

1 BRISTOL BAY FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
3
4 PUBLIC MEETING
5
6 VOLUME I
7
8 Bristol Bay Native Association
9 Dillingham, Alaska
10 March 3, 2010
11
12
13
14 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
15
16 Molly Chythlook, Chair
17 Pete Abraham
18 Alvin Boskofsky
19 Dan Dunaway
20 Dale Myers
21 Dan O'Hara
22 Richard Wilson
23
24
25
26 Regional Council Coordinator - Donald Mike
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Recorded and transcribed by:
45
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
47 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
48 Anchorage, AK 99501
49 907-243-0668
50 sahile@gci.net

1 P R O C E E D I N G S
2
3 (Dillingham, Alaska - 3/3/2010)
4
5 (On record)
6
7 CHAIRMAN DUNAWAY: Good morning. Randy
8 Alvarez, our Chairman, his term expired and he chose
9 not to renew. And I understand that Nanci Morris, our
10 vice chair, is not going to be here today, so.....
11
12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Who's that?
13
14 CHAIRMAN DUNAWAY: Nanci Lyons. So if
15 we can call this meeting to order, and if you'll call
16 the roll, Donald.
17
18 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
19 Meeting called to order by the secretary, Dan Dunaway,
20 the officer for Bristol Bay Council.
21
22 Roll Call. Mr. Pete Abraham.
23
24 MR. ABRAHAM: Yeah.
25
26 MR. MIKE: Mr. Daniel O'Hara.
27
28 MR. O'HARA: Here.
29
30 MR. MIKE: Ms. Nanci Morris Lyon. Mr.
31 Chair, Nanci had a prior commitment and she couldn't
32 make this meeting today. Mr. Dale Myers.
33
34 MR. MYERS: Yeah, here.
35
36 MR. MIKE: Mr. Alvin Boskofsky. Mr.
37 Chair, Alvin weathered in in King Salmon since last
38 night, so he'll be here later on this morning.
39
40 Ms. Molly Chythlook.
41
42 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Here.
43
44 MR. MIKE: Mr. Dan Dunaway.
45
46 CHAIRMAN DUNAWAY: Here.
47
48 MR. MIKE: Mr. Richard Wilson.
49
50 MR. WILSON: Here.

1 MR. MIKE: Mr. Thomas Hedlund. Mr.
2 Chair, Mr. Hedlund couldn't make this meeting also.
3 His wife left town and he needs to stay at home.
4
5 Thank you.
6
7 Mr. Chair, you have six members
8 present, and you have a quorum.
9
10 CHAIRMAN DUNAWAY: Okay. Donald, thank
11 you very much.
12
13 I guess before we get any further, I
14 wonder if I could ask Pete Abraham to give us a little
15 invocation.
16
17 (Invocation)
18
19 CHAIRMAN DUNAWAY: I'm not used to
20 running these, so -- I guess with that I guess we could
21 start with a welcome to all of the folks that are here,
22 and I guess we could start around with some
23 introductions. And remind me, Donald, how we do those.
24
25 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, we can start off
26 with the Council members all seated and then we can
27 move to the audience.
28
29 CHAIRMAN DUNAWAY: Okay. Let's start
30 with Pete and let's go around and then -- for
31 introductions.
32
33 MR. ABRAHAM: Pete Abraham, Togiak.
34 I've been around for quite a long time.
35
36 CHAIRMAN DUNAWAY: Okay. Dan Dunaway
37 from Dillingham.
38
39 MR. O'HARA: Dan O'Hara, Naknek. Okay.
40
41 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Molly Chythlook,
42 Dillingham.
43
44 MR. O'HARA: There you go.
45
46 MR. MIKE: Donald Mike, Council
47 coordinator.
48
49 MR. WILSON: Rich Wilson out of Naknek.
50

1 MR. MYERS: I'm Dale Myers from King
2 Salmon.
3
4 MR. MILES: Burton Miles.
5
6 MR. LEIDBERG: Paul Leidberg, manager
7 of the Togiak Refuge here in Dillingham.
8
9 MR. UNDERWOOD: Tevis Underwood with
10 Togiak Refuge from Dillingham.
11
12 MR. SHARP: Dan Sharp with Bureau of
13 Land Management.
14
15 MR. KRIEG: Ted Krieg, Subsistence
16 Division, Fish and Game, Dillingham.
17
18 MR. DEVALPINE: Andrew deValpine with
19 Fish and Game, Boards.
20
21 MR. KLUTSCH: Joey Klutsch.
22
23 (Microphone turned off)
24
25 CHAIRMAN DUNAWAY: Okay. Well, I'd
26 like to welcome everybody here today and thanks for
27 making it in. Good to see Joey there. He's grown up
28 since the last time I saw him. A bunch.
29
30 With that, I believe we need to elect
31 officers of the Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary. And I
32 guess I'll turn that over to Donald Mike to take
33 nominations and select a Chair. Is that how it's done?
34
35 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Dunaway.
36 Nominations for Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary. We'll
37 start off with open the nominations for Chair.
38
39 MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chairman. I nominate
40 Molly Chythlook.
41
42 MR. MYERS: I second the motion.
43
44 MR. MIKE: Any other nominations.
45
46 MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chair. I make a
47 motion that we close nominations and ask for unanimous
48 consent for Madam Chair Chythlook.
49
50 MR. MIKE: Is there unanimous consent.

1 MR. MYERS: I'll second it.
2
3 MR. MIKE: Seconded by Mr. Dale Myers.
4
5 MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chair. Is there
6 unanimous consent?
7
8 MR. MIKE: Unanimous consent. Yes,
9 there's unanimous consent. Ms. Chythlook, you have the
10 Chair. You have the table.
11
12 Thank you.
13
14 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Good
15 morning everybody. We'll continue with our nominations
16 for Vice Chair.
17
18 MR. DUNAWAY: I nominate Dan O'Hara.
19
20 MR. O'HARA: Dan O'Hara declines. I've
21 been on this thing long enough. I'll nominate Dan
22 Dunaway.
23
24 MR. MYERS: I'll second it.
25
26 MR. DUNAWAY: Madam Chair. One thing I
27 was wondering is if Dan or anybody from the Naknek/King
28 Salmon area talked to Nanci Morris. She's been in that
29 position, but I was wondering if she is interested in
30 continuing, or just what her interests are. Over.
31
32 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. Could I
33 address that?
34
35 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yes.
36
37 MR. O'HARA: Yeah, Dan. I talked with
38 her and I don't think she's interested in -- we'd even
39 talked about if she was interested in being the Chair,
40 and she said her schedule is pretty busy. And we --
41 the dates got changed on our meeting here, and so she
42 had previously set up a time down in California for
43 manning a booth for their tourism stuff, so she
44 couldn't make it. So I don't think she was interested
45 -- she might be interested in being maybe the
46 secretary.
47
48 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair. Richard
49 here. What about Thomas Hedlund? What is his interest
50 here, anybody know?

1 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. I talked
2 with him yesterday, Richard, and he's not interested.
3 I talked to him about being Chair, and he was not
4 interested.
5
6 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any more
7 nominations for Vice Chair besides Dan Dunaway.
8
9 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. I'll make a
10 motion that we close nominations and ask for unanimous
11 consent for Dan Dunaway, Vice Chair. I made a motion,
12 somebody has to second it.
13
14 MR. WILSON: Yeah, I'll second.
15
16 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. We asked for
17 unanimous consent, meaning we all agree?
18
19 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yes. Okay.
20 The second -- or the third is the secretary. Any
21 nominations.
22
23 MR. DUNAWAY: Madam Chair. I'll move
24 to nominate Nanci Lyons. I think she did a great job
25 as the Vice Chair when called upon, if we think she's
26 interested, unless there's somebody else that would
27 rather do it.
28
29 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any
30 other nominations besides Nanci.
31
32 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. I guess I'm
33 the only one who's going to talk here, so I'll go ahead
34 and do it. I think we ought to -- I'll make a motion
35 that we close nominations and ask for unanimous consent
36 for Nanci Lyons for secretary. She does a good job.
37 She works hard at it.
38
39 MR. WILSON: And I'll second that
40 motion.
41
42 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
43 Continuing on with our agenda, we're going to keep our
44 agenda open and I guess what we'll do is right after
45 the elections here, we'll have Donald Mike, our admin,
46 do the business with that, and then we'll do the number
47 5, review of agenda, number 6, review and approval of
48 minutes. And then after the review and approval of
49 minutes we'll be going into I guess a work session. So
50 continuing on with Mike, admin business.

1 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
2
3 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. I'm
4 sorry. Okay. Review and adopt agenda. Is there any
5 changes, any other changes. We're going to plan on
6 doing breaks here every so often, and then at about
7 11:00 o'clock we've invited the preschool kids to come
8 in and entertain for us.
9
10 Okay. Review and adopt agenda.
11
12 MR. O'HARA: Yes, Madam Chair. I would
13 like to, before we make a motion to adopt the agenda,
14 ask Donald Mike if under G of the agenda, number 2,
15 it's my understanding that the State caribou dates end
16 on March the 15th and the Federal ends on March 31st;
17 is that right?
18
19 MR. MIKE: Which proposal are you
20 talking to? Through the Chair, Mr. O'Hara. Which
21 proposal?
22
23 MR. O'HARA: I'm sorry. Madam Chair.
24 that would be 9A and 17A I believe in this -- if
25 they're different dates, I think one of the things we
26 could discuss at the end of the meeting is to try to
27 align those dates so that we don't have two different
28 dates and two different lines.
29
30 Madam Chair.
31
32 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Mike.
33
34 MR. MIKE: Thank you. Through the
35 Chair, Mr. O'Hara. We have our Staff biologist here
36 that will explain the proposals as far as how it's
37 going to be approached. I don't know if Mr. Spencer
38 Rearden will be able to come up to the table and
39 explain what the plan of action is to be taken during
40 those particular proposals.
41
42 Thank you.
43
44 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. So that can
45 fit into the agenda wherever Donald wants to fit it in.
46 And so I'll -- unless there's no other insertions, I'll
47 make a motion that we.....
48
49 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Mr. Chair -- or
50 Madam Chair, pardon me. I've been looking through the

1 agenda for a while. One thing I would like us to
2 consider is changing the order in which we take up some
3 of the proposals, because one of the first ones we take
4 up, WP10-45, when it was proposed, the folks proposing
5 it said that they only wanted to pass that if some of
6 the other proposals also passed. So I was wondering if
7 we took up 46 through 49 and 52 first and then could go
8 back to 45 might make it a little better order for
9 considering Number 45.

10

11 Also, I'm thinking somewhere in here I
12 would really like to -- as a Council we do a resolution
13 or a letter thanking Randy Alvarez for his service on
14 this Board. I think he did a wonderful job. And I was
15 kind of flat-footed and not thinking, I'm kind of
16 ashamed that I didn't think of it at the last meeting
17 when he was there to hear it personally. Maybe that
18 could be under other business.

19

20 And then the third thing, and I'm not
21 quite sure where to put it in, but I believe Friday the
22 Board of Game in Anchorage will be considering predator
23 control for 9E and C. And if it's appropriate, we
24 possibly could send a resolution or a letter expressing
25 our wishes on that item. And I thought Lem Butler was
26 going to be here this morning, because that's how -- he
27 mentioned it to me by email the other day.

28

29 And those are the items that I can
30 think of that I might add to the agenda.

31

32 Thank you, Mr. Chair [sic].

33

34 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank
35 you, Dan. So the third item that you have would also
36 go under other business?

37

38 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Madam Chair. I
39 think that probably would be the place to put it.

40

41 One other item on my personal schedule.
42 I'm going to have to leave at about 2:30, quarter to
43 3:00 tomorrow afternoon. So just kind of a side item
44 there.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. I think
49 there was a motion on the agenda to approve?

50

1 MR. O'HARA: No, Madam Chair. I
2 withdrew my motion because of the additions. But I'll
3 be glad to make a motion now. I'll make a motion to
4 adopt the agenda as amended. And if it's okay with the
5 rest of the Council, arrangements of the proposals
6 would be fine, possibly a State alignment of Federal 9A
7 and 9B and 17A on caribou dates, we'll talk about that
8 somewhere. And so appreciation for Alvarez and the
9 predator control.
10
11 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. There's
12 been a motion to adopt the agenda.
13
14 MR. DUNAWAY: I'll second that motion.
15
16 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. All in
17 favor, yes, say aye.
18
19 IN UNISON: Aye.
20
21 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thank you.
22 Okay. All opposed same sign.
23
24 (No opposing votes)
25
26 MR. O'HARA: The ayes have it.
27
28 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Excuse
29 me. October 27th, 2009 fall meeting that we had at
30 Naknek.
31
32 MR. DUNAWAY: Move to approve.
33
34 MR. O'HARA: Second the motion.
35
36 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. There's
37 been a move and then a second.
38
39 MR. O'HARA: Ask if there's any
40 corrections or.....
41
42 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Is there any
43 corrections to the minutes.
44
45 (No comments)
46
47 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Seeing none,
48 all in favor say aye.
49
50 IN UNISON: Aye.

1 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any opposition.
2
3 (No opposing votes)
4
5 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Seeing none.
6 The second -- or the next on the agenda would be the --
7 we're moving item 9 to this portion of the meeting now.
8 Okay. You have the floor, Mike. Or Donald.
9
10 MR. O'HARA: You've got to do 7 and 8
11 yet.
12
13 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Pardon?
14
15 MR. O'HARA: You need to do 7 and 8. 7
16 is the Chair's report.
17
18 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. 7.
19 Chair's report.
20
21 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
22 Under the Chair's report we normally have annual report
23 responses from the Federal Subsistence Board or the
24 Section .805 of ANILCA on actions taken by the Federal
25 Subsistence Board on fisheries or wildlife related
26 proposals that the Board took action on. But since we
27 didn't have any actions taken at the last meeting with
28 the Board.....
29
30 What we've had although is Council
31 members attending some meetings with Pat Pourchot, the
32 Secretary of Interior -- Special Assistant to the
33 Secretary of Interior, and they're going through the
34 process of the Federal subsistence review all over the
35 State. And Mr. Dan O'Hara and other Council members
36 from the State attended those meetings. So I don't
37 know if Mr. O'Hara would want to give a short briefing
38 on how that meeting went.
39
40 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. Could I go
41 ahead and just mention that report.
42
43 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yes.
44
45 MR. O'HARA: Under Council members
46 reports, and there may be other ones that have things
47 to say, too, but Nanci and I did attend. First of all
48 during the Fish Board meeting, we went to -- the Chairs
49 attended also with Pat Pourchot, and we had kind of an
50 introduction and people kind of talked about some of

1 the concerns they had in their region. And the people
2 up on the Kuskokwim on up into McGrath area, the
3 economy is so bad that they don't even have -- can't
4 afford gas to go out and get subsistence, and that's
5 really incredible. You know, Bristol Bay has been so
6 blessed, we just have no idea. You know, last year 31
7 million harvest, this year 33.5, maybe 35 million.
8 Those are unheard of numbers. And so that was really
9 an eye opener for me to hear those people say that.

10

11 When we met the second time with the
12 Federal Board, I believe -- was it the Federal Board,
13 Donald, that we met with the second time or was it just
14 Pat Pourchot again?

15

16 MR. MIKE: I think it was Pat solely.

17

18 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Okay. They talked
19 about some of the changes that's going to take place to
20 Title VIII. And if I leave something out, you go ahead
21 and feel free to fill in.

22

23 But they feel like the State of Alaska
24 is not cooperating enough to be able to fulfill the
25 requirements of the Federal Subsistence Program, and
26 the Secretary of Interior is really interested in
27 changing some of that. And I made a suggestion that
28 maybe the Federal Board take over game control on
29 Native lands, but I was immediately told that that
30 would take a Congressional action and probably won't
31 happen.

32

33 And was there other things that we
34 should have mentioned?

35

36 MR. MIKE: Madam Chair. I think Mr.
37 O'Hara covered the brief synopsis very well, although I
38 can add to it is that Secretary Salazar's office, you
39 know, they opened up sort of an application period for
40 selecting a new chair for the Federal Subsistence
41 Board. And I don't know where that is in the timeline
42 process. But that's all I have to report.

43

44 Thank you.

45

46 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. Could I ask
47 Donald a question?

48

49 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yes.

50

1 MR. O'HARA: Donald, who is the new
2 chair of the Federal Board?
3
4 MR. MIKE: There is no selection.
5 There hasn't been a selection made yet.
6
7 Madam Chair. It's still in D.C.
8
9 Thank you.
10
11 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Moving on the
12 Council member's reports. Any reports from any of the
13 Council members.
14
15 (No comments)
16
17 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Seeing
18 none, I guess we move on. Now we're to your business,
19 administrative business. Mike. Donald.
20
21 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madam Chair. In
22 front of each Council member there's a yellow folder.
23 There's some items in this yellow folder that did not
24 make our publication of our meeting book material, but
25 if you open it up and we have a green document. It's
26 got the Bristol Bay Council letterhead on top. I'm
27 sorry. But I neglected to include the title of it, but
28 this document, it's on the green copy paper, it's a
29 report to Bristol Bay Council from the Bristol Bay
30 subcommittee addressing red fish take in Naknek Lake.
31 So when you get a chance, you can read it briefly.
32
33 But this draft went out to all the
34 subcommittee members, and I had Pete Hill, he responded
35 to it, and he thought it was fine. And Nanci Morris
36 Lyon also reviewed it, so she had no additional
37 comments to it.
38
39 But later on in the meeting, either
40 today or tomorrow, the Council will have a chance to
41 adopt this subcommittee report and recommendation as to
42 go ahead and forward it to the Federal Subsistence
43 Board. But that will come up later on in the meeting.
44
45 And the second one is the Bristol Bay's
46 2009 annual report, the draft annual report. Towards
47 the end of the meeting, probably tomorrow, the Council
48 will have an opportunity to review it and adopt it and
49 go forward with -- finalize this draft 2009 annual
50 report. So it's a white copy paper.

1 The next one is the -- it's a blue copy
2 paper, and it's a summary of moose 2009 trend area
3 survey that the Refuge did for the Peninsula this past
4 last year. So that's for your information. And we'll
5 have Staff to present these summary to the Council.
6

7 And this orange document, that's from
8 the Lake Clark Subsistence Resource Commission. They
9 submitted comments on the wildlife proposals for the
10 record and for the Council to review and take into
11 consideration. And also they've written a letter to
12 Pat Pourchot on their comments on the Federal
13 Subsistence Management Program.
14

15 And then we have a Council
16 recommendation log for 2010/2012. This is recent
17 actions that other Councils took actions on the
18 wildlife proposals, either to support or support with
19 modification. But that's just for your information.
20

21 And finally I have this yellow
22 document. It's a draft resolution recognizing Afonie
23 Takak for his services in the Aniakchak National
24 Monument Subsistence Resource Commission. So we can
25 take final action on that and provide a signature and
26 send it to his family.
27

28 That's all I have on this yellow
29 folder. Madam Chair.
30

31 And getting back to the agenda, on the
32 statewide proposals, we have five statewide proposals.
33 Our staff, Ms. Polly Wheeler from OSM, she won't be
34 able to be here this morning, but she will be here this
35 afternoon. She's the primary presenter for those
36 statewide proposals. So we can either go right into
37 the Bristol Bay regional proposals and get business
38 started, or, Madam Chair, since we're going to have
39 some guests later on this morning, we have the
40 kindergarten class coming to perform; is that correct?
41

42 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yes.
43

44 MR. MIKE: We can do a Council
45 orientation for our newest member here and then -- but
46 it's up to the Council to see what they want to do, to
47 get started with the wildlife proposals or get into a
48 work session and start a Council orientation.
49

50 And, finally, I have a green card for

1 anyone that wish to testify on any subsistence-related
2 issues or any proposals they wish to testify on. They
3 can just fill out a card and just submit it to me, and
4 I'll let the Chair know that the person wishes to
5 testify on a particular proposal or on subsistence-
6 related issues in general. But this is on our sign-in
7 table out in the front. And if you haven't done so,
8 please sign in at the front table so we'll have a
9 record of who attended all these meetings.

10

11 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan, did you
12 have a comment.

13

14 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Madam Chair. I was
15 looking here at the agenda. It talks about public
16 testimony, but if I'm not mistaken, commonly don't we
17 allow folks to testify throughout the meeting, possibly
18 when it's the most either convenient for the folks that
19 want to testify, or when it might be more appropriate
20 to the discussion; is that correct?

21

22 MR. O'HARA: Yes.

23

24 MR. DUNAWAY: And, you know, so I just
25 want to make sure our audience knows that. I think
26 there may be one or two that are here to testify. And
27 maybe another one's here to testify now.

28

29 Thank you, Madam Chair.

30

31 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Well,
32 throughout the meeting session I guess we could
33 announce the green card session as people come in, so
34 we'll keep the testimony session open throughout the
35 day.

36

37 Okay. The next agenda item would be --
38 what's the Council's wishes for the continuation of the
39 wildlife proposal, or do we want to go into the work
40 session?

41

42 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. May I?

43

44 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Uh-huh.

45

46 MR. O'HARA: I think I'd like to have
47 the workshop session now, and then wait for Alvin to
48 get here a little later, if that would be okay.

49

50 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.

1 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
2 Yeah, if get into the work session, we'll need about
3 10, 15 minutes to get the projector lined up and in the
4 meantime we can have coffee and restrooms I believe are
5 down the hall. And the public's welcome to stay
6 through the work session.
7
8 Thank you.
9
10 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. We'll
11 take a 15-minute break while we set up for the work
12 session.
13
14 (Off record)
15
16 (On record)
17
18 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: And I'll call
19 the meeting back to order. And then we'll go on with
20 the statewide proposals.
21
22 DR. WHEELER: Yeah, if you look at the
23 top of Page 2 in your -- this is Polly Wheeler with the
24 Office of Subsistence Management.
25
26 If you look at the top of Page 2,
27 there's a presentation procedure for proposals. And
28 typically we'll start out with the introduction of the
29 proposal and analysis, and OSM staff will do that. And
30 then you go you go into -- there's usually somebody
31 from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game that will
32 provide comments and just kind of go down that list.
33 That's the fairly straight forward process there.
34
35 So are you ready?
36
37 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yes.
38
39 DR. WHEELER: Okay. We'll start off
40 with Proposal 10-01, and again for the record my name
41 is Polly Wheeler. I work for Office of Subsistence
42 Management.
43
44 This first proposal that I'll be
45 talking about you can find on Pages 9 to 12 in your
46 books. So I'll give you a second to find that.
47
48 We're starting off with -- there's
49 actually five statewide proposals and these are going
50 to each of the 10 Regional Advisory Councils, because

1 they are statewide proposals. But I just want to
2 caution you, these are all housekeeping proposals. You
3 guys are all familiar with the Board of Fish and the
4 Board of Game, and sometimes you have these kind of
5 housekeeping proposals before you, and the first five,
6 10-01, 10-02.....

7
8 REPORTER: Polly.....

9
10 DR. WHEELER: Oh, I'm being told to
11 stop.

12
13 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: I guess we need
14 to adopt this proposal. Motion to adopt.

15
16 DR. WHEELER: If I could, Madam Chair,
17 when you get down on this list on the top of Page 2,
18 you kind of go through each of these, and then the last
19 is number 9, is the Regional Council deliberation,
20 recommendation and justification, and that's when you
21 would ask for a motion to adopt the proposal. So you
22 get to wade through the list of commentators before you
23 have to adopt the proposal or not. So are we okay?

24
25 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Uh-huh.

26
27 DR. WHEELER: All right. So as I was
28 saying, there's five statewide proposals before you.
29 These are each being presented -- these are being
30 presented to each of 10 Regional Advisory Councils.
31 They're all housekeeping proposals, and I'll talk about
32 them all in order, but I just want to put that up front
33 that they're all housekeeping.

34
35 As you know, we deal with wildlife
36 every other year, we deal with fisheries every other
37 year. And every so often during the year we'll realize
38 that some of our regulations are goofy or they're
39 something that we could make a little more clear, and
40 these five proposals are examples of that.

41
42 So this first proposal that again
43 begins on Page 9 in your Council books, it was
44 submitted by the Office of Subsistence Management. So
45 we submitted the proposal to ourselves. And it
46 requests the addition of a definition of drawing permit
47 to the Federal subsistence management regulations. And
48 this is one of those things, the existing regulations
49 have drawing permits in
50 them, but then when we were reviewing our regulations,

1 we realized that we didn't have a definition of drawing
2 permit, so this proposal was submitted to ourselves to
3 include a definition of drawing permit in the
4 regulations. Since our regulations actually have a
5 drawing permit in them, we need to have a definition
6 that goes along with it.

7

8 The addition of this definition does
9 not affect fish and wildlife populations, subsistence
10 uses or other uses. The Federal Subsistence Management
11 Program has used drawings as one way to distribute
12 permits among residents of a community that are
13 similarly situated relative to the customary and
14 traditional uses of those wildlife populations.

15

16 If you go to Page 12 in your books,
17 there's the preliminary conclusion is to support this
18 proposal with modification. And the definition that
19 we're supporting at this point in time is pretty
20 simple, and I'll read it for you. It's the drawing
21 permit is by definition a permit issued to a limited
22 number of Federally-qualified subsistence users
23 selected by means of a random drawing.

24

25 And by way of explanation, the reason
26 why the OSM preliminary conclusion is to support with
27 modification is that when we originally submitted the
28 definition of drawing permit, which is on Page 11, you
29 can see that that was submitted about a year ago
30 actually, and it's a much lengthier definition and
31 there are some implica -- there's some legal wording in
32 there. And after review we decided that simple is
33 better as a general rule, so we came up with a more
34 simple definition. That's why it says support with
35 modification, because the original definition was a lot
36 longer. The definition we finally landed on is a lot
37 shorter.

38

39 So again the preliminary conclusion at
40 this point in time, Madam Chair and members of the
41 Council, is to support this definition. And again the
42 reason why we need a definition is that we have drawing
43 permits in our regulations, and we don't have a
44 definition to go along with it.

45

46 So I hope I haven't hopelessly confused
47 you, and hopefully it's fairly straight forward, but
48 fire away with questions.

49

50 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any questions

1 from the Council.

2

3 MR. ABRAHAM: Madam Chairman. On
4 conclusion of modification, the drawing permit issued
5 to limited number of Federally-qualified subsistence
6 users. Is that by means of random drawing?

7

8 I think the wording should be added to
9 it per household. One per household. There was a
10 conflict for further west of us over here on a muskox
11 drawing. The family of one -- one family had five
12 hunters and they all brought tickets, and out of those
13 five, three of them got the muskox, it was permits.
14 And there was friction in the village there, because
15 there were some needy people that could have gotten
16 those two extra tickets. So that's why I'm saying this
17 over here, per household be appropriate I think for
18 this purpose here.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 DR. WHEELER: You raise an interesting
23 point. Through the Chair. You raise an interesting
24 point. We haven't done that in the past, but you do
25 raise an interesting point, because if you get to the
26 point where it is a drawing permit, clearly there's not
27 enough for everybody to go around. Where we have
28 drawing permits is like in Unit 19A we have a drawing
29 permit for moose and we have drawing permits for
30 muskox. So you raise an interesting point, because if
31 there's not enough to go around, then you don't -- you
32 probably want to spread it as far as you can, so having
33 it one per household it -- it's a good point.

34

35 Madam Chair.

36

37 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair.

38

39 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, Richard.

40

41 MR. WILSON: Pete, do you think maybe
42 language saying no more than one per household?

43

44 MR. ABRAHAM: One per household.
45 That's a family, because you take 45 hunters and out of
46 those 45, there are, you know, 20 permits. And in one
47 family there's five hunters, and those five hunters in
48 one family, and they all draw permits. And out of the
49 five, you know, two of those or three of those, you
50 know, get a permit.

1 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair. I'm just
2 thinking, the wording, if you say -- it sounds to me
3 like you're saying that you want a permit per every
4 household, whereas I think, you know, if it's there's
5 only a certain amount of moose out there and you're
6 only drawing 20 permits and you've got 50 families,
7 then it seems like the wording would be more like no
8 more than one per household, indicating that, you know,
9 as many as one per household, but not that every
10 household has to have a permit.

11
12 MR. ABRAHAM: Madam Chairman. Whomever
13 in the village is willing to draw, you know, permits,
14 go for the permit. Well, every household doesn't have
15 a hunter, but if the wording says per household, well,
16 it's open to the public for each individual person per
17 household to draw a ticket. Per household cannot draw
18 more than, you know, one ticket.

19
20 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

21
22 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Mr. Chair -- Madam
23 Chair. Excuse me. Possibly any -- if we have any
24 legal beagles out in the audience. I think Pete
25 certainly brings up an important point, but I'm
26 wondering in this case if this is -- since it's just a
27 general definition, that maybe the per household
28 language might better be included in whichever drawing
29 comes along. Because what if we end up in a fishing
30 situation -- I can't quite anticipate how or where
31 lotteries or drawings will be used, but I would be
32 concerned that if you included it in the definition it
33 might unnecessarily constrain a drawing later depending
34 on what it is, if it's fishing opportunity or something
35 else.

36
37 So I don't disagree with you, Pete, on
38 the idea. But I'm just wondering if it would be better
39 put in the definition of whatever activities are
40 limited in the future. Do you understand what I mean?
41 So like you wouldn't put it in the definition maybe,
42 but you would say, if you a muskox hunt. But what if
43 you had -- and it maybe still would be per household if
44 it was like opportunity to put a set net out for a
45 while or -- I'm trying to think if there might be some
46 subsistence opportunity where it might not work to
47 limit it by household. And I'm kind of hard put to it,
48 but maybe if Polly or somebody else in the audience had
49 some experience with that, I'll shut up.

50

1 MR. ABRAHAM: Madam Chair. Dan,
2 remember some years back we talked about selling salmon
3 and we worked on it for some time and we put a limit of
4 \$500 per person to try that. Well, if there's 10
5 people in the home, and \$500 per person, well, they'd
6 take advantage of that, you know, \$500 and 10 of those
7 people in home, they would go out there and fish and
8 sell their, you know, \$500 limit. But, well, I think
9 we finally got it down to what, \$500 per home and it
10 worked and satisfied whomever out there.

11
12 But the same thing with this permit
13 system over here. You want to give a chance to every
14 home, not somebody taking advantage of, you know,
15 permits like three, four hunters, like I said three,
16 four, five hunters in one home. You know, the reason
17 I'm saying this over here, I want to give every needy
18 or hunter a chance. I mean, that's -- I'm not trying
19 to stir up a can of worms. I'm just trying to simplify
20 so the people, you know, what you -- you know, you
21 confuse the people easy. And there's how the friction,
22 if one gets more than the other. Okay. I mean, is
23 that understandable now?

24
25 Thank you.

26
27 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Polly.

28
29 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
30 And through the Chair, if you look at -- you all have
31 the blue, the wildlife regulations book. Just as an
32 example, look on Page 42. It's not your area, but it's
33 an example of where this comes up, or a situation that
34 you've just raised, Pete, comes up. If you look under
35 moose, and you look down, it's about, I don't know,
36 two-thirds of the way down the page in the italics, in
37 the middle column, it says, only one moose permit may
38 be issued per household. This is in Cordova and it's
39 where we have a joint Federal/State hunt. And then it
40 says a household receiving a State Unit 6C moose permit
41 may not receive a Federal permit, and then it goes on.

42
43 But that's an example of where, as Dan
44 just said, Member Abraham, this is a general
45 regulation, this definition of drawing hunt is in the
46 general regulation, and then where you get into the
47 specifics of a situation like you just mentioned where
48 you want to make sure that the permits go to only one
49 per household, that can go very specifically in the
50 unit-specific regulations. So that if you have, for

1 example, a hunt occurring in your area, you can use the
2 drawing permit, but then you as a Council can recommend
3 that, yeah, only one drawing permit per household.
4 That's a fair way to do it.

5
6 So that's where, you know, we have
7 these general definitions and they're sort of a one
8 size fits all, but when you get into the specifics of
9 managing the hunt in your region, that's where you list
10 those specific type things, where you only have one
11 permit per household or we have a proposal this cycle
12 for Southeast asking for one permit per household for
13 moose. So that's where you get into the unit specific.
14 But the general definitions are meant to apply
15 statewide and sometimes these little things that happen
16 in units don't always apply on a statewide level.

17
18 Mr. Chair -- or, Madam Chair. I'm
19 sorry.

20
21 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah. (In
22 Yup'ik)

23
24 MR. ABRAHAM: Yeah.

25
26 MR. PAPPAS: Good morning, Madam Chair.
27 You'll notice in the meeting materials for Proposals 1
28 through 5, which are the statewide materials, the State
29 has not offered comments. We're in the process of
30 collecting information, like the information you just
31 presented, excellent point, before we finalize our
32 position. So we're attending all the RAC meetings to
33 collect information and input from the RACs and the
34 public before finalizing our comments.

35
36 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Could we have
37 your -- could your name?

38
39 MR. PAPPAS: Oh, sorry. I apologize.
40 George Pappas, Department of Fish and Game, Subsistence
41 Liaison Team.

42
43 So, thank you for having me here. And
44 we're not making comments yet on the statewide
45 proposals or C&T proposals. So when it comes to our
46 name on the list, you can skip over us for the first
47 five proposals, unless you have specific questions for
48 us.

49
50 Thank you. Madam Chair.

1 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any
2 questions from the Council.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: No questions.
7 Okay. Other Federal, State and tribal agency comments.
8
9 (No comments)
10
11 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: InterAgency
12 Staff Committee comments.
13
14 DR. WHEELER: Madam Chair. I'm the
15 Chair of the InterAgency Staff Committee in addition to
16 working at OSM. And the Staff Committee doesn't have
17 any comments, and won't have any comments on these
18 proposals at this point in time.
19
20 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Then
21 Fish and Game Advisory Committee comments.
22
23 MR. O'HARA: I believe that Subsistence
24 Resource Commission.
25
26 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Subsistence --
27 sorry. Subsistence Resource Committee comments.
28
29 (No comments)
30
31 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Seeing none.
32 And then -- Dan.
33
34 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. I had a chance to
35 look through some of the papers in the yellow folder we
36 were given while the new members were going through the
37 training, and I should point that there are, I believe,
38 some comments from some of the -- what they're called
39 SRCs in there. I don't recall if there were any that
40 addressed this particular proposal, but maybe we should
41 look. We have comments from the Lake Clark SRC.
42 That's the orange one. And there's a yellow one that's
43 from Aniakchak. But I don't know if there's anything
44 that addresses this particular proposal. I would think
45 I'd see somebody jumping up and down out there if there
46 were.
47
48 As another side note, I think it's
49 interesting, and I'm wondering if it's kind of a new
50 phase for the State of Alaska to listen to the RACs as

1 a forum of being maybe more responsive and more
2 interactive with the Federal system. If that's the
3 case, I'll commend them.
4
5 Thank you.
6
7 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Fish and
8 Game Advisory Committee comments.
9
10 (No comments)
11
12 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Seeing
13 none. Number 7, summary of written public comments.
14 Donald.
15
16 MR. MIKE: Yeah. Madam Chair. There
17 were no written public comments submitted for this
18 statewide proposal, WP10-01.
19
20 Thank you.
21
22 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank
23 you. Public testimony.
24
25 MR. MIKE: Madam Chair.
26
27 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.
28
29 MR. MIKE: Madam Chair. I did not
30 receive any requests to testify on this proposal.
31
32 Thank you.
33
34 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Regional
35 Council deliberation I guess now.
36
37 MR. DUNAWAY: Move to adopt.
38
39 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. There's
40 a motion to adopt this WP10-01.
41
42 MR. DUNAWAY: I should clarify. Move
43 to adopt with the recommended language in the
44 preliminary conclusion.
45
46 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. I'll second
47 that motion.
48
49 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: There's been a
50 second on the motion. Any discussions from -- Richard.

1 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair. Yes, so the
2 language that we had asked for earlier with Pete, is
3 that in consideration with this proposal also as in the
4 unit section specific.

5
6 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Polly.

7
8 DR. WHEELER: Just to -- I probably
9 wasn't clear earlier. This is a general regulation
10 that will be -- or a definition that will be applicable
11 statewide. Where we go to the specifics like what Pete
12 had raised where it's one per household or something,
13 that's where -- that would go in the unit specific
14 regulation, so if there were to be a drawing hunt in
15 this region, the Council would add that we only have
16 one drawing permit per household. So this is a general
17 definition that is applicable in all 26 game management
18 units statewide for hunting regulations. And where you
19 would have a specific regulation would be in the unit
20 specific. Because it may be in some parts of the state
21 where they have drawing permits, they don't want to
22 have that unit specific regulation.

23
24 MR. WILSON: Madam Chairman. So am I
25 to understand this is not the appropriate time to ask
26 for this then?

27
28 DR. WHEELER: That would be correct.

29
30 MR. WILSON: Thanks.

31
32 DR. WHEELER: Madam Chair. I had one
33 other point, too. There have been -- there's actually
34 been five Councils that have met thus far on this
35 proposal, and again because it's a statewide proposal,
36 we're presenting to all 10 Councils. The Y-K Council
37 meeting started yesterday, and I didn't get a report.

38
39 So what I do know is that the North
40 Slope Council, the Northwest Arctic Council, the
41 Eastern Interior Council, and the Western Interior
42 Council have all met to date and they've all supported
43 this proposal with modification, with the language
44 suggested by Office of Subsistence Management.

45
46 Madam Chair.

47
48 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thank you.
49 Dan.

50

1 MR. O'HARA: Which Dan?
2
3 MR. DUNAWAY: You had your hand up
4 first.
5
6 MR. O'HARA: Polly, when -- this
7 umbrella thing is good, and I'm glad to see that
8 happen.
9
10 And then getting to Pete's, if
11 something comes up, what's the timeframe for putting
12 this in order so that it doesn't become a runaway
13 train? We submit a proposal saying that now we want
14 this language?
15
16 DR. WHEELER: Where you would act on
17 that specific language would be if there's a drawing
18 permit hunt in your area, then you could submit a
19 proposal or a special action. So there's two vehicles.
20 You could do a proposal, and obviously now we're
21 dealing with wildlife proposals, so a proposal
22 submittal would be two years down the road. But you
23 can do a special action any time. So if there's a hunt
24 that's going on that you feel like ought to be changed
25 to have one per household, that would be your vehicle
26 until the next proposal go-around.
27
28 Mr. Chair -- Madam Chair.
29
30 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Madam Chair.
31
32 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yes.
33
34 MR. O'HARA: The reason I mention that
35 was the speed on which some of this would happen. And
36 we've done special actions before and the Federal Board
37 has responded and it's worked well. So just a matter
38 of information on this.
39
40 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Dan.
41
42 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Madam Chair. I
43 guess I should add to the motion, not so much as part
44 of the motion, but discussion of the motion is
45 certainly we want to maintain the consideration and
46 concerns and move them forward that Pete brought up as
47 I think would be important as, what do they call it,
48 record discussion or whatever. That in my mind I think
49 it would be better to leave that language out of this
50 particular regulation, but have the concerns carried

1 forward as part of the discussion. And that we keep
2 that in mind in the future, because there's other hunts
3 that we've had around here considering the Nushagak
4 Peninsula caribou where it could have been discussed as
5 a drawing hunt, but what was done instead was the
6 community representatives from Manokotak, I don't know
7 if Togiak was there, Aleknagik and Dillingham, and we
8 all got together and said, well, there's so many
9 permits will be issued in Manokotak, and so many in
10 Dillingham, and so many in Aleknagik. And then we
11 agreed to let each community decide who would take that
12 permits and hunt for the community, which is another
13 kind of way of regulating things. Which would not
14 necessarily have a bearing on this, because we didn't
15 create a drawing hunt.

16

17 So just to -- I want to make sure Pete
18 and other folks feel that I wasn't disregarding their
19 concerns, because they're valid, but I'm not sure it
20 would work so good in the definition.

21

22 Doi. Thank you.

23

24 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair.

25

26 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

27

28 MR. O'HARA: Call for the question.

29

30 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Motion
31 -- I guess we're going to be motion to adopt WP10-01
32 with modifications. Okay. All those in favor say aye.

33

34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35

36 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any

37 oppositions.

38

39 (No opposing votes)

40

41 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. I guess
42 we're going to be checking on the preschool.

43

44 DR. WHEELER: Madam Chair. I could be
45 fairly quick with the next one and you don't even have
46 to vote on it, because it's a status report.

47

48 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. We'll
49 pick that up then.

50

1 DR. WHEELER: Okay. If you look at
2 Page 13 in your Council books, you can see there's a
3 lengthier briefing, and I'll just give you the
4 highlights here. As I said, it is not an action item,
5 so it won't require a vote by the Council. It's just a
6 briefing on where we're at with the bear handicraft
7 proposal, and you're on that committee as you know.

8
9 This proposal, just to give you a
10 little bit of background, a proposal was submitted in
11 the last wildlife cycle by the Alaska Department of
12 Fish and Game and it received a new number this
13 wildlife cycle, something I'm going to change from now
14 on. When we have a proposal that was submitted one
15 cycle, it doesn't help anybody to give it a new number,
16 because you think it's a new proposal. So we're going
17 to keep the old number as we move through.

18
19 But that proposal was deferred by the
20 Federal Subsistence Board when it addressed this
21 proposal at the May 2008 meeting. And the Federal
22 Subsistence Board voted to form a work group to address
23 the issue of developing a method of tracking brown bear
24 claws. The proposal submitted by the Department of
25 Fish and Game was to refine our regulations dealing
26 with incorporating brown bear claws into handicrafts.
27 So the Federal Board deferred the proposal, said we
28 need to form a work group.

29
30 And the Federal Board further said that
31 the work had to include representatives from all
32 interested Regional Advisory Councils. So it wasn't
33 just going to be a Federal/State working group. It had
34 to have.....

35
36 Do I need to stop, Donald?

37
38 MR. MIKE: Yeah, I think so.

39
40 DR. WHEELER: I'll stop. We'll take it
41 up when they're done. We'll stop and take it up.

42
43 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, we'll
44 take a short recess to accommodate the kids.

45
46 (Off record)

47
48 (On record)

49
50 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Back to

1 order. And, Polly, continue.

2

3 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
4 Boy, they were cute.

5

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A hard act to
7 follow.

8

9 DR. WHEELER: Yeah. Exactly. Sorry.
10 It's just me talking about a bear handicraft proposal.

11

12 So, again, if you look on Page 13 in
13 your book, there's a lengthier briefing, and I'll just
14 hit some of the highlights here.

15

16 There was a proposal submitted by the
17 State of Alaska several years ago to the Federal
18 Subsistence Board to refine the regulations governing
19 the use of brown bear claws in handicrafts for sale.
20 And, again, the Federal Board when it took that
21 proposal up in May 2008, the Federal Board deferred it.
22 They voted to form a work group to address the issue
23 and they were very clear that they wanted to have as
24 many Regional Advisory Councils represented on this
25 work group as wanted to be represented.

26

27 An initial scoping meeting was held
28 between State and Federal Staff in January of 2009.
29 Those Staff developed a draft charge, which you can see
30 at the bottom of Page 13. It's just a two-liner there.

31

32 A briefing on the status of the group
33 was provided to all Regional Advisory Councils during
34 the winter 2009 meeting cycle. A year ago. And at
35 that time representatives from interested Regional
36 Councils were selected to participated in this group.
37 And as I mentioned earlier, Molly was the
38 representative from this Regional Advisory Council.

39

40 The work group has only met once, that
41 happened in June of 2009. Participants from each of
42 the different Regional Advisory Councils asked a bunch
43 of questions. There wasn't a complete agreement on
44 whether or not this was a problem. They asked a bunch
45 of questions, so Federal and State Staff went back to
46 answer these questions. They had to do additional
47 research.

48

49 The group attempted to meet -- or just
50 Federal and State Staff met several times last summer,

1 but unfortunately we couldn't get the Regional Council
2 members all at the meeting. So the work group with all
3 the Council members has only met that one time. So we
4 provided another briefing to you all, to all of the 10
5 Councils at the fall meeting cycle.

6

7 The goal now is to have the work group
8 meet sometime during summer 2010 to address the
9 questions raised at its first meeting and to begin
10 working towards resolution of the issues. At the next
11 meeting, which will be fall 2010, the work group's
12 findings will be presented to each Council for their
13 recommendations, and a full report will be provided to
14 the Federal Subsistence Board at its January 2010
15 meeting. And so the proposal is basically just going
16 to be deferred until that time.

17

18 So this is just an update for you.
19 It's just letting you know where we are at this point
20 in time, which is to say not much further than we were
21 six months ago when we provided you an update.

22

23 Madam Chair.

24

25 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

26

27 MR. O'HARA: Polly, you said they met
28 last summer? I mean, June and they're meeting again
29 this year in June or summertime?

30

31 DR. WHEELER: That's the goal.

32

33 MR. O'HARA: Well, that's not a very
34 good time to meet, I mean, if you want participation,
35 or will the Federal Council not be involved in these
36 meetings; do you know?

37

38 DR. WHEELER: Oh, no, the whole goal is
39 to have the Council members involved.

40

41 MR. O'HARA: Well, summertime is not a
42 good time for us to be meeting anywhere. I mean, after
43 April, we're (microphone off). Sorry. I just thought.

44

45 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Well, when we
46 met it was on -- we did a teleconference, and it was --
47 I didn't know who was all involved -- well, I knew who
48 was involved, but it was hard to detect who was on the
49 other end of the telephone. But we have tried doing a
50 teleconference, and even with a teleconference, it was

1 hard to get people together, so I imagine it's going to
2 be -- especially for the summer season, it's going to
3 be harder yet.

4
5 Okay. Richard.

6
7 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair. Just being a
8 new guy on the block here, have you guys -- as a
9 Council here, have you discussed any of this here so
10 you're going forward with information from this
11 Council, or where are we at with that?

12
13 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Polly.

14
15 DR. WHEELER: I can start and, Molly,
16 you can chime in at any point in time. Over the past I
17 think five or six years there's been a number of
18 proposals, both at a statewide level and then at
19 different regional levels dealing with incorporating
20 brown bear claws in particular into handicrafts for
21 sale. And under Federal subsistence regulations, it's
22 currently legal to do that, but that has been a point
23 of contention for the State.

24
25 And so when they submitted this
26 proposal several years ago to the Federal program, the
27 thought was they could refine this, we could maybe come
28 up with a method for tracking these brown bear claws so
29 we could see that we're incorporating into handicrafts,
30 so they could see if there was really an issue.

31
32 I will say I think some of the Councils
33 are still not convinced that this is an issue, but the
34 Federal Board has committed to working through it.

35
36 So when we met as Federal and State
37 Staff and I think we had nine of the Councils
38 represented at that meeting. The North Slope Council
39 didn't have a representative at that time, because they
40 hadn't met the previous spring. So the Council members
41 were all saying, okay, what's the problem. You know,
42 under ANILCA, you have to take the bear for subsistence
43 purposes anyway, and so what's the problem with then
44 taking the claws and incorporating it into a handicraft
45 for sale. And so there was a lot of talk about that.

46
47 Federal Staff in particular did a bunch
48 of background research, put together a booklet that all
49 of the Regional Advisory Council members that were part
50 of the work group received, and hopefully that

1 addressed a lot of the questions that were raised.

2

3 So I would say it's been discussed both
4 at a statewide level and then amongst the individual
5 Councils. It's currently legal. And until there's any
6 kind of change, that won't change. So it's currently
7 legal to take brown bear crafts [sic] for subsistence
8 purposes and then take the claws and make them into
9 handicrafts.

10

11 But there is some interest in coming up
12 with some sort of a method to track these claws, if
13 it's like, you know, some sort of a paper certificate
14 that goes along with the claws in kind of a chain of
15 custody thing to protect the subsistence user. So if
16 somebody does sell a handicraft with a claw in it, they
17 will be protected as will the buyer.

18

19 If that helps.

20

21 MR. WILSON: Thanks, Polly. Yes.
22 Thanks for the update. I appreciate that. And my
23 thought was also has this Council recommended anything
24 to Molly when she sits on this as one of the members of
25 that. That's what I was asking, was there any
26 recommendations from this Council that she took as part
27 of our take.

28

29 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Polly, go
30 ahead.

31

32 DR. WHEELER: As I remember from this
33 Council, the marching orders from this Council was to
34 kind of make sure that the subsistence user is
35 protected so that, you know, there's some concern that
36 this Council and others don't want there to be a
37 tracking -- if a tracking method is put into place, it
38 shouldn't be so burdensome to the subsistence user,
39 because the thought is that people are trying to make
40 -- you know, take this bear anyway, if they do take a
41 bear, and then incorporate the handicraft.

42

43 And I think Molly was watching out for
44 the subsistence users in this region as a member of
45 that group and then reporting back.

46

47 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any more
48 comments from the Council.

49

50 (No comments)

1 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. No action
2 required on this? We don't have to go down.....
3
4 DR. WHEELER: No action required.
5
6 MR. O'HARA: We don't have to go down
7 through the list?
8
9 DR. WHEELER: No.
10
11 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Good.
12
13 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. I guess
14 we'll go to the second.
15
16 DR. WHEELER: Madam Chair. I can talk
17 about Proposal 10-03, because there will be action
18 required on the part of this Council for that proposal.
19 So we can move into 10-03.
20
21 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
22
23 DR. WHEELER: Okay. The analysis for
24 this proposal can be found on Pages 14 to 19 in your
25 Council books. Again this is Wildlife Proposal 10-03.
26
27
28 This is another housekeeping proposal.
29 It was submitted by the Office of Subsistence
30 Management, and it requests the addition of a general
31 provision in Federal subsistence management regulations
32 to allow the harvest of fish and wildlife by
33 participants in a cultural and educational program.
34
35 Again, this proposal is a housekeeping
36 measure to clarify how these permits are currently
37 issued, but adoption of this proposal will not change
38 how the Office of Subsistence Management currently
39 issues these permits. Most requests for these cultural
40 and educational permits come from culture camps
41 sponsored by Native nonprofit organizations. The
42 permits are typically requested both to teach cultural
43 and educational activities associated with harvest and
44 to provide food for participants in the program.
45
46 Once a program has been approved for a
47 permit, follow-up requests may be made annually for up
48 to five years by the same program to harvest the same
49 type of animal and the amount.
50

1 This proposal basically puts into
2 regulation the guidelines the Federal program currently
3 follows when issuing these permits.

4
5 The regulation has four parts. First,
6 it defines a qualifying program. We've got to have
7 definitions for what these thing are -- what they
8 actually cover, so it defines a qualifying program.

9
10 Second, it alerts the public that the
11 Office of Subsistence Management needs time to process
12 the application while at the same time it allows the
13 Office of Subsistence Management to accept a request
14 for a permit any time. Which is basically the current
15 policy.

16
17 Third, the modified regulation gives
18 direction tot he local field manager in the area where
19 the harvest will occur.

20
21 And, fourth, it gives direction on how
22 to issue follow-up permits.

23
24 The Office of Subsistence Management
25 preliminary conclusion is to support this proposal with
26 modification to simplify the proposed regulation.

27
28 And as I described with Proposal 10-01,
29 the drawing permit proposal, we originally submitted
30 this proposal, but then after looking at it, we
31 realized we could make it more simple. And if you look
32 on Page 19 in your books, the regulation, the modified
33 regulation that we're supporting is in there. And I'll
34 just point out a few key points.

35
36 Before it says, this is again under
37 general regulations, and it's cultural and educational
38 program permits, a qualifying program must have
39 instructors, enrolled students, minimum attendance
40 requirements and standards for successful completion of
41 the course. Applications must be submitted to the
42 Federal Subsistence Board through the Office of
43 Subsistence Management and should be submitted 60 days
44 prior to the earliest desired date of harvest.

45
46 Before, if you look at the original
47 proposal, I think we said they must be submitted 60
48 days prior, so we softened that language a little bit,
49 saying, hey, it would be nice if you could get it in 60
50 days early, but if you can't we'll still accept it.

1 That's the biggest change.

2

3 And then harvest must be reported and
4 any animals harvested will count against any
5 established Federal harvest quota for the area in which
6 it is harvested.

7

8 And then, number 2, requests for
9 follow-up permits must be submitted to the in-season or
10 local manager and should be submitted 60 days prior to
11 the earliest date of harvest.

12

13 So that's basically the process. And
14 now we'll have it in regulation. We had a request for
15 a cultural and educational permit a year ago, and there
16 was a bunch of flurrying around, because we didn't --
17 we realized that we didn't have the process written
18 down in regulation, so this just is a housekeeping
19 process thing. Now we have it in regulation and we can
20 follow it when we get these requests.

21

22 Madam Chair. One other thing again,
23 four Councils have met on this issue so far, and I know
24 the North Slope Council, the Northwest Arctic Council,
25 the Eastern Interior and the Western Interior all
26 supported with modification consistent with the Office
27 of Subsistence Management conclusion.

28

29 Madam Chair.

30

31 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. I guess
32 the next step would be the Alaska Department of Fish
33 and Game comments.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: No comments
38 from -- Federal, State and tribal agency comments.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Seeing none.
43 InterAgency Staff Committee.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Subsistence
48 Resource Committee.

49

50 (No comments)

1 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: I see none.
2 Okay. Fish and Game Advisory Committee.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Seeing none.
7 Summary of written public comments. Donald.
8
9 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madam Chair. We
10 did not receive any written public comments on this
11 Proposal WP10-03.
12
13 Thank you.
14
15 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. About
16 the public testimony.
17
18 MR. MIKE: I did not receive any
19 requests for public testimony.
20
21 Thank you.
22
23 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. The
24 Regional Council deliberation, recommendation and
25 justification. Dan.
26
27 MR. DUNAWAY: I'll move to adopt the
28 recommended modified language.
29
30 And any time you can make the language
31 simpler, I'll certainly support it. I'm also
32 supportive of some flexibility on that 60-day rule.
33 When I was first reading that, I thought, wow,
34 sometimes it can be hard to pull it all together. At
35 the same time, it can get to where it's a little too
36 much if there isn't a little rigor there. But, yeah, I
37 think it's all good intent, and I intend to support the
38 modified language.
39
40 Thank you.
41
42 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair.
43
44 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yes.
45
46 MR. O'HARA: I'll second the motion.
47 And I'll just make a point of order that we make a
48 motion and get a second, then address the comments.
49 Just to get it on the floor. I want to be nice about
50 it.

1 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
2 Additional comments. Any comments from the Council.
3
4 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair, we have not
5 put a number on that motion.
6
7 MR. O'HARA: 10-03. Is that right?
8 Yeah, 10-03. Yeah, for the record.
9
10 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Sorry. Yeah.
11
12 MR. O'HARA: Polly, this is really a
13 good recommendation. And I'm glad to see kind of a
14 working umbrella on these types of things.
15
16 And this may not relate to this
17 particular proposal, but some of the schools and I
18 don't know if the fish biologists are out here today or
19 not, but of the young people, and especially Port
20 Heiden, caught a bunch of, seined up a bunch of -- some
21 silvers and did the aquaculture type thing of putting
22 them in and holding them and everything, and this was a
23 special program. And I'm sure the Alaska Department of
24 Fish and Game was very closely monitoring this for any
25 disease that might take place between when these
26 developed and when they were let go.
27
28 I don't know if they ever followed
29 through the program or not, but these types of things,
30 educational type things -- this was really educational
31 for the young people at Port Heiden to see the milk and
32 the egg and then the development. And I went down
33 there as a contract pilot with the teachers and looked
34 at the program, and it was really fascinating. And
35 there was always a little huddle around there.
36 Elementary and high school students.
37
38 I can see where this probably could
39 relate to those type of things, and I think it's a
40 wonderful program.
41
42 If no more questions, Madam Chair, I
43 would call for the question.
44
45 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. All in
46 favor of 10-03 say aye.
47
48 IN UNISON: Aye.
49
50 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any opposition.

1 (No opposing votes)
2
3 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Seeing
4 none, this 10-03 passed.
5
6 And continuing on.
7
8 DR. WHEELER: Sorry. It's still me.
9 Just two more to go here.
10
11 The next proposal up before you is
12 Proposal 10-04, and you can find it in your book on
13 Pages 20 to 33. This is a little bit more -- this is
14 kind of an odd one, but I'll try and walk you through
15 it, and feel free to ask questions if you -- as always
16 if you have any.
17
18 This proposal was also submitted by the
19 Office of Subsistence Management. This proposal would
20 remove a number of game management units from the areas
21 for which the assistant regional director for
22 subsistence management has the delegated authority to
23 open, close or adjust Federal subsistence lynx seasons
24 and to set harvest and possession limits.
25
26 And just for some of you new members,
27 you might think, why is this proposal before us. Well,
28 the reason is because the customary and traditional use
29 finding is all rural residents. So this is one of
30 those proposals, because the customary and traditional
31 use finding is for all rural residents, all rural
32 residents can harvest lynx on public lands throughout
33 the state. So this proposal, because it's affecting
34 all rural residents, it's before each of the 10
35 Regional Advisory Councils.
36
37 Lynx trapping seasons are adjusted
38 annually based on recommendations determined using
39 Alaska Department of Fish and Game's tracking harvest
40 strategy for managing lynx. The Alaska Board of Game
41 removed Units 6, 12, 20A, 20B, 20C east of the
42 Teklanika River, 20D and 20E from the list of units
43 that are managed using the lynx harvest strategy. And
44 based on this action, these units should also be
45 eliminated from regulation.
46
47 And I will say that the Federal
48 Subsistence Management Program has consistently
49 followed the Alaska Department of Fish and Game with
50 regard to lynx management and the tracking strategy.

1 And over time, the State has removed a number of units
2 from its lynx tracking strategy. So if this proposal
3 is adopted, it would align Federal and State
4 regulations regarding lynx management.

5
6 Season and harvest limits can still be
7 changed through the normal regulatory cycle or through
8 special action if needed.

9
10 There will be no adverse impacts to
11 subsistence users. It's really only the authority
12 delegated to the assistant regional director for the
13 Office of Subsistence Management that would be affected
14 through this proposal.

15
16 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
17 support with modification to delete the regulatory
18 language that's found actually on Page 22, and to
19 delegate the authority to open, close or adjust Federal
20 lynx seasons, and to set harvest and possession limits
21 for lynx via a delegation of authority letter only.

22
23 So that was a bunch of verbiage, but
24 basically in the end what this proposal would do is
25 eliminate the regulatory language and delegate the
26 authority to follow this lynx management tracking
27 strategy to my boss, the assistant regional director
28 for subsistence management, Pete Probasco. Actually
29 it's to the position, it's not to the person, so it
30 would delegate the authority to the person.

31
32 And if you look on Pages 32 to 33 in
33 your book, you can see a sample letter that we would --
34 that would be used to enact this regulatory change.
35 And we're doing this more and more, instead of having a
36 lot of regulations that are really complicated, the
37 delegated in-season manager gets the authority through
38 a letter that describes kind of all the parameters of
39 it. So this would be the sample letter.

40
41 So this regulatory change would again
42 take the lynx management language out of the
43 regulation and put it into the delegated authority, but
44 perhaps more importantly, it would align lynx
45 management, State and Federal lynx management.

46
47 Madam Chair.

48
49 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Dan.
50

1 MR. O'HARA: Polly, go back to Page 22
2 and go to existing Federal regulations, and that little
3 blank and it's .26(f)(3). And that paragraph starting
4 -- do you see where it says February 1 to February 28,
5 do you see that?

6
7 DR. WHEELER: Uh-huh.

8
9 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Now, this says that
10 delegation may be exercised only when it is necessary
11 to conserve lynx population or to continue a
12 subsistence use only within guidelines listed within
13 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game lynx harvest
14 management strategy, and only after Staff analysis of
15 the potential action, consultation with the appropriate
16 Regional Chairs and InterAgency Staff, and you say it
17 pretty much goes back to Pete or did I see something
18 not there that should be there?

19
20 DR. WHEELER: The Office of Subsistence
21 Management preliminary conclusion is to basically
22 delete all that language, but if you look at the
23 delegation of authority letter on Pages 32 and 33,
24 those parameters are included in that delegation of
25 authority letter. Specifically, if you look on Page 33
26 and under number 4, guidelines for delegation, and it
27 goes down, the second paragraph says you will
28 immediately notify the Federal Subsistence Board and
29 notify/consult with local ADF&G managers, Regional
30 Advisory Council members and other affected Federal
31 conservation unit managers concerning actions being
32 considered. You will issue timely decisions, blah,
33 blah, blah.

34
35 But it's got that consultation is
36 imbedded in the delegation of authority letter.

37
38 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any more
39 questions from the Council.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Comments,
44 Polly.

45
46 DR. WHEELER: Just to give you an
47 update on what's happened with the Councils that have
48 met on this thus far, three of the four Councils have
49 supported it. The North Slope Council supported it.
50 The Eastern Interior supported it. The Western

1 Interior supported this proposal as modified. And the
2 Northwest Arctic Council opposed it.

3
4 Madam Chair.

5
6 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Richard.

7
8 MR. WILSON: Polly, the Northwest
9 Council. Reason, please, they opposed?

10
11 DR. WHEELER: It sort of begs the
12 question, doesn't it. They opposed it because that
13 Council in particular is very much opposed to State
14 management, and they didn't like the idea that there
15 would be Federal action that would align with State
16 action, so they opposed it on that principle, just the
17 opposition to State management.

18
19 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

20
21 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Polly, you have all
22 these units up here, and they don't pertain to us, and
23 the Bristol Bay is not in the picture. We don't have a
24 problem with lynx as far as I know. I think we catch a
25 lot of lynx. So why is it here in the first place?

26
27 DR. WHEELER: I know, this is one of
28 those goofy things. It's because the customary and
29 traditional use finding is all rural residents. So
30 under -- so you all could harvest lynx on Federal
31 public lands throughout the state under Federal
32 subsistence management regulations. So it's before you
33 because you are a Federally-qualified user.

34
35 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any
36 more.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: I've got -- I
41 don't know whether or not this is an appropriate time
42 to do it, but on Page 23, there will be no adverse
43 impacts to subsistence users. But I guess in the
44 regional proposal, there was probably some information
45 as to how subsistence users would not be impacted. And
46 in this situation there's no information regarding, you
47 know, now the -- like, for instance, how subsistence
48 users would not be impacted. I don't know if I made my
49 question clear enough.

50

1 DR. WHEELER: I'll take a stab at it,
2 and if I haven't addressed your question, Madam Chair,
3 then ask it again.

4
5 The reason why that statement is in
6 there is because this is really sort of a -- it's
7 taking our lynx management strategy out of regulation
8 and putting it into a delegated authority letter. So
9 on the ground the subsistence user won't see any
10 impact, good, bad or otherwise. So it's just kind of
11 simplifying the lynx management regulations. It's
12 probably a pretty broad statement to say there will be
13 no adverse impacts, but we honestly believe that it's
14 not changing what's going to happen on the ground.
15 It's more of a bureaucratic exercise, if that helps.

16
17 Madam Chair.

18
19 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thanks. Any
20 more comments from the Council.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Seeing
25 none, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: No comments.
30 Other Federal, State and tribal agencies.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Seeing
35 none. InterAgency Staff Committee.

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: None. Then the
40 Subsistence Resource Committee.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: None. Fish and
45 Game Advisory Committee.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: None. Okay.
50 Summary of written. Donald.

1 MR. MIKE: Madam Chair. We did not
2 receive any written public comments on this, nor did we
3 get any requests for public testimony on this proposal.
4
5 Thank you.
6
7 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: And no public
8 testimony.
9
10 MR. MIKE: No public.
11
12 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Regional
13 Council deliberation.
14
15 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. I make a
16 motion that we support Proposal WP10-04, lynx trapping
17 season as -- and there was an amendment to it, if we
18 can get that on the floor. Yes, the modified language
19 is what I was looking for.
20
21 Thank you.
22
23 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. There's
24 a motion on the floor to adopt 10-04.
25
26 MR. DUNAWAY: Second.
27
28 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. There's
29 been a second. Any discussion.
30
31 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair.
32
33 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.
34
35 MR. O'HARA: We have worked at length
36 on this Council, just for some of the people who might
37 be a little new on here, to try to align State and
38 Federal programs all the time. And so I think this is
39 a good thing.
40
41 I'm amazed at how silent the State of
42 Alaska is, but maybe that's a good thing, too. I don't
43 know. Just a comment.
44
45 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.
46
47 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Much like what
48 Mr. O'Hara said, I've always been pretty strong on
49 where they can and where it will make sense that we can
50 get State and Federal things aligned. It reduces

1 confusion to the public, hopefully enhances management
2 of the resource instead of bureaucratic squabbling.

3
4 I'm on a couple of trapping forums now
5 and then, and I believe this Howard Golden has been
6 mentioned in there. I think there's a few State
7 furbearer biologists in the Interior that are working
8 pretty darn hard to do some good work and deserve some
9 credit. And I'm thinking that might be partly why this
10 looks like it will work, and so I'm very much in
11 support of the alignment and simplicity wherever
12 possible.

13
14 Thank you.

15
16 DR. WHEELER: And, Madam Chair, if I
17 could. I just want to, from a process standpoint, my
18 understanding is the Council is supporting the proposal
19 with the modifications suggested by OSM, which is again
20 to delete the regulatory language and to delegate to
21 the ARD for subsistence.

22
23 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. To who?

24
25 DR. WHEELER: To the assistant regional
26 director for subsistence.

27
28 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Richard.

29
30 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair. Yeah. I'm
31 also in favor of this proposal with the understanding
32 that it's a good thing to still have the Feds being
33 able to open and close with the special action. Say,
34 you know, everybody out there is catching a lot of lynx
35 and the numbers go down, it still allows for
36 subsistence users, you know, still to take lynx under
37 special conditions when numbers are dropping. So I'd
38 be in favor of it because of that.

39
40 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any additional
41 comments from the Council.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. I'd call for
46 the question.

47
48 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. For --
49 what is it. All in favor of WP10-04 say aye.

50

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any opposition
4 to this 10-04.
5
6 (No opposing votes)
7
8 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Seeing none,
9 this WP10-04 passed.
10
11 Okay. I guess we move on to -- is it
12 the last?
13
14 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
15 This is the last statewide proposal. Fortunately for
16 you, Spencer will be presenting the rest of the
17 wildlife analyses that are specific to your region, so
18 you won't need to listen to me any more after this.
19
20 This proposal, or this analysis can be
21 found on Pages 34 to 40 in your books. Proposal 10-05
22 was submitted by the Office of Subsistence Management,
23 just like the previous proposals. And it seeks to
24 update, clarify and simplify the regulations regarding
25 accumulation of harvest limits for both fish and
26 wildlife.
27
28 Again, this is a statewide proposal so
29 it's going to be reviewed by all 10 Councils.
30
31 The wording in the general Federal
32 subsistence regulations concerning accumulation of
33 harvest limits dates back to 1990 and 1994, at the very
34 early part of the program. And while the Federal
35 Subsistence Board has addressed a number of area
36 specific proposals concerning the accumulation of
37 harvest limits over the years, this part of the general
38 regulations has not been updated to reflect changes to
39 the unit and area specific regulations. There's a need
40 to update the wording, so therefore we've put in this
41 proposal.
42
43 Proposal 10-05 does not affect fish and
44 wildlife populations, subsistence uses or other uses.
45 Rather the proposal seeks to update, clarify and
46 simplify the sections of the general regulations which
47 reference accumulation of harvest limits.
48
49 The proposed wording changes retain the
50 general prohibition of accumulation of Federal and

1 State harvest limits and they point to unit and area
2 specific regulations for the details and exceptions.
3 So again, the proposed wording, we have the general
4 prohibition of accumulation of harvest limits, and
5 that's retained, but the regulations also point to the
6 unit and area specific regulations for any details or
7 exceptions.

8

9 And again this proposal doesn't change
10 any unit or area specific Federal subsistence
11 regulations concerning accumulation of harvest limits
12 or the timeframe, and the timeframe would be daily
13 accumulations, seasonal accumulation or regulatory year
14 accumulation for those harvest limits.

15

16 The Office of Subsistence Management
17 preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal 10-05,
18 and the proposed language can be found on Pages 36 to
19 37 of your book. So if you look at Pages 36 and 37,
20 it's kind of at the bottom of Page 36 and over to the
21 top of Page 37, the deleted language. And again the
22 OSM preliminary conclusion is to support this proposal.

23

24 And I tell you what the other Regional
25 Advisory Councils did, Madam Chair, while I'm here.
26 Again North Slope, Eastern Interior, Western Interior
27 supported this proposal, and Northwest Arctic did not
28 -- or the Northwest Arctic Council opposed the proposal
29 for the same reasons that they opposed Proposal 10-04.

30

31 Madam Chair.

32

33 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any
34 comments from ADF&G.

35

36 Oh, I'm sorry, I need to question the
37 Council, if you have any comments. Dan.

38

39 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Mr. Chair --
40 pardon me, Madam Chair. Maybe we could have Polly help
41 us make sure we understand accumulation and possession.
42 I was reading this at about 11:30 a couple nights ago,
43 and I had to read it and read it and read it, and I
44 think I understand it, but I was not clear what -- so
45 maybe just what you mean by accumulation and then
46 verify that possession. I think I understand what
47 possession limits are. Once I wrap it and put it in
48 the freezer, it's no longer in possession I think.
49 But, anyway, if I could get help with that, I would
50 appreciate it.

1 DR. WHEELER: I'll try. But sometimes
2 it's easy to get wrapped around the axle with these
3 language changes. Accumulating harvest limits is
4 basically, you know, there's this general prohibition
5 where you can't add up the harvest limits. If there's
6 harvest limits under State and Federal regulation, you
7 can't combine them to get more than what you would be
8 allowed under either system. So you can't say, well,
9 I'll get three fish for Federal subsistence and two for
10 State subsistence get my five. You either get three or
11 you get two. You don't get to add them together, so
12 that's the accumulation part.

13
14 And the possession part, and there's
15 probably enforcement people here, so they can certainly
16 correct me if I'm wrong. But, yeah, once it's wrapped
17 and in the freezer, that's different. Possessing it is
18 literally having it on your person. So depending on
19 the set of regulations, there's sometimes a daily
20 possession limit, a season possession limit. You know,
21 those sort of vary. But once it's off your person and
22 processed, that doesn't count as possession
23 necessarily.

24
25 But obviously, you know, if the harvest
26 is one, that's it. If it's one per year, that's it.
27 If it's one per day, then you can add them up. Does
28 that help?

29
30 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Madam Chair. If I
31 may. So it's not like -- I finally figured it out I
32 think that so it eliminated the confusion that somebody
33 would take say these two reg books and say, oh, the
34 State says I can take one moose in this area, and the
35 Feds say I can take one moose in this area, so I'm
36 going to get one under each. That's what they mean by
37 accumulation. It's not like -- I was thinking more in
38 the case of grouse, I get six today and six tomorrow or
39 whatever. That goes under the possession limit and
40 that sort of thing. Is that correct?

41
42 DR. WHEELER: That's correct.

43
44 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. Thank you.

45
46 DR. WHEELER: Yeah. You can't add up
47 your -- the main point is you can't add up your harvest
48 limits. That's the key point. And that has been a
49 misunderstanding. It kind of ebbs and flows.
50 Sometimes we've had to speak to it, but it has been a

1 concern. Part of aligning regulations is making clear
2 that you can't add up your harvest limits.
3
4 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair.
5
6 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.
7
8 MR. O'HARA: We can go up Snow Creek
9 and kill a moose on State lands and up Big Creek on
10 Federal lands and kill a moose. So you can't get two
11 moose?
12
13 DR. WHEELER: No, sir. I believe we
14 had a special action for Yukon River for Scammon Bay to
15 up the harvest limit to two moose. But to my
16 knowledge, that's the only place in the State where you
17 can get two moose.
18
19 Madam Chair.
20
21 MR. O'HARA: Otherwise, Madam Chair, we
22 might meet the law.
23
24 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Sorry. I saw
25 ADF&G shaking their heads, no comment. Okay.
26
27 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
28 George Pappas, Fish and Game.
29
30 Federal subsistence regulations, area
31 specific ones, do allow some accumulation. The Copper
32 River, you're allowed to accumulate annual limits of
33 king salmon and Federal subsistence caught king salmon.
34 In Southeast you're allowed to accumulate steelhead.
35 It goes to the Federal Board. They can make the
36 decision.
37
38 DR. WHEELER: This is a general reg.
39
40 MR. PAPPAS: General reg. This is a
41 general reg, yeah.
42
43 DR. WHEELER: Right.
44
45 MR. PAPPAS: You can't as a general
46 provision unless you as a RAC request some type of a
47 cumulative regulation.
48
49 And you were talking about the two
50 moose earlier. In a situation where a Federal

1 subsistence limit is higher than a State subsistence
2 limit, you couldn't go -- in the State regulations, you
3 couldn't go out and shoot a moose under the Federal
4 subsistence regulations and then go shoot a second
5 moose under the State regulations, but you can do just
6 the opposite. If you went out and shot your State
7 animal under the State regulation and there's an area
8 that has a regulation that allows two moose, the second
9 animal could be the Federal animal. Does that make
10 sense?

11
12 DR. WHEELER: If the regulations allow
13 it.

14
15 MR. PAPPAS: If the regulations allow
16 it, yes.

17
18 DR. WHEELER: Which the Scammon Bay one
19 doesn't.

20
21 MR. PAPPAS: It doesn't.

22
23 DR. WHEELER: No.

24
25 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you. Madam Chair.

26
27 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.

28
29 DR. WHEELER: Madam Chair. To a
30 certain extent this goes back to what you covered under
31 10-01, and that is there's this general regulation, but
32 if the unit specific regulations allow for a
33 difference, that's okay, but otherwise the general
34 regulation applies. So this is the general over-
35 arching regulation, but there may be unit specific
36 regulations that allow for that.

37
38 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah. Okay. I
39 think we kind of have an idea about that one. Okay.
40 Other Federal, State and tribal agency comments. Frank
41 Woods.

42
43 MR. WOODS: I think one thing to
44 remember that was said -- Frank Woods, Bristol Bay
45 Native Association, subsistence coordinator.

46
47 In every region of the State we have
48 high cost of fuel. High cost of living. And there are
49 some members of the community are designated as super
50 hunters that in certain regions they combine all

1 resources to send somebody out to harvest subsistence
2 foods.

3

4 I wasn't too clear on that. I
5 understand accumulation and what it means as a general
6 idea, but in some regions of the State it might be
7 beneficial to keep -- and it sound like from the State
8 side there are provisions for that, but I'm not too
9 clear on what that might look like.

10

11 You know, I know that subsistence
12 opportunity is opportunistic. When the time is there,
13 you need to go harvest. Under this regulation, it
14 looks like they may be able to restrict harvest and
15 limits. Take, for example, on the lower Kuskokwim, the
16 State had mandated no subsistence fishing for king
17 salmon. And I'll caution that if in these regulations
18 we restrict subsistence users from helping themselves
19 provide for their families, then I think that we need
20 to be cautious.

21

22 But I understand the concept and as
23 long as the State provides adequate information and
24 regulation to provide for the subsistence use activity,
25 and accumulative -- I mean, there's a part where, you
26 know, there's times of shortage, you've got to send --
27 you know, I can't afford to run 80 miles upriver by
28 myself at 6 bucks a gallon, so what I'll do is I'll
29 buddy up with my family members and friends. And also
30 a proxy hunt. And the State allows for that, you know,
31 because I've got a big family, and I'll provide for as
32 many family members as I can. But I would be real
33 cautious is just my concern.

34

35 With that I'll leave it up to you.
36 Thanks.

37

38 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. We appreciate you
39 coming, Frank, and testifying today.

40

41 You said that the State might make a
42 provision for an accumulation of things. I didn't
43 quite understand that. And maybe the State of Alaska
44 will help us out, too, on that, too. Yeah.

45

46 MR. WOODS: Maybe George. He testified
47 in certain areas of the State it works one way from
48 being able to go get a Federally-recognized hunt permit
49 to get a moose, but it doesn't work the other way.
50 Maybe explaining -- that's why I'm cautious about it,

1 because right now the caribou regs for the Multchatna
2 herd in 17 -- or basically all of them are kind of
3 mixed up and that's I guess it's on the next agenda.

4
5 But my caution is, is that when people
6 need to harvest -- just like the Village of Stuyahok,
7 and they have a herd. It's opportunistic. They have a
8 herd that runs through there right in their front door
9 and back door and they're on Federal lands. They might
10 want to -- and I'll just refer to last year. They
11 requested an emergency order to extend the hunt to
12 April 15th so they can harvest while the caribou
13 migrated around in the spring. The State basically
14 said it was a non-issue. But, you know, because right
15 now under Federal regs they're allowed three caribou
16 and under State regs they're allowed to. And it's
17 restricted from October until March 15th.

18
19 So you've got to be a little bit, I
20 mean, flexible, and I don't know if this will allow it
21 I guess is my understanding.

22
23 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Polly.

24
25 DR. WHEELER: If I could, Madam
26 Chairman. Frank raises some good points, and there's a
27 couple of issues that you have there. But one of them
28 is, I mean, in the example that you just gave, if the
29 State allows two caribou, the Feds allow there, you
30 could get two caribou under State regs, and you could
31 get a third -- you could go up to the third if you're a
32 Federally-qualified subsistence user. If you're a
33 State user, you just -- which would be, of course, all
34 Alaskans, you only get the two. But you don't get
35 five. So you get a maximum of three. You know, you
36 can get the two and then the one, up to three, but you
37 don't get the five.

38
39 The other thing is Frank mentioned the
40 proxy hunt. The Feds have the same or similar program
41 with designated hunter, and you can see it on Page 18
42 in the reg book. It talks about, you know, if people
43 aren't able to go, somebody can go hunting for somebody
44 else.

45
46 But this proposal, this Proposal 10-05,
47 is not intended to limit subsistence opportunity. It's
48 just intended to make clear that you can't add up these
49 harvest limits.

50

1 MR. O'HARA: That's understandable.
2
3 DR. WHEELER: So you don't get to five.
4 If there's two and three, you don't get to five.
5
6 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dale.
7
8 MR. MYERS: Madam Chair. Polly -- or
9 Frank brought up some good points there on the proxy
10 hunting. Kind of ran into different situations, you
11 know, the cost of fuel in going out, and there's some
12 people who can't hunt. When you're doing the proxy
13 hunt, I mean, I've had -- you know, like you can't go
14 out and get yours and the proxy one at the same time.
15 I don't know if there's -- and then, you know, like for
16 caribou, if you're only allowed one say in an area, and
17 you have four people that want to proxy hunt, well, you
18 have to go out four different times to get those
19 caribou, you know, and five times if you want to get
20 your own. And if you have a herd running by and you
21 know you need them, and it's like, well, I've got to
22 run back and close out this one, turn in my permit, get
23 the other permit, come back out and go back up. And
24 then, you know, sometimes the weather changes,
25 opportunities change, and, you know, somebody ends up
26 going without. So I don't know if that was kind of
27 what -- I think that's what you were kind of getting
28 at.
29
30 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Polly.
31
32 DR. WHEELER: And, Madam Chair, if I
33 could, if you look on Page 18 on the left-hand side of
34 the page in your blue book, it talks about the
35 designated hunter provisions, and I'll just read it
36 here.
37
38 If you're a Federally-qualified
39 subsistence user, you may designate another Federally-
40 qualified subsistence user to take deer, moose and
41 caribou on your behalf. So there's no disability, you
42 don't have to be disabled or anything. You can just
43 designate somebody else to take it on your behalf.
44
45 Designated hunters may hunt for any
46 number of recipients. So you can hunt for any number
47 of people. But have no more than two harvest limits in
48 possession at any one time except where specified under
49 unit specific provisions.
50

1 So as an example, I mean, you as a
2 Council could submit a proposal to change that if you
3 wanted to, but as it stands, as a general rule, you can
4 only have two harvest limits in possession. You can
5 hunt for any number of people as a designated hunter,
6 but you can just have two limits in possession at any
7 one point in time.
8
9 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any more
10 questions, comments from the Council.
11
12 (No comments)
13
14 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thanks,
15 Frank.
16
17 Okay. The InterAgency Staff Committee.
18
19 (No comments)
20
21 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: None.
22 Subsistence Resource Committee.
23
24 (No comments)
25
26 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Fish and Game
27 Advisory Committee.
28
29 (No comments)
30
31 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: No comments.
32 And, Donald, any summary of written.
33
34 MR. MIKE: Madam Chair. There's no
35 written public comments received on Proposal 10-05.
36 And I did not receive any requests for public
37 testimony.
38
39 Thank you.
40
41 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Pete, you have
42 something?
43
44 MR. PAPPAS: Yes, Madam Chair. I need
45 to clarify my comments earlier. There isn't a State
46 provision that allows accumulation of Federal and State
47 harvest limits. What I was trying to say in an area,
48 if there's a State limit of one animal, and you hunt
49 that animal under State regulations, you're done for
50 the year. In an area that has two animals under

1 Federal subsistence regulations, if you get that first
2 animal under the Federal subsistence regulations, you
3 can't participate in the State hunt, because you
4 already have your annual limit of that one animal for
5 the area. Does that make sense? So there isn't a
6 State provision allowing accumulation. If you shoot
7 your State one first, as Polly said earlier, if there's
8 a higher limit under Federal subsistence regulations,
9 under Federal regulations you're allowed additional
10 animal.

11

12 Thank you. Madam Chair.

13

14 MR. O'HARA: George. Frank made an
15 interesting point there. He said that the animals were
16 going by Stu and I think maybe the State had already
17 closed down their program. It's been too long I guess
18 since I've been on the advisory board for the State of
19 Alaska, but is there a provision that you can make, is
20 there an emergency provision you can make to let them
21 -- since they didn't -- say their caribou came up
22 toward Lake Iliamna and then swung back through Stu in
23 the springtime, and it's March 14th, you're not going
24 to get them, and closed on the 15th, can you have an
25 opening? You've got to come up and talk to the
26 microphone and give us your name.

27

28 MR. WOOLINGTON: Excuse me. I'm Jim
29 Woolington, Fish and Game, area biologist here in
30 Dillingham.

31

32 The question was regarding what people
33 can do regarding contacting the Board of Game for
34 emergency proposals. For biological emergencies,
35 people can address the Board, but as far as, you know,
36 being considered an emergency because people didn't get
37 animals before the season closed, it's generally not
38 considered a biological emergency.

39

40 It's not a biological issue, and that's
41 what the Board of Game has to go by.

42

43 MR. O'HARA: Thank you.

44

45 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Richard.

46

47 MR. WILSON: Yes, madam Chair. Over
48 there in King Salmon/Naknek area we have Tier II
49 program, you know, for the caribou. And that, maybe
50 the State guys can help me on that, and how that's set

1 up and what kind of window they look for for that
2 opening. And that maybe can help clarify some of this.

3
4 MR. BUTLER: Mr. Chair [sic]. Members
5 of the Board. My name is Lem Butler, I'm the area
6 biologist out of King Salmon and manage that hunt
7 that's being referred to.

8
9 The caribou regulations in 9C around
10 King Salmon are actually somewhat complex. There's a
11 Tier II Northern Alaska Peninsula caribou hunt that we
12 haven't opened in a while. But what we did recently, I
13 think in 2005, was we established a winter registration
14 permit to take advantage of Mulchatna caribou coming
15 into the are. I'm still not issuing Tier II permits for
16 the Northern Alaska Peninsula herd, because there isn't
17 a harvestable surplus in that herd. But when the
18 Mulchatna herd is in the area and the Northern
19 Peninsula herd is not vulnerable to the hunt, I have
20 issued emergency orders to open a pre-authorized hunt.

21
22 So the Board actually set up season
23 dates and bag limits of it at some point, and they just
24 give me the discretion to open that when we have the
25 opportunity. And again that's when the Northern
26 Peninsula herd isn't vulnerable, but the Mulchatna herd
27 is in the area and available.

28
29 Generally those still fit within the
30 regular Multchatna season dates, so affect most of the
31 areas around 17 and 9B. But it's just a discretion,
32 pre-authorized.

33
34 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair.

35
36 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Richard.

37
38
39 MR. WILSON: Yes. Lem. So what kind
40 of key component do you look at for the actual opening?
41 What kind of numbers or -- I'm assuming it's numbers,
42 you know, that you look at before you can open that
43 system?

44
45 MR. BUTLER: Through the Chair. I
46 guess there's several levels associated with it. I
47 mean, part of it is again that the Mulchatna herd does
48 have animals that are available for harvest. And again
49 that ability is recognized through the general
50 regulations associated with other herds.

1 In terms of the decision-making
2 process, when that hunt's actually been opened, it's
3 not necessarily the number of Mulchatna caribou that
4 are in the area, although I do like to see enough
5 caribou to provide reasonable opportunity for people.
6 But if there were only 100 animals in the area and the
7 Northern Peninsula herd wasn't vulnerable, and someone
8 wanted that hunt, we'd probably open it to give what
9 little opportunity is there to go get a Mulchatna
10 caribou here. Because again the greater population
11 tends to sustain some harvest.
12
13 I guess the only time I wouldn't open
14 the hunt is when the Northern Peninsula herd is
15 vulnerable to the hunt, of the Mulchatna herd -- like
16 this year, the Mulchatna herd just didn't come into the
17 area, so we didn't open the hunt, because it would have
18 been essentially a moot point. People would have been
19 looking for caribou where there weren't any, and it
20 wouldn't have served a purpose.
21
22 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any more
23 comments from the Council.
24
25 (No comments)
26
27 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. I guess
28 we can.....
29
30 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Madam Chair. I'll
31 move to adopt WP10-05 with the recommended language as
32 presented to us by --in the book here and by Polly
33 Wheeler.
34
35 Thank you.
36
37 MR. WILSON: I'll second it.
38
39 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Discussion.
40 Council. Dan.
41
42 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Madam Chair.
43 Well, again, simpler should be better. It is a pretty
44 complex topic, but if it helps people. I can see how
45 you could get a group of folks talking among themselves
46 and they got off on a wrong track. It could be a trick
47 to get everybody reeled back in. So I hope this aids
48 understanding.
49
50 I was curious about the State position.

1 I'm pleased their listening.
2
3 But I'll be supporting this proposal
4 with the recommended modified language.
5
6 Thank you.
7
8 DR. WHEELER: Madam Chair. There is no
9 modified language. It's just support as is is the
10 preliminary conclusion for OSM.
11
12 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.
13
14 MR. O'HARA: Mike. Donald. Do you
15 have a little flier or some information you send out to
16 the Bristol Bay Region?
17
18 MR. MIKE: Madam Chair. Mr. O'Hara,
19 through the Chair. A flier? Can you be more specific
20 of a flier you're discussing, either wildlife or
21 fisheries?
22
23 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. You know, earlier
24 when you gave your introductory report, you said that
25 some kind of information went out the region, and in
26 relationship with Mr. Dunaway, it's just going to be
27 really confusing on lines and boundaries and dates and
28 bag limits. And all this stuff, there's always just a
29 citation sometimes.
30
31 So I guess there's -- you know, as
32 Council members we can talk to a certain number of
33 people, but we're not going to reach the whole region.
34 So if you have any way of communicating to our
35 subsistence users in Bristol Bay.
36
37 MR. MIKE: Through the Chair. The
38 flyer I was talking about earlier today, was this
39 during our work session?
40
41 MR. O'HARA: Yeah.
42
43 MR. MIKE: Yeah, it's our program
44 issues I think two newsletters, twice a year, for
45 distribution statewide, but I was suggesting to the
46 Council if they want to keep in contact with their
47 constituents in Bristol Bay, we can have a similar
48 newsletter issued to the villages, so just to keep them
49 up to date on Bristol Bay Council activities or any new
50 regulations what come out, and that's another way of

1 outreach to the public.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 MR. O'HARA: Is that pretty costly to
6 do something additional?

7

8 MR. MIKE: It may cost us printing, but
9 we can do it in-house as far as doing some information
10 gathering, but as far as production, I don't know how
11 much it would cost, but we may look into it.

12

13 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Polly.

14

15 DR. WHEELER: The other point that I
16 was going to make with regard to the regulations, Madam
17 Chair, is that this, you know, the blue book, the
18 handy-dandy, is the public's regulations, you know.
19 The actual regulations are in the Federal Register.

20

21 But I would suggest, and I always do,
22 that if you have changes, you know -- and these, the
23 regulations that you're making recommendations on right
24 now, those are going to be before the Federal Board on
25 May 18th to 21st. So they won't be actually
26 regulations until the Federal Board acts, and then we
27 have to quick get them in the Federal Register, and
28 then we'll publish this book.

29

30 But if you have recommendations, I
31 recognize that sometimes this book isn't as clear as it
32 could be, so if you have recommendations, or if anybody
33 has recommendations for how the language could be
34 simplified, that would be very, very helpful to us. So
35 I would ask, you know, if there's things that you see
36 that you think, God, that's goofy, that doesn't really
37 make sense, or it's not real helpful, anything that you
38 could help us to make things more clear, that would be
39 appreciated.

40

41 Mr. Chair -- or Madam Chair.

42

43 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: And, Polly, the
44 recommendations can be -- can come any time or is that
45 through the proposal process?

46

47 DR. WHEELER: Well, recommendations for
48 wording and how to make the reg books, you know, a
49 little more clearer, that we'll take any time. The
50 actual regulations get acted on the by Board for

1 wildlife every two years and for fisheries the opposing
2 years. So it's every two years we would accept
3 proposals.

4
5 But then we can also take regulatory
6 action through the special action process.

7
8 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

9
10 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. That stuff would
11 be quite a tangle though. I'm not going to propose any
12 language, but I was going to draw people's attention to
13 a feature that I think both the State regulation and
14 the Federal hunting regulation book have that I think
15 is really, really helpful, and it's called a what's new
16 section up front. And I found it on Page 2 of the
17 Federal regulation book. And that would be one place
18 that the public could get notified. I think there's
19 something like that in the State books, too, but I
20 don't see it in the first couple pages.

21
22 I think I'd be inclined to support
23 having a newsletter generated for our council, too, to
24 get the word out that could also go to like the media
25 outlets to help the word get out. I think some of
26 these statewide regulations are probably more confusing
27 than the local ones. But this one -- I don't know if
28 it's been a problem, but it might be helpful to get it
29 out there.

30
31 That's really all I had to say. Thank
32 you.

33
34 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any more
35 comment.

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: I just need I
40 guess clarification. I'm not a hunter, but I'm a
41 processor, and I got lost when there was a discussion
42 on the -- what is it, the lottery hunt. So because of
43 the gas, the high cost of gas, and if two or more
44 people, hunters, go to go harvest moose or caribou,
45 could one go like for one and the other one for the
46 other, or if I went, it would just be for the harvest
47 of caribou and another person that comes with me
48 wouldn't be coming to do the lottery hunt. Do you
49 understand what I'm trying to get at?

50

1 DR. WHEELER: I'm not sure I understand
2 you. But I think Richard does.
3
4 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Right.
5
6 MR. WILSON: I think you're referring
7 to the proxy hunt.
8
9 DR. WHEELER: Proxy or designated
10 hunter?
11
12 MR. WILSON: Proxy, yeah.
13
14 DR. WHEELER: Yeah. And under Federal
15 regs, a designated -- you know, if you're a Federally-
16 qualified subsistence user, which you are, you can
17 designate another Federally-qualified subsistence user
18 to hunt for you.
19
20 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Same time?
21
22 DR. WHEELER: Same time. Well, no, I
23 mean, if you're hunting, then you can't designate
24 somebody else to hunt for you. But you can designate
25 somebody else to hunt for you if you can't or don't
26 want to hunt.
27
28 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: How about if I
29 went hunting and then somebody else came along that was
30 designated by somebody else?
31
32 DR. WHEELER: Yes, that's good. Yes.
33 But you can't go hunting and designate somebody else to
34 go hunting for you.
35
36 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Dan, did
37 you have something.
38
39 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Call for the
40 question.
41
42 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. All in
43 favor of 10-05 say aye.
44
45 IN UNISON: Aye.
46
47 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any opposition.
48
49 (No opposing votes)
50

1 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. You're doing
2 good. It's hungry time.
3
4 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: It's 10-05
5 passed. And I think we can break for lunch and then
6 deal with seven other.....
7
8 DR. WHEELER: Region specific
9 proposals.
10
11 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah. After
12 lunch. So come back, what, 1:30? Or is that long
13 enough? 1:30. Okay. We'll break and be back at 1:30.
14
15 (Off record)
16
17 (On record)
18
19 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. We're
20 going to call the meeting back to order.
21
22 One of our Board members that was stuck
23 in King Salmon arrived here, so I'm going to have him
24 introduce himself to you folks. Alvin.
25
26 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Alvin Boskofsky from
27 Chignik Lake.
28
29 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: And then
30 there's a couple of Staff members I guess that haven't
31 got introduced.
32
33 MR. CAMPBELL: Do I need to go to the
34 mic?
35
36 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yes.
37
38 MR. CAMPBELL: Rod Campbell. I'm with
39 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence
40 Management.
41
42 DR. WHEELER: Polly Weaver with the
43 Office of Subsistence Management.
44
45 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: And then before
46 we get started, remember the green cards for public
47 testimony. They're in the back on the table. And
48 we're going to keep this open throughout the day.
49
50 And Donald wants me to have Joe

1 introduce himself.
2
3 MR. KLUTSCH: Hello.
4
5 MR. MIKE: Welcome, Joe.
6
7 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. We have
8 one Board member missing. I guess he had a late lunch.
9
10 So I guess if there's no more
11 announcements, business, we can get started with our
12 Bristol Bay regional proposals. We have about seven to
13 cover. 10-45.
14
15 MR. REARDEN: Yeah. Spencer Rearden
16 with Office of Subsistence Management.
17
18 Earlier you mentioned maybe skipping
19 10-45 or did you guys prefer to start with 10-45 as the
20 agenda.
21
22 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Yeah, I
23 guess this morning when we were discussing the
24 proposals, I think it was Dan that suggested that we go
25 from -- or skip 10-45 and go from 45 down to 53 and
26 then we'll pick up 10-45 last. In that order.
27
28 MR. REARDEN: Okay. Madam Chair.
29 Members of the Council. Spencer Rearden. Like I said,
30 I'm a wildlife biologist with the Office of Subsistence
31 Management.
32
33 The analysis for Wildlife Proposal 10-
34 46 begins on Page 52 of your Council books.
35
36 This proposal was submitted by the
37 Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and
38 requests that Federal public lands in Unit 9B and a
39 portion of Unit 9C be closed for the taking of moose by
40 non-Federally-qualified subsistence users.
41
42 Data indicates that Alaska Department
43 of Fish and Game's management objectives are being
44 maintained. Populations appear to be stable and
45 bull/cow ratios are healthy. Unit 9 reported success
46 rates are typically above 30 percent for locals. And
47 non-local success rates are typically above 50 percent
48 because of the use of airplanes. Between 2000 and 2008
49 reported harvest for Federally-qualified subsistence
50 users has been relatively stable.

1 The effect of the proposal, if adopted,
2 would lead to a closure of Federal public lands to non-
3 Federally-qualified moose hunters. Some competition
4 with non-locals may be reduced, but may also increase
5 if non-locals are concentrated near areas where locals
6 hunt.

7
8 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
9 opposed the proposal. The closure of Federal public
10 lands will not likely result in a significant reduction
11 in competition or a significant increase in the moose
12 population. And biological data indicates a healthy
13 moose population.

14
15 I'll take any questions if you'd like.

16
17 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Council
18 members have any comments. Questions. Dan.

19
20 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Madam Chair. And,
21 Spencer, you know I started thinking. We've got quite
22 a few moose proposals and some of them kind of over
23 lap, and one move was to separate that first one
24 because it was -- the way it's written is it depended
25 on our passing one or another of these other ones. I'm
26 wondering if we should take a few minutes just to
27 briefly touch on all of the ones that are coming in
28 front of us to kind of help maybe zero in on maybe
29 which ones we do or do not want to adopt or change or
30 whatever. Or if everybody's had a chance to prepare or
31 not.

32
33 I've read through them, but I still get
34 them a little confused, but I was kind of wondering
35 what the rest of the Council feels like. I feel like I
36 need to kind of have an overall view here. Otherwise
37 if I go and take an action on one, and then go to the
38 next one, I might go, oh, shucks, I should have done
39 this one, not that one, and so on. I'm just wondering
40 how the Council feels, or if Spencer could maybe just
41 touch on the main points of the other few we have in
42 front of us. And I'll see what the pleasure of the
43 Council is.

44
45 Thank you.

46
47 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any
48 comments to that. Richard.

49
50 MR. WILSON: I would be in agreement of

1 it. Madam Chair. That would certainly help things,
2 align my thoughts.

3
4 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. If it's
5 okay with the Council, we'll have Spencer give us an
6 overview of all these proposals before we take any
7 actions.

8
9 MR. REARDEN: Okay. Well, many of
10 these moose proposals are for closures of Federal lands
11 in one way or another within a portion of Unit 9,
12 either it be Unit 9B, C, or E. The one I just
13 summarized before you is closing Federal lands entirely
14 for 9B and a portion of 9C.

15
16 I also have a few proposal analyses
17 that want to close Federal public lands along selected
18 waterways, within two miles of selected waterways
19 within 9B, 9C and 9E. And each one of those are
20 analyzed separately; however, the data and the
21 conclusions -- there's many similarities between them,
22 but there's some minor differences. So like I said,
23 they're pretty similar.

24
25 And the proposal that we skipped over,
26 which was 10-45, this, from my understanding, is
27 contingent upon what happens in 10-46, so they're
28 related. And 10-45 wanted to reduce the length of the
29 season based on adoption of 10-46 from my
30 understanding. This is what the Council was
31 recommending.

32
33 And then I have another proposal for
34 Unit 9E which wants to close Federal lands entirely for
35 non-Federally-qualified users from moose hunting.

36
37 So, you know there's some differences,
38 but many similarities. And I'm not sure. I know
39 originally, specifically with the waterways, that the
40 former Chair wanted these to be addressed separately
41 and that's why we did analyses separately. However,
42 like I said, there are many similarities.

43
44 My summaries are fairly short, but I'm
45 not real sure on what the best way to address each one
46 of these since there's so many similarities with these
47 moose proposals.

48
49 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.
50

1 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Madam Chair. Even
2 that much helps me. Even though like I say I've read
3 these, I get them -- I'm coming down with a cold and my
4 thinking's slowing down right along with it. So I
5 don't know if people want to go further into it or if
6 we could wade in.

7
8 Now that you remind me, I see they are
9 somewhat separated, but I just wanted kind to regroup a
10 little bit before we waded in.

11
12 MR. BOSKOFISKY: (Indiscernible,
13 microphone not on)

14
15 MR. DUNAWAY: Numbers?

16
17 REPORTER: Alvin.

18
19 MR. BOSKOFISKY: (Indiscernible,
20 microphone not on)

21
22 MR. MIKE: The Recorder's asking you to
23 turn your mic on.

24
25 MR. DUNAWAY: Maybe restate our
26 question.

27
28 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Well, I was asking if
29 we had any survey numbers of what's been caught by
30 State or Federal before we really get into changing
31 proposals and stuff on our subsistence users. We're
32 looking at shortening days for subsistence, but I don't
33 think, you know, there's no shortening of anything for
34 sport. So we're basically restricting our subsistence
35 users from hunting.

36
37 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

38
39 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Madam Chair.
40 Through the Chair. Alvin, I think that's partly why we
41 wanted to step over that 10-45, which is the only one
42 that talks about shortening seasons. And I think if
43 you look on that one page there, it said something to
44 the effect that we were proposing that and would
45 support it only on the condition that Proposal 46,
46 WP10-46, gets adopted. There on Page 41. So we were
47 going to skip over that one.

48
49 As far as your questions on numbers and
50 such, from my reading through this book, there is quite

1 a bit of analysis that's provided, I really appreciate
2 the folks that did all this work, showing Federally-
3 qualified hunters, non-Federally-qualified residents
4 and then non-residents for a variety of locations.
5 According to the main point of the proposal.

6

7 And I see several wildlife biologists
8 and other folks out here ready to support I think if we
9 need more help.

10

11 Do we need a little time for folks to
12 look at these or go into more detail on kind of the
13 basic nature of each proposal before we tackle them?
14 I'll turn it over to the Chair. Here, take it.

15

16 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Well, my
17 feeling is like Dan may have spent a lot of time
18 reading through the proposals, but some of us may have
19 not, so I'd be comfortable if we go through each of the
20 proposals and have -- you know, then have you explain.

21

22 I don't know if -- I'm not sure if we
23 should -- because they're so closely related and
24 intertwined, if we should go through and vote on each
25 one as we finish one, or just -- what's your --
26 Richard, do you have any comments on how we can deal
27 with these.

28

29 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair. I, myself,
30 would like a little more background from biologists
31 into things on how perhaps they came upon the numbers
32 that they're giving us. I mean, I, myself, as a
33 resident over in the 9C area, 9B don't see these kinds
34 of numbers. And I wonder how these numbers are
35 originated, you know, how they come about, so I can
36 better understand what's going on here.

37

38 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: So I guess we
39 can just go through the process and deal with each one
40 of these proposals. Because if we try to do an
41 overview and not really understand the background
42 information on them, we're going to have a hard time
43 deciding.

44

45 So you have the floor.

46

47 MR. REARDEN: Okay. Madam Chair. I
48 could walk you through some of the analyses that I've
49 done, but to address Mr. Wilson's comments, as far as
50 how the data is collected and stuff, I would have to

1 refer to one of the biologists that's actually on the
2 ground to maybe fill you in on how that process works.

3
4 But as far as what's presented in front
5 of you in the text, I can kind of walk you through to
6 help you gain a better understanding, because, yeah,
7 they are intertwined and challenging to separate in
8 your mind.

9
10 So if you'd like, I could start, or if
11 you'd like more information to begin with as far as how
12 we came up with some of these numbers as far as moose
13 densities and composition, I'd turn it over to one of
14 the local biologists who actually collects the data.

15
16 MR. WILSON: That would be my
17 preference. That at this time would be great for me if
18 I could maybe get a little input from biologists at
19 this point would help me before I continued on.

20
21 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.

22
23 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madam Chair. We
24 are Becharof Refuge Staff that are weathered in in King
25 Salmon, but they'll try to make it in, but the Staff
26 from Becharof, you know, they have some information
27 that they can provide to the Council if they have any
28 particular questions on the survey data. But if we
29 need to, we can set up a teleconference and tie them in
30 through teleconference and that way they can answer
31 some questions or provide a summary to the Council.

32
33 Thank you.

34
35 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. You have
36 the floor. We're all yours now.

37
38 MR. REARDEN: Yeah. Madam Chair. I'd
39 like to turn it over to Lem Butler who helps collect
40 this data from my understanding cooperatively with
41 Becharof National Wildlife Refuge, at least some of it.
42 Some of the data is collected together.

43
44 MR. BUTLER; Ms. Chair. Members of the
45 Council. My name is Lem Butler, area wildlife
46 biologist for Game Management Unit 9, based out of King
47 Salmon.

48
49 And I do work pretty closely with
50 Becharof Refuge. We have very similar areas that we

1 survey. I'm familiar with their methodology that
2 they're applying, so I can probably answer the
3 questions at hand.

4
5 Just as an overview, there's generally
6 two methods for collecting moose surveys, data that I
7 utilize and what you see in your tables. The primarily
8 tool that's been used through time is trend area
9 surveys where we have identified specific areas that we
10 feel are representative of the area and large enough to
11 include enough animals to get a feel for what the
12 population's doing in that area.

13
14 Both survey methods I'm going to talk
15 about are airplane based, and we try to do it at the
16 same time of year so we can get as consistent of data
17 as possible. The moose in the area are migratory.
18 They move around.

19
20 Bulls, of course, lose their antlers
21 early December so we're trying to typically fit our
22 surveys into a time of year where the moose are
23 sightable. There's good snow cover. The moose have
24 antlers so we can identify bull to cow ratios, calf to
25 cow ratios, that sort of thing. And again they're
26 consistently in the same area so we can identify over
27 time the trend of the population so we can monitor the
28 population using those techniques.

29
30 Survey data and conditions tend to be
31 very difficult to get in the areas. I'm sure Richard
32 is well aware of. Consistent snow cover where it's
33 really easy to see moose readily is important.
34 Sightability varies drastically with poor snow cover.
35 You get into milder conditions and it can be really
36 difficult to see moose at all from an airplane.

37
38 But in the interest of continuing to
39 collect data, I've gone progressively to doing fall
40 composition surveys where again trying to just go out
41 at the same time of year when the bulls have their
42 antlers and, you know, you can identify cows and calves
43 and that sort of thing, trying to get as many moose
44 sighted as possible in these different areas to
45 represent bull ratios and calf ratios.

46
47 So that's kind of one of the
48 differences you see. If you see a density estimate,
49 it's probably coming from a trend area where we went
50 out and counted as many moose as we could. We will have

1 come up with a bull to cow ratio, calf to cow ratio in
2 those instances. And typically also you're see a
3 density estimate, how many moose were seen per square
4 mile in the area that was surveyed. If you just see a
5 bull to cow ratio, that's probably one of these
6 composition surveys where again I'm just trying to go
7 for a sufficient sample size in an area to make a
8 determination as to what the ratios are.

9

10 And pretty much what we're looking at
11 that there is, you know, do you have enough bulls to
12 breed the cows and provide a reasonable opportunity for
13 hunters. You know, hunters aren't really happy if you
14 have 10 bulls per 100 cow, it might enough to breed the
15 cows, but that means that hunters are seeing a lot of
16 cows and not many bulls, legal animals. So we're
17 trying to collect enough data we can to make those
18 evaluations and management decisions.

19

20 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair.

21

22 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

23

24 MR. O'HARA: Lem, who goes from Igiugig
25 on up north on State and Federal lands? Do you do
26 that as well?

27

28 MR. BUTLER: (No audible answer)

29

30 MR. O'HARA: So, you know, if we're
31 going to tie these, try to tie these. Dan was just
32 telling me we might try to get a composition of
33 proposals into maybe something we can live with without
34 spending the rest of the day trying to do all the rest
35 of them.

36

37 You know the concern we have in the
38 Naknek area up through about Big Mountain. We feel
39 like there's a decline of moose, and in your report it
40 looks like there is a decline of animals there
41 apparently. And then you've got from -- you know,
42 they're all the way down to Ugashik, that's another
43 section. And then you've got the Meshik, from that
44 area all the way down to Alvin's place. So could you
45 address maybe geographically?

46

47 And what was the second point? The
48 first one was use of airplanes and they stay in the
49 same areas. You do a visual from an airplane. What
50 was the second thing that you did? I missed it? You

1 said you had two things.

2

3 MR. BUTLER: Well, yeah, there's two
4 different methods that I'm using again, the trend
5 survey, which is what we've done historically. We have
6 data going back to the 70s.

7

8 But with complications associated with
9 getting good consistent snow cover, I've gone to
10 composition samples where we're just trying to -- we're
11 not trying to figure how many moose there are in any
12 given area. We're just trying to get a representative
13 sample of the moose to identify bull to cow ratios and
14 calf to cow ratios. So those are the two different
15 methodologies.

16

17 In terms of area, again I'm the only
18 person that surveys all of Unit 9 up to Lake Clark and
19 down through the Becharof Refuge area. So I'm pretty
20 involved with most areas.

21

22 The only area I really don't get much
23 into is Lake Clark, Buck Mangapane (ph) up there is a
24 really biologist, gets out and does the majority of the
25 sampling up in that area. He uses a similar, you know,
26 rotating trend area in his methodology.

27

28 And that's the area where we're
29 wondering what the moose population is doing. He had a
30 low data point last year. I talked to him briefly this
31 year, and I don't think they were able to get as much
32 done as they wanted. But that's the only area that
33 we've documented a decline.

34

35 The Alagnak area has been pretty
36 stable, in 9C, since the 1980s, which I think I gave a
37 more thorough report on two years ago, as are most of
38 the areas in Unit 9. We're really not seeing a decline
39 in moose numbers. And the bull ratios are really good
40 in all those areas, so we don't have a concern with
41 moose other than that one consideration again around
42 Lake Clark, wondering what might be going on up there.

43

44 But again the thing to realize with
45 trend data is that it can be variable from year-to-
46 year, and you can't base your assessment on one data
47 point. Moose do different things, just like the
48 caribou did something completely different in the
49 Naknek area this area. Moose often do the same thing.
50 If it's a warm winter with less snow cover, they might

1 utilize the habitat differently. And that might affect
2 the number of moose you see in any one given area. So
3 it's really a long-term trend that you're looking for,
4 and that's why -- and I think Buck would agree with
5 this, that you're hoping to get another data point at
6 some point to confirm or disapprove essentially what's
7 happened in that particular area before you make a
8 large conclusion.

9

10 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair.

11

12 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yes.

13

14 MR. O'HARA: These guys just don't show
15 up in September. And you go up there in December and
16 they're everywhere. That one island had 200 moose on
17 it at one time, and the wolves weren't hardly getting
18 any of them. But, you know, back in September, we
19 could barely get a -- they move differently in December
20 apparently than they do -- and maybe it's too warm and
21 the rut is coming a little later or something.
22 Whatever. So how do you take three areas and make it
23 into one proposal.

24

25 MR. BUTLER: I wouldn't take -- you
26 know, and that's the thing I try to reemphasize
27 whenever we talk about moose in Unit 9. It's a big
28 geographic area. Unit 9 is 34,000 square miles, and
29 what's happening in one area doesn't have any bearing
30 on what's happening in another area often. I mean,
31 there's some connectivity obviously, but, no, I think
32 it's really difficult to make a sweeping statement, you
33 know, in that regard. Or to come to a simple proposal
34 that would somehow capture the needs and differences of
35 all the different areas and associated.

36

37 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. Okay. The
38 one way of looking at shortening the days, is that
39 you're very familiar with our proposal. And that's a
40 pretty cut and dried, something that the State of
41 Alaska can nod their head on?

42

43 MR. BUTLER: Say that one more time?

44

45 MR. O'HARA: Well, our proposal to
46 reduce the number of days in 9B, you're pretty much
47 aware and understand, and maybe that's a good
48 conservation move?

49

50 MR. BUTLER: Yeah, I think that is. I

1 don't know if we're talking about that proposal right
2 now, but I think that's really something to look
3 closely at. The State supported that proposal. I
4 think if you look through the regulatory history,
5 essentially what you have is non-locals operating in
6 the fall season, and they really don't show up during
7 the winter.

8

9 The purpose of the State winter season,
10 which in my opinion is long as it stands, was to
11 provide opportunity to local residents in the area.
12 The Federal system expanded on those dates further,
13 providing even more opportunity, but, you know, it's a
14 low density moose population. Moose recruitment into
15 the population isn't very large. The populations don't
16 have much capacity for increase.

17

18 And based on those two points, I've
19 always stated consistently that you really have to do a
20 good job of managing what you have. If you hurt what
21 you have, it's going to have a hard time recovering.
22 So I think you know, reducing those seasons and working
23 conservatively with what you have is beneficial to
24 subsistence use in the area.

25

26 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

27

28 MR. DUNAWAY: The other one. Yeah.
29 Dan O'Hara, one thing, I wasn't necessarily advocating
30 rolling these all into one proposal. But I was
31 thinking that a lot of the discussion kind of covers
32 all of them, and also to give us time to say, well,
33 some of them could conflict if we adopt this and then
34 turn around and look at the next one and say, oh, we
35 like -- so I was thinking if we talked about them all
36 kind of as a group and then maybe go one at a time.

37

38 And then that one with the shortening
39 of the season, which as we proposed it, we said we
40 really only wanted to support that if, for example,
41 Proposal 46 is also adopted, which was going to be a
42 lot more restrictive on non-Federally-qualified folks.
43 I was thinking it would take time to look at them all
44 and give us time to understand the data, understand
45 what else is in the pipe like this State/Federal or
46 State predator control plan that may be adopted soon I
47 understand. All of those things kind of come together
48 I think before I want to even make a decision on any
49 one.

50

1 The one last thing I was thinking, we
2 were talking about how we get the biological data. I'm
3 wondering if Richard also had a question on how the
4 harvest and hunter data that we have here, where that
5 came from. Is that correct?

6
7 Mr. Chair -- Madam Chair.

8
9 MR. WILSON: Yeah. Madam Chair, if I
10 may. I'm still not really real clear on how -- I mean,
11 I realize -- you're saying that the ratio between the
12 bull and the cow, the cow ratio is good yet. In your
13 surveys, do you do hard numbers or is this just a --
14 and when was the last time you surveyed and are they
15 hard numbers?

16
17 MR. BUTLER: Through the Chair. You
18 know, it's a big area again, so, you know, our effort's
19 distributed differently for each areas. I did
20 composition data this winter, last winter. The year
21 prior we did trend survey data. So we try as best we
22 can to get data from as much area as possible, but
23 it's.....

24
25 MR. WILSON: Well, help me to
26 understand, please. Composition data, do that one
27 first for me, please.

28
29 MR. BUTLER: Okay. So the composition
30 data is what I get from both survey groups, but again
31 in years where we just don't have very good conditions
32 for snow, but we still want to get some information, I
33 don't do a trend area survey, I do a composition survey
34 in those years just to try to sight as many moose as
35 possible, to come up with that bull to cow ratio and
36 calf to cow ratio, so the composition of the population
37 is the target. And so that's essentially what's
38 happened the last two years between, you know, plane
39 availability, weather conditions, you know, and the
40 different things going on in that small window of time
41 where you actually have a good chance of seeing moose.
42 As Dan mentioned, in the summer, you know, they seem to
43 just disappear and then they pop out of nowhere
44 seemingly. So during that time of year where you can
45 see them and the bulls have antlers and you can still
46 identify readily from an airplane what a bull and a cow
47 is. That's when I'm trying to get that composition
48 data.

49
50 So I have done that in 9C for the last

1 two winters. 9B I got composition data last year. And
2 Becharof Refuge I guess did some survey data this
3 recent winter in 9E, which would be to the south of us,
4 down towards Egegik and further south.

5
6 MR. WILSON: And so those numbers, I
7 think I read it somewhere in the State, was like there
8 was 8,000 moose that was estimated in 9B? Is that what
9 I was -- I can't remember where I picked that up at.
10 Dale, do you remember?

11
12 MR. BUTLER: Oh, I think I can add some
13 clarity to that, too. It just took me a while to try
14 to rectify that number. 8,000 moose is what I estimate
15 for all of Unit 9, so that's 9E, B, C, and that
16 includes park lands and everything else. It's a low
17 density population, you know, you're right, ranging --
18 well, some areas just aren't good moose habitat at all,
19 so there's zero moose in some areas obviously. But
20 typically from the subunit point of view, you're
21 looking at about .5 to less than one moose per square
22 mile. Generally about .9 moose per square mile in most
23 areas.

24
25 And again we don't survey the entire
26 unit. We do obviously game surveys throughout the
27 area, but we have key areas that we try to look at
28 consistently, and those are the origin of those
29 numbers.

30
31 MR. WILSON: Okay. I guess kind of
32 where I'm going there, Madam Chair, is I wasn't part of
33 this operation here last year, but this is before us
34 this year, you know, and there was a definite concern
35 of, you know, the lack of moose, you know, for
36 subsistence purposes in Unit 9. And I was just trying
37 to get some reality behind it here.

38
39 Because myself show that same concern.
40 You know, we've been, especially in the Naknek/Kvichak
41 district, that area there which I'm pretty familiar
42 with, I don't see these kind of numbers. And so that's
43 why I questioned this, and that's why I'm going where I
44 am. I don't know.

45
46 Thanks.

47
48 MR. BOSKOFISKY: I think the numbers
49 that we really want to see is what sport is taking
50 compared to what the subsistence users are harvesting.

1 I haven't heard anything what numbers are in the Black
2 Lake/Aniakchak area. From the word that I've been
3 hearing, that there's been a big decline. It's
4 probably over half of what it was -- what the count was
5 the year before. And it's no way to fix the problem.

6

7 MR. BUTLER: I think I can address at
8 least portions of that. I don't think there were any
9 counts down for several years in the Black Lake area.
10 The Fish and Wildlife Service did do a count this
11 winter. They didn't feel like the survey conditions
12 were great for coming up with that total number of
13 moose. They simply threw out the ratios in that case.
14 Do you have that to hand out? Or do you have that
15 information?

16

17 MR. REARDEN: Yeah. The handout should
18 be in the.....

19

20 MR. BUTLER: Okay. Great, so you can
21 look at the ratio data there.

22

23 And what I recall after talking with
24 the pilots right when they got back from that survey
25 was that they did see a lot of bulls down in that area,
26 and that looked pretty good.

27

28 In terms of harvest, generally what
29 we're seeing from the non-locals is a decline. You
30 know, they aren't taking a lot of moose, particularly
31 in 9B and 9C. 9E is an area that they do take more of.
32 But about 70 percent of that harvest is north of Port
33 Heiden, and only about 30 percent is south of that.
34 You know, as you get down towards Black Lake, it gets
35 pretty hard to reach.

36

37 You do have guides that operate down
38 there on a regular basis, but the air transporters in
39 particular are reluctant to go that far with clients.
40 Their clients land in King Salmon. They want to get
41 out in the field, but they don't want to spend too much
42 money, so they stack up closer to King Salmon and
43 really don't hit the lower section of the Peninsula,
44 which is what we see for bear hunting as well. As you
45 get down into that Black Lake country, the harvest
46 rates just really start to taper off in those areas.

47

48 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

49

50 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Dale, help me out

1 with this. But I didn't see, Richard, too many non-
2 Federal subsistence users in the Naknek area for moose.
3 What do you mean, they don't go very far and they stay
4 in Naknek? I probably misinterpreted that. And I want
5 to talk to you about a little farther down the
6 Peninsula.

7

8 MR. BUTLER: Thanks, Spencer. That's
9 right. There aren't many non-local users in the Naknek
10 drainage. They tend to hunt more around Becharof Lake,
11 Ugashik, you know, Pacific side, Kvichak, King Salmon
12 River, so further to the south. The non-locals flying
13 out of King Salmon are hunting in 9E more so than 9C.

14

15 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair.

16

17 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

18

19 MR. O'HARA: In relationship to Alvin's
20 comment about moose taken out of the Black Lake area,
21 and around that area, is there much of a commercial
22 effort in that area, do you know, Lem?

23

24 MR. BUTLER: (Indiscernible, microphone
25 not on)

26

27 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. But the stuff that
28 they have in their backyard.

29

30 MR. BUTLER: There's some activity --
31 thanks. We're all having button problems today. There
32 is some non-local activity down there. I think even
33 the Chignik Corporation lands are offered to a guide
34 down there who hunts on the corporation lands in that
35 drainage. So there are a few moose that get taken from
36 that area. I don't have that breakdown to offer you to
37 put a hard number on it, other than to say that, yeah,
38 there are moose taken. It's not a significant number
39 of moose. The bull ratios are good, and that's
40 primarily what we're going on.

41

42 The key difference, and I think you
43 started to touch on this at one point. What is the
44 difference between the local and non-local and why, you
45 know -- I think at one point it was said why are we
46 talking about restricting the locals and doing nothing
47 to the non-locals. Well, one of the primary
48 differences is that, again, the non-locals hunt during
49 a very short period of time. They have about 10 days
50 to hunt or 15, depending on where you are. And they're

1 taking their moose under an antler restriction. Which
2 means that they aren't going to harvest every moose
3 available. They have to have a moose that's 50 inches
4 or greater. As such they really aren't able to impact
5 the populations significantly, and they're again
6 reduced over such a short period of time with a very,
7 you know, big restriction in place, that it's hard to
8 really restrict them further, particularly since the
9 bull ratios are so good in these areas. It's just not
10 -- that limited harvest isn't have a big impact on the
11 moose population. It's occurring over a large
12 geographic area. Areas where often locals don't have
13 access to. The non-locals are using airplanes a lot.
14 I know a lot of guides actually make a big effort to
15 stay away from local users. You know, they'll -- to
16 the point of relocating camps to try to avoid them. So
17 they typically are in areas that aren't, you know,
18 directly conflicting with the local use.

19
20 Another thing that we've talked about
21 at past meetings is that they are taking moose, but
22 they're also often donating that moose to communities.
23 At times that can be problematic if the moose meat
24 isn't in good condition. But I think in other cases
25 we've identified times where it's actually beneficial
26 the local community in that they're getting moose meat
27 that they otherwise might not have access to. So I
28 mean, it's really something to weigh into the balance
29 that there are benefits to having non-locals including
30 that our wolf harvest goes up when the non-locals are
31 in the area. They're accessing areas and taking wolves
32 to some extent, or bears in season.

33
34 So, you know, it's just -- I mean,
35 again the non-locals are pretty restricted as is and
36 there's probably some real benefits to consider
37 associated with their presence.

38
39 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair.

40
41 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Again, there was a
42 report that was put out here not too long ago that I
43 heard. There was 48 sport moose taken, and two
44 subsistence users that took moose.

45
46 MR. O'HARA: Alvin, where was that at?

47
48 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Out of Black Lake area.

49
50 MR. O'HARA: Out of Black Lake are.

1 Wow, that's a huge number.
2
3 So you go to -- have you heard of
4 Triple A?
5
6 MR. BUTLER: I have heard of Triple A,
7 yeah.
8
9 MR. O'HARA: And you heard of Pumice
10 and you heard of Cinder River. Meshik. And then Jay
11 King has Scotty Allen. He's the biggest threat to Port
12 Heiden, Jay is, because you can see him from the
13 runway. And he may take one moose a year, something
14 like that. A lot of times he didn't get any.
15
16 And so the guys from Ugashik, their hue
17 and cry is that the non-subsistence guys are taking all
18 the moose. They're miles from those guys. The only
19 way you can get there is if you've got a Super Cub or a
20 helicopter.
21
22 And then you take Port Heiden, the
23 nearest guide is Jay, and he takes one moose. And I
24 don't know if they're going to get over there to get
25 his moose or not. It's just hard to get there. You've
26 got an 18-foot Lund and if you don't have money for a
27 jet boat, you're just not going to go to those places
28 and get those moose.
29
30 And so, you know, Butch King may have
31 14 heads at Cinder. And I've seen a lot of heads, and
32 I've hauled a lot of stuff out of Cinder, a lot of
33 those things off of his neck out of there. Pen Air.
34
35 Dale, you know the area better and more
36 than I do.
37
38 I think if you really wanted to help
39 Alvin out, then on Federal lands in the Black Lake
40 area, you're going to have to put a zone in there where
41 they can if they can reach it with a fourwheeler and an
42 18-foot Lund, give them the moose.
43
44 The guys in Becharof Lake, they go up
45 all the way up there with an 18-foot Lund. If you want
46 to draw a zone around Becharof Lake so that Igiugig
47 guys can go up there with a skiff and get a moose
48 without landing on some lake and setting up a camp,
49 they're not going to do that, then you're going to help
50 the subsistence user out.

1 Ugashik guys, they're just too far
2 away. And I think Triple A's too far away, you know.

3
4 And then, of course, we compete with
5 most anybody in the Bristol Bay are in 9B.

6
7 So I think that's the crux of the whole
8 thing is if they're taking too many moose out of
9 Alvin's area and they are a non-subsistence user, then
10 this body needs to start restricting those guys in that
11 area. And it sounds like you've got a little bit of a
12 moose problem anyway.

13
14 And Meshik, Cinder River, Ugashik those
15 are miles away. There's no sense even blaming those
16 guys to be realistic about it. I mean, I've flown
17 every inch of it I don't know how many hundreds of
18 times. I've seen it all. And then, of course, we're
19 our area by reduction of time.

20
21 So those are my thoughts.

22
23 MR. ABRAHAM: Madam Chairman. I had a
24 serious question, but I think the wind blow it away. I
25 can't remember it now. Well, just a last question.
26 Who are the non-Federally-qualified subsistence users?
27 Who are they? I mean, you've got Naknek and Port
28 Heiden. You know, there's not that many people down
29 there. Who are they?

30
31 MR. BUTLER: Through the Chair. I
32 guess I'm not really sure exactly to what we're
33 referring to, but typically probably what we would
34 consider the non-Federally-qualified subsistence user
35 -- the State views all Alaska residents as subsistence
36 users, and that's how we manage wildlife resources,
37 with preference for subsistence users, but under our
38 constitution we have to treat everyone equally. The
39 Federal Government makes further discretions, so you --
40 in that scenario, you might get into a non-Federally-
41 qualified subsistence user scenario. Anyway, I'm just
42 kind of speculating as to what that might be referring
43 to without actually being able to see it. Maybe
44 Spencer wants to chime in there, too.

45
46 But I will say, you know, with
47 reference to 48 moose being taken around Black Lake, I
48 know that that number is going to be wrong. There's,
49 you know, only about 60 moose taken in all of 9E, and
50 70 percent of that harvest is occurring north of the

1 Meshik, so the numbers just don't add up to 48. I'll
2 bet that's just bad information that may have been --
3 you know, come from who knows where, but that's not
4 accurate.

5

6 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Spencer.

7

8 MR. REARDEN: Madam Chair. Maybe to
9 address your question, the question about Federally-
10 qualified/non- Federally-qualified, Lem summed it up
11 pretty good. And in my analysis I kind of presented
12 between the groups. Obviously Federally-qualified
13 rural residents are the people from that particular
14 area, people from Unit 9, are people that qualify under
15 the Federal regulations.

16

17 A person, for example, that's non-
18 Federally-qualified, but still an Alaskan resident is a
19 person from Anchorage or someone outside this Unit 9
20 area. Someone from Fairbanks, Anchorage would not
21 qualify under the Federal regulations.

22

23 And then, of course, non-residents are
24 non-residents, not from the State.

25

26 So under the Federal customary and
27 traditional use determinations, we consider Federally-
28 qualified rural residents as folks from those areas,
29 and we specify for each within our regs.

30

31 So I hope that helps clarify some of
32 this.

33

34 MR. ABRAHAM: Yeah. Madam Chairman.
35 In other words, those people are from like Fairbanks,
36 Anchorage, they're big game hunters?

37

38 MR. REARDEN: Madam Chair. Not
39 necessarily. Like the State, they consider them
40 residents, simple residents, and subsistence hunters as
41 State residents. Under the Federal regulations, we
42 don't consider them as qualified residents, or rural
43 residents, because they're not from that area. So the
44 people that are from Outside, you know, I'm not sure
45 what you label them. I mean, they're just not
46 qualified under our regulations for the Federal side of
47 it.

48

49 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. I mean, I think
50 probably a lot of them would come from the larger

1 population centers, but when talking about Unit 9E, for
2 example, if even you were to go down there and hunt in
3 that area, since you're not from a community that's
4 designated to be able to hunt in that area under the
5 Federal regs, even you might be lumped into that
6 category at some point coming from a different part of
7 the State or the same with someone from Bethel or some
8 other location. So it's just identifying the hunters
9 that are under Federal identified as having the ability
10 to hunt under Federal regulations in that area versus
11 all other Alaska residents.

12

13 MR. ABRAHAM: Madam Chairman. Yes, I
14 understand non and rural hunters, subsistence hunters,
15 but all under the State law, Federal law. To restrict
16 these people over here from different areas, in the
17 eyes of Federal law or State law, especially the State
18 law, is discriminating these other subsistence hunters.
19 Yes, Federal law says, yeah, we have some restrictions
20 here and there. I mean, we are supporting subsistence
21 users, some local subsistence users.

22

23 But under the State law there's
24 discrimination. That's why you see, you know,
25 opposition here and there. I mean, if we look at a law
26 a little closer and work with the local people and work
27 with the traditional council, and work together, the
28 State and Fed together, I think we'd have less -- none
29 of these frictions between us, and I mean between the
30 State and the Fed, because the other guy is not telling
31 the other guy what we're going to do and what we're
32 doing. That's why we have these questions and
33 unanswered questions. And in the length of time of
34 talking about one particular item for many hours,
35 because there's no communication, adequate
36 communication between these two governments over here.

37

38 Thank you.

39

40 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

41

42 MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you, Madam Chair.
43 Yeah. That's helpful, Pete.

44

45 I think this is helping me to just get
46 an overall picture of the terms we're using and how
47 data is collected and even a little bit you touched on
48 was how, say, the non-subsistence folks use the area.
49 And you touched on it a little bit.

50

1 And one question I had is, is there any
2 -- like the air taxi drop-off hunters or guided
3 hunters, do they -- or which ones do or don't use, say,
4 like Becharof or Ugashik Lakes, or do most of the fly-
5 out guys stay well out of the drainages that are
6 readily accessible to local communities from Naknek
7 down to Chignik I guess. I'm real curious about that,
8 because some of these proposals are trying to set up
9 two-mile buffers with the idea, I think of providing
10 more local opportunity. I think the hope was -- at
11 least the parts that I had advocated, the hope was help
12 the local guy, but not wipe out the other folks either,
13 because it's a huge area, and there's a lot of the area
14 that unless the local person has a float plane, or a
15 plane, they can't get there either. It's just not --
16 it wouldn't be fair to wipe the other folks out.

17
18 But could you give me a little more on
19 how the area is used by folks?

20
21 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. Through the Chair.
22 I mean, it would seem to me that they're really using
23 it quite a bit differently and accessing areas
24 differently through the use of airplane. I mean, a lot
25 of the fly-in activity occurs, you know, either -- I
26 mean, there's a few guys that are hunting the Pacific
27 side in areas that locals aren't getting. In some
28 cases like Dan was saying, they're at the upper extent
29 of a river where even though they're on a waterway or
30 close to a river, they aren't directly in the same area
31 necessary that a person from a local village might be
32 able to access.

33
34 In some cases, the non-locals might be
35 floating the rivers. They're starting at a high place
36 and floating down to a location. So the two user
37 groups do interact to some extent, but probably the
38 majority of it is pretty well separated, just simply
39 due to the method by which they're accessing the area.

40
41 I think the thing to realize though is
42 that a lot of the moose habitat is within two miles of
43 a river corridor, so, you know, if you -- you know,
44 you're essentially getting into a lot of land and
45 effectively closing an area if you go with a simple
46 two-mile buffer on a waterway.

47
48 And, you know, in years past we're
49 looked at this data, trying to figure out where people
50 are having conflicts at boaters and such. And one of

1 the things that came to light there, there were a lot
2 of rivers that were identified in that particular year
3 in that proposal that we didn't have much evidence that
4 locals were using, or non-locals, so, you know, again
5 similar to that, if we just put these blanket two-mile
6 buffers across large sweeping areas, we probably aren't
7 getting at the heart of the issue.

8

9 Another interesting thing to look at
10 is, you know, if you're hunting close to a community,
11 you're probably talking about -- on a riverway, you're
12 probably not talking about Federal land. If you're
13 hunting out of Chignik Corporation owns a lot of that
14 land around the lake, so it's not Federal land that's
15 in question, it's corporation land, and again in the
16 case of Chignik, Chignik's actually allowing a non-
17 local guide to operate in that area. They're receiving
18 some benefit in terms of revenue, probably receiving
19 some meat from that particular operator. But it's not
20 a Federal land issue, which is what, you know, we're
21 talking about here.

22

23 Port Heiden, Ugashik, Pilot Point, even
24 Naknek/King Salmon, that's all surrounded by State
25 lands in a lot of cases. And, true, as you move up
26 those river corridors you do get into Federal land
27 relatively quickly, but a lot of that activity, you
28 know, where you have good deep, navigable channels and
29 such, you're starting at least in State lands, and it
30 isn't until after a while before you're into the
31 Federal lands. And the non-locals may be on the same
32 river, but, again, with airplanes they're probably
33 accessing a point much higher on that river channel.

34

35 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

36

37 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. That helps.
38 Excuse me. Another thing, there's a whole bunch of
39 Board of Game meetings have been going on or are going
40 on, I can't keep it all straight, this is a really busy
41 winter. Are you aware, Lem, or anybody else here, are
42 there any either recently adopted or soon to be
43 discussed State proposals for State regulations that
44 would mesh or supplement these proposals or address the
45 local concerns in these areas for moose hunting?

46

47 I found last night letters to our
48 meeting from a year ago and I know we've had them in
49 the past, because some of this has been kind of a
50 festering issue for Chignik area and Ugashik area. I

1 know I heard a bit I think a year ago from Dan Kingsley
2 about how hard it was for folks to find moose. And
3 Randy Alvarez spoke of it. So are there any State
4 actions that might help address this that we don't know
5 about?

6

7 Thanks.

8

9 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. It seems like I've
10 been to all the Board of Game meetings recently, so,
11 yeah, we have had quite a flurry of activity there.

12

13 But in terms of proposals that would
14 directly address moose hunting in Unit 9, our cycle is
15 to have those proposals brought to the Board in the
16 spring of odd numbered years, so in the spring of 2011
17 there will be another opportunity to address moose
18 hunting regulations.

19

20 What we're currently working with with
21 the Board of Game is predator control issues that have
22 largely been deferred from past meetings. The Northern
23 Alaska Peninsula caribou herd has a proposal to address
24 wolf predation on caribou in parts of Unit 9C and all
25 of Unit 9E. That proposal was deferred from March 2009
26 to the January 2010, and now this weekend I'll be going
27 back to the Board of Game to talk to them about that
28 same proposal.

29

30 One of the sticky points with it is
31 that Unit 9E is about 70 percent Federal land, so
32 anything that we do in that area has some tie to
33 Federal lands, and what we'll be able to do in that
34 area with predators is part of an ongoing discussion
35 that we're having with the Federal Government right
36 now. So even if that proposal is passed, whether we'd
37 be able to implement a predator control proposal that
38 is designed to benefit caribou, but may by default
39 benefit moose remains to be seen again due to this
40 standing issue with Federal lands and application of
41 predator control on Federal lands.

42

43 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

44

45 MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you, Madam Chair.
46 So there weren't any proposals from those communities
47 for similar, like two-mile buffers closer to the
48 communities or maybe some other effort to encourage
49 opportunity and maybe discourage nonlocal opportunity,
50 strictly the predator control?

1 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. Right now we're
2 strictly talking about predator control. The cycle in
3 which the Board of Game can even put out a call for
4 proposal and address the Unit 9 moose specific proposal
5 won't occur until spring of 2011, so this fall,
6 probably in September, there will be a call for
7 proposals for that meeting. So at that point a
8 proposal could be forwarded moose in this area.

9
10 In the past we certainly have had a
11 number of them, you know. Consistently again it's the
12 same issues that you're -- and information that you're
13 hearing essentially is what the Board's had to go on to
14 make their decisions. And with no conservation issue
15 associated with the moose population, and fairly light
16 harvest in a lot of areas, they really haven't seen a
17 need to restrict non-locals. Well, I mean, and, of
18 course, they would talk about this in a different
19 arena. They haven't seen a need to restrict State
20 regulations, because again there's no benefit to the
21 moose population that would be forth-coming from that
22 sort of restriction. So typically proposals have been
23 presented to the Board, but they've failed.

24
25 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

26
27 MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you, Madam Chair.
28 Well, and some of this, you know, the two-mile buffer I
29 believe, just for background, springs from what I think
30 has been a relatively successful solution to a problem
31 in the upper Nushagak River, but I wasn't following
32 some of that that close. But that's a State
33 regulation. And from somewhere I guess near the mouth
34 of the Mulchatna upstream quite some distance on the
35 Mulchatna and on the upper Nushagak there's a two-mile
36 buffer that's in State regulation. My sense is, and
37 there might be a few folks who can speak better to it,
38 but my sense is that folks in New Stuyahok and
39 Koliganek are pretty darn happy with it. I don't
40 recall hearing that the State enforcement people are
41 having much trouble enforcing it. There is room for
42 the guides and non-qualified people to hunt outside
43 those areas, and apparently do.

44
45 And so I think the people are looking,
46 I know I was looking at that when I was thinking, can
47 we somehow translate this down to 9E and help folks out
48 and get this boiling teapot settled down a little bit.
49
50

1 And I don't know, I see Jim Woolington
2 in the room, were there different circumstances that
3 allowed it to be enacted, or can you speak to that?
4 Thanks.

5
6 MR. BUTLER: I can address it to some
7 extent, although I'd certainly welcome Jim's input into
8 the issue.

9
10 I think what you essentially have is a
11 difference in the scope of the regulations. You're
12 talking about a closure under State regulations in one
13 case, or a restriction under State regulation, which
14 affects user groups differently than when you're
15 talking about doing that same thing under the Federal
16 regulations. You know, even at that level, and again
17 Jim might be the better to address this, but you're
18 talking about an allocation between user groups. You
19 aren't getting rid of all Alaska residents, just some,
20 and there may be some permit provisions associated as
21 well that Jim could speak to certainly better.

22
23 And I think another component of that
24 was trying to separate caribou hunters from moose
25 hunters, trying to, you know, reduce some conflicts and
26 tensions that way.

27
28 So it really is a different vehicle
29 though if that is done under State regulations versus
30 Federal regulations again due to the scope and the
31 authorities to close. You know, under the Federal
32 regulations without a biological issue, conservation
33 issue, if there's not a direct impact on customary and
34 traditional uses, I think those closures have been a
35 lot harder to institute, whereas when the Board of
36 Game's making a decision on that level, it's more of an
37 allocation between user groups and trying to reduce
38 conflicts that way.

39
40 In terms of application of that concept
41 to Unit 9, I think there are potentials ways to do that
42 under State regulations, and you know, I'd certainly be
43 willing to talk to people as we're coming up on this
44 Board cycle about different ideas that may help
45 alleviate some of these conflicts, and try to see if we
46 can't do something under the State system with that.

47
48 MR. DUNAWAY: Thanks. Madam Chair.
49 Those are some of the things that I was swirling
50 through my head, and it seemed like if we talked about

1 them once instead of as we did proposal, it might be
2 helpful. I'd forgotten of the cycles. I was really
3 hoping that there would be an associated State proposal
4 that might make them work, but maybe we're just off
5 cycle enough. I think I'm satisfied at the moment.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 MR. O'HARA: Lem, you're familiar with
10 the lodge there at Igiugig on the mouth of the King
11 Salmon River? He's right on the Igiugig River. I
12 think it's called Lake Becharof -- Lake Lodge or
13 something like that. And they have some really big
14 high powered equipment that you're probably well
15 familiar with, and Public Safety is, the brown shirts
16 are familiar with. But they cruise up that Igiugig
17 River with a four wheeler and they hit the beach a
18 running, and they're a big taker of animals. If you're
19 thinking about somehow impacting the locals in Igiugig
20 and doing a two-mile corridor on either side of the
21 King Salmon River, a two-mile corridor on Becharof
22 Lake, because that's all Federal lands, you know, they
23 don't go very far up King Salmon River before you're
24 right in Federal lands. You can look at that chart
25 there. You'd go a long ways -- not necessarily you,
26 but we would make proposals to do that. And then those
27 guys who have that equipment will just have to move up
28 the hill a little farther.

29

30 Thank you. Madam Chair.

31

32 MR. WILSON: Yes, Madam Chair. So many
33 different thoughts going on here, but I just -- hunting
34 along the areas that I'm familiar with in the Naknek
35 River drainage, the Kvichak River drainage, and some of
36 the lake area there, typically when a resident goes out
37 and wants to harvest a moose, they generally will go
38 places where they don't believe anybody else is. So if
39 there's a lot of activity on a river system with guides
40 and that, typically you don't get residents doing a
41 subsistence hunt up there, because they know they ain't
42 going to find what they want.

43

44 And so that's a difficult one to gauge
45 if you say that people aren't using that section, you
46 know, no numbers are coming in from that section on
47 subsistence users, well, one of the reasons is, you
48 know, they just -- they tend to go where people don't
49 want to be -- I mean, where this is nobody.

50

1 And in the Kvichak drainage, there's
2 very little area there of Federal lands. There's some
3 BLM lands. Bear Creek, there's a little chunk. You've
4 go to go two miles up the creek, and about that time
5 then the creek runs out of water. So there's a little
6 chunk there. You go up the Yellow Creek, and you get
7 far enough up there, on a good year where there's a lot
8 of water, you can get in there, but there's a -- you
9 know, it's way up. So there's not a whole lot of
10 Federal stuff there. And then the further on you go up
11 into the lake country, you know, a lot of it's back off
12 of the river systems. So there's not a -- this
13 language here that we're trying to adopt, or looking
14 into here would assist those areas very little, but it
15 will help.

16
17 But I like the idea of maybe the State,
18 you know, coming on board with some of the thoughts
19 about maybe at least in thought putting some corridors
20 aside, you know, that would keep commercial traffic
21 off.

22
23 That's kind of what I had for that.
24 Thanks.

25
26 MR. O'HARA: Lem, along Richard's
27 thoughts there, there's a restriction for two miles off
28 of the Nush, but any Alaskan can go in there, and
29 you've got to come to Dillingham and get a permit,
30 prove your rights, you know. And it's just hard to
31 come all the way down here and get a permit, then go up
32 the river if you're from Anchorage unless you're here
33 for some other reason. So it's a win/win situation,
34 because everybody can be equal on it, it's State law.

35
36 And when it comes to Becharof Lake and
37 King Salmon River and Black Lake and we start putting
38 those kind of zones in, it's only going to be the
39 Federal subsistence user period that's going to get
40 that, and that's a pretty black and white thing, which
41 I think we could think about doing.

42
43 MR. REARDEN: Yeah, I hear a lot of
44 ideas coming out. And I just want to remind that
45 there's still a working group idea floating out there
46 to explore these things, because, you know, when I
47 analyzed these, these are pretty complicated, and
48 trying to figure out what makes sense, you know, I
49 don't have the answer. And it seems it's going to
50 require much more discussion.

1 So I just wanted to remind the Council
2 that when we last left there was still the idea of
3 putting a working group together to come up with some
4 creative areas that may address these concerns, and
5 work.
6
7 That's all.
8
9 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.
10
11 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
12 [sic] Chair.
13
14 That's a good point. I appreciate that,
15 Spencer. Along similar lines, too, I notice in a lot
16 -- in fact, in every one of these proposals that some
17 of the Federal recommendation seems to be encouraging
18 us to consider the alternative of maybe shifting season
19 dates a little, or extending season dates. I'm
20 wondering if these proposals as written and publicized
21 are adequate public notice to say abandon say a buffer
22 zone type concept and go to a season date change, or
23 would that be too dramatic? I know it wouldn't be in
24 some of the State sport fish stuff. I've been
25 dumfounded at how things switch around.
26
27 But, anyway, if you would answer that,
28 I'd appreciate it.
29
30 MR. REARDEN: Yeah, through the Chair.
31 I really don't know the answer to that, but I
32 understand there's been some struggle with trying to
33 resolve some of these. These are conflict issues, and
34 they're kind of continuing. And, you know, I'm a big
35 advocate of a work group, because you get the right
36 minds together that maybe creative and come up with a
37 solution that can satisfy, you know, a bunch of people.
38 I'm not going to say all, but, you know, we're here to
39 make change and in the future here I see no reason why
40 a new idea that comes forward can't be explored and
41 further discussed to see if that idea will work.
42
43 Thank you.
44
45 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Polly.
46
47 DR. WHEELER: Yeah. Thank you. Polly
48 Wheeler with the Office of Subsistence Management.
49
50 To address Dan's question specifically,

1 the proposals that deal with kind of buffer zones,
2 those would not -- I mean, seasons dates is a separate
3 proposal, so I don't really think it would be
4 appropriate to use the buffer zone proposals as a
5 vehicle to then go to season dates, because that's a
6 whole new kind of a different idea that hasn't been
7 analyzed. It hasn't been before the public. And
8 remember that where we're at in this stage right now is
9 the RAC recommendations that then go to the Federal
10 Board in May. And it probably -- using that as a
11 vehicle to do through a special action, that would be a
12 stretch also. But you could, you know, two years down
13 the road from the Federal side would be another set of
14 proposals. I know that's not very satisfying, but
15 that's the process that we're in right now.

16

17 Madam Chair.

18

19 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any more
20 comments.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: I guess one
25 thing that I've been observing, and reading through
26 these proposals is that all the proposals that the RAC
27 suggested and wrote were all opposed because there was
28 no conservation concern on moose population. So it
29 seems like we're just going around and around and
30 around because there's no conservation concern. So I
31 don't know.

32

33 I keep hearing from the user groups
34 from 9 that there is -- the subsistence harvesters
35 aren't harvesting their needs. But where are the
36 moose? And then the sports I guess hunters, the non-
37 locals, they're able to fly into lakes and harvest
38 their resources, and maybe that's where, you know, the
39 resources are.

40

41 But my question is why are the
42 subsistence users struggling to meet their needs when
43 there's no conservation concern on moose population.

44

45 MR. BUTLER: Well, I've had a chance to
46 have a few thoughts on that. And, you know, again I
47 really think that this idea of expanding seasons is
48 detrimental to the local subsistence resource user.
49 And again to remind you of what I said at the
50 beginning, the State regulations have very liberal

1 winter seasons currently that are tailored to local
2 efforts, creation of opportunity. And there seems to
3 be a reoccurring idea that somehow if you have a moose
4 shortage, if you extend the season, you provide more
5 opportunity and that might make things better. But if
6 you have a moose shortage issue, expanding opportunity
7 to take more moose is the wrong direction to go.

8

9 And that's why I advocate again really
10 considering what influence hunters are having in the
11 areas that they're hunting, the local hunters. It's
12 quite conceivable, this is again a 34,000 square mile
13 area, as you mentioned, for the moose population to be
14 doing something different in one area than what it's
15 doing in another area. And I think what's important
16 for subsistence users is again moose opportunity in
17 areas that they have consistent access to, and trying
18 to do the best we can to manage and cultivate that
19 population, again to benefit subsistence resource
20 users.

21

22 So that's why I advocate again the one
23 proposal that would reduce the season. Proposing
24 something to the Board of Game to try to mitigate some
25 of these user conflicts is certainly in order.

26

27 But oftentimes, you know, when we're
28 talking like the Kvichak, even if we're talking about
29 the State lands, we're not going to get at some of
30 these issues on the Kvichak by a unilateral exclusion
31 of non-Federally-qualified users from other areas.

32

33 And as Spencer said, I think if we work
34 together, we can probably come up with a solution to
35 try to mitigate some of the tension that surrounds
36 these populations and some of that may entail trying to
37 just do a better job with what we have. Again, it's a
38 resource that's low density. It doesn't have a great
39 potential for growth, and that's really what we want to
40 do if we're going to be able to benefit from this into
41 the long term is to try to do well with what we have.

42

43 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Well, I guess
44 to shorten the seasons for moose and caribou, I guess
45 mainly moose, when there's no conservation concern,
46 what's the solution there?

47

48 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. Again in terms of
49 the population as a whole, you know, you're talking
50 about no population concern. But that doesn't

1 disqualify the idea that in a local area, if everyone
2 hunts in a small area, they can deplete the moose in a
3 small area, even though the population is doing just
4 fine. We can go out and we can find lots of moose. We
5 can find good bull ratios that are adequate for
6 reproduction, enough moose to not detrimentally impact
7 the population if they're harvested.

8

9 But again you could have a situation
10 where -- you know, the King Salmon River is, you know,
11 kind -- or Naknek/King Salmon area is kind of like
12 this, where you have State lands, a lot of interest,
13 it's all mostly local hunting efforts. A lot of it's
14 targeting Big Creek and King Salmon Creek, State lands.
15 You just have a lot of user impact in that area,
16 because geographically it's close, convenient, and you
17 have a long winter season. You can get in there and
18 you can really put a hurt on the local moose population
19 if it's unregulated.

20

21 So while there is no conservation
22 concern for the larger population, it's more just
23 trying to manage moose in a way that again we can put
24 meat in subsistence freezers. And as contradictory as
25 it might sound, having seasons and bag limits that are
26 appropriate for those areas is actually going to be
27 beneficial. I mean, that's why we restrict these
28 things and we don't just have a year round any moose
29 season. It's trying to recognize that again there are
30 biological limitations that a population has that it
31 can only support so much effort in certain areas.

32

33 And, you know, non-locals again are
34 often hunting places that local people can't access, so
35 getting rid of them isn't going to put more moose in
36 these areas that might have more concentrated effort.
37 And again it's these long seasons that I look at that I
38 just don't know how anyone can expect a low density
39 moose population with limited reproduction to be able
40 to stand for a two, three-month long season.

41

42 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

43

44 MR. DUNAWAY: Well, kind of getting
45 back to predator control, I was kind of looking around
46 in the audience here. I don't know if there's anybody
47 can speak to it, but, Lem, do you have any sense that
48 the folks you would need to coordinate with to do
49 predator control, are they giving you any indications
50 that they are going to cooperate? Are they going to

1 work? Because I start wondering if maybe we're going
2 to throw up our hands for the moment and hope the
3 predator control gets enacted, maybe make some
4 proposals to the Board of Game next cycle, and take
5 that route from what I'm hearing here. But at the same
6 time leaving it to chance is something that, as dicey
7 as predator control, I'm hesitant to put a lot of eggs
8 in that basket. Because it's been a long time, folks
9 from Alvin's country and Pilot Point and stuff are
10 getting frustrated. And Naknek, Igiugig. They'd like
11 to have some hope of seeing a few more moose. So any
12 indications?

13

14 Thanks.

15

16 DR. WHEELER: The Fish and Wildlife
17 Service is talking about it. But because they're
18 public lands that are owned by the Nation, if we were
19 to do predator management anywhere on public lands in
20 Alaska, it would have to go through the NEPA process,
21 the National Environmental Protection Act, for review
22 and analysis. I know that our deputy regional
23 director, Gary Edwards, gave a presentation on this
24 issue to the Board of Game, and it was either late
25 Friday, because I was there on Friday, and he hadn't
26 done it by the time I left, but it was either late
27 Friday or sometime on Saturday.

28

29 But all I can say is that, yeah, the
30 Fish and Wildlife Service is talking about it,
31 recognizes it's an issue, but also recognizes that
32 because it's public lands owned by the Nation, it would
33 have to go through the NEPA process, and so it's a long
34 way out.

35

36 MR. DUNAWAY: Well, in the past when we
37 were trying to put some of the folks on the east side,
38 Federal groups to be more specific, they talked about
39 it with really long poles, and danced around and wanted
40 it to away without us asking any more. When you say
41 they're talking about it now, have they shortened their
42 pole? Are they -- I mean, I think a certain amount of
43 this bureaucracy is going to start saying that.....

44

45 Especially, I just heard something on
46 the news the other day, how this guy doing a study on
47 wolves in the McKinley Park area, that how salmon has
48 become a pretty darn -- they realize salmon is a
49 significant alternative prey. Well, if it's
50 significant in McKinley, and we've seen some of the

1 first photographs of moose -- or wolves eating salmon
2 were taken where, Brooks Falls or something? And I
3 remember asking some of the Federal biologists in the
4 past or even some of the local folks to say, we seem to
5 have a moose problem, people are saying there's gobs of
6 wolves, what are they eating? Well, it sounds to me
7 like we've got an answer pretty obviously. And it
8 sounds like that's being recognized by the academic
9 community more.

10

11 So I'm think there's a lot more grounds
12 to argue that, hey, those moose -- or those wolves,
13 especially to get their pups through the toughest part,
14 which I understand a lot of the die off in the fall if
15 they have to just depend on big mean animals like
16 moose. But if they can go eat salmon until November,
17 they can get big and strong and go chase that moose
18 down.

19

20 Again, any sense that the Federal
21 agencies are going to be a little more vigorous in
22 trying to do, see a positive note that, yes, we think
23 we ought to do this or not?

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 DR. WHEELER: Well, I can only speak
28 for the Fish and Wildlife Service, and even then only
29 marginally. But I can't speak or won't speak for the
30 other Federal agencies. All I can say is that in the
31 time that I've been with the Fish and Wildlife Service,
32 it's never really been talked about. But all of a
33 sudden in the past say six months, six or eight months,
34 it has been.

35

36 You're right, it's been deferred,
37 saying, oh, well, defer to the land management agency,
38 and then the discussion doesn't go any further.

39

40 But I will say there are discussions
41 ongoing. I will say it's very controversial within our
42 agency. And there is the recognition that because
43 these are public lands owned by the Nation technically,
44 it would have to go through this other public process.
45 I honestly don't think that's sort of an off-putting
46 thing. It's a recognition that if this were to happen,
47 it would have to go through this -- by law it would
48 have to go through this other process.

49

50 How -- you know, how realistic is it?

1 I don't know. Is it going to be embraced? I don't
2 know that either. But it is being talked about.

3
4 And we had a project leaders meeting a
5 couple weeks ago, and the last day of the project
6 leaders meeting there was a discussion on predator
7 management with the Refuge people. So it is being
8 talked about.

9
10 But I have no idea if those discussions
11 will end up in predator management of any form.

12
13 Madam Chair.

14
15 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Polly,
16 before you take off. Regarding the working group. The
17 working group's been discussed for some time, but I
18 guess because of no -- to finance that group, the group
19 hasn't met?

20
21 DR. WHEELER: I don't think it's a
22 financial question, Madam Chair. I think it's a
23 question of will. I think that there was an initial
24 meeting, oh, I think it was a year ago November. A
25 year and a half ago now. And it just never got off the
26 ground. And I think probably Fish and Game and Fish
27 and Wildlife Service each had a role to play in that.
28 It didn't get off the ground. We recognize, as Spencer
29 said, it would be a way to move things forward, but it
30 didn't get moving.

31
32 But I will -- if there's a will, we will
33 work it out. We recognized this earlier when we were
34 talking about the bear handicraft work group, summer is
35 not a good time. So it's got to be either fall or it's
36 got to be spring, fall or winter. We're honing in
37 towards spring now, and summer's pretty close. Maybe
38 not close enough for some of us, but, you know, if
39 we're going to do something, we'd probably have to do
40 something sooner rather than later. But I will say,
41 too, that, you know, trying to get everybody together
42 has -- is challenging at times, but if we get the very
43 clear direction from this Council that they want
44 something to happen and they want something to happen
45 sooner rather than later, we'll do what we can.

46
47 MR. O'HARA: Polly, who's on that
48 working group from the Council?

49
50 DR. WHEELER: Through the Chair. I

1 don't believe that there's ever been a first meeting of
2 the working group. State and Federal Staff met.
3 Again, I think it was in November of 2008, and it was
4 some folks from Fish and Game, and it was Fish and
5 Wildlife Service, and there was a Park Service person
6 there, I was there. It was over at Fish and Game in
7 Anchorage. We looked at some data. We'd asked some
8 questions about harvest data from the Subsistence
9 Division, and they were going to come back with some
10 answers, and that's about as far as we got. But there
11 were no -- there was never a formal meeting per se of a
12 working group.

13

14 MR. O'HARA: Well, that doesn't answer
15 my question. Is the Council part of the working group?

16

17 DR. WHEELER: Again, when the Federal
18 Board dealt with these proposals in May of 2008, it was
19 Proposals 30 and 31. They said a working group should
20 be formed. That working group was never formed. And
21 so, yeah, it just never took off. Yeah.

22

23 MR. BOSKOFISKY: That working group was
24 supposed to have been for the 28th and 29th of October
25 of that fall after we had that RAC meeting, and that
26 never happened.

27

28 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. I think
29 this is a good time to take a 10-minute break, and
30 we'll get back.

31

32 (Off record)

33

34 (On record)

35

36 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. We're
37 back to order, and I guess before we continue on,
38 there's a predator control comment here. And state
39 your name.

40

41 MR. SHARP: Yeah. I'm Dan Sharp with
42 BLM.

43

44 Just for the benefit of the Council,
45 with respect to predator management issues, what Polly
46 said is correct. It's a function of the respective
47 Federal agencies.

48

49 BLM does have a predator management
50 policy, and it is in effect sort of a laissez-faire

1 approach to where we allow predator management to occur
2 on BLM lands provided it's compatible with some of the
3 land designations. In effect, the wild and scenic
4 corridors, we would take exception to, but in general
5 most of those yellow colored lands up there on the map,
6 we would not object to predator management occurring on
7 BLM lands. And that's the statewide policy.

8

9 And again it's been difficult, because
10 a lot of folks just say the Feds, and all the Federal
11 agencies don't have the same approach and such, so just
12 in your own minds there just know that it's not all --
13 we're not speaking with one voice, one policy that
14 covers all the Federal lands.

15

16 Madam Chair.

17

18 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank
19 you. Excuse me. I need I guess direction from the
20 Council as to how much longer we need to go and do you
21 want to deal with these proposals one-by-one. So give
22 me some direction here.

23

24 Richard.

25

26 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair. If I may
27 make a suggestion. A lot of the conversation here is
28 over, you know, Unit 9, is with the moose availability
29 and such. I would entertain the idea of tabling these
30 few proposals that deal with moose in 9B and put them
31 into the working group that was established. And I
32 understand that some of the State entities might also
33 be involved in this.

34

35 And to me that seems like a better
36 approach. I feel that -- I mean, I wasn't here on the
37 original portion. I mean, I understand why some of
38 this language got in here, these proposals, but to me
39 it's still a bandaid on the problem. I don't see this
40 really as a solution. I see this just as another way
41 to maybe contribute, but it's not a solution. I would
42 entertain the idea of just going back to the group
43 thing here and developing that coming with some ideas
44 both on the State side of things and the Fed side of
45 things, because there's things under subsistence on the
46 State side of things, you know, subsistence being a
47 priority, that we might be able to help at least my
48 area out, I'm talking to 9B and C here, because there's
49 just very Federal lands here that if these regs went
50 into play would play very little on what we have. I

1 mean, there would be very little impact on these ones
2 here.

3
4 I could see more happening, because a
5 lot of the area is State lands. And if we were to sit
6 down with the State and the Feds to get together and
7 try to come up with more opportunities for us here, I
8 would like to entertain that idea.

9
10 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

11
12 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Thank you, Madam
13 Chair.

14
15 Richard, you sound like you've been on
16 here a long time. I don't think we've tabled much.
17 I'm impressed, because I've just been kind of wringing
18 my hands on what to do, because a lot of it looks like
19 -- we don't get a lot of credibility with the Board
20 sometimes when we propose stuff that they just can't
21 do, like if you're trying to propose Federal actions on
22 lands they have no jurisdiction. So I've been not
23 eager to do that. At the same time I'm eager to send a
24 message, because I'm hearing it I think that something
25 needs to be done. And, yeah, if the working group
26 could become functional, I think I'd be in support of
27 that.

28
29 I'd still want to make sure that some
30 sort of a record goes to the Federal Board of what
31 we're doing and why. I'm also wondering if we
32 shouldn't even put some placeholder type proposals to
33 the Board of Game for the next cycle to try to
34 incorporate them in any possible solutions.

35
36 But, yeah, I'm not against the idea of
37 what you're proposing at all. It's interesting.

38
39 Thanks.

40
41 MR. ABRAHAM: Yeah. Madam Chairman. I
42 think the solution is over here is like, you know, you
43 mention working group. But they should have a
44 different season for this over here. I'm giving the
45 working group an idea what would work for 9E or for 9.
46 And if they have a different season for the
47 sportshunters, that will quiet a lot of things down.
48 If it still is going to go like this over here, no
49 matter how much working group works, it's not going to
50 work. The only solution I think for it is to have a

1 different season for the sportshunters.
2
3 Thank you.
4
5 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair.
6
7 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Richard.
8
9 MR. WILSON: You know, in this working
10 group, you know, I would suspect that you would want
11 representatives from all the drainages that are
12 involved in Unit 9 so that everybody can be well
13 represented in those areas, you know, so when some of
14 these issues come back to us, you know, we'd have all
15 the necessary background and input from those local
16 communities to help us better make a decision here.
17
18 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair.
19
20 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Dan.
21
22 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. I think that is an
23 excellent idea, Richard, because I asked Lem, I said,
24 we shorten the days -- it will shorten the days, but it
25 doesn't really solve the problem just because you
26 shorten the days.
27
28 And then Dale over there who sits there
29 very quietly, thinking, shows me the chart. And
30 there's a certain amount of moose taken, non-residents
31 take a certain amount of moose. It shows the
32 population trends. And one starts here, Dale, from 25
33 all the way down to 12, was it? Or 2?
34
35 MR. MYERS: Yeah, it was just.....
36
37 MR. O'HARA: If he could speak. Madam
38 Chair.
39
40 MR. MYERS:the cow to calf ratio
41 and, you know, overall mortality rate for the moose.
42 You know, the human consumption part of it is
43 relatively -- or probably in the single digit
44 percentile rate, you know, as far as overall mortality.
45
46
47 MR. O'HARA: And what did you tell me
48 was the problem?
49
50 MR. MYERS: Well, more than anything

1 else is predation.

2

3 MR. O'HARA: Predation. Madam Chair.

4

5 MR. MYERS: And I'm not sure exactly if
6 any of these guys have any number on overall mortality
7 rate for moose or, you know, calf survival rate and
8 whatnot and what's healthy for growth of the moose.

9

10 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. Well, if
11 he's going to come to the table.

12

13 You asked a question, you asked a key
14 question. There doesn't seem to be a problem with the
15 numbers as far as the Alaska Department of Fish and
16 Game goes, and yet the needs are not being met by the
17 subsistence users, so what is the problem. There's
18 another something else out there, you know, that is
19 there. And I've flown, and so has Dale, we both work
20 the same area, and the last people I take out of the
21 woods down there usually are the guides.

22

23 And I asked about six of them, what was
24 your moose population like three years ago? Well, we
25 saw a few calves. And what about two years? Saw a lot
26 less calves. And what did you see this year? We saw
27 very few calves. What do you see in the way of wolves?
28 Bill Mark over on the other side there on the
29 Peninsula, we don't go in there any more. What's the
30 name of that place? Dontarnek (ph), yeah. When he
31 first went there, he saw a wolf. Three years later, he
32 had 18 wolves. Something is happening. Look at the
33 wolves travel that you caught that it takes. Fifty
34 miles.

35

36 So I think we can shorten the days if
37 we want, and subsistence users are going to get so
38 much, and those who do it for recreational or
39 commercial use are going to do it so much. And the end
40 result is going to be in predation.

41

42 And when I say that, Lem, I believe
43 there was -- and I said this at the Federal Board level
44 when we met with Pat Pourchot in Anchorage. I said
45 there was a time when the Federal people did a
46 predation hunt on an island. And I told him, I said,
47 you know, you need to get some real sharp lawyer to
48 look at that, because if they had done predation one
49 time, they can, even if it is on a national level for
50 the national interest of people, Polly, they can do it

1 another time, too. And the other 40 percent of this is
2 on Federal land. And some of the biggest population of
3 who are using it is on Federal lands.

4
5 It's a nasty thing to do, but I don't
6 see where -- Federal people have liberalized bear take
7 almost to every year up in the Lake Clark area. The
8 State of Alaska is still one every four years or so
9 many every other. Yeah.

10
11 Do you want to think about that? Would
12 you care to address the predation problem? Or how do
13 you feel about that?

14
15 MR. BUTLER: Well, I can certainly
16 address it as best we've looked into it. You know, we
17 really haven't done an in-depth study of predation
18 relative to moose. We've focused most of our attention
19 on caribou. Anecdotally, you know, predators I would
20 assume are a big factor on moose, particularly moose
21 calf survival.

22
23 You know, the little bit of work we
24 have done with moose, we typically have good pregnancy
25 rates, high twinning rates, but, you know, as we've --
26 as Dale points out and as we've talked about in the
27 past, calf recruitment is a big issue for the moose
28 population. Adult survival's pretty good from the
29 collaring work that we've done with adult moose, but
30 the calf mortality is a big issue. Then moose are
31 healthy when they're born. They don't make it to fall,
32 so predation, you know, is likely at the root of it
33 But again we haven't done a calf mortality to say that
34 it's, you know, wolf predation, bear predation, to what
35 extent. I mean, it's certainly a conceivable
36 conclusion.

37
38 Relative to the bear population, you
39 know, that's an area that again we've always wrestled
40 with. What do you do about bears. The take of bears
41 is by, you know, non-locals primarily. Bears are taken
42 in villages particularly when they're causing trouble,
43 probably more so than are reported at my level. But
44 the area impacted is probably, you know, relatively
45 close to the communities where they're impacting
46 people.

47
48 When non-locals come in, again similar
49 to what we're talking about with moose, they're hunting
50 a lot of country and, you know, over a large geographic

1 area. They come for the high density of bears and high
2 quality of bears. And if you shoot the bears out,
3 they're not going to come and do that.

4
5 So the vehicle by which you try to
6 affect brown bears is problematic. We've talked about
7 with the caribou relocating bears potentially, but, you
8 know, you quickly realize that you'd have to move them
9 a long distance, you'd have to move a lot of bears.
10 And it's just going to be plain hard to get a 1,000
11 pound bear in the back of a Beaver without any
12 equipment. So relocation of bears hasn't been an
13 issue.

14
15 So, for example, the Northern Alaska
16 Peninsula Caribou Herd, you know, we're going through
17 all this discussion with the Board, and pretty much it
18 comes down to, you know, what do you do about wolves.
19 And that's where we are with the caribou. And I'd
20 assume that's probably where it would go with moose,
21 too, for all those reasons. It's, you know, trying to
22 identify how much of a factor wolves are on the moose
23 population and could you do anything.

24
25 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. I think
26 there's no doubt that one of the biggest problems
27 you've got equal to 50 percent of the wolves is the
28 bears getting calves. I mean, they can run a cow moose
29 down if they want to run them long enough. I mean,
30 they are a huge predator. And what do you want to do,
31 wipe out 25 percent of the bears? That would be a hue
32 and cry across the country.

33
34 MR. BUTLER: You'd probably have a
35 knock out a lot more bears than that to get at it. I
36 mean, there are a lot of bears in the Peninsula. I
37 mean, it would take, you know, several thousand bears
38 from some areas to, you know, try to have a beneficial
39 result on the moose.

40
41 Typically bears aren't -- there are
42 typically a few bears that specialize in predation of
43 calves. Most of them take them opportunistically.
44 Moose calves are most vulnerable during the first month
45 of life, so if you have a moose calf that's vulnerable
46 for a month, you know, you'd have to really reduce the
47 bear numbers in that area that it might encounter if
48 you're going to have an effect on moose.

49
50 With wolves, you know, we are doing

1 predator control work to benefit caribou. In those
2 instances, if we have a really confined area where the
3 caribou calves are being born, we're able to reduce the
4 wolf population locally. We're not having to do
5 anything with bears at all. But by removing just a few
6 wolves from that local area, we're getting a big
7 response in the caribou population.

8

9 Whether you could get a similar result
10 for moose, you probably couldn't if you reduce the
11 wolves small area. You'd have to do it over a large
12 area, but, you know, whether you could at least get the
13 calf ratio up, I guess, with just a wolf reduction over
14 a large area, probably could benefit calf survival. To
15 what extent I guess is what we'd want to look at in
16 terms of, you know, considering it. But it's certainly
17 game for a proposal to the Board of Game or, you know,
18 you guys can lobby as you can with the Federal side of
19 the house for that.

20

21 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair.

22

23 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Uh-huh.

24

25 MR. O'HARA: Could you teach a wolf how
26 to kill a bear cub?

27

28 (Laughter)

29

30 MR. BOSKOFKY: Lem, is there any
31 survey going to be done on bears in the Chignik/Black
32 Lake area of how many there is?

33

34 MR. BUTLER: We could reinstitute
35 those. I don't I've been down there since 2006 I think
36 to do the Black Lake. We kind of sidelined looking at
37 the Katmai Preserve bear hunt issue that flared up,
38 trying to figure out what the bears were doing. And we
39 do that survey about the same time of year. It's a mid
40 October survey. So we could certainly go back down
41 there.

42

43 It seems like -- and maybe you know
44 better from that local perspective, it seems like the
45 fish run hasn't been quite the same and there haven't
46 been as many bears, particularly at the outlet -- or
47 the inlet I guess to the Chignik Lake system. I don't
48 now if you -- anyways, we could do it if there's an
49 interest.

50

1 MR. BOSKOFISKY: I know there's been a
2 big increase in the bears.

3
4 Hunting-wise, what is the estimated
5 size limit that's been taken out?

6
7 MR. BUTLER: We see -- we typically
8 measure size of bears different than most hunters
9 would. We look at skull sizes. A lot of hunters talk
10 about how big your bear is in terms in square foot for
11 the hide, but that tends to be an inconsistent form of
12 measurement. And by the time we see it, a lot of
13 hunters have put salt on it and shrunk down. So
14 anyways, based on skull size, which is the measure that
15 we take and we look at, you can get some big bears from
16 the Alaska Peninsula. You know, the biggest is
17 probably in the 30's. That hasn't happened in a while,
18 but there are a few bears in the, you know, record
19 books that were of 30-inch skull sizes. And we get a
20 fair number of 29's and more 28's and more 27's still.
21 Your typical bear is 24-inch skull size that's
22 harvested from the Alaska Peninsula.

23
24 But they're harvesting big bears, and
25 that's again the draw to the area for the non-locals is
26 a opportunity to high density bear population is the
27 potential to harvest a big bear. And, you know, if
28 that's reduced, then you typically start to lose your
29 interest from non-locals. It's a lot of money to come
30 to the Alaska Peninsula and effort, and that's the
31 incentive for them.

32
33 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Right across from the
34 lake there was a mother and a couple cubs that killed
35 three moose, and it was two calves, a calf from another
36 moose. It seems like they catch them as soon as they
37 come across the rivers when they're heavy and can't
38 hardly move. And they even got the mother. So there's
39 a lot of predator that are getting our animals. So the
40 bear population seems to be increasing more and more.
41 Moose don't even come around the village like they used
42 to. And the local hunters have a hard time finding
43 moose, so it makes it pretty tough.

44
45 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Let's
46 deal with the moose proposals and I need direction I
47 guess from the Council regarding Richard's suggestion.

48
49 Dan.
50

1 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Madam Chair.
2 Maybe our Parliamentarian O'Hara might help us with --
3 do we just come in a motion, and if it would be a
4 motion, I think since it was Richard's idea, I would be
5 thinking it might be appropriate, however you table
6 things.

7
8 Thank you.

9
10 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. Richard can
11 make a motion to table these proposals until, say --
12 did you want to go falltime, the next fall meeting, and
13 look at it. And what would be in the cycle for
14 proposals at that time.

15
16 DR. WHEELER: Through the Chair.
17 Because these proposals are active proposals, the
18 Federal Board can act on them at any time. The next
19 time that the Federal Board will meet after May of 2011
20 will be in January of 2011, so it would be basically
21 what, 10 months from now, so the Board -- even though
22 it would be -- they're acting on fisheries proposals at
23 that time, because these are active proposals, they
24 were deferred from the last meeting, they could act on
25 them.

26
27 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. If I could.

28
29 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Uh-huh.

30
31 MR. O'HARA: Richard, if you were to
32 make that motion, I would suggest that you can table
33 it, and then you would tell the time when it comes off
34 the table. And it doesn't need a second. Just done.
35 Nobody can talk about it any more. It's all over.
36 That's just the way Robert's Rules of Order -- and it's
37 a good one. If you've got something that you don't
38 want to -- that's not going to work, just table it.

39
40 But with your motion, then maybe --
41 Polly spoke to it quite thoroughly, this workshop needs
42 to have something done a couple of times before we come
43 back. They're not going to do it in one sitting. It
44 needs to be done this spring and next fall. Forget May
45 and June. We're just not going to be here. And I
46 think this Council, you know, that Madam Chair should
47 put a couple of Council members with that working group
48 or else it's not going to get done.

49
50 And so that would be about the only

1 thing, Dan, I think we could do, but some teeth has got
2 to be put into that thing. And along with that, you
3 know, they need to start thinking in terms that this
4 Council wants predator control. So you've got about
5 three things. You can table it, because these
6 proposals are not working, or you don't think they are.
7 You need to make sure the working group is going to be
8 active, and that message can go to the Federal Board to
9 make sure that the Federal Staff along with maybe a
10 couple members from here is going to be working
11 together on some solutions. And Lem has just been
12 giving us a wealth of information all day, and we've
13 got a lot of things to work with. And then make sure
14 that that idea of our concern for predators is --
15 somewhere along the line that's got to be brought in
16 whether we like it or not.

17

18 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair. At this time
19 then I would make a motion to table 10-45, 10-46, and
20 in tabling it develop a working group that would take
21 care of these issues along with predator control
22 before, what is it, January of '11?

23

24 MR. O'HARA: Our September meeting.

25

26 MR. DUNAWAY: October.

27

28 MR. O'HARA: October.

29

30 MR. WILSON: Before October meeting,
31 understanding that summers are very busy and it's not
32 the time to gather.

33

34 MR. O'HARA: Could you also add that at
35 that time it will be taken off the table?

36

37 MR. WILSON: And then at that time we'd
38 take it off the table.

39

40 MR. O'HARA: We're done.

41

42 MR. DUNAWAY: We've got 45, 46 -- for
43 some reason the table of contents, 47 says brown bear,
44 but it's all about moose.

45

46 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: It's about
47 moose.

48

49 MR. DUNAWAY: 48's about moose, 49 and
50 50 are about moose, and 52's about moose. Was it your

1 intent to throw all of those in that hopper?
2
3 MR. WILSON: Yes, it was my intent.
4 Sorry. Misread.
5
6 MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you.
7
8 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. Recorder,
9 that will go in the record like that. That will go in
10 the record, those proposals?
11
12 REPORTER: All of them.
13
14 MR. O'HARA: Uh-huh. Okay. That Dan
15 gave. Okay.
16
17 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madam Chair. I
18 think I spoke too early for our fall meeting. I was
19 looking back at our meeting schedule for the fall and
20 the fall of 2010. At our last meeting in Naknek the
21 Council planned ahead for the upcoming fall meeting,
22 and they selected September 22, 23 in Naknek. So I
23 just wanted to clarify for the record.
24
25 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yes.
26
27 MR. O'HARA: We were going to make that
28 meeting in Dillingham so we don't have to pack a lunch.
29 But don't change the dates.
30
31 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.
32
33 MR. MIKE: Thank you. Madam Chair. At
34 the end of our meeting when we review our fall meeting
35 schedule and winter meeting schedule, we can just make
36 those corrections.
37
38 MR. O'HARA: Thank you.
39
40 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair.
41
42 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yes.
43
44 MR. WILSON: Did my motion get a
45 second, or are we still on the floor with it.
46
47 MR. O'HARA: When you make a motion to
48 table, there's no second. You'd have to take it off
49 the table.
50

1 MR. WILSON: Gotcha. Okay. So the
2 corrections were recorded then so it will be all those
3 proposals. Thanks.
4
5 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Well, I guess
6 I've got a question on -- we need to before we leave
7 develop a working group so that this working group will
8 work.
9
10 MR. O'HARA: Oh, we did leave one thing
11 out there.
12
13 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. We'll
14 set it under 16, other business, to develop a working
15 group.
16
17 At this time we're going to take up the
18 public testimony. And the first one is Sidney Smith.
19
20 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Madam Chair.
21 Can you hear me?
22
23 Well, I'm glad to be here and I'm glad
24 to see you guys working. I'll give you a little
25 history.
26
27 I started in '67 and I was also
28 chairman for 10 years for the subsistence bill. We got
29 it passed in Washington, D.C. in 1997. And since we
30 got the State in 1979, we had some of the younger
31 people kind of take it over, working with the elders
32 from different parts of the State.
33
34 I hear a little innuendoes from the
35 young gentleman over there, from Dan. I seen him on
36 TV. And I hear Peter. When you talk about a working
37 group, if you look at your 10 regions and if you look
38 at advisory groups for the Federal Government and also
39 for the State, in 1972 when Babbitt was here, I
40 explained to him that he didn't have regional boards at
41 that time even being paid. He read the book. He said,
42 Sid, you're going to get your regional boards.
43
44 The thing I hear from Dan and the young
45 man over there and Peter is that you need to take a
46 look at what you call regulatory powers within your own
47 geographical area. You've got 10 regions to work with.
48 Because we felt that advice is only advice.
49
50 When I look around the room, I see a

1 lot of Fish and Wildlife and Fish and Game people. I
2 have nothing against them, because they're trying to
3 help us. But the elders will tell you around the State
4 that they do not understand our way of life. The whole
5 subsistence bill was our way of life. There's two
6 films that was put out, two of them up in New Stuyahok.
7 Nothing to do with subsistence. That word was put in
8 there. It really tore us up with the State.

9

10 I'm going to try to give you food of
11 thought. Look at the regulatory powers that we talked
12 about in '74, because we felt in all our meetings, a
13 lot of the people would say, (In Yup'ik). When we talk
14 to them, the individual that's taking the notes, we
15 would come back four, five years later and say, this is
16 not what we said. This is not what we talked about.
17 So we made a comparison with three Native gals from
18 Bethel, and we also took the copy of the State
19 stenographer or whatever you call them, who types and
20 whatnot. We were 180 degrees out of phase of what our
21 people said.

22

23 It's been 30 years now, and we're still
24 doing the same thing. When you talk about 9E or 9B, if
25 you're looking at the Nushagak, when we complained
26 about all the sportshunters up in Mulchatna, what you
27 do is you set a date for your local residents and set a
28 date for your non-residents.

29

30 When you take a look at the predator
31 control that Dan talked about, up in our area years ago
32 the Federal Government used to pay us to get wolves.
33 Had a bounty on them. They used to pay 25 and it went
34 up to \$32. So it is possible what Dan says. That if
35 they did it once, why can't they do it again.

36

37 When you look at these different regs
38 and whatnot for our people, the main concern is our
39 people. The Fish and Wildlife, Fish and Game, I give
40 them credit for trying to help us. But you'll find out
41 they don't know, and the elders would say (In Yup'ik).
42 They are human beings that are trying to help us, but
43 if you don't understand our way of life. That's why we
44 run into problems.

45

46 Peter talked about his village per
47 household. It makes sense.

48

49 So the whole thing about the regs is
50 for our priority. There's big money out there, and the

1 first thing they're going to listen to is the big
2 money.

3

4 But I just want to let you know that
5 I'm glad you guys are doing that. Like I was talking
6 about, Unit 9E and 9B, set a precedent and say, okay,
7 we want to set up for the residents only. It's not
8 that hard. And then set one up for the, you know,
9 sportshunters and sportsfishermen, whatever you want to
10 be talking about.

11

12 The predator control about the bear
13 issue is true. The wolves are true.

14

15 But I want to thank you for at least
16 letting me talk, because I really appreciate it.
17 Because I've been in the same kind of shoes you guys
18 have been in. But why do we have to keep explaining
19 our way of life. And nobody's listening.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair.

24

25 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

26

27 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. I really
28 appreciated that. That's good to hear that again from
29 the grassroots.

30

31 And you're right. When I was growing
32 up and you were growing up, they went up as high as \$50
33 for the right front foot of a wolf. We got five cents
34 for a trout tail that dried. A nickel. We got \$7 for
35 an eagle claw. Imagine killing an eagle claw and
36 telling it today, we'd all be in the same jail.

37

38 (Laughter)

39

40 MR. O'HARA: \$6 for a seal nose. And I
41 think that was it. And you know, my dad used to beach
42 seine those rainbow trout up there and cut the tails
43 off and feed the rest of them to the dogs. And we'd
44 all go to jail for that today. We really have gone a
45 long way from what we really call what was one time our
46 subsistence way of life. And both you and I lived in
47 those days, and I really appreciate your comments,
48 because that strikes home.

49

50 MR. SMITH: The other thing I forgot,

1 the other thing I wanted to talk about was if you
2 listen to our elders back in the 60's and latter part
3 of 60's and 70's, the way of our life and the new word
4 that came out in 1976 through AFN, is that the elders
5 talk about our economic system. If you look at the
6 Western culture, they deal with the dollar value. It's
7 a cash economy. But if you look at what we explained
8 to Jackson's committee, if you take our way of life and
9 their way of life, there isn't a cash economy, we're in
10 our own economy, which is our way of life. They're the
11 same. But they could never understand our economic
12 system. The elders talk about it a lot, (In Yup'ik),
13 you know, they don't know. But if you look at our way
14 of life, we've had an economic system for almost 40,000
15 years, and how did we survive without an economic
16 system. It's a different system in this day and world,
17 I know, because, you know, now we're going into the
18 cash economy thing. But still a lot of our people live
19 in our own economic system.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank
24 you, Sidney. Thanks for your comments.

25

26 I know that after working for
27 Subsistence Division for some time and struggling to
28 have my people understand that process, and trying to
29 relay the information back to the people that I worked
30 for, it was a struggle. I wasn't accepted with my --
31 from my culture, because I was working for the
32 Department that they weren't -- I guess, well, that
33 they weren't welcoming. And then me trying to relay
34 the in-depth knowledge back to the people that I was
35 working for, it was a struggle. And then eventually --
36 especially the traditional and ecological knowledge,
37 that knowledge was not that somebody paid for when they
38 were going to college, and so it was something that was
39 anecdotal. And it's still today, but not like it was
40 before.

41

42 Most of our -- right now I'm working
43 for Bristol Bay Native Association under the natural
44 resources, and most of our projects, our survey
45 projects implement traditional and ecological
46 knowledge, which is we've come a long way.

47

48 And I really appreciate especially with
49 our resource agencies how much they try to understand
50 what we're trying to deal with now. And although they

1 may not fully understand like we don't fully understand
2 their culture and vice versa, we still try to work
3 together, because we can't -- no man is an island, and
4 so I just want to appreciate the agencies that are
5 sitting before us and for those of us that are here
6 trying to relay the information.

7

8 I guess back to you. Got a hand. I
9 have to recognize this one. Joe.

10

11 MR. KLUTSCH: Can I testify.

12

13 MR. O'HARA: If you sign up.

14

15 (Laughter)

16

17 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: You have to
18 sign up. Yes.

19

20 MR. KLUTSCH: Madam Chair and the
21 Council and folks who have been sitting here discussing
22 these proposals.

23

24 I just wanted to share an observation
25 after working with the Board, both Federal and Board of
26 Game process for several years. And then just looking
27 at the regulations that you guys are dealing with and
28 comparing them with some of the other regulations
29 throughout the State, you know, in the 20, 21 years
30 that I worked with the Fish and Game Advisory
31 Committees, a lot of these same issues that folks in
32 Unit 9 in particular are facing or have been addressed.

33

34 And I know that, you know, you guys
35 will be I guess this idea of having a working group,
36 maybe addressing them is a good idea. And that's
37 exactly kind of the same method that I think we used in
38 the Nushagak Advisory Committee through the years in
39 addressing user group conflicts and then crafting
40 regulations. That I think as Pete mentioned earlier,
41 separated times when different user groups could hunt.
42 I know that both Iliamna Advisory Committee and Naknek
43 Advisory Committee and even down lower Bristol Bay
44 through the years have tried to address on the State
45 side some of these user group conflicts that we still
46 have.

47

48 But if you will notice that in Unit 17
49 in particular that one thing that I think that has
50 helped in Unit 17B and C is separating out the

1 subsistence hunt as an earlier hunt and then giving a
2 non-resident season later in the season. And that has
3 allowed, even though the number hasn't-- the number of
4 users since the subsistence law now in the State
5 includes everybody, but prior to that it really limited
6 the (microphone off).

7

8 There you are. Anyway, what I was
9 coming to is it really limited and separated out the
10 user group conflicts I think that I hear being
11 expressed in Unit 9 by having that permit hunt earlier
12 primarily for local resident subsistence users. And,
13 of course, you know when the State law made it so that
14 everybody that can come from anywhere in the State and
15 qualify as Alaska resident can participate, that kind
16 of messed up, you know, 17B and C somewhat. But maybe
17 through advisory committees, both Naknek and Iliamna
18 and maybe even lower Bristol Bay, in the coming cycles
19 one way to address that would be to come up with
20 proposals similar to what we have in the Nushagak 17B
21 and C. You know, separate out. And maybe, you know,
22 this is something that can be discussed.

23

24 I don't know if the Board of Game and
25 the Department would have to come up with I guess
26 consensus that this is something that could work prior
27 to presenting it to the Board of Game. If the Board of
28 Game would adopt something like that, and the Federal
29 Subsistence Board would adopt something like that, I
30 think it would perhaps address the user conflicts that
31 I think prompted these Regional Council proposals that
32 I notice you folks were discussing today.

33

34 And so I just thought I'd throw that in
35 for maybe thought in the future. And if you need any
36 participants from the public on a working group, if I
37 have time, I'd be willing to lend some time and help --
38 to give a little help now and then.

39

40 One other concern I have is, you know,
41 I sit on -- Dan O'Hara and I and others sit on BBNC
42 Board. And more and more our village corporations and
43 our regional corporation, of course, who's joint land
44 owner with our villages, has a lot of our resources are
45 becoming more and more needed by our shareholders. The
46 concern is becoming more prevalent that perhaps even
47 within our corporate lands that some of these issues
48 that both the State land and Federal Land folks are
49 concerned about might be something that would become
50 more in discussion in the future. I know in some

1 areas, some other areas there's some idea that's being
2 discussed today of public land owners -- or private, I
3 guess private land owners allowing public to hunt
4 within their private land for a fee. And I think
5 that's something that you might be seeing more and more
6 in the future.

7

8 And then lastly, I just got on AFN
9 Board, and I know that the subsistence issue that has
10 been discussion, Sidney mentioned it, for years is a
11 continuing process, and the current AFN Board is trying
12 to address it with the new Administration. And there's
13 I think those of us who use the resource in the State
14 need to be aware and follow that very carefully. And
15 then especially those of you who sit on Regional
16 Councils I think also need to watch that and follow
17 that, because whatever action that AFN is able to come
18 out of this Administration will greatly affect I think
19 how we do and deal with the subsistence regulations in
20 the future. So I'm sure, you know, you folks are
21 somewhat aware of this already, but I just wanted
22 mention it.

23

24 So thank you for the opportunity, Madam
25 Chair.

26

27 MR. O'HARA: Hey, Joe, we really
28 appreciate you. It's good to see you again, and fun
29 working on some of the committees we work on as well.

30

31 You said something I think that was
32 really good that sparked something here, and that was
33 the working group, and, you know, we're off record, you
34 don't have to make motions or seconds, you can just get
35 your work done. You can talk freely with each other.
36 But did you say it might be a good idea to have the
37 State maybe on that working group as well? I mean,
38 we're dealing, right, with State lands. I don't know,
39 maybe I'm just reading something in there.

40

41 MR. KLUTSCH: Well, I think, you know,
42 if we're going to deal with -- it seems like the last
43 few works that I worked for both Board -- well, Board
44 of Game in particular, that the idea of aligning
45 regulations, because of our subsistence regulations,
46 that system that we have in place now, I think it would
47 really be good if we could have both, you know, people
48 within our working group. And I think the idea of
49 having an informal working group is more something that
50 probably would work, because, you know, it's taken

1 since 1991 I guess when we started getting away from
2 the State Regional Council system and adopted the new
3 Federal Regional Council system which is in place now
4 to try to iron out some of the subsistence issues that
5 have been placed on both boards to address. So I think
6 it would be great if we could utilize both Federal and
7 State folks to sit in on this. And make it as informal
8 as possible, but try to come up with a product I think
9 that would address some of the concerns you have, and,
10 of course, addressing some of the proposals which are
11 before you.

12

13 MR. ABRAHAM: Madam Chairman.

14

15 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah.

16

17 MR. ABRAHAM: Can I explain a quick
18 example. I mean, we talk about this stuff a bunch
19 already, but you take Togiak Refuge for instance over
20 there. Well, for years and years I had, you know
21 worked with the people over the, the traditional
22 council. And finally the Refuge, the State,
23 traditional council been working together. And we have
24 a lot less headache. A lot less headache, because
25 they're working together side by side. So let's go
26 that route and make things work easier for us.

27

28 Thank you.

29

30 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thank you.

31 Sorry. Okay.

32

33 Elliott Lind.

34

35 MR. LIND: Madam Chair, my name is
36 Elliott Roger Lind. I'm from Chignik Lake. Born and
37 raised subsistence lifestyle.

38

39 Thank you for the opportunity to come
40 up and speak. I really didn't have anything planned
41 until I heard what was all going on here.

42

43 I'm a little disturbed about the
44 process of what we have to go through to keep what is
45 rightfully ours. A subsistence lifestyle.

46

47 In Chignik Lake I've seen -- first of
48 all, we've lost the pride of our table, the caribou.
49 We've lost that already. We're not allowed to hunt any
50 more. It's closed. Only for like potlucks. And I'm

1 afraid we're heading down the same road with our moose
2 in that area, and this is the reason why. I've seen a
3 bear kill one moose right across from where I live.
4 And this was a good sized bull. And a year later we
5 saw a moose swimming, a big bull moose, one of the
6 biggest I've seen, swimming, trying to come across to
7 our side of the village, turned around and disappeared.
8 He drowned. And a day later one of the locals picked
9 it up when it floated up and salvaged the meat. But
10 when they cut it up, they found that a bear had
11 attacked it, ripped the muscle off its back. Just
12 striped, you know, on the back the whole -- keep the
13 neck strong. And a week later a friend of mine
14 reported another big bull moose was killed down at the
15 Chignik Lagoon. And that's disturbing, because we
16 still had a lot of fish in our rivers. The falltime.

17
18 So not only are the bears targeting the
19 younger moose, but they're killing the big bulls, too,
20 in that area.

21
22 And I read and heard that since the mid
23 1960s Chignik Lake's population of bears have tripled.
24 And the wolf population have definitely come up,
25 because we've got them coming into the village now.
26 I've actually saw during mid winter, you know, just
27 outside in front of the village.

28
29 So with that in mind, how do we protect
30 what we've got left?

31
32 What disturbs me is -- I don't know how
33 many of you read that survey in December '09, there's
34 an admission there that 51 moose is a low count for
35 Black Lake. But then in the end of it, it's all right.
36 That's what scares me. I mean, which are we going to
37 believe, what they actually saw or presuming? This is
38 why they got a low count. I think we better take into
39 consideration that survey's important, yes, and start
40 believing the counts, or do we just assume that the
41 reason we didn't get the right counts was for some
42 other reason. And then all of a sudden we're not
43 allowed to get moose in our area.

44
45 I really believe that we're here
46 because of subsistence, you know, and I think we have
47 to take steps, not only in our villages, but through
48 people like you and, you know, the State to step up to
49 the plate and say there's something wrong. Let's fix
50 it before it breaks. Don't make excuses that, you

1 know, oh, it's all right. Just assume it's all right.
2 That's what happened to our caribou. And now, you
3 know, we're suffering for it.

4
5 You know, we enjoyed caribou meat so
6 much we passed up moose just to go get caribou. We
7 didn't bother the moose. Now we're on the list as one
8 of their predators. Now we target moose when the
9 season's open if we could catch them.

10
11 So, you know, I'm in support of the
12 proposals 49, 50 and 52, just to start something. Just
13 to start doing something just so we can protect what
14 we've got left. The process is slow a lot of times and
15 sometimes it's going to be too slow and we're not going
16 to catch it in time and we're going to lose it. And
17 that's what I'm afraid of.

18
19 You know, for years our people have
20 been saying -- you know, I may not look that old, but I
21 was brought up in a sod house. But for years, you
22 know, we've lived off the land and we've enjoyed what
23 we've been blessed with. But, you know, we've allowed
24 the State and the Federal agencies to help destroy what
25 God gave us. We've allowed sportshunting right when
26 the reproduction period is on. We've allowed that.
27 You know, I don't mean to preach, but God gave us --
28 said, you know, multiply and flourish. Man has gone
29 right into that period where they're supposed to
30 multiply, and we've started killing them off. That's
31 something to think about in the future. Maybe that
32 part of the season should be closed to subsistence
33 users and sportshunters. Maybe in the future we'll do
34 that. I don't know. I hope so, because I see it as a
35 problem. To bring back what we're losing.

36
37 But, yeah, it's discouraging, too, you
38 know, but we're here to try to fix something, so let's
39 try to fix it. Let's not wait. I hate to see our
40 people suffer and say -- well, I've already seen it
41 actually. Well, I tried to go hunting, but I couldn't
42 catch anything, and it's getting worse each year. And
43 when you tell somebody to do something about it, it's,
44 well, we just don't have the funds to do it, you know.
45 So where do we start?

46
47 We have to start some place. Please
48 think about some of these proposals. Give us a
49 starting point. And support them.

50

1 Thank you.
2
3 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank
4 you, Roger.
5
6 Any questions from the Council to
7 Roger.
8
9 (No comments)
10
11 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank
12 you, Roger.
13
14 Let's deal with 10-51/53, caribou.
15 Page 102.
16
17 MR. REARDEN: Madam Chair. Members of
18 the Council. Again Spencer Rearden with the Office of
19 Subsistence Management, and I'm a wildlife biologist.
20
21 This one is a pretty complicated one
22 because it includes multiple units and it has various
23 regulations as it is currently. And I would like to
24 start off saying that the original intent of this was
25 to manage the Mulchatna Caribou Herd as a whole, and
26 have similar regulations throughout, which would be the
27 benefit to the hunter.
28
29 So the analysis for 10-51 and 53 begins
30 on Page 102 of your Council books. Proposals 10-51 and
31 10-53 were submitted by the Bristol Bay Subsistence
32 Regional Advisory Council. Proposal 10-51 requests
33 that the caribou season be established as August 1st
34 through March 31st within the Mulchatna Caribou Herd
35 range. Proposal 10-53 requests that the harvest limit
36 for caribou be made the same at two within the
37 Mulchatna Caribou Herd range.
38
39 The proponent states that the change in
40 the season dates and harvest limit will provide
41 consistency for managing the Mulchatna Caribou Herd on
42 Federal public lands. Consistency will also be
43 provided with the State regulations as for the change
44 in the harvest limit, two caribou.
45
46 In 1991 the Mulchatna herd was
47 estimated at 90,000. It grew to about 200,000 in 1996,
48 and then declined to a minimum estimate of about 30,000
49 in 2008.
50

1 Bull/cow ratios have been estimated at
2 less than 35 bulls per 100 cows for 2001 through 2008,
3 and the last bull/cow ratio was estimated at 19 bulls
4 per 100 cows in 2008.

5
6 Caribou harvest continues to decline.
7 Harvest within each unit has fluctuated and appears to
8 have been highest in Units 9B, 9C, 17B and 18 for years
9 2005 through 2008. The harvest of males was as high as
10 86 percent in '91/92, but decreased to about 48 percent
11 in 2005/06. Most reported harvest has occurred in --
12 occurs in August and September, but the month of March
13 also accounts for a relatively high amount of the
14 harvest.

15
16 Effects of Wildlife Proposal 10-51,
17 would lengthen the seasons in some units and shorten
18 the seasons in others. Extending the season to the end
19 of March when weather and daylight are more favorable
20 will likely increase harvest. Opening the season
21 earlier will likely have little effect on the amount of
22 harvest as most hunters hunt caribou after July.

23
24 The effects of Wildlife Proposal 10-53,
25 would likely decrease overall harvest and help conserve
26 the bulls.

27
28 OSM preliminary conclusion is to
29 support Proposal 10-51 with modification to make the
30 season ending date March 15 for all units within the
31 Mulchatna herd range. For Proposal 10-53, the OSM
32 preliminary conclusion is to support the proposal.

33
34 Based on the decline of the Mulchatna
35 Caribou herd population with no indication of
36 stabilization, conservation concerns necessitate a
37 reduction in harvest.

38
39 Adopting Wildlife Proposal 10-51 with
40 modification would reduce season lengths in most units,
41 except for Unit 19A, thus reducing harvest. A season
42 ending date of March 15 is supported over a March 31st
43 date to reduce harvest. Extending the season to March
44 31st for Unit 18 where the majority of harvest has been
45 occurring in recent years may allow for increased
46 harvest in particular.

47
48 Adopting Wildlife Proposal 10-53 would
49 also help reduce overall harvest and provide
50 consistency within the Federal and State regulations

1 for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. It may also help
2 reduce harvest on the bulls, which have been declining
3 and there's much concern over the low bull ratios.

4
5 With that, I'll take any questions.

6
7 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair. In '96 you
8 had 200,000. In 2008, what was the number?

9
10 MR. REARDEN: The minimum population
11 estimate was at 30,000.

12
13 MR. O'HARA: 30,000.

14
15 MR. REARDEN: And that's a minimum, so
16 somewhere.....

17
18 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Thank you.

19
20 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any
21 comments from the Councils.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any
26 comments from ADF&G.

27
28 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
29 George Pappas, Department of Fish and Game.

30
31 You did a fine job, Spencer, on the
32 analysis. He stole most of the thunder here, so I'll
33 be very brief.

34
35 Changing the Federal subsistence
36 hunting regulations for caribou in the range of the
37 Mulchatna herd to uniform regulations will reduce
38 confusion for hunters. And our notes are on Page 119
39 of your book.

40
41 So in conclusion, the Department
42 supports modification to amend the closing date to
43 align with the State hunting date seasons, which is
44 closing the season on March 15th. So the Department
45 supports both proposals, but modification for the end
46 date of March 15th.

47
48 Thank you. Madam Chair.

49
50 *****

1 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
2 *****
3
4 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
5 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council
6
7 Wildlife Proposal WP10-51:
8
9 (GMU 9A, 9B, 9C, 17A, 17B, 18, 19A
10 caribou seasons)
11
12 Wildlife Proposal WP10-53:
13
14 (GMU 9A, 9B, 9C, 17A, 17B, 17C, 18, 19A
15 caribou bag limit) Proposal WP10-51 would align
16 federal subsistence opening and closing dates for
17 caribou hunting on federal public lands throughout most
18 of the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. Proposal
19 53 would align federal subsistence bag limits for
20 caribou hunting on federal public lands throughout most
21 of the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.
22
23 Introduction:
24
25 Declines in the Mulchatna Caribou Herd
26 from its peak population in the mid-1990s necessitated
27 reduced season and bag limits throughout the herd's
28 range as the population changed. Earlier changes in
29 federal subsistence hunting regulations kept pace with
30 changes made by the Alaska Board of Game in response to
31 population changes. Present federal subsistence
32 hunting regulations throughout the range of the
33 Mulchatna Caribou Herd are inconsistent between Game
34 Management Units. Changing the federal subsistence
35 hunting regulations for caribou in the range of the
36 Mulchatna Herd to uniform regulations will reduce
37 confusion for hunters.
38
39 Impact on Subsistence Users: Proposal
40 WP10-51 would shorten the caribou hunting season in
41 those areas where the federal subsistence hunting
42 season for caribou presently closes after March 31
43 (Units 9B, 17B, and that portion of 17C east of the
44 Wood River and Wood River lakes, 19A south of the
45 Kuskokwim River, and 19B). This proposal would
46 lengthen the caribou hunting season in those areas
47 where the federal subsistence hunting season for
48 caribou presently closes before March 31 (Units 18 and
49 19A north of the Kuskokwim River). By establishing
50 consistent federal subsistence opening and closing

1 hunting season dates, confusion by hunters over what
2 federal areas are open will be reduced. Establishing
3 dates that are not aligned with present state hunting
4 season dates will create confusion because of the mixed
5 land ownership patterns throughout the range of the
6 herd. The shorter state season, ending March 15,
7 occurs during a time when travel conditions are poor so
8 would have little impact on federally-qualified
9 subsistence users and reduce risk of enforcement
10 actions.

11
12 Proposal 53 would reduce the caribou
13 bag limit in those areas where the federal subsistence
14 bag limit is presently greater than two caribou (Units
15 9A and B, 17A, B and C, 18, 19A south of the Kuskokwim
16 River, and 19B). This proposal would increase the
17 caribou bag limit in those areas where the federal
18 subsistence bag limit is presently less than two
19 caribou (Units 9C that portion in the Alagnak River
20 drainage, and 19A that portion north of the Kuskokwim
21 River). By establishing consistent federal subsistence
22 bag limits, confusion by hunters over how many caribou
23 can be taken on which federal public lands will be
24 reduced. In addition, because of the mixed land
25 ownership patterns throughout the range of the herd,
26 aligning federal subsistence caribou hunting bag limits
27 with present state caribou hunting bag limits will
28 further reduce confusion and risk of enforcement
29 actions.

30
31 Opportunity Provided by State:

32
33 Present state hunting season and bag
34 limits throughout most of the range of the Mulchatna
35 Caribou Herd are August 1 through March 15, and 2
36 caribou (no more than one bull may be taken, of which
37 no more than one caribou may be taken from August 1
38 through January 31). The exception to this is the area
39 of eastern Unit 17A and southwestern Unit 17C (that
40 area north of the Nushagak Peninsula) which may be
41 opened by Emergency Order authority with a bag limit of
42 one caribou. Recent action by the Alaska Board of Game
43 closed caribou hunting by nonresidents throughout the
44 range of the herd to assure a subsistence preference
45 for Alaska residents.

46
47 Conservation Issues:

48
49 Hunting season dates and bag limit were
50 liberalized as the Mulchatna Caribou Herd grew in size

1 and expanded in range. Similarly, reductions in season
2 and bag limits are necessary to manage declines in this
3 herd. While all the reasons for the herd's growth and
4 subsequent decline are not well understood, reductions
5 in take have been recognized as essential to reduce the
6 rate of decline.

7

8 A regulation change at this time that
9 would result in additional caribou taken during late
10 spring (i.e. in Unit 18) would be inconsistent with
11 other management actions undertaken for this herd.
12 There is no need to separate the caribou season north
13 of the Kuskokwim River in Unit 19A since this area is
14 generally unoccupied by caribou.

15

16 A regulation change at this time to
17 reduce the number of caribou allowed in those areas
18 with present larger bag limits, as well as to establish
19 uniform bag limits throughout the range of this herd,
20 is warranted.

21

22 Enforcement Issues:

23

24 Proposal WP10-51 changes in season
25 dates for federal public lands would open the same but
26 would end two weeks later than the state caribou
27 hunting season. Proposal WP10-53 changes of federal
28 subsistence bag limits for Mulchatna caribou on federal
29 public land would be consistent with present state
30 caribou bag limits. Federal public lands occur
31 throughout a great part of the herd's range and are
32 scattered and not contiguous (especially in Units 9B,
33 17B and C, and 19A and B). In addition, much of the
34 area around villages in Unit 18 is under state
35 regulations. It may be difficult for federally-
36 qualified subsistence users to easily discern land
37 ownership from the ground and be sure they are hunting
38 on federal land.

39

40 Other Comments:

41

42 As written, the proposal appears to be
43 a substantial reduction in hunting opportunity (because
44 of the shortened season length from most of the herd's
45 range). However, the realistic effect is that the
46 proposal will likely result in additional harvest
47 because the season would be extended in Unit 18, where
48 the bulk of the reported harvest from the herd has
49 occurred for the past several years under existing
50 season dates.

1 Recommendation:
2
3 Support with modification to amend the
4 closing date to align with state hunting season dates,
5 closing the season on March 15.
6
7 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
8
9 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chair.
10
11 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.
12
13 MR. O'HARA: Yeah, George, I was
14 running around this morning trying to get support for
15 making it the 31st when actually the proposal said
16 15th, which is better. Yeah.
17
18 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Spencer.
19
20 MR. REARDEN: Yeah. One more thing I
21 left out is that since this proposal includes other
22 regions, the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Council is
23 going through the process probably as we speak, looking
24 at a similar proposal and this proposal. They have a
25 proposal on Unit 18 to also reduce the harvest to 2 and
26 have a March 15 deadline. So it would be similar.
27
28 And then also the Western Interior
29 Regional Council, they looked at this recently, and
30 they did support this with the modification.
31
32 Thank you.
33
34 MR. O'HARA: Madam Chairman.
35
36 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.
37
38 MR. O'HARA: Give us the districts that
39 pertain to Bristol Bay only?
40
41 MR. REARDEN: For this particular
42 proposal, it's Western Interior.....
43
44 MR. O'HARA: That's not Bristol.
45
46 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: 17.
47
48 MR. REARDEN: Oh, which.....
49
50 MR. O'HARA: It's not our practice to

1 deal with somebody else's region when we make a motion,
2 so I was kind of wondering, just give us how Bristol
3 Bay by this proposal, and 17A, 17, 9C, B, D, whatever.

4

5 MR. REARDEN: Okay. The proposal
6 covers many of the units within Bristol Bay. 9A, 9B,
7 9C, 17A, B and C. The proposal also covers Unit 18,
8 19A.....

9

10 MR. O'HARA: That's not us.

11

12 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Here's a picture
13 of the range of the Mulchatna, wherever it falls.

14

15 MR. O'HARA: Is that in our region? 18
16 is our Region? 18 is in our Region.

17

18 MR. REARDEN: No. But I was just
19 stating which.

20

21 MR. O'HARA: Yeah, we don't want
22 anything except our region. So that's it. You've got
23 9A.

24

25 MR. REARDEN: Yeah, within your region.

26

27 MR. O'HARA: B, C, 17A and B and C, and
28 we're not dealing with 18. We just don't make it a
29 practice of dealing with anybody else's unit. So when
30 we make a motion to either accept or reject, these are
31 the numbers we want to put into our motion.

32

33 So, thank you. That's all I wanted to
34 have. They'll deal with theirs however they want to
35 deal with it.

36

37 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Donald.

38

39 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madam Chair. The
40 reason Spencer Rearden brought up those other regions
41 the proposal -- I mean, it's a cross-over proposal
42 across Unit 18, or Western Interior Region have C&T for
43 this particular caribou herd. The only reason he
44 brought it up is it was a cross -- I believe it's a
45 cross-over proposal, and have a chance, the opportunity
46 to review and make comments on it.

47

48 Thank you.

49

50 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any more

1 comments.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. You're
6 through?

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Other
11 Federal, State and tribal agency.

12

13 MR. WOODS: Madam Chair.

14

15 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Frank. Frank
16 Woods.

17

18 MR. WOODS: Yeah. Madam Chair. Board.
19 I've got a handout. This morning we covered, what was
20 it, the cumulative harvest proposal you guys had and it
21 was pertaining to big game and being able to harvest --
22 not being able to accumulate more than what the State
23 regs require.

24

25 I was asked -- and this proposal will
26 eliminate subsistence opportunity for a lot of the
27 villages on the Upper Nushagak and the Kvichak Rivers,
28 especially on the Mulchatna herd.

29

30 If you look on the map, the orange and
31 the yellow right there is all Federal lands that they'd
32 be able to hunt on. And it's the majority of it would
33 be -- right now it's open until April 15th and they're
34 allowed three caribou. And then on the western 17A,
35 they're allowed three caribou up until March 31st.
36 That's by regulation.

37

38 I would strongly -- at least this
39 letter supports that at least the Nushagak villages are
40 requesting a harvest opportunity.

41

42 On Page 114, the year 2008, it's the
43 caribou harvest, unit, residency harvest reports. In
44 17B there were 39 resident harvest and non-resident was
45 29. In 17A there were a total of 16, that's a true
46 subsistence hunt that this Board addresses I believe.
47 In Unit 17C there was five resident and one non-
48 resident.

49

50 Although the numbers are small, I think

1 29 caribou for sportsmen or non-resident hunters is too
2 many, because if I don't have that opportunity or the
3 opportunity isn't there for me to harvest, then I think
4 that's -- or anybody in the region that is a Federally-
5 recognized subsistence user, the first people they
6 should go to is the sports and the recreational hunter,
7 not the subsistence hunter.

8

9 I'll kind of refer to the -- you know,
10 what are we managing? The State and the Federal
11 Government say they're managing the herd. Are they
12 managing harvest numbers? Are they managing predator
13 control? Are they managing the tickets they collect or
14 the license fees that they administer for them hunts?
15 If I had adequate science that they were saying that
16 they were this number and this 30-day window from March
17 31st to April 30 -- excuse me, March 15th to April 15th
18 was going to be a detriment to that herd, then I would
19 say yeah. Because if I would say 10 people from
20 Stuyahok went out and killed 30 caribou in that
21 timeframe, because that's what the sportsmen did during
22 that time, for at least in my -- as a subsistence user
23 and a subsistence representative, it's kind of hard for
24 me to swallow that we cut back on opportunity.

25

26 And I'll slow down there, because it's
27 -- you know, I'm passionate about it, is that I haven't
28 tasted caribou, neither has my grandmother, for the
29 last going on three, almost four years. Just like the
30 Chigniks, you know, there's an old saying. I remember
31 an elder telling me that, you know, you can -- we've
32 kind of got over-regulated and we're over-managed, but
33 how do you regulate common sense. You know, if we're
34 -- especially now, I'm just going to address this a
35 little bit in the perspective of we are the biggest --
36 you are sitting in the biggest predator population in
37 Bristol Bay, Dillingham. We've got 2500 people. And
38 if them 2500 people are harvesting off the top end of
39 that, the bulls, the main breeders, and then you've got
40 all the bears and the wolves on one end, you know, and
41 it's happening down -- it happened on the caribou
42 population, and it's happening on the moose population
43 right now. We're seeing it in our area. Sometime it's
44 going to hit -- and it's going to come in the middle,
45 and I'm afraid that's -- you know, we're a detriment to
46 our own success after a while.

47

48 But, you know, I'm in favor of
49 opportunity for more harvest for subsistence user, and
50 I would -- you know, my recommendation would be to

1 leave it as is, or just keep the hunt like the Togiak
2 population does until the end of March would be good.
3 Because we're flexible. If you talk to any local, not
4 rural, it's the Bush and Native after a while. But we
5 are flexible. We want to protect the resource just as
6 much as anybody else. And how do we do that? Try to
7 work together.

8

9 So I'll shut up.

10

11 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

12

13 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Madam Chair.

14

15 Frank, if you could help me out. I was
16 scrambling to catch up to you on those figures you were
17 giving on the harvest that were disturbing. At the
18 top, is that year 2008, 17 what B and C? Is that on
19 Page 114?

20

21 MR. WOODS: Yeah, 114. It's Unit B and
22 C, and the harvest, it says resident harvest of 39 and
23 the non-resident harvest was 29. And that's the area
24 that's open to non-resident hunting.

25

26 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. Madam Chair, if I
27 may continue.

28

29 Frank, you and I both sit on the
30 Advisory Committee, but right off the top of my head
31 right now, for the Nushagak, I'm trying to remember
32 what the Nushagak Advisory Committee recommended for
33 the seasons and bag limits for the State?

34

35 MR. WOODS: I don't know. I wasn't --
36 I attended that meeting I believe, or maybe I missed
37 that one, but I just got on last fall. You can
38 remember Ofium (ph). I took Ofi's spot as he resigned,
39 so I don't think I was at that meeting, or I remember I
40 don't -- I wasn't able to weigh in as much as I would
41 like to have. But I think just to be friendly
42 neighbors, I think the majority of the people would --
43 and I think on the Native end, or at least the rural
44 end, or the village person end, you know, we're always
45 pretty agreeable.

46

47 But when harvesting opportunity is
48 there and if you look at my letter, they ask for a
49 simple emergency opening and the State couldn't provide
50 that. And maybe there's a special harvest provision or

1 something we could put in there to help that
2 population, or at least the upriver villages, because
3 fresh meat in the springtime is real important. A lot
4 of people don't have the economic opportunity and, you
5 know, people are hurting with the high cost of fuel oil
6 and expenses.

7

8 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

9

10 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Frank, on your
11 previous comment here, you'll notice that 2007 and
12 2008, and Dale can -- oh, sorry. Yeah. You'll notice,
13 Frank, on 2007 or 2008, and Dale and Richard and myself
14 especially, the minute that we could go into 9B and 17A
15 and hunt same day as airborne, you could hear those
16 planes start up in Anchorage, and they came through
17 that pass for the expressed purpose of taking caribou
18 home. And that's why you get the huge numbers. Now,
19 if you -- the next year's, when you go to 2009, you're
20 going to find out that it is completely the other way
21 around, and I haven't gotten any either, because they
22 never came to Naknek this year at all. So it just is
23 going like this and pretty soon, it's like the economy
24 went like that. But, boy, the same day as airborne
25 hunting, I talked to dozens of guy who came out of
26 Merrill Field and Kenai, just to get caribou, because
27 they wanted them, too.

28

29 But there happened to be a pretty good
30 abundance of animals, 25, 30,000 animals roaming around
31 over there sometimes in a couple of those years. Yeah.
32 But it's different now. They didn't come see us this
33 year.

34

35 Thank you.

36

37 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank
38 you, Frank.

39

40 Okay. Where were we. Okay. Andy.

41

42 MR. ADERMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.
43 Council. My name is Andy Aderman. I work for the
44 Togiak National Wildlife Refuge here in Dillingham.

45

46 I just wanted to state that the Togiak
47 Refuge supports preliminary Staff conclusions on
48 Proposals 10-51 and 10-53.

49

50 And just as a follow up to Frank's

1 comments, in 2009 or starting in 2009, the Board of
2 Game restricted all non-resident hunting for caribou
3 within the range of the Mulchatna herd.
4
5 That's all I had.
6
7 MR. WOODS: (Indiscernible, away from
8 microphone)
9
10 MR. ADERMAN: Yes.
11
12 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank
13 you, Andy.
14
15 Any more Federal or State, tribal.
16
17 (No comments)
18
19 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Seeing
20 none. InterAgency Staff Committee.
21
22 (No comments)
23
24 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: None.
25 Subsistence Resource Commission. Donald.
26
27 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madam Chair. I
28 had copies made for the Council members. It's a copy
29 from the Lake Clark National Park Subsistence Resource
30 Commission.
31
32 They made comments on Proposal 10-51
33 and 10-53. And they were both in support of those
34 proposals. And there's some statements, I'm not sure
35 if it's related to 51 or 53, but I'll go ahead and read
36 it into the record. They weren't clear on that
37 statement of what it refers to, but it states, in
38 addition we would recommend that a letter be sent to
39 the Office of Subsistence Management requesting them to
40 clearly state in the Federal subsistence regulations
41 that Native allotment, Native corporation lands and
42 property are not included in the Federal subsistence
43 season. A cautionary message should be included in the
44 regulations with an asterisk for each unit where
45 subsistence users will see the notice.
46
47 That concludes the summary from the
48 Lake Clark Subsistence Resource Commission.
49
50 Madam Chair.

1 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: (Microphone
2 off)
3
4 MR. MIKE: Madam Chair. There was no
5 -- we did not receive any summary of written public
6 comments on Proposal 51 and 52 -- 53, sorry.
7
8 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any more
9 public testimony.
10
11 (No comments)
12
13 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Seeing
14 none. Regional Council deliberation, recommendations
15 and justifications. Richard.
16
17 MR. WILSON: Madam Chair. Just one
18 thought here, I know over there in 9C that we've gotten
19 openings with Tier II late in the spring. I mean, in
20 the last couple, three years, it seemed like our winter
21 cycles have been kind of rotating on the calendar. We
22 don't start until a little later and end a little
23 later, you know, like fighting ice bergs going to
24 Togiak, you know, trying to get herring. So the
25 caribou, the Mulchatna herd is coming into the backyard
26 a little later. And I don't know that I'm fully in
27 support of March 15 cut off date as opposed to the 31
28 because of that. I feel that it's been a tough battle
29 as it is trying to get caribou especially once they
30 move into our back yard and they it open up for us
31 users over there. Sometimes that window is the window
32 that we need, just like other conversations here about
33 New Stu and others that have -- you know, it's a timing
34 thing, and I'm wondering if it ended up going to the
35 March 15th that our window there might be closed, or it
36 might put a damper on that section for us.
37
38 And that's all I had.
39
40 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Dan.
41
42 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Madam Chair. I
43 think before we discuss it further, aren't we supposed
44 to get it on the table?
45
46 MR. O'HARA: Yes. I'd like to call a
47 point of order there. But it's moot.
48
49 MR. DUNAWAY: So if I may, I'll move to
50 adopt with the recommended modified language.

1 MR. ABRAHAM: And I second the motion.
2
3 MR. DUNAWAY: Madam Chair, that's WP10-
4 51 and 53, just for the record.
5
6 MR. O'HARA: And may I ask (microphone
7 off). Dan, Mr. Dunaway, and that's 9A, B, C, 17A, B
8 and C, period, or do you want to take on 18 and 17 and
9 all those other guys.
10
11 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Madam Chair. Mr.
12 O'Hara. The way I understand, we do these broadbase
13 one that are herd based rather than area based. I
14 think it's okay for use to weigh in to the extent it
15 affects the areas we're involved in is my
16 understanding.
17
18 MR. O'HARA: Well, Madam Chair, that's
19 fine with me. Yeah, Richard, what we're supposed to do
20 is we put the motion on the floor, since that's what
21 we're supposed to do next, and then if we want to go
22 into further discussion on that, but we just want to be
23 nice to you and not cut you out.
24
25 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Polly.
26
27 DR. WHEELER: Yeah. Madam Chair.
28 Thank you. Just as a matter of clarification, and just
29 to keep the record clean, I would suggest, or you might
30 want to consider taking up Proposal 51, dealing with
31 it, and then taking up Proposal 50 [sic], because
32 they're actually -- they're analyzed together, but
33 they're separate proposals. So -- what did I say? Oh,
34 I'm sorry, 51 and 53. They're separate proposals.
35 They're analyzed together, but they're separate
36 proposals, and the OSM preliminary conclusions are a
37 little bit different. 51 is support with modification,
38 53 is support. So for the record, it would be easier
39 for us if you took them up separately.
40
41 Madam Chair. Thank you.
42
43 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.
44
45 MR. MIKE: Madam Chair. Thank you.
46 Mr. Dunaway made the motion, and I think Mr. O'Hara
47 seconded it?
48
49 MR. O'HARA: No.
50

1 MR. MIKE: Or Pete seconded it.
2
3 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Pete.
4
5 MR. MIKE: If you want to go ahead and
6 amend your motion to adopt Proposal 51, I think the
7 person that seconds the motion have to agree with it,
8 so it can just go that route.
9
10 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.
11
12 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Madam Chair. With
13 the pleasure of my second I'll move to adopt 51, let's
14 see where is it, modification. I guess do that one
15 first. And we'll just do them one at a time.
16
17 MR. ABRAHAM: (In Yup'ik) (Yes).
18
19 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Madam Chair. That
20 was my intent. And I'm withdrawing the first motion
21 and replacing it with just a motion to address a single
22 proposal.
23
24 MR. ABRAHAM: (Nods affirmative)
25
26 MR. O'HARA: He's nodding his head.
27
28 MR. ABRAHAM: (In Yup'ik) (Yes.)
29
30 MR. WILSON: Can you hear me now? If
31 Council could just help me out a little bit here on the
32 ending date, from 31 to 15. Reasons why I should go
33 with 15 and not 31. If somebody here could help me
34 there to help make a decision, please.
35
36 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Spencer.
37
38 MR. REARDEN: Yeah. In regards to that
39 question, I could just give you the OSM point of view,
40 and it has to do with a concern to the population
41 declining. And the intent of the proposal as we took
42 it was to provide some consistency throughout. And
43 there were some worry in particular for Unit 18 that if
44 the season was extended to the end of March, given that
45 March has become a pretty popular month for many of the
46 caribou hunters, that in fact it might increase
47 harvest. So our support with the modification to end
48 on March 15 was in dealing with the conservation
49 concern, but yet allowing some consistency throughout
50 for the Federal and State regulations.

1 Thank you.

2

3 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

4

5 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Madam Chair. As I

6 asked Frank Woods earlier, and I had forgotten that he

7 was not on the Nushagak Advisory Committee, I sit on

8 the Nushagak Advisory Committee, and I'm not here

9 really representing them, so I didn't speak earlier,

10 but to my best recollection, the advisory committee

11 also supported the dates as they appear here in the

12 modified language. And maybe we might be able to get a

13 little more enlightenment if I could ask Jim Woolington

14 if he could speak to it.

15

16 MR. WOOLINGTON: Jim Woolington, Fish

17 and Game here in Dillingham.

18

19 Dan, I don't recall what the Nushagak

20 AC's stand was when the proposal went to the Board of

21 Game to change it.

22

23 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Dan.

24

25 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Madam Chair. If

26 while he's up here I could ask a couple more questions.

27 But now the State -- Here we go. I'm finding it, the

28 State regulations currently are March 15th. Some of

29 what Spencer was talking about sounds familiar from

30 over a year ago.

31

32 And I had another question for you

33 here, but I think it really applies -- well, no, it

34 does. Do you have any sense of what harvest might be

35 between March 15th and, let's see, March 31st? I seem

36 to remember that this was quite a point of discussion

37 when we did discuss it at the advisory committee, but

38 do you have any sense of what harvest might be in that

39 time period for Bristol Bay area.

40

41 MR. WOOLINGTON: Yeah. Madam Chair.

42 (Microphone off) Oops. Sorry. Madam Chair. It's

43 actually kind of a difficult question to answer,

44 because harvest is going -- in the late winter or early

45 spring is going to be so dependent on distribution, and

46 there's just no way to predict whether they're going to

47 accessible to where people are at within reasonable

48 traveling distance.

49

50 I can address that for 18, if you're

1 wanting to take up the proposal as a whole. I think I
2 have a pretty good idea if you'd care for some
3 information on that, to kind of round out the picture.
4 Or if you want me to back up and, you know, why we're
5 at where we're at now, I can try to explain that a
6 little better, too.

7
8 MR. DUNAWAY: Madam Chair. I'd like to
9 hear what he has to say.

10
11 MR. WOOLINGTON: Well, to back way up
12 for Mulchatna caribou, to realize just how convoluted
13 and confusing a whole issue it is, is as was presented
14 to this Council over at one of the Naknek meetings, Joe
15 Klutsch got up and said he remembered when the
16 Mulchatna herd was 11,000 caribou and they really
17 thought they had something then.

18
19 It's started out as a very small
20 caribou herd, restricted range up in the upper reaches
21 of the Mulchatna River, and then starting in the 70s,
22 you know, started noticing more caribou there. In the
23 80s it was growing more. It grew a lot. By mid 1990s,
24 '96 there was a peak population of 200,000. So it grew
25 from an extremely small and isolated herd to a very
26 large herd, and it was a very large herd for a
27 relatively short time. In '96 it peaked and started
28 declining then.

29
30 And the range of the herd was kind of
31 restricted into the Mulchatna and Nushagak drainage,
32 and probably got down to around the Kvichak area and in
33 that area. In the mid 90s the herd started traveling
34 clear over to the west and got over in to 18, into the
35 Bethel area and what not. And then kind of erratic
36 movements. I think '94 I believe was the first time
37 that the herd actually wintered over there on between
38 the hills and the Kuskokwim River.

39
40 And then started -- and then it would
41 come back in late winter, early spring, to calve over
42 in this area. And then the calving area where -- we
43 name caribou herds by where they calve. Well, it's the
44 Mulchatna herd, that's where they were, that's where
45 they calved. About that time they started calving in
46 different areas. In the Titchik Basin. And then in
47 spring of '99, they moved down into the Kemuk Mountain
48 and Koliganek area for calving. And then the next year
49 or the year after that, in fact there were caribou
50 calving up by Lime Village and Tundra Lake. And since

1 then we've seen two main calving areas, down around the
2 Kemuk Mountain/Koliganek area and then also up in the
3 Lime Village/Tundra Lake area.

4
5 Well, as a consequence of this
6 different movements and distribution and herd growth,
7 and there were different seasons and bag limits in
8 different areas. And as the herd grew, the Board of
9 Game liberalized hunting opportunities, seasons and bag
10 limits in the area. And over in 18, up until about --
11 I believe it was about 2001, 2002, something like that,
12 it was actually opened over in 18 by emergency order
13 when caribou went over there. And since it seemed to
14 be a regular thing going over there, then the -- and
15 that's a different -- that's a Region 5 and so during
16 the Region 5, or Northwest Alaska board meeting, they
17 established a regular season and bag limit for over in
18 18. And that was -- and at that time I believe it was
19 the same as here, five caribou and the season closed
20 March 15. Where over in this area around here, it
21 closed April 15th, and starting in about '95 or '96, we
22 could actually starting January 1st take them same day
23 airborne. And then there were -- there was even, you
24 know, it was somewhat different up in 19A and B where
25 they also occurred up in there.

26
27 So as the herd grew, there was -- the
28 opportunity was liberalized for both seasons and bag
29 limit. And then in '96 when the herd peaked and
30 started coming down, then it was time to start
31 restricting.

32
33 You know, there were a lot of caribou
34 for a while, and then as they continued to decline, as
35 wasn't unexpected, then the seasons and bag limits
36 needed to be restricted to provide protection to the
37 herd.

38
39 And that's where we're kind of at now,
40 except the State seasons a few years ago, an effort was
41 made through the different -- it was actually three
42 different Board cycles that had to be addressed,
43 because 19A and B are in the Interior region, 18 is in
44 Region 5 and then 17 and 9 are in the Southcentral
45 region, so that Board of Game meeting. So it was a
46 relatively confusing process to get all these things
47 aligned.

48
49 Meanwhile we had the Federal Board
50 system, which is on a -- you know, not on a cycle --

1 you know same timing as the State Board. And as State
2 regulations were changed in different areas, then the
3 Federal regulations sort of caught up as opportunity
4 allowed and that sort of thing. It kind of got to
5 where we're at now.

6

7 So the most recent State action, or
8 Board of Game action on seasons and bag limits was it's
9 two caribou total, similar -- it's basically similar to
10 what is in this proposal. The season opens August 1st,
11 two caribou; however only one prior to January 31st,
12 and of the two, only one can be a bull. And then
13 season closing on March 15th. We felt that that was
14 the date that we could -- you know, it would provide
15 additional protection to this herd that was still in
16 decline. And hopefully it's, you know, either turning
17 around now or should, you know, hope to -- it turns
18 around soon.

19

20 And as I said, meanwhile the Federal
21 regulations hadn't caught up yet, so that's where we're
22 at.

23

24 Oh, excuse me, and on 18, the present
25 Federal season ends for caribou over in 18 or south of
26 the -- in the area where the Mulchatna caribou are at
27 presently ends March 15th. So the proposal as written
28 would actually be an extension of caribou hunting in
29 18.

30

31 And that as far as your question, would
32 the change result in more caribou hunting, I feel it
33 certainly would over there, because the season
34 presently isn't open, and it would be an additional two
35 weeks of hunting over in that area, so it would I feel
36 increase the number of caribou taken over in 18.

37

38 MR. O'HARA: That was a long answer,
39 but to a good question.

40

41 And, Richard, I think I came here
42 looking for it to stay open until, you know, for the
43 April 15th for us. But then when you see it drop from
44 in '96 200,000 and in 2008 to 20,000, now that's -- and
45 I'm not sure some of those caribou went elsewhere and
46 they had a disease, too, and they just went downhill
47 rapidly, but I can certainly see why shortening it up
48 is going to be a conservation issue.

49

50 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thank you.

1 Okay. We've got the -- okay. Where were we. Okay, if
2 no more questions, I'm going to ask for a question.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 MR. O'HARA: Question. Call for the
7 question.
8
9 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Call for the
10 question. Okay. All in favor of 10-51 say aye.
11
12 IN UNISON: Aye.
13
14 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any opposition.
15
16 (No opposing votes)
17
18 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. The 10-
19 51 is passed. And then now we'll be dealing with 10-
20 53.
21
22 MR. ABRAHAM: What about 10-47, brown
23 bear.
24
25 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Those have been
26 tabled.
27
28 MR. DUNAWAY: That's not brown bear;
29 it's a moose one. It somehow has a.....
30
31 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Dan.
32
33 MR. ABRAHAM: That's not brown bear?
34
35 DR. WHEELER: No.
36
37 MR. DUNAWAY: Madam Chair. I'd like to
38 bring to the table Proposal WP10-53, which addresses
39 the bag limit for the Mulchatna herd.
40
41 MR. O'HARA: I'll second the motion.
42 Madam Chair. I second that motion.
43
44 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
45 Discussion from the Council.
46
47 (No comments)
48
49 MR. ABRAHAM: Question.
50

1 (Pause)
2
3 MR. ABRAHAM: Question.
4
5 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan, did you
6 have.....
7
8 MR. DUNAWAY: Well, he called the
9 question.
10
11 MR. O'HARA: No, you can discuss it.
12
13 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah.
14
15 MR. DUNAWAY: Well, this is real quick.
16 I recall this one a little more clearly. It was also
17 discussed at the Nushagak Advisory Committee, and I
18 think grudgingly folks went to two caribou just to help
19 the herd recover. And I'm inclined to support this
20 proposal as written.
21
22 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any more
23 discussions.
24
25 (No comments)
26
27 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Let's see.
28 Vote. Any questions.
29
30 (No comments)
31
32 MR. O'HARA: Call for the question.
33
34 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. The
35 question's been called. All in favor of 10-53 say aye.
36
37 IN UNISON: Aye.
38
39 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any
40 oppositions.
41
42 (No opposing votes)
43
44 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Seeing
45 none, 10-55 has been adopted.
46
47 And I think this probably would be the
48 best time to call a recess until tomorrow morning at
49 8:30.
50

1 MR. O'HARA: I think our Madam Chair
2 did a pretty good job.

3
4 MADAM CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: We'll recess
5 until 8:30 tomorrow morning.

6
7 (Off record)

8
9 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public, State of
Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court
Reporters, LLC do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through
139 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the
BRISTOL BAY FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY
COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I taken electronically by
Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 3rd day of March
2010, at Dillingham, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct
transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter
transcribed under my direction and reduced to print to
the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party
interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 13th day of
March 2010.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 9/16/10