able to use a
42 fishing method that is legal to use in Districts 1, 2
43 and 3 and the adjoining Subdistrict 4A. It would also
44 potentially increase the amount of time needed to
45 harvest fish by using less efficient gear types.

46

47 The Office of Subsistence Management's
48 preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal 15 and
49 oppose Proposal 16. The reasons for supporting 15 is
50 that Chinook salmon subsistence harvest in the Federal

1 drift gillnet fishery in Subdistricts 4B and 4C have
2 been extremely low in all three seasons so far, 2005,
3 2006 and 2007. The primary management concerns with
4 the expansion of the drift gillnet fishery into
5 Subdistricts 4B and 4C was that there was possible
6 significant potential for harvest expansion beyond the
7 historic level and the potential shift of stocks
8 harvested that may be taking more Canada-bound fish.
9 These concerns have not materialized.

10

11 Aligning the drift gillnet fishing time
12 with the other legal subsistence gear fishing times
13 would reduce confusion and provide additional harvest
14 opportunities of Federally qualified subsistence users.
15 It also provides additional time for them to explore
16 for, find and utilize viable drift gillnet sites. No
17 increase is anticipated in the combined harvest of
18 Chinook salmon in Subdistricts 4A, 4B and 4C.

19

20 The justification for opposing No. 16,
21 our Staff feels that eliminating the Federal
22 subsistence drift gillnet fishery in Subdistricts 4B
23 and 4C is not justified. The proponent's two claims
24 were considered and rejected by the Federal Subsistence
25 Board when it first established the fishery in 2005 and
26 again it is the use of a resource that is determined to
27 be customary and traditional, not the method or means
28 of harvest. The low participation rate by Federally
29 qualified users in the three years that this fishery
30 has been in existence is not a valid reason to
31 eliminate it.

32

33 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

34

35 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thanks, Don. I
36 actually participated in that drift fishery in 2005.
37 At least I was on a boat when some guys were drifting.
38 There's a real learning curve to drifting a net down
39 the Yukon River. We didn't catch a single fish.
40 Anyway, ADF&G comments.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Nobody is here. Other
45 Agency comments.

46

47 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair, I do have the
48 State comments and recommendation here.

49

50 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Go ahead.

1 MR. RIVARD: The State opposes FP08-15,
2 which would liberalize the fishery and they support
3 FP08-16, which would eliminate the fishery. Thank you,
4 Mr. Chair.

5
6 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. Kawerak
7 comments.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Inter-Agency Staff
12 Committee.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN QUINN: There's nobody here.
17 Nobody is here from the A.C. Me and Tom. That's not
18 why we're here. Summary of written public comments.
19 Barb.

20
21 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. There
22 are no written public comments on Proposal 15/16, but
23 for the YK-Delta Council, they opposed both of the
24 Proposals 15 and 16 and in your copies you have their
25 justification. Those are the reasons why they
26 opposed.....

27
28 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. This is Don
29 again if I may.

30
31 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, they supported
32 16?

33
34 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah.

35
36 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, okay, I'm sorry.
37 That's right. I wrote that down and I missed it here.
38 They did support 16 with 8 votes and 2 voting against.
39 And their justification is to say this is not a
40 traditional fishery and could negatively impact the
41 lower Yukon fishers over time. That's what they wrote.
42 On 15 they opposed with 6 votes, 3 for and 1 abstain.
43 And for 15 their justification is creation of this new
44 fishery in Yukon 4B and Yukon 4C could negatively
45 impact the lower Yukon fishers over time. The Yukon
46 River Chinook fishery is already fully allocated.
47 Thank you, sir.

48
49 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Any public
50 testimony.

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Seeing none, we can go
4 into deliberation on it. Anybody want to comment.

5

6 MR. GRAY: This is Tom Gray. I do have
7 comments. It seems to me there is a fishery there
8 already. Some people are asking to expand that
9 fishery, am I right in that? There's an 18-hour
10 fishery in 4B and 4C and they want this thing open all
11 the time. I guess my comments on this thing is this,
12 again, is a subsistence issue. It's a subsistence
13 fishery. My understanding is that should take
14 precedence over commercial fishing in that river.
15 Anyway, I'm going to support 15 and oppose 16.

16

17

18 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah, I don't think
19 they have a commercial king fishery in District 4.
20 Steve, have they had any king commercial seasons? Y1
21 and Y2 gets them, but I'm not aware that 4 has had any
22 commercial king openings for quite some time.

23

24 MR. GRAY: But let me clarify my point
25 here. We're talking about fish in this river system.
26 In my eyes, that river system, subsistence users should
27 have priority over those fish than any commercial
28 fishery in that river. I don't care if it's Y1, Y10,
29 Y30, whatever Y it is. Subsistence use should be a
30 priority. Again, Proposal 15 has a system in place
31 already. They want it expanded. Let me give you an
32 example. If back in White Mountain I go seine fish
33 like I do every year, seine whitefish and I'm a week
34 early, those eggs aren't ready, I've wasted my time,
35 I've wasted that resource. The same thing with these
36 people. If they have 18 hours that some bureaucracy
37 says you've got 18 hours today to go get those fish,
38 that resource may not be ready. Anyway, again,
39 subsistence is kind of the issue here and everything
40 else should come up afterwards.

41

42 MR. KLEIN: To answer the question on
43 commercial harvest in Subdistrict 4, the State manages
44 the commercial fishery, they have guideline harvest
45 ranges for each subdistrict, including District 4, and
46 then there's subsistence fisheries in every district as
47 well.

48

49 For this proposal, it's not to open it
50 seven days a week, 24/7, it's just when the other

1 subsistence fisheries are open, this would be open for
2 the entire 42-hour period in this case instead of just
3 the last 18 hours. Mr. Chair.

4

5 MR. GRAY: Just one last comment. We
6 come back to traditional use, customary and traditional
7 uses. It's not how you get it. If you have a use for
8 it and you've used it, it's not how you get it, it's
9 you using it. So for us to regulate how a subsistence
10 user goes out and we say you've only got 10 minutes to
11 catch five fish but you can go set a setnet for three
12 days, again that's wrong.

13

14 MR. BUCK: With Tom, I support the
15 subsistence users. The subsistence users again can't
16 practice territorial jurisdiction here, but I do
17 support 15 and oppose 16.

18

19 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, like I said I
20 participated over there and I think OSM has some real
21 valid comments here. It's not even expected to
22 increase the number of fish harvested, the harvest has
23 been so low. What it actually does is diminish
24 competition for fishing sites. At least from my
25 experience, people over there kind of feel like they
26 have -- without the drift fishing you're either stuck
27 using the fish wheel or a gillnet and on that Yukon
28 River it can only occur in certain places. They need
29 an eddy to put a gillnet and then they need a spot with
30 deep water and current to put a fish wheel.

31

32 These sites are limited and people use
33 them year after year. So there's the potential that as
34 new people grow up in the villages they don't have a
35 place to fish, they have to work within their family to
36 fish in these certain spots and this fishery allows
37 more people to find new places as a drift fishery to
38 get their fish. So it's not going to increase harvest,
39 it's just going to decrease competition and like they
40 said, increase safety because in some cases people
41 won't have to go as far to do their fishing. I would
42 also support 15 and oppose 16.

43

44 If anybody wants to make a motion, now
45 is the time.

46

47 MR. GRAY: I'll make that motion.

48

49 MR. BUCK: Seconded.

50

1 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Tom, be more clear on
2 your motion.
3
4 MR. GRAY: I make a motion.....
5
6 CHAIRMAN QUINN: 15 and 16.
7
8 MR. GRAY: I make a motion we support
9 15 and do not support 16.
10
11 MR. BUCK: Seconded.
12
13 CHAIRMAN QUINN: The motion has been
14 made and seconded. Any discussion.
15
16 (No comments)
17
18 CHAIRMAN QUINN: If not, I'll call for
19 the question. All those in favor of the motion say
20 aye.
21
22 IN UNISON: Aye.
23
24 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Opposed.
25
26 (No opposing votes)
27
28 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Motion carries. And
29 you wanted justification, Barb.
30
31 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: On 13 and 14,
32 please.
33
34 CHAIRMAN QUINN: So you're happy with
35 15 and 16.
36
37 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay, for 15 and 16,
38 too.
39
40 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Our justification is
41 to support the subsistence users in that region.
42
43 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: For 15?
44
45 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah. Our motion on
46 15 and 16, our justification was to support the
47 subsistence users in that region. Our justification on
48 13 and 14 was to -- well, to accept the justification
49 made by the YK-Delta RAC.
50

1 Okay. That should cover Don's part.
2 Anything else you need to do, Don?

3
4 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair, I appreciate
5 your time and patience in listening to my presentations
6 and have a good lunch.

7
8 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thank you, too.

9
10 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Is it lunch time?

11
12 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, what I'll
13 entertain comments here for whether we should break for
14 lunch or keep going and see if we can get this done in
15 another hour. What's everybody's feelings on that.
16 Tony, give me an idea of how long you think you're
17 going to need.

18
19 MR. GORN: My Unit 22 report is pretty
20 short and it will be dependant upon how long the
21 committee would like to talk about the four game
22 proposals. I can think of two you might want to talk
23 about a little bit and the other 22 of them I'll just
24 let you know what they're about and you may not want to
25 spend any time on.

26
27 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. Then I'm
28 going to suggest we break for lunch and come back in an
29 hour. Let's be back here before 1:00 o'clock. It's
30 quarter to 12:00.

31
32 (Off record)

33
34 (On record)

35
36 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right, folks,
37 take your seats and we'll get started again. While
38 everybody gets situated, Steve Klein can come to the
39 mike and we're going to do number 11, the Fisheries
40 Resource Monitoring Program.

41
42 MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Our
43 first topic this afternoon is the draft 2008 monitoring
44 program for fisheries. We have a draft plan to present
45 to you today. It's just a draft and the Board will be
46 making a decision on what projects to fund in December
47 or January following this meeting, but before the Board
48 deliberates they want to hear from all the Councils.
49 This is your opportunity to provide input on the
50 monitoring program.

1 The Fisheries Monitoring Program, the
2 goal is really to collect the information to manage
3 subsistence fisheries so we can continue to provide
4 subsistence uses for subsistence users to rural
5 residents. An excellent example of it is Jim Magdanz's
6 paper that he did with Sandra Tahbone, Austin Ahmasuk,
7 David Coster and Brian Davis. I think Jim handed a
8 copy out to each of the members. This is an excellent
9 example of what we're trying to do with the Monitoring
10 Program. It's not just a State agency or Federal
11 agency going out there and collecting information, they
12 worked very closely with Kawerak on this and with local
13 subsistence users. Now we have a wealth of information
14 on customary trade of fish and I hope you take time to
15 look at that. It's really a prime example of what
16 we're doing with the Fisheries Monitoring Program.

17
18 What we need to do this afternoon is we
19 need to get the Council's recommendation on what
20 projects to fund in 2008, so there will be new research
21 that starts next year. The draft plan is laid out in
22 your Council books beginning on Page 33 and it goes to
23 Page 50.

24
25 If you look at Table 1 on Page 37, the
26 Monitoring Program is a statewide program and we've
27 divided the state up into six regions. So if you look
28 at Table 1 there you can see the number of projects
29 which is the same as investigation plans. There was 30
30 projects that we're considering for funding for 2008
31 and of those 23 were recommended by the Technical
32 Review Committee.

33
34 At this point, the Technical Review
35 Committee, which is comprised of the five Federal
36 agencies and three ADF&G members, they've looked at
37 these projects and with the funding that is permitted,
38 they've decided that 23 can be recommended for new
39 research in 2008.

40
41 The process began in November of last
42 year where we requested proposals and we identified
43 priority research needs and for the Seward Peninsula
44 Council your priorities that you identified were salmon
45 and char fisheries as being the most important for your
46 region. Before we release our next request for
47 proposals, which will be in November of next year, your
48 fall meeting next year, we'll look at what you view as
49 the priorities for the next monitoring plan that we
50 initiate.

1 If you look at Table 1 on Page 40, that
2 summarizes the projects that have been funded and
3 completed so far. The Seward Peninsula is listed there
4 on the bottom. You see the customary trade of fish in
5 the Seward Peninsula area, that's one of your completed
6 projects. Several studies on the Pikmiktalik, salmon
7 surveys in the Nome district and Unalakleet River coho
8 salmon distribution and abundance. Those projects have
9 been completed and then there's several that are
10 ongoing. Those are listed in Table 2. The one Seward
11 Peninsula project that collected information this past
12 summer was the Pikmiktalik River chum and coho salmon
13 tower project.

14
15 On Page 43 is listed the three projects
16 that are being considered within the northern region.
17 The northern region includes the Seward Peninsula area,
18 but it also includes Kotzebue Sound as well as the
19 North Slope. There was three projects that are under
20 consideration and they're listed on the top of Page 43.

21
22 The first one that the Technical Review
23 Committee viewed as the highest priority was looking at
24 sheefish spawning and run timing in the Kobuk River.
25 Sheefish in the Kotzebue area are very important for
26 subsistence. They migrate up both the Selawik and the
27 Kobuk Rivers. There's been some research done on
28 abundance of Selawik and Kobuk Rivers sheefish. This
29 study would fund some radio telemetry work that would
30 look at where the fish are spawning, whether they're
31 spawning every year, every other year and just give us
32 better information to manage those fisheries and to
33 sustain them for subsistence uses.

34
35 The second study is the Unalakleet
36 River Chinook salmon ASL, which is age, sex, length
37 determination. We can tell a lot of a population by
38 looking at the age, the sex and the length. When we
39 looked at the Yukon River proposals, that was very
40 important for 13/14, the age and sex composition. It's
41 very important for looking at escapement goals. For
42 that study, ADF&G had proposed to collect ASL
43 information from beach seines in the lower Unalakleet
44 River for Chinook salmon and try to understand what's
45 going on in greater detail with Unalakleet River
46 Chinook salmon.

47
48 The third study that is being
49 considered for the Northern region is the Nuiqsut
50 baseline fish harvest assessment. That study is

1 intended to collect and synthesize information on
2 subsistence harvest around the village of Nuiqsut. So
3 those are the three projects that are under
4 consideration and the Board wants to hear from you and
5 the other Councils of what you view as the priorities.
6 When the scientists looked at it, and you all know they
7 don't know everything, but they thought the Kobuk River
8 sheefish was the highest priority and the second
9 priority was the Unalakleet River Chinook salmon and
10 third priority was Nuiqsut baseline fish harvest
11 assessment.

12
13 Given the funding level for the
14 Northern region, their funding guideline was about
15 \$100,000. The Technical Review Committee is
16 recommending that the highest priority be funded with
17 that funding guideline of \$100,000 and there really
18 wasn't sufficient funding to do the number two priority
19 or the number three.

20
21 So this is an action item for you to
22 say you support the Technical Review Committee's
23 recommendation or, alternatively, that you would
24 recommend a different project or more projects and this
25 will go to the Board, along with the recommendations
26 from the Northwest Arctic and North Slope Councils as
27 the Board finalizes the Fisheries Monitoring Plan for
28 2008.

29
30 Mr. Chair, I would turn it over to the
31 Council and be happy to answer any questions. Thank
32 you.

33
34 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thanks Steve. Does
35 anybody have any questions.

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 CHAIRMAN QUINN: It looks like we
40 haven't done too bad over the years with fisheries
41 monitoring. We've had a project going on it looks like
42 since '01 here. So we've been getting our fair share
43 of studies it looks like. Does anybody want to make a
44 motion.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. If nobody wants
49 to make a motion, we'll just let your recommendation
50 stand and I thank you for your time.

1 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: It's still an action
2 item.

3
4 CHAIRMAN QUINN: It's an action item.
5 We're supposed to take action, huh.

6
7 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You can make a
8 motion to support the TRC's recommendation.

9
10 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay.

11
12 MR. GRAY: You have \$87,000 and you
13 want to do the Kobuk study. Is that your
14 recommendation?

15
16 MR. KLEIN: Yes.

17
18 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: So he's asking
19 you.....

20
21 MR. GRAY: I understand.

22
23 MS. B. ARMSTRONG:if that's the
24 way you want to go and that's an action item you need
25 to voice.

26
27 MR. KLEIN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Gray. These
28 are really the only three studies you can make
29 recommendations on at this time. At your fall meeting,
30 we really want your input on what priorities are and,
31 Mr. Gray, I know you brought up grayling interactions
32 with other fisheries. That might be a topic we want to
33 recommend as a research priority so we can get some
34 proposals looking at grayling for the next monitoring
35 plan. But for the 2008 Monitoring Plan these are the
36 three studies that are under consideration.

37
38 MR. GRAY: Are you saying that there
39 may be Federal monies spent on my river system? In the
40 past, I've tried to shake the bushes and get some money
41 shaken out for my region or my river system and I keep
42 hearing that there's not enough Federal lands up there,
43 we're not going to spend any money on that river
44 system. Has that changed?

45
46 MR. KLEIN: No. For the Monitoring
47 Program it needs to be focused on Federal lands. That
48 was kind of reinforced by the Board at their last
49 meeting when they looked at the proposals. If you're
50 talking about systems that are exclusively State land,

1 the Board has directed us to spend those dollars on
2 Federal lands and for the system like the Unalakleet,
3 which has both Federal and State lands, at the last
4 Board meeting this Council and the TRC had recommended
5 a project for Unalakleet Chinook salmon and there the
6 Board did not approve the project for funding because
7 they thought the State should be contributing a
8 significant portion of the cost to the program given
9 the amount of State lands and the commercial fisheries
10 as well. No, that has not changed and the program
11 needs to be focused on priorities and for the Federal
12 Subsistence Board that's Federal public lands.

13

14 Mr. Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

17

18 MR. GRAY: Let me ask this. You guys
19 must have went through some priority ranking or somehow
20 the Kobuk River came out on top out of these three
21 priorities. Is there any rhyme or reason how you came
22 up with this? I look at this thing and I'm thinking to
23 myself, Kobuk, they can fend for themselves. I want my
24 region to get some money. So it would be easy for me
25 to say, bologna, I make a motion to support Unalakleet,
26 but if there's a reason you guys have prioritized it
27 the way you have, I'd like to hear it.

28

29 MR. KLEIN: You're correct, there is a
30 rhyme and reason to the recommendation. There's four
31 criteria that we look at for each and every study and
32 one is strategic priority, is it a heavily-used
33 subsistence resource, is it mostly or exclusively on
34 Federal lands. That's the strategic priority and for
35 the Kobuk sheefish that ranked pretty high. We look at
36 the technical merit, is it going to achieve the
37 objectives, are they scientifically sound. Basically
38 all three of these studies had pretty high technical
39 merit. We also look at partnership and capacity
40 building as a criteria. That really didn't separate
41 out any of these projects. And the last criteria is
42 past performance and that wasn't a major separating
43 factor among these three studies. So the main criteria
44 we used to separate these projects really was the
45 strategic priority, which also included for the
46 Unalakleet River where you have a mix of State and
47 Federal lands.

48

49 Following upon the Board direction,
50 that was mostly a request for Federal dollars with

1 little contribution of State dollars and that weighed
2 into the decision-making or the recommendation from the
3 TRC. There's no question that Unalakleet River Chinook
4 are important. I sit on the Technical Review Committee
5 and given the recent Board action and the lack of State
6 funding support for the project, that was one of the
7 separating factors as well as Kobuk sheefish are very
8 important in that area.

9

10 Mr. Gray and Mr. Chair. We tried to
11 summarize the rationale for our decision-making in the
12 short descriptions of the projects on Page 43.

13

14 CHAIRMAN QUINN: So what you're saying
15 is even though us guys would probably like to see a
16 Unalakleet River Chinook salmon study, the Subsistence
17 Board has pretty much already shot that down because
18 much of the Unalakleet River is State land and without
19 matching funds from the State, they ain't going to fund
20 the project or approve funding of the project. The
21 Kobuk River project has a lot of Federal land and on
22 Page 42, Steve, there's something here and it talks
23 about matching. There's a column for matching funds.

24

25 MR. KLEIN: Yes. For the Kobuk
26 sheefish project they did have a substantial match of
27 99,000. Actually, they're contributing more in
28 matching funds than they're requesting, whereas
29 Unalakleet they're requesting 62 and they counted a
30 match as 42, so there was a much higher match on the
31 Kobuk River sheefish project.

32

33 MR. GRAY: I'd like to throw in that we
34 need to be a little bit careful on this match thing
35 because I think some of these projects are always going
36 to have trouble getting matches and we can't eliminate
37 that resource or managing that resource just because
38 the match isn't there. I mean we've got to figure a
39 different way of making that -- and Unalakleet may be a
40 good example. If you needed more match money to make
41 this project happen, maybe we need to go back to the
42 back burner and this Board prioritize, yeah, Unalakleet
43 should come in next time as our ultimate goal, but
44 somebody's got to figure out how we're going to get
45 this match hurdle dealt with because you guys are going
46 to come in every time and say, hey, we've got Federal
47 money, we've got match money up here and these projects
48 just keep going somewhere else. The match thing
49 shouldn't be shooting these projects down so to speak.
50 Somebody needs to do a little better homework or

1 something.

2

3 MR. KLEIN: Through Chair. Mr. Gray.
4 When the Technical Review Committee looked at these
5 three projects, I think it was really the strategic
6 priority that separated out the Kobuk River sheefish
7 from the other two projects and the matching funds I
8 think it was a secondary benefit to the project. In
9 the face of declining dollars, when you see a project
10 that's a strategic priority and one brings matching
11 funds that exceeds the other project by 50,000, that's
12 something at least the TRC is looking at. The Council
13 can look at it different ways. We're just presenting a
14 recommendation and the Board will be looking at your
15 input as what you view as the highest priorities.

16

17 CHAIRMAN QUINN: But the Board is also
18 going to take money into account. Go ahead, George.
19 Come on.

20

21 MR. KLEIN: I think I can speak for the
22 Board. If money wasn't an issue, we would be
23 recommending all three of these projects. They are
24 good projects, but we're not allowed to overspend our
25 budget, so we have to make these tough choices. The
26 way we do is prioritize it based on the four criteria
27 the Board gave us and the highest priority wins.

28

29 CHAIRMAN QUINN: We need a motion from
30 the local experts or we're going to be here until 8:00
31 o'clock.

32

33 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. I so move to
34 accept TRC's recommendation.....

35

36 MR. SAVETILIK: Second.

37

38 MR. SEETOT:to fund the Kobuk
39 River sheefish study.

40

41 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thanks, Elmer. The
42 motion has been made and seconded. Any discussion.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Call for the question
47 then. All those in favor say aye.

48

49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

1 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Opposed.
2
3 (No opposing votes)
4
5 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Motion carries.
6 Thanks, Steve.
7
8 MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
9 We'll work with you to identify what research
10 priorities should be highlighted as priorities for the
11 next Monitoring Plan. Thank you for your motion.
12
13 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Maybe there will be
14 enough money left over for a fact-finding trip so all
15 of us can go up there this spring and get some
16 sheefish. Barbara will arrange that.
17
18 (Laughter)
19
20 CHAIRMAN QUINN: I believe that brings
21 us back to Item Number 14, numbers 5 and 6. Secretary
22 Kempthorne's letter and the Regional Advisory Council
23 compensation. Do we need to do those, Barb? We did
24 number 1, 2, 3 and 4.
25
26 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Did we do Council
27 composition? You did that one. You didn't do 2. You
28 didn't do the rural one. I mean 3, sorry.
29
30 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Oh, okay.
31
32 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And then the other
33 two you mentioned, Secretary Kempthorne's letter and
34 Regional Advisory Council compensation, I think earlier
35 I said composition, those two are informational only.
36 You don't have to do anything on those.
37
38 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Good.
39
40 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: So we'll move to the
41 rural/nonrural that's on Page 58. This is also
42 informational. You don't have to make any
43 recommendations, but we wanted to inform you as to what
44 was going on. I believe you should have all received a
45 green packet of -- it was a document that was put
46 together of all the requests for reconsiderations on
47 rural. Did you all receive that in the mail?
48
49 Okay. Those were the requests for
50 reconsiderations on the rural/nonrural determinations

1 and we've been giving you briefings for the past couple
2 years as to what we were doing on that. The Board did
3 meet last December and made their final determinations
4 on rural and then it was finalized in May of 2007.
5 Then the public has 60 days where they can request the
6 Board to reconsider those. We just wanted you to be
7 aware that people have made some requests for
8 reconsiderations. Those are all listed at the bottom
9 of the page on 58. There's six of them.

10

11 None of them had anything to do with
12 anything in this region, so you don't need to be
13 concerned in terms of your region. They were
14 predominantly the Kenai Peninsula and also Southeast,
15 Ketchikan and Saxman. There was somebody who had a
16 concern about Adak that wasn't in either of those two
17 areas, but generally the request -- I mean they don't
18 have anything to do with this region, so you shouldn't
19 be really concerned, but we just wanted you to be aware
20 that this is happening, the Board can take up the rural
21 issue again. Whether they will or not I don't know.

22

23 We're in the process of evaluating the
24 claims. We'll do a threshold analysis and then if
25 there are some that meet that threshold of either being
26 -- there's some criteria they have to meet that's
27 listed on that Page 58. It either has to demonstrate
28 that existing information used by the Board is
29 incorrect, that the Board's interpretation of
30 information, applicable law or regulation is in error
31 or contrary to existing law or that it's based on
32 information not previously considered by the Board, if
33 any of those three criteria are fulfilled, then the
34 Board will take up the rural/nonrural determinations
35 again.

36

37 Any questions.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Thanks, Helen.

42

43 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you.

44

45 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. That moves us
46 on to the National Park Service, Agency Report.

47

48 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Council
49 members. Ken Adkisson, National Park Service.
50 Basically the Park Service in terms of its wildlife

1 research and monitoring efforts, again cooperating in
2 the 2007 Seward Peninsula musk oxen census. However,
3 most of our work this year was focused in Unit 23 with
4 bears, sheep, moose and musk oxen in Unit 23. Also as
5 part of the Park Service program our arctic network
6 inventory and monitoring program continues to work on
7 defining it's vital signs, the things that are
8 considered important to the parks to monitor on an
9 ongoing basis and those include a number of wildlife
10 species or will include a number of wildlife species,
11 including caribou, musk oxen, bears and we're still
12 working on those.

13

14 Another thing we were involved in, of
15 course, was along with the Musk oxen Cooperator's
16 Group, along with ADF&G, we developed a proposal,
17 submitted to the Alaska Board of Game to revise the
18 amount needed for subsistence ANS for the Seward
19 Peninsula musk oxen. Basically that would raise the
20 ANS from 100 animals to a range of 200 to 250 animals.
21 That recommendation came out of the cooperator's group
22 in which about a day and a half of really intensive
23 work went into evaluating different methods of
24 calculating ANS and settling on criteria that we felt
25 were transparent and we'll see where the Board of Game
26 goes with that when it meets next month.

27

28 Just to give you an overall idea,
29 there's basically right now 2,688 musk oxen out there.
30 Growth is down from the 14 to 18 percent that it
31 exhibited in the early part of the history of the
32 animals out here down to about eight percent. Tony will
33 probably talk more about that for ADF&G when he gives
34 his report.

35

36 Just to give you a rough idea what that
37 translates into right now though is an allowable
38 harvest of 187 animals. So even if the Board of Game
39 adopts the 200 to 250 range, if the herd continues to
40 grow and expand, we'll probably be approaching a point
41 in the foreseeable future where we'll once again hit
42 the ANS threshold. How that will translate into
43 reshaping the hunt is a little hard to say right now.
44 Whether it would go to something like a Tier I
45 registration hunt, that's usually the next step in the
46 State system. It also would have implications for
47 Federal closures and so forth on Federal lands for musk
48 oxen.

49

50 The last thing I guess to touch on is

1 the Park Service, in its role, capacity as in-season
2 manager for this area basically issued three special
3 actions for the Unalakleet Wild River aimed at
4 conservation of Chinook salmon, balanced efforts to
5 increase and ensure an adequate escapement base with
6 providing subsistence opportunity.

7
8 For the first time in several years the
9 Chinook escapement goals were met down on the
10 Unalakleet River. I don't remember exactly what the
11 numbers were, but they fell within about the midpoint
12 of the escapement range. What that means in terms of
13 next year and the year after I think we're just going
14 to have to wait and see. My guess is though that we're
15 probably going to be managing that area down there by
16 special action for the foreseeable future, at least the
17 next several years, unless things consistently pick up.

18
19 That's all I've got for now unless
20 there are questions.

21
22 MR. SEETOT: To date, how many musk ox
23 have been taken on Federal land?

24
25 MR. ADKISSON: I don't know of any
26 right now for us this year.

27
28 MR. SEETOT: And then you said there
29 was some openings or slots for Federal -- or taking of
30 musk ox on Federal lands A and B.

31
32 MR. ADKISSON: No, Mr. Seetot. 22A
33 there is no Federal hunt. 22B there is a musk oxen
34 hunt and the permitting for that is being handled by
35 BLM. I think Tom Sparks explained it. People who are
36 interested in those permits needed to contact the BLM
37 Anchorage office. As for the rest of the area, the
38 Park Service continues to handle the Federal permits
39 for those. We're not involved in C. The number of
40 permits in D is sort of limited, severely limited to
41 Federal permits, largely under recommendation of the
42 Musk oxen Cooperator's Group. And 22E is really a
43 unique situation in that there's a Tier I registration
44 hunt under the State system for 22E. We still continue
45 to give out a fairly large number of Federal permits
46 for that. I believe the allowable harvest for E this
47 year is something like 76 animals.

48
49 And we're also doing Federal permits in
50 23 Southwest, the Buckland/Deering area.

1 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Thanks, Ken.
2 Next is Kawerak, Incorporated report.

3
4 MR. AHMASUK: Thank you. Good
5 afternoon. For the record, Austin Ahmasuk, Kawerak
6 subsistence. We appreciate being on your agenda. In
7 the future, if you just wanted to include Kawerak as
8 part of a public comment period, we wouldn't be miffed
9 or anything like that, but we appreciate being on the
10 agenda.

11
12 Kawerak, as you know, is an Alaska
13 Native non-profit organization. My program, the
14 subsistence program, had an extremely busy year, '06-
15 '07. We did a lot of projects. We continued to manage
16 migratory bird program in which we administer a co-
17 management function for the newly enacted Migratory
18 Bird Treaty Act protocol amendments. We also
19 administer a migratory bird subsistence harvest survey
20 program. We are involved in the Alaska Native ICO
21 working group. While we don't have an ICO program, we
22 do conduct ICO activities as part of our, sort of
23 grandfathered, kind of political appointments we have.

24
25 I'm a member via my job as a part of
26 the Alaska Native Subsistence Halibut working group.
27 We don't have a halibut program, but we're involved in
28 a halibut co-management issues and then we have an
29 environmental component.

30
31 In terms of the projects, I'll get into
32 the other stuff that we do. In terms of the migratory
33 bird projects, the additional bird projects that we did
34 this year we did some work via Fish and Wildlife
35 Service agreement to document and study avian influenza
36 occurrence in our region. We tested birds on St.
37 Lawrence Island, Stebbins, St. Michael, Shishmaref and
38 Nome. From that study we do have some results back.
39 The most worrisome bird disease, avian influenza H5N1
40 has not been found in any bird sample, although H5
41 types have been found and occur at about a 2 percent
42 rate, none of the bird samples returned indicated the
43 highly virulent N1 types. There were N types, but none
44 of the very scary diseases.

45
46 And then we had a very intensive
47 subsistence harvest survey efforts this year. I would
48 like to pass out information regarding our most recent
49 efforts this past year for the '05-'06 year. We
50 finished up this project in June. It took a fair while

1 for us to develop the final report, but it was a
2 culmination of North Pacific Research Board funds and
3 ADF&G funds and we conducted a comprehensive harvest
4 survey of our region.

5
6 We went to the communities of
7 Shishmaref, Wales, Brevig Mission, Teller, Gambell,
8 Savoonga, White Mountain, Elim, Koyuk, Unalakleet, St.
9 Michael and Stebbins. The only mainland communities
10 that we did not get to were Shaktoolik. Each community
11 is given the opportunity to approve or not approve the
12 project and that's up to the community. Shaktoolik
13 opted not to be in this survey. And just for
14 logistical purposes, the community of Golovin we
15 weren't able to finish our harvest survey activities
16 there, so we didn't get any information from there.
17 Additionally, Diomede for the same reasons, logistical
18 reasons. We weren't able to canvas subsistence harvest
19 survey uses out there.

20
21 This project was a highly anticipated
22 project and it has already been extremely useful. We
23 have been able to develop this report, analyze a whole
24 slough of data that is absolutely enormous. The
25 information has been shared with U.S. Fish and Wildlife
26 Service, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, it's being
27 shared with you now. The report to the region, to the
28 tribes, is being developed now. We are trying to cater
29 that report so that it isn't so wordy.

30
31 The final report is 300-plus pages and
32 involves a lot of information that would put a lot of
33 people to sleep maybe. It's a really great project.
34 We'll be able to build on this project. We're going to
35 continue activities like this. This project will be a
36 building block for future harvest surveys. We were
37 able to show in a very comprehensive manner subsistence
38 harvest for our region.

39
40 I think a little later on Division of
41 Subsistence is going to present some information on our
42 joint efforts on customary trade project. This past
43 year, as I see here, you're at least looking at Nome
44 area Unit 22 Board of Game proposals. Kawerak
45 submitted several proposals. The Kawerak Subsistence
46 Program, we're governed by the Kawerak board of
47 directors, which is our representatives, generally the
48 IRA presidents of all the IRA's in the region.

49
50 As much as we possibly can, we try to

1 maintain a close association with tribes and ideas. We
2 have three main functions. Number one, tribal
3 advocacy. Number two, subsistence harvest survey
4 study. And then number three, my position and our
5 functions come with some political appointments.

6

7 Kawerak, we truly see our role in the
8 business of creating ideas. We respect the fact that
9 we don't make any regulations and we certainly spend a
10 lot of time and spend a tremendous amount of effort
11 studying subsistence. We believe that our function is
12 just that, is in the business of creating ideas,
13 proposing ideas and seeing ideas through to their very
14 end whether it's Board of Game, Board of Fish or
15 Federal Subsistence Board.

16

17 I believe that I've captured most of
18 what the subsistence program is doing. The Kawerak
19 Fisheries Program's funding is running out this year.
20 Some of our fish counting projects will not be
21 continued. The Pikmiktalik project, that will not be
22 continued because of funding. Most of the Nome fish
23 counting projects will not be continued.

24

25 We recently hired a social scientist,
26 she's in the back of the room here, on her second day
27 of working here, and much of the activities that we
28 conduct some of them are compact derived, but a great
29 majority of our activities come from soft money that
30 wholly depend upon our grant writing activities. We
31 try as much as we can to write as many grants and
32 proposals as we possibly can.

33

34 Kawerak though is feeling the heat of
35 funding cuts across the board at Kawerak. Some
36 employee benefits have been reduced. Kawerak hours
37 have been reduced in order to reflect budgetary
38 reductions.

39

40 The Reindeer Herder's Association
41 maintains a high level of activity with its meetings
42 and its activities. We have not been able to hire a
43 fisheries biologist. Our young wildlife program still
44 has a placeholder. Our wildlife biologist left this
45 year and we hope to hire a fisheries biologist and a
46 wildlife biologist to take on those activities.

47

48 Land Management Services manages trust
49 responsibility for Native allotments and so forth. Of
50 course, Kawerak does a lot of things ranging from

1 education to general assistance to transportation,
2 things like that. I know a lot less about those
3 programs than I do our own natural resource program.

4

5 With that, thank you for your time.

6

7 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Any questions for
8 Austin. Go ahead.

9

10 MR. SEETOT: Elmer from Brevig. You'll
11 still request funding from NSCDC for maybe the counting
12 towers at Pilgrim River?

13

14 MR. AHMASUK: Yeah, Elmer, it's very
15 likely that that project will continue. The new
16 sockeye salmon fishery there is entirely dependant upon
17 the run timing and the run strength and the threshold
18 levels getting up river. That project will very likely
19 continue. The other Nome projects may not.

20

21 MR. SEETOT: And you're not associated
22 with that commercial fishery thing that they're doing
23 in Port Clarence
24 district?

25

26 MR. AHMASUK: Well, no, we are not
27 associated with those activities. The counting tower
28 provides the scientific information for managers.
29 NSCDC has thrown a lot of money into that area to help
30 commercial fishermen, gear and things like that.
31 They're the sole buyer, so Kawerak has zero to do with
32 those activities other than -- in the beginning, as you
33 know, Elmer, Kawerak provided funds for yourself and
34 other representatives from Mary's Igloo and Teller to
35 comment during Board of Fish process regarding that
36 fishery.

37

38 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Thanks, Austin.
39 Well, we're ready for Fish and Game. Let's just take
40 five minutes for everyone to get coffee, use the
41 bathroom or whatever before we start the ADF&G report.

42

43 (Off record)

44

45 (On record)

46

47 CHAIRMAN QUINN: We're going to get
48 started again here. Tony, you're going to go first?

49

50 MR. GORN: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I'll go

1 first.

2

3

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Proceed.

4

5

6

MR. GORN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
Committee members. My name is Tony Gorn. I'm the Unit
22 area biologist here in Nome. We also have Jim
Magdanz.

9

10

11

MR. MAGDANZ: Jim Magdanz, Division of
Subsistence from Kotzebue.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Just a quick summary of fall hunting
seasons in Unit 22, specifically what people are
interested in are the registration moose hunt along the
Nome road system. In Unit 22B, west of the Darbies,
which includes Golovin and White Mountain, the 2007
harvest was 18 moose. We issued an emergency order to
close the fall portion of the season. The quota for

1 that area is actually 23 moose. In the regulation
2 book, it's described as having 18 moose available in
3 the fall and then five moose available in the winter
4 and that split in the quota was decided by the Advisory
5 Committees, specifically White Mountain and Golovin,
6 wanted that five moose available in the winter season.
7 That's the short history behind that.

8
9 In 22C, that's actually a typo. It
10 says 29 bulls were harvested. It was 30. We harvested
11 30 bulls in 22C. The quota was 50. I'm continuing to
12 scratch my head. I don't understand why the harvest
13 was so low in 22C. For years we've taken 42 bulls in
14 22C just because of the population increase that we
15 observed during the last year census that we increased
16 the quota to 50. Talking to local hunters, the moose
17 were available for harvest. I'm not sure why they all
18 weren't harvested. But we took 30 out of 50 there.
19 And our antlerless moose hunt in 22C we saw 14 moose
20 out of the 20 permits be harvested.

21
22 In 22D, in the Kuzitrin, Pilgrim,
23 Kugruk drainages, the fall quota was 39 bulls. We
24 actually harvested 42 and issued an EO to close that
25 season. In 22D southwest, we took 7 out of 8 and the
26 last registration hunt we have on the Seward Peninsula
27 is a nonresident hunt which takes place in Unit 22D
28 Remainder and we took 5 out of 10 there.

29
30 I'll move on to where we are with musk
31 ox harvest and hunts for this regulatory year. As many
32 of you are all aware, the musk ox season is very long.
33 It opens in August through March 15th, so we're really
34 kind of at the beginning stages of it. We won't see
35 most of our harvest until later in the year. Anyway,
36 in TX102 we harvested 11 animals, in TX103 we harvested
37 4 and in the registration hunt up in 22E we've
38 harvested 5 permits to date. There's a drawing hunt
39 also in 22E where we issue 20 permits and so far we've
40 harvested one bull out of that.

41
42 On the handout I gave you, you can see
43 it talks about how many permits were issued and the
44 overall quota and I'll just let you guys look at that
45 for background information.

46
47 Does anybody have any questions on
48 moose or musk ox harvest?

49
50 MR. SEETOT: The Nome road system, it

1 doesn't pertain to communities of Teller or Brevig or
2 other communities within 22, am I correct?

3

4 MR. GORN: Elmer, through the Chair. I
5 guess it does include in a way the community of Teller.
6 That area in the regulation book is referred to as 22D
7 southwest and that's where the quota is 8 moose.

8

9 MR. SEETOT: So they got seven and
10 they're allowed just one more and that's it, my
11 understanding of what you said?

12

13 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Elmer.
14 The season is actually closed now, so they're not
15 allowed one more moose, but the season just ended
16 naturally in that area and we only harvested seven out
17 of eight moose. There was one more available for
18 harvest.

19

20 MR. GRAY: This is Tom Gray. Do you
21 have any plans for 22C to reopen moose hunting?
22 Looking at these numbers, you're 25 animals short of
23 what you budgeted for the hunt here. Do you guys have
24 any plans to address them animals?

25

26 MR. GORN: Mr. Gray, through the Chair.
27 That's a very good question. The short version is, no,
28 we don't. The reason why is because this has never
29 happened before. Usually in Unit 22C the moose that
30 are available for harvest are harvested. For many
31 years there was no quota. It was just a 14-day season
32 and then through the evolution of this registration
33 hunt the harvest quota was established, but it was met.

34

35 Because of what we saw this fall, at
36 this next Board of Game meeting we're going to take
37 actions so if this ever happens again in the future we
38 will hopefully have a season on the books to take that
39 unused portion of the quota like we do in 22B west and
40 22D, we have those to-be-announced winter seasons. So
41 if this happens in those areas, we can harvest those
42 moose in January. Because we just never experienced
43 this before in 22C, we didn't have that season on the
44 books. Hopefully we will after November.

45

46 MR. GRAY: But don't you have authority
47 to create an emergency order to extend the season or
48 somehow reopen this thing so those animals can be
49 addressed?

50

1 MR. GORN: The Division of Wildlife
2 Conservation has emergency order authority, but it's
3 used to close seasons. It's not used to create or open
4 seasons unless on the books we have a to-be-announced
5 season, which we don't have here yet.

6
7 MR. BUCK: I have a comment on the 22B
8 moose season. On the Darby west moose to be taken, 18
9 were taken and White Mountain residents didn't harvest
10 very much of that because of low water this year. The
11 Council residents were the ones that harvested most of
12 the moose. Also, the past two years when we've been
13 harvesting moose in White Mountain area the fat content
14 of the moose hasn't been there. Three years ago it was
15 good, but the past two years has been real bad.

16
17 MR. GORN: Peter, through the Chair, I
18 appreciate that comment. The allocation component of
19 your question is a real challenge for where we are
20 right now. I think what we have to do is continue to
21 work through the Northern Norton Sound Advisory
22 Committee to come up with a new hunt regime for the
23 area. Of course, the easiest solution here is for us
24 to experience an increase in the moose population and
25 at some point I sure hope we get to see that. But
26 until then I think we need to work through that AC to
27 come up with a better work regime than we have now.

28
29 To continue with brown bear harvest, if
30 you turn the page over. The 2006 brown bear harvest,
31 which is the second row there, is the second highest
32 documented brown bear harvest ever in Unit 22. The
33 2007 harvest you see, which just represents this fall's
34 harvest is about average. That's what we see on a
35 normal year in the fall time.

36
37 The most noteworthy comment I'll make
38 about our brown bear harvest is that although it
39 continues to be high, it's about double of what we saw
40 on an average previous to 1998. The ratio of harvested
41 bears -- the sex ratios of the harvested bears are
42 still not noteworthy. We haven't seen a real increase
43 in females over males. That ratio has stayed the same.

44
45 Is there any questions on brown bear
46 harvest.

47
48 (No comments)

49
50 MR. GORN: Then if it's okay with the

1 Chair, I'll just briefly go over the Unit 22 Board of
2 Game proposals. What I'll do is just read the proposal
3 number and the effect of the proposal and maybe just
4 mention a couple proposals that you all might consider
5 taking some type of action on prior to your October
6 19th deadline.

7

8 Proposal 11 would extend mink and
9 weasel trapping dates and also separate those species
10 in the code.

11

12 Proposal 12 eliminates brown bear
13 sealing and tag requirements.

14

15 Proposal 13 changes the brown bear
16 hunting season dates in Unit 22A.

17

18 Proposal 14 changes the brown bear
19 spring season hunting dates in Unit 22C.

20

21 Proposal 15 allows salvage of bears
22 when taken in defense of life or property.

23

24 Proposal 16 modifies the hunt area
25 description for caribou hunting in Unit 22B.

26

27 Proposal 17 opens caribou hunting for
28 residents in 22B and D.

29

30 Proposal 18 opens moose seasons for
31 resident in the central portion of Unit 22A.

32

33 Proposal 19 does the same thing, just
34 using a different technique.

35

36 Proposal 20 eliminates drawing
37 requirement for nonresident moose hunters in Unit 22B.

38

39 Proposal 21 modifies the nonresident
40 drawing system for moose in 22B.

41

42 Proposal 22 establishes a bow hunt for
43 moose in Units 22C and D.

44

45 Proposal 23 changes the nonresident
46 moose registration hunt to a general harvest hunt in
47 Unit 22D.

48

49 Proposal 24 establishes nonresident
50 registration permit hunt for moose in Unit 22E.

1 Proposal 25 changes the amounts
2 necessary for subsistence numbers and season dates for
3 moose in Unit 22.

4
5 Proposal 26 eliminates musk ox tag
6 requirements.

7
8 Proposal 27 changes the amount
9 necessary for subsistence for musk ox.

10
11 Proposal 28 increases the number of
12 musk ox drawing permits in Unit 22E.

13
14 Proposal 29 eliminates trophy
15 destruction requirements for musk ox hunts.

16
17 Proposal 30 provides an additional
18 nonresident drawing hunt for musk ox in Unit 22E by
19 targeting groomed animals.

20
21 Proposal 31 modifies seasons and bag
22 limits for musk ox in Unit 22E.

23
24 Proposal 32 adjusts trapping seasons
25 and the hunting bag limits for wolf seasons in Unit 22.

26
27 Proposal 33 lengthens the hunting
28 season for wolves in Unit 22D and 22E.

29
30 And Proposal 34 extends the wolverine
31 hunting season in Unit 22E and D.

32
33 The two proposals that I'll mention
34 that to me seem noteworthy to the committee would be
35 Proposal 19 and Proposal 24.

36
37 Proposal 19 I'll mention because, as
38 most of you are probably aware right now, there is not
39 a moose hunting season in the central portion of 22A.
40 The Department and the Southern Norton Sound Advisory
41 Committee and the residents of Unit 22A have all worked
42 very closely together over the last four years on the
43 season closure and what steps to take to begin hunting
44 moose in the area again. I really applaud the efforts
45 of the residents of the central portion of Unit 22A.
46 They've really stuck with us and worked hard. Proposal
47 19 is a product of their efforts. I'll mention that
48 because there's a lot of BLM land in that area of Unit
49 22A, so it might be appropriate to consider a Federal
50 season that is similar to what is being proposed.

1 The second proposal I'll mention is
2 Proposal 24 and actually Jim Magdanz is going to go
3 over the ANS proposals just briefly and describe those
4 to you, but Proposal 24 is going to re-establish a
5 nonresident moose hunting season in Unit 22E on a
6 limited basis.

7
8 Just a brief background of that
9 proposal is that basically around 2000 the moose
10 population in Unit 22E has increased greatly, to the
11 point now it's two and a half times our population
12 objective for the area. The resident season in Unit
13 22E is very long. Harvest pressure and traditional
14 harvest from the area is relatively low and it just
15 seems appropriate at this time to offer some
16 nonresident opportunity.

17
18 The way we're going to approach it is
19 to try to mirror what's going on in Unit 22D remainder,
20 which is just adjacent to the area to the south, so the
21 Department is proposing a nonresident season with the
22 same season dates, registration hunt, the season dates
23 are September 1 to 14. The harvest quota would be 10
24 bulls.

25
26 So those are the two that I would like
27 to bring to your attention and I can take any questions
28 you have. Thank you.

29
30 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

31
32 MR. GRAY: There's a proposal you guys
33 put in addressing the caribou in 22B and what I'm after
34 is just a clarification on what this says because I
35 personally -- if it says what I think it says, I don't
36 have a problem with it, but if it says something else,
37 I want to hear it.

38
39 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Mr.
40 Gray. There's two caribou proposals that relate to
41 Unit 22B and I thought you might ask about them.

42
43 MR. GRAY: I'm against 17 period. No.
44 16, the one Fish and Game proposed, it looks to me like
45 you guys want to reopen the Libby Creek valley and
46 everything above Libby Creek on the Niukluk River, is
47 that right?

48
49 MR. GORN: It would exclude the Libby
50 River drainage. What that proposal would do, Tom, do

1 you remember in 2005 when we all worked together.....
2
3 MR. GRAY: It would open up the Libby
4 Creek drainage.
5
6 MR. GORN: Right.
7
8 MR. GRAY: And it would open up the
9 land between Libby Creek and the Niukluk River.
10
11 MR. GORN: Correct.
12
13 MR. GRAY: And that's what you guys are
14 after.
15
16 MR. GORN: What we're after is -- well,
17 in 2005, when we all worked together to come up with
18 this proposal, it went to the Board meeting and it was
19 adopted and everybody and the public understands what
20 the proposal is supposed to be. In the big, thick law
21 book, they wrote it incorrectly, so this is what the
22 Department calls a housecleaning proposal. We're just
23 getting the bean counters down in Juneau to fix their
24 error. But, effectively, it's not going to change the
25 season as you and the Advisory Committee proposed it
26
27 MR. GRAY: We set up initially.
28
29 MR. GORN: Right. Correct.
30
31 MR. GRAY: Okay, your guys' proposal is
32 fine as far as I'm concerned. The other one I'll
33 address that tomorrow.
34
35 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah.
36
37 MR. GORN: Thank you.
38
39 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. I was going to
40 say thanks, Tony. I wish we had time to go over a
41 couple of these, but for this RAC to draft a proposal
42 like that at this time and submit it to the Federal
43 Board, we're just not in a position to do that right
44 now.
45
46 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You've got time.
47
48 CHAIRMAN QUINN: You think?
49
50 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

1 MR. GRAY: Mike, can I interject.
2
3 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead, Tom.
4
5 MR. GRAY: I really think, and I was
6 kind of waiting on Myron to interject something here.
7 You know, we had a lot of talk over the Shaktoolik
8 moose hunt and there's a proposal in here addressing
9 moose hunting in you guys' country. You might want to
10 look at that and have the Board send a recommendation
11 to the RAC or somebody tomorrow. If this guy wins,
12 there won't be a registration deal for moose hunting in
13 I want to say the Shaktoolik drainage, is that right?
14
15 MR. GORN: Tom, through the Chair, I'm
16 actually a little confused. The proposals for Unit
17 22A, the moose proposals focus on the central portion
18 of Unit 22A, which generally speaking is the Unalakleet
19 River drainage and the Unalakleet area. So they would
20 not have an effect on the Shaktoolik area.
21
22 MR. GRAY: Okay. I'm digging for it
23 and maybe I'm wrong. Maybe it is for the Unalakleet.
24
25 CHAIRMAN QUINN: No. 19 was put in by
26 Southern Norton. That's for 22B.
27
28 MR. GRAY: That's what I'm talking
29 about. What's this 22B one?
30
31 MR. GORN: Tom, that would eliminate
32 the drawing requirement for nonresident hunters in 22B
33 east. So right now east of the Darby Mountains there's
34 a drawing hunt that goes on from November 1st through
35 December 31st and the quota is 8. This is a proposal
36 from a guide that would eliminate that. So that
37 wouldn't necessarily impact the Shaktoolik area. It
38 more is asking to change how the nonresident system is
39 working in 22B east. So, you know, Koyuk.
40
41 MR. GRAY: Okay. I'm going to back out
42 of this. Myron, I know this was an issue with you guys
43 at one time, but this is something that was in your
44 ballpark at one point, I remember.
45
46 MR. SAVETILIK: Yeah, it was. In 22A
47 they had stated that the decline of moose population in
48 that area they were afraid that if it wasn't done there
49 would be nothing left. In the few years it has been,
50 they're seeing the moose population coming back. So

1 other than that it's just for that Unalakleet drainage
2 area. I think that was the proposal, right, Tony?

3

4 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Myron,
5 you're correct.

6

7 MR. SAVETILIK: And that's where we're
8 at, too, right now. I sit on the Southern Norton Sound
9 Advisory Council also and that was one of the reasons
10 they did that. So they're looking at opening up again
11 next year probably, so that's where we're at too right
12 now.

13

14 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Well, that's a
15 State proposal and some of us will be at the AC meeting
16 tomorrow. Are you on the AC? No, you're on the
17 Southern AC.

18

19 MR. SAVETILIK: Yes.

20

21 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, if you want to
22 stay in town, I bet they won't mind you being at the AC
23 meeting tomorrow night. Peter, do you want to say
24 something?

25

26 MR. MARTIN: I'll get back to you
27 later.

28

29 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. So I've been
30 instructed that -- I can?

31

32 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: The Council can.

33

34 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Can request an action
35 item and I'd like to request that we do an action item
36 and ask Mr. Risdahl to help us draw up a proposal on
37 this 22E nonresident moose season, but I don't have all
38 the Federal stuff in front of me.

39

40 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. If that
41 is what your plan is on doing that proposal for this
42 Council to put forth, you can do an action, asking for
43 it and then Greg should work with the State to put a
44 proposal in for you on the Federal side by October
45 19th.

46

47 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, I would like to
48 see us request an action item because, according to Mr.
49 Gorn there, the moose population in 22E is 2.5 times
50 their objective. All right, Ken, have at it.

1 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. I think all
2 you'd have to do as a Council is put in a request and
3 it probably wouldn't take much for Greg to help you
4 with this, but all you'd have to do is put in a request
5 to evaluate or remove the Federal closure would do it.
6 You wouldn't have to create a season or harvest limit
7 or anything like that because that's all State reg and
8 the issue right now is 50 percent of the land up there
9 is Federally managed and closed to non-subsistence
10 uses. If that proposal is adopted by the Board of
11 Game, that eliminates that 50 percent of Federally
12 managed land from that proposal.

13

14 So all you'd have to do is remove that
15 closure and the State regulation then would apply
16 throughout Unit 22E. It would give the villages and
17 things a chance to the next RAC to evaluate the
18 proposal to remove the closure.

19

20 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Well, I like
21 that. This Council move to remove a closure in 22D
22 Remainder last year, I believe, and the Federal
23 Subsistence Board approved that proposal. This council
24 also supported a proposal for Unit 18 to -- I can't
25 remember exactly, but they removed the closure for
26 moose hunting in Unit 18, which this Council supported
27 because we have members or residents of our area of
28 concern that occasionally hunt in Unit 18 for moose and
29 those people were forbidden from hunting there at that
30 time.

31

32 Actually, Ken, clarify this for me.
33 The current closure on the Federal lands in 22E means
34 that people from Nome, White Mountain, Golovin, some
35 other areas can't hunt there, is that correct, because
36 they don't -- I'm assuming that only Shishmaref, Wales
37 and Brevig have C&T for that area.

38

39 MR. ADKISSON: No, Mr. Chair. The
40 moose C&T is for residents of Unit 22 and that would
41 only be further narrowed down if there were an 804
42 situation like was developed for 22B west of the
43 Darbies. So currently all Unit 22 residents have C&T
44 for 22E moose and local residents can hunt up there.
45 It's the non-locals that can't hunt and it's that
46 population, primarily the nonresidents, that Mr. Gorn
47 was talking about and that would be the population
48 affected if the closure would be removed, as well as
49 Alaskan residents that wanted to hunt up there, but I
50 think this is strictly a nonresident permit system, so

1 that wouldn't be affected.

2

3 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Then I wasn't
4 quite clear on that. I've got a feeling I'm not going
5 to get a lot of support on this if it's going to open
6 up the Federal lands to non-local residents. If
7 anybody wants to entertain a proposal, that's fine. We
8 certainly could let the State proceed with their
9 proposal and see how things work out and then in the
10 future come back and do a proposal at the Federal level
11 if people are so inclined.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. So we're
16 not going to do anything with these State proposals
17 today. Does that finish up you, Tony?

18

19 MR. GORN: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
20 That finishes up the material I wanted to cover. And I
21 guess I was just going to say for any of you that you
22 might think of something. Write it down because, of
23 course, tomorrow we've got the Northern Norton Sound
24 meeting and then Friday night we've got the Southern
25 Northern Sound AC meeting, so we've got 48 hours of
26 talking about game proposals ahead of us. And now, I
27 guess, we'll let Jim discuss the two ANS proposals
28 briefly.

29

30 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Go ahead, Jim.
31 Hang on, Jim.

32

33 MR. MARTIN: Tony, Unit 22A, the hunt
34 used to be in December until end of January, but we
35 have only January 1st through the 31st now. Why was
36 that changed? Would we be able to reopen that December
37 to January 31st again? We have a hard time getting
38 bulls in the January hunt if we have only bull season
39 that opening. If the Southern Norton Sound have their
40 board meeting, I guess they just had an election. I
41 haven't seen the results of that to see if they
42 proposed that too.

43

44 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Peter.
45 So your question is can you extend the winter season in
46 the southern portion of 22A, that's your idea?

47

48 MR. MARTIN: We used to have two
49 months. I don't know why it got changed to only one
50 month, only month of January. We used to have December

1 and January. Now we only have one month.

2

3 MR. GORN: Peter, I'm trying to
4 remember. You might be able to help me remember. That
5 happened several years ago.....

6

7 MR. MARTIN: Yes, it did. I can't
8 remember why.

9

10 MR. GORN: Wasn't one of the reasons
11 because of travel conditions?

12

13 MR. MARTIN: Oh, yeah. But we have
14 hunted in December before and we seem to have more luck
15 with the bulls at the time. Now we started having a
16 January season and it seems to be harder to get some
17 bulls.

18

19 MR. GORN: Okay. That's definitely
20 something we can talk about. I'm not sure we'll be
21 able to address it at this upcoming Board meeting, but
22 we can table it and make sure that we address it at the
23 next meeting and adjust those season dates.

24

25 MR. MARTIN: The Southern Norton Sound
26 meeting, is that going to be a teleconference, do you
27 know?

28

29 MR. GORN: No, it will be in
30 Unalakleet.

31

32 MR. SAVETILIK: In Unalakleet.

33

34 MR. MARTIN: I wasn't aware of that.

35 Thank you.

36

37 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay, Jim. Start up.

38

39 MR. MAGDANZ: Mr. Chairman and members
40 of the Council. Thank you for having me here today.
41 I'm with the Division of Subsistence, ADF&G in
42 Kotzebue.

43

44 First of all, I just want to
45 acknowledge the work that Kawerak has done especially
46 in the last year, but over the last several decades,
47 but the harvest assessment project they did this
48 summer, the surveys in 12 villages is unprecedented.
49 We've never had that much good subsistence harvest data
50 for the Norton Sound region. Very few regions in the

1 state have ever had that level of detail. Billy and
2 Austin and really the whole crew over there. Eileen
3 and Loretta and Roy and Rose and Karen have all done a
4 terrific job in the last few years in gathering
5 information about not only the biology but about the
6 harvest, then carrying on into the regulatory process.
7 I just am delighted with the progress they've made in
8 their program over there and I enjoy working with those
9 guys. It's good data and a terrific example of
10 cooperation. So I wanted to put that on the record.

11
12 There are two proposals that I'll
13 briefly talk about. Proposal 25 is one that comes from
14 Austin and Kawerak, which would change the amount
15 necessary for subsistence for moose. The current
16 regulation is 250 to 300 moose for subsistence.

17
18 To explain what the ANS is briefly, the
19 amount necessary for subsistence is a benchmark against
20 which we evaluate whether or not subsistence is being
21 provided for and when subsistence harvest drops below
22 the minimum amount necessary for subsistence, then non-
23 subsistence uses go away under State regulations. As
24 the subsistence harvest increases as the harvestable
25 surplus increases above the upper range of ANS, then
26 other kinds of uses are allowed. So the ANS is a
27 benchmark that determines whether or not non-
28 subsistence users are allowed to come into a hunt or
29 not. So it's a really important number.

30
31 Proposal 25 for moose would establish
32 Sub-unit ANS's. Right now we just have a unit-wide ANS
33 of 250 to 300, but the proposal would set an ANS of 80
34 for Unit 22B, 70 for 22C and 110 for 22D. It doesn't
35 specify amounts for the rest of the Unit 22, but just
36 those three add up to 260. So presumably, when all was
37 said and done, we'd have an increase in the amount
38 necessary for subsistence in Unit 22. Even with the
39 current ANS, we're very close to being in a Tier II
40 situation in Unit 22. If the Board adopted this
41 proposal, we would likely be managing in Tier II.

42
43 We'll probably talk more about this one
44 tomorrow, but it's a very significant proposal. And
45 the data that Kawerak has collected from the villages
46 couldn't be more timely.

47
48 The other proposal is number 27. That
49 will change the ANS for musk ox, which is currently
50 100. That ANS was adopted in 1997 when only Brevig,

1 Teller, Wales, Shishmaref and Deering and Buckland were
2 in the hunt area and the ANS was based on those
3 communities alone. Since then Nome and White Mountain
4 and Golovin have become in the hunt area. The State
5 hunt is open to all Alaska residents. Given the demand
6 for permits in the Tier II hunt, which I believe was
7 250 individuals that are applying every year, about 198
8 households on the average, the musk ox cooperators last
9 year thought that the ANS needed to be revised. So
10 they proposed to the Board an ANS of 200 to 250 musk
11 ox, which would keep that hunt in Tier II as it is now
12 in all areas except 22E.

13

14 The significance of both of these
15 proposals would be whether or not these hunts are
16 managed in Tier I or in Tier II and changing the ANS
17 could tip the musk ox hunt -- could keep the musk ox
18 hunt in Tier II and raising the ANS for moose could tip
19 that hunt into Tier II, which it's now not in Tier II,
20 it's in Tier I.

21

22 So I'll stop there, Mr. Chairman. Are
23 there any questions on those two proposals.

24

25 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, Jim, I believe
26 that each year after the proposals are out you guys all
27 sit down somewhere in the State and go through each
28 proposal and decide if you're going to support it or
29 not support it. So you tell me, what does the State
30 say on Proposal No. 25?

31

32 MR. MAGDANZ: The State dodges both of
33 these bullets because they're allocative, that is they
34 would potentially allocate moose or musk ox from one
35 user group subsistence to another user group or vice
36 versa. It's not a biological decision. What we will
37 do is provide background information about harvest and
38 the history of these hunts and how these regulations
39 were developed and how the ANS amounts were determined.
40 The actual amount the State will be neutral on those.
41 The Board will make the decision and public testimony
42 will be important. So will harvest histories be
43 important. That's one reason Kawerak's harvest data is
44 such a key point. So we're neutral.

45

46 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Any other
47 questions. Go ahead. Elmer.

48

49 MR. SEETOT: Outside of those two
50 proposals, what is the current location of the caribou

1 herd? Is it different from last year? They had a lot
2 of problems with the sport hunters. I think that kept
3 the caribou from moving down within our area. Last
4 spring I went up to the Kugruk Mountains and I was able
5 to spot some caribou and get one due to the terrain.
6 It's at least a two hour ride from Brevig Mission
7 bordering right near the Serpentine hot springs, so
8 close to 65, 70 miles before you can spot caribou.
9 That's just something I wanted to know for personal
10 information.

11
12 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Elmer.
13 The first thing I'll say is that the caribou migration
14 seemed to be a little bit behind the power curve. It
15 was a little bit later than what we've experienced and
16 I'm talking about just this fall and recent years.
17 Neither Jim nor I have radio-tracked caribou recently.
18 I'm going to radio track on Friday on my way down to
19 Unalakleet. But satellite collars show that the
20 caribou just made a beeline right down to the Nulato
21 Hills. There are collars right now in the northern
22 portion of the Nulato Hills and then there's one collar
23 that seems to be just north of Koyuk. But there are no
24 satellite collars in the western or central portion of
25 the Seward Peninsula and we haven't radio-tracked to
26 see if there's VHF collars there yet.

27
28 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. I guess you've
29 got something else, Jim.

30
31 MR. MAGDANZ: Mr. Chairman. I want to
32 talk just briefly about the report we handed out and
33 ask Austin to join me here. At a break this morning
34 Barbara handed out the customary trade report in the
35 Seward Peninsular area. I just wanted to again
36 acknowledge Kawerak. This was a joint proposal.
37 Kawerak and Fish and Game were on equal terms in this
38 proposal.

39
40 Austin submitted a proposal to the
41 Board of Fisheries in the last cycle. The Board of
42 Fisheries considered that proposal in January and again
43 in March and as a result of his proposal and the
44 research we have done the Alaska Board of Fisheries
45 adopted a customary trade regulation for Norton Sound
46 making customary trade in finfish in the Norton Sound
47 and Port Clarence districts legal for the first time
48 since Statehood and now both the Federal and the State
49 systems allow limited amounts of customary trade. The
50 Federal rules are much more liberal than the State

1 rules. I and some of the people here are fully aware
2 that customary trade in the past has exceeded the
3 levels that the State rules now provide for.

4
5 Nonetheless, it was a landmark change
6 in subsistence regulations. The Council support for
7 this research project and Austin's advocacy on behalf
8 of the people in the region were major factors in
9 bringing about this change. It's a work in progress.
10 I imagine that other areas in the State will follow
11 this example and we'll see some changes elsewhere and
12 we may see proposals in the next cycle to change some
13 of the details of this new regulation and particularly
14 this amount, this \$200 limit per household.

15
16 In our division it's viewed as a
17 landmark change and it's been a pleasure working with
18 you and with Kawerak here. I want to also acknowledge
19 Sandra Tahbone, who was one of the original PI's on
20 this project and did a lot of the field work in the
21 communities.

22
23 One of the other significant events
24 that followed from this, we managed to rename a member
25 of this Council. You'll notice that Elmer Seetot is
26 now Elmer Oyana and we'll try to correct that in the
27 next edition.

28
29 (Laughter)

30
31 MR. MAGDANZ: Austin.

32
33 MR. AHMASUK: Thanks Jim. I guess I'll
34 just add that the proposal should have been a Kawerak
35 proposal, but because of the quarterly schedule of the
36 Kawerak Board and in between the deadline of the Board
37 of Fish, it wasn't a Kawerak proposal only for the
38 reason that the deadlines and the quarterly meetings
39 didn't jive, so a proposal needed to be submitted in to
40 that effect. I believe I did mention that at a past
41 council meeting as well as Advisory Committee.

42
43 The original idea for the amount was a
44 highly contested issue. I'll say that there was one
45 agency of the State government that really had a hand
46 in ratcheting down that amount and that was law
47 enforcement. They had a heavy hand in the amount and
48 the permit conditions that now exist in the law and the
49 Advisory Committee supported the idea of customary
50 trade on a limited basis in the amount of \$1,000, but

1 it was eventually neutered down to \$200.

2

3 That being said though, there is
4 certainly opportunity now for other areas of Alaska
5 who, as Jim mentioned, looked very strongly on that
6 proposal for precedent as well as ideas for their own
7 areas. It was a very good project and hopefully it can
8 be modified into an idea that really works for us.

9

10 Thank you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Thanks. I just
13 learned of a little potential unfinished business here.
14 Along with the Southern Norton Sound's proposal to open
15 moose hunting in the Unalakleet River drainage, I see
16 that that same area currently has no Federal open
17 season. So what we could end up with here is a State
18 season where the Unalakleet residents can hunt on the
19 State and the private land in their area, but can't
20 hunt on Federal land in that area. I know that some of
21 that upper Unalakleet is Federal land. So what was
22 suggested is the RAC make a motion to have Greg work on
23 a proposal that we -- I guess we have to do a season.
24 We can't just remove a closure, can we? We have to do
25 a season? Okay. I can't make a motion. If you guys
26 wanted to.

27

28 MR. SEETOT: What page are you on?

29

30 CHAIRMAN QUINN: You're in the
31 fisheries book and I'm in the harvest of wildlife book.
32 I assumed when the State moved to close that area to
33 moose hunting a similar proposal went before the Feds
34 and all that area was closed about the same time. So,
35 in order to make things a little easier for those folks
36 down there, it would behoove us to do a proposal to
37 open that area and give them free range to hunt in
38 their area.

39

40 MR. SAVETILIK: Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yes.

43

44 MR. SAVETILIK: I move we make a
45 proposal for the Federal lands for that area. Was it
46 22A?

47

48 CHAIRMAN QUINN: 22A within the
49 Unalakleet River drainage and all drainage flowing into
50 Norton Sound north of the Golsovia and south of

1 Shaktoolik.

2

3 MR. MARTIN: Second.

4

5 CHAIRMAN QUINN: A motion has been made
6 and seconded. Any discussion.

7

8 MR. BUCK: Question.

9

10 CHAIRMAN QUINN: The question has been
11 called. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

12

13 IN UNISON: Aye.

14

15 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Opposed.

16

17 (No opposing votes)

18

19 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Motion carries. Greg,
20 maybe you can work with Tony and whoever else and get a
21 proposal going. We'll be able to consider that at our
22 next meeting. Great.

23

24 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Season dates.

25

26 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah. Greg will work
27 with Tony and come up with something very similar so
28 everything's nice and easy for everyone hopefully.
29 I've kind of pushed on Tony occasionally in private
30 that -- I was at the Federal Subsistence Board meeting
31 in May and it kept coming up that the big wigs in the
32 State and the Feds want more cooperation, so I've
33 pushed on Tony when I've had the chance to work with
34 the Federal people and I hope the Federal people are
35 working with the State people. It would be nice if
36 things changed at both levels at the same time, whether
37 they changed for more restrictions or less
38 restrictions. Without each entity having to do things
39 totally separately and whatever.

40

41 So, we're done with ADF&G. Mr. Sparks
42 already did the BLM. So now we're on to 15. Other new
43 business. Do we have any, Barb?

44

45 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, there isn't any,
46 Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Then we move on to
49 number 16. We need to confirm our winter meeting date
50 which I guess last winter we tentatively set for the

1 21st and 22nd here in Nome of February. Does anybody
2 have any new recommendation for that. Barb, you've got
3 the calendar in front of you, but we don't have that in
4 our book, do we?

5
6 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: It's in the back of
7 your book.

8
9 MR. GRAY: Did we move to have that
10 meeting on that date?

11
12 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yes, you did.

13
14 MR. GRAY: So it's set already? So
15 there's no action we need to take.

16
17 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. We're happy
18 with that.

19
20 MR. SEETOT: It looks like it will be a
21 one-day meeting like this.

22
23 CHAIRMAN QUINN: It's scheduled for two
24 currently, the 21st and 22nd.

25
26 MR. SEETOT: While we're in the current
27 situation of being overseas, I see that happen with our
28 tribal governments where programs in the past have
29 pretty much helped the Native people, now we're
30 scrambling for money and we need to take these into
31 account. I think setting two days with the current
32 situation nationwide, we just have to look at it
33 realistically. I don't think that we're going to spend
34 two days like we did in the past. It might be
35 different with the game proposals, but pretty much
36 that's what it goes down to, is just a budget of
37 getting these meetings.

38
39 CHAIRMAN QUINN: I need to make a phone
40 call. We need to establish a date and place for the
41 fall 2008 meeting. You guys talk about that for a
42 second while I go.

43
44 MR. BUCK: I would recommend the 7th
45 and 8th of October.

46
47 MR. GRAY: Do you make that motion?

48
49 MR. BUCK: I so move.

50

1 MR. SAVETILIK: Second.
2
3 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I have a discussion
4 for that, please.
5
6 MR. GRAY: Discussion.
7
8 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: We have some of your
9 Staff here attend the Northwest Arctic and if you have
10 it October 7th and 8th, that would be back to back.
11 Helen has to be at the Northwest Arctic meeting also.
12 So you have to kind of give her time in between. Helen
13 works with North Slope, Seward Pen and Northwest
14 Arctic, so we need to separate it out.
15
16 MR. GRAY: How about 6th and 7th?
17
18 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That's still too
19 close. If you would move it ahead between Barrow and
20 Northwest Arctic. If you would do that, please, we
21 would appreciate it. Thank you.
22
23 MR. BUCK: I would recommend the 1st
24 and 2nd of October because subsistence fishing usually
25 starts on 6th, 7th, 8th, 10th. Any later than that
26 you're getting into the whitefish season.
27
28 MR. GRAY: Helen, is Staff good with
29 that?
30
31 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: (Nods affirmatively)
32
33 MR. GRAY: There's a motion to amend.
34
35 MR. BUCK: Yeah.
36
37 MR. SAVETILIK: I second.
38
39 MR. GRAY: Any more discussion.
40
41 MR. SEETOT: Tom, yeah. When we do
42 subsistence activities, it's so close. Today is
43 caribou day, tomorrow is moose day, next day is musk ox
44 day. We go when the opportunity exists, not, oh, I've
45 got to take a rest, I'm on jet lag, stuff like that.
46 We, as a people that represent our communities,
47 sometime do not find the times appropriate for our
48 areas. Geese are still plentiful back home around the
49 Basin. I almost didn't want to come, but I already
50 made a commitment to Barbara saying that I would be

1 here. I eat berries that I picked to at least show
2 support.

3

4 (Laughter)

5

6 MR. SEETOT: But it's something that we
7 need to kind of look at, saying that these people that
8 sit behind a desk they have to go through certain
9 periods. I guess with the Federal system, you know.
10 For us to engage in subsistence activities is pretty
11 much a year round. I, myself, think that in the past
12 woman pick berries, woman cut fish, do this and that.
13 I, myself, am doing these things because I like these
14 subsistence foods while they're in season. It is not,
15 oh, tomorrow is Sunday, I've got to go to church.
16 Church or not, you know, the berries are going to
17 continue to get ripe and stuff like that.

18

19 Some of these arguments that are put by
20 Staff I would think are moot compared to the activities
21 that we do day in and day out, especially during the
22 spring to fall season. Thank you.

23

24 MR. GRAY: And I have to admit I've
25 been waiting very patient all day to go deal with my
26 beluga and that's tonight.

27

28 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. On that note
29 there, Tom, the last thing I'm going to do here before
30 I request.....

31

32 MR. GRAY: Ask for a vote.

33

34 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. We're going to
35 vote on our date, is that it? Was there a motion made?

36

37 MR. GRAY: Yeah.

38

39 CHAIRMAN QUINN: And seconded. The
40 question. October 1st and 2nd. All those in favor say
41 aye.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

45 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Opposed.

46

47 (No opposing votes)

48

49 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Motion carries. I
50 want to announce that tomorrow morning at 9:00 is the

1 Northern Norton Sound Advisory Committee meeting. It's
2 at the Old Kawerak board room. So that's the old
3 Kawerak building. There's a new Kawerak building and
4 an old Kawerak building or you don't know, Susan?

5
6 MS. BUCKNELL: I don't know.

7
8 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, the last meeting
9 we had was actually in the newer building. It's a
10 little larger room.

11
12 MR. BUCK: They're right next to each
13 other.

14
15 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah, they are. So
16 we'll figure it out. Whoever shows up can figure it
17 out. Everyone is invited. There's going to be some
18 interesting stuff to discuss, I think. So that
19 concludes our agenda here. If somebody wants to make a
20 motion to adjourn.

21
22 MR. SAVETILIK: So move.

23
24 MR. SEETOT: Second.

25
26 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Question. All in
27 favor of adjourning.

28
29 IN UNISON: Aye.

30
31 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Opposed.

32
33 (No opposing votes)

34
35 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Motion carries. We're
36 done. I want to thank everybody for coming. I hope
37 you enjoyed your time in Nome and all this stuff and
38 we'll see you again.

39
40 (Off record)

41
42 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

