

Nushagak ADFG Advisory Committee

Draft Meeting Minutes

September 17, 2013

Dillingham City Council Chambers

Minutes

I. Call to Order: 9:04 AM

II. Roll Call:

Present in chambers

Frank Woods – Dlg Chair,
Dan Dunaway – Dlg Secretary
Joe Chythlook - Dlg - Vice Chair
Lloyd (Tom) O'Connor – Dlg
Robert Heyano - Dlg
Kurt Armstrong - Dlg
Glen Wysoki - Koliganek
Peter Christopher - New Stuyahok
Gary Kline - Alt.
Chris Carr - Portage - by phone
Mariano Floresta - Clark's Pt. - by phone

Absent

Robin Samuelson – Dlg
Joe Kazmirowicz - Ekwok
Jon Forsling -Togiak
Travis Ball - Alt Aleknagik excused

No Aleknagik rep at this time.

Louie Alakayak - Manokotak -by phone joined at 9:30

Other Agency staff in Attendance:

Susie Jenkins-Brito ADFG Boards
Jason Dye ADFG Sport Fish
Craig Schwanke ADFG Sport Fish
Sarah Evans ADFG Subsistence
Gayla Woods BBNA
Courtenay Gomez BBNA
Suzanna Henry Spt. Togiak Refuge

Tim Sands ADFG Com Fish
Mike Mason KDLG News
Ted Krieg ADFG Subsistence

Danielle Stickman BBNA

Andy Aderman USFWS Togiak Refuge

Rob Fuentes, Bear Claw Lodge / Alaska King Fisher Camp - by phone

Jim Woolington – Public

Stan Small – Public

(see attached attendance sheet for full list of attendees)

III. Approve Agenda:

Robert H. moved to adopt, Glen W 2nd: Susie advised committee that Rob Fuentes was listening by phone and requested to present some information and comments. **Carry unanimous.**

IV. Approve Minutes of April 14 meeting

Robert H. moved to adopt, Joe C 2nd:

A mistake was noted:

p2 V. Commercial Fisheries: Herring: 2nd sentence should read:Harvest forecast, Seine ~~2,100~~ [21,000] tons, Gillnet 9 tons, no regulation changes, maybe 7-14 day fishery, expect 6 processors, 40 gillnetters, 28 seiners - all increases from 2012....

Comments: Item VI: There was a request for an update and more information on what had occurred regarding information request to DNR:

Chair verified a letter had been sent for the AC to Commissioner of ADFG requesting how the Dept. had participated in the DNR revision of the Bristol Bay Area Plan. The commissioner never responded to the AC's letter. It was agreed to follow up under Old Business.

There was a question regarding the list of names attached to the end of the minutes. Secretary said he was trying to maintain a list of Committee members to aid roll calls.

Carry unanimous (with corrections).

V. Introductions: All present briefly introduced themselves.

BELOW: minutes reported in the order they came on the floor vs. the order of the agenda.

VI. Staff Reports:

1) Togiak Refuge, Andy Aderman

There was a brief discussion of Nushagak Peninsula caribou. Counted 926 animals in July, issued 70 fall hunt permits that can be used into the spring if unsuccessful in fall. 46 issued to Dillingham, 10 in Aleknagik, 14 in Manokotak. So far 4 kills reported. Aderman may add more winter permits. A total of 109 animals taken last season

17A Moose: Aderman reviewed the new hunt regulations adopted last spring. Bag limit may be up to 2 moose, some cow harvest will be allowed. Aderman requested formation of a subcommittee to work with him and Togiak AC to select hunt time, timing critical to avoid over-harvest of cows, not certain yet what he'd think is an acceptable cow harvest, may need to have strict kill report times. Last moose count was 2011, just under 1,200. Currently we see lots of calves and 2 yr olds with calves - good sign of a strong population.

Committee member said he wants to be sure there is equal opportunity to hunt, might need pre-registration, want to avoid conflicts among area communities or unequal chances to hunt. Some AC members are glad to hear of cow harvest opportunity. Cows' meat is best in October or November when they're still fat, not December or later.

Others said it would be good to have a subcommittee; we need checks and balances on this process.

New Stuyahok Representative Peter Christopher stated he would like to see the fall Moose season extended from September 15 to September 20th in GMU's 17B and 17C. He also feels very strongly that the caribou season should be extended and additional two weeks in the spring time to allow for more local hunting opportunity.

2) ADFG Sport Fish, Jason Dye:

Nushagak King Summary. Sport fishery managed according to the King Plan; on June 21 11,000 kings counted by sonar and for the rest of the season, escapement stayed ahead of the curve for a final count of 114,743. The inriver goal was exceeded, but the escapement was within the escapement goal range. Fishing was good and no Emergency Orders were issued. No guide log book data yet available for 2013.

Nushagak Coho Summary. Usually this would be a mid-size cycle run but ended up a Big run at 200,448 escapement double the Plan goal. Sport effort was light, bag limit increased to double once upper end of escapement goal was reached, and counter ran until mid August. Increase in bag limit may have attracted a few more anglers.

New Sport Regulations. There was some preseason concern how new regs would be observed. After a king angler keeps the allowed 2 kings that angler may not use bait. Troopers found few problems, there was some confusion but it wasn't a big problem. Troopers seemed to take an educational approach to enforcement this season, locals seemed generally well informed, mostly non-locals were uninformed.

One comment was that some villagers didn't know about the regulations at first, especially single hook regulation.

3) ADFG Subsistence, Ted Krieg

We'll be contacting Clarks Point, Ekwok, New Stuyahok and Koliganek concerning their participation in project that will be focusing on king salmon. The project proposes to conduct subsistence harvest surveys, TEK interviews and participate with those villages in the summer subsistence fishery. Krieg asked everyone to remember to turn in their subsistence salmon reports for the 2013 season.

4) ADFG Commercial Fisheries, Tim Sands.

Tim provided a Power Point overview. Herring: Preseason forecast was for about 30,000 tons in the sac roe fishery. Seiners harvested about 20,256 tons during 224 hrs of fishing time and the gillnet fleet took about, 8,551 tons in 408 hrs fishing time. There were 24 seiners and 37 gillnetters. Roe percent was in the high 9's for seines and a little higher for gillnet fish. Ex-vessel price was about \$150 per ton. There seemed to be more interest in the fishery and may be even more next year if a new processor Silver Bay buys in 2014.

AC Comment: processors seem to figure roe percent differently between the seiners and gillnetters and this may affect how fishers are paid. There is additional concern for the accuracy of these reports and potential effects on biological management. Request ADFG to keep an eye on how percentages are calculated.

Nushagak District Salmon: No pre-sonar king openers were planned. About June 14 the king counts were strong enough a 5 hour commercial opener was allowed; 8 boats caught about 500 kings. Total escapement for the season was about 113,000 kings, total commercial harvest about 15,000 mostly taken incidental to the sockeye fishery.

There were concerns ADFG starts their Wood R. counts late. On June 18 first day of the tower, count was 348 reds, 6/19 - 90, 6/20 count was 7,000 and continued upward. ADFG believes start date is good.

Total Wood River sockeye escapement was 1.18 million and just over the mid range of the goal. Fish came early and fast.

Nushagak R. Sonar started June 6 and first counts could be apportioned on June 11 at 649 reds. By June 20 the count was 80,000 reds.

Total sonar estimated escapement: 894,172 sockeye which is over the upper end of the goal.

Total coho was 207,000 and chum count was 628,000 fish.

Igushik River counts delayed from normal June 21 start for cabin construction and ice blocked access. ADFG flew an aerial survey June 21 and saw few fish. First count June 24: 51,882 sockeye. Escapement continued strong. First commercial opening was 6/18. Total escapement was 383,000. The river exceeded its escapement goal because fishery was closed due to tender sinking June 30 and to avoid potential oil contamination. Igushik closed for half the season.

Togiak River tower started July 3 with a count of 4,000 sockeye. Total escapement was 128,000 reds when the tower closed August 5; just over the low end of the goal. ADFG recognizes the interest in starting tower earlier but there are significant cost and logistics obstacles if the counts start in June vs. very modest utility. As it is the Togiak Tower is often at risk of being cut from the ADFG budget.

Committee generally not eager to see project cuts.

Bristol Bay wide tentative harvest by district:

Ugashik - 2.2

Egegik 4.8

Naknek / Kvichak - 4.8

Nushagak 3.2

Togiak numbers not provided.

Official season summary and final numbers are drafted, under final review and due out soon. 2014 season forecast for salmon and herring due out in mid November.

For the Nushagak District there was lots of fishing time and no need to use the Wood River Special Harvest Area. We exceeded the midrange escapement goals and had the best coho run/harvest since 1984. The Lone Star sinking was the main problem. Salvage crew still trying to remove the ship. ADFG expects the problem to be gone and no issue in 2014.

Discussion: Some reports of good numbers of reds up at Koliganek June 10, does sonar start early enough? ADFG has reviewed start time, costs, database.

Questions why there is no more test boat. ADFG says lack of funds and the fish caught did not fully pay for the program and recently didn't prove really useful.

Some comments that public would like to see an early season test program.

Discussion:

Interest in counts of sockeye spawning in the Nushagak River sloughs, tributaries that don't go into lakes. Without Nuyakuk Tower ADFG has no means to address. Some folks are observing a decline or absence of reds spawning in Koktuli R., also decline in kings spawning there.

Several comments with major concerns for declining ADFG budget - what can we do to maintain funding? We don't want to see ADFG losing management tools. Flat base funding amounts to significant budget cuts when fuel costs and personnel costs, skyrocket. Seems like with the significant base price increase state should see substantial increase in fish tax and should recognize Bristol Bay deserves strong, even increased base funding.

Concern expressed for climate change effects.

Guide/ lodge owner commented that Nushagak sport fishery for kings was good this year and there was a good run of chums. The lodges had to learn how to interpret the new Didson sonar counts but they are figuring it out. Regarding new Single Hook rules, he says its clear they missed more king strikes with the single hook PLUGS/ LURES - definitely reduced catch. BAIT with single hooks seemed to be taken deeper and injure more fish, clients harvested smaller fish they wouldn't have kept in previous years - due to the injuries. Pervious baited double hook practice were taken shallower and did less injury. Wood River fished well, especially coho.

VII. New Business

A. Susie Jenkins-Brito discussed the Joint Boards October meeting schedule and process.

B. Three NOAA researchers from the Alaska Fisheries Science Center (Kristin Hoelting, Conor Maguire, and Stephen Kasperski) did a brief introduction that they are investigating economic, social and environmental impacts to fishing communities. In particular this is connected to the federally managed fisheries such as the CDQ groups, harvest share programs etc. They plan to interview locals and hold a meeting Wed. Sept 18, 6-8 PM at the Bristol Inn.

C. PROPOSALS

1. Joint Board Proposals

Susie addressed these to the AC.

(Advisory Committee Membership & Areas of Jurisdiction; Proposals 1-8)

PROPOSAL's 1-8 are not relevant to Bristol Bay area or our AC - not considered.

(Advisory Committee Uniform Rules of Operation; Proposals 9-18)

PROPOSAL 9 - Dan Moves, Robert 2nd

ACTION: Fails 0-11

DESCRIPTION: Change the Advisory Committee Membership terms.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Considered ADFG position. It's not broke doesn't need fixing. Villages fill seats and this new schedule won't mesh well with tribal or village council schedules. Everybody is in the field in the summer.

PROPOSAL 10 - Robert Moves, Joe 2nd

ACTION: Fails 0-11

DESCRIPTION: Clarify the Advisory Committee Voting Process.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Considered ADFG position. AC member thought each committee can set up its voting system by current regulations. Much prefer current system. At some of our meetings we might not have enough in attendance to fill the seats - same for other small communities.

PROPOSAL 11 - Robert Moves, Joe 2nd

ACTION: Fails 0-11

DESCRIPTION: Modify the Nomination Process Advisory committees.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Considered ADFG position. Strongly opposed, as a sitting AC could maintain a tight "clique". Let the attendees and voters decide who's qualified.

Chair, please note in minutes we are STRONGLY opposed to this.

PROPOSAL 12 - Dan Moves, Tom 2nd.

ACTION: Fails 0-11

DESCRIPTION: Modify the Advisory Committee Membership Nomination and Election Process.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Considered ADFG position. Several member expressed they are strongly opposed to this - what about places where population doesn't speak English well or at all? Seems like an effort to address urban AC problems. In AK's rural areas including our own, many members have extensive knowledge of fish and game resources but not of statutes and the Alaska Constitution, for some English isn't even their first language. This proposal would unfairly exclude many people. It gets away from whole intent of AC process to have citizen involvement and block cronyism of other states. Discussion of 82 ACs statewide, 15 members per AC, would consume all time and funds of the board. Waste of effort.

Chair, please note in minutes we are STRONGLY opposed to this.

PROPOSAL 13 - Robert Moves, Joe 2nd

ACTION: Fails 0-11

DESCRIPTION: Clarify the Procedures for Declaring Vacancies and Noticing the Public.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Considered ADFG position. This proposal may unfairly limit a member's opportunity to become informed and to respond. Especially in remote portions of the state. It seems like current regulations should be sufficient. Some of this seems redundant to existing regulations / process. Some ACs need to stay on top of their process & membership.

PROPOSAL 14 – Robert Moves, Joe 2nd

ACTION: Carries as Amended 8-3

DESCRIPTION: Modify the Uniform Rules of Operation to incorporate use of Bylaws and Provide Other Clarifications.

AMENDMENT: Align support with Department comments; only consider Portion 3, 4, 6; eliminate portions 1, 2, 5.

DISCUSSION: Considered ADFG position. ADFG supports 3, 4, 6 and opposes 1, 2, 5.

Dan offered friendly amendment to motion to support those portions (3, 4, 6) supported by ADFG. Robert and Joe accept friendly amendment.

Discussion on the Amendment: Generally support status quo and don't really need 30 days, 14 days has worked pretty well around Bristol Bay. Some discussion of by-laws and burden of creating them or need for them. AC had more discussion of supporting ADFG position and in

favor of supporting amendment to the proposal. Some are generally opposed to the whole proposal amended or not - not needed especially the 30 days provision.

Vote on amended proposal: 8 in Favor, 3 Opposed.

PROPOSAL 15 - Robert Moves, Joe 2nd

ACTION: Carries as Amended 10-1

DESCRIPTION: Clarify the Uniform Rules of Operation to Accurately Reflect the Current Procedures Followed by the Advisory Committees and Boards Support Section.

AMENDMENT: Remove section 5, addressing changes in term dates and discuss remaining proposal.

DISCUSSION: Comment, given action on [9] should we take no action? Yes, it might be better to be clear in our position.

AC considered ADFG position. AC already addressed this change in proposal 9. If joint boards do it already...

Dan offered friendly amendment to adopt but ELIMINATE the term dates from this proposal. Robert and Joe accept friendly amendment.

Resume discussion: When we vote be clear it's on the amended proposal eliminating the 5th section [section f. regarding changing term dates] and reflecting current actual practices.

PROPOSAL 16 – Robert moves, Joe 2nd

ACTION: Carries as Amended 11-0

DESCRIPTION: Establish a Standard for Advisory Committee Minutes.

AMENDMENT: Exclude section (e.) of the Proposal

DISCUSSION: Some don't think this is asking too much. Some have experience with minimal or confusing meeting minutes, hard to feel informed. Others expressed resistance to yet more regulations. ADFG says BOF seems to be moving to setting their own requirements for minutes that are submitted. At minimum we should support a, b, c, d, f, g but exclude e. E. could be a real problem - who is to say what is relevant - could create a lot of arguments and confusion, too subjective. Everyone who makes a comment feels their comment is relevant. There was more discussion on what to record in minutes.

Dan offers friendly amendment to **eliminate (e)** from the proposal. Robert and Joe accept friendly amendment.

PROPOSAL's 17 & 18 Robert moves to take Proposals 17 & 18 together, Joe 2nd

ACTION: Proposal 17 – Carries 11-0

Proposal 18 – Fails 0-11

DESCRIPTION: Proposals regarding Removal for Cause.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: This committee supports ADFG position to address apparently vague situation in AC rules relative to a problem AC member. It would be good to have a requirement to inform the individual of concern.

ADFG reviewed likely process for removal of a community selected AC member - letters of concern to tribal or village council.

Discussion was to vote on proposals separately.

Vote on 17 Supports Unanimous.

There was brief additional discussion on 18. ADFG opposes. It could be very difficult to determine what is "frivolous".

Vote on 18 Oppose Unanimous

(Advisory Committee Membership Qualifications; Proposals 19-21)

PROPOSAL's 19, 20, 21 Robert Moves, Joe 2nd

ACTION: Fails 0-11

DESCRIPTION: Expand/change the qualifications for AC membership

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: All these proposals seek to expand the qualifications of AC members; change qualifications of AC chair, qualifications of members.

AC considered ADFG's opposition to all 3.

Discussion detailed that the system isn't broken; some voiced objection to frivolous proposals; let attendees, electors decide who is qualified; support assessment of ADFG.

(Advisory Committee Active Status, Function, & Staff Assistance; Proposals 22-24)

PROPOSAL 22 - Robert Moves, Joe 2nd

ACTION: Carries 9-2

DESCRIPTION: Reduce the Number of Meetings Required for Advisory Committees to Remain in Active Status, and Clarify the Process for Merging Advisory Committees.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Very extended discussion. Strong concern that if only 1 meeting is required, state administration will eventually whittle down budget to only 1 meeting and 1 is not enough, especially for the Nushagak AC. Don't let the budget folks off the hook.

Many could also see the side that quite a few AC's only meet 1 per year, it's very expensive, members are too busy to meet more than once, 1 per year can be enough, don't want to see AC ruled inactive for only having 1 meeting.

Some wanted to separate the Active Status issue from the budget and funding concerns and were willing to risk the budget concerns. Fight the budget concerns through contacts legislature etc.

Generally discussion evolved that most whose support allowing 1per year Active Status was contingent on the assumption that funding should remain at levels to allow 2 or even 3 meetings per year as needed for individual ACs. Nobody wants meeting funding cut.

Vote Support 9 Oppose 2. Opposition continued strong concern for reducing pressure on State to fund adequate numbers of AC meetings, and some wanted to continue current practice of allowing Active Status with 1 meeting if a second wasn't possible due to weather or member schedules.

PROPOSAL 23 - Tom Moves, Joe 2nd

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Clarify the functions of Advisory Committees and add the applicable Regional Council Functions.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Opposition expressed since Regional Councils have been "dead" for years.

From the audience, a request to remember this proposal has nothing to do with the Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils.

The State RAC consisted of the chairs of all the ACs in the area. State no longer funds State RAC.

ADFG position, opposes this proposal.

12:15 Motion to Table 23 **Robert Moves, Joe 2nd.** There are other similar proposals like 30, 31 we should look at the same time. ADFG supports 30 and 31. Call for unanimous consent. NO objection.

Proposal 23 Tabled by Unanimous Consent

******Resume proposal 23 after discussion of Proposals 30 & 31**

Joe Moved to take up 23. Dan 2nd

Based on actions we have taken in 30 and 31 should we take no action? No.

Discussion continued ADFG opposes putting RAC functions into ACs. Some folks prefer where ADFG and Board would have to consult more with ACs. Did State RAC have veto power over ADFG management decisions? Some felt State RACs provided some checks and balances to ADFG and State. We'd like to see some opportunity for AC to exert checks and balances to Boards. But functions of State RACs pretty much is already done by ACs.

Chair asked for consensus for NO action based on actions in 30, 31 but wants Boards to note the discussion points. Consensus granted. No Action

PROPOSAL 24 – Robert Moves, Joe 2nd

ACTION: Fails 0-11

DESCRIPTION:

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Consider ADFG position: Opposes as it has no practical effect. After AC members read over proposal several expressed their agreement with ADFG.

(Adoption of Fish and Game Regulations; Proposals 25-27)

PROPOSAL 25 – Tom Moves, Joe 2nd

ACTION: Carries 10-1

DESCRIPTION: Clarify the Procedure for Accepting Proposals for each Board.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Confusion grew as to what the proposal really does and what the "actual practice is" or what the proposal really says. Will this allow acceptance of proposals POST MARKED by the deadline vs. "Must Be Received IN Juneau by deadline"? Several members recalled how they thought the process works now. Several commented that it can be hard to make sure proposals are IN JUNEAU by the deadline and prefer allowing post marked by deadline.

To some the proposal seems to allow acceptance of [nearly ALL] proposals after the deadline given the typical broad language of most Board meeting notices. If such is the case this proposal seemed much too broad and could be unfair no point in a deadline.

Vote on proposal 25: Support 10 on the condition that final language says ONLY PROPOSALS POSTMARKED BY THE DEADLINE may be accepted. **Opposed 1** - proposal too confusing and old system works.

**** 12:30 BREAK for lunch. ****

1:08 pm Resume Meeting.

Some members had to depart for other duties.

Excused: Robert Heyano, Joe Chythlook

Members present:

Chris Carr - on phone

Louie Alakayak - on phone

Present in chambers:

Kurt Armstrong

Tom O'Connor

Frank Woods

Gary Cline

Glen Wysoki

Peter Christopher

Dan Dunaway

Quorum re-established.

There was a general discussion and consensus to set aside joint board proposals to address ACR's while upriver members are still present.

Discussion of Agenda Change Requests (ACR) - they are not proposals but a request to Board to form a proposal.

Only a few address Southwest Alaska 6, 12 & 14. No oral testimony will be allowed at BOF Work Session, AC must send written testimony, due September 25. Online comment process explained.

BOF WORK SESSION ACR's

ACR 6] Commercial dipnets statewide. Tom Move Dan 2nd

Discussion: Some members concerned / object how this might affect Bristol Bay fisheries. Others had heard commercial dip nets were used on the Yukon this summer as the only option for a commercial fishery so kings could be released. Then proposal should not be statewide but limited to particular areas where needed and likely to work. Article in Bethel paper might have suggested trying dip nets in the Kuskokwim. We don't need a statewide regulation just because it works somewhere. Might support it for areas where extreme conservation is needed - we don't need it here. **Strongly Opposed Unanimous statewide.**

ACR 12 & 14] Repeal some of the single hook and bait restrictions adopted in December 2012 for the Nushagak drainage sport fishery. **Joe Move, Dan 2nd.**

ADFG comments that both ACRs seem to be confused on the bait regulation. Current regulations allow bait EXCEPT after a person who is fishing kings has kept their second king for the day.

Discussion: Authors of both ACRs acknowledged they were mistaken when composing their requests and wanted to clarify that the main concern is the all year single hook restriction. Both authors heard numerous complaints about this new regulation and wanted to be sure an ACR was submitted in time. To clarify they would like to leave the single hook regulations in place for the May 1 to July 24/31 chinook salmon season(s) but for the rest of the year, return to the sport regulations that existed prior to December 2012.

The strong king runs in the Nushagak and lack of a real conservation concern for them or any other species was frequently brought up.

Upriver rep said some villagers use sport gear for resident species in the spring prior to the king season - amounts to very low impact but important subsistence harvest.

AC members recalled that they originally proposed single hooks only for the king season. The original intent of this was to conserve kings.

The Nushagak AC would really appreciate the Boards reconsidering this regulation.

Support both ACRs 12, 14 (change to May- July single hook) Unanimous.

Resume considering Joint Boards proposals.

Chris Carr (on phone) departed the meeting exact time note noted, approximately 1:45 pm.

(Adoption of Fish and Game Regulations; Proposals 25-27 continued)

PROPOSAL 26 – Joe Moves, Glen 2nd

ACTION: Fails 0-9

DESCRIPTION: Require Joint Board to Meet Every Year; Establish a Standing Committee of the Joint Board; and Remove the Reference to Council.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Excessive oversight, added expense, burdensome to board members, current system works, we didn't support other related changes by this proposer.

PROPOSAL 27 – Joe Moves, Tom 2nd

ACTION: Carries 9-0

DESCRIPTION:

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Discussion, current practice seems to work, costly waste to mandate annually if not needed.

(Advisory Committee Participation at Board Meetings; Proposals 28-29)

PROPOSAL's 28 & 29 Joe Moves, Tom 2nd

ACTION: Fails 0-9

DESCRIPTION:

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Up to 29 ACs might want to participate in Bristol Bay deliberations. This would be very cumbersome and difficult to manage. Current system works as far as who would board listens to.

(Regional Councils; Proposals 30-32)

***AC agreed to take up proposal 31 first.*

PROPOSAL 30 - Joe Moves, Tom 2nd

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION:

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Joe moved to take no action given action on 31 and asked for unanimous consent.

PROPOSAL 31 - Tom Moves, Gary 2nd

ACTION: Carries 8-1

DESCRIPTION:

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: State RACs may have been warranted pre Federal Subsistence but not now. Don't use State RACS now there are Federal RACs and system in place. If this proposal would allow what is currently done.... And we still have the means to address the issues thru ACs and Federal RACs.

Vote Support 8 Opposed 1 Opposing voter likes the idea of still having a State RAC & potential to address regional wider spread issues like for caribou herds and similar.

PROPOSAL 32 – Joe Moves, Peter 2nd

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Repeal the Regional Council Regulations and Incorporate the Functions into the Advisory Committee Regulations

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Joe moved to take no action by unanimous consent; based on actions for 23, 30, 31. Peter 2nd There was no objections.

Chair noted time that some AC members would have to leave soon and we'd lose quorum. He requested AC form a subcommittee and authorizes it to complete the meeting agenda and associated business for the whole AC.

Joe Moved to form and authorize a subcommittee to address remaining proposals, select representative to Joint Boards and deal w/ 17A moose. Kurt 2nd. Support Unanimous. Subcommittee members named Tom, Kurt, Frank, Garry, Dan; also open to all AC members available.

Louie Alakyak announced he had to depart the meeting for work. 2:35 PM.

Peter Christopher had to leave same time. He asked that next meeting's agenda include proposals to extend the fall moose season to September 20; and extend caribou season 2 weeks later in the spring. Chair agreed to note these items.

*****SUBCOMMITTEE continues addressing proposals and meeting business approximately 2:45 pm.

(Subsistence Uses & Procedures; Proposals 33-37)

PROPOSAL 33 – Dan Moves, Tom 2nd

ACTION: Fails 0-5

DESCRIPTION: Modify the Process for Determining ANS Findings.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: ADFG is opposed, they already do household surveys, maintain salmon harvest report system, there's the big game harvest tickets and permits. The reporting in 30 days could be a real annoyance and hard to comply at times. Our salmon permits go all summer would we have to make multiple reports? Current system is working.

PROPOSAL 34 - Gary Moves, Tom 2nd.

ACTION: Fails 0-5

DESCRIPTION: Modify the Subsistence Procedures for Determining ANS for Subsistence Uses.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: AC agrees with ADFG, object to requiring new analysis and reporting process. Current ANS ARE based on harvest reports in large part - already do what this proposal seems to request.

PROPOSAL 35 – Gary Moves, Tom 2nd

ACTION: Fails 0-5

DESCRIPTION: Create a Definition for Nonsubsistence Harvest.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Share ADFG's concern for legal problems, this isn't needed and makes no sense. Current system is working. Don't understand what proposers are trying to do.

**Glen and Kurt depart. Times not noted. (Vote changes to four total on Subcommittee.)

PROPOSAL 36 – Gary Moves, Tom 2nd

ACTION: Fails 1-3

DESCRIPTION: Delete reference to Proximity of the User's Domicile to the Stock or Population.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: This is mostly a house keeping type proposal, may address the community harvest quota process, hold over from old processes disallowed by courts etc.

"If this change would reflect current practice and use eligibility would not be negatively affected, then let's support it. Housekeeping."

Support 1: if it's just housekeeping. **Opposed 3:** Opposition concerned that there could be unforeseen consequences. Preference of the AC is to retain current language.

PROPOSAL 37 – Gary Moves, Tom 2nd

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Add a Statewide Definition of "Noncommercial" as it Applies to Barter.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: A very long discussion with several concerns listed:

A MAJOR CONCERN: Would this affect barter as regulations now allow among commercial fishers? They are allowed to barter now and commonly do when they have really small catches - especially set netters. Want to be able to continue the practice.

Maybe this is to address the quasi commercial take we hear about, possibly done under subsistence harvesting. Hear complaints about large amounts of strips being sold in urban areas. But don't want a hassle for a grandma who sells a couple jars of fish at a bazar. Some folks seem to sell quite a bit.

Confusion where Federal Subsistence allows a certain amount to be sold but state doesn't - who can tell?

What is legal regarding selling small amounts. Sure wish a Trooper could have been here to explain.

Yes with this confusion it would be nice to have more clarity on these regulations. We could use clarification.

I have real concerns for a grandma selling a few strips. We don't have enough information to make a decision.

No Action by unanimous consent. But please note our concerns per the discussion.

(Nonsubsistence Areas; Proposals 38-41)

PROPOSAL 38 – Gary Moves, Tom 2nd

ACTION: Fails 0-4

DESCRIPTION: Repeal the State Nonsubsistence Areas.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: They need a much clearer plan and explanation before anything is repealed.

There is an awful lot to absorb related to this proposal and could be very significant. We don't have time or enough information to decide on this.

Should we take no action on this? No we need to address these.

PROPOSAL 39 – Dan Moves, Gary 2nd

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Reduce the size of the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: We should take no actions as it's out of our area. There is concern for precedent it might set.

NO Action, Out of Area, unanimous consent.

PROPOSAL 40 – Dan Moves, Gary 2nd

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Create a Kodiak Nonsubsistence Area.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Some discussion on human population of Island, borough, and municipality. We are concerned what precedents might be set. While we recognize and support how extremely important subsistence is for many people in Alaska, Kodiak is geographically far removed from Bristol Bay. We should take no action as it's out of area and we have insufficient information.

NO Action, Out of Area, unanimous consent.

PROPOSAL 41 – Gary Moves, Dan 2nd

ACTION: Fails 0-4

DESCRIPTION: Create a Bethel Nonsubsistence Area.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: We share Mulchatna caribou and other subsistence resources with Bethel area users, share GMU boundaries and usage, C&T (Federally and/or State recognized) areas with them, Togiak Refuge usage, Brown Bear special management area with them, so we should act on this proposal. Harvest efficiency may have to be limited somehow.

We have significant concerns what precedents and implementation might mean for Bethel and eventually for our area. Human population size alone shouldn't be the determining factor. Bethel's lack of economic alternatives and opportunities should count, as well as sheer heavy dependence on subsistence resources. How would it work for Bethel residents vs. nearby Kwethluk and similar communities? What is really practical to do given easy mobility?

****END of Proposal Review.

VIII. Old Business

A. 17 A. Moose

FWS Biologist Aderman explained he's concerned for the 2 moose bag limit and potential excessive cow harvest; how it might work if the moose season isn't opened until January 1. He doesn't want to overharvest cows and there could be difficulties issuing permits and reporting first kill. As currently set up, a hunter gets one permit then must report a harvest before being able to get a second permit.

He would like to develop a criteria for a cow hunt with all the other villages some time between now and December.

Need to have a plan and work it out with all villages.

It would be nice to schedule a meeting close to the Togiak AC meeting to maximize participation of key members.

Discussion: We could possibly send a Nushagak AC rep to Togiak, would like to avoid long teleconference meetings they are so hard.

The Nushagak AC Subcommittee need to get prepared for the meeting - what do they think works for the users of this area?

Its possible as part of their normal job, some of the subcommittee members will attend the Togiak AC meeting anyway. There might be ways to get several Nushagak reps over to Togiak.

B: Representation at Joint Boards meeting.

The Nushagak AC chair or secretary represent the AC at the Joint Boards meeting.

Adjourn 4:26 PM
