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PROCEEDINGS

(Anchorage, Alaska - 4/1/2009)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. I'll call the
meeting to order. Bristol Bay RAC here at the Hilton,
April 1st, 10 to 9.

And, Donald, would you do roll call and
establish quorum.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Donald Mike, Council Coordinator. Roll call for the
Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council.

Pete Abraham. Mr. Chair, Pete called
and said he couldn't make it. Nobody was able to take
care of his cabin out in Togiak.

Mr. Dan O'Hara.

MR. O'HARA: Here.

MR. MIKE: Ms. Nanci Morris.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Here.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Dale Myers.

MR. MYERS: Here.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Alvin Boskofsky. Mr.
Chair. Alvin called, too, yesterday and he couldn't
make it out of Chignik Lake due to weather, and he
wasn't able to make it today.

Ms. Molly Chythlook.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Present.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Dan Dunaway.

MR. DUNAWAY: Here.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Thomas Hedlund. Mr.
Hedlund called, too, yesterday, and he's unable to
attend this meeting due to nobody taking -- his house
was -- nobody was able to take care of his home. Mr.
Chair.

Mr. Randy Alvarez.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Here.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. You have six members present. You have a quorum. And we have one vacancy. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thank you, Donald.

Okay. I'd like to welcome everybody here to the meeting. It was originally scheduled for Naknek on the 24th and 25th, but with the volcano, we managed to make it here.

So I guess we'll do introductions then. We'll start with Sandy.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch with National Park Service. And I'm one of the Staff Committee members to the Federal Board.

DR. WHEELER: I'm Polly Wheeler with the Office of Subsistence Management. I recently was hired as the deputy to Pete. I used to be the chief of the anthropology division.

And I did want to take the opportunity to introduce Krista Gunn who's a recent hire by Dru Pierce with the Office of the Federal Coordinator, the gas pipeline. She's going to be here for the meeting today. And I'd urge you to meet with her. The Bristol Bay folks may have -- there's some interest I think in a gas pipeline, or there's some areas that you might want to talk about. Anyway, Krista is relatively new to the state. We did a briefing on subsistence yesterday, and she's interested in finding out how the program works, and what some of your concerns are, so she'll be here for the meeting.

Thank you, Randy.

MS. GUNN: And, again, Krista Gunn, and I welcome you all (indiscernible, cell phone buzz).

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: There was a question. Do you have anything to present to us on
that?

MS. GUNN: I do not.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMS: Elizabeth Williams, anthropologist, Office of Subsistence Management.

MR. SHARP: Dan Sharp with BLM.

MS. GREFFENIUS: And I'm Laura Greffenius, one of the wildlife biologist in the Subsistence Office.

MR. EASTLAND: Warren Eastland, wildlife biologist with BIA, InterAgency Staff Committee member.

MR. PAPPAS: George Pappas, Department of Fish and Game, Subsistence Liaison Team.

MR. FRIED: Steve Fried, fisheries biologist, OSM.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Thank you. That's everybody except for our recorder.

MR. HILE: I'm Nathan.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Nathan. All right.

Next on the agenda is the election of officers for Chair, Vice Chair and the Secretary. And I guess talking to Donald, we're supposed to do this every year, and we neglected to do it at the last meeting. So we'll have to have it now.

And I just -- I wanted to say that I didn't renew my application on this Board, so my term expires at the end of this year. So I'll be here for one more meeting after this one. And if you guys deem it necessary that I remain Chair, I guess I could do it for one more meeting after this, because I'm going to be testifying to the North Pacific Council in a couple days on the bycatch issue. So it might be more appropriate that the Chairman do it.

And so I guess what I'm saying is if
you guys wanted me to be Chair, I would do it for one more year, and then the next spring meeting I guess you'd have to elect a new Chairman. Thank you.

Do we have any -- Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Before you open up election, you sitting as the current, I think it would be appropriate for the Vice Chair to open up the nominations for Chair and then you can take the gavel back.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Good idea. All right. Nanci, would you take over as the Chairman for the election of the Chair.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Absolutely, Randy. I'm opening the floor to nominations for the chair for the Regional Advisory Council. Dan.

MR. O'HARA: Yes. I would nominate Randy for the Chair through the remaining of the Council to the next meeting.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Is there a second. Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Okay. We've got a second. Any discussions.

(No comments)

MR. O'HARA: Question.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: The question's been called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thank you, guys. I so now we're at election for our Vice Chair. Do we have any nominations for Vice Chair. Dan.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Nanci Lyons.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. A motion to appoint Nanci as the Vice Chair. Do we have a second.

MR. DUNAWAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seconded by Dan Dunaway. Any.....

MR. O'HARA: Question.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: The question's been called. Okay. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So we have a Vice Chair.

Okay. Now we are at for election of a Secretary. Do we have a motion.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Well, we're on a roll and I would like to nominate Dan Dunaway.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: We have a motion to nominate Dan for.....

MS. CHYTHLOOK: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: And seconded by Molly for Dan Dunaway for Secretary. Any other.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. There we are. We have a Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary, the same as before.

All right. Number 5 is review and adoption of the agenda. Everybody should have a copy of the agenda before them. Do we have a motion to adopt.

MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chair. I make a motion that we adopt the agenda.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: We have a motion.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seconded by Nanci, to adopt this agenda for this meeting. Do we have any amendments or anything.

(No comments)

MR. O'HARA: Question.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: The question's been called. Okay. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Motion carried.

Number 6, review and adoption of the minutes from the last meeting. Do we have a motion.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: I move to support.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. A motion made by Molly to adopt the minutes of the last meeting, October 6th, '08.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seconded by Nanci.
Any questions on it, Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. It overall looks really good. The one thing that I found a little confusing. My memory was getting weak, and I looked to the minutes regarding our resolution on bycatch to the North Pacific Council, and I was just wondering if we could ask Mr. Mike to maybe flesh that out a little more. I think I corresponded, and I couldn't -- it doesn't really indicate that we adopted a resolution in there. It says that there was a motion. It doesn't say that motion was adopted or anything like that. Maybe Mr. Mike can speak to that.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, there was a motion made on the resolution on the bycatch issue, and it was passed at the meeting. I apologize for not being clear on the minutes, but the resolution with the cover letter was drafted in November and it was shared with I think most of the officers sitting on this Council for review. And I had an electronic copy sent to the Chair, Mr. Alvarez, and he signed the copy, and it's been moved forward.

But just for your information, in this pink folder there's a copy of the resolution that the Council approved at its last meeting in Dillingham, and it's a blue copy.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Does that answer your question then, Dan?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. And I really want to thank Donald for carrying through on that, because I couldn't remember what we'd done on some of that. So I'm really pleased we got it done. It's just a minor bookkeeping error on the minutes.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Yeah, so that takes care of that. And I guess we can probably discuss it when we get to the bycatch issue then later on in the meeting.

Okay. Any more comments or questions
on the agenda -- or adoption of the minutes I meant.

(No comments)

MS. MORRIS LYON: Question.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: The question's been called. All in favor of the minutes of the last meeting signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Motion carried.

Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Before we move on, I had a teleconference set up for 9:00 o'clock for those communities that wished to participate telephonically. And if we can take five minutes, I'll get the teleconference set up.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. We'll take a five-minute break get the teleconference set up.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Call back to order.

There's a letter from the Chairman, Mr. Mike Fleagle, what action the Federal Subsistence Board did. Apparently we only had one fishery proposal, and it -- Donald, they did approve that, didn't they?

MR. MIKE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So that the only action we had for that, was the Chignik proposal, FP09-11.

Okay. Any questions or comments on that report.

(No comments)
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seeing none, we'll go down to number 8, Council member reports. Do any of the Council have anything they wish to report on. Molly.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Thank you, Chair. This is Molly from Dillingham.

I don't have anything to report. I would like to make a suggestion, and that is to hold a work session prior to the Council member meeting. And hopefully this could be done at our Dillingham meeting. And it's usually helpful to have like a work session to go through whatever we're going to cover. And then it seems to run smoother for the members, especially the new members that are coming in. So that's my suggestion, is to possibly have a work session. Half a day work session.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. That's a good idea. Yeah. We're going to have a work session after this meeting to discuss the bycatch. We're going to discuss the bycatch in the meeting. It's on the agenda, but after that we need to also discuss our stance for when I go to testify to the North Pacific Council on what I need to be -- what's our position on what the bycatch issue for the chinooks. And I guess there are a bunch of -- there are some alternatives that they're considering. And I think we should discuss those alternatives, of which ones we favor and which ones we don't, and what kind of number we need to come up on. So we're going to be doing a workshop on that.

And also new Board training. Donald wanted to do that at the beginning, but I thought it might be better at the end, because, Dan, I didn't know how long he was going to be here, so I wanted him for the quorum. And at the work session we really don't need a quorum for Board training, so we'll be doing that tomorrow.

But it's a good -- a work session is a good idea as long as there's something to discuss at the work session. Sometimes there's not a lot of issues to bring before us, so we might not need work session.
Is there anybody else that has any comment on or reports that they want to bring before the Council.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seeing none, we're down to number 9, administrative business. Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Earlier I mentioned that I had a pink folder for all the Council members, additional information.

But in the pink folder we have a white document from the Pilot Point Traditional Council, a resolution to close sport hunting on Federal lands in Unit 9. And there's also a copy of a letter from the Chignik Lake Village Council, and it's a yellow copy, and they wrote a short letter saying that they support the closure of Unit 9 sport hunting on Federal lands. That's for your information.

And lastly for your information, a blue copy, a resolution from the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council that they passed last fall meeting to the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, a resolution on bycatch.

So those are the three items in the pink folder I have. And for the public, we have copies out in the back if you need some information on that.

I want to thank all the Council members for taking the time, this was a short notice, to have this meeting here in Anchorage. It was a challenge, but we managed to pull it through to have the meeting here in Anchorage. And I wasn't too sure if we could have a quorum, but we do have a quorum.

But the notices for rescheduling of the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council was sent out through email, through radio announcements, and through press releases, and it went out to the radio stations in Dillingham and in Naknek of the change, the rescheduled Bristol Bay Council meeting to Anchorage. So I think we got all our bases covered. But if I forgot anybody else on the mailing list, I do apologize. But I think we have adequate public notice for this meeting change.
And there are a couple of notices that would want to call in later on, but my suggestion, Mr. Chair, we can address how we're going to handle these public testimony that we'll be hearing later on this morning. And it will be up to the Council how you want to address the public testimony.

(Feedback)

MR. MIKE: Are we on?

MR. HILE: Yes.

MR. MIKE: The last question for the Council is that -- the Council can have a time certain for which villages want to testify first for Unit 9 moose. So we can set that up right now, or we can listen to public testimony if there's public testimony out there that wish to address the Council.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I think we should do that right now to hear Pilot Points testimony on what they have in mind. And anybody else that probably comes on. It's up to the public testimony on the agenda now anyway, so I guess.....

MS. MORRIS LYON: Do we need to review this charter at all? We have that on here.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. We can do the charter after.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I agree. While we've got them on the line, we should.....

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. While they're on line, they won't have to wait so long. So does anybody else have any comment on that if we move to public testimony now ahead of the charter review.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Donald.

MR. MIKE: Yeah. Mr. Chair. The teleconferencing is available from nine to five today, so we have all day to receive public testimony from those villages that do wish to testimony. I would suggest that, Mr. Chair, we identify who's on the teleconference line right now individually.
And then for those people on the
teleconference, I would recommend that you address your
name and who do you represent and then the Chair of the
Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council will recognize
you. So if we can started with -- Mr. Chair, if you
can get started with identifying who is on line right
now, and then we can go from there.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay.

MR. KINGSLEY: Daniel Kingsley
representing Pilot Point Tribal Council is on the
phone.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Dan Kingsley,
Pilot Point. Anybody else from Pilot Point.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Chignik. Who
do we have from Chignik.

MS. J. CARLSON: We have Roderick
Carlson, Debbie Carlson, and Jennet Carlson.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Just a sec. Rodney
Carlson?

MS. MORRIS LYON: Roger.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Roger?

MR. CARLSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. I just wanted
to get the names down.

Ms. J. CARLSON: Roderick, not Roger.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Oh, Roderick.

MS. J. CARLSON: R-O-D-E-R-I-C-K
Carlson.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Who else.

MS. D. CARLSON: Debbie Carlson.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: And?

MS. J. CARLSON: And Jennet Carlson. And Michael Shannigan is also here.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Michael.

MS. J. CARLSON: Here you go.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Do we have -- oh, we have Mary McBurney.

MS. McBURNEY: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: National Park Service. Do we have anybody else on line.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Okay. Let's start with Pilot Point Traditional Council. The resolution that you guys wanted to -- that we have before us for the closure of sport hunting on Federal lands. Can we have your testimony on that.

MR. KINGSLEY: Yeah. We put in several game proposals to the State Board of Game stating -- can you hear me? I've got an echo coming back.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I can hear you.

MR. KINGSLEY: Okay. The State Game Board. We put in two proposals. One of them was to implement a predator/prey plan, a predator plan, control plan for Unit 9E. And then the other one was to open up a brown bear season seasonally. And both of them were shot down by the Game Board, because they said that 9E is specifically managed for brown bear to maximize elderly brown bear and that we do not have a predator problem with the bears and the wolves on our caribou and moose calves. They stated that 70 percent success rate for moose for all licenses sold in 9E. And our rebuttal was of the local licenses sold, we only had two moose. One I got last fall. And then one was taken in the winter hunt. That their success rate of 70 percent for sport hunting license was predominantly big game guides utilizing airplanes.

We have put this proposal in front of the Subsistence Board is because as you know, we are no
longer Tier II. We're absolutely shut down from
caribou hunting and probably will be for, what they're
saying, eight more years. Without caribou, we've been
hunting moose heavy. Every year fewer and fewer people
are getting moose.

Our bear population right now is topped
off and the estimate by Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and
Wildlife in 9E is approximately 3500 bears. This is an
increase of an average of 1800 to 2,000 10 years ago.
So what we are seeing, tremendous bear populations, and
we're seeing the State mandating optimal bear hunting
while we're watching our cows, our moose cows
predominantly are all barren. The calves are getting
killed.

So as a subsistence issue, Pilot Point
Tribal Council, the Traditional Council of Ugashik ask
that the Subsistence Board take into consideration our
needs for meat, considering that our traditional
caribou staple is non-existent to us, and all we have
here in the fall is we're inundated by guides' planes,
big game hunters, and obviously they're quite
successful with their planes, which most of us locals
do not have access to. We do fair chase on ground,
with skiffs, and see very, very few moose. Because our
access via water is predominantly surrounded by bears.

That's why we have put this
resolution/proposal together.

Sue Evanoff has just joined me. Do you
have anything to say, Sue? They want testimony now on
our resolution.

MS. EVANOFF: There are not really any
more.....

MR. KINGSLEY: Get closer. It's just
that we don't have caribou.

MS. EVANOFF: There really are not
calves, except that it's real -- it's so critical for
us to keep the moose, because we can't hunt our caribou
any more.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Thank you,
Sue and Dan.

I'm looking at a map here that shows
State and Federal lands in 9E, Alaska Peninsula National Wildlife Refuge, Federal lands there, up from Ugashik Lakes, kind of around the end of Ugashik Lake or most of the Ugashik Lakes. Now much -- what percentage of your moose is taken on Federal land as compared to State land?

MR. KINGSLEY: Well, we have three registered guides, actually four registered guides within the Federal area. Our largest being Triple A. So let's say Triple A, what do they get, 15, 18 a year. The other guy up at the top gets about five. I would say that on Federal land you're talking around here probably close to what, 70, 80 percent. 38 (ph) percent probably off the top of our heads are taken on Federal lands.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. What about the local, the resident harvest, how much -- can you give me an estimation of what percentage is on Federal land?

MR. KINGSLEY: Well, last year it was 50 percent. They only got two moose, and mine was taken Upper Ugashik Lake.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. But most of the non-resident guided hunts are on Federal lands then, right?

MR. KINGSLEY: Yeah. The biggest guide we have around here are off Dog Salmon Creek, which is Federal land, up in the Upper Ugashik Lakes, and Lower Ugashik Lakes, all federal. Heavy pressure. There's several guides locally here that hunt on State and corporation land. they probably take a total of about 10. So, yeah, predominantly Federal.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay, Dan. Is there any other Council members have any questions for Pilot Point?

MS. MORRIS LYON: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah. Daniel, Nanci Morris Lyon. And I just had a quick question. You went over it rather rapidly. Did you say that Ugashik Council was also supporting this resolution?
MR. KINGSLEY: That's correct.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan Dunaway.

MS. BRIGGS: Can you repeat the -- I'm sorry. I just came on and I just came on and I just heard the Ugashik, but I can hardly hear what you're saying. Can you repeat what was just said?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Is this Ugashik?

MS. BRIGGS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Can you state your name?

MS. BRIGGS: Yes. Victoria Briggs.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thank you. And, Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes. Victoria, this is Nanci Lyon on the Regional Advisory Council. I was trying to find out what support Ugashik was giving this resolution. Thank you.

MS. BRIGGS: I believe it's 100 percent.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thank you, Victoria. Dan Dunaway.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Kingsley, this is Dan Dunaway. I was wondering if it was possible for you to fax or forward in some manner all that information that you read to us. I'm having trouble getting it all down, but it would be really useful even in kind of hindsight to have that. That's all.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thank
you. Is there another commenter from Ugashik or Pilot Point.

MR. KINGSLEY: If you have a fax number, I could get that information to you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I'm sorry, I'm can't hear you very well. You're breaking up. Can you say that again.

MR. KINGSLEY: If you had a fax number, I could get that information to you concerning the Board proposals we put in and the minutes from our last advisory committee that went over all this data that I just gave you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Just a second, Dan. Do we have a number, Donald.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. Yes, he can fax it to our office and we can have staff bring it to this meeting. Our fax number's 907-786-3898.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Did you hear that, Dan?

MR. KINGSLEY: Yeah. 786-3898.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: That's correct.

Okay. Do we have any more public testimony from Ugashik or Pilot Point before we move on to Chignik.

Okay. We have another RAC member. Dan O'Hara.

MR. O'HARA: Daniel down at Pilot Point, can you hear me? Hey, Dan, can you hear me? Dan at Pilot Point, how do you read. Victoria, can you hear me there at Ugashik?

MS. BRIGGS: Yes, I'm still here.

MR. O'HARA: Okay. Thomas is one of the guides in the.....

MR. B. CHRISTIANSEN: Hello, this is Port Heiden.

MR. O'HARA: Good morning, Port Heiden.

MR. B. CHRISTIANSEN: Good morning.
This is Bob Christiansen down in Port Heiden.

MR. O'HARA: Bobby, how are you?

MR. B. CHRISTIANSEN: I just got on the phone, it was busy, so I missed part of what's going on. I thank you guys for letting us on.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Bobby, this is Randy Alvarez. Hey, we're glad to have you on. Can you wait for your testimony? We're on Pilot Point and Ugashik right now, and Dan O'Hara's asking them a question, so can you wait? We'll get to you in a few minutes.

MR. O'HARA: Hey, Dan at Pilot Point, can you hear me? It looks like Pilot Point must have gone off line, Randy.

Anyway, Victoria.....

MS. BRIGGS: He's trying to get a fax to you. Yes, go ahead.

MR. O'HARA: Okay. That's fine. Anyway, where does Triple A work out of there? I've never been to their airport. I've been to Pumice and over at Cinder River and Meshik, but I've never been to Triple A. Where are they located next to Ugashik?

MS. BRIGGS: I'm sorry, where is what located next to Ugashik?

MR. O'HARA: Triple A.

MS. BRIGGS: Triple A? They're about 20 miles -- well, they're 20 miles upriver technically. Hold on, yeah, I'm getting a lot of screaming. Hold on. They're west of Ugashik Village. Does that help? About 15 miles overland.

MR. O'HARA: Victoria, did you say west?

MS. BRIGGS: Yes, they're west.

MR. O'HARA: Triple A? No, they can't be west of Ugashik. They've got to be east.

MS. BRIGGS: I'm sorry. Yes, they are
east. I'm listening to my husband and I should know better. Okay. Yes.

(Laughter)

MR. O'HARA: Well, I can guarantee you big time you should not listen to him. He won't quit talking.

MS. BRIGGS: Yes. They're difficult for us to get to if you're -- and, I'm sorry, because I came in just on part of this. When we're hunting moose and have to get up into that area, it's difficult, because it's only available via the river, and we can't get up into the lakes with a boat. We went with a skiff the last.....

(Feedback on line)

MS. BRIGGS: I'm sorry, I'm getting the screaming. We can get into the lagoon, but getting into the lakes has become increasingly difficult for us even with skiffs to do that. We've had I think only two people who have been able to do it recently. And it literally has taken people getting out of boats and pulling them at different times, depending on what the water is. So we basically get cut off from all that area that is up by the lakes for us to be able to go up in the fall moose time, unless you've got access to an airplane with floats.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thank you, Victoria. Is there any other Council members' questions for Pilot Point or Ugashik.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Seeing none, can we have Chignik, your public testimony.

MR. CARLSON: No, Randy, Mr. Chair. This is Robert Carlson.

(Feedback on line)

MR. CARLSON: We didn't have no proposals. We were just concerned about a moose survey out here. We didn't have no proposals or anything. We were just going to sit in and listen. But predator control, harvest, moose, Federals. Survey.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, you don't necessarily have to have a proposal. We would like to hear what Chignik is -- you're interests in moose, caribou, bear and predators, what your issues are. We'll be discussing some game proposals on Federal land later on in this meeting. There's a call for proposals for game on Federal lands in Bristol Bay. Can you tell me what the deadline for the call for proposals is, Donald?

MR. MIKE: I think it's April 30th, right?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So any of you guys on line, the deadline is April 30th for game proposals on Federal land in Bristol Bay. So about a month from now if any of you guys want to make any proposals to the Federal Subsistence Board, the deadline is going to be April 30th. So, Chignik, if you have any concerns you want to bring it before public testimony, now is your chance to do that.

MS. D. CARLSON: Randy, on our predator control, our area down here has seen a lot of increase with the wolves down in this area. In the past few years we've been seeing wolves down inside our village. And we've been having -- there used to be a bunch, like three or four moose up on our hill, and now the moose are gone. And then last fall the hunters went out, and we didn't get a moose at all in the Chignik Bay area. There was no harvest that I know of down in this area. So we were just kind of wondering, too, also if there's ever going to be a survey, for the State and Federal surveys count for the moose down in this area.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Before each of you speak, can you state your name first?

MS. D. CARLSON: Oh, I'm sorry, this is Debbie.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay, Debbie Carlson. I don't know. Maybe Staff can answer that question if there's going to be any moose surveys. They're working on that. We'll have to get back with
you in a few minutes.

Is there anybody else from Chignik that wants to testify.

MR. O'HARA: Randy.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan O'Hara.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Hey, Debbie and Rodney, can you hear me?

MS. D. CARLSON: Hi, Dan.

MR. O'HARA: How are you doing, Debbie? Hey, I noticed, you know, flying out of the lake there a lot there's a huge amount of wolves up on Chignik Lake and going out to, you know, the west there. So you feel like maybe the wolf population has moved into the bay as well, and just pretty much affecting your moose?

MS. D. CARLSON: Dan, it's moved down here. I know the lagoon's been having trouble with wolves up there also. And we've already got, like I said, within the past five years, there's been a lot of moose [sic] sightings just up at our dump, and, you know, it started -- it is starting to become a problem with them coming into the villages.

MR. O'HARA: Debbie, this is Dan again, and Rodney and Chickie, who else is on there. Anyway, I think that maybe one of the things the Council would do, Randy, would be make sure we push for a survey on the moose. And I think it's been done every year, providing there's snow.

MS. BRIGGS: I think -- I believe Ugashik would like to see that, too, because we feel that there isn't a good representation, a good understanding of the moose that is available, you know, and what the populations are.

MR. O'HARA: Okay. Yeah. And this is Victoria.

MS. BRIGGS: So Ugashik would strongly support that also.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah, I think that's one
of the things maybe we'll maybe bring under the
Council, make sure of that.

I kind of feel like the Feds have been
a little weak on the survey thing, depending on the
snow and depending on if there's a holiday. And we'll
just leave it at that, Mr. Chair.

But Ugashik, Pilot Point and the Bay, I
certainly would push for a predator control program.
The Feds don't like predator control unless it's
something that they favor. So I think this Council
needs to step up and say, we're going to do some
predator control things here.

Ugashik, Victoria, I think the guides
are a pretty long ways away from your lands as far as
moose go. I could be wrong. And, of course, we have
one of the new Council members here. So I have some
doubts about your resolution, but we'll look at it.
Okay?

MS. BRIGGS: Yes, I agree. And they
are far away, but to be honest, in the wintertime we
have -- if things freeze over and with the changes of
what they have done in the past, or how the seasons are
where they go into January, usually we're frozen over
enough. We're very seldom successful getting up there
to do a fall moose hunt, but we are in the wintertime
to be able to do that, even with that distance, once
things freeze over. And that's kind of what people had
always used in the past. It didn't work out real well
this year. And we do have moose that move down. We
actually have moose that come close into the village,
and there are moose -- or have been. They just killed
at least one of them off in the last two weeks, a
little population that stays between Pilot Point and
us. And the wolves are the ones that they literally,
the guys saw it, take them -- the wolves take the moose
down, at least one of them, that was between here and
Pilot Point. So we do have some access, but there is
populations that move around between the Federal lands
and the State.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah, I think that's a
really good point, Victoria. And I'm not real familiar
here with December hunt, or January, whatever, but I
think that's something that maybe this Council could
work with as far as maybe being a little more liberal on seasons. You can always put in a request, right, Randy, for a proposal change to favor the subsistence hunt.

Well, I sure appreciate Chignik Bay being on line, and Pilot Point, and I guess Bobby Christiansen is at Point Heiden, and Victoria there at Ugashik, I appreciate you coming on line.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Before we get to Bobby, Nanci had a question.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah. Victoria, I just wanted clarification. It sounded to me like what you were telling us was that your ability to access the moose on the Federal lands was more of a physical problem as in when the water's were too low, you could not get access in there. And, of course, if you don't have a plane, that's totally understandable. Is that correct though; am I understanding that correctly?

MS. BRIGGS: Yes, that is correct. As far as the fall hunt goes, getting up there on the lakes if the water is low, it does pretty much cut off our access to a portion of that. And so that -- unless you have a plane, you know, a float plane to do it. And so that's -- we have got in -- my understanding is in the last 5 to 10 years more and more of the hunting is done in the wintertime just because of that reason. That water level seems to be coming down for some reason in the last few years, and the access has been fully cut off, or at least extremely hampered. And so we are moving more and more towards a winter hunt.

But even this fall, trying to get out, there was very little. I mean, we did -- a number of people flew for moose, because we a lot of times will fly for them even if we don't have floats to be able to locate them, and then see if they're accessible by way of boat or fourwheeler or whatever we -- you know, whatever's the ability to do. And there just wasn't the sightings this year that there have been in the past.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Victoria, thank you.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Can I follow up?
CHAIRMANK ALVAREZ: Okay. Just a second, Nanci. On the issue on the moose survey, the State biologist, can you comment on that?

MR. PAPPAS: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. George Pappas, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

Currently Lem Butler is conducting surveys out of Cold Bay right now, and I'm having a problem getting ahold of Staff. I'll continue to attempt to find out when the most recent survey was and if there are any plans. And I'll try to get back to you later on today.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMANK ALVAREZ: Okay. Thank you.

So did Chignik and the rest of you guys on line hear that? They're working on -- he's going to find out this afternoon when the next survey is going to be done, but apparently they're doing something out there in Cold Bay now.

And who had their hand up.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Me.

CHAIRMANK ALVAREZ: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah. Victoria, I just wanted to follow up on your comments. I appreciated them.

And I just wanted to say that, you know, for you guys to be aware of the fact that we have restraints on our part for justifications in issues like this. And physically being unable to access areas is something that we're probably not going to be able to address. But I'm leaning towards wanting to do something for you folks and certainly understand the problem, but I'm thinking along the same lines as Dan O'Hara is in the fact that we might do better by extending or liberalizing your winter hunt seeing how access might not be as much of a challenge at that time for you folks. Thanks.

MS. BRIGGS: Yeah. Again that's probably one of those that if we can do a proposal, we
might -- we've talked about doing that also. And I think our biggest thing was again the predator control, is looking at that issue.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Yeah. One thing on predator control, the Federal Subsistence Board doesn't do predator control. We asked them to do that before, and their answer to us was that we have to deal with the individual land agencies on predator control. Say, for instance, on the Becharof National Wildlife Refuge and the Alaska Peninsula National Wildlife Refuge, or the Aniakchak, we would have to deal with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to implement predator control, so that's kind of the avenue to go about that. And I've asked about it before, but like Dan O'Hara said, the hesitant to do anything unless they're in support of it first. But we're going to have to keep working on that. And in talking to Lem Butler at the last Board of Game meeting earlier this month, the Alaska Board of Game passed control for 9C, and according to Lem Butler that he's having talks with them about 9E, because it's half of the land use area.

So I really didn't a run down talking to Lem about that exactly what they're going to be doing. And Lem has been kind of pretty busy and gone. I haven't been able to talk to him. A couple weeks ago he was down in Southeast, now I guess he's down in Cold Bay, so he's pretty busy.

You know, each one of your villages and councils I think needs to contact U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and tell them your concerns also, because it's not the Federal Subsistence Board that you need to address on this issue.

Any other -- Dan Dunaway.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yes. Dan Dunaway with the RAC here.

For all you folks that have been listening in, maybe, number 1, like Randy's saying, I'd definitely encourage you to submit a proposal to at least open the door to discussion and regulation. I know in the past you've made some attempts, and they haven't been real successful.

But as I listen here now, I was
wondering what your local knowledge on seasonal
movements of moose are. And I start thinking of an
analogy over in the Togiak Refuge and in the Dillingham
area, where the Dillingham folks agreed to restrain
their winter hunting which allowed moose to move into
the Togiak Valley in numbers abundant enough that now
they have a hunt. And then in turn the Togiak area
folks restrained their hunting enough to allow moose to
start moving into the Goodnews Bay drainage, possibly
even towards Kanektok, and it appears they're having
some success.

So I start wondering, do you feel that
moderation or in your case it looks like you want
elimination of the sport hunt, do you think that would
allow moose to move towards Ugashik more, or do they
move more at certain times of the year. You might want
to mention those in any proposal. And I'm just curious
to what you have to say.

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thanks, Dan. Does
anyone want to comment on Dan Dunaway's comments?

MS. BRIGGS: I'm sorry, I'm not hearing
part of that. Did you ask for comments on that
particular thought?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yes. Did you hear
Dan Dunaway's.....

MS. BRIGGS: Yes, I heard what he was
-- he was talking about about the Togiak and letting
off. And, yes, we do feel that by reducing the sport
hunting that it does. Because in the wintertime they
do move down. We actually have cows in the past that
come into the village to calve, you know, in February
and March. So they do move down closer to. And we've
found in that in the fall, the more pressure that's
been put on by the sport hunters, the farther they move
up, and then we see less down here even in the
wintertime. So I believe that that was the proposal,
to reduce the sport hunting in the fall to allow
them not only to recover some, but also to move down
and get a stronger population. Because in the
villages, when they're down closer, they have less
threat from the predators also.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Thank you,
Victoria. Does any other, Pilot Point or Chignik, anybody else have any comment on that?

MR. KINGSLEY: No, we don't, Randy.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. All right. Any other Council members, any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Then we'll be moving on to Port Heiden. Bobby Christiansen. Bobby, are you still there?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. I guess he must have stepped out. And Chignik, were you -- did everybody testify that wanted to testify in Chignik.

MS. D. CARLSON: Yeah. We're done.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Thank you. All right. Moving back to the agenda. If anybody else comes on line and beeps, we will recognize them then.

MS. L. CARLSON: This is Lynn Carlson in Port Heiden.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Good morning, Lynn. This is Randy Alvarez.

MS. L. CARLSON: Good morning.

(Indiscernible) testimony of Frieda Kosbruk and Emil Christiansen.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Just a sec. Let me write that down. Lynn, did you say you have Emil and who?

MS. L. CARLSON: Emil Christiansen and Frieda Kosbruk.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Did you guys want to testify on any of the issues? Game issues.

MR. B. CHRISTIANSEN: Yeah, I just got -- I hung up the phone by accident, I hit the wrong button. This is Port Heiden.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Bobby, did you want to testify.

MR. B. CHRISTIANSEN: Yeah. Okay. I'm right in the same order I think with the Chigniks and Ugashik. And, you know, the Feds aren't giving us a survey down here, and what's the State's saying is that our moose is up where it's supposed to be. It's good.

But, you know, this last two years in the wintertime we haven't got a moose or it's been good flying. I think the wolves are taking over, you know, whenever they want one they get one, because we're seeing a lot of wolves in this area. And last fall no one got a moose here in Port Heiden. The only meat that was brought in is the little from the guides.

What's happening I think is with the sport hunters and the wolves, we're losing out. We're going to end up -- you know, we fought this battle 10, 15 years ago on our caribou. And it's all coming right into same place, is what's going to happen with our moose. We'll end up being on Tier II and pretty soon there's going to be no more. It's going to be too late before somebody start doing anything about it.

I believe the Lower -- I'm on the Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee. I think we might have a proposal in, if it's not sent in already, on predator control with the wolves here. And the whole thing comes down to is this land issue with the Feds and the State and, you know, I'm pretty sure that on our Native lands, we'd give okay for them to do predator control. All it just takes is just a pass from, you know, the State or the Feds to ask the Native leaders of the -- I think it's ATC to do something down here.

But we haven't been able to get any meat in here. And I appreciate you guys listening to our concerns. I understand, you know, if there's no proposal in front of you, it's kind of hard to fight the battle, but you're hearing our cry from these villages, and I'm concerned that what's going to happen is, and I see it already, that we're going to end up losing, because of the sport hunters and the wolf. It happened with our caribou and it's going to happen with our moose. There's no more caribou for the wolves to eat on, so they're eating on the wolves and dogs. I mean, there's so many wolves around here, they ate five
dogs out of our village. And there was eight wolves
saw in the village this winter, and I believe five last
winter. So it's increasing.

I just wanted to spill this out, and I
hope something comes up here pretty soon, or we get
more input from the Feds and State to help this dying
breed out.

Okay. Thanks for listening.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Thanks,
Bobby. This is Randy. Hey, I've got a couple of
questions for you. How much of your hunting is done on
Federal land as compared to State land?

MR. B. CHRISTIANSEN: Well, in the
falltime, you know, we always hunt the Federal land.
And like I said, you know, last fall there was zero
moose got. Don Holmes found a moose, but it was too
small up in the Federal land, so that wasn't shot, you
know. It was just the horns were too small. And I
seen one big bull up -- I don't know the name of this
valley up here, we call it Hununapuk (ph) Valley, but
there must be another name for it. And there was one
who was way up high. Way up where there's no access to
it.

It's not like it used to be. You know,
Port Heiden was a pretty good moose area. Everybody
always got their moose in the fall and always got a
moose in the wintertime, the people who went out and
hunt for the village. And the last two years, like I
said, there was zero shot, you know, Randy.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Did you get any,
Bobby, in the wintertime? Bobby, did you guys harvest
any moose in the winter season?

MR. B. CHRISTIANSEN: No, we didn't get
none this last two years, like I said.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. And most of
your hunting you say is on Federal land as compared --
looking at the map here, and it looks like most of the
land around you, except for right around the village
and the bay is State land, but you go in a little ways,
and you are closer to Federal land than any other
village.
Okay. I guess we will be discussing later on proposals. And what I guess I would like you guys in the villages is to submit proposals that you want the Federal Subsistence Board to take up, because if we don't do them here, they won't have any proposals before them on these issues that you guys are telling us. So I would recommend that you guys send in proposals also, even if we do, or if we don't. That way they will be in. And your proposal might be different than ones that we submit, so I would recommend that you guys in your villages do that. And if you need proposal forms, you can call -- Donald, do you a number for them to call or faxes?

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In our harvest of wildlife regulations book, July 1, 2008 to 2010, on Page 15 there's a proposal form individuals can use to submit proposals. But if the villages or any individual needs some technical assistance, I mean, they can call my office and I'll be glad to assist them. Plus we have biologists on Staff to help also. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Give them your number.

MR. MIKE: My office number is 786-3629. And you can also call our 800 number. 1-800-478-1456.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thanks, Donald. Anybody didn't get that that wanted that number.

MR. B. CHRISTIANSEN: We've got proposal forms. I think all the villages must have one.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Well, I just wanted to make sure, because if you.....

MR. B. CHRISTIANSEN: I think we've got a proposal in or being sent in.

MR. KINGSLEY: It got shot down, Bobby.

MR. B. CHRISTIANSEN: What was that?

MR. KINGSLEY: The Board of Game shot both of our proposals down for predator.....
MR. B. CHRISTIANSEN: Oh, okay. I can barely hear you, Dan.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Bobby, this is Randy again. Yeah, these -- Board of Game proposals are different than what you need to send in to the Federal Subsistence Board. So that's what I'm saying, if you guys have issues, you should send a proposal in, because if we don't do any, the Federal Subsistence Board won't have anything before them to take up. And it would be better to have more proposals before them, because if it's as bad as it sounds, that they need to take this up at -- well, probably it will be at the next spring meeting or next summer or something like that.

Okay. We have George, the State representative, will report on the moose survey.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. George Pappas, Department of Fish and Game.

I just got off the phone with Lem Butler. He's currently assembling moose darts and heading to I believe the Meshik area later on today.

The Unit 9 area is 34,000 square miles. There's a lot of complexities with logistics and weather with the surveys. The Chignik areas were surveyed for moose he said a couple years ago. And it's a rotational basis. So it will probably be a couple more years before they get back to that area. And in the last couple years they've spent a fair amount of time in the northern part of Unit 9 surveying up there. So it's actually Ivanof Bay and out west in that direction is the most logistically difficult surveys they have to do for moose. The regulations are established to be conservative to protect the bull population. And they'll get back there as soon as they can, and they're doing their best. And I guess they've had a bad stretch of weather here in the last several years for that part of the world.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Thanks, George. Did you guys in the teleconference hear that.

MR. B. CHRISTIANSEN: Yeah. Well, they're always finding excuse, you know. That's the
Chairman Alvarez: Okay. I know. I think what Dan O'Hara had said is we should have moose surveys every year if possible, yeah, because circumstances change with predators and hunting. And we can't really make/pass good regulations without recent surveys of populations to really say what they are, if it needs -- if the regulations need to be adjusted or not. And the only, you know -- you have to have those surveys to show that it needs to be adjusted or not.

Mr. O'Hara: Mr. Chair.

Chairman Alvarez: Dan.

Mr. O'Hara: Yes. Dan O'Hara

Hey, you guys in the villages, here about several years ago had a Federal Subsistence Council meeting. We shut down all of the big game guides on moose in Federal lands. That was our proposal. And the Federal Board decided that there would be no more sport hunting on Federal lands until a moose survey was done, and this was in the month of April. And the next day the airplanes cranked up and went out and did a moose survey.

So we're not going to buy off on the fact that the -- and I think the Feds are the worst of anybody, the worst of all of the organizations, the worst of all of them, as far as getting the work done. I mean, if it's a holiday or if it's not good that day or something. You know, they could contract it out to private people who can do these type of things, and to get the job done. And they just won't do it. And if this Council doesn't, you know, stick in the eye with a sharp stick, they won't get it done. And if you guys shut things down and make those guides go away, I guarantee you there will be a moose survey. But they won't do it for you subsistence people. And we've heard that before.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman Alvarez: Thank you, Dan.

Nanci.

Ms. Morris Lyon: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Yeah, I would add to what Dan's saying, too. I agree we've heard this over and over again, and there's all kinds of excuses why they don't get that area, and specifically you guys that are on teleconference with us, that is the area. We request it, you request it, everybody requests, and we don't see it done.

I would also just say since we're on this subject, that maybe it's something we should consider also when we're doing our allocation of resources to make sure that the Feds understand that it's a priority for us, and not something that should be taken lightly, because when they're doing their projects and stuff and they bring them before us and they ask us to prioritize them, we should also consider having those put in there so that they understand. Unless we have good information, it's hard for us to work within our limitations for justification.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan Dunaway.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yes, Mr. Chair. And all the folks listening in. I see one component that I don't think we can do, but I'd certainly encourage you to do through various avenues is encourage all relevant lawmakers to try to provide more funds. Of course, a lot of times it is the weather, but if we could assure State and Federal Government to seek more funds that they could have a few more people. This is a vast area, and Lem's stretched from one end to the other, and so are all the Federal folks. Two or three more folks that could maybe swarm the area a little bit might be a huge help. So I would encourage you to pursue that avenue as well as continue like what Dan and everybody else here is saying, because I know all of us with the cost of everything, this meat source is a lot more critical than it was a few years ago when fuel was cheaper and everything else was cheaper.

That's all. Thanks.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Dan.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah. You guys listening out in the villages, it's just pretty tough to shut the sports guys off, the commercial guides off. But if we started reducing the number of animals that they could take. Say Pumice can only take five or six moose until
we start getting something back to the subsistence
user. Or Butch over at Cinder River. Or your boss
over at Meshik. Meshik's a long ways away.

Anyway, that's a thought, Madam Chair.

Thanks.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: I agree,
Dan. That's a good one.

Did somebody on line have a comment?
Please go ahead.

MR. STANG: Hello. This is Perryville.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Okay.
Would you please identify yourself for the record.

MR. STANG: Hello, this is Perryville.
Can you guys hear me?

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Yes, we
can, Perryville. Will you please identify yourself for
the record.

MR. STANG: Austin Stang (ph), Native
Village of Perryville.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Say your
name again, please, for us?

MR. STANG: Austin Stang. Perryville.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Okay.
Austin, thanks for checking in. We're going through
public testimony right. And we're talking about a
resolution to close sport hunting for moose in Unit 9E.
And you're welcome to weigh in on the subject if you'd
like.

MR. STANG: Yeah. We were just
wondering about the moose survey. When was the last
current or moose survey done down in this area. We
haven't seen or heard any kind of numbers the last few
years. And it's starting to take a toll down here.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Yes,
Austin. To catch you up to date, we just found out
literally minutes ago that your last survey in that
area was done two or three years ago, and they only do
them periodically and you're not expected to be on the slate again for another two or three years. The comments from the Council have been that we're not happy about that and we are kind of brainstorming ways and ideas to get that addressed in a more timely fashion, and any comments you have would be welcome.

MR. STANG: All right. We're listening, so we'll just keep in.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Okay. Thank you. Bobby, did you have any more other comments you'd like to add to that? Bobby, did you have any comments that you'd like to add to that?

(No comments)

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madam Chair. As we speak, we can try to get the Refuge Staff out in King Salmon to speak on moose survey issues. So I have Staff right now calling, contacting King Salmon, so if we hear, maybe we can have them identify. And if it's the biologist from King Salmon, we can ask him to fill in on the status of the moose surveys.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Good. Thank you, Donald. I appreciate that. And I hope you folks on line heard that, we're attempting to get Staff out in King Salmon to be able to respond to this query as well, and we hope to have them on line later on. Thank you.

Dan Dunaway. Dan O'Hara.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah. I think for the people who are on line out in the villages, at the end of our agenda, probably other business, I think we ought to do a recommendation to the Feds that we maybe be a little more conscientious about a moose survey in those regions. Madam Chair. If we go on record as under new business or old business, whatever it -- I guess it would be new business of making a recommendation that we be a little more conscientious about this survey, we'd get an idea of what predators are doing and the animals that are available for subsistence.
Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN MORRIS LYON: Yes, Dan.
I agree. I think that would be a good idea and I think it's overdue that we address it, because we've heard about it for a long time.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Where are you?

MS. MORRIS LYON: Okay. We just got done. We had Austin from Perryville check in as well, and any comments that he might have. We were just talking about surveys and how to address them. We're going to address it under other business at the end of the meeting, about putting in some sort of a recommendation that they take a better look at surveys more often and more timely.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Donald.

MR. MIKE: No, I didn't raise my hand. But we do have somebody on line.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Do we have somebody else on line.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. Before we move on, I forgot to mention that we have a visitor, the regional director for the Alaska Region, Geoff Haskett. I just want to recognize that he's here at the Bristol Bay Council meeting.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yes, when I was out a minute ago, I met Mr. Geoffrey Haskett. He's the new regional director for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. He also is one of the members of the Federal Subsistence Board. So I would like to introduce you to Mr. Haskett. Do you have anything to.....

MR. HASKETT: Well, thank you. I hadn't come prepared to say anything, but I'll say hello. Mostly I want to come to be able to sit in and kind of listen and hear what you all are doing here. And I've been here for six months now, so I'm still fairly new in the region. It's actually my second time in Alaska. I lived here in the mid 80s for three years as well. And actually Jerry Bergman said this would be a good opportunity for me just to kind of figure out...
what's going on here. So I'm mostly here to learn.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thank you. And if you have any questions, just don't hesitate to ask us.

MR. HASKETT: Okay. I didn't mean to interrupt you either. I just thought I'd sit down and just listen in. Thank you for letting me.....

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Oh, no. Our meetings are not as formal as yours, so we kind of just jump around and when somebody wants to say something, we do it. We're not as formal as that.

Polly.

DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Polly Wheeler with the Office of Subsistence Management.

Given the discussion that just happened for the last 45 minutes or so, we will make sure that when the transcript comes out that Regional Director Haskett gets a copy of it, and that the concerns that were heard from -- that were voiced from the villages with regard to surveys and the other related issues, we'll make sure that that gets to Director Haskett.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: That's good. Then he can get a feel of what we're faced with here. Thank you.

Any other.

(No comments)

MS. MORRIS LYON: Somebody just went on the teleconference.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Is there somebody else on line? Teleconference?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Hearing none, I guess then we move back to number 9A, the charter review. Donald, would you take care of that.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The charter for Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council is up
for review every odd year. The Council will have an opportunity to make comments or make suggested changes to the charter. And that’s done every odd year. And if the Councils have any changes to the charter, it will be submitted to the Federal Subsistence Board for consideration.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay, Donald. Is there any of the Board members have any comment on, questions on the charter.

MS. MORRIS LYON: May I just ask one question.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Donald, the only question I have, are there anything in particular that’s been changed that we should be aware of, or is everything pretty much the same as it had been?

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. Member Nanci.

There’s no changes since the last time you reviewed it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So if there’s no changes, do we need to take action on this?

MR. MIKE: You can take an action right now or you can just make a motion that you don't have any changes, or just move it forward as is. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Molly.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Thank you, Chair. I just have -- I'm new to the RAC here. This is Molly Chythlook from Dillingham.

I just have a question on -- let's see, it would be on Page 12, C, where it indicated that there should be appointments from RAC to these councils. Has there been anybody that's appointed from the RAC to these councils? Well, there's the Lake Clark National and then another one.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yes, Molly. We do appoint some of the SRC members. For instance, Thomas
Hedlund, he's not here, but he serves on the Lake Clark SRC, and he's appointed by this Council. But not all the members are appointed by the Council. Is that right, Donald?

MR. MIKE: That's right, Mr. Chair.
The Council appoints members to the SRC for Lake Clark and Aniakchak Subsistence Resource Commissions. And I normally get a notice from the Park Service as far as membership status and the Park Service provides recommendations for names for the Council to consider for the Council to appoint to these SRCs.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Does that -- Molly.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Yeah. Thanks. Thanks for the clarification.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Does anybody want to move we adopt the deal or -- Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Move to adopt, Mr. Chair.

MR. O'HARA: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Motion by Nanci to adopt, seconded by Dan O'Hara. Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seeing none, all in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Motion carried. All right. Okay. Since we just did public testimony, unless there's somebody new on the -- for public testimony, or something different than what we discussed, we will take that now.

(No comments)
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Hearing none we'll move on for.....

MS. CARLSON: Excuse me.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. I heard somebody on teleconference. Can you speak up?

MS. CARLSON: Good morning. The information you requested, Dan has faxed that. He sent it to you folks, too. So you can be looking for that.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan has faxed?

MS. MORRIS LYON: The information that was requested.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. The information. All right. Thank you.

And I just wanted to let you guys know that we're moving on for call for proposals and we'll be discussing some proposals. So if you guys would like to testify on any of the proposals we are working on, you will have a chance to do that also. And we would ask that you not interrupt, but we'll ask if there is any public testimony and then you will have a chance to do that.

Okay. Number 11, call for proposals to change 2010/12 Federal subsistence wildlife regulations. A. changes to the procedures to comment on proposed rules and submit proposals. Polly, are you going to be reporting on that?

DR. WHEELER: I am, Mr. Chair. Polly Wheeler for the Office of Subsistence Management.

I will say though that Donald and Member Dunaway were both looking like they maybe needed a quick break before I started on this.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: You're right. I got a note that we need a break. So we will do that. Thank you.

(Off record)

(On record)
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I guess we'll get back to order here. Polly.

DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The next item on the agenda is the call for wildlife proposals. As you know, we have -- the call is open right now. We'll be accepting proposals until April 30th.

We did want to bring to your attention a small point, and this may be of greater import to the people that are on the phone rather than this Council, but there's been a little bit of a change in how we accept wildlife proposals or fisheries proposals when that cycle comes around. And it's on Page 14 in your Board book. I'm not going to read to you.

Suffice it to say that the Obama administration is looking to, and this has been a movement in the past couple years before the new administration, but they're looking to accept more and more items through into government electronically. We recognize that this is potentially a problem for people, particularly out in villages, so we worked with people back in D.C. to develop a process that would keep our problem in compliance with the whole movement towards accepting things only electronically, but give folks more flexibility out in the villages that don't necessarily have access to the technology or the speed, the bandwidth to get information in.

So right now we've been granted, we being OSM, has been granted special permission to accept comments to our proposed rules and subsistence proposals by the following methods. There's three bullets there.

The key is that for this Council in particular, you can give -- we can accept anything at a Council meeting or in a Board meeting. You know, you can hand deliver, you can use the U.S. mail, mail it to the Office of Subsistence Management. So I would encourage all of you as Council members to let the public know that things are probably changing and over time it may be that we can only accept things electronically, but for now we can use the mail, and you can hand something off to us at OSM.

So if you have any further comments on that, I can address them. I think it's fairly self-
explanatory. But we just wanted to make that note, just to bring it to your attention.
And then that's all I had. And then that's sort of the introduction to the acceptance -- or the discussion of proposals.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thank you, Polly.

Does anyone have any comments or questions for Polly. Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah. Polly, I would just like to recognize you and the OSM office for immediately realizing the difficulty that that could potentially cause, and taking immediate action, and just say thanks for that.

DR. WHEELER: Immediate is an interesting word in the context of government, but we do what we can. Thank you.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So that would bring us to proposals.

I guess one thing we should discuss is the status of our moose proposals that the Federal Subsistence Board tabled. Donald, can you updated us on that.

MR. MIKE: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to clarify, is the proposal that the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council submitted on moose for Unit 9 in certain areas, but the Board deferred it last spring. And if I could have Laura Greffenius, our wildlife biologist come up to the table and give you a status. But the deferred proposal from last spring, it automatically goes into our cycle and is submitted again as a proposal.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Laura, can you report on what our proposal says and would do. We have some new members, and, in fact, I have an idea what it says, but can you give us the reading on it also.
MS. GREFFENIUS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Laura Greffenius, and I'm a wildlife biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management.

So as Donald already said, this is WP08-30/31, so I'll just refer to 30/31. And these proposals came before the Federal Subsistence Board and were discussed at their spring meeting. And it was decided to defer that proposal.

And so the procedure is, is when something's deferred, then it comes up the following year. And we did check on this just recently. It will come before the Board as is, the way it is right now. If you want to make any like slight modification to it, you can do that. If it's going to change considerably, if you wanted to do that, you can request that, you know, this one, that whatever you put in instead would be considered in lieu of this one. Otherwise it will come before the Federal Subsistence Board as it.

And I can just go over what the proposed regulation is just for everyone. It was in two parts, but since they're really similar, then we put it in the analysis together.

So Number 30 was for Unit 9B moose, and the harvest is for one bull in Unit 9B. And there's two seasons. As it is right now, it's August 20 to September 15, and then there's a December 1st through January 15th. And the idea being the proposed regulation was to shorten the seasons and there's been concerns about the moose populations in these areas. So the Council was willing to shorten the seasons. And so the proposal was for September 1, so shortening it by 10 days, through September 15th, and December 15th, shortening it by two weeks, through January 15th. So shortening both the fall and the winter season. And that was for 9B.

And then for Number 31, it's for 9A and B and C. and that one was not affecting the season dates. The season dates would stay the same. But the proposal was to close Federal public lands, except to the rural Alaska residents of Units 9A, B, C and E under these regulations. So it's a Federal public lands closure. And let's see if it continues on the other side. And as I said it would affect B and C, and the other ones were not including Federal public lands.
So that's -- and what was -- there was kind of discussions, if some of you remember, amongst the Council about, well, shortening the seasons or closing Federal public lands. And the Council from what I recall was willing to shorten their seasons and not close the Federal public lands, or leave the seasons as is and close -- or close the Federal public lands. So you can discuss how you want to do it.

And, Randy, you could go from there.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thank you, Laura. That's good, that refreshes our memories, especially mine.

Yeah, if I recall, we did make two proposals. The 31 asking to close Federal lands to non-subsistence users, or qualified users. And then 30 was to shorten the season for residents if the Board saw fit to close non-residents. We felt that the residents would show that they would bear part of the burden by shortening the season also. But we wanted that if the Board didn't -- I reported when I went to the Federal Subsistence Board meeting when the discussed them, I asked that we didn't want to shorten the season if they didn't close the non-residents. So there was supposed to be a working group with the State, but the State hasn't done it.

And so I personally still think it's a good proposal, although I think from the last fall and last winter moose season, the harvest in my opinion is probably what it was the year before, if not a little bit more. So in my opinion, it's probably -- the moose situation is probably the same or getting better from what I've seen. But I think with the amount of predators we have, it's probably not going to get much better faster. So I'm thinking that I still support those proposals.

And does anybody else have any questions or comments on these two proposals that were deferred. Dan.

MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chairman. Dan O'Hara.

Is that proposal in our packet? No?
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I don't think so. That was in our packet last time.

MR. O'HARA: The point I guess I wanted to make, Laura, was that we heard Bobby Christiansen at Port Heiden, excuse me, mention that he had found a moose, but the horns requirements were -- he couldn't kill the moose, because of the horn requirements apparently on Federal lands. And a lot of places, I know on State lands, 50-inch with 3 brow tines. Is that in the proposal?

MS. GREFFENIUS: For the Federal proposed regulation, it's not, no.

MR. O'HARA: And so there is no.....

MS. GREFFENIUS: I can look under the State regulation, and.....

MR. O'HARA: I know what the State one is, it's 50 and 3 brow tines.

MS. GREFFENIUS: Right. We do not have that specificity in the proposed Federal regulation.

MR. O'HARA: Now, see, I said something good about the Federal.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Yeah. Looking at the regulations, there's no restriction on antler size, just a bull.

But I guess, you know, I don't want to make one proposal for the whole area. I think it would be better to have different proposals for different areas, because the Board would -- if they didn't like one proposal or, you know, on one area, if one area was fine, they might throw the whole ball of wax out the door, you know, instead of passing one and rejecting another. So if we do, we need to probably make separate proposals for separate areas.

But I guess, does anybody not -- does anybody oppose or have any comment or oppose our moose proposals, the 30 and 31 that we have that are tabled, or any comments on it.
Donald, do you want to say something.

MR. MIKE: Yes, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

Like I said earlier, the deferred proposals from last spring by the Board on the moose issue for Unit 9 and other areas, it's automatically going forward since there was no action taken by the State, but the deferred proposal is going through. But I think the Council will have an opportunity to make further comments and recommendations on those deferred proposals.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Laura, do we have any harvest information, since it's been a year since we submitted this proposal, and with the new harvest, with one more year of harvest data for this area, 9B, and also Number 31 is 9A, B and C, the new harvest data, is that available? And I was just wondering, because it would show if the harvest was any better or staying the same or getting worse of what -- because with the amount of surveys that the State and the Fed biologists are doing are not every year, the only real good population numbers that I look at is what the people are harvesting. And if the people are harvesting adequate moose, it tells me that there must be quite a few moose around, but if they're not harvesting any, and they're hunting quite a bit, there must not be any. So since there's not hardly any new surveys, we have to go by the harvest data, and there should be one more year of harvest data out, and maybe we can get that and see what's happening. Would that be available to us this afternoon, Laura.

MS. GREFFENIUS: Yeah, Randy. Just to mention that this will be taken up and then an analysis will be done, and this information will be updated. And I do not have the current, as you said, if we had it right now. No, I don't have it right now. You know, if somebody, if Lem perhaps was available, he might, but I don't believe he's in the office.

Usually when we're working on these, I just glanced at the table that's in this analysis, and I was working on this in the fall of 2007. It's usually the most current is the previous year. Like right now there might be some information tallied up for the fall harvest, but it's not so likely for the winter that they'd have that all compiled. But it could be available, and we can check with Lem, but I
don't have it with me right now, but it would certainly -- any information in here would be updated, and so that the Federal Subsistence -- or the Council when you go over it in the fall meeting, and when the Federal Subsistence Board see it, you know, the information would be updated.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So the Federal Subsistence Board then won't be taking it up in May. They'll be taking it up probably in December.

Polly.

DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, the Federal Board will be meeting in January 2010 to take up this proposal.

And I would say that in addition to the reported harvest that you just were mentioning and Laura was talking about, we also in the context -- I mean, part of the value of the Council meetings is that we hear public testimony. I think we heard pretty loud and clear based on the public testimony that was on earlier today that there is a problem. That will I suspect be validated by the actual reported harvest figures.

But we do use the qualitative information that we hear that people are saying with their problems with harvesting, as well as the reported harvest, because we know that sometimes the reported harvests don't capture all of what people are taking or not taking. But we'll take the reports from local folks as well as the harvest number.

But, yeah, it's 2010 in January that the Board will be meeting on this.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan Dunaway.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Maybe Polly could remind us, why was it deferred? I seem to remember, but was it -- I want to say it was that they were afraid to move before the State did? Anyway, if you have an answer, go ahead.

DR. WHEELER: I know. Yeah. I don't want to speak for the Board as far as their rears go. But I know that when this item was discussed, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game offered up a working group as there were differences of opinion with the
Department and the Office of Subsistence Management as far as the nature of the information and what the data were telling us, so the State offered up a working group to try and resolve some of these issues. And the Board took that opportunity to defer on the proposal pending the outcome of the working group.

And I will say that the working group, that some Department and Federal Staff met in the fall to talk about the issue. We were trying to set up a meeting after that initial meeting out in Bristol Bay area, and we were not able to do that.

I do understand, and Molly might want to speak to the upcoming moose meeting that is being planned for that neck of the woods.

But basically the Board deferred the proposal pending the outcome of this working group. And at this point I can report that there is no outcome.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, that's what I recall, Dan, was the Fish and Game, they convinced the Federal Subsistence Board, this is the way I seen it, to form a working group to discuss -- bring together all the different users for moose, but it never happened. And I asked about it a couple of times, and so it -- I even tried to get one together before the last meeting, and it didn't happen. In Dillingham.

So, Molly, did you have something.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, Mr. Chair. BBNA has been working on a working group for the moose and caribou enhancement. It's going to be an enhancement program. And that's been going on for the last probably two years, and with the Natural Resources Department, BBNA, having no funding to work on that, our CEO just three months or so ago contracted this out to Hans Nicholson to start the project going. He is in the process of getting the working group first meeting. It was scheduled for April 2, and I don't know if that's still happening.

But I wasn't -- I think we're -- I'm kind of confused with the State working group versus the BBNA working group. I guess the State was developing a working work, but I know about BBNA working group that we've been trying to establish, and
now it's ongoing, and there's actually been people
contacted to attend this first meeting.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Yeah. The
State was supposed to organize a working group for
these two proposals, the moose proposals that got
deferred, but that had never happened for I don't know
what reasons. But I think we just need to move on and
in my opinion, I think we still -- I would support
those unless somebody has some other suggestion we do.

So is there any more comment on this.

Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah. Mr. Chair. I
would say I agree. I think that we need to leave them
on the agenda and review them again when they come back
up and not have them taken off of there. And hopefully
at that point we'll have this additional information
and perhaps some results from a working group that's
being put together. And that would be my thought.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So that takes
care of the two proposals that are tabled then.

So that brings us to other game
proposals. Does anybody want to -- thinks that we
should submit any other proposals to the Federal
Subsistence? Moll -- excuse me. Polly.

DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
did want to point out that the fax or the resolution
from Pilot Point did come in, and you all have a copy
of that at your desk if you want to -- or at your seat,
so if you want to take a look at that. Carl Jack from
our office brought it down, and copies were made. So
that's what they had presented to the Board of Game I
believe based on their testimony earlier today, if you
want to take a look at that, see if there's anything
you want to act on. I just wanted to point that out.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Let's take a
minute and look at this.

(Off record)
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. Looking at that fax, it looks like just Lower Bristol Bay's comments on game proposals that was before the Alaska Board of Game.

Laura.

MS. GREFFENIUS: Yeah, Randy. I'm referring to this resolution with the Pilot Point Traditional Council, some of you I think had gotten copies of that. Well, and I'd also had some calls just in the last month or so from people out in Chignik Lake and so I've been answering some questions and actually providing people with copies of it's WP06-26. So that was submitted by the Chignik Lake Village Council at that time. It was for 9E and requesting Federal public lands closed to the taking of moose. And so I just wanted to remind the Council, and I know some of you -- you have new members, that this issue was take up at that time in 2006, and so we have a proposal that is several years old, but the information would be updated.

And one of the needs was, and that was brought up during the discussion with the public testimony, one of the needs being of more survey work and getting more updated information. So if there's a proposal, whether it be by the Council or by one of those community members that was giving testimony earlier, we would just re-examine this and update the information.

So if anybody has any questions, it's not in your Council books, but I have a copy of it, and I can -- some of you had some questions on harvest information, and I can just look at this answer what you might have.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Yeah, Laura. Yeah, I recall that proposal a little over two years ago. I believe that was by Chignik, right, to close 9E to non-qualified subsistence users. And at the time we didn't even think it was necessary, because they'd just had a moose survey done right before our meeting, and what did they count? 160 some moose up around Black Lake or that area. But since then, I don't know, there
doesn't seem to be that much any more the next survey that got done.

And so besides Chignik now, it seems that Port Heiden is not harvesting any, and Ugashik is having trouble. So apparently it seems to be all of 9E. I know Egegik in the Refuge, I don't know what Egegik's harvest is, but it doesn't sound like they're getting a lot.

Dale, do you know how Egegik -- what kind of harvest that they were reporting?

MR. MYERS: No, I haven't heard. I talked with a couple of the guys there, and I haven't really heard. I did get some comments about some of the people that were drifting along the river got a couple along the King Salmon River by that one near Egegik. But other than that, I haven't been able to -- I talked to a couple of the local guys, but they hadn't gotten any.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Is that on Federal land or State land?

MR. MYERS: I believe it's a mixture of both. Some of it starts up by Gertrude's Creek and then as it comes down, it comes out of the Becharof Refuge into State land.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I feel the need to propose something, you know. Like I said before, any proposal we submit here we're going to be discussing again this fall. And then by then we'll have the Staff reports. So if we don't like what we proposed this fall, we can always throw it out, but if we don't have anything to discuss, you know, there would be nothing -- we can't let it go before the Federal Subsistence Board. So I always feel it's better to submit stuff and then discuss them and we can always throw them out, instead of having nothing at all to discuss. So I would be in favor of submitting some proposals to help these guys, these communities out. So if any of you guys have any suggestions, I'd like to hear them.

Dan.

MR. O'HARA: I think one of the things, the brown bear population in Unit 9 are just continually increasing, you know. And I think maybe on
Federal and State land you need to liberalize the take of bears more. Maybe a spring and fall hunt. It's worked pretty well in the Naknek drainage where we do have a spring hunt on a regular basis, and if there -- you know, there's no natural predator for a brown bear. And the biggest concern, I mean, you -- Dale and I have flown on these regions and talked to sports guys that have come out of the area.

And just to show you, in the Meshik area, these guides, you know, like a few years ago there was a certain number of animals that they saw. Then last year they saw a decrease in the number of male bulls. And then this last year, this year, when we flew the guys out in the fall time, the numbers are reduced again.

And, you know, you can't kill of 25 percent of the bears. I mean, that's just not practical to kill that many animals. You can't do it with a good conscious, just go out and start slaughtering bears. But we need to do something. I don't know if the State would even be interested in liberalizing the number of animals taken other that one every four years. You know, I don't know what the interest would be. The economy is changing. People aren't coming back to do things they used to do. They don't need to kill a bear to stay alive.

But anyway, just a thought. I mean, when you look at the -- you know, look at this piece of paper we have before us and see the magnitude of bears increasing, and the bulls may go away, they may kill each other off. Who know.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: What paper are you looking at?

MR. O'HARA: Well, this one that was given to us here.

MS. MORRIS LYON: The fax.

MR. O'HARA: The advisory -- well, I'll just read it to you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Oh, yeah.
MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chair. It says here that -- it says, of particular concern is the population estimate of brown bears in the game unit is based on harvested only. And it talks about there's a three-fold increase in the number of bears in this game unit since the early 1980s.

Donald, did you just hand this to us? This fax on the Pilot Point Tribal Council or Bristol Bay Advisory minutes, is that I was looking at.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I was looking at the regulations, Dan. In Unit 9E, one bear by Federal registration permit only. The season is from September 25th until December 31st. And then again April 15th to May 25th. I don't see what the limit is. Is that every year? I guess this would be for the -- this is different than what you're thinking about. You're probably thinking about the State season for guided hunts, right, instead of the qualified subsistence user.

MR. O'HARA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Let's see what it says. If you wanted to read the regulations, if you wanted to tweak it. Oh, one bear every four regulatory years. And this year there's no open season.

Dan Dunaway.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. If I'm not mistaken, I'm not real well versed in the Unit 9 bear seasons, but I think part of their trophy management strategy was that kind of every other year opening for the sport hunting, as well as that one bear every four years restriction on any individual hunter.

Also I'll throw in that I've been trying to warn some of the State biologists that the local folks have been getting fed up with the trophy management. And I first started hearing that in the Lake Iliamna area before I retired back in the late 90s. And it looks like it's moving south pretty steady.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thanks. So I guess we're discussing bears to start with. So it
wouldn't -- in my opinion, there wouldn't be any sense
to tweak the resident user, because it's pretty liberal
the way it is. One every year for quite a while in the
fall until the end of the year and then again in April
and May. And if anything were to be done, the non-
resident user on Federal lands -- but they're under
State rules, aren't they? They hunt under State, under
these, is that correct? The non-resident hunter that
hunts on Federal lands uses this book here?

MS. MORRIS LYON: Uh-huh.

(Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So their
season is one bear every four years by permit.

MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan.

MR. O'HARA: A young guy drowned up at
Pedro Bay a few years back, and they sent a diver down,
and I don't know if he ever recovered a body, but he
brought up eight bears. And the people in Pedro Bay
determined that bears just did not know how to swim, so
there might be a solution there somewhere. Don't put
that in the minutes though.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Any suggestions.

MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan.

MR. O'HARA: We can make a proposal, it
doesn't have to be done here in this meeting, but we
can do it individually, too, and submit it. I'd be
interested in doing it individually to submit to the
Federal Advisory Council.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: You know, it's my
opinion that it's much easier if we want to do one
here, because we have people to write them up for us,
you know. Otherwise, if you want to go home and write
one up yourself and then send it in, that's fine, too.

Nanci.
MS. MORRIS LYON: And I would suggest, too, in light of what these minutes have said and in light of what Dan mentioned earlier, I think maybe we might be remiss in not considering making the huge step that none of us really care to look at or make, but perhaps these trophy areas need to be eliminated, and we maybe need to start moving in that direction instead. Because it's going to be a hurdle that we have continuously over our heads as long as they're recognized as trophy areas.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. And asking to liberalize the non-resident season, I don't know how much good that's going to -- if it would do a lot of good.

MS. MORRIS LYON: With that designation, it's almost impossible.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. According to our biologist, Lem Butler, there's more -- I guess I was referring to 9B, more bears are harvested in the last couple years than in the years before that. It's probably more related to a lot of bears.

But I guess if nobody has any suggestions -- Molly.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Thanks, Chair.

Listening to the people that were testifying earlier, there was more wolf concerns. I heard more wolf concerns than there were bears, but I was looking at the regulation here, and for rural residents, including 9, they're able to harvest 10 between August 10 and April 30. I wonder -- I don't know who collects the data for harvest of wolves, since wolves is one of the predators. Is there anybody that has any knowledge of wolf takes in that area.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Laura.

MS. GREFFENIUS: I'm not familiar just off hand with the wolf harvest in that area. It's information we can look up and find out. I don't have it right now.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Another thought I just had, too, Molly, and maybe you can help us out
with this, or me out with it. What about -- I'm thinking we've got a working group that's coming together that is going to do analyzing and hopefully some potential problem solving. Randy, what if we would table this discussion until a time, and this could be before the fall meeting, where the working group would have some suggestions to come out with us, and they can contact us by mail or email for considerations for proposals to put together through what that working group can come up with as ideas for immediate help for these areas versus right now trying to come up with something on short notice with some difficult situations facing us.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. Go idea. I'm having trouble trying to find solutions, too, on short notice, but, you know, I can't make -- the Chairman can't make any motions. But he can vote. I leave it to you guys for your suggestions.

Molly.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Thanks, Chair. I know that the working group, a component of that working group, they're going to be inviting I think the Regional Chairs, so Randy I think will be involved in this working group. And they'll be inviting, well, interested agencies. So I think Nanci has a good idea.

And at those working group meetings, I guess Randy or somebody could bring up suggestions, and I assume -- not the first meeting, but I think they're going to be also dealing with management plans, the management plans that have worked in other areas. You know, Dan mentioned Togiak, and I know that the moose management plan up in Kuskokwim worked for them. So they'll probably be working or looking into that in this group.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. I think this working group, it should probably have to discuss predator management, because that's part of the problem, not only just closing non-residents. You know, they're such a small part of the harvest that -- you know, I think that the major component is predators even take more than the residents and non-residents. So there would probably have to be part of the discussion, what can be done. In fact, we probably need to discuss what our options are at this meeting.
You know, like I said before, if we do -- if there is to be any predator management on Federal lands, especially this land down here, that's going to be -- have to deal with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the land managers.

So maybe what we should do is ask them what they plan on doing. You know, nothing is -- status quo isn't going to work in our opinion, or my opinion. And it should be all of us here. So I suppose we should draft a letter to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, because at the last Board of Game meeting the Board of Game did pass, according to what I understand, predator control for 9C. That's what I was told. And I haven't heard what the reasoning why for 9C and not 9E, or if they're planning on doing 9E.

But I also heard from Lem Butler, from another guy that said what Lem -- I wasn't at the Board of Fish [sic] meeting when they were deliberating this proposal, but Lem Butler had reported to the Board that he was working with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on something, and so I'd kind of like to know what, and if they have any plans. So maybe we should have a letter asking U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service what they are doing, or what they plan on doing on this issue.

Dan Dunaway.

MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Dan O'Hara.

Kind of getting a little back on track is a few things here. I believe we need to have a proposal in by April 30, so deferring to the working group, whether that would occur before April 30 could be a problem.

At the same time, I'm reluctant to offer up like a placeholder proposal like has been done in the past, I think more in the State system. That can be really vague and kind of treacherous for everybody.

And as I sit here listening, I seem to recall one of these proposals in the past coming out of Chignik, the reason I don't think we supported it or it flew was they wanted some really severe restrictions on sport hunting. The way I remember it was that at the same time they were still allowing guided sport
hunting on their own lands. And some of the -- a lot of the area they were proposing to close was far away from their traditional hunting areas and of questionable value whether it would really help their situation. And in my recollection, I certainly sympathize with their need for moose, but I think we asked them to re-evaluate their own practices on the lands that they controlled as well as refine a proposal for lands and areas closer to home without, say, disenfranchising users that likely had no effect.

And that's why I'm really eager again for those still listening in, I'm very eager to encourage these communities to have a more honed down proposal.

At the same time I'm wondering, I'm just struggling in my own mind, could I come up with some sort of language that would serve as a placeholder, but would have some specifics enough to allow the other public to respond. I'm thinking like -- and, you know, on Federal lands as well, some of these things, I wish there'd been proposals like out of Egegik, Ugashik, Chignik for hunts like they have in the immediate area of Cold Bay and Naknek for bears on State lands.

I'm wondering if in Federal lands, especially like Ugashik, we tried a couple years ago I think to propose closure to non-residents within two miles of water bodies or something, and that kind of got shot down. I don't recall why.

So anyway, I'm still pretty -- nothing has gelled in my head yet. I would encourage more discussion, but I think we should maybe have some sort of a placeholder proposal, but it should address specific concerns of these communities that are speaking to us. And as close as we can say, look at maybe season lengths of bear hunts, bag limits for bear hunts. The same for wolves. As well as hunters eligible to hunt moose in areas close to these communities.

Anyway I'm kind of just doing a brain dump here, but that's what's kind of going on in my mind here, so I'll defer and let that help.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. Good suggestion, Dan. Yeah, maybe we should resubmit that proposal instead of having a total non-resident closure, because, you know, like in 9B anyway, but for some areas in 9E, it might be better to submit a different proposal to close it there altogether, because if they're not getting any moose, the residents aren't getting any moose at all, maybe something different has to be done, more drastic.

MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan.

MR. O'HARA: Dale, you know as well as camp and kill a moose. That is not going to happen. They're not going to go up Cinder River all the way to the Park boundary. They're not going to do it at Pumice. These -- maybe they're killing off enough moose so they don't get down to the local people to hunt moose. And they don't have the wherewithal to get in a $225,000 float/wheel operations to go camp out and get their moose. It just doesn't happen. The residents don't have that kind of capability, and it's even going to get worse.

So if you do something, it's going to have to be done on more of a residential type zone. And I don't know why the Feds didn't give us, you know, zone areas around a certain area only for the -- only on Federal lands. That I think would be, you know.....

But what I was going to talk about before we took off on the direction of moose was that if you liberalize the bear season to read something like one bear every regulatory year for the State of Alaska residents, and I'll give you an example of that. When those guys -- and the Bristol Bay Borough is going to put an electric fence around the dump this year in Naknek, and those bears are going to go right down to the communities.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I think it is one. Right now it's a bear every year for residents, isn't it? Or, no, that's just for qualified users, not residents.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah. And, you know, well, those guys look at a bear out there and they run
up and get -- well, they might even -- I don't know if they would do it or not. Maybe they would shoot the bear, then go get the permit. I'm not going to say they do that, but they will run and get the permit -- or get a permit for $50 in case a bear comes by and they want to kill it.

My wife wants a bear hanging on the wall, and I'm too lazy to kill a bear and skin it. I don't even want to do that, you know. But I might have to.

But if you liberalize it, you know, you could put that in a proposal. One resident bear -- I mean, one bear for a resident per year, period. I mean, that would be a good proposal to start off.

And the thing that is interesting is so much of this land as you see in A, B, C, D and E, Randy is mostly -- the Federal land doesn't come hardly close. Maybe Ugashik Lake I and II, they would get bears there. Chigniks, that's Federal, isn't it? Chigniks? Yeah, that's Federal, but still maintained by the State. So it might help somewhat in reducing the population a little bit.

And then with a proposal to maybe give on Federal lands some kind of a zone area where, you know, the non-residents are -- or non-qualified people from Anchorage even could come in might help.

But I would certainly favor regulating it something like one bear every regulatory year for State of Alaska residents. That would be a good proposal.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: So I've got a question. Could we do that.

MR. O'HARA: Sure, we could.

DR. WHEELER: Member O'Hara's right, you can do it. The only problem is the Board of Game just dealt with this area at their last meeting, and so it's going to be two more years before they deal with this area again. And under the Federal regs, the Federal regs do allow a bear a year. It's the State -- so it's just -- it's confusing, but it's the State system, the Federal system. And under Federal regs you can take a bear every year. It's just under State
regs, but that won't come up before the Board of Game for two more years.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, but that's a bear a year for only qualified residents, not all State residents.

DR. WHEELER: That's correct, but our regulations, the Federal regulations only speak to Federally-qualified users.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. And you're right. So it wouldn't do any good to open it -- to ask to open it for all State residents, then that would fall under State regulations, and they're not going to do anything for two years. So I know that's what I was reading. It's pretty liberal for qualified users right now, but like you say, we're -- I quit hunting bear quite a few years ago, because I was getting tags and then I realized, what am I going to do with it when I catch it. And it costs too much to, you know, send it out, and I don't have wall big enough to put it on. So I quit doing that.

MR. O'HARA: I've got a wall big enough.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I believe the State of Alaska have an avenue to deal with proposals out of their meeting cycles, and I think that's through their agenda change request, so that's one avenue an individual or someone else can do.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: You're right. I didn't think of that part.

Sandy, you're pretty quiet. I see you raise your hand and nod once in a while, so if you, you know, need to say anything, just let us know.

MR. RABINOWITCH: A comment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Sandy Rabinowitch with the Park Service.

It's an interesting discussion, you know, that you're having here, and there's obviously
challenges.

But, you know, kind of thinking my way along, one thing I was going to point out, and I don't think any of you were going this way, but in Lake Clark Park, in Unit 9B, you actually have one of the most liberal bear regulations. Some of you that have been on this Council remember this came up from the SRC itself. And if anybody started to go real broad, where Dan was talking about trying to narrow it down, I agree very much with him, because if you had a real broad proposal for brown bears, you might actually knock this regulation kind of out of the box inadvertently, and, you know, I don't think you all would want to do that.

So I think as you talk about this, both wolves and bears, I think trying to think about the subunits, because most of this is broken out into subunits. That's one bit of advice I'd offer, is look at it by subunit and, you know, try to tailor whatever ideas come up to the subunits, because again as you've all recognized, on the Federal side with brown bears, many of these regulations are pretty liberal already. There might be some you want to make a little more liberal, you know.

But like with Lake Clark, it's 365 days a year, you know, so that one's kind of topped out on the season part.

The other comment I would make back to one of Molly's comments, I actually do have harvest data. I don't have it with me, but I might be able to get it over the lunch hour for the NPS areas about wolves and bears. Now, some of it's current to '03 and some of it's current to '05, and that's as fresh as it is.

But I do look at that stuff, and one comment I could make with wolves is I don't think we've ever seen anybody be restricted by a limit of 10 annually. So you can't find a hunter that's, you know, topped out and that we know of would want to go get more. So my point is I'm not sure that it's the limit.

And we've also observed, I'm sure as many of you have, a lot of the intensive management regulations more broadly all around the state. You know, and in a lot of areas their regulations are 10 wolves a day. It's very hard to find people that are
really out there, you know, working super hard to fill those kinds of limits. The State should speak to this more than I, but I'm not sure just raising a limit actually gets you an increased harvest. That's just my observation.

And so there's challenges here obviously that everybody's working with. But certainly limits have been raised in areas including, and people probably blink when I say this, the Park Service, we've worked to support increased limits and increased seasons in a number of places over the years, and it's really all about the biology. As long as there's enough animals and so on, you know, those kinds of things can obviously be fine.

So that's just some general comments.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thanks, Sandy.

Yeah, I agree with you. You know, just because we raise the limit or make more season, sometimes that doesn't necessarily make people go out there and -- more people go out and harvest them, just like the Federal regulations for bear. It's pretty liberal and it's open every year, but, you know, they're not -- that doesn't make them go out there and do it, you know.

And then also I agree that we need to be subunit specific with our regulations. I don't like making one regulation to cover the whole Unit 9, because if it doesn't work in one little sot, they tend to throw it out.

All right. Molly.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Well, traditional and ecological knowledge regarding bears as well as moose. These two animals, historically people used to eat bear. But since they've become what we call garbage bears, people aren't willing to eat the bears that come into the communities and eat out of people's garbage dumps. And so people are -- they've got the waste not, want not in their minds, so that they are not going to go out there and kill a bear if they're not going to make use of it. As well as wolves.

Wolves, you can tradition -- or the use
for wolves have also changed. Twenty-some years ago
people were harvesting wolves for warmth, you know, for
their ruffs. But you go to the communities now, and
you don't see people wearing ruffs, except maybe people
that are Iditaroding.

And so even though the harvest has
increased into these rural community for rural
preferences, that's not going to work, because people
aren't going to harvest these animals just to kill.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thanks, Molly.

Nanci, let's have you and then we
should take lunch I guess.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Well, I've got a
quick wild one to send out there just listening to what
Molly has to say, in Dan O'Hara's line of thinking as
far as getting people's attention, I think perhaps if
we would encourage the Federal entities to offer an
incentive program for the taking of predators, seeing
as how they're not being used so much in traditional
ways, perhaps we could increase the predator take. And
that's something to think about.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan.

MR. O'HARA: I need to maybe disagree
with Sandy a little bit there. The Togiak area does
not have a lot of natural predators on the moose yet,
because I was Chair of this Council when we brought
that moose population from 90 to 6 or 700 or 1200,
whatever it is, and that's good, and they still have
not come in big time. But you go to the Ugashik and
Meshik and all those other places, and those bears are
eating up those moose just left and right. And those
guys in the Nushagak, that river system, the moose will
get into the thicket, a cow moose will get -- you fly
to Dillingham, and I've said this before in the
Council, and you fly over 15 acres of land with a big
brush patch, and right in the middle of that brush
patch for two months will be a cow moose and her calf,
and she'll survive, because wolves can't get her in
that brush. And the Nushagak has had a good moose
population, because they've got a huge browse. The
Meshik, Ugashik has huge browse and the moose
populations have well, because they can survive in
that.

But you get a good snow season, and those guys are going to get 20 wolves. Not 10, they'll get 20. I know some guys in Naknek who have gotten more than 10 this year, and we've had a pretty good snow. So I think take the limit up to 20 if you want to do something on predator control. Just a thought.

And I'm hungry.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. When we come back we will.....

MR. MYERS: Oh, I was just going to say though.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Dale.

MR. MYERS: Under the trapping license for the State of Alaska, there's no limit. So you can basically take as many as you want.

I think though the main problem is, like we were pointing out, is that a lot of people in the villages just aren't doing it. And some of them don't have the means. The cost of fuel. I know myself last year I had my expenses for my hunting and trapping hobby were probably well over $4,000, and some people don't have that kind of money to be able to take towards it, you know. And so it's pretty hard for them. You know, the demand isn't out there for the furs with all the anti-hunting and trapping people. And they've made it to where it's hard for people to do something about it.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, I know. And at the Board of Game meeting when the Board -- the Board took up two proposals by a conservation group from some place to bring back -- put the wolf bag limit back to five a day on Federal lands. Because, you know -- but the Board didn't, because, you know, it's on Federal lands, but it's managed by the State, as some of these other -- as some of even non-residents or some of the other regulations, but the Board didn't do it. But, you know, it might be -- we could ask, you know, it wouldn't hurt to propose it for more bag limit, you know, because there are a lot.

MR. O'HARA: The day's not over yet.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: But when we come back, we'll continue. So I guess it's -- well, maybe about a quarter after one. That gives us a little over an hour.

And also, I can't forget, we need to make a directive to Staff when we come back to write a letter to Fish and Wildlife Service and ask what they plan on doing on some of these issues before us.

So we'll be adjourned until about -- I mean recessed. We don't want to get adjourned yet. Until about a quarter after one.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Back from recess. 1:30.

I guess I'd like to start then, we probably don't need a motion, so I would like to make a recommendation that we write a letter to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service -- have Staff write a letter to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to ask them what their plans are on Federal lands and particularly 9E for predator control, especially since what the Alaska State Board of Game did for 9C and if they're thinking about -- what they're thinking about, if anything, for doing in 9E.

Is there any -- anybody want to add anything to that? Dan.

MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chairman. We'll make that a directive from this Council, and you'll sign the letter.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. I think that will be fine. I don't think we need to move on it, but does anybody want to put anything else in that we need to have in that letter, asking them what their plans are.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan.

MR. O'HARA: Ask the Feds if they do
predator control anywhere on Federal lands in southwest Alaska or in the State of Alaska.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So we'll ask them if they do predator control anywhere in Alaska, or, for that matter, anywhere in the United States.

Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I would suggest perhaps also when we ask them that question, anticipating what the answer might be, that we would ask them what it would take to justify a predator control plan for them.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. That's a good idea. Dan, did you want -- Dunaway? You didn't?

MR. DUNAWAY: No.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So unless anybody has anything else to add to that, I guess --

Donald, do you have that written down?

MR. MIKE: Oh, yes, Mr. Chair. I've got the notes. I just had one quick question. You mentioned Fish and Wildlife Service, is that directly to the Federal Subsistence Board or the Regional Director or both.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: It would be to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I don't -- the Federal Subsistence Board said they don't have any jurisdiction to do that, so I was told that we have to work with the individual land manager to implement something like that, so that's probably -- because 9E is Refuge lands, and that would be managed by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. MIKE: Okay. Mr. Chair. Thank you. What I can do is for now I guess I can address it to the Regional Director for the Alaska region, and we can cc a copy to the Board. Will that be appropriate.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right, Donald.

Thank you.

So would that be appropriate?
DR. WHEELER: Yes, Mr. Chair. Polly Wheeler with the Office of Subsistence Management.

That will be appropriate. I mean, I understood your direction clearly, and I think what Donald -- if Donald got it, and we've also got the transcript, so we will make sure that we capture your concerns and send a letter to the Fish and Wildlife Service, and I guess out of -- we can cc the Federal Subsistence Board. That means Director Haskett will get it twice, but we'll make sure that he does.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thank you, Polly.

Okay. So now we are back to submitting game proposals.

Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. We've talked about it at length, and I've made a really, really rough attempt to, excuse me, make a motion to address it specifically.

So I'd like to move that we propose changing 9E moose hunting regulations to close hunting to non-qualified subsistence hunters for two miles on each side along navigable waterways, and this is for Federal lands, in the traditionally used waters close to the communities within 9E, including Egegik, Ugashik, Pilot Point, the Chigniks, Ivanof and Perryville, Port Heiden.

And what I have in mind here, I know we took a run at this in the past and I can't remember why it didn't work, but from what I was hearing today from the folks calling in, a lot of the access is along these waterways. My goal is to provide a little bit better opportunity for the local folks in the areas the local folks use, and yet not, say, totally disenfranchise some of the other hunts and activities that occur so far away that they don't have any impact. So I hope you can capture my intent as well.

I'd like to include in that proposal some other possible options, all designed to improve moose numbers or hunting opportunity would be possibly reduce the fall season even for qualified users and maybe at the same time slightly increase the winter season. My understanding is all season hasn't been as
successful and access has been difficult.

In general, I'm looking for ways to possibly reduced, maybe not qualified, the non-qualified take. And I don't know if we need to do this for each subunit of Unit 9, but I was trying to make a focused proposal about moose hunting and bag limits and whose qualified. I wondered about something else that might address brown bears or predators, but......

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I think we should have a corridor proposal for every subunit.

MR. DUNAWAY: So if we could have this same language, but for each subunit in Unit 9.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. 9E, B, C.

MR. DUNAWAY: A, B, C, and E.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Well, A probably don't need it.

MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. I'd be -- I guess I'm considering it still a motion.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Well, I guess I shouldn't deliberate -- I mean, we shouldn't -- well, my recommendation is that if you're going to make a motion, that we have a motion for each subunit instead of one for the whole 9 unit. Or, I guess we don't need to go into 17, do we. They already have -- on Nushagak River.

MR. DUNAWAY: I think it would be safer to stay with Unit 9, especially addressing these concerns. And again part of the intent here is this could serve something as a placeholder for addressing moose hunting, but I'm trying to put some specifics in it. And I recall there were problems with the two-mile buffer zone, closed zone or something, but I'm going to try it again. I think we were too far-reaching last time. I'm hoping this is a little narrowed down.

So that's enough yak on my motion.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So before we get going, would you make that a motion then?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, that's the -- if
Donald thinks he can capture the essence of that, and I've tried to.....

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seconded by.

MR. O'HARA: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan O'Hara. Okay. So then that motion would be in those villages you said in 9E and I guess we need to clarify then 9B. You know, didn't we have 9B -- we had a 9B proposal for corridors a couple years ago. We could probably -- would that work, do you think? I don't remember the exact language in the proposal, but maybe we could submit that same one, because I believe it had mentioned certain rivers.

And then also 9C which would be the Alagnak River, which is a heavily resident hunted. And most of the Alagnak is in Federal, so that would be a definitely one for 9C. And I'm not sure exactly what other 9C ones that you would want to ask. I suppose we could say the Big Creek, King Salmon Creek, and along the -- well, that's probably -- how far up King Salmon Creek though is Federal land, but Big Creek, you get into the Preserve, yeah. But mostly Branch River I think for 9C.

MR. O'HARA: For clarification.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan.

MR. O'HARA: You can go all the way up to the mountains at Big Creek with a jet boat. They go way up there past, you know, into the park actually. Almost into the park.

Does your motion address just navigable waters, or what are you talking about when you're talking about watershed. Mr. Chairman, that was for Dan.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan Dunaway.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Mr. Chair. Dan. I was thinking navigable in the sense of where the local folks traditionally access, so, yeah, you can get into a real hornet's nest on what constitutes navigable, depending on what agency.
But my intent was to address the traditionally accessed waters, like Mr. Kingsley was talking about, that when waters allow, they get up into the Ugashik Lakes, and some years not everybody, or very few can. I think I heard that possibly in the Port Heiden area, too. So in that sense of where these folks really traditionally access their hunt.

I hadn't thought of 9C so much, Randy, because there's a lot of other adjustments there, but now that you bring it up, yes, I could see that might -- that's a hot point, too. I guess I wouldn't want to exclude Levelock, since that's definitely their kind of backyard, too, and they're in 9B, not C.

MR. O'HARA: You're also in 9E? You're getting to 9E?

MR. DUNAWAY: Originally I had said 9E. I hope -- my intent would be is I'm willing to agree with what Randy suggested and make a proposal of this nature for each subunit.

MR. O'HARA: So what did you make a motion on? 9E?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, that was my original draft language here. I guess we'd call it friendly amendment to include that. Okay. That's the way.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan O'Hara.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Dale. Triple A, looking at 9E, where do they go from Pilot Point to their camp, do you have any idea? I don't know where they go to. I know they've got a little runway that they wreck their airplanes on a lot.

MR. DUNAWAY: Go rescue them.

MR. O'HARA: Oh, my goodness, yeah.

MR. MYERS: Yeah, I'm not sure exactly where they all go. I know a few of the people go up the river into the lake and do some hunting up in there, but like he said, it was just -- the main problem with that would be just nature itself with the water levels and stuff, you know, depending on year-to-year. That was one of their main concerns, is they
weren't able to access the land just because they couldn't get there to do their hunting.

MR. O'HARA: Too bad Becky Brock is not here. She does permitting for that whole region on Federal lands. She would tell us. You know, I just look at State lands there, and at Pilot Point, and maybe Triple A is on State lands or maybe it's on Federal lands.

MR. MYERS: I think Triple A is on Federal land, but they're -- I don't think actually where they're at, unless they're right up around Ugashik Lake, in the upper end of the lake or something, I'm not sure exactly where their camps are. Or are they on the Dog Salmon River.

MR. O'HARA: Second question, Randy, is Scotty's Island where Jay is at, does it really affect him?

MR. MYERS: Yeah, that would basically shut him down.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah, it would shut him down.

MR. MYERS: And, you know, I don't know, I've been flying around and work with one of the guides down there, Venton (ph). I actually haven't seen any local people up in there with boats or otherwise, unless they're either working for Jay or for Joe. I've seen them on the fourwheelers up along the Aniakchak, around the crater and up into that area.

I know that one area is open for them. For Jay -- it was opened for Joe to use as a guide area and then they had some kind of a switch thing go on there, and then Jay King has that section that actually goes into where those guys could hunt, but they don't hunt it, because the locals are up there hunting it. They haven't been using it.

So I don't -- you know, I don't know what they have as far as numbers. I mean, that would be something when you get ready to do that, to find out, is where they traditionally go to -- you know, you would have to get an idea probably from the village or something to find out, you know, where do you guys like to go and hunt, before you go ahead and just make an
encompassing thing over the whole thing. You'd have a lot of people affected by it that would be kind of happening.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Well, I think that's probably something we need to work on is we need to find out where the locals use and make corridors around that, but some of these local guides, like Dan says, we don't want to put them out of business. That's not the intent, but we're mainly wanting to protect the local user, because the situation -- so I suppose we.....

Laura.

MS. GREFFENIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Council. I have several questions just for clarification. You had mentioned about doing the corridors in the other units, 9B and C, besides 9E. I just wanted to, just as a reminder, that the deferred proposal, the one that we had discussed earlier, 31, we're proposing for Federal public lands closed in 9B and C. So then, if you want to do this one, then it would be more specific to corridors. I just want to know, do you want to do both -- this is, you know, for the Council to discuss, do you want to do both where you have one proposal where it says Federal public lands are closed for the whole subunit, and have the one where it's for the corridors? And I know we had talked about 9E, and I just had a question for clarification for that. But that's my first question.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: yeah. You know, the more we talk about it, the more it comes back to me. You know, when we submitted the last time, a couple years ago, the corridors, didn't we withdraw our proposal because it was deemed not following the rules of ANILCA, because of -- if there wasn't a problem with the resource, if there wasn't a shortage in resource, then you really couldn't shut out one user group? But that doesn't seem to be the case now. The case is that there's not enough to go around. So it seems to me we could ask for corridors. And it would probably still allow non-residents to hunt if they stayed away from the areas that the residents typically use. You know, like Dan had mentioned or from Port Heiden there or some place up there where the locals can't get to. So unless there's hardly any moose left, there shouldn't be anybody hunting, but if there's enough to have a
non-resident hunt, then they could do it where they're not in conflict with the resident user. That seems to me why that proposal didn't go anywhere last time.

And then because it didn't go anywhere, and then the circumstances have changed, we asked for a complete closure. So, you know, we can -- in my opinion, we can throw out both proposals to the Federal Subsistence Board and let them decide what meets the circumstances, if any at all.

Sandy.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I recognize you're still deliberating and trying to, you know, put together one or more recommendations.

Two things I would add into the mix. I think a bunch of you have a copy of this map, or you've got a book open with it. And what I would point out is that you might not need this kind of proposal in 9A for the following reason, that all the purple land in 9A is Lake Clark Park land, so that land is not opened to sport hunting.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, we weren't going to, or recommend not submitting a proposal for 9A.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Okay. Maybe I missed that. I was just trying to save us all some paperwork. So good on that.

And the other thing, and I'm just going to pass a few sheets of paper around and you can sort of look at them. Over the lunch hour I was able -- my office is really close, and I printed out the most updated information that I have in the Part Service about moose harvest in Katmai, which is the Preserve, not the Park, Lake Clark, which is Park and Preserve, and Aniakchak, which is Preserve and Monument. They're all a little different. And the data only goes up to '05, so, you know, it's not quite as fresh as any of us like it. So I'll just pass these around and you can look at them, and they're real self-explanatory.

The other thing that I would point out is this data is 100 percent State data. State harvest ticket data. So that's what it is. It's not more, not
That's where it comes from. And what we've simply done is we've simply excised out the data that goes inside the NPS boundaries. So that's what these three charts are. And so I'll just pass them around. You can look at them.

So thank you.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. I agree with you, Randy, that if we could have a few proposals out there to take a run at it, and whichever one might be the best vehicle at the time as we get more information.

And this latest motion of mine is admittedly very imperfect. My intent would be that it would only be on lands and under circumstances where we have jurisdiction to address this kind of hunt.

I was trying to remember why all that our previous corridor proposal was rejected, and there may have been a jurisdictional question as well. So I'm still looking for a way to where we have jurisdiction, where we could help these folks, when it's like four, six years now that they're making complaints they don't have enough moose, and they're getting less moose they say, and at the same time the cost of getting those less moose has skyrocketed. It makes a lot of pressure. And I think again emphasizes their need for these animals. So it's again to kind of flesh out my intent behind this really rough proposal. And I could be happy to work with Donald on language that will work. Or that seem a little -- be acceptable to get into a proposal form.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. I think we probably need to work with some of these -- ask some of these villages in 9E exactly where they go, you know, because we can't -- I don't think we should ask for corridors everywhere in Federal land in 9E. And, you know, the goal is to protect -- if there's corridors, to protect the area that they use. And if there's an area that they don't use or can't get to, it should be still open to non-residents if there's enough -- if the Federal Subsistence Board deems there is enough for both -- other user groups.
And I guess we have Mr. Hedlund on line. Are you there. Thomas Hedlund, are you there.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: We'll try again in a minute.

Any more comment on this. Okay. Molly and then Dan.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: I think Nanci had her hand up before I did.

I just had a comment regarding collecting information of where the concerned villages harvest. I think by doing that, we need to remember to collect the historical. Because as the gas prices came up, the hunters weren't able to get to their historical harvest areas, so in collecting information like that, we need to remember to include historical harvesting locations.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I've got a -- before we get to you. One question.

Sandy, can you tell me what LACL is and KATM?

MR. RABINOWITCH: Yes. I'm sorry. LACL is Lake Clark. I meant to write it on there. KATM is Katmai. And then I think Aniakchak's spelled out.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. Aniakchak is spelled out.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Yes. So Lake Clark and Katmai.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Nanci, did you have a comment?

MS. MORRIS LYON: Well, I do, and I don't want to sidetrack anything for working on your proposal, Dan, but my thought, you know, with the concerns of putting people out of business in addition to this, was I in my mind grasped it coming at it from a different angle. Would it be feasible or even possible for us to possibly make it a requirement in
the future, and to include this perhaps in the proposal, to require in the future that non-qualified users submit a plan and/or proposal in some form to show their usage areas and the amount of use they plan on having in an area to the Council for approval a year in advance, so that we could steer them away from the areas we feel are sensitive and perhaps alleviate some of the villages problems with those areas that they feel they're getting, you know, too much pressure from and eliminating their own harvest?

I don't know if that has any place to go or any ability to go anywhere, but that was a thought I had.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: That sounds like a good idea to me.

Molly.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: You know, any time our resources are of concern, the local user groups are required to do a customary and traditional use of our areas. The local people that have used these resources forever are required to do a customary and traditional use to prove that they harvest in these area. Do we do that same thing for people that are coming in from elsewhere besides our areas here to prove that they use these resources.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Isn't there some kind of report that these guides have to fill out on Federal land on the areas they use and how much they take?

Laura.

MS. GREFFENIUS: Just from my understanding, I'm not one of the Fish and Wildlife Staff out in King Salmon, but my understanding is that when these permits are provided to the guiding companies, they are permitted by the Federal land managers. For example, the refuge manager in King Salmon. So certain stipulations are put in those. And I know in other parts of the State there might be, you know, certain areas that they're asked not to -- or they're required not to go to.

So it sounds like it's feasible, and it would be something that would be done through the local
refuge manager or park superintendent, whichever would be applicable.

And then I just had one other clarification question, when we're off of this particular discussion.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I was thinking, too, on this proposal, would it be appropriate to make this proposal now and then sometime -- by the time we meet again, to ask the villages what their land use area is, or what, you know, their use area to protect -- actual boundaries of the corridor at the next meeting. Or approve of the boundary. Because we're not certain where those boundaries need to be. And I don't want to put them everywhere when it would essentially impact the guides where it wouldn't need to be.

Polly.

DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We could do one of two things. I mean, we can make our best guess -- or we can take the direction of the Council and craft a proposal based on what's been talked about today. And then at the fall Regional Advisory Council meeting, it will be an opportunity -- you know, the proposal will be analyzed as it. Then that will be an opportunity to collect public testimony on these corridors, you know, where they need to be, where they shouldn't be, and that's a good opportunity to get it on the record so that it supports -- you know, there's additional support for the Council recommendation, and it will enable you to refine your recommendation a little bit more. I mean, that's the whole -- the beauty of this system where the public input to weight in on these types of issues.

Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: That sounds good.

Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah, that's a great idea, Polly, because we can do that, we can form a proposal and then through Council recommendation as a proposal advances, we can have it filtered in, the
information we really want in there filtered in. I agree with that.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan O'Hara.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah. What did we just do?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Well, we're proposing -- we haven't proposed it yet.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah, it's a motion on the floor, I understand.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: And to put in corridors, 9B, 9C, and 9E. And Staff if going to determine around the villages what areas are being used by locals so that when it comes before us at the next meeting, we'll look and see with the testimony from the villages and the guide user groups, and then we'll determine if that is enough or too much at the next meeting for the areas for the corridor.

MR. O'HARA: Okay. Mr. Chairman. The reason I asked Dan, we're putting this in motion. It's not going to go before the Board at the next meeting and become hard facts. I just talked to Tony Gregori (ph). I don't know if he's gotten back here or not.

But there's a couple of guys down in Port Heiden and Perryville and the Lakes that guide, do guiding. And the three people that are local, I mean, you know, that guides at Perryville and at Lakes I believe, and then Jay, it would put all those guys out of business. And, you know, we really can't do that. I mean, we don't want to put anyone out of business.

So if we can refine it so that the thing will work, then that's exactly what I would want. So if you want to put it in motion and then refine it as we go along, I would vote for that.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I think that's the plan. Unless somebody doesn't believe that. Anybody have.....

Donald.
MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I believe we've captured Mr. Dunaway's intent. We have anthropologist Staff here and wildlife biologist Staff here, and I. We can help draft the proposal as stated by Mr. Dunaway.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Any more comment.

(No comments)

MR. O'HARA: Call the question

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Laura, you had......

MS. GREFFENIUS: Just one more. I know people were taking notes, but just for clarification, and Dan was mentioning for 9E, the corridors on either side of the waterways for particular communities in 9E. Could you please say again which ones that you had initially stated as part of your motion.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Laura. The ones I had written down at the time were Egegik, Ugashik, Pilot Point, I said the Chigniks, meaning all three, Ivanof, Perryville.

MR. O'HARA: Port Heiden.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. I hadn't gotten Port Heiden written down. My intent was for these communities, the traditional hunting areas that they typically use. And, yes, I'd make that now, expecting we'll really need a lot of input from these communities. And I hope that it's amended and refined considerably, because it's really rough. But I didn't want to just put some really vague placeholder proposal in there that could either be misinterpreted or twisted up.

And, no, like Dan says, I don't want to destroy the economies of these small communities either, but maybe those folks can speak up and say what would work for them.

Is that sufficient? Mr. Chair.

MS. GREFFENIUS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thanks, Dan. Okay. The question's been called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Motion carries.

Mr. Hedlund, are you on.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. I guess he's not on.

So are there any other -- Dan, did you feel any need for any bear proposals? I don't know what to do, you know. They're pretty liberal on Federal qualified. But we can't do much for, you know -- well, we could ask the State to -- of we wanted to propose something to the State to take an agenda change request, but that might not be -- they just got done with.....

Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I guess I would want to know if anybody would support a second for a proposal that would include what I described earlier. I'm still not sure -- okay. Let me try and put thoughts together as they go screaming through my feeble little brain.

I'm thinking in case we do not get corridors to work or capture what we are trying to achieve or we stumble, I'm wondering if we shouldn't also do a proposal if we feel there's enough support for it on the Board for the non-subsistence users to be required to give notice of their usage and their areas through management offices so that into the future as well as traditional uses change and areas change, so we would be able to evolve with this into the future as far as the non-qualified users go. You know, to make
that a requirement in all areas or one area at a time, either way the Council might find that appealing.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. One more thing, you emailed me about Mulchatna caribou. You wanted the Council to discuss aligning regulations.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, I was waiting for an opportunity to bring that up.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Now is your opportunity.

MR. DUNAWAY: Well, Mr. Chair, first I was going to maybe say something to Nanci, give her an answer.

Are you -- I've got a few questions. Number 1, are you kind of envisioning something like, what was it, Ron Hood adopted for, what was it, Severson Peninsula, for caribou quite some time ago where they kind of nudged the guides out of that area. I forget how that worked out.

There's two things. We could put a proposal in and see where it goes, or some things like that might be handled administratively. But maybe putting a proposal in is a way to head-s up all the folks involved. But I know some of that, if it's not a subsistence user, do we have any authority to make any regulations. So anyway that's two more.

But the last thing, to answer Randy, is I did want to speak briefly about Mulchatna caribou regs, but let's get through the moose first.

Doi.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Well, then.....

MR. O'HARA: Nanci had a question.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I don't know that answers to that, and I'm hoping these folks with a lot more brain power than myself do have those answers, because it's my intent with this proposal would be to shape a proposal whereby into the future we can address
this problem more immediately than what we've been able
to do for the past five, six, seven years that the same
problem has come before us where villagers are feeling
like commercial entities, or at least people from
outside their area are taking advantage of their source
of food. And so that would be my intent would be to
somehow address on Federal lands the ability for people
to arbitrarily come in and hunt in areas that might in
the long term be detrimental to villagers.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms.
Nanci Morris' comments brought up some thoughts to me,
but the comments you made sounds very similar to what
the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge had in place
in Unit 18 for transporter licenses. I think the
refuge manager required that the transporter stay away
from traditional use areas that the local villagers
mainly hunt traditionally for moose. And the refuge
manager I believe in their transporter license made
some sort of requirement that they stay away from these
traditional use areas. Thank you. And I can look
further into that and see what the details entail.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: George.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
George Pappas, Fish and Game.

The question I had was we're talking
about commercial operations that are permitted through
the Federal process or you're talking about all
residents of Alaska. I'm not aware of regulations that
would require to file a plan to hunt on Federal
properties as a private resident with private
equipment. That's what I was looking for
clarification.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes. And, Mr.
Pappas, I would recognize the difficulty in making that
work. However, I figure because the commercial, both
transporters and guides are required to be regulated
already, we would have an avenue to go through for
that. So I acknowledge that as a problem. And I don't
think I'm ready to tackle that one at this point.
However, the one that's a little bit more tangible
would be the one I would be focusing on.
MR. PAPPAS: Through the Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: So where are we at on the -- do you want to make a motion we do something or was it just discussion.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I'll go ahead and make a motion. Do you have something?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I guess. Could we do it?

MS. MORRIS LYON: It sounds like we can.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. All right. So I guess, Nanci, made a motion on that. Do we have a second.

MR. DUNAWAY: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seconded by Dan Dunaway.

MR. O'HARA: Can we have the motion read back.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: We'll have to have Donald. Can you repeat that? If you can't, ask Nanci to explain it to you.

MR. MIKE: Okay. I'll try my best, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Nanci Morris, her motion was to in corridors where the transporters or guides should submit a plan where -- their plan of operations and to keep away from subsistence use areas. Is that correct, Ms. Morris Lyon?

MS. MORRIS LYON: That is correct. And I guess I would expand it, in Unit 9E at this point, because my thought is that it will give us an opportunity -- when this happens, again this has been a complaint and a problem that we've not been able to address for years for a variety of number of reasons. And into the future, that if we just expand the area to include the entire area that they need to submit a plan for, as usage changes, we will be able to address those
changes through the plans submitted by the commercial
user.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Polly.

DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just to clarify here, I understand the intent and I'm
sure it's been captured in different -- I mean Donald
and the court transcriber.

I would caution you that this may fall
outside of the scope of what this Regional Advisory
Council can do, the parameters of what the Federal
Subsistence Board can do, and maybe that it's an annual
report topic. But I think for the purposes of this
group, the concern is on -- the concern has been noted.
We'll pursue it in whatever way we can. It may not end
up being a proposal, but it could end up being
direction to -- in other places. I just think it's a
bit outside the scope -- or outside -- it crosses a lot
more than what the Federal Subsistence Board can do.
But your concern is noted and we'll follow through on
it.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. I understand
what you're saying. So if the Federal Subsistence
Board, if it's beyond their scope, but then we could
work with the land manager to implement such a program?

DR. WHEELER: Yeah. My commitment to
you is that we won't just say, no, it's beyond our
scope and leave it at that. We'll pursue it and, you
know, we'll figure out what we need to do and we'll
help you out in that way, if it is beyond the scope.
I'm not saying -- I think it is, but I don't want to
answer yes or no for sure.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So you
seconded it, Dan. So would you agree with this now?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I have
the same intuition nagging at the back of my head, but
it's kind of like, my golly, we've got to find
something. And I think that's what drove the Severson
Peninsula concerns quite some time ago. And I think
there are administrative answers that seem to work out.
But, yeah, so that it's not forgotten, I guess I'm willing to second the motion to make it a proposal and let them tell us we can't.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: You did. I was just asking you if you agreed.

We have a gentleman back here that wants to testify on this. Would you state your name.

MR. FITHIAN: Mr. Chairman. For the record my name is Bobby Fithian. I live in Lower Tonsina, Alaska and I represent the Alaska Professional Hunters Association as their executive director.

Related to the proposal that Nancy just came up with, and thought concept, on all National Park Service preserve and U.S. Fish and Wildlife refuge lands, the guides, not the transporters necessarily, but the guides have been awarded those areas through concession prospectuses. A significant part of that prospectus policy and the criteria for selection has to do with the applicant's ability, willingness, desire, how he is going to cooperate with local communities and other user groups. In addition to that, he has an annual use report that he has to provide annually.

It's pretty well documented that his proposed activities are in relationship to local communities and social atmospheres, other user groups through his plan of operations and his annual use reports. And he gets graded on those annual use reports annually by the Federal agencies.

So as far as the guide industry goes, that accountability already exists and is there.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fithian?

MR. FITHIAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. So I guess then Staff will check into this and then make sure that if it already is taking place.
Dan, you had a question.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah. I think it's a good motion, because it becomes actually more informational for us. I don't want to get into the guide's plan just because we're Federal subsistence people. You know, I've been to some of those places. I need to know more information on how we can make a better decision in relationship to the first motion that was made. So I think to me it's getting some good stuff that I would like.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thanks, Dan. Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah. One more point for clarification, too, is the other part of this intent is actually to make sure we don't put people out of business because of conflicts, okay. So there's support out there for the commercial as well as support for protecting local subsistence use is the intent in this proposal. It's not to exclude anybody. Okay.

MR. O'HARA: Call for the question.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. The question's been called. And all in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Motion carried.

Yeah. You know, I think I agree with Nanci on that. You know, we don't want to put them out of business, but if there's not enough resource, then somebody has to bear the brunt of it, and the non-subsistence user would have to go first. So -- but the Federal Subsistence Board would have to determine that.

Okay. Mr. Dunaway.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I believe you're turning to me regarding Mulchatna caribou.
I just kind of wanted to the RAC and general, I thought we were going to be entertaining support for a proposal from possibly the biologist at Togiak Wildlife Refuge regarding getting Federal and State caribou hunting regulations out of conflict and meshed better. There's some little slivers of land that through oversight, some changes in the State regulations, there's differences in season lengths and bag limits as we've, by State and by our actions, have reduced seasons and bag limits. But there's a few places that got forgotten.

I talked to Andy Aderman at the Togiak Refuge and he was working on it really carefully to make sure he addressed it all.

I brought it up to the Nushagak Advisory Committee, thinking that in general we've worked real hard to -- well, it sounds like he might be on line here as I speak. I thought there might be general support for meshing them so there's reduced confusion of where you can hunt and when you can hunt and under what bag limits and rules and stuff. However, when we got into quite a discussion of it at the Nushagak Advisory Committee, and both as a member now of the Nushagak Advisory committee and a member of this RAC, I have to say there's quite a variety of opinions, and there are -- quite a few folks spoke up expressing that they would like to see some rural preference opportunities continue under Federal regulations, whether or not they're meshed with the State.

Especially some upriver villages expressed, that would be Koliganek and New Stuyahok expressed a real interest in a pretty late spring opportunity to take caribou. Apparently there's times where the herd will get within reach of those two villages in late March/early April. And that's an important opportunity for them.

So at this point I'm not sure if there's going to be -- I'm not sure from the group I'm supposed to come from if there's much of a consensus. So I just want to express that, that I had already encouraged the Togiak Refuge to submit that proposal from them, and if Andy's on, he may want to speak to that, Mr. Chair.

And so I'm not going to be advocating a
proposal for us, but we may expect to see one.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Andy, are you on line?

MR. ADERMAN: Yes, I am, Mr. Chairman.
This is Andy Aderman, Togiak Refuge. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I can hear you fine, yeah. Would you like to comment on what -- did you hear Dan Dunaway?

MR. ADERMAN: Yes, I did hear Dan.
Yeah, and then I just got looking at the Federal regulations, and it's quite varied as far as season dates go. Most of the bag limit is three throughout the range, but there are some differences. Like in the Alagnak drainage there's a limit of one caribou, and then over in 9A there's a limit of four caribou.

And I've talked to folks with the State within the region of the Mulchatna herd, and there is support for, you know, making the State and Federal regulations as consistent as possible. But right now they're kind of all over the place from the Y-1 start date to August 1, August 10th, the ending dates March 15th, March 31, April 15th.

We all know the herd has been in decline. There's been pretty poor bull to cow ratio for the last eight or nine years, below the management objective. Calf numbers haven't been very good as well, but that's -- you know, that kind of explains the decline.

I just think it's something worth taking a look at and maybe aligning them or making them consistent, or more consistent throughout the range of the herd.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thank you, Andy.

Molly.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Thank you, Chair.
Another -- I don't know if I should call it a problem,
but there's the State caribou season closed, when was it, March 30th?

MR. DUNAWAY: Fifteenth.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Fifteenth. And except the Federal caribou season is open until the 15th.

Around our area, Dillingham and the Nushagak locations, there's not too many Federal lands except little dots here and there, but if the villagers in that area could pinpoint those little dots, caribou season's still open until April 15th. The problem is not too many people have, what are they called, GIS or GPS, and in order to get into those little dots of land to get your caribou right now until the 15th, you need to find that location, that little dot, and see if there's any caribou in there. So I think that's another problem we have.

And BBNA, our subsistence coordinator, was trying to work with New Stuyahok, which was wanting to harvest caribou still. They requested an extension, but they requested it too late after the State caribou season closed, so their request wasn't taken up. But then they realized that there was this little location that they might be able to harvest caribou, so I think they're in the process of maybe trying to figure out or find that location.

And I don't know what -- how we can correct that. If there's these little pockets of land that are still open, there needs to be a way to identify them so that possibly the local people could make use of them. And I think the reason why they haven't in the past is because of the same problem. They are not sure, you know, and are afraid to find these little pockets to get their caribou.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. Thanks, Molly. I know some of them are not that small, you know. If you look at BLM land, maybe we can get the BLM representative up here, and tell us how these boundaries were drawn out, but they're not that small. If you look just south of Igiugig, that piece of yellow land there, BLM land, that's -- if you look at how long it is across from -- it's at least 15 to 25 wide and probably almost -- it's that from the top to the bottom to where it crosses the Alagnak, or meets the Alagnak River. So that's quite a bit of land right there, you
know. And it -- if I was to go home now and go
hunting, I'd have to hunt their caribou, because State
land is closed.

I could stay in Federal land right
there, but those little tiny pieces, you know, then,
you know, there could be a problem with being out of
Federal land there.

But, you know, like -- and around New
Stuyahok to the east, you know, those guys from New
Stuyahok, I think they should be able to have a -- be
able to harvest caribou in that, as long as they didn't
get too close to the border I would, you know, think.

Can you -- I can't remember your name,
but can you come up and.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's Dan Sharp.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan. Explain this,
how these boundaries got defined?

MR. SHARP: I wasn't going to tell you
my name, but since I've been identified, I'm Dan Sharp
with BLM.

The boundaries generally for BLM lands
are artifacts of what wasn't selected, so that's
probably why they're so scattered and broken up is
because BLM is the repository of Federal lands that
otherwise aren't spoken for. So that pattern is
common even, well, throughout the State.

As far as being able to adequately
describe for hunters and such where boundaries are, in
truth if you wanted to take advantage of some of those
small little plots, you would need to a GPS to find
where it was. I don't think it's within BLM's ability
to go stake out all these lands and make it obvious as
to where they are. But that's sort of how that
checkerboard pattern was created.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Thank you.
Yeah, I see that now. Just a sec.

And, are you still one? Aderman?

MR. ADERMAN: Yes, I am.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Were you -- was the
Togiak Refuge thinking about putting something in? A
proposal?

MR. ADERMAN: Well, I think at a
minimum something that is more Refuge specific, you
know, that deals with Unit 17A, maybe that portion of
17C that's on the Refuge, but I kind of view this as a
much wider issue, and, you know, I could see various
agencies submitting proposals or, you know, for their
areas, and you'd end up with probably a dozen or more
proposals, just about the subunits and whatnot, and,
you know, I see value in one big proposal that covers
the range of the herd, kind of what the Board of Game
has done. I mean, there's basically one regulation
throughout the range of the herd, one bag limit, and so
I.....

To answer your question, I think the
Refuge at a minimum would submit something or the area
most directly associated with Togiak Refuge at least
for now

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Thanks. Dan,
did you have something.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. I've got a few
things here. To kind of add to what Molly was saying
about what shows on the map as BLM land and what Dan
Sharp was saying, I've seen some maps that show some
very small tracts of land I think near the Iowithla
drainage don't even show up on here.

And then one of Molly's employees,
Frank Woods, was reminding us at our Advisory Committee
meeting that these yellow spots are just
approximations, and there's been a lot of surveying and
final conveying and finalizing of selections both by
villages and individuals. So these are just
approximations, very rough ones, and I know Frank Woods
warned everybody that to charge off and go hunting in
some of these, he didn't have enough information to
pass onto them, and he was still hoping to get that
kind of information from BLM.

To add on, I've been struggling with
whether to propose this or not, but from what Andy
brings up, I'm wondering if rather than as an advocacy,
but just to get it on the table in a tidier form, if
this RAC shouldn't consider at least for the
opportunity to discuss it, a proposal, a single proposal to get these seasons and bag limits in uniformity. It would be a service to a lot of the public that has a real hard time sorting out where things are.

And then I know -- I think it's within the Refuge there's one little sliver of land that still has a five animal bag limit, but I think that season is to be established by the State or the Feds or jointly State and Feds. Andy or Jim Wellington is constantly getting questions about it. I think they'd like to get that out of there.

And I would be willing to make the motion just to get it on the table for discussion to get it out there, but I have to say that a lot of the folks I live around and I guess supposed to be speaking for have very mixed opinions on how the final outcome should be.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: A motion on what area?

MR. DUNAWAY: Well, in this case I would make a motion to adopt Federal subsistence regulations to get them meshed into -- in agreement with the State Mulchatna Caribou Herd seasons and bag limit regulations as much as possible. And possibly look to Andy to supply the specifics on that.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I guess I don't see a second on that.

But here's an instance right here. If you look at the Federal land where it says New Stuyahok, the BLM land, for instance, this BLM land, that -- half of that part there in 17C closes March 31st, but if you go on the other side of that where that's 9B, then it closes April 15th. So I could, you know, go along with closing it on the end of March in 9B, but I wouldn't go along with closing the season March 15th as in State land, because like Molly had said, people were still interested in getting caribou, because they hadn't gotten their limited caribou. And keeping it open until the end of March, it's still good traveling conditions, but once you get to April 15th, and then it's pretty dangerous in my opinion. Some
place may not be, but it would probably be beneficial right in that area, because that one area of BLM land there where it says New Stuyahok, is two different closing dates. So, you know, but I would -- I could certainly see shortening the 9B up to March 31st instead of April 15th like the season above there and the season below is. You know, that would take away, you know, of shooting a caribou in the wrong side of the boundary line after March.

Molly.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: My recommendation I think would be to get the harvest numbers meshed together, because with the State I think it's, what, two? And with the -- or three.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Three with the Federal.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Three with the Federal, two with the State. And in this location that's still open, it's still harvest of three. My recommendation would be to keep the Federal open until the 15th, but -- the caribou in the BLM lands, but mesh the harvest numbers with the State.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: You mean the 15th of April. So we would have to make a proposal to extend the season in 9A and 9C, and 17C to the middle of April.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: No, I'm not. I think we -- couldn't we just keep the seasons as they are and correct the amount of harvest? Or are we trying to -- the closure dates to match with the State? And I'm not agreeing with that, because I want to give the Nushagak villages and anybody else that would be interested in harvesting until the 15th, just to harvest two still that the State has on board for two harvest.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: The Nushagak villages, the Federal season closes in 17C the end of March. It's only 9B where it's open until April 15th according to the regulations.

You know, and I could support aligning the bag limits, because I suppose if a family needs more than two caribou, you need to send out more than one hunter. And if there's only one guy hunting, they
probably have a small family, so they could
probably.....

The reason why I say this is if we're
going to get the Board of Game to be more receptive to
doing predator control in 17C and 9B, you know, we
probably should try to align these. Because to do
 predator control, it has to be a pretty poor situation.
And if the situation is that poor, maybe a bag limit of
three caribou is too much. That's what I'm saying, you
know.

Anybody else want to comment on that.

Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. We had
a little bit of this kind of discussion at the advisory
committee meeting, and I was just finally finding it in
my notes. I know one of the representative from
Koliganek said that running a hunt into late March
could be important.

It seems like I heard somebody else say
they might be more inclined to compromise a little on
the bag limit, but still have a little more opportunity
on the season.

But there's two ways we could look at
that. We could debate this now and decide whether or
not to make a motion and put a proposal forth, or we
could say clearly there's room for a lot of discussion,
and if we're willing to have confidence in the system
and throw a proposal on the table and then let people
really weigh in on it. Then there may be places where
everybody's willing -- in agreement that things should
be cleaned up.

And so I am looking for a little -- I
don't want to make a motion if I'm not going to really
get a lot of support, but I would be willing to make
that motion just to get it out there for discussion and
we sort out among the communities and the various users
what would be the best solution.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah. Dan, I would
support a motion for those very purposes as well. I
think we're hearing both from management as well as
user groups that this needs to be addressed. And I
think for the purposes of getting it on the table, and
in the hopes that if it wasn't put on the table in a
form that was palatable to the entities, we could
through recommendations this fall when we review it
hopefully make the changes necessary at that time.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. It sounds
like the way to do it. You know, like I said before,
you know, we can't take it up if we don't have
something before us to take up.

So, you know, I don't like -- I don't
think that BLM land where it says New Stuyahok is --
one side being closed on the end of March and the other
side of that piece of BLM land opened until April 15th,
and it would be hard to determine and even hard to
enforce. But April 15th is kind of late in my opinion.
This year is different I think. You know, it's
probably going to be huntable until then. But this was
a cold year.

And we probably should show that we --
you know, I'm trying -- we need to show that we, you
know -- how am I supposed to day it.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Addressing the
problem?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, address the
problem so that hopefully if it gets any worse that the
Board of Game would implement predator control in this
area. And if we don't show that we are trying to help
the situation, they would be hesitant, in my opinion,
to do anything.

So I would support moving the season
back from April 15th in 9B to March 31st, even though
that affects us more than anybody else. But it does
show that we need to -- we have a problem.

And if the rest of you guys think that
we should move the season -- move the bag limit to two
from three, you know, I could support that. As I said,
you know, if you need more caribou, you need to send
somebody else in your family to get a couple more.

Is there any more comment. Dale, I
haven't heard from you.
MR. MYERS: Well, I don't know, I was just looking at all this, and, you know, we have to do something. I kind of hate to see closures and cut-backs and everything. I mean, you look at the lower Peninsula in 9E for the caribou herd down there. That's been cut back completely to the max and totally shut down. And it hasn't helped their populations any. It's kind of a trend that's growing. There's an obvious predator problem, and it's starting to creep throughout the State in quite a few different areas, and, I mean, it just -- it's a politically ugly thing, but, you know, at a certain point it's a dirty job, but somebody's got to do it. And, you know, I don't know what we can come up with. We should try to come up with something. That's my thoughts.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. And I see part of 17B and 17C also has a three bag limit for caribou, open until April 15th.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: That's what I was trying to tell you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Oh, I was looking at Unit 9. All right. Sorry, Molly. So who made a motion.

MR. DUNAWAY: I can.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Dan made a motion.

MS. MORRIS LYON: No, he's going to.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Oh, Dan, you're going to make a motion or did.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I mean, I guess at this point I'm willing to move that we develop a proposal, maybe with the help of Mr. Aderman and possibly the State biologist to get seasons and bag limits for caribou hunting, the Mulchatna Caribou Herd, in the range of the herd, and to be more uniform, well, seasons and bag limits.
It sounds to me like from the discussion, we even have -- this could serve the subsistence public as well as the rurally qualified subsistence public as well the commercial and sport public, reduce confusion.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Why don't you put a date on it, March 31st.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, I'll do March 31st. And I don't know what the prevailing start date is. I think whichever is the most common start date for the range of the caribou herd. Because this goes on into Unit 19 and 18 as well. And I guess I'm open to Andy's comments, if he know what date that might be for a start date in the fall.

Mr. Chair.

MR. ADERMAN: Yeah. Mr. Chairman. Andy Aderman with The Togiak Refuge. August 1st is the most common start date throughout the range of the Mulchatna herd.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Thank you, Andy. So we're looking at an August 1st to March 31.

MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan O'Hara.

MR. O'HARA: I'll second that motion so we can have discussion.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: The motion been seconded. Okay.

Yeah, you know, I could support it. I'm in one of those areas where we would be shortened, but, you know, we need to do this for conservation measures. And I'd also clarify it's easier for protection to enforce. And also I'm kind of hopeful that by doing this the State Board of Game favorably looks at it. Because if it does get any worse, it might be -- in fact, it might be in a measure right now, that would implement predator control. By doing what we're proposing, it would show that we are trying to help the problem, so I would be in support of that.
Anybody else. Molly.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Just clarification. So the April 15 closure was only on BLM lands and not Togiak Refuge.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: On both I thought, wasn't it, Dan? The Federal lands in 17A and C and B?

MR. O'HARA: Is Andy still on line?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Andy, are you on line? Aderman.

MR. ADERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am on line. It's April 15th closure on Federal lands in 17B, which just the very western tip is Togiak Refuge, the area around Hart Lake. And then there's the BLM lands that you talked about earlier, and then I believe Lake Clark Preserve is in the very eastern portion of 17B.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So the intent was not to take 17A or 17 -- part of 17C in the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge. Dan Dunaway?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. As the maker of the motion, yeah, I think my intent was within our area of jurisdiction, wherever the Mulchatna Caribou Herd ranges. My understanding is the biologists would like to have very similar, if not identical, seasons and bag limits throughout the range of the herd, which has expanded considerably the last 30 years. So, yes, 17 A, C, wherever.

And through this discussion, I'm not sure where the season closure will end up, but I guess I'd entertain having the discussion.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So this proposal is pertaining to the Mulchatna caribou. Any more comment on this.

MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan O'Hara.

MR. O'HARA: So open August 1 and close
the end of March, that's your proposal? Okay.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, the State regulations are open until March 15th, but it would be a little longer than that, but it would show some protective measures and also trying to align the season in that one area a little bit better.

MR. O'HARA: Call for the question.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: The question's been called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Motion carried.

Okeydoke.

Krista, can you -- I forgot.....

MS. GUNN: That's fine. I do have to leave though.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay.

MS. GUNN: I can stay -- how long do you think.....

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: How long would you.....

MS. GUNN: Well, I can just give you the handouts and answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Well, can you sit there and give us a brief discussion of your handouts.

MS. GUNN: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: And tell us your name and who you represent.

MS. GUNN: I shall.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: You have the floor.
Would you turn your mic on.

MS. GUNN: I shall. And it's Krista Gunn. I'm with the Office of the Federal Coordinator.

I do apologize. I had a more detailed presentation for you, but due to the lack of time, I can just go over the slides pretty quickly.

The first slide has my contact information, so if you do have any further questions, please feel free to give me a call.

The second slide is basically a fact sheet on the Office of the Federal Coordinator. Who we are, what we represent, what our mission is. And obviously the end goal is to build the pipeline.

The third slide details the Federal agencies that we are going to be coordinating with for the natural gas pipeline. There are 22 agencies involved, and as you all probably know, there are four proposals at this point. There are the two big pipelines and the two in-state natural gas pipelines.

For the two larger pipelines, we anticipate that those two proposals, the first from the AGIA representative, Trans Canada, and the second from Denali. We propose that they will merge at some point, because we know that only one larger line is going to be built. We just don't know when. And if you take a look at the next slide, the FERC pre-filing environmental review process, that checkmark is the point where they're going to have to merge.

We may see two environmental impact statements or EIS's, and so those 22 Federal agencies are going to have to coordinate on both of those EIS's at this point. So a lot of work. And where our office comes into play is we're going to expedite that coordination, ensure that those Federal agencies don't levy any additional requirements on the companies, so that we can ensure that the pipeline does get built.

The next slide details the FERC resource reports. They are the lead for the EIS as well as there are the 11 resource reports. I would take note of number 4 and number 5, because those are probably going to have the greatest impact to you, and those are cultural resources and the socio-economics.
And finally the last two slides are the timelines for the two larger line projects, the first one being Denali and the second one being Trans Canada.

And I'm sure many of you know that Denali has prefiled with FERC, so that basically begins the process for them to meet the open season in 2010. Trans Canada has not prefiled yet, and they're basically looking at the process about a year ago, and they're following that process versus the legislation that was just passed. But you'll probably be seeing them prefile soon.

And again that was kind of a shortened version. So if you have any quick questions, I would be happy to take them.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yes, what is FERC?


CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. And I guess the gas line, is it going to run kind of along the Trans Alaska Pipeline, or it really hasn't come out and.....

MS. GUNN: The proposals, and again would you look at this one. I only have one copy of this, I apologize.

Those are all four proposals, and as you can see, the two larger pipelines do propose at this point to come down the TAPS corridor.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Any questions. Molly.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Yeah. What do you mean by like Trans Canada hasn't prefiled?

MS. GUNN: Basically the slide that says FERC prefileing environmental review, Trans Canada hasn't submitted their application to FERC. So that application has to have some detailed information on the engineering specifics of the pipeline, what their proposed corridor is. And so they haven't really reached that process yet, so they have not submitted that documentation and paperwork to FERC.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan.


MS. GUNN: Yes, sir.

MR. O'HARA: That pipeline's a long way from Bristol Bay.

MS. GUNN: Correct.

MR. O'HARA: And so is it just kind of information for us then to think in general terms, because 4 and 5, you know, is going to affect a lot of things.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: The Counsel, specifically Nanci and the Chairman, asked me to give you a brief update.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: And we appreciate it. Anybody else. So I guess it's still -- a lot is still up in the air yet.

MS. GUNN: It is. It's still very much in the planning stages. We anticipate about 10 years.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So.....

MS. GUNN: So, again, lots more updates.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yep. All right. Well, we expect to see you again then.

MS. GUNN: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: And hopefully we have more time.

MS. GUNN: Yes. And thank you, Mr. Chairman and the Council.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: You're welcome.

Dan, do you have something.

MR. DUNAWAY: The way these things go, you say approximately 10 years. Ten years to what, the pipeline or the beginning of a pipeline?
MS. GUNN: No, until construction is complete, until we see the first gas. So 10 years until the first gas.

MR. O'HARA: Do you think we'll have a pipeline?

MS. GUNN: I do. The Administration is very favorable at this point. And I know that there's been a lot of press on the shale gas and that market. And obviously the economics in the United States right now. But it's the right time, so we really believe that we'll see it through fruition.

MR. O'HARA: When you say Administration, you're talking about the Federal Administration?

MS. GUNN: The Obama Administration, correct.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: One more. Dan Dunaway.

MR. DUNAWAY: It just occurred to me there's quite a few folks pretty concerned about oil development out in Bristol Bay. Would this same process occur out there or will you be involved or -- I guess I'll leave it at that. Or what.

MS. GUNN: The LNG plant or specifically -- I'm not sure what you're referring to.

MR. DUNAWAY: Mr. Chair. The oil lease sales and possible drilling, although I hear that there may be more gas than oil out in what's called the North Aleutian Basin.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thank you, Krista.

MS. GUNN: Just to answer your question, no, we would not be involved with that. We are involved just with the natural gas projects. And again thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: You're welcome.

MR. O'HARA: About time for a break.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yes, it is. Liz has
a comment.

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Sorry to interrupt. Ronald Lind is on the line. He
was from Chignik Lake and he wanted to testify, and
he's been waiting for awhile. We were on Unit 9 when
he called and then we got off while he was waiting.
Are you still there, Ronald?

MR. LIND: Yeah, I am, but I never
heard what unit or subunit you guys were one. I just
heard 9B and that was not what I was on here for. I
thought it was 9E.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, Ronald, this
is Randy Alvarez. We discussed 9E on moose proposals
for 9E to do -- to implement corridors along some of
the rivers and creeks and streams so that locals and --
some of the communities that use Federal lands in 9E
where they hunt typically moose, to have corridors in
those areas to keep -- to restrict specifically non-
residents and people that are not qualified subsistence
users, to help locals get more moose.

And the Staff is going to be working on
exactly where these corridors are in Unit 9E on the
rivers and streams and creeks that they utilize to hunt
moose. So they're probably going to have to be
contacting these villages, Egegik, Pilot Point,
Ugashik, Port Heiden, the Chigniks, Perryville and
Ivanof Bay on what -- where they hunt moose on Federal
land with boats so that there can be a corridor put
there.

And our intent is not to eliminate non-
resident hunting. It's just to protect the local
people where they hunt so that they don't have to
compete with the non-residents.

Do you have any comment on that.

MR. O'HARA: It's two miles.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Oh, and it's a two-
mile corridor on each side of these rivers and streams.
So do you want to comment on that, Ronald.

MR. LIND: Well, I guess if it's
anything like Nushagak Rivers, I wouldn't have any
problem with the way they're going to set it up if it's
two miles off the river. But I guess the only people
you're going to really hurt is the ones that are in our
area for any kind of commercial hunting, but anybody
that's outside of our corporation land won't have to
deal with anything like this. They could go out and
hunt for, you know, any moose and don't have to worry
about being away from the rivers, because they have
their airplanes to go after them. And if that happens
in our area and we can't do any commercial hunting for
moose, all we're doing then is saving the moose for the
guys that are hunting on the outside of our corporation
land.

That's all I have to say about what you
guys are trying to do with the two-mile limit. And I
see it up in the Nushagak area, and they have a lot of
area to hunt, but down here where we're at, I mean, the
rivers we hunt out of, you know, they're not very far
-- I guess to go hunting off of corporation land, to
get away from the two-mile regulation you're putting is
going to be -- it won't affect those guys that are
hunting outside of our corporation lands. I don't know
if you understand what I'm trying to say.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Kind of. We don't
want to eliminate, you know, the guided hunts, but we
want to keep them separated, and, you know, most of the
local people, they have their specific areas that they
hunt with. They run up the rivers and creeks with
their boats usually as far as they can go, and that's
kind of the areas we wanted to protect for them. And
you guys are going to have to be working with Staff to
determine what your areas are. Because, you know, we
don't want to close any more area than needs to be,
unless there's just not enough moose to supply
everybody.

So the Staff is going to be working on
these corridors in the next -- we're going to take up
these proposals again in October at our next meeting,
and then we'll finalize where these corridors will be.
So everybody should have an opportunity to have their
say. In fact, there also will be public testimony
again in October at our next meeting on these same
proposals. The meeting's going to be in Dillingham I
believe, so you'll have another opportunity, Ronald,
besides contacting Fish and Wildlife Staff to where
these corridors are going to be around your villages.
MR. LIND: I understand what your proposal is there for, but I just am thinking that, you know, for guys that like I said have airplanes, they can get away from this two-mile corridor and still be able to hunt for the moose out there, so we're not really doing anything about protecting our moose. We're just -- you know, they're not able to come in our areas, so they'll still be able to get to them with an airplane. So if you're trying to protect the moose, then you need to, you know, put a cap on the amount that a guide could get. Otherwise that don't seem right to just go two miles off the rivers, and then our rivers are -- you know, you can't get to certain places because it's so shallow, but to me it seems like this is not going to really work out very long, because these guides still can get out, way out past two miles with their airplanes and still be able to get to the moose. And all we're doing is saving the moose in our area where we're supposed to be hunting them for ourselves, but yet we can't commercially hunt them, but these guys with the airplanes are going to be able to get to them and, you know, there just needs to be something put in with that if this two miles doesn't really work. I mean, I understand what you're trying to do, but still it don't seem like it's going to work. But anyways, like you said, there's more meetings coming up in October, so.....

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Yeah. Ronald, so you think more needs to be done from that I can gather. It probably should be close. See, Pilot Point Traditional Council is supporting a closure of the sport hunting on Federal lands in Unit 9E. So you're kind of believe in this also?

MR. LIND: Yeah, I can see the moose numbers went down over the years, you know, and I don't very many hunters at all for moose. The most I ever took was four. But, you know, not everybody gets a moose, because they're just quite a ways out there, but I'm just trying to say that, you know, the moose numbers, even if you're putting in this two-mile corridor on each side of the river to stop the sport hunting, or, you know, to make it -- like to have subsistence users get their moose and then the commercial guys, but it's still not going to slow the commercial guys down, because like I said, their airplanes could take them wherever they want to go to get to the moose, and they could be, you know, three miles out and still get their moose, and what we're
doing to protect them is not by doing this two-mile
corridor. We need to do something else by, you know,
putting a cap like I said on the commercial hunting for
moose and, you know, have them only do up to four, you
know, because some of these guys get 15, 20 moose
hunters. And all we're doing in our area is, if we're
going to put this two-mile in place, we're not doing
anything to slow them down.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. You know, you
guys, you can submit a proposal into the Federal
Subsistence Board on this. That's kind of something
that you -- what you just said was something different
than what anybody had discussed, was putting a limit on
how many hunters guides can have in this area. And
maybe that's something you should submit. That sounds
like a good proposal to me. In fact, even Pilot
Point's proposal to close sport hunting is a legitimate
proposal.

You know all this is going to hinge on
how many moose there are, is in my opinion how much the
Federal Subsistence Board restricts it. You know, if
there's quite a bit of moose, they'll go with a
corridor where everybody can harvest. If it's even
less, maybe the guides should be limited to only take a
few hunters out, say four like you said. Or if there's
not enough moose for everybody, like some people think,
Pilot Point, Port Heiden, it should be closed to sport
hunting in Unit 9E. And these proposals need to be
sent in, otherwise we're not going to be discussing
them next October.

So I hope you guys, like you or Chignik
or Port Heiden or Pilot Point send some proposals in.
Otherwise -- and not leave it to us to submit a
proposal for every one of these. So I just wanted to
say that.

Dan, you have a comment?

MR. DUNAWAY: Yes, Mr. Chair. For Mr.
Lind, I was the maker of the motion. I wanted to get
something on the table to open the door to discussing
moose hunting, to address a growing and on-going
concern for moose. I think our final wording in this
proposal will include some language to the effect of
not just the corridors, something to the effect or
other options to possibly include reducing the fall
moose season for qualified users, slightly increasing
the winter moose season for qualified users, or seek ways to reduce, but not necessary close the take by non-qualified hunters in these areas.

But like Randy, I 100 percent agree, you guys need to submit proposals. The more proposals addressing a problem, somebody might have a better idea, and probably has a better idea out there.

One other item, it sounds like you're also a guide though. I really struggle with talking about widespread closures to sport, commercial use or other use in areas far, far from any local community or far, far away from traditional hunting areas if that community still allows sport and commercial hunting essentially in their backyard or on their lands. If there's enough moose to support some sort of commercial activity close to home, and yet other folks in that very community aren't getting enough moose to eat, it seems to me it's the community's responsibility to sort out a solution closely, whether it's a requirement that every guided moose taken on corporate lands, half of it goes to the community or something.

Anyway, but we'd certainly welcome your input and encourage you to stay involved, because it can only help, because there's certainly a problem. Thank you.

MR. LIND: Well, just to let.....

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Go ahead, Ronald.

MR. LIND: .....you know, when I go out to do these moose hunts, whatever moose we get, I give to everybody in the village, because people need the moose, and sometimes some of them can't get out there to get to the moose, so whatever we get, I share with everybody, and it goes to them.

But we'll follow up before the next meeting I guess and I'll get ahold of some numbers to put in a proposal.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Ronald, the deadline for proposals is April 30th I believe so you need to send a proposal in, if you are going to, by April 30th. And if you need help on that, you can call Donald Mike. Donald, would you tell him your number and fax number or whatever he needs from you.
MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My office number is 786-3629, or our 800 number is 1-800-478-1456. And our fax number is 786-3898. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Did you get that, Ronald, or do you need him to say it again.

MR. LIND: Yes. All right. 786-3629, 800-478-1456, 786-3898.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Is that right, Donald?

MS. WILLIAMS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So.....

MR. MIKE: No, it isn't.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Tell him again.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. My desk number is 786-3629.

MR. LIND: 786-3629.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: So if you need help to send in a proposal, call him up and he'll fax you or give you the paperwork and tell you how to do it. But it would probably -- what you were discussing would probably be a good proposal before us, besides the corridor, and I hope Pilot Point's closure proposal gets sent in. And then if you send in one dealing with the amount of guided hunters a guide can take, it would probably be another good option.

All right. Ronald, is that all for your testimony.

MR. LIND: Yep, that's about it I guess. I missed the first part. I didn't know what was being talked about. So you guys took care of it. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, that was it. We discussed a lot, but we didn't make very many proposals. All right. Talk to you later.

Now we shall take a recess.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: We'll come back to order. So I guess we need to discuss if we want to align the bag limit. Sandy asked if that was part of our intent. And so we need to discuss that.

Here's my thought. I would be in support of moving the bag limit for Mulchatna caribou from three down to two on Federal land if we could get the State to move the deadline -- I mean the closing date from March 15th to March 31st. If the Alaska Department of Fish and Game would support that, then it would at good chance that the Board of Game would pass it. Because if the intent is to align the regulations for bag limit and closing dates, maybe that's what we should ask for.

Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just sort of following Robert's Rules, if the Council is going to take this up on the Mulchatna Caribou Herd, there was a motion already made and passed. If the mover of the motion agrees and the majority agrees with the mover to reconsider this motion that the Council just passed, we'll need to go through that step.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Why don't we make it a second motion. That way like I always say, it's better to have two motions in case one gets thrown out and then everything gets thrown out. So they might want to pass aligning the dates, but might not want to pass aligning the bag limit, so maybe that should be a separate proposal.

Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. When I was discussing that initial Mulchatna proposal, I think I mentioned, and I finally did find in my advisory committee notes where I had a line that somebody said, maybe we ought to reduce the bag limit from three to two. My sense is that there may be more acceptance of that reduction than an extensive reduction of the season dates.

So to get it on the table, I'd be
willing to make a motion to the effect of what you were
just saying, to support a bag limit of two, and a
season end of March 31st for Mulchatna caribou I think
would be the cleanest way.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. The
motion's been made. Do I have a second.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seconded by Nanci.

Any more comment on this proposal.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I would like to
comment.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah, I just would
like to clarify for the record, too, what you said,
that, you know, I'd like to see this done in the
interest that the State would acknowledge somewhat of a
give and take here. We're trying to take the lead to
bring things in line and make things less confusing for
all user groups. And we would like to see an extension
on State lands to March 31st of hunting season
closures. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Anybody else.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seeing none, all in
favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Motion carried.

Thomas Hedlund, are you on?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay.

MS. WILLIAMS: Is somebody on?
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Is somebody on line?

MR. DUNAWAY: Is Andy on line?

MR. ADERMAN: I'm still here. This is Andy Aderman with Togiak Refuges.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay, Andy. Good.

So you heard our proposal.

MR. ADERMAN: Yes, I did. Loud and clear.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So now is there any other game issues we want to take action or move on.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I don't see any. So we're at number 12, closure review and Council recommendation. A. Wildlife closure review briefing.

Laura Greffenius.

MS. GREFFENIUS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And members of the Council. I'll be covering this, the wildlife closure review briefing. And this starts on Page 15 in your book.

The closure review briefing and the actual policy on closures to hunting, trapping and fishing, it's in your Counsel book on Pages 15 through 19. I'm going to go through some -- summarize that, some highlights of that, and then I will cover the two closure reviews that are in your book.

Section .815 of ANILCA allows the Federal Subsistence Board to establish closures to hunting, trapping and fishing on Federal public lands and waters when necessary for the conservation of healthy populations of fish and wildlife, and to continue subsistence uses of the populations.

In 2005 the Federal Subsistence Management Program began a periodic review of all Federal wildlife closures to hunting. The reviews are to determine whether the original justifications for the closures continue to apply.

The closures were originally
established by the Board according to the following considerations. Is the wildlife population sufficient to provide for both Federally-qualified subsistence users and other users? Is the wildlife population sufficient to sustain uses by all Federally-qualified communities or just certain communities? Is the closure necessary for reasons of administration, limited funds or resources or public safety? And is the closure necessary for reasons pursuant to other applicable law.

These reviews are being conducted in accordance with guidance found in the Federal Subsistence Board’s policy, which begins on Page 16 in your book. And this policy on closures to hunting, trapping and fishing on Federal public lands and waters in Alaska, and was adopted by the Federal Board in 2007.

Mr. Chair and members of the Council. The closure policy clearly states that the Board will consider the recommendations of the Regional Advisory Councils before it takes regulatory action on these Federal closures.

And according to the policy, existing closures will be reviewed on a three-year rotational schedule. All of the closures being reviewed this cycle were originally reviewed by the Regional Advisory Councils and the Federal Board in 2006. Three years have passed and it is time once again to take a look at the closures to hunting and trapping. So today I will present to the Council two reviews on Federal closures that were originally reviewed three years ago.

Through these reviews we will summarize if the status of wildlife population has changed in three years. In other words, has it remained the same or has it grown or decreased in size. And we must also consider if the wildlife population has improved to where it can sustain the needs of subsistence users and other users.

Again, the Board would like a recommendation today, and that will be passed on to the Federal Subsistence Board, on these closure reviews that I will present to you shortly. And after each presentation, the Council will have the opportunity to recommend to either maintain the status quo and leave the closure in place or initiate a proposal to the
Federal Subsistence Board to modify or eliminate the closure, or the Council can make some other recommendation to the Board.

This concludes my presentation on the wildlife closure review and the Board’s closure policy. I'll stop and answer any questions you might have before I present the closure reviews for this region.

(No comments)

MS. GREFFENIUS: If no questions, I'll go to the first closure review. It begins on Page 20 in your Council book.

This one pertains to Unit 9C, that portion draining into the Naknek River from the south, so it’s the King Salmon neighborhood. And under current Federal regulation, that italics portion, the closure is for the winter season only.

I'm not going to go through all the specifics on this, but just touch upon some of it, just for the highlights of it.

This was originally initiated in 1992, and more recently with WP06-24. That proposal, that the Board passed, eliminated the hunting of antlerless moose during the December season. That was to discontinue the cow harvest out of concerns for the population there.

And now I'm on Page 22, if you wanted to follow along just as far as the resource population trend.

There have been management concerns based on the declining moose population and the low calf/cow ratio in the Big Creek area. Because of this, harvesting of cows is not considered sustainable in this area. And based on surveys in the park border trend area south of the Naknek River, the moose population has been declining by five percent annually since 1988. And that was as of 2006. The cause of the decline has been related to poor calf recruitment. In all the trend count areas of 9C the moose population, there's been declines in this area, raising concerns about harvesting cows. That's not sustainable in this area.
The OSM preliminary conclusion is to maintain the status quo for the closure of Federal public lands during the winter season, closure to non-Federally-qualified subsistence users.

And the reasons being, and I'll just go through the justification. In 2006 the Federal Subsistence Board adopted Proposal WP06-24, which eliminated the antlerless moose hunt in this area, thus implementing conservation measures to help increase the moose population and eventually provide improved hunting opportunity for subsistence users. Since only two years have passed since WP06-24 was adopted, it is recommended that the closure remain in effect.

The fall and winter hunters for Federal subsistence users provide opportunities to harvest moose in Unit 9C in that portion that drains into the Naknek River from the south. The status quo is necessary to continue subsistence uses according to Section .815 of ANILCA. And maintaining the closure is also consistent with sound management principles and the conservation of healthy wildlife populations while providing a preference for subsistence uses.

So this concludes my review for this closure, and I'll answer any questions if you have them before I go to the next one.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay, Laura. Thank you. It says here in your justification on 22, WP06-24 which eliminated the antlerless moose hunt in this area. So the winter season has to be antlered moose, but it doesn't say that. It says one bull. It only says antlered bulls in 9E, is that right?

MS. GREFFENIUS: We're in 9C.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: 9C, on the -- where it says one bull, September 1st to September 15th, December 15th to January 15th. It doesn't say one antlered bull. But, you know, it says antlered bulls on the bottom in 9E there.

MS. GREFFENIUS: Well, what -- excuse me.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: And also 9C and 9B and 9A, they all say one bull, except for 9E. It says one antlered bull. I'm just making a comment, because the Alaska Board of Game just passed a proposal, a regulation for moose in 9B and C, or all of 9 I believe. They changed it from one bull to one antlered bull. So the lack -- I was saying that they're aligning regulations. But what you said there would only pertain to 9E; is that right? Or am I reading it wrong?

MS. GREFFENIUS: This particular closure review is for 9C, Charlie, and only for that portion draining into the Naknek River from the south, so it's just -- it's kind of that little portion south of King Salmon on the boundary there with Katmai.

And also referring just back to, I brought a copy of it, to this WP06-24, the language that used to be in for the December hunt was that antlerless moose could be taken by Federal registration permit, and that it would be up to five antlerless moose could be taken. That was what was in the strike-through, and is no longer allowed. So it's just for the one bull.

But, you're right, it doesn't specify antlered bull, but the antlerless is what was the strike through in this proposal several years ago. So when I'm referring to antlerless, I'm kind of referring to the language that was in the strike-through that was changed by this proposal a couple years ago.

Does that help clarify?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. So, yeah, it eliminated the cow hunt. All right. I guess that.....

Who do we have on line?

MS. WILLIAMS: Did someone just come on line or did someone hang up?

MR. WOODS: This is Frank Woods out of Dillingham. I just got on line.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Great, Frank.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Any more comment.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay, Laura. I guess you can continue.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I think we need to make a recommendation to approve their recommendation or not.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Oh, were you done with your briefing on this closure?

MS. GREFFENIUS: I'm done with this closure. And then the Council -- I can either do both of them, and then you make your recommendation of what you want to do, or you can make your recommendation based on what I just presented and then go to the next one. However you prefer.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: We probably should make a recommendation on each one. So would that be all right? So anybody want to move on keeping this status quo.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I will.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Nanci so moves. Do we have a second.

MR. MYERS: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seconded by Dale.

Any question.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I'll speak to it.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Nanci wants to speak.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah. I so make that motion in the interest of conservation practices, and once again trying to promote a healthy population for the users in that area so that we can bring it back to a population base that we can use a little bit more liberally.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Any more.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seeing none, all in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Motion's carried.

Okay. Laura, the next one.

MS. GREFFENIUS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The next closure review begins on Page 24 in your book.

And this one is pertaining to portions of Unit 17A and 17C, the Nushagak Peninsula area for caribou. And Federal public lands are closed to the taking of caribou except by the residents of Togiak, Twin Hills, Manokotak, Aleknagik, Dillingham, Clark's Point, and Ekuk hunting under these regulations. And the closure dates are continuous for the fall and winter seasons.

And this hunt was established in 1994. The caribou were reintroduced to the Nushagak Peninsula in February of 1988. The reintroduction was intended to reestablish caribou in an area where they had been an important subsistence resource for area residents. And the principal objective was to establish a population large enough to sustain a reasonable harvest while still allowing the herd to grow.

So Federal public lands for this hunt when it was established were closed to the harvest of the Nushagak caribou except by the residents in those communities that I mentioned. And the closure was established to allow subsistence use of this limited wildlife resource.

As far as the current resource abundance, in January 2008 a census was conducted and estimated the caribou population at approximately 556 caribou. The management plan sets a harvest level of
not more than 10 percent when the population is between 600 and 1,000 caribou.

And the permits, the permits are allocated to eligible communities based on a formula for each community.

And so based on just those current population census information, there were no fall hunts in 2006, 2007 and 2008 due to the population remaining below 600 animals. As prescribed by the management plan, those hunts didn't take place.

There was a limited number of permits, five, that were available for the winter hunt in '06 to '07 and '07 to '08, but no harvest was reported.

OSM preliminary recommendation is to maintain a status quo for the closure of Federal public lands to non-Federally-qualified subsistence users.

And the justification for that is that while the population of the Nushagak Peninsula Caribou Herd has declined, there is close monitoring by the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge biologists and current regulations allow the refuge manager to adjust the harvest limit to allocate the number of permits available to hunters, and to close the season if necessary.

A continued closure is necessary to conserve the caribou population and to continue subsistence uses according to Section .815 in ANILCA. And the status quo is consistent with sound management principles and the conservation of healthy wildlife populations while providing a preference for subsistence uses.

MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chairman. I move.....

MS. GREFFENIUS: So that concludes my review for this closure. And I should mention Andy Aderman was very helpful in gathering the information for this. So if there's any questions, this is his area.

So thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thank you, Laura.
Dan O'Hara moves to keep the status quo.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: I'll second the motion.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seconded by Molly.

Any questions.

(No comments)

MS. MORRIS LYON: Question.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: The question's been called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Motion's carried.

Okay. We are -- number 11. Bering Sea chinook salmon bycatch update.

MR. O'HARA: How did we go from 11, 12 and then to 11 again.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: A long day.

MR. DUNAWAY: That's new math.

(Off record comments re numbering of agenda)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. I didn't even know what you were talking about. Now I see. We're backing up here. Okay.

Back to the new 11. Donald, do we have somebody to report on that.

MR. O'HARA: Did the Federal people (indiscernible, microphone not on.) Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: What's that?

MR. O'HARA: Have the Federal people
weighed in on this bycatch thing? Do they do things like that?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah.

MR. O'HARA: I guess they can do it.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Donald, do we have somebody to report to us on this issue, update.

MR. MIKE: No, I can give the Council an update. And I'll have Staff assist me with it.

At our fall meeting, the Bristol Bay Council made a resolution to maintain a hard cap of -- I'm sorry, I've got to find the numbers here. Not to exceed 38,000 fish annually. And the Federal Subsistence Board weighed in on this bycatch, and they issued a letter to the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Board's recommendation was a hard cap not to exceed 29,000 chinook salmon.

There's a difference between what the Board made their recommendations on a hard cap and the Council's recommendations on a hard cap, so we have two different hard cap comments to the National Marine Fisheries Service. But it will be up to the -- I don't know if you want to revisit your resolution and support the Board's letter or if you want to keep with your resolution.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Well, let's discuss it. Okay.

As most of you know, I went to Kodiak last April and testified on our behalf to the North Pacific Management Council, which is going to be meeting -- is meeting right now over here day after tomorrow. They're going to be taking public testimony for this bycatch issue again. And I'll be testifying on behalf of this Council on that issue again.

And there's other people here I believe from Yukon-Kuskokwim RACs that will be also testifying. In fact, there was -- when I went to Kodiak last spring, Pete Probasco and Rod Campbell were Staff, and then me and three other Yukon-Kuskokwim RAC people went over and testified on behalf of the -- for the Federal
Subsistence Board.

And when I testified last spring, our recommendation was the cap of 38,000 chinook. That's what we recommended -- that's what I recommended to the North Pacific Council last year, because 38,000 was the average from 1996 to 2001 of the bycatch. And after 2001, that's when it really shot up. So that's where that number came from.

And I think the Yukon-Kuskokwim people think that number is way too high. And now there were -- let's see. The number of 29,000 -- yeah, right there. Let me turn to that page also.

DR. WHEELER: Page 28 in your Regional Advisory Council books. That kind of gives a history of the numbers and where they came from. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. All right.

Thank you, Polly.

On Page 28 we have an update here. And -- what's that?

MS. MORRIS LYON: It says right here that's how they came up with that number, consistent with the stated goal of the U.S./Canada Yukon River agreement.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. All right.

You'll see on the bottom bulletin point, it says we will send a letter to the North Pacific Management Council with a recommendation of 29,300 so it has gone down. Note, this amount of chinook bycatch is consistent with the stated goals of the U.S./Canada Yukon River agreement signed in 2002, and mostly likely will be most beneficial to subsistence users in Western Alaska.

Well, the U.S. has an agreement with Canada to let so many chinook up in the Yukon River into Canada. But the last couple years or so only about half of the goal has been met.

So we probably need to -- I would recommend we support the smaller bycatch number of 29,300 as the 38,000 that we supported last spring.

And, Nanci, did you have?
MS. MORRIS LYON: No. (Indiscernible, microphone not on)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. I've got a newsletter here from the Bering Sea Fishermen's Association. And it talks about four alternatives that the Council is going to be considering when they take action on this to determine a number.

And, for instance, the first alternative, number 1, calls for status quo, but that in my opinion is not going to work, leaving it, doing nothing.

Alternative number 2 that they have before them deals with some sort of chinook salmon hard cap for the pollock fishery. Within this alternative a broad range of numbers available to choose from if they wish to set a chinook salmon hard cap. These hard number amounts range from a low of 29,323 up to 87,500 chinook salmon.

Alternative number 3 considers triggered area closures. This alternative would close areas that have high chinook salmon bycatch when a certain amount of bycatch is reached. Under this alternative pollock fishing would not be allowed to consider outside the closed area without further restriction.

And then alternative number 4 is known as the preliminary preferred alternative. It was created at the Council's June 2008 meeting, and is a specific set of options chosen from alternative 2, hard cap, and with an additional element that includes provisions implementing of chinook salmon bycatch incentive plans from the pollock industry. In summary this PPA would allow a hard cap of 68,392 chinook salmon if the pollock industry can present an acceptable incentive plan or plans that rewards or penalizes vessels based on their chinook salmon bycatch performance. If the industry doesn't come up with an acceptable incentive plan, then they get a hard cap of 47,591 chinooks.

Well, that doesn't sound like a good plan.

I'm kind of in supportive of alternative number 2. Alternative number 2 has a hard
cap, would give them a hard cap in the range from 29,323 up to 87,500, but I would support, you know, a hard cap of 29,323, because looking at the ADF&G -- I was on line looking at the ADF&G website for 2008 salmon season. And the last couple years the chinook harvest or the chinook return was less than forecasted by the ADF&G. In fact, the amount of harvest was 36 percent less than what they had predicted it should. And so if that was the case, we probably in my opinion should ask -- go with the lower bycatch, because I'm pretty certain that those people up in Yukon-Kuskokwim are going to be asking for none, because last year they did not get a king fishery in the Yukon River. And they had some subsistence fishery and they ended up being closed even for subsistence because they didn't have enough to even make it into Canada. So we need to come up with -- if I'm going to testify before the North Pacific Council, we need some recommendations so I can present -- so we need some discussion and also probably need to vote on what alternative to support and a number, if any. Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, I missed the fall meeting, but I was very glad to see that you guys had put forth an effort on this. And I would definitely like to weigh as saying that right now my mind is totally headed towards alternative 2 and 100 percent towards a lower limit than what was decided acceptable in the fall by the Board.

My justification mirrors yours and includes the fact that we have so many rivers and -- I think it would be nice if we had the ability, and I don't know if we have the ability to do it in time for you, Randy, to give you some armor to go in there with, but I would like to see the number of streams in the Bristol Bay area, both from the State side and the Federal side with escapement goals that are way below 30,000 fish. I know for the Naknek alone it's only 5,000 fish. And with that realization, the number of streams that could be literally wiped out in one set for these fisheries is brutal to think about. And I wish we could have a number of streams for you to go in there with. But I think that I'm going to be hard pressed to be swayed from anything other than the lowest possible number for us to be supporting, for the reasons you mentioned as well as that reason also.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thank you, Nanci.

I know when I was looking online, the only forecast numbers they had was for the Nushagak, and I couldn't find any for Naknek and Egegik or Ugashik for what they have predicted for a return. But those might be out there, but I don't know.

Dan, did you have something.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Thank you. Yeah, I don't think they have enough data to do a forecast on anything but the Nushagak. And the Nushagak I believe is forecast for a run of 145,000. It's considerably down from recent years.

I've heard it roundabout, I've never seen the data, but supposedly some king salmon tagged up off of Kuskokwim Bay, showed up down around the Nushagak.

So if some of these trawlers are taking kings out there, it may be affecting Bristol Bay as well as the Yukon. And I've had a lot of personal experience with the Nushagak King Salmon Management Plan for the inshore waters between commercial, subsistence and sport. And I like to say that that plan was forged in fire, and any little threat to make it go tilt and puts a lot of the users against each other. And if there's a removal out at the Bering Sea, it throws us all in an unpleasant situation. So if there's any potential that that Bering Sea fishery is affecting runs to the Bristol Bay.....

And I don't think there's any genetic data. I think we were wishing for that at the advisory committee meeting. But maybe this will be one way to spur them on to collect it.

I could, like the rest of you, support the 29,000 hard cap, and I don't want to see any flex to 80,000. That's unacceptable to me.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan.
MR. O'HARA: Yeah. No, this sliding scale thing is not good. We'll take hard lower numbers.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. At our last borough meeting we discussed this bycatch, and our mayor brought up a good suggestion, that I suggest to the Council, North Pacific Council, that maybe there's some way where they can enhance the chinooks returning into the Yukon, Kuskokwim, Bristol Bay where the impact they're making wouldn't be so big. But I don't know how they would do it.

You know, I know that this fishery, this pollock fishery is big money according to our information from our manager, that the CDQ groups in the Bering Sea, maybe DEC is one of them and the other one's up the Yukon, and all up the Norton Sound, only get 10 percent of the allocation. The other 90 percent goes to Seattle or Oregon or wherever. So I know how much money the CDQ groups receive. And if that's only 10 percent, they have an awful lot of money available where, you know, if they wanted to try some enhancement, maybe that's something that they should consider. I don't know what kind of program or even if they could do it, but I was going to suggest that to them. But I'll ask you guys first if that's a good idea.

Dan.

MR. O'HARA: What did -- well, did you guys send a letter of support on a lower number from your borough?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yes, we did. It was the 29,000 number.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Our borough sent I think it was 36,000.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: In fact, it was. It was 30,000 I think. Yeah. But that's what the Lake and Pen Borough Assembly voted on was I think 30,000.

Anyway, so I was thinking, you know, asked to convey that to the North Pacific Council of, you know, do an enhancement if one could be done. But I don't know how. The least they should do is consider it.
Anybody else have any comment.

MR. DUNAWAY: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Do you think by enhancement your mayor meant like hatcheries or something up in the Yukon? And the first question I come to right away is we seem to be succeeding in convincing the public to buy -- that buys commercial fish that they want wild fish, and I don't know if the enhancement would compromise that marketing issue or not. That's just kind of a side comment.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, I don't know. You're right. I guess hatchery fish is not as valuable as fully wild I guess, because if you look at some of the areas where they do fish for -- Cordova, for instance, their first run is wild fish, and then I think the hatchery sockeyes come in later. Isn't that right? And I don't think they're worth as much for that reason. So maybe that wouldn't be a good idea. But I might be wrong.

Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, I think just being able to say they're wild.

The other thing though is I seem to remember glancing at a paper just this spring. There is some concern that when you start -- and look at the Columbia River. When you start putting hatcheries on and diluting your wild stocks with hatchery-based stocks, that sometimes there's a question of the viability of all the stocks, that hatchery fish tend to evolve to work well in hatcheries. And there's some folks that are concerned -- I might look to whether Dan's reading these papers or George or Polly, but concerns whether your strength and your vitality of your wild stocks get compromised. So another concern.

I know personally we're -- oh, stuff I used to be involved in, we're pretty proud to keep with wild stock fisheries management for your sports species in Bristol Bay.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: So it might not be a good idea then. All right.

Dan.

MR. O'HARA: I have a question on the agenda. Will we here tomorrow again probably?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I think so, right? I was supposed to meet with some the other RAC representatives, and we were supposed to.....

MR. O'HARA: My question was, are we going to get done tonight.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: What do we have left?

MR. O'HARA: The reason I'm asking, I've got to -- I unfortunately have to go do a service here, and I'll leave my stuff here if we're going to come back. Oh, I can come back in here anyway.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, we probably won't get done. We've got to listen to all the reports.

DR. WHEELER: I can go really fast.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay.

MR. O'HARA: Anyway, one of you guys call me on the cell.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. I will. Okay. We've just got the reports to do.

MR. O'HARA: Well, we're going to be hard core on (indiscernible, away from microphone), right?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I would support it. Let's -- somebody's got to move.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Make your motion,

Dan.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah, I would go with the
29 that the Board went with. (Indiscernible, away from microphone)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: No, that's unreasonable. That's way too high.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I would second that to change our proposal to that, or our.....

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Our recommendation?

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes.

MR. O'HARA: I don't think that (indiscernible, away from microphone). We'll vote again. What was it, 29,000?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: 320-some. All right. A motion made by Dan O'Hara.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seconded by Nanci to recommend to the North Pacific Council 29,323.

Any more discussion. Polly.

DR. WHEELER: Just to clarify, Mr. Chair. The Board actually did send a letter to the Council with a hard cap amount of 29.3, so it wasn't a sliding scale. It was a hard cap.

And just to also let you know, I appreciate you supporting Randy to attend this meeting, but also we're sending representatives from the Eastern Interior, Western Interior, Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Council, and also the Seward Peninsula Council. And the Federal Board Chair is prepared to testify at Friday's meeting as well. So they'll get a consistent message from the Federal Subsistence Management Program.

Mr. Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Thank you, Polly.

So any more question. Donald.

MR. MIKE: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Thank you.
Just looking at the agenda, I talked with the Chair, and I thought we could get done with the agenda in one day. So if we can have a break for dinner and come back at seven maybe and work for a couple hours, but it's up to the Council.

The other option we can do is I can extend the contract for this room and we can meet tomorrow. I have the Council discuss those options.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Let's finish this first.

MR. O'HARA: Call the question.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: The question's been called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Motion carried. All right, Dan.

And let's see, I was going to mention something.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I would propose that we dig into the reports and see how long they take, if you want to hear my two cents. Because I'd just as soon be done and not have to come back.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Now I remember what I was going to say. So I guess on that 29,323, I guess I'll have to -- I'll report that we support alternative number 2.

MS. MORRIS LYON: That's the hard cap.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: So we probably should have had that in the motion. We'll have a hard cap between -- in alternative number 2 here is a range from 29,323 up to 87.5. Okay.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Now we should move on to -- Polly.

DR. WHEELER: Just a recommendation, Mr. Chair. You may just want to clarify that you support option 2, but not the range. You support the lower hard cap number.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yes.

DR. WHEELER: So it's sort of a modification of option 2. Just to clarify, because they'll be getting a lot of testimony. You want to be as clear as you can.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Maybe I better not mention option 2 then. I won't even. I'll just go with the hard cap. All right.

And we are on fisheries resource monitoring. Back to 12 again.

(Laughter)

MR. DUNAWAY: The IRS doesn't let me count like that.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Polly.

DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I can make a brief report on the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. We will actually -- the review -- I'm sorry, the request for proposals went out in November, and in response to that request for proposals, we received 68 proposals dealing with fisheries issues across the State.

The Technical Review Committee met several weeks ago and recommended forwarding about 43 of those proposals. Or I think about 43 of those proposals. My numbers may be a slight bit off. And those investigators were just notified this week that they need to develop investigation plans. Those will be reviewed by OSM staff and the Technical Review Committee this next summer.

At your fall meeting, you will have a full discussion of the investigation plans, the projects that are up for consideration in your region, both the projects that have been recommended for
funding and the projects that have been recommended not
for funding.

And for Dale's benefit, since you're
new to the Council, the Fisheries Monitoring Program,
the mandate of that program is to provide -- is to fund
projects that provide information for Federal
subsistence fisheries management. And we fund projects
across the State. We fund projects that are kind of
your standard weir projects, telemetry projects, but
also projects that collect and analyze traditional
knowledge, and harvest monitoring, harvest assessments.
So it's a wide range of projects.

So we'll have copies of the
investigation plans, copies of the recommendations for
funding or not at the fall meeting, and we'll be
prepared to talk to you in detail about those projects.

But just to give you a head's up, we
had a good response to the request for proposals, and
we're moving forward, so it should be exciting coming
up in the fall.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thank you. We don't
need to take action on that?

DR. WHEELER: No, sir. That was just
an informational item. You'll be needing to take
action in the fall, so come prepared to talk about
projects.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Good. Now
we're on 13. Agency reports. BLM.

MR. SHARP: Yeah. Mr. Chairman. Dan
Sharp with BLM. I'll be very brief.

A couple of things. Generally Jeff
Beyersdorf would be here to present the BLM report.
Currently he is being a diligent Federal employee and
flying aerial surveys in Unit 21. Of note, with
respect to that particular survey initiative, it's with
the Innoko and Department of Fish and Game Staff.

And they're doing something a little
different this year in which they have the airplane and
the capability, but they are taking locals up along on
the surveys. One, to give them a sense of what it is
the management Staff is seeing. And again I guess to
try to buy some credibility for the survey program.

The other issue I guess I'll bring
forth is the timber policy that I presented at the last
RAC meeting with respect to BLM and subsistence timber
harvesting. Right now that's still in a draft status.
What is has run up into is the free use timber policy,
or Free Use Timber Act of 1898 which mandates that
permits must be issued. But what BLM is trying to do
is allow Federally-qualified subsistence users to
harvest up to 15 cords of firewood in acceptable
without a permit. We're trying to work through that to
allow that to happen, but again these ancient rules,
much like the mining laws of 1872 seem to still hold
sway. But we're still working on that and trying to
have a credible subsistence policy. Again that was at
the behest of the Western Interior RAC where they
wanted their subsistence use of timber and forest
products recognized under ANILCA and not under standard
BLM laws.

I guess as a side note, too, with the
chinook bycatch, I've been tracking the issue upstairs
a little bit. I was attending the meetings yesterday,
just to give you some information. They do have a lot
of science behind it. They do have all of the State's
genetic information plugged into their analysis.
They've actually compared that to the past scale
pattern analysis. They've thrown a lot of fairly high-
powered science at trying to figure out by stock of
origin what they're impacting. They're giving it a
very hard look.

I guess the word that I've picked up
is, as you said in that Yukon newsletter, the were four
alternatives, the first being that the industry had to
come up with a credible savings plan. I believe they
have put one on the table. I was trying to find one,
at least a hard copy of it, but I believe that's being
given serious consideration. And it has, just from the
conversation in the hallway, a number of formulas
attached to it with respect to I guess promoting clean
fishing and such, but the details I couldn't even begin
to explain.

But again I know the industry is
putting forth their own proposal and that will probably
get a consideration.
Taking off my BLM hat, I guess having had observer experience and knowing how that program is running, at least from conversation I understood that bycatch so far this year is up. It had been a downward trend from '07, you know, and so folks were thinking '08, it went down. They were hoping it was going down. I think just the initial fishery, they were getting some fairly high rates that if it continued would be another high catch.

One of the problems with all of the initiatives being put forth is that these savings initiatives wouldn't be implemented until 2011. I guess perhaps a recommendation would be to maybe ask them to try to do something in 2010 if they have a plan on the table. Again, just as a thought to sort of spur things along. Regardless of the plan they come up with, if there's a savings, and the industry has come forward with it, I guess I might recommend that your testimony include they speed that up. But that's my own two cents worth.

That's all I have. If there are questions.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: That sounds like a good idea. I forgot about that part, because last spring after I testified and left, and then I heard that they what they were planning on doing wasn't going to take effect for three years, because it has to be written up and go through the book, and then by the time it comes out in regulation, it takes that long.

So you're right, I need to urge them to do something right away.

Do you know what -- you said the bycatch was up from last year. Last year I know in I think -- wasn't it the start of '08, the first season, it had dropped. Because from what I understand, they were fishing farther west over towards Russia, so they were bycatching less chinooks out there. From what I seen, from information I gathered before going to the meeting, is most of the bycatch when it went up, they were fishing just outside the three-mile State boundaries out of, you know -- I don't know, maybe 100 or 200 miles, but that's where most of it went up. And then I guess they quit -- from what I understand, they couldn't catch their allocations, so they were going farther and farther out, and I guess when they're going
farther and farther out, they were catching less
bycatch.

Is that correct, what I'm saying there?

Dan.

MR. SHARP: I guess I can't speak to
the specifics of how last year's fishery was conducted.
I agree that they were moving further west and stuff.
They're going to go where the fish are. They're not
going to work hard to -- you know, that's their target
species I guess. And what was telling was in addition
to Western Alaska and Bristol Bay stocks, there were
Oregon stocks, Washington stocks, Russian stocks. It's
not, you know, the closest river, it's up and down the
west coast, and again Russian stocks also. So many
fish are impacted.

And they had some fairly telling maps
as to where the hot spots were based on by vessel and
such. If you can catch that presentation, I think
they'll show it another. Diane Stram who gave the same
talk to all the RACs, it's been enhanced a little bit
there as to additional information.

But the folks upstairs know exactly
what number of chinook have been caught thus far to
date. You know, there's a lot of people in this
building right now that probably, you know, know what
their boats are doing out in the Bering Sea. And I
suspect, you know, the word I got on numbers being up
was strictly hallway talk, you know. But that's just a
head's up.

And again I think that particular
industry knows they've been put on notice, and they
know that they have to respond in some fashion. And
they're going to try to carve the best deal for them,
and I think you guys have to try to carve the best deal
for your own stakeholders.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah. I would just
make one quick comment, Randy, that as a Council
member, you would have my support, and also assuring
that they would implement this as quickly as possible,
and not wait for the normal timeline that they need,
but fast track this thing in any way possible, because
it's adding up year by year.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. I guess we

DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. I do have some talking points on the MOU. I know it's been a controversial issue for some people, and so I'm prepared to make a few comments on that. But I assure you they're short. And I'm prepared to answer questions if you have any.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay.

DR. WHEELER: Thank you. And again for the record, Polly Wheeler.

The memorandum of understanding can be found on Pages 30 to 36 in your Council books.

As of December 2008, the MOU was signed by all parties, which included the Chairs of the Alaska Board of Fisheries and the Alaska Board of Game, the Commissioner of ADF&G, as well as the Chair of the Federal Subsistence Board and its members, consisting of the Alaska Regional and State Directors of the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Park Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the USDA Forest Service.

The purpose of the MOU is defined fairly early on in the document. It is, quote, to provide a foundation and direction for coordinated interagency fish and wildlife management affecting subsistence uses on Federal public lands. And the purpose of this MOU is to occur while allowing the Federal and State agencies to continue to act in accordance with their respective statutory authorities.

The MOU helps to address the necessity of having some degree of communication and coordination between State and Federal governments in order to aid in effective management of fish and wildlife resources in Alaska. In fact, several sections of Title VIII expressly require the Secretaries to communicate and/or consult with State representatives on certain issues relating to subsistence uses by rural Alaskans. And these can be found in the Alaska National Interest Conservation Act, Section .802, .806, .810, .812 and .816.

The body of the MOU contains several
references to State law, which was, I would note, some concern to some observers, and it prompted some people to express concern that in signing the MOU, the Board undermined its obligation under Title VIII to provide for a subsistence priority for rural Alaskans on Federal public lands.

However, the Board’s authority, charge and obligation to rural residents comes only from Title VIII and any other applicable Federal statutes. The MOU will not and cannot change that. Board members are well aware that they have no authority to undermine or ignore the legal obligations imposed upon them by ANILCA.

And all signatories agree to several things. Number 1, no memorandum of understanding can change Federal law or impose State legal requirements on a Federal decision-making body. And, 2, none of the parties to the MOU intend or desire for it to have any impact on the decision-making authority of the Federal Subsistence Board or its obligations to rural residents.

Board members and State representatives did agree that once the MOU was signed and an initial trial period had passed, the signatories will engage in another review process, the goal of which will be to update and edit the document to address any concerns, ambiguities or problems that may arise, including any language which may be potentially subject to misinterpretation.

So that’s all I have to say about that, but I’m happy to answer any questions or address any concerns that you might have.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Any concerns or questions for Polly.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seeing none, we are -- the two-year cycle projected regulatory schedule.

Polly.

DR. WHEELER: Okay. Page 37 in your books has a diagram which basically points to the two-year cycle that the Office of Subsistence Management is going to be operating under. As you may remember, due
to budget issues, budget -- you know, you've heard the
song all along on budgets. We haven't gotten an
increase, so functionally it's kind of gone downhill,
because of -- in absorbing the cost of living and
everything else. So in order to address some what
really amount to budget cuts to our program, we decided
to go to an every other year cycle, so that one year
we're dealing with wildlife proposals, the next year
we're dealing with fisheries proposals. And this
diagram kind of outlines how we'll move through those
regulatory cycles.

I will say that we are going to revisit
this whole idea of doing an every other year cycle
soon, because I'm telling you, the work hasn't
decreased. I mean, we've received 25 wildlife special
actions. You know, the idea was we'd do a wildlife
proposal every other year, and in the interim, you
know, we'd -- and those regulations would be in effect
for two years, but if something came up, an emergency
arose, we could do a special action. Well, we're
getting a lot of special actions. We've gotten like I
said 25 wildlife special actions, we've gotten a couple
-- so far only a few, well, I think four fish special
actions. But needless to say, I mean, if the idea is
to kind of reduce or, I don't know, to kind of deal
with things more efficiently, a reasonable person could
say, is dealing with -- are we really dealing with it
more efficiently? Maybe we would be more effective to
go back to an every year cycle. So I would say the
jury's still out on whether this has saved us anything.

So I'm just putting that out there.

There's been nothing formal. I think we're just going
to look at it. I mean, you have to let a cycle play
out to see if you're really saving anything, but I
would be in favor of looking at it sooner rather than
later in terms of seeing how efficiencies have been
achieved.

The other thing is the Regional
Advisory Councils are meeting twice a year, so that's
not changing.

I'm getting the feeling there's some
activity going on behind me. Is there some -- okay.
We've got some public that are coming in. I don't want
to distract from more important issues here.

But anyway, if you have any questions
about the regulatory cycle, we're trying to keep everybody apprised. Like I said, the wildlife cycle, the regulations will be good for two years. The same with the fisheries regulations, which start effective today.

Yeah, Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Well, I would just say, Polly, that as a Council member, I remember when this decision was made kind of -- it was just informing us that that's what it was going to be without any input from us, and I didn't have any big objections to it. Only I said exactly pretty much what you're saying now. If it appears, however, that this is not going to work, we should be ready to revert to what will work and what will become necessary. And so I guess that I would just urge the administrative parties that be that they should maybe revisit.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Molly.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Thank you, Chair.

Polly, could you explain the special action, what that is? Is that because of overload or just -- explain it to me, please.

DR. WHEELER: I can certainly try. We have the regulations, the wildlife regulations are effective for two years. Fisheries regulations are effective for two years as well. If a situation arises where there's an extenuating circumstance, then people can submit a proposal. You know, if there's changes in the resource abundance, if there's some administrative issue that comes up, if there's an extenuating circumstance that arises, then a proposal can be submitted. It can go on the fast track.

We have temporary special actions and emergency special actions. Emergency special actions are good for the regulatory -- I always get.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For less than 60 days.

DR. WHEELER: For less than 60 days, and temporary special actions are more than 60 days.
For temporary special actions, we have to have a public hearing. But all that's bureaucracy for saying that we have a mechanism for dealing with issues as they pop up. So if there regulations that are in effect for two years aren't working for people, people can say, well, hey, I want to submit this to see if I can change it or get it fixed. Get a short-term fix.

I will say that sometimes bureaucracies being what they are, it's maybe not as responsive as it could be. We go through a lot of layers of review. We're a multi-agency program. We do the Staff work internally and then it goes out for review. So I think there's been some times this winter where I would think -- I think that our program hasn't been as responsive as it could or should be. I'd like to see that change.

But it's supposed to help people deal with circumstances that pop up that aren't addressed in the regulatory -- through the regulations.

Does that help you, Molly?

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Yeah. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thank you, Polly.

Any other comment for Polly on the two-year cycle.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Seeing none, Polly, we're going to take some public testimony. We have some folks here from the Yukon-Kuskokwim. They want to testify on the bycatch issue.

When you gentlemen come up here, would your state your name and who you.....

MR. WALTERS: Would you like to have some copies?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Sure.

MR. WALTERS: Yeah. My name is Alexie Walters, Sr.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: And who you represent or are from?
MR. WALTERS: Mountain Village City.
The City of Mountain Village sent me over this way.

Before I came, I'll clarify that we had a joint meeting with the tribe, city and the corporation, since this is a very important issue.

My name is Alexie Walters, Sr. I was born and raised in Mountain Village, Alaska on the lower Yukon River. I have hunted and fished all my life, and that has been my livelihood. I am 69 years old.

Today I stand before you to testify against the Alaskan pollock fishery and the amount of damage I and many of us believe the fishery has been doing to our way of life.

We have heard and know that the pollock fishery is a multi-billion dollar industry, which is a lot of revenue for many, many people, including the State.

What I want to know is how do you weigh these benefits when they have such a big impact on Alaska Native families, who have relied on the salmon. This fishery is hurting. And we know that industry is having an effect on our salmon based on the amount of bycatch in recent years. How can it not.

Mr. Chairman. Questions have been asked to many of us, such as, how important is chinook salmon to you, your family and community? For many, many of us who live along the river, it everything. The anticipation of salmon returning in itself is something all of our families look forward to. Every one.

Mr. Chairman. We as people have no control over other factors that have been reducing our salmon. Global warming, predation by other species of animals, perhaps natural changes or extreme conditions at their spawning grounds. This is one factor that we can control now, and that is bycatch.

Although there are many who would rather see a moratorium placed on the pollock fishery, but if that cannot be done, a hard cap on bycatch is definitely in order.
Mr. Chairman. Our community of Mountain Village has asked for such a moratorium or hard cap by way of resolution, Resolution Number 09-03, which you may have seen. If a moratorium on pollock fishery cannot be done, we would like to ask that a hard cap on bycatch be set at 29,300.

Also, this is for -- I just thought about this, too earlier. You know, Mountain Village is located at the lower Yukon River towards the mouth, about 84 miles from the mouth of the river.

Before we used to get -- our fishery, the fishermen there, the most restricted to me by everything, due to the Canadians. Now we're getting a problem from the pollock fisheries. And we're right smack in the middle of it. I'd sure hate to see our families do without what they've been living, eating all their lives.

Our grandkids are not only in Mountain, it's all the way up the river, north, west, east. We're not the only ones hurting. Other problems are out there besides fish, too, you know.

So something is happening and we would like to see this resolved in a sensible matter somehow. Come up with a solution. If that don't work, have an alternate solution. I mean, it's got to fit some place.

This is the first time in the history of subsistence I was told not to use my king gear. I not only could not use it, it goes in my table, and I got restricted. We're following what other people want us to do to try and get more salmon to return to our rivers, and we abide by that. We try to follow whatever restrictions or rules they set up in our area. We do our best to abide by them. Because they weren't placed there just to let us read or look at them. They're there for a reason.

I believe that this problem we're facing could be solved. Somebody's got to sacrifice something somewhere. That I know. Things are just out of hand right now.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Walters. Yeah, I know....
MR. WALTERS: Yes. Thank you for having me.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. I'm going to be testifying, too, before the North Pacific Council on Friday.

And we just passed our -- we took up the bycatch a little earlier, about probably 15, 20 minutes ago. But we also support the cap of 29,300 chinooks. You know, we -- the hard cap. So it's -- you know, it affects us also, but not as much as it does you guys. And we know that they need to do something. And if the North Pacific Council doesn't, you know, there's other alternatives that can be done. So we want to thank you. Is there.....

MR. WALTERS: Well, you know, subsistence overrides everything to me. It's priority. That's been that way all my life. So if they can't see it from their side, I don't know.

Thank you for having me.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yep. Does some of the other guys back there want to come up and testify. State your name and.....

MR. BLANKET: Mr. Chairman. My name is David Blanket. I'm representing Azachorak, Incorporated, the village corporation.

Thanks for the opportunity to testify on salmon bycatch reduction or closure in the Bering Sea pollock fishery. My name is David Blanket, born a subsistence user and commercial fisherman since 1967. The return of chinook salmon plays a major role in our way of life and economy throughout western Alaska. I've seen a boom of chinook salmon to today of no commercial openings and restrictions on subsistence. Failure of management crosses my mind and over-harvest of the species.

Protection of the life cycle of the chinook salmon has to reach out into the Bering Sea in order to help rebuild salmon stocks.

Over the years we fishermen and fisherwomen on the river system have abided all restrictions in hope of rebuilding the salmon stocks,
and yet they are still declining. Should pollock fisheries do the same, I say shut down the Bering Sea side of pollock fisheries to avoid bycatch of chinook salmon until salmon stocks have rebounded. Then you can install hard caps.

I would like to comment on the five-year moose moratorium that happened below Mountain Village, Unit 18. Management and people working together made it a success. Now there is enough moose for future generations. I believe salmon rebuilding can be achieved by doing similar actions by management and people working together to ensure the survival of our fishing activities.

On behalf of future commercial and subsistence users, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, that's a good testimony, Mr. Blanket. I was at the Board of Game meeting when they took that up, and because of your moratorium on your moose, now you have enough moose to have a season. So, you know, it's a good example of maybe what could be done.

MR. BLANKET: Because right now there -- there was hardly any moose, but now we've got over 3,000 moose running around like rabbits.

MR. DUNAWAY: Send some our way.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. Yeah. Thank you for your testimony.

Do we have another gentleman back there that wants to testify.

MR. WILDE: I've got no papers.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: That's all right.

Me either.

MR. WILDE: Yeah. Mr. Chairman. My name is Harry Wilde. I'm a member of Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Subsistence Council.

We've been wondering how come these Subsistence Regional Councils never meet together and talk about fisheries. Right now Yukon is really hard time, and we don't have no support. Like in the Yukon
River last summer we had to barely go catching few for subsistence. They kind of dried away. And we used six-inch mesh and we catching fish all right, but in the Yukon what we try to same some fish for upriver. That's where they spawn. And we have to set aside and try to make sure this king salmon go up there.

And sometime I always wondering, is the only people out in the -- or fishermen out in the ocean catching a lot of our king salmon. How about these fishermen or subsistence fishermen and also commercial fishermen right along the beach of Bering Sea. We never heard of them. But we heard of them, they're catching king salmon in the areas.

Like one of the boys, elder like me, I'm 79, upriver in upper Yukon River, she told me, Harry, I never even have a taste of king salmon for three years. Three years. Well, I think we're subsistence fishermen, and we need to get together from Bristol Bay up, because some people up there, up north, Unalakleet and in that area, we need to get together and do something. There must be a way to save some of this fish that goes up to Canada and, you know, where the spawning streams are, where they spawn.

Like this year -- last year, 2008, they didn't even -- about maybe 85 percent didn't make it there, U.S./Canada negotiation. U.S./Canada negotiation item, that one that first signed Regional Advisory Council for quite a while. And I've been with the U.S. Subsistence Regional Advisory Council for quite a while. And I've been with State, work with them for quite a while. They're doing the best as they can I think. Like when I used to have advisor in State, we do very good, because we work hard, really hard. So I think it would be good.

We don't know how much CDQ catch king salmon out in mouth of Kuskokwim, and mostly catching quite a few of them. We sure would like to see some time that how much they catch and all that.

Thank you.

MR. WILDE: Recommendation?
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yes.

MR. WILDE: For what?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: For bycatch?

MR. WILDE: Bycatch is what I recommend, they've got to reduce the catch. They have to.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. I know that. I mean they realize that. But what kind of number?

MR. WILDE: 29,000. Mine is 29,300 and something.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: That's ours also, you know. You know, I went to Kodiak last spring, and I testified to the North Pacific Council on bycatch then, and then we recommended 38,000 back then, but since then we have -- now we came up with that 29,000 also, because 38,000 I think is still too much, you know.

MR. WILDE: Yeah. I think that the reason I'm -- I'm kind of with subsistence fishermen in the lower Yukon and because I'm with the corporation, we try to do as we can to try to -- if there are too much, maybe they wouldn't accept it or whatever. So we just put that 29,300, somewhere in there.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Mr. Wilde, thank you.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Mr. Chair. I just want to thank these three men for coming and talking to us. I had a little experience at least being in meetings that Harry ran when I was working with the Kuskokwim fisheries. It's good to see you again, Harry. And thanks for bringing your concerns to us. And again I want to emphasize we share your concerns. And I'm from Dillingham. Dillingham area is sending a guy name Kenny Wilson to this North Pacific Fisheries meeting for this very concern as well.

So I like your idea of possibly getting together with the other RACs at some time if we have shared concerns.
So again, just good to see you, and thank you for coming to talk to us.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Polly, I guess we're back to you again on tracking of handicrafts made with brown bear claws. Just a second.

Donald, did you say we had something at six, or that can wait, or how long should we go.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. We can go until we're done or take a break for dinner. But I realize you had a premeeting with our Staff prior to this North Pacific Council meeting tomorrow I believe.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Well, if that's -- I would just rather get it over with.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Me, too.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: So we might be here another half hour, maybe an hour, but I don't think any longer than that.

All right. Polly.

DR. WHEELER: I'm warned. So I'll make it short and sweet, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

On Page 38 in your Council books you'll see a briefing on the tracking of handicrafts made with brown bear claws. You may remember that this issue has been before off and on for the past few years.

Last year there was a proposal submitted by the State of Alaska to refine Federal regulations. The State was concerned that existing Federal regulations allowed for unconstrained commercial sale of handicrafts made from brown bear parts and created a market incentive for poaching.

The Board heard a fair amount of testimony on this. The Councils weighed in. The Commissioner of Fish an Game was at the meeting. He offered that -- he suggested that one option would be for the Federal Board to defer the proposal and have a work group that would address this issue of tracking of bear claws, and, you know, do we need to track these claws. These claws are taken by subsis -- the bears
are taken for subsistence, the claws are made into handicrafts. So the idea was the work group would discuss this issue and if there was a way to track these claws in — almost slipped up there — track these claws in a non-burdensome way to the subsistence user.

So there were State and Federal Staff that got together in January to kind of explore this notion, look at the idea of a work group. They came up with a charge for the work group. And then the idea would be that the work group would meet one or two times this spring or summer to address this issue.

There still is concern on the part of some of the Councils that it's really not an issue, but that could be addressed in the context of the work group, too.

So what we're asking each of the Councils is let them know where we're standing with that, because, again, the Federal Board deferred that proposal, saying, okay, we'll go with your idea of a work group. The Board was pretty insistent that Regional Advisory Council members needed to be part of this work group, so we're talking to each of the Councils and ask if you all want to participate — if you want to participate in these work group meetings.

I'll tell you up front, I don't know what it means as far as participation. I don't know if we're going to fly a representative from the Council in, if we're going to be able to do it by teleconference. So it may be a meeting or two. It may be in person, it may be by phone.

We've had kind of mixed interest on the part of the Regional Advisory Councils. Some have been very interested and some that have been kind of tracking this issue all along, no pun intended, tracking the claws, tracking the issue. But we are looking to see if you are interested, if you want to have a representative participate in these meetings.

We'll keep you up to date as far as what's happening with this, but that's all I have for you. It's a question for you, if you're interested in participating, and if so, who do you want to designate as a participant.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: When.

DR. WHEELER: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: When. What date.

DR. WHEELER: We don't have a date.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Next year?

DR. WHEELER: No, it will likely be this spring or this summer. I mean, the Federal Board deferred on the proposal with the understanding that some work would happen on the work group, and then they would take the proposal up probably January 2010 actually, because that's the wildlife cycle. So they'll probably be taking up that issue again.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Molly looks interested, so.....

DR. WHEELER: She's looking pretty excited over there.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I designate her.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: No, I was -- I didn't raise my hand to be interested. My recommendation was going to be not to -- I don't know who the coordinators are, but just make sure that the coordinators are going to be somebody that's working on these and not let it drag like the other working group that were assigned.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, I think that would be a good -- Molly is a good choice. But anyway I don't see a problem. Is there, has there been a problem with bear handicrafts since it's been initiated?

DR. WHEELER: This issue comes up every time there's a proposal before the Federal Subsistence Board, and there seems to be -- all I can say is that there's a difference of opinion. There are some people that think there is a problem, and there's others that think there isn't a problem. And there are some that say, well, if we had some mechanism to track legally harvested claws in handicrafts, then it would protect legal users. There's some concern that there's a big market out there for bear claws.
But I appreciate your question, because this is the crux of the issue right there. Is it an issue. And some people think it is and some people think it isn't. And I would say most of the Councils that I've spoken to or that I've been involved with on this issue don't really believe it's much of an issue.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Neither do I. Okay. I guess then we'll move on. So if.....

DR. WHEELER: Just to clarify, so you're interested in being kept informed. Is Molly your representative?

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah, Molly's a good representative. But have Donald contact her. And if you can't find anybody, then I guess we won't have anybody.

DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Just real quick. Thanks. I'd like to stay informed and appreciate it if Molly will do it. Somebody called me about this issue quite some time ago, and I was kind of flattered that they called me. I wasn't entirely sure why, but.....

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: They were trying to sell you claws.

(Laughter)

MR. DUNAWAY: No, they were just asking my opinion. But anyway, what i got a sense of was that the working group was working, trying to come up with a solution.

And I'm kind of with Randy. I worried about it at one time, but I think it's time to move on and move forward.

Thanks. I hope they make fast progress.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Polly, I guess we're down to the Chistochina court case summary.

DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. By
the time I'm done, you will have had more than enough
of me, I'm sure.

The Chistochina court case, a summary
of that can be found -- or a summary from our attorneys
can be found on Page 39 in your Regional Advisory
Council -- actually it's 39 to 43 in your Council book.

And just to give you a little bit of
background, you've all dealt with, or most of you
anyway, have dealt with customary and traditional use
determinations as a Council. A summary of the Ninth
Circuit Court of Appeals decision on the most recent
case having to do with customary and traditional use
determinations is called the Chistochina case. A
summary of that case can be found on Pages 39 to 43 in
your Council book.

Just to give you a little bit of
background, in 2004 a village in Interior Alaska
submitted a proposal requesting a customary and
traditional use determination for moose throughout an
entire unit, which was Unit 12. Both the Southcentral
and Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Councils
recommended that customary and traditional uses of
moose throughout Unit 12 be recognized as was the
request in the proposal.

Fish and Game did express reservations
about this request. At its meeting, the Federal Board
supported the recommendation from the Councils and
recognized -- the community was Chistochina, just so
you know, recognized Chistochina's customary and
traditional use of moose throughout Unit 12. The State
of Alaska filed a lawsuit in U.S. District Court, it's
a Federal decision so it has to be filed in Federal
Court, challenging the Board's decision. The State
alleged that this decision was made without substantial
evidence, was inconsistent with ANILCA and would cause
unnecessary restrictions on non-subsistence uses,
which, of course, is not allowed under ANILCA.

In 2007 the U.S. District Court found
in favor of the Federal Subsistence Board decision.
The State appealed that District Court's decision to
the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. And last fall, in
September of 2008, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
validated and vindicated the Federal Subsistence
Board's decision on Chistochina's customary and
traditional use of moose in Unit 12.

There's been a lot of talk about what this means in terms of how the Federal Board will deal with customary and traditional use decisions. There's been some interpretation saying it really changes how the Federal Board will have to make customary and traditional use determinations. But the bottom line is, the Federal Subsistence Board's process was upheld through the court decision and then its subsequent appeal. And so the court basically found that the process that the Federal Board used to make the customary and traditional use determination, and that is using the eight factors not as a checklist, but as a holistic approach, kind of understanding this pattern of use in a particular area, and validated that.

So you're not going to see a lot of changes. I can't promise you that C&T, customary and traditional use determinations won't be any less agonizing, because they do tend to be some of the more difficult kind of -- but there's -- it's maybe a little less black and white than some other issues that are before the Board. But I know it's frustrating. You know, some people say, well, we need benchmarks, we need thresholds.

But, you know, ANILCA was passed to protect and continue subsistence uses and sometimes benchmarks and thresholds don't really figure in there. And the court actually made some specific findings with regard to benchmarks and thresholds.

But the bottom line is that it supported the Federal Board's approach to making these determinations.

So that's just a point of information, Mr. Chair. So you'll be seeing more C&T determinations in front of you, I'm sure. And we'll do our best to help you through them.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thank you, Polly.

Number C, Tribal and nongovernmental organizations. I don't see any. Do we still have Frank Woods from BBNA on teleconference.

MR. DUNAWAY: I doubt it.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Frank, are you on?
(No comments)
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. We do not have anybody in BBNA.
MR. DUNAWAY: Is Andy still on?
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Andy, are you on?
(No comments)
(No comments)
MS. MORRIS LYON: They haven't been on all day.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: George, you're still here. Number E.
MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. No report from the State. Our Staff are out doing surveys right now. And Lem Butler's probably running from an angered moose.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay.
MS. MORRIS LYON: Donald has something for you.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Donald.
MR. MIKE: Yeah. Mr. Chair. The Alaska Peninsula and Becharof National Wildlife Refuge did submit an agency report, and I forgot to make copies for the Council members, but I have a copy here, and if you wish, I'll provide a copy or mail it to you.
CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. Nanci.
MS. MORRIS LYON: One more point, too.
Togiak entered a report on Page 44.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Togiak has a report on Page 44.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Mr. Chair. It seems like Togiak Refuge always provides us a really nice written report, and I really appreciate it. It's very helpful.


(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Mary's gone. Aniakchak National Monument.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Man, we're going through this stuff like butter.

MS. MORRIS LYON: That's the trick from now on.


MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. At our fall meeting in Dillingham, the annual report issues came up, and there was no issues that the Council forwarded. But if you wish, you were talking about concerns about moose surveys, and it's been ongoing. But I'll leave it up to the Council.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: You're right. Dan O'Hara -- I guess that should go into our annual report that we would like to see moose surveys done every year, because otherwise without these surveys, it's hard to make a good decision. Anyway, all we've got to rely on is this harvest report, so without the surveys we do, we -- I rely on harvest reporting, so if the harvest reporting doesn't look good, it tells me that there's -- the population isn't good.

Okay. Number B, Council topics for May 2009 Board meeting. That's for the Federal Subsistence Board?
MR. MIKE: Yes, that's for the Federal Subsistence Board coming up in January. If the Council members have any concerns that they'd like the Chair to present to the Board, this is an opportunity for members of the Council to provide their comment to the Chair so he can bring those issues to the Federal Subsistence Board.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: I guess the main one then would be the surveys.

Anybody else have anything they want to bring before the -- Polly, have you got something?

DR. WHEELER: Sorry to interrupt, Mr. Chair. I think this might be an artifact of -- you know, it used to be that we had two Federal Board members a year. Now we just have the one Federal Board member a year. So you'll be meeting at your fall -- you'll be meeting again in the fall, and at that meeting you can come up with topics to be discussed at the January 2010 Board meeting.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Oh, okay. So there is no May meeting.

DR. WHEELER: Yeah. There is not a May Board meeting, no. Sorry about that.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would confer with the Council before adding this to a list by any means, but perhaps also in light of the letter that we've deemed was worthy writing to the Fish and Wildlife Service, bringing in front of the Federal Board our frustration with wanting to know what limits or guidelines are necessary for implementation of predator control. And I think that we're well justified knowing of all the populations we have that are in not healthy standing in our area. How would the members feel about something along those lines as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: That's good. That's probably -- and your comments should be on our annual report then.

Is there any other comments. Donald,
did you have something to say?

MR. MIKE: Yeah, I was just going to suggest that Nanci's comments should be included in the annual report. This has been ongoing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Future meeting plans. We need to confirm the time and location for the fall '09 meeting. Look on Page 51. And it shows a calendar for the fall meeting. And October -- we have scheduled October 27th and 28th in Dillingham.

But I was asked that we probably should change that to Naknek, because with all these proposals that we proposed, they deal with Unit 9 B, C, and E. And so Naknek would be a better place. We'd have better public testimony as people -- it would be closer to the people.

MS. CHYTHLOOK: So move.

MR. DUNAWAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Moved by Molly and seconded by Dan to have the meeting in Naknek this October. Any comments on that.

(No comments)

MR. MYERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: The question's been called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Motion's carried. The meeting's going to be in Naknek.

Now, number 15. We are adjourned. Is there anything else? I guess it's too late. Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: A couple comments. First I want to commend Donald for scrambling during this volcano thing. I think it was harder to have a meeting here, and it was I'm sure frustrating and difficult for
the communities that wanted to participate. But to
acknowledge Donald and any other Staff, he's doing the
best he could with a hard situation.

But also I guess it emphasized to me
that if we can, and this is no reflection on you,
Donald, but to the best that we can, I think we want to
avoid being out of area.

And then the last thing was whoever
provided us with this map, thank you, because it's a
lot easier for me to talk about a lot of topics --
maybe he'll take it away from me so I won't talk -- but
it's sure nice to have this map in front of me when
we're talking about a lot of things. It really helps a
lot.

MS. MORRIS LYON: We could maybe make
that a regular thing.

MR. DUNAWAY: I might save this one.
And I just want to thank all the staff for hanging on
to the bitter end.

Doi. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Good comment,
Dan.

Nanci, you've got something?

MS. MORRIS LYON: I do. And this is to
you personally, Randy. I appreciate you going in front
of the North Pacific Management Council and carrying a
voice for us. And I would say that I am open should
anything else come to mind, or you have any other
questions, please feel free to contact me for my
opinion. I'll be happy to be available in whatever
capacity I might be able to help you out on that with.
And thank you for doing that.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: All right. And
you'll be here -- well, let's see. Tomorrow, when do
we meet? When am I supposed to meet with the other
representatives from the RACs with Staff to discuss our
testimonies?

And then if you want, you can show up
there. Because what I need to do is get information to
write a testimony, so I need to put a testimony
together tomorrow. And then the schedule, I believe
to public testimony if Friday, day after tomorrow.

So, Donald, do you have a time that
we're supposed to meet?

MR. MIKE: Yeah, in 10 minutes, Mr.
Chair, at the Marriott. It's a good thing we got done
early, but I'm sure they'll be waiting for you. But if
you want help with your testimony, writing it up, you
know, I can be available, and other Staff can be
available, and we can.....

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Polly is shaking her
head.

DR. WHEELER: I believe it's 6:00
o'clock tomorrow night, Donald. Another crisis
narrowly averted. But it's 6:00 o'clock tomorrow
night.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: At the Marriott?

DR. WHEELER: Yes.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. I stand
corrected. I've been dealing with so many details, I'm
going lost.

MS. MORRIS LYON: But I've already
entered personal testimony as well.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Yeah. Well, I kind
of heard what, you know, you had to say. I'm not going
to talk for 15 minutes, I can tell you that. I don't
have that much to say, you know. I'm not going to talk
about the enhancement. That probably won't be
appropriate. So I just don't see a whole lot that I
have to -- it's not going to take me long, probably
three minutes.

MS. MORRIS LYON: No, but I appreciate
you doing it.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. Well, all
right. Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: I'm going to stay in town
until Friday about 2:30 for personal business, so I
don't know if I can help out. I have some other
appointments and such, but I've thought about trying to
duck into some of these meetings, too. I can give you
my cell number.

CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. We are
adjourned I guess. See you guys later.

(Off record)
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