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CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: We're allowing some extra time for some things. What a wonderful evening last night. After all the stress of doing the regulatory work I usually only sleep about two hours a night when we're working and last night -- well, it was all I could do to get out of bed at 7:30 this morning, I'll guarantee you, but I feel so much rested. We're not quite done with that. After we do the work on Fortymile Caribou Management Plan, I understand there's going to be a motion to reconsider 57 and we'll go ahead and deal with that after the Fortymile Plan, then we'll go into our meeting with the -- our annual balling out by the Council Chairs.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: No, our meaningful discussion with the Council Chairs on issues that need to be discussed. So that's our plan for the day. I still think we're going to get done fairly early today. So that's kind of the plan and we'll deal with it. Let me say this about the motion for reconsideration on 57, just so everybody knows what's going to happen, we are not going to go through the whole process again as far as everything. We're going to go consider the reconsideration if it prevails.

I understand there's some modification to the proposal, so we're going to just kind of go for the vote and get that as a matter of record. We have everything else on the record. So the parties will have a chance for one last say and then that will be that and then we'll go to a vote because I don't really want to rehash the whole thing. We know the issue.

Okay, Randy, if we can call upon you.

MR. ROGERS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. Again, for the record, my name is Randy Rogers. I'm a wildlife planner for Department of Fish and Game in Fairbanks. This morning I'm here to present the updated Fortymile Caribou Herd Harvest Plan on behalf of the Coalition of Advisory Committees and the Eastern Interior Regional Council that prepared this
This plan is a little different than some of the other planning processes and I want to emphasize the fact that it was put together by the Advisory Committees with involvement of the RAC and Department of Fish and Game essentially supported it through Staff support, help mailing information, organizing meetings and helping to draft part of the plan, but at the direction of the coalition of users.

This plan, as I said, the second harvest plan, it's a direct outgrowth of the Fortymile Caribou Herd Management Plan that was held up as a major collaborative planning effort success several years ago and involved a non-lethal wolf control program in the area.

The last harvest plan was on the verge of expiring, so this is to update it and also has the purpose of trying to promote herd growth. I'm going to try to go through this rather quickly because Mitch has pointed out that you've all had a copy of the plan and have had a chance to read it and be a little familiar with it anyhow.

This graph here shows growth of the Fortymile Caribou Herd, which basically has been stable or slightly declined since 2003. For several years now, in part because of the extensive wildfires in the area, we haven't been able to get a new survey of the herd, so we're hoping to get that done this spring.

A primary goal of the harvest plan is the same as the original Fortymile Caribou Herd management plan and that is promote continued growth of the Fortymile Caribou Herd and restore the herd to its historic range in both Alaska and Canada. A secondary goal in the harvest plan is to increase the allowable harvest of the Fortymile Caribou Herd when the herd grows.

Going into this planning effort, there was an assumption, and the previous harvest plan built in increasing harvest as it was anticipated the herd was going to grow. It just didn't materialize the way people had expected. Initially, most of the folks involved thought we were going to have a much increased harvest quota, but when we looked closely at the biology and what has really gone on with the herd, it turned out that that
just wasn't possible. Of course, we've also worked
closely with the folks from Yukon Territory, both their
wildlife management agencies and their first nations and
they very strongly advocate sticking with the program of
getting the herd to increase so they'll return to the
Yukon and they have started going over there.

Population objectives is to try to reach
50,000 to 100,000 caribou with a harvest objective of
1,000 to 15,000. There was no specific population or
harvest objective in the original Fortymile Caribou Herd
Management Plan. It was just a general concept of
restoring the herd to its historic range. So, for
harvest management, what the plan provides -- and it's
essentially almost identical to the previous harvest
management plan. There's very little change. That it
maintain a conservative harvest rate of two to three
percent of the population. Sixty-five percent of this
harvest is allocated to Alaska and 35 percent to the
Yukon. So, essentially, the harvest rate in Alaska is
two percent of the population of the herd.

For now we're going to maintain an annual
quota of 850 caribou in Alaska with no more than 25
percent being cows. When the population increases to
50,000 or more animals, the harvest quota will be
increased to 1,000. This is a much more simple approach
than was used in the previous harvest plan. On the Yukon
side, even though animals have started coming over there,
they haven't started to harvest yet and their entire
allocation of harvest is being contributed back to herd
growth and they intend to continue that. The seasonal
allocation of harvest is to have 75 percent of the quota
in the fall, 25 percent in the winter.

This map lays out the harvest management
zones, which basically we have a zone in the northern
part along the Steese Highway, zone 2 in the central
area, which is essentially roadless, and zone 3 along the
Taylor Highway. For allocation of harvest between the
zones, 35 percent to zone 1 in the Steese Highway area.
This is the fall harvest. In zone 2, a minimum of 15
percent and zone 3 50 percent. For winter harvest
allocation by zones, the plan provides for 60 percent of
the harvest being allocated to the road accessible zone
where the caribou happen to be when the winter opening
is. So that's either zone 1 or 3. Zone 2 is included in
the 60 percent allocation and 40 percent of the quota is
assigned to the other roaded area.
This is just to make sure that people throughout the range of the herd get to share in the benefits of harvest and one area doesn't take the entire quota if the caribou happen to be say on the Steese Highway. Also, any quota that's not met in the fall is then added to the possible winter quota. This last year we didn't even make the harvest quota.

The main hunt recommendations are the Department of Fish and Game and Federal subsistence program managers should cooperatively manage the fall and winter Fortymile Caribou hunts and continue using a single joint State/Federal registration permit. This is probably the most important element here that we really need to cooperate on. In the future, if the Fortymile Caribou Herd reaches a higher population, management of the hunt should go to a general harvest ticket or at least be considered.

I'm jumping a few slides ahead of you here. This next slide lays out what the changes in seasons and bag limits are. To keep it short, I'll just say there essentially is no change. The only single addition proposed is to have an additional season in American Summit, which would be under the State regulations to be announced October 20 to November 30. That was specifically requested by the residents of Eagle because when the Federal hunt starts out there the caribou aren't on Federal lands, so this would be an accommodation under State regulations to help what are the Federally-qualified subsistence users out there actually. For non-residents, there is an increase in the non-resident season of 10 days from September 20th to September 30th.

The plan also includes recommendation for predation control and states that a lethal wolf control program designed to achieve the population and harvest objectives for the Fortymile Caribou Herd is recommended. The plan also states that while the recommendation for predation control program is closely related to the harvest management plan, the two issues should be addressed separately in the public review of Board of Game and Federal Subsistence Board process. We do recognize the concerns of the National Park Service about the wolf predation control program, but would like to encourage you to address that issue separate from the harvest management plan.

In terms of actions on the harvest plan
up to this point, it was endorsed by the coalition of Advisory Committees and the Eastern Interior Regional Council, was endorsed by the Board of Game in March. The Advisory Committees, Eastern Interior Council and the ADF&G would appreciate the Federal Subsistence Board's endorsement and support for continuing the cooperative harvest management program for the Fortymile Caribou Herd.

With that, I'll call it a conclusion and say thank you. I'll be happy to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes, Randy. There is going to be some discussion, so if you could just stay right there in case there's some things that do come up. I'd certainly appreciate it. Go ahead, Ray.

MR. STONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question for Mr. Rogers.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Go ahead.

MR. STONEY: Mr. Rogers, on the Fortymile Caribou Herd, what is their migration path like in the fall time, winter time and spring time? Does the migration stay in one area or migrate different directions?

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Stoney. The Fortymile Caribou Herd is not quite like the Western Arctic Caribou Herd that I've worked with you on where they have a distinct summer range and winter range. They have a core area in the Fortymile/Charley River area and they will move north and south. In any particular year, they may, in the fall time, be up north near the Steese Highway or they may be further south down near the Taylor Highway or even over in the Yukon Territory. It's not quite the same consistent established pattern that the Western Arctic Herd has.

I think maybe if the herd does grow larger -- you know, there were projections at one time of it possibly being up to half a million animals. If it were that size, maybe it would have more of a regular migration route.

MR. STONEY: Thank you, Mr. Rogers.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Go ahead, Judy.
MS. GOTTLIEB: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Normally I'd be the first one to endorse any sort of cooperative management effort, but I think, as outlined here, you've heard that this has not been a full stakeholders group. In fact, the National Park Service, as a land owner in this area, has not been involved at all, which has been extremely disturbing to us. We were heavily involved in 1995 and, preceding that, in the excellent Fortymile Caribou planning effort that resulted in the management plan that did afford protection to Yukon/Charley wolves. There was a second version of that plan that was renewed after five years where we were somewhat involved, maybe not as heavily, that continued that protection. This effort, again, we were not invited to the table at all and I would like to move that the Federal Subsistence Board defer action on this resolution and, having a second, I'll continue my reasons for that.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: We have a motion. Is there a second.

MR. CESAR: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Further discussion.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As I said, I'm not satisfied that this planning process fully involved all the stakeholders. We've never been asked to review or comment on this. We did get an invitation to one meeting to present information. In fact, it was pretty difficult to actually get a copy of this plan, which we initially picked up on a table at a Board of Game meeting and it was likewise handed out to Staff Committee. We cannot support the primary goal and objective of this plan shown on page 7 and mentioned on page 3 which focuses on intensive management. I brought this up yesterday. I don't believe the Board can endorse this either based on our policies. It's certainly inconsistent with NPS management. This plan eliminates the protection that's been afforded to Yukon/Charley wolves that have been in place since 1995. Now, we are trying at several levels within Fish and Game to have discussions about this and to see if there are ways to work this out. So
that's why I'm asking for a little bit more time for us
to try to come up with some solutions that will allow us
to then encourage the Board to endorse this. I don't
believe this is time sensitive. We would appreciate the
opportunity to try to work more with the Department on
this.

We support caribou hunting and we support
the goals and objectives relating to the caribou harvest,
but we are not in favor of the intensive management goals
and actions that will result and affect Park resources.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Go
ahead.

MR. OVIATT: Mr. Chairman. And like the
Park Service the Bureau of Land Management was involved
in this plan. We feel like we can support this plan as
written. In fact, we wrote a letter to the Eastern
Advisory Council supporting this plan. Our field people
in Northern District feel like they were at the table in
helping and understanding this. It is a harvest plan and
I would like to see if we couldn't make some compromise.
I hate to throw this out. I think it's a good plan. I
think it's one that works. I think it does a lot of good
for the people in the areas. So I'd like to see if we
couldn't make some compromise rather than delay.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Randy, let me just
ask a question right here and that is these plans are
like the regulatory process, that they are subject to
improvements. I'm not saying change, I'm saying
improvements, as issues come up. Is that not correct?
As somebody raises an issue and it improves the process,
then we have a chance to add to the plan, is that
correct?

MR. ROGERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Any of
these plans have to be adaptable to new information, new
situations and improvement. If I might just add, too, to
further elaborate on the process, this was very different
than the original Fortymile Caribou management team,
which Ms. Gottlieb has referred to, which was very
heavily involved with all the agencies and stakeholders.
It's not on that end of the spectrum. At the same time,
there was notification and invitation for agencies to be
involved in the single meeting that Judy referred to,
which was really the only major meeting that occurred and
John Birch with the Park Service was there.
We did try to get copies of the plan and stuff as soon as we completed internal review and I worked with John Birch to get them to him as quickly as possible, but it wasn't anything like the Fortymile Caribou Herd planning team model, but we did try to at least keep information flowing.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Sue.

MS. ENTSMINGHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to address some questions to Judy if I may. From the standpoint of the user and like a long history, my husband was on the Upper Tanana Fortymile Advisory Committee when the Fortymile plan began. He's probably instrumental in making that happen. All government agencies were involved and everybody went through the process. I mean it's 16 years old. And the Park Service is fully aware of what's going on within the Department.

I'm sure the Eastern Interior would be very distraught being that Yukon/Charley is a preserve and not a park and there's no -- I don't know how to say it, but anyway it's a little bit different than what the local people where we live call hard park versus preserve where people are trapping and wolves are being taken and any means other than like a predator control area.

Throughout this whole process, the Park has always been recognized that that cannot be done inside the Park and these wolves, somebody might say we want to protect a group of wolves, but the fear of the people are you might identify every wolf in the Fortymile. The Park Service may do that and it's a concern to the people that we'll never see growth of herds if the Park Service could stop any type of critter control in areas like that.

I feel like you have been a part of it and I feel that it's important that we continue these working relationships and have the Board endorse this plan for all the years it's been worked on.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Judy.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thank you, Mr. Chair and Sue. In this case, we do not feel we were involved. The specific concern is when the Fortymile Caribou Herd Management Plan was initiated the wolf packs in Yukon/Charley with their home ranges identified, and
we've continued a collaring program so we can continue to identify where those home ranges are, those packs were afforded protection as kind of a control for the basis of when we were doing the non-lethal wolf control. They were the control area and they were afforded protection from that non-lethal control not only within the Preserve but if they wandered outside the boundaries. That's part of Alaska statute. It got incorporated that way and it continued that way through the two subsequent harvest plans.

This is the change that occurred with this effort where that protection is no longer afforded just to those packs and there are other wolves that wander in and out of Yukon/Charley Preserve that we're not bringing up here. So it's not every single wolf there. That clause has been withdrawn without consultation or communication with us. I understand this was done more through the local Advisory Committees. The Department and we need to have more of a consultation and communication about how to make this work a little better.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Randy.

MR. ROGERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. My suggestion is that -- you know, the harvest plan itself there's only two paragraphs at the very end that refer to the predation control part. I think it's fairly clear that the Harvest Management Program that is really the core of this plan is a benefit and supported by the Federal subsistence users and other users. And I understand that the Federal Board has a policy against being involved in predation control activities and it's, according to that policy, not appropriate to get involved in predation control activities.

If it would be possible to pass a resolution that indicated support for the harvest management side of it and specifically exclude the predation control side, I'd even be willing to work with Staff to craft language to make it very clear that there is no endorsement or support and that you want to have a continuing consultation with the State on those issues. I think it would be very appropriate given the situation.

Again, as I went through the presentation, the thing that really is paramount here is to maintain the cooperative State/Federal Harvest
Management Program that we have going on there. I don't think anyone has talked about not doing that and that's really the core of this plan.

So, if it would be possible to endorse that and put an indication in there that the Park Service would like to have continuing discussions with the State on these predator management issues, I think that would be very appropriate. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Let me just clarify one point in your last presentation. It's not a Board policy and we have to understand that. This Board has not been delegated the authority for predator and that's a big difference. So it's not us doing that. Without us having the authority, we just don't have any jurisdiction with regard to predator control. So I just wanted to make sure that we clarified that point, that that is why we don't deal in that issue.

Judy, you had something else.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chair. I certainly appreciate that suggestion and I think, if the Board will agree, we could probably work on some changes in the resolution that would be fully acceptable to all of us and perhaps adopt it at the next work session.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Let me just say about your motion to defer, I think this last statement of yours -- I don't want to not recognize the work that has been done, but if we could fine tune Park Service's comments in an efficient manner of time and incorporate that in. I'm kind of changing my mind on deferral that we can wait, but I just don't want this to go on because people have made a significant effort and for us not to recognize that, I don't think we'd be serving our purpose.

So what I would basically say, as long as we have the guarantee by Park Service that any changes that you may want to see happen in a very efficient manner, that we can move forward with all the hard work that's been done. I might be waffling on my opposition to the motion to defer, but basically that's where I was. It is out of courtesy and respect to all the people that have put in all the time to get this thing this far and I really do -- as we talk about all the time, we all basically appreciate that kind of massive taking of their own time. But I just don't want this thing to go on and
MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chair. If you have a specific time frame in mind, as in a month, will that work?

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah. I'll give you until about 11:00 o'clock this morning. No, I want it to be efficient. That's what I'm saying. We do have monthly work sessions. We can take it up as soon as you feel comfortable that you're ready. Randy, go ahead.

MR. ROGERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I haven't had a chance to see the draft resolution, so I don't know what kind of language there is in there now in terms of the concerns about the predation control aspect of it. I don't see why maybe Mr. Rabinowitch and myself couldn't sit down for a few minutes this morning and revise that and maybe come up with some language that would be acceptable and get it done today. I don't know what additional discussion Park Service Staff may feel they need to have that they could do in a month other than what we might be able to do right now. I guess I'd like to just see it done with. It shouldn't be that complicated.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: With that in mind, I'm going to go ahead and defer action on the deferral motion. We do have agreement from Sandy. If they can get the superintendent on the phone, go ahead and work on that. Maybe my joke about getting it done by 11:00 o'clock is real. I think there's only one certain little clause in the resolution. The three of you can huddle up and we'll go ahead and postpone action if that's okay with the Board until we allow that process to happen.

MR. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I did have one question.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Go ahead.

MR. EDWARDS: On the harvest quota, if the population does continue to increase even up to the number of potentially half a million, I'm trying to understand when the 2 percent kicks in versus the 1,000 harvest goal. Let's say if it goes to 70, does the 2 percent kick in?

MR. ROGERS: The last Harvest Management Plan was based on the harvest quota being increased...
annually based upon 10 percent herd growth that was projected. It got too complicated. It didn't end up happening that way. So this one is basically locked in at a quota of 850 right now, which at this point in the size of the herd is about 2 percent. That will not change until we have clear certain information that the herd has reached 50,000. At that point, the quota would go up to 1,000. We're not anticipating within the five-year life of this plan that we would be so fortunate as to go much beyond that. I suppose if we really got good weather conditions and a number of factors and phenomenal herd growth, that might be another thing that could be reconsidered before the end of the life of this plan. So it's generally the 2 percent harvest rate, but there's specific numbers locked in it at population levels to keep it simple for now.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Given that and knowing that this work is going to get done, basically I think what we're doing is looking for a motion to table until later in this meeting to allow the work to get done.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chair. I so move.

MR. CESAR: I second.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: No discussion on the table of the motion. All those in favor of the motion to table please signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Those opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Motion carries.

I'd ask as you guys begin your work, Randy, that Sue is informed on behalf of the RAC on the process, you know, where any changes might be happening because she's going to have to report back to her RAC. So if we could keep her in the loop during your work. She's got other issues here that we need to deal with, but I'd just ask you to take the time to get her in the loop and get her knowledgeable about any changes that may be forthcoming.

MR. ROGERS: Yes, I'll make sure that we keep Sue informed, but I don't see that it's possible
that we do anything to change the plan itself. It would just be the wording to make the Federal agencies comfortable with the level of endorsement and stating of the concerns that exist.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: With that, we'll move on. Now we're going to go back with Proposal 06-57, which I understand we have a motion or an action for reconsideration.

MR. BREWSTER: Yes, Mr. Chair. I'd like the Board to reconsider Proposal 06-57 from yesterday, which I was on the prevailing side of the vote. Before making a motion and asking for a second, I'd like to inform the Board and the people here of my rationale for asking for that reconsideration. I won't be making this motion lightly. I recognize that the people of Arctic Village are very concerned about the sheep resource and they may feel that the Board took a final action yesterday.

As I said yesterday, I was concerned by the lack of substantial evidence to either eliminate the closure or, for that matter, to maintain the closure. My vote yesterday was to support the Eastern Interior RAC's recommendation because I felt we didn't have sufficient information not to. Our default position must be with the council unless we feel that one of the criteria of ANILCA 805 part C is met, which would give us the latitude to not follow the council's recommendation.

At the same time I recognize that we have an obligation under ANILCA 815 part C to not unnecessarily close Federal lands to State authorized uses. So, for me, this is sort of a dilemma. We should not unnecessarily maintain a closure and at the same time we should only disagree with the Regional Advisory Council's recommendation on an issue of take if one of the three 805(c) criteria is met. Those criteria, again, being: one, that a recommendation is not supported by substantial evidence; two, that it violates recognized principles of fish and wildlife conservation; or, three, that it would be detrimental to the satisfaction of subsistence users.

The Fish and Wildlife Service said on the record yesterday that they will be conducting a sheep survey in the Arctic Village sheep management area this year. In further discussions, they've committed to do that survey in June or, at the very latest, in July. If
those surveys show a healthy level of sheep in the Red Sheep Creek and Cane Creek drainages which could support both Federally-qualified harvest as well as non-
Federally-qualified hunting during the next hunting season, I would then support the proposal to remove the
closure for these two drainages as recommended by the Interagency Staff Committee.

Even after the survey were complete and if there were sufficient numbers of sheep in the Arctic Village Sheep Management Area outside of Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainages to support all harvests, I would still support the proposal to defer a decision on the main area of this management area until a future time as recommended in the motion made by Gary Edwards yesterday.

The reason for the difference between the Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainages and the balance of the Sheep Management Area is that I believe there is more evidence based on the record and the testimony received yesterday that a closure could be needed to continue subsistence uses or for conservation purposes in the balance of the Sheep Management Area as compared to those in the Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainages. Continuing subsistence uses and conservation are the two reasons for closure under ANILCA 815 part 3.

If we reconsider the proposal, it would be my objective that we would find a way to tie the elimination of the closure in the Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainages to the survey work being done by the Fish and Wildlife Service this June or July. We need to be sure that there is not a conservation reason to keep these drainages closed. If sufficient animals are observed, then these drainages could be made available to non-Federally-qualified hunters next hunting season. If insufficient animals are observed, then the area should remain closed for conservation purposes.

I would like to say that if we were to vote on the same motion as we voted on yesterday with no modifications to tie removal of the closure to data from this summer's survey work, then I would vote on the motion as I did yesterday. Therefore, Mr. Chair, with this explanation, I move to reconsider Proposal 06-57. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: There's a motion. Is there a second.
MR. EDWARDS: Second.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Of course, we all communicate with each other very well. I knew this was coming, so, like the rest of us, I've had ample opportunity to prepare my own discussions. Even though I don't write it down, I still know where my thoughts are coming from.

One of the biggest issues that we have as a Board, one of the biggest things that we confront as an issue is that we're delegating from the top down instead of working with the people up. On a variety of issues through the years I have said that any regulation is only as good if the people are involved in that process and buy into that process. Otherwise, we could make all the regulations we want and -- I have to be careful how I say it. I know that it would be the first thing that would be discarded if we don't allow the people in the process.

Why I intend to vote against this reconsideration is the Arctic Village people made substantial effort to get here, including flying their primary representative in at the last minute. I see none of those people here. What's wrong with this process if we can't have the patience to deal with the biological information when it gets in and educate the people with regard to the findings of that information. We would totally disenfranchise ourselves from a significant effort that was put on by those people if we reconsider in their absence and I really have a problem with that. Why is there a need to push this on without involving those people who would be most affected. It just does not make sense to me. For that reason, I intend to vote against the motion for reconsideration.

I beg the Board's indulgence to be patient and let things happen. Let's get some information and let's go about this in the proper manner. Everyone is willing to wait apparently but this Board. We heard again the State say that they are willing to wait getting biological data. We do have the time to take on this.

Terry, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. I don't want to interrupt your train of thought, but I do need to clarify that the Department's position was to support re-
action on the remainder of the Arctic Village Sheep Management Area until these surveys were done. I just want to make that correction if I could.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, thank you.

I'm sorry, Terry.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thank you. I guess a question for Fish and Wildlife. Yesterday I'm not quite sure I heard the specific months where you thought this survey was going to be flown, and maybe I missed it, but now it sounds like you have more precise, hopefully, times when you would fly the data, so that data could possible be available then before August 10. So can I ask then maybe consistent with what the Chair was saying if our decision from yesterday holds, but if new data is available, there could then be a special action to request to open process-wise.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Well, let me just say that I'll make a commitment as the Chair that we will take the time with data to take timely action, but we do need data. We've already got the commitment to get that information ready for us. If we don't have the time, we'll make the time to deal with this because it is important. I just don't want to do it in a vacuum.

Further discussion on the motion.

MR. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman. I guess two things. One, it answers Judy's question. It's our understanding that the refuge would fly in June or July. I guess I'd leave that up to their discretion when they feel is obviously the most appropriate thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to your remarks and I put a lot of stock in those and I think in many ways you were right on. One approach to this might be to go ahead and go through the vote on the reconsideration. If it does pass, then I'm planning to make a motion which would be somewhat modified from the one yesterday and maybe we could listen that through and if that still doesn't provide some of the Board members with what they feel is necessary, then once again we could defeat that motion but that would allow us to maybe discuss some other options.
CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you, Gary.

George.

MR. OVIATT: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your remarks and I think for a reconsideration without representation is a serious endeavor that we would take, but I would be in favor of moving forward for reconsideration in order to hear the new motion that Gary would put forth in front of this Board, so I would be supportive of the reconsideration for that reason.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Further discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Hearing none.

Tom, I'm going to ask for a roll call vote.

MR. BOYD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm going to go from my right to left. Mr. Oviatt.

MR. OVIATT: Yes.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Cesar.

MR. CESAR: No.

MR. BOYD: Ms. Gottlieb.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Yes.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Edwards.

MR. EDWARDS: Yes.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Brewster.

MR. BREWSTER: Yes.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: No. Okay. We now have the reconsideration before us. I understand you have a motion, Gary, so I'm going to call upon you. If we can please just get the motion up and then get it seconded so we have it on the table and then I'll give you ample time to explain your justifications.

MR. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
original motion that I made yesterday was that we move to adopt with modification Proposal 57 contrary to the recommendations of the Eastern Interior and North Slope Regional Advisory Council. That modification would remove the closure to non-subsistence sheep hunters in the Red Sheep Creek and Cane Creek drainage of the Arctic Village Sheep Management Area and defer action on the proposal with respect to the remainder of the management area.

That part of the motion would remain and then I would suggest or request that it be further modified that would authorize the refuge manager of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to restrict the harvest based upon conservation concerns or any impact to Federally-recognized subsistence users regard continuation of subsistence use. Those actions would be done in consultation with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game as well as the chair of the Eastern Interior Advisory Council. In my mind, implicit in that is also working with the Arctic Village. Again, implicit in that motion is a commitment on behalf of the Fish and Wildlife Service to get the surveys done in a timely manner. Also work with transporters who would be taking people in that area, to work with them to ensure minimum impact, disturbance, concerns about trash and those other things that we've heard and that were brought up.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Is there a second to that motion.

MR. OVIATT: I'll second that motion.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Discussion.

MR. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman. I guess quite a bit has been said about the lack of information or more information and maybe yesterday I should have made it a little clearer. With regards to lack of information on the number of sheep, you know, affects this decision, at least from our perspective, differently for two parts of the management area.

In Red Sheep Creek and Cane Creek there was not initially a conservation concern when the closure to non-subsistence users was established. I wasn't here, but my understanding is that the Board weighed a lot of other factors in addition to the conservation issues. Currently, we have no information to suggest there would be a conservation concern now if this closure is
rescinded for those drainages. At that time there was
conservation concerns identified as the reason for
closures to non-subsistence users in the remainder of the
management area and we have no information indicating the
status of the sheep population has changed to where it
could support the harvest that could occur under State
regulations.

The other thing I wanted to re-emphasize
and I mentioned yesterday is that rescinding this closure
for Red Sheep Creek and Cane Creek will still provide a
meaningful preference for subsistence users. They will
continue to have the advantage of a more liberal fall
season ram harvest and able to take two rams of any size
versus one full curl ram for non-subsistence hunters.
Plus they would also have 10 extra days of hunting
opportunity in September. In addition, subsistence
hunters, from our perspective anyway, would benefit from
a more liberal winter season harvest limit under State
regulations, which would allow them to take three sheep
of either sex rather than limit it to rams only as they
currently are.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you very
much. From my perspective again, I intend to vote
against the motion. There's no reason for me to
reiterate, but for all the reasons I stated in the motion
for reconsideration I basically feel like I have to vote
against this proposal. I don't want to go into that
again. Sometimes Tom accuses me of liking the sound of
my own voice. Anyway, go ahead. Further discussion.
Judy.

MS. GOTTlieb: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Two
questions on the biological information. If we don't
really have any more information since the original
closure, then what causes us to open it rather than wait
for new information this summer and possibly open it
then? That's one part.

Secondly, I wonder if you would explain
further the refuge manager's responsibilities regarding
trying to reduce interference with subsistence
activities.

MR. Edwards: Ms. Gottlieb. Sort of
going back, like I said originally when it was closed,
based upon our knowledge of the population we didn't feel
there was a conservation concern. Nothing has really
changed that would lead us to believe otherwise. As I
think I said yesterday, in talking to our biologist on
the refuge, with a restriction of one full curl ram,
there's not a threshold of animals we could come back and
say if the population is 100 or 30 or whatever, to have
any different opinion because we don't think there's
going to be a biological impact with regards to
harvesting full curl rams.

With regards to the refuge manager, all
guides on the refuge have to be permitted. It's my
understanding that there are no permitted guides for
hunting this area. The only people available would be
transporters. They also have to be permitted, which
provides the refuge manager a lot of authority to work
with those transporters, keeping a good understanding of
the number of hunters going in and would be in the
position to take action if we felt for any reason we had
a conservation concern or we were impacting the ability
of subsistence users to continue to use that area.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Further
discussion. Go ahead.

MR. BREWSTER: Yes, Mr. Chair. If I may
ask of you, even though you said you've stated your
position already, did I not hear you say that you really
felt it was important for the Board to re-engage in this
in some fashion after this new information was available?

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I think probably
regardless of how this particular vote turns out, I think
we're going to have a work session. Like I said, we
usually meet in work sessions once a month and I think
we're going to have to make the time because that is
going to be some solid information regardless of how this
turns out.

MR. BREWSTER: I appreciate you saying
that because I guess I do share the concern that the
Board needs to respond in some fashion once this
information is available. So I'm not sure procedurally
whether this is appropriate, but I would suggest that
perhaps we modify the modified proposal here to read
something to the effect that the Board is authorized to
modify the proposal in consultation with the refuge
manager. My purpose being that the Board actively re-
engages in some fashion.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I'm not convinced
that we need to have it as part of the motion. Let's
just say that we have the commitment of getting
information that we are going to have to re-engage given
the fact that we will have in coming months here
biological information I think is going to be important
for us to take a look at. Regardless of how this vote
turns out, it's not just going to go away. We're going
to have to follow up.

Gary.

MR. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman. I certainly
wouldn't have any problem with that either way. I feel
very confident that our folks on the Arctic Refuge are
going to do the right thing. They'll either make the
decision unilaterally or be pleased to come in and sit
down with this Board and go over the rationale of their
findings. These folks are very concerned about the
resource. They're very committed to their responsibility
for ensuring that subsistence needs are met and I know
they'll be happy to come in and speak to the Board.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Before we
go to the vote, we have a couple requests for testimony.
We do have the representative here from Arctic Village.
Merle Hawkins. I'm going to ask the testifiers to please
keep their comments brief as possible.

MS. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am
not from Arctic Village. I'm from Ketchikan. But on
this issue to reconsider and to bring this issue forward,
I would just like to say if I had left town and you
brought up the Ketchikan issue when we'd already gone
home I would be very upset because my tribe has sent me
to represent them and have spent a lot of money. The
same with Arctic Village. If there's no one here to
represent them and speak to the issue, I just think it's
really inappropriate to bring an issue back when our
whole constitution and everything is based on
representation. So that's my major concern. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you very
much. Aaron Tritt.

MR. TRITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
think we all knew that we'll have problems and I'm a
little upset on how these procedures are taking place.
And I think any time both sides of the issue should be
recognized and right now Arctic Village is not being
represented and you guys are voting on an issue that's
going to affect the people in Arctic Village and the
future of Arctic Village and the Native policy as it is
in the state of Alaska and you're making decisions and it
should be very public involved in this issue and you guys
are voting right now on your own and without your support
I think they would have passed it. Thank you for your
support.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you very
much, Aaron. Further discussion. Sue.

MS. ENTSMINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
You're faced with a lot of hard issues, like we are, as
the Councils, and I think in working many years in this
public process what I'm hearing here is how the Council
would feel. We should have had the courage to do it
yesterday. Even yesterday the people were all here and
we could have had maybe a subcommittee, a little meeting
including us. This is what frustrates people in the
public process. We're taking out time. These are not
paid positions. You know, not to be disrespectful to
anyone that has these positions, we take all our time,
it's all volunteer, and then here we are at these
meetings and we could have had an opportunity yesterday
to stop and have like a small working group work it all
out and maybe feel good about what the decisions are, but
I think without that it's real hard for us to see
something like this go through like that.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Grace.

MS. CROSS: I don't understand why all
this would have to be worked out now. It seems to me the
prudent thing to do is wait for the numbers and then get
a special action. That way everybody gets involved in
it. I think you're just leaving out a whole bunch of
people. You're just guessing at what the numbers are
going to be. It would make sense just to get the numbers
and do a special action and then everybody will get
involved through that method. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Go ahead, Niles.

MR. CESAR: Mr. Chairman. I intend to go
against the motion for the reasons that you talked about
as well as some of the public comments we've received. I
think some of the reason that we're in a hurry to do this
because people who may want to hunt that area like to make their plans in a timely fashion so that if they were going to hunt in August or whatever they would like to begin that process and get their reservations and do all that stuff and I understand that and I don't have a problem with that except I don't view this -- it doesn't sound as if it's going to get that much attention to begin with. I think by shortcutting our process without the folks involved I think we're more in danger of our own credibility suffering from this for a reason that I don't view as sufficiently important enough to do, so I intend to vote against it.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.

Southcentral.

MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. I don't want to belabor this, but I sat here yesterday as a disinterested party and listened to all the arguments for and against. I don't feel that the Department of Fish and Game made a good case for it. I think you folks thoroughly argued it. I think you made a decision -- whether I agree or not, you made a decision yesterday and I've been honored to sit on this type of a board because of that and I would hope that you would think about that long and hard before you change your mind. I don't see any new information that would have changed my mind. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Ray.

MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman. I would just like to reiterate that too from the standpoint of Advisory Committees and so on and the fact that they did send representatives down here that any action you took now, whether it's good or not, would appear that you're bypassing them and leaving them out of the process and I think you would really lose from it if you take any action right now in their absence after they were here yesterday. As you said, you can act later. You can in work sessions and so on bring this up and get involved in it at that point. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Go ahead.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair, thank you. I put this motion for reconsideration out there and I'm glad I did. What I've heard here from everyone was important for me to hear. So airing this in the fashion that we have I appreciate you allowing this to come
forward. I'm not going to be able to vote for this
motion as is currently written. I would instead perhaps
prefer that we defer this and, as you suggested, when
that information becomes available that the Board take a
special action and involve the appropriate parties.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Well, I think we
need to vote up or down on the motion. Regardless of how
it turns out, when we get the biological information it's
going to come back before the Board this summer as soon
as it's available. I mean there's no getting around
that. It's the first time we will have something solid
on which to base a decision. Quite frankly, I know I
have the patience to go ahead and wait for that and make
sure that everybody is dealt from the same deck of cards
and that we're giving people the opportunity to present
their views.

Further discussion.

MR. BREWSTER: Mr. Chairman. I will vote
for my motion because I think the information is there
and I think it's the right thing to do. Saying that, I'm
certainly willing, if the vote fails, to look at some
other options that we might be able to proceed and to
address everybody's concerns.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Harry.

MR. WILDE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. Arctic
Village is a long ways from our area and it's people come
in here and they need help. I understand Arctic Village
people because I've got a son-in-law up there. They
always come and tell me about how they live. Everything
is flown in. Gas is expensive and everything. People are
living from the land. They come here and ask for you to
help, I'm really sorry for them a lot of the time. When
my daughter went up there and talked to them, Daddy,
these people are not living like us. We're rich compared
to them. Rich on subsistence way of life. That's all I
have.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.

George, you had something.

MR. OVIATT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Boy, I'm sort of neutral on this. As a Board member, I
do appreciate and understand the cost of people that they
spend and the time they spend to come in and testify.
BLM, where we are neutral in situations like this, we
have a tendency to want to show reverence to the managing agency. I'm not sure there is a conservation reason to keep this closed. I think we have an obligation where there maybe isn't a conservation reason that we do need to open this up. I think I'm going to rely upon the Fish and Wildlife Service's biologist in the field and with the safeguards that I think Gary has put up here that I'm going to support the motion.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Judy.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chair. I really appreciate the comments we heard today. I think from the process point of view I will not support the motion. I really appreciate that Fish and Wildlife Service has made some extra efforts here today and outlined some really good plans, more specifically on how they would manage the area. And I hope, if the population counts are what we may expect them to be, that there be a special action so that the Board would take action in a timely way this summer and that the refuge manager would be monitoring as described. I think that would be an excellent effort.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Again, I'll reiterate that the Board, the public, the RAC have my sincere commitment that getting biological data -- and the State, anybody else that's involved with this, getting that information. I will make sure that we have the time to make an informed decision with the appropriate parties involved in the process, so we're all dealing from the same deck. Is there further discussion.

Yes.

MS. ENTSMINGER: I don't want to drag this out, but in reading what I see in front of me now, can someone explain what that does any different because it says defer action. Just explain to me what the motion does.

MR. EDWARDS: It's my understanding this action before us would not defer. If it gets defeated, then it's going to require another motion to do something. The only deferral on the original motion had to do with the rest of the area, not the two drainages. The motion only opens the two drainages. It continues to keep closed the remainder of the drainages -- or the remainder of the area, excuse me.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Gary, if I can just point one thing out and that is that if this motion
fails, the regulation is as it stands until we revisit it based on biological data. So that's the way it would be. We're not going to belabor the point. I think the record is very solid in terms of people not being involved in the process and we just need to get everybody to the table in order to move this thing on. But we will do it timely, I assure you.

Given that, if there's no further discussion, roll call vote. I don't care which way you go.

MR. BOYD: I'll stay from my right to the left. Mr. Oviatt.

MR. OVIATT: Yes.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Cesar.

MR. CESAR: No.

MR. BOYD: Ms. Gottlieb.

MS. GOTTLIEB: No.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Edwards.

MR. EDWARDS: Yes.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Brewster.

MR. BREWSTER: No.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: No. Motion fails. We are going to move on here. I think it's probably appropriate for us to take a short break and then we'll have the discussion with Regional Council Chairs.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. We're going to go ahead and start this conversation out with our Council Chairs. The last time we went 10 through 1. This time we'll go back to 1 through 10, so we'll start out with Region 1 first. Dolly.
DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you to the Board for having the Councils here. It is very important for us as representatives of our region to be here and part of the deliberations and we know that you're listening to us and we can report back on that.

I have several points that I would like to bring up, Mr. Chair, so bear with me. This is my last meeting, so I might talk until you kind of throw me out of here, but I'll try and be as brief as possible.

First, Mr. Chairman, the rural status determination is quite a concern for Southeast. We have three communities that are basically on the chopping block so to speak. The Southeast Region has reported to you and continues to maintain that it is an issue of deference, it is an issue of taking. If you take away a rural status and you lose that opportunity, then you lose that taking opportunity; therefore, the Council recommendations regarding rural status of the Southeast communities should be paramount to the Federal Subsistence Board’s decisions.

In terms of that process, we are a bit disappointed that the initial determination will be made in a working session that is an executive session, as we feel that it's difficult to respond to that through the Federal process once it goes out for public review if we don't have an idea of what your concerns are as Board members and how to respond to them.

So, in that process we are interested in getting correspondence, any type of major correspondence that we think has impacts on the Councils or impact on subsistence, that that type of correspondence be made sometimes quicker than the time that we've seen it in so that we have opportunity to review it.

On another point, Mr. Chairman, I know that you've seen this letter before and it has been distributed to the Council as well as to the Federal Subsistence Board again. The Southeast Region does intend to petition the Secretary of Interior to eliminate the requirement that we have a State hunting license in order to hunt for subsistence resources on Federal lands. That is not required by law. We do not require a State fishing license for subsistence fishing in Federal areas.

Because this has potential for statewide
impact, we are asking the other regions to bring this up in their fall meeting. So their October meeting, if you would take this up, take this letter forward, we can provide you with additional copies if you need and we would appreciate any comments that each Council has, whether or not they support it, don't support it. Those comments will be attached to our letter and sent forward.

But it is our intent to get all of these comments and to make a final determination as a Council at a November teleconference meeting and then to send the request off. We hope that the Federal Subsistence Board understands our request and our need to have this change.

You said this was an opportunity for us to shoot at you, but we do want to thank you for the Makhnati issue. I know that that was a big stretch. At least in Southeast Alaska, the importance of the intertidal zone to subsistence users is just fundamentally huge. So, to have an area like Makhnati where we now have protections or will have protections for subsistence uses of those resources in a marine area because it's a Federal reserve is very important to us and the Sitka people are extremely pleased that that decision was made.

We have resource issues that are coming up, Mr. Chairman, the Board and Council. We have sockeye issues in Southeast in the Angoon and Kake area primarily, which have smaller streams. Their sockeye returns have been dismal. It appears the primary culprit is commercial salmon fishermen, whichever gear type. The Angoon area, the Southeast Regional Advisory Council did petition the Board of Fishery, did request that there be a working group created and the Board of Fisheries declined. So basically we will be seeking from the Federal Subsistence Board that they take extra jurisdictional action in order to protect these stocks because they are extremely low and subsistence needs are not being met.

The other area, Mr. Chairman, in terms of resource concern is eulachon in the Unuk River area and this is the third year that we have not had a return. Eulachon have somewhere between a three and five-year cycle. So, to have three years of no return is very critical. I know that Forest Service in Ketchikan is working on this, but we will probably seek research funds
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and some type of action. There's no known intercept of
the resource. We just do not know what's going on, so
that's just a heads up of something to come.

In the area of deer planning, Mr.
Chairman, we did have Mike Bangs and I thought he would
be back here to report on Unit 2 deer subcommittee and I
guess I kind of want to give you an idea of -- it was a
success. We did get some action out of it, but I wanted
to give an idea to other Council members and what made it
a success in terms of sort of the administration or the
nuts and bolts. What was paramount to a subcommittee
being successful was that it was a subcommittee of the
RAC and it fell under FACA requirements that the chairman
of that subcommittee and the vice chairman were both RAC
members. That was absolutely paramount.

The Regional Advisory Council established
the boundaries of what would happen at that meeting. It
gave direction to the subcommittee of what they should be
doing and that boundaries ensure that we protected
subsistence rights and opportunities, so it didn't become
a free for all if this is what we want to do.

The RAC established the size of the
subcommittee, so we estimated how many people we would
need for subsistence. We wanted to make sure we had
broad makeup, so we did have representation from all
users, but we limited the number of perhaps the guide,
the non-rural Ketchikan person. We made sure we had a
balance of everybody, but we were very careful that the
group did not get too large so it was functional.

The subcommittee of the first meeting was
made aware of ANILCA because when you have non-rural you
have guide people, you have non-subsistence people on the
subcommittee. They're not familiar with ANILCA like we
are. They haven't spent the last 10 years defending
ANILCA and subsistence, so it did take some education for
them to understand the parameters of protecting
subsistence while providing opportunity to non-rural,
which primarily was Ketchikan.

So what was the negative side of it?
That some of the people did not have ANILCA at heart,
that they did not take the lecture of ANILCA to their
heart and they didn't understand the status of being a
subcommittee of a FACA, that their recommendations would
go to the Regional Council. There was this level of
trying to take ownership of a report that had not been
adopted by the Regional Advisory Council and saying this is the way it is. So taking the draft that suited your needs in trying to take it forward and that is not the way FACA works. So that was a bit of a concern.

Again, I did mention when Mr. Bangs reported that there were too many meetings. I think there were five meetings. Six with a pre-planning. That's very difficult when you're working and trying to make money, when you have other obligations, when you're trying to go out and get some of these subsistence resources. By having five meetings and people missing one or two meetings, it was not as effective.

Then, finally, one of the concerns with the subcommittee versus the Regional Advisory Council is that the subcommittee didn't really understand the history. I mean I could talk to any of you about U2 deer and you would know it because you've seen it so many times. You've seen all the reports, you've seen all the past proposals. If you haven't, you've probably caught up on it, but they didn't have that same type of history that the Regional Advisory Council had with what proposals had worked or didn't work or had been tried or didn't have the biology, didn't have whatever it would take to make it happen, so there were numerous recommendations that were brought forward as ideas that we knew just weren't going to happen, just wouldn't make it through the ANILCA and FACA process.

So, in conclusion, that it is a subcommittee of the Regional Advisory Council is a paramount, that the boundaries of that subcommittee should be determined by the Regional Advisory Council, that that subcommittee should be time limited so that people can commit to three or four meetings and say, okay, I'm done.

Then I know I mentioned it earlier, but it's so important to start first with education. If we had several workshops in Ketchikan about what ANILCA is, what the status of deer on Prince of Wales are, there would have been far less hostility than what we faced at our first meeting. So, in the future, if you're looking at subcommittees, it shouldn't start without the education prior to.

Just a final note, it was important to have the independent person, Shineburg and Associates, hold the meetings. They had no position for or against
they were very good coordinators, they listened to all sides and that made it valuable for all sides. As a Ketchikan person, I'm a non-rural person, but I felt like I had as much voice as the Prince of Wales people did because of that independence.

I think those are all of my points. Again, thank you for allowing me to participate.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Do we have any questions or comments by Board members.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you very much. Region 2.

MR. BLOSSOM: I was honored to be here and take Ralph's place. I thoroughly enjoyed it. I think we did our homework because you agreed with what we said, so I'm real tickled there. We do have one thing that hasn't been resolved yet. We were asked to form a subcommittee on fishery issues and defer our fishing proposals and our Southcentral Council would like to extend the deadline on that and have those proposals brought in by like the 21st of October so that we can take it up normally like we do in the spring on fishery issues. In fact, we held a meeting with you folks trying to get that and I haven't heard that being resolved.

I'd like to read into the record our chairman's resolution on this issue. It's regarding the preliminary plan for the Kenai Peninsula Fishery Stakeholder Subcommittee. Whereas the Federal Subsistence Board requested a Southcentral Regional Advisory Council establish a Stakeholder Subcommittee to help make recommendations for the Federal Subsistence Fishing regulations on Federal public waters of the Kasilof River drainage and for the waters north of and including the Kenai River draining on the Kenai Peninsula within the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge and the Chugach National Forest.

Whereas the goal of the Stakeholder Subcommittee was to draft proposals for Federal subsistence fishing seasons, methods and means, harvest limits on these Federal public waters.

Whereas the Council reviewed the preliminary draft plan for the Kenai Peninsula fisheries,
Stakeholder Subcommittee, at their March 14-16 meeting in Anchorage.

Whereas the Council voted to reject the plan as presented by a 6-2 majority vote and further stating that the current members of the Council are knowledgeable of the Kenai fisheries resources and are also represented as a sport and commercial users on the Kenai Peninsula.

Now, therefore it be resolved the Council requests the Federal Subsistence Board to either extend the current deadline for the 2007 fishery proposals or call for fishery proposals through the deadline of October 21st of 2006 concurrent with the 2007 call for wildlife proposals.

Whereas the extended deadline for a call for fishery proposals would be specific to means, methods and means and seasons, the harvest limits on Federal public waters of the Kasilof River drainage and the waters north of and including the Kenai River drainage within the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge and the Chugach National Forest within the Kenai Peninsula district.

Therefore it be resolved the Council felt the existing Council meeting structure was adequate to address Kenai Peninsula fisheries and encourages other users to participate in their normally scheduled public meetings through their existing regulatory process.

This was passed by our Council on March 14th, 2006. Just to further that, there's probably a time when we'll need a subcommittee, but we'd first like to see the proposals to see what we can do with them and if it gets past us, then a subcommittee would be in order.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Any questions or comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Appreciate your concerns. Region 3.

MR. TUTIAKOFF: I'd like to thank the Federal Subsistence Board for allowing us to be here today. It's a process that I think the chairs of all the RAC's appreciate. We have an opportunity to understand
how you're thinking and possibly you'll understand how
we're thinking. We can resolve a lot of these proposals
as they come forward to you and we move on from within
the RAC's to you our concerns.

One of the concerns of the Kodiak area
and the Aleutians has been since its beginning, which
I've been a part of, and I'm sure Tom can appreciate this
because I say it at every one of these meetings, is that
we have a situation in the Aleutians/Kodiak kind of
unique maybe to the other regions is that we have a long
ways to travel to get to some of the villages, in some
cases 1,400 miles. In doing so, we lost membership. We
lose at least one a year. This last year I think we lost
two only because they could not make the meetings due to
regulation.

Appointment by the RAC is not allowed,
you know, getting a new member. One instance it took a
year and a half and by then election or process of
elimination we had three seats open. We requested this
before and I'd ask you to look into it again. Let's get
the authority of the Chairman of the Federal Subsistence
Board to appoint for a period of time so that we can have
a full meeting. We've had two meetings where we had to
travel all the way to Sand Point and we've not had a
quorum. That's very expensive.

And allowing the Staff to travel with us
that we need their input. We've had to travel back to
Anchorage, spending a couple more days, costing more
time, which we are willing to do, but it's hard on the
Staff. They've got other commitments to be with other
RAC's in some cases. So allowing the consideration of
the Federal Subsistence Board Chair where you, yourself,
appoint somebody for an interim period until such time
the Secretary appoints somebody, it would really help us
out.

The other one is on the comments now. In
regards to the gentlemen from some of the villages when I
was here yesterday listening to, in regards to Arctic
Village and some of these others, I think those are the
same concerns in our region. It's not only coming from
the Interior, Arctic Slope or wherever, it's coming from
all the RAC's and I support his comments that he made
yesterday in regards to being considerate of the RAC's
and the people that travel to these meetings.

The Alaska village initiatives issue that
was spoke of yesterday, I'm very interested in that. I think that's a program that I'm going to ask the RAC members of Kodiak/Aleutian to really look into. It would help our whole problem that we have in regards to keeping the herd in the peninsula. We had to address that issue here at this level and I appreciate your support in keeping two bulls for the communities that are involved. I can see if we don't do something to bring that herd up or do more surveys or disallow commercial hunts or guided hunts for a period of time we're going to lose that herd for various other reasons other than hunting. There has to be some other reason why this herd went from 25,000 to close to annihilation within a four-year period. We just didn't understand and I don't think anybody does. So we're going to look at that.

In regards to rural issues, Kodiak and Adak are on that list within our region. We will support Kodiak to continue to be rural and, of course, Adak because of its reduction in the military and population does qualify. We thank you for your support in that particular issue.

What does come to mind and I just heard this this morning that June 26 meeting, executive meeting of the Federal Subsistence Board is going to be an executive session. Consideration of public comments is going to come after you've made a recommendation. That's very hard to take. The process seems to me ought to be the other way around. Get public input, then go into discussions, deliberations and make recommendations to the Secretary. I've been a part of this process for almost 13 years. I don't think I've seen a process within the Federal Subsistence Board that once a recommendation is made has been reversed. It's very hard to do by the RAC's to come to you and say this is hurting our community. It may happen, but it takes two to three years for it to happen and that hurts our people, all of us. So consideration in regards to the rural issue affects a lot of our communities. I hope you take that into consideration and ask for public comment prior to your recommendations. This is very hard to change.

One of the issues we brought up in regards to the caribou issue on the peninsula was that guides come in from all over the country. Some are out of state. I've seen it happen in Adak. That herd out there needs to be hunted, I understand that, but we do have wanton waste going on within Adak and also in the peninsula herd. Comments I received at the last meeting
we held in Cold Bay there were several community members
who were out hunting and observed these guides and non-
subsistence users just packing off the horns and leaving
the meat in the field.

The other issue is the duck hunting that
goes on in the fall in Cold Bay. Many of you may not be
aware of it, but close to 200 to 300 birds were
slaughtered by a guide under the privy of subsistence.
He actually utilized photo taking to enhance his own
business in the Lower 48. Very disturbing to those
people who are hungry and go out there and spend a lot of
money to get to Cold Bay from the other communities.
That has not to my satisfaction nor the RAC been
resolved.

There are proposals that have come before
this Council. One of them, unfortunately, I had to
observe this morning, for participation by the RAC's,
individuals from other communities who traveled here to
speak for or against a certain proposal, to have it
brought up again during a reconsideration. I understand
what the process is, I understand what the intent was,
but I think it's going to be viewed by the rural people
and the RAC's when they get back to their communities
that the Federal Subsistence Board basically utilizes the
RAC's as a tool to say, yeah, we've done our job. It
goes back to affect the people and it's going to be very
hard for most of us to convince our people that this is
the right process. They're going to start to mistrust
it. I think the intent is there. I think you're doing
what you think is right, but it's going to be viewed as
very untrusting again.

Lastly, an ongoing issue in regards to
the budget. This has always been Kodiak/Aleutians' big
issue, trying to get the other communities that benefit
from use of Federal lands, hunting, fishing and being
able to go out and get their own food. I don't know how
we can resolve this other than -- there are some
communities that haven't been involved with this process
within the Aleutians and it's unfortunate because a lot
of them would like to be. Due to budget concerns, we go
to Cold Bay, Kodiak or Anchorage. Sometimes we do get to
Sand Point. Because of weather we don't get to King
Cove. With the weather issue, nobody shows up and it's
very hard. There's other communities such as St. Paul in
the Pribilofs, St. George in the Pribilofs, Adak on the
Aleutians has jet service from Anchorage, three-hour
flight. The cost is similar to get into Sand Point.
They are not involved in this process and I think as long as I've been here, Tom, I seem to bring that up at every one of these meetings. I know it's a tough issue that you don't control the budget, but what is it we can do as RAC's. Maybe go to Senator Stevens, Senator Murkowski, Young, the Secretary, who, to get some additional funds.

I read this letter from Southeast about the amount of money going into the Department of Fish and Game from the Federal funds. That money could be used to bring in more input from the communities or get the communities that have not been reached. I support this idea and always have. If you're hunting or fishing on Federal lands, you do not need a State license or permit, but it's happening and I would support to change it and I will take it to my RAC in the Kodiak/Aleutians.

Again, I would like to thank you for this opportunity. I might be harsh, but sometimes that's the only way we can get our message across. I do what I can to help out in all of the RAC issues whenever we do get together and I support all the RAC people that have come out here and I hope that you'll take and consider some of our comments when you get together on your work sessions. Thanks.

Chairman Demientieff: Thank you. Let me respond to a couple points that you brought out. One is that, as Chairman, I do not have the authority to do interim appointments. It's not only affected your region, it has affected others. Because of meetings like this with the RAC chairs where we run into that problem, we did request that delegation of authority to me or to the chair from the secretaries, but we did not get that delegation of authority. Secretaries retained that appointment.

However, we have been able to streamline our annual appointment process, which sometimes we'd have to wait months, which also affected some regions other than yours. So we were able successfully to streamline that review and get those appointments out. The interim appointments remain a problem, but we have tried and will continue to try to find a way to see if there's a way we can do that. We have the same concern you do. We do not want the Councils to not be able to react.

The other thing was the June 26 meeting. We have to get a proposed rule out and that's the whole purpose of that, then we can have something for people to
review. We have changed when we get a proposed rule out based on public review. We have changed the rule prior to adoption. It's been done times in the past, so we're not putting out the final rule. It's just like a regulatory proposal. If we don't have something down for people to react to, then it kind of defeats the point. So I just wanted to respond to those two things.

We're scheduling a trip to Kodiak. I know I'm planning. I think there are a couple other Board members that are going down there. We'll be working on that as soon as this meeting is over and working closely with people to finalize the dates. We're looking at early June, so I just wanted to let you know that. That date will firm up hopefully before the week is out because people we have are also busy people, just like people in Kodiak. I know, Gary, you just got back from Kodiak, didn't you? So we will be firming that date up in cooperation with local people.

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yes, Mr. Chairman. If I can respond. Thank you for that information in regards to going to Kodiak. I know it's a very intense issue for the community members of Kodiak, those people on the road systems. I get constant e-mails from people down there about when is this going to happen, when is the RAC going to have an advisory meeting in Kodiak so they can bring up their concerns, maybe formulate some response when you do get there. There again it's a budget issue. There's about three members in Kodiak that would be willing to sit down and hold a public meeting. There again they're waiting for word from Washington to get something done. We appreciate your efforts to get there.

In regards to Chair appointment, I've received that letter from the Secretary to you and I appreciate you sending it to me. I think it's an issue that's just the matter of one line within the authority of the Chair to appoint. I mean that's all we're asking for. It's not like we're changing the whole system to allow that to happen. You still go through the process of nomination or whatever. If that individual appointed is wanting to go through that process, fine. That's all I'm asking for is some help because we have had to delay meetings and it's very inconvenient for everyone involved, including the Department.

Other than that, appreciate your input.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. We're
just going to continue to go around the table by region because Harry had to leave to go home and some of the people didn't have representatives here. So I'll just go with who I see. Bristol Bay concerns, please.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Mr. Chair as well as Board members. I appreciate also the opportunity to be here and be heard and I appreciate the action that you took on the revisiting also, I think in honor of the process, and I was happy to see the outcome such as it was. I think that's a dangerous thing to do. Otherwise many of us will be wishing reconsideration on issues that we feel are controversial. So I do appreciate that.

For our region we continue to have most resource concerns. Unfortunately, we don't have many positives to report in our troublesome areas. We continue to have concerns with our sockeye returns for the Kwichak and ongoing studies are going there. The good news there was our subsistence users in the upper regions of Lake Clark were able to have their subsistence needs met last year satisfactorily, which was the first time in several years. We do have kind of a gloom and doom forecast once again for that region, so that area is going to have to continue to be watched and monitored very closely to make sure that those folks are getting what they need.

As everybody is fully aware, the Northern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd is still at an incredibly low number. It's pretty much disastrous. We've gone from the thousands down to our latest estimate between 1,500 and 2,000 animals. It no longer supports a subsistence hunt for us. Though our items were all on the consensus agenda, two of them involved subsistence hunts that we deleted from ourselves because of problems out there with our resources.

It needs to be noted also that, you know, in the past some of the more fortunate hunters on our northern borders were able to access the Mulchatna herd for those who are using the Northern Alaska Peninsula herd and they were able to access those animals and bring home some meat for people and do some sharing, but the Mulchatna herd is also now on the decline and that's just kind of a warning that we're going to have to start monitoring things there much more closely. For those of you who haven't seen the reports, it's definitely on a downhill slope, which is not necessarily unexpected since it had reached a very high point in past years. We need
to be aware of that because the animals also didn't
migrate as far south this winter as they have in the
past, so there were a lot of villages that were unable to
meet their needs as far as caribou went.

I think it's worthy to once again note,
as several of my colleagues before me, that as the
competition increases and difficulties grow for people
who live in the remote areas, with fuel prices,
everything else going up, we're going to have to become
more creative in our abilities to protect those
resources. The sheep proposal that was revisited this
morning is an ideal example. We also had proposals on
our plate at our meeting in February that we had to
address that were very much the same where perhaps
conservation concerns couldn't be totally identified but
user groups were definitely at conflict. I think it
would heed all of us, including us chairs, to start
putting on our thinking caps and thinking about how we're
going to address these issues in the future.

Personally, I put most of the burden upon
everybody who is the head of their departments for each
one of the services, including the State, to begin to
have stringent requirements for transporters and guides
that are going into Federal areas. I think it's a major
concern to subsistence users who feel like these people
are coming into their back yard and taking what little
they have.

We are already depleted in our herds.
The southern Alaska herd has fallen down to dangerously
low levels. We're already there with the Northern Alaska
herd. Our moose hunts we've had to decrease this winter
because of lower numbers as well. I think as we're more
and more threatened that threat becomes more and more
real. I understand that when the biological numbers
don't show it, ANILCA is very specific about who gets to
hunt when, but I think it would be a very smart idea for
the Federal people to start looking at how they allow
people to go in there and what the requirements should be
when they're using the land and property, especially when
there's heavy subsistence use in an area.

That's kind of a personal comment of
mine, but I wish everybody would think about it because I
think we're all hearing it from all of our people and I
think it's important or we would not be hearing it over
and over again.
Other than that, we are hoping that studies and work continue to be done on the problems that we're having out there with our resources and I am not finding fault. I think that we're having our studies met as best as possible until the scientific world can become more realistic or more knowledgeable I should say about how things are happening and why we struggle through and we continue to thank you for your support in our area and our voice. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you for your input. I should have opened this by saying this, but I'll just do it right now. Time and time again the Board uses this input. Since we added this meeting with the Council Chairs, we draw upon the input, we work with it and we apply it to areas. So we do utilize the input fully and we've done things and respond to it. So make sure you understand that we apply the things that we're learning to our deliberations during the course of the year. I should have pointed it out in the beginning, but sometimes we get tired towards the end of the meeting, but I just wanted to point it out right now. Make sure you understand that your inputs are not falling upon deaf ears. We use it as a tool.

Okay. Eastern.

MS. ENTSMINGER: I thought I was going to be last. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I learned a long time ago you get more with sugar than you do with vinegar. It took a while for me though.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I remember working with you.

(Laughter)

MS. ENTSMINGER: I might have to tell a funny story because you're very good at it. I remember when the Park Service first came to the Slana area and Chuck Budge was the superintendent. I might have been all of 28 years old and I made fur hats and I had a skunk hat with the tail straight up and a sign on the back that said National Park Service stinks, so you have an idea where I might be coming from. I've grown a lot. They asked me to give that had to him for his retirement.

(Laughter)

MS. ENTSMINGER: I want to say that I've
learned a lot also being here during these meetings and I really want to commend the Board. That exercise in reconsideration probably brought a lot of good information out that we may learn to work together better in the future. I also would like to thank Judy for her willingness to work with the FortyMile plan. I think that's awesome and the people will be real happy about that. I feel that we have a long road to hoe. It's really hard to be patient at times when the government works pretty slowly.

I think the process of learning is that we need to get together and join hands. I feel like the Native and non-Native issues sometimes become very contentious and very difficult, but I believe that we need to join hands in the future because as time goes on it's our kids and our grandkids that need to have us all working together and that means a lot to me personally. There's probably a lot of issues that I could bring up now, but I feel like it will all come out. I'm ready to move ahead with a positive manner. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I guess I should point out for the rest of the RAC representatives, when I say I remember those days, of course, I was a long-term chair of our own Advisory Committee and between Sue and I we probably had about five gallons of vinegar. That's what I mean. We both were in the same boat and coming from the same hard point of view.

Judy, you had a follow up.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Sure, Mr. Chair. While I know the Park does appreciate all of Sue's hard work and dedicated efforts and she advocates joining hands but she truly does it, too. So it's always nice to match the actions with the words that are said. Thank you for your service.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.

MR. STONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm borrowing Grace's mike so I can look directly at you and Tom. In the process last night, the case of Tom's retirement, at least I was so impressed about the fishing gear last night. At least he got a decent fishing pole in order to go fishing. You might recollect, Tom, two years ago you and I were down at Aleutian Islands on one
of those vessels, we had to have a commercial fishing license in order to be on the vessel, so they gave Tom a fishing line with maybe a 500 pound test line and a screwdriver for a fishing pole. He says how am I supposed to fish. Well, throw it out and jig it. Within about two minutes I seen Tom, uh-oh, uh-oh, pulling, pulling, pulling a tom cod about that long. Tom's eyes were like an owl, he was so excited to be fishing with a screwdriver fishing pole. So, Tom, I congratulate you about your two fishing poles last night and I hope you have good luck on your retirement and go fishing down at King Cove.

Of course, to the members of the Board, I certainly want to thank you for the most hard you've ever done again for this meeting for all of us. Always remember that us right here in the RAC's give a strong recommendation to you on your process to do business with all the communities throughout Alaska, Arctic Village, you know, and Arctic Slope, we should have somebody from the RAC testify on this proposal. We work with all the communities and work with the Board here. Dolly and Vince, I certainly want to thank you about the issue about the fishing license and sure we will take 100 percent attention to it at next fall meeting and respond to it.

Again, I want to thank Mr. Chairman, you and the Board members on a job well done again this year. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Seward Pen.

MS. CROSS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think the Board did excellent work these past few days and I was really impressed. I was very glad that you were able to -- that proposal this morning, I was very glad that you were able to look at it rationally and deal with it rationally.

Seward Pen's major concern, as you can notice from our proposals, it's regarding moose. Our moose seasons are getting smaller, the catch is getting less. In Unalakleet and Wild and Scenic River there will be no moose hunting. So that's our main concern.

I was so impressed or actually envious when they started talking about what happened in Harry Wilde's country and how the moose has gone back so much
that they asked to get a calf and they're able to do that
and I was also impressed with the caribou working groups.
I certainly hope BLM and the State will be looking at
something like that for situation, especially at
Unalakleet and Wild and Scenic River. The people
themselves chose to stop hunting because the situation is
so dire.

I think what really bothers me is that
all around Seward Pen the moose populations have declined
but yet we still have non-resident hunts in some of our
little bit healthier areas. So I would really encourage
this Board to start encouraging the State and OSM to
start addressing our moose situation. We are making our
own choices as subsistence hunters of cutting out and
reducing our subsistence needs. It needs to be
addressed, otherwise we'll probably be in the same
situation with our chum, still trying to recover. We
still have rivers that have no chum stock that used to
boil in the river. So I really would encourage you to
start looking at it. I will be talking to the RAC about
it in our next meeting.

What I also want to encourage OSM to do
is to pay more attention to the users. We live there, we
hunt there and we fish there. When we start noticing
certain things, they are real. If the game is going
down, we notice that because usually most of us hunt in a
certain area all the time and we venture out of it only
when there's not much there. So I really would encourage
OSM to continue to get as much input as possible from the
users from rural Alaska and start relying more on their
input versus maybe statistics from three years ago.

Well, this morning's decision scared me
at first, but, like I said, you made the right decision
and I encourage you to continue to do that. I wanted to
thank Tom Boyd for being my guinea pig a number of times
and I'm sorry I missed your picnic yesterday. Seward Pen
will certainly miss you. I know you have been to
meetings there, which we really appreciate it, to see a
top person from somewhere come and pay attention to us
with very few Federal land, so we were very much
impressed with that.

I also want to thank you for returning
Barb Armstrong to the region. She is really an asset to
us. Barb usually does things beyond call of duty. For
example, when I was going to come here, late at night I
was going to check in online and found out I couldn't
check in online, so I called her up at home. She had it
fixed by 7:00 in the morning. That's the kind of person
she is. Any time we need information she goes out of her
way to find it for us. So thank you very much for
returning her to the region.

And thank you, Board, for listening to us
once again. Throughout the years I see all of you
improving more and more and I really appreciate that.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Tom.

MR. BOYD: I do want to respond to
something Grace said about going to her meetings. I know
eyear when Grace became the chair I went to a meeting
and I believe it was in Unalakleet and it was a real
snowy time and Grace was admonishing us for something and
I can't even remember the issue and very stern about it,
but occasionally she would look right at me with a big
wink and what I took from that is Grace was saying to me
listen to me, I'm saying something to you, but don't take
it personally. At that moment I kind of knew we were
kindred spirits, Grace, and I've appreciated your
leadership in that council over the years. You've stayed
with it as well as most of you and your leadership has
really brought that council a long way. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Western.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's been a while since I've been at one of these
meetings. I was chair in the early years. I've been on
the Western Interior RAC since its inception and it's
good to see this process has matured. I think one of the
last meetings I was at was at what happened is when you're
dealing with our area I would come up and sit before a
mike, but then the rest of the time I was in the
background, but now to see us all around the table here
throughout the discussions and interact is a real growth
in this process and I think it's much better than it was
in the early years.

A little bit of background. I mentioned
I've been on the Western Interior RAC since the
beginning. I've also been on the Denali Park SRC since
its founding and I was involved in the State process
since the mid '70s when I became chair of the McGrath
Fish and Game Advisory, so I've kind of been able to
watch this whole thing through as its developed. I think
It's important that we make note of some of the lessons that we've learned and try to build on those and build them into the process.

One of the things that I've learned and I think you're learning too is that there's a real strong need for interagency cooperation and State and Federal and cooperation with the RAC's and the local people if we're really going to do a right job in management.

For example, Henry Deacon, an elder from Grayling, and myself were on the Western Interior RAC when we saw what happened in the Koyukuk and it finally led to that moose management plan coming into place up there, we were finally able to deal with some of the issues. At other times we had tried on the Federal side to pass an action and then it didn't coincide with the State and the users out there were very unhappy because they didn't see either process working. We started asking about that time, it was about eight years ago, that we needed to do that same process down in the Innoko River and eight years later we have a plan in place there.

I hope in some of these others when we identify a need for a plan we'll be able to move a little quicker. I know we got behind the curve on the Kuskokwim in the Aniak area and we lost it there, so now we have advisory groups closing seasons and taking melodramatic action to try to build it. So I hope that we can keep this cooperation going.

Another strong example of that is I'm on the Kuskokwim River Working Group in the fisheries area and that's a group that really functions well together. When the Federal money came in for fisheries, all of a sudden we were able to do research projects that they weren't able to do before and we're starting it in genetic data, we're getting weirs in place to be able to monitor the fish and we're really learning a lot about that resource. I'm glad to see that go forward.

If we're going to build on those lessons learned, I think we need to carry some of that over to the wildlife side. We're still using data that the State gathered on subsistence use and patterns out there and that data has not been brought up to date. You do a little study now when there's a need on customary and traditional use, this kind of a study goes around, but we're not developing the background history on some of
those communities of what their actual patterns of use are.

On the part of the wildlife refuges and so on, I don't know if they're actively documenting the history of use in their areas and building it into the plan so that when a new manager comes in he has a history of what went on there.

One example of that is the Park Service funded village histories and I was hired to write the history from Nikolai and Telida and I really enjoyed doing that and getting some of that on the record to show how they used the park, but also about their lifestyle and that's on the web now under Denali Park, the Dichinanek'hwt'ana people of the Upper Kuskokwim, so new people coming into the park can read that at least. I guess they're using some of the stories in their presentations to the public, so it carries on.

It seems to me that something like that should go on in some of the other refuges too, those kinds of histories and studies involving local people so that it's there as part of the record. It's not an afterthought.

One of the questions that keeps coming up is what is natural and healthy and you're supposed to manage for natural and healthy. What does that mean? One of the books I read this last year that really made an impression on me was 1491, a picture of what the Americas were like before the Europeans came in. What they found through the studies that have gone on is the landscape here has been reshaped by the people that lived here for thousands of years. They were reshaping the jungle. They were reshaping the eastern U.S. when the colonists first landed here. They landed on a coast that was depopulated because of sickness. Moved in and started farming on the same thing, but when they went into the forest, they could walk through the forest because fire had been used to reshape that landscape. It looked natural, there was abundant wildlife there, but the people had been reshaping that. Human use has been part of the natural landscape all along. We need to think about that in Alaska.

There's another issue that I've been bringing up on the Denali Park is that the Park Service can't get involved in predator control and many of the agencies are reluctant to do that, to not get involved in
intensive management, but what they can do is do the
studies to show what is the predator/prey relationships
in the Park where there's no hunting as opposed to what
is predator/prey relationships in the wildlife refuge and
so on. I'd like to see an in-depth study of that and see
that information made available to the public because
every time these issues come up there's so much bad
information that gets in the press. Like that focus on
how many wolves are killed. Well, wolves are killed
naturally every year. About a third of the population
gets kicked out every year from an area and they're
killed by other wolves or hunters and so on. We need to
understand what the natural relationships of those
populations are.

Just at this meeting a couple issues come
up. Down in the Aleutians they said, okay, we've got a
caribou herd there that's around 2,000 now. There's no
recruitment of calves. That sends up a red flag to me
that that refuge needs to study why is there no
recruitment of calves. What is going on there that's
causing that, what are the factors? And the sheep up in
Arctic Village we said what's the data there. Well, why
isn't there a history of what the harvest is of those
people and what that sheep population is doing now. We
need that information for decisions. So we need to flag
some of those and try to get studies going that address
some of those problems and maybe we can start answering
what is natural and healthy.

I know the Park Service reacts to
intensive management, but it would be much better, I
think, if we could become proactive instead of reactive
on a lot of these issues. But it's going to take
cooperation on all the parties.

So I'm hoping there can be some
directives from this Board that we need a study in this
area and the various agencies could take it back and do
something about it. And on the State side too, going
back when an area is identified, try to work out
cooperative teams to solve these if we're going to really
stay on top of this and manage the resources so they
benefit all the users out there and we won't get into
these crisis situations when we're trying to deal with
seasons and bag limits to protect a threatened population
instead of knowing ahead of time what's going on and what
kind of actions we should take.

But I'm glad to see the process going
forward and I think we are making some progress. I just hope we don't lose sight of some of these and all go back and work in our own areas and forget the big picture because I think we need a better understanding of what the big picture is. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. With regard to the Fortymile Caribou Management Plan, it appears they're going to need a couple more days, but I've talked to Park Service and made it time specific that they will have a report out. We have a meeting with Drue Pearce next week, so I'm going to take a little time at the end of that. That is time specific and I think efficiently enough, so if there's no objection from the Board members we'll go ahead and deal with that next week.

MR. OVIATT: I have no objection.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Good. I'm not seeing any objection, so that's the way we'll deal with it. That's timely enough for me and it gives the Park Service the additional days they need.

You may have noticed a little cough in my throat. I assure you I don't have a cold. It's just stress comes out of me in different ways. Sometimes I come out -- Tom has seen me like that. I come out just shaking, especially after tough arguments. But I see the stress in other people as well. I assure you, when I drop this gavel, which is coming up very shortly, that will go away. I see that stress because of everybody's commitment to the work that we're doing. I don't care whether it's Staff, whether it's RAC, Board members. Everybody brings a certain level of stress to our job because of the dedication to our job. I think in terms of Ray's comments about maturity I think that pushes us to be better because we are constantly striving to improve our process.

So thank you one and all again. Terry, you want something.

MR. HAYNES: Just before you adjourn I have a couple comments I'd like to make.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Sure.

MR. HAYNES: I keep interrupting your train of thought and I hate doing that.
CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: It's not much of a train anyway.

(Laughter)

MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With reference to the Fortymile Caribou Management Plan, we want to extend our appreciation again to the Office of Subsistence Management for its continued financial support to the Department to conduct management activities that are very important to monitoring that herd and harvest of the Fortymile Caribou. Without that support it would be extremely difficult for our Staff to continue that work.

My second comment is on behalf of the Department. I think all of us wish Tom Boyd very well in his future endeavors and I personally agree with much of what was said last night at the gathering. I don't deal with Tom directly that much. When I have, it's been very professional. We are often on other sides of the table, but we do our business and move forward. I've always had a lot of respect for Tom and how he handles his business and I personally wish him well in the future.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you very much. We do not have any further business. It looks like we've got a beautiful day out there. We might as well get out and enjoy it while we can. We are adjourned.

(Off record)
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