

**BRISTOL BAY SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING**

November 12, 1996
Dillingham, Alaska

VOLUME I

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Daniel J. O'Hara, Chairman
- Peter M. Abraham
- Andrew Balluta
- Alvin Boskofsky
- Robert A. Christensen
- Robert Heyano
- Harold R. Samuelson

Comment [Watermark1]: 1

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Well, we'd like to call the Federal Subsistence Advisory Board meeting to order tonight. I have about 7:00 o'clock and that's a good time to start and I'd like to welcome you this evening. Ask Helga, if you'd do the roll call of the Council members, if you would please?

MS. EAKON: Okay. Pete Abraham? Dan O'Hara?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Here.

MS. EAKON: Robin Samuelson? Robert Heyano?

MR. HEYANO: Here.

MS. EAKON: Robert Christensen?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Here.

MS. EAKON: Alvin Boskofsky?

MR. BOSKOFSKY: Here.

MS. EAKON: Andrew Balluta?

MR. BALLUTA: Here.

MS. EAKON: A forum is established.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay, thank you. As far as a welcome goes, we're glad to see you here this evening, it's a good place to meet. It was very disappointing that we did not have the opportunity to make it in Togiak. Due to weather we were unable to make it over there in October. However, I believe it's our plans, Helga, maybe to try again next year at this time?

MS. EAKON: Yes. Earlier in the fall.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MS. EAKON:before the snow storms hit.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All right. We'll plan on making Togiak one of our places for our meeting this next fall.

We have had, since the last time we met, some good success with our proposals, Council members, at the Federal Board level in Anchorage that we went to this last spring. I'll give you a report a little later on on that. But we really appreciate Helga's direction in helping us getting our work done. We have Council members that work very hard. We have had a good success rate as far a our Council members showing up and we're delighted to be able to work with them.

We have two new members with us today on the Council and at this time I'd like to have the Council members go

around and introduce themselves. My name is Dan O'Hara, Naknek.

MR. HEYANO: Robert Heyano of Dillingham.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Robert Christensen, Port Heiden.

MR. BOSKOFISKY: Alvin Boskofisky, Chignik Lake.

MR. BALLUTA: Andrew Balluta, Iliamna.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: And Alvin and Andy, we're glad to have you with us today. Sam Stepanoff, you take Sam Stepanoff's place and you take Tim LaPort's place. And both of these gentlemen come to us with a good deal of experience in their background on subsistence issues. I've known Andy for a long time from Lake Iliamna, we pretty much have the same roots and he and I are very aware of the same subsistence needs up there. And Alvin is a long time Chignik resident and has a very good grasp of the subsistence needs in that area.

Welcome Robyn.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Hey, Dan.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: How are you?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Good.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Good. And so we're glad to have you with us today. And I'd like to ask maybe if we could go around the room tonight, if you would like to introduce yourself starting here at the front and tell us your name and what you do if you'd like.

MR. BURTON: I'm Greg Burton and I'm a reporter for the Times.

MS. MEEHAN: Rosa Meehan with Fish & Wildlife in Anchorage, Subsistence Office.

MR. KRIEG: Ted Krieg, BBNA Natural Resource Department.

MR. BERG: Jerry Berg. Fish & Wildlife Service, Subsistence Office in Anchorage.

MS. WENTWORTH: I'm Cynthia Wentworth. I'm the migratory bird harvest survey coordinator in Anchorage. And this is my little girl, Leelee.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Thank you.

MS. COILEY: Pippa Coiley Kenner, Subsistence Division with the State.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Way in the back.

MR. HINKES: Mike Hinkes, biologist with the Togiak

Refuge.

MR. ARCHIBIQUE: Aaron Archibique, I'm the refuge manager for Togiak Wildlife Refuge.

MR. BOOTH: Tony Booth, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Division of Refuges in Anchorage.

MR. SMITH: Sid Smith, local.

MR. CHARLIE: (In Yup'ik) and I come from Manokotak and the Council put in many proposals (indiscernible - away from mike)

MR. POETTER: I'm Rick Potter, Alaska Peninsula Wildlife Refuge, Deputy Manager.

MR. SMOKE: Bill Smoke. Alaska Fish & Wildlife Refuge.

MS. MOORE: I'm Heather Moore, I'm a biologist with (indiscernible - away from mike)

MR. LIND: Orville Lind, Deputy Ranger, Alaska Becharof Refuge.

MR. WONHOLA: New Stuyahok, subsistence.

MR. RABINOWICH: Sandy Rabinowich with the Federal Subsistence Board, Staff Committee and I work for the National Park Service.

MS. SAVAGE: Susan Savage, Katmai/Aniakchak.

MS. MCCLENAHAN: Pat McClenahan, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Anchorage, Subsistence Team.

MR. MINARD: Mac Minard with Fish & Game in Dillingham, Sport Fish & Game.

MR. ADERMAN: Andy Aderman, Wildlife biologists for Togiak National Wildlife Refuge.

MR. VAN DAELE: Larry Van Daele, Fish & Game Wildlife, Dillingham.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: State of Alaska?

MR. VAN DAELE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Thank you.

MS. EAKON: Helga Eakon, Regional Coordinator for this particular Regional Council and the Southcentral Regional Council. And our Court Reporter today is Tina Hile.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Robin Samuelson, BBNA.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Good thank you. Appreciate it. I'm

glad to have Pat McClenahan back. She was working out of the Katmai National Park in King Salmon and then went south, got too hot and came north and we're glad to have her back in the Anchorage office and we really appreciate her work. And I've worked with her in the King Salmon area, we're just glad that you've come back and joined us today. Did we introduce everyone? Okay. Well, we're glad you're here this evening, we have quite a bit of work to do and we'll move right along.

We do have a set of minutes to review and adopt this evening, March 18 and 19, '96. Council members, have you had a chance to look over the minutes?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I move for adoption.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Is there a second?

MR. BALLUTA: Second.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Andy seconds the motion. Any corrections, deletions, the minutes look okay? Call for the question?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Question.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All those in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Opposed? Okay, we've accepted the minutes of the meeting.

Election of officers, at this time I'll turn the Chair over to Helga.

MS. EAKON: Thank you, Mr. O'Hara. The office of Chair serves a one year term, however, may serve more than one year. The Chair conducts the Regional Council meetings, attends and represents the Regional Council at meetings of the Board. The Chair is a voting member of the Council and signs reports, correspondence, meeting minutes and other documents for external distribution.

With that, I'm going to open the floor for nominations for office of Chair. Robert?

MR. HEYANO: I nominate Dan.

COUNCIL: Entire Council seconds in unison.

MS. EAKON: Dan O'Hara has been nominated for the office of Chair, are there any other nominations?

MR. SAMUELSEN: I move that nominations be closed.

MS. EAKON: Robert has moved that nominations be closed?

MR. BALLUTA: I second the motion.

MS. EAKON: And Andrew Balluta has seconded the motion. All in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MS. EAKON: Opposed same sign? Members of the Council, your reelected Chair, Dan O'Hara.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Well, thank you gentlemen. I'm pretty sure that's an appreciation, but thanks for electing me to head up your Council another year. At this time, do you continue with the vice chair or.....

MS. EAKON: If you wish me to, I could or you could?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: You can go ahead, that would be fine.

MS. EAKON: Okay. Office of vice chair also serves a one year term in that capacity, however, may serve more than one year. Helps the Chair and assumes all functions in his absence. With that, I'll open the floor for nominations for the office of vice chair.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I'll nominate Helga. You'll I'll nominate.

MS. EAKON: Robin Samuelson, okay Robin Samuelson has been nominated as the vice chair. Are there any other nominations?

MR. HEYANO: I move that the nominations be closed.

MS. EAKON: Motion that nominations be closed, is there a second?

MR. BALLUTA: Second.

MS. EAKON: Seconded by Andrew Balluta. All in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MS. EAKON: Those opposed same sign? Robin Samuelson has been reelected as the vice chair. The office of secretary serves a one year term and may serve more than one year in that capacity. Takes roll call and decides if a quorum is present. Records the votes and assumes all functions of the Chair in the absence of the Chair and vice chair. And at the discretion of the Regional Council records the minutes. With that, I'll open the floor for nominations for the office of secretary.

MR. SAMUELSEN: I nominate Peter Abraham.

MS. EAKON: Pete Abraham has been nominated, is there a second?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Second.

MR. ABRAHAM: I decline.

MS. EAKON: Pete Abraham has declined.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Same as last year, um?

MR. ABRAHAM: I've got too many caps.

MR. HEYANO: I nominate Alvin.

MR. BOSKOFISKY: I'll decline.

MS. EAKON: Alvin Boskofisky has declined.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Andy, we're getting close to you now.

MR. SAMUELSEN: I nominate Bob Christensen.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I decline.

MS. EAKON: Robert Christensen has declined.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I'll nominate Andrew Balluta.

MS. EAKON: Robert Christensen has nominated Andrew Balluta.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Come on Andy say, yes.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Second.

MR. BALLUTA: I'll accept.

MS. EAKON: There's a second and he accepts. Andrew Balluta is the new secretary.

MR. SAMUELSEN: I move that nominations be closed.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Second.

MS. EAKON: Those in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MS. EAKON: Those opposed same sign? Okay.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. We have Robyn as the vice president and Andy, you're the secretary.

MS. EAKON: Before we continue, Mr. Chair, I would like to introduce the coordinator for the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, John Andrew. Could you please introduce your member.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All right.

MS. EAKON: Could you.....

MR. J. ANDREW: Fritz George.

MS. EAKON: Fritz George of the Regional Council.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Hey, Butch, where are you from?

MR. FRITZ: Aniakchak.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: We've had more member come in just recently. Your name here, please if you wouldn't mind giving us your name.

MS. FRIENDLY: From Quinhagak.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Good. We're glad to have you here. Any other new members come in in the last few minutes that might have -- we'd like to introduce you today to our meeting here, anybody new that just came in? John -- Dave, Dave, did you just come in?

MR. FISHER: Dave Fisher, Fish & Wildlife Service, Subsistence office in Anchorage.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Could we have you gentlemen in the back, would you like to introduce yourself? It's nice to see you tonight, John. You guys want to introduce yourself, would you mind, in the back?

MR. DYASUK: My name is Jon Dyasuk. (Indiscernible - away from mike) from Quinhagak, the IRA Council.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Good. Thank you, we appreciate you being here tonight. Right here, what's the name.....

MR. COOLE: Anthony Coole. Quinhagak, tribal administrator.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Great. We're glad to see a good number of you here from that area for the meeting. We have a proposal we were wanting to discuss on the Quinhagak area and we didn't have enough information at the last meeting, so we're glad to have you here.

I haven't missed anyone now on the introductions this evening?

MR. MARK: I'm Mark with the Togiak Refuge.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Mark, thank you. Anyone else we might have left out this evening while -- yeah.

MR. J. ANDREW: Andrew also from Quinhagak.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. All right, good, thank you.

At this time, if we've introduced everyone, I'd like to open the floor for public comment. We have these forms you can fill out, if you would like one just raise your hand now if you would like to testify this evening. If you're not quite prepared now to do it, certainly feel free to pick one up anytime as the meeting goes on. We'll go probably through tomorrow evening. Fill one of these out, we'll give you an opportunity tonight and tomorrow to be able to have an opportunity to testify. We really would like very much -- this Council would like very much to have your public input, it is needed badly. And we'd like to call on Peter, introduce yourself here to everybody.

MR. ABRAHAM: Pete Abraham, Togiak, Advisory Council and RIT.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Got to moving too fast here, I left an item off. At this time we'd like to ask the Council members if we would look at the agenda and we need to adopt the agenda for this meeting. What are the wishes of the Council?

MS. EAKON: Excuse me, Mr. Chair, there are some changes to the agenda. Because the dates of this fall meeting of this Regional Council had been changed two previous times, please make sure that you do have the correct version of the agenda dated November 12, Tuesday. Under reports for U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, instead of Ron Hood giving the report, Rick Poetter, the deputy refuge manager will be doing that. For Togiak National Wildlife Refuge, instead of Aaron Archibique presenting that, it will be Andy Aderman. For National Park Service, Page 2, Bill Pierce is not here, so in his stead, Susan Savage will present that report. Under 5(C), Lake Clark National Park and Preserve, Lee Fink is not here, so Sandy Rabinowich will present that report, as well as presenting 5(D). I don't know if we have anyone here from BLM, if we do not, then we'll skip that. On Page 3, likewise for new business 9(E), instead of Lee Fink presenting the report it will again, be Sandy Rabinowich. And under G(3) Proposals #36, Unit 17(A) moose, the remarks for the Y-K Delta Regional Council will be made by Mr. Fritz George instead of Steven White and those are the changes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. I missed some of those, but we'll go over them and make sure that we get the right people giving the right reports.

MS. EAKON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: I apologize to the Council for bypassing the agenda and new agenda items. So Council members, what are your wishes as far as accepting or adding anything to the agenda that we have before us?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Mr. Chairman, I move for adoption of the agenda with the additions that Helga pointed out.

MR. ABRAHAM: Second.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Peter seconded it. Under discussion, if you don't mind, since you made the motion, Robyn, some of the items that we're going to have to be looking at, I think, to add to this agenda today will be, in our minutes of March the 18th, we had a Proposal #26 for additional information under Unit 9 where the brown bear was to be a c&t finding, customary and traditional finding for mainly the Naknek area and on down the Alaska Peninsula, that area. We had the Quinhagak, we did not act on the request for Quinhagak to become a part of 17(A), which is my understanding, Helga, until we have some additional information and we have Quinhagak people here today.....

MS. EAKON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA:and so we will be able to look at that a little more seriously and that needs to be under new business. And then we have a proposal that would come up under new business as we go along. So if there's no further comments on the agenda items, we'll call for the question.

MR. ABRAHAM: Question.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All this in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: We have established the agenda. Helga, are we ready for public comment at this time?

MS. EAKON: Yes, that is right.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All right. Just in case you've come in, we do have these forms in the back if you'd like to testify today or tomorrow. Certainly feel free to pick one of these up and put your name on this little card for public testimony and we'll give you that opportunity. The first individual tonight to testify is Sid Smith. Would you come up and sit at the table if you would please, Sid.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Dan. My name is Sid Smith, I lived most of my life up in New Stuyahok. As you probably, too, I spent about 12 years on the Subsistence Bill itself. I helped make two movies, I've been around this whole State on this issue.

The agenda that you had in Togiak kind of disturbed me in a lot of different ways. You started your agenda with having Joe Chythlook interpret. In my eyes there's nothing wrong with that, but the point is -- I'll get to it later -- but with Joe interpreting and he also is working for the State, by being human, Joe will a lot of times interpret what the State kind of makes him feel to interpret. The next thing

that we found out, that the State of Alaska and the Federal government was always against us. Every time we testified, every time we did our homework trying to get things done, we kept feeling that the State was against us. But we did find out in Bethel is that if you look across over here, you've got the lady over here taping the meeting and whatnot testifying, what we did in Bethel is we took four independent secretaries and the State had their own, after the meeting was over, what we did was we compared the two and you will see an unreal situation, totally different than what the people testified. So that item we hammered out with the State also.

And one thing, if we look in the Bill itself, we talk basically about real people and what I mean by real people is the people that really live that lifestyle. It's very difficult, I know, you know, we need leaders like Robyn and Robert and the people who are on here. But the whole concept of the idea of the Subsistence Bill, because if you look in the back room here, we've got five or six professors that know the land and everything, but we don't utilize them. Right now there's probably four of them that can't even speak English very good. We go on our business and make our rules and regulations and they don't fit. Why, because we don't use those people. They are our teachers and everything.

The other thing about real people is what I found traveling around the State was that the elders kept saying, how come you guys aren't staying focused? We took a long look at it. A lot of us Board members, we belong either to the regional corporation or the State or the Federal government or something, not that you're trying to do this because we're all human, and what they were talking about is focusing. It's very difficult if you got luggage on your back. I know that. The chief from New Stuyahok used to always tell me, just because you got a position you don't change, you stay the same. You still stick up for the people. And going on through your agenda, one thing that I heard not too long ago was that they put this under Bill 19-20 and it reminded me of the language that the Subsistence Bill had. We didn't want to call it subsistence, but at that time AFN, Senator Jackson's committee pleaded with us to call it subsistence. What we did in our first movie, I helped make two movies, our way of life, with ties and everything. Tony Knowles, Rasmussen, Atwood and Hickel was at the meeting when they were trying to defeat the Subsistence Bill. The kids at East High had them running around to the malls and the church is explaining not to defeat the bill. When we met with the four group before Knowles was mayor, I told him, I said, look, and Al Adams backed me up the next following day, I said if you want to defeat the Subsistence Bill, we will divide the State into three States, or we'll divide the State within the State. And the turnaround that the urban areas took a look at when the word got out that there is, because Al Adams put in the paper, we will start dividing the State.

The thing I talked about before is hoping in a lot of different ways within our geographical areas we have what we start looking at, regulatory powers within the State. If you

look in this room when we first came in, we had 21 people that's not even really from here. There's only three of us, plus the lady that's sitting over here that actually kind of understand what's really going on. I guess basically what I'm trying to do is, all the hardship things we went through, like the secretary thing, like utilizing our elders in the back, you know, a lot of them probably don't even know what I'm saying, but those are our professors. They're the ones that taught us so many different things. And I'll tell you one thing, I won't give up -- I mean if I hear of villages -- like if you look at the Senator Bill 19-20 and the language that they have in there and the information that the State collects from us, it opens the door to the sports fishermen. I know you guys have a difficult position up here. But one thing I've learned through the time is that it's like the chief says, don't change just because you got a position. This is too important for us to start letting it go by. You know, it's not her fault or it's not your fault, but if you took a look at the two -- the information the State picked up and what the local people in the Bethel area from different villages picked up, and looked at that meeting, man, it looked like a total different meeting. And I think that's the problem we see all around this State. You know, we learn that. Because we kept feeling that the State was against us, every time we'd talk they'd do something else, the Federal government would do something else. But with the Bill itself here, I really hope we stay on focus because once we lose our focus on the Bill itself, we're over. I mean you could even take like our non-profit, we have a subsistence specialist that probably come from Pennsylvania, you know, how far off can you get? Not to say that the guy's not doing a good job. And that's why I mention the elders back there, they're back there but nobody uses them.

I just got to town and they said, well, I don't know what's going on, I don't understand what they're talking about. But that needs to be addressed. I realize when you do it in Yup'ik, it takes a long time and we get fidgety and we got to go home. But the trouble, when they go home you have to live with it. Thank you, Dan.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Wait, Sid. Any questions that the Council members might have? I have a question. You said that -- I think you changed it from a Senator Bill 19-20?

MR. SMITH: Right.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Is that a State Bill or.....

MR. SMITH: It's a Senator Bill in Washington, D.C.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Oh, it's in D.C.?

MR. SMITH: Right. And what appears to me is that what they're doing is the sports fishermen and the hunters are trying to get in on the same level as subsistence, which means that when you deplete the resources within a geographic, they'll be on the same levels we are. Because if you look in

the beginning, in the last 11 years, anytime -- we was guilty in this area -- anytime we passed a bill we lumped them together. I mean nowadays we're kind of keeping them separate because they are separate issues, and they're also different acts. But in the beginning, what happened, we lumped a lot of them together. And so anytime we have to deal with them, we have to deal with the whole pie instead of one issue.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: This 19-20, what does that bill pertain to, do you know offhand?

MR. SMITH: Well, what it pertains to is that the sport fishers and sport hunters want to get in with.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah.

MR. SMITH:the Subsistence Bill on the same level.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Under Title VIII, yeah.

MR. SMITH: Right.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay, good, thank you. I appreciate you clarifying that. Robyn.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, Senate Bill 19-20 was introduced by Senator Murkowski. The bill didn't go anywhere, it died, Senator Murkowski said he'll bring it up in the next Congress so we'll have to wait and see if there's any revisions or whatever.

MR. SMITH: Right.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other questions of Sid? Thank you, appreciate you taking the time to testify tonight.

I was wondering if -- Sid mentioned we have some of the elders in the back and maybe they didn't understand what he was talking about, is there a need tonight to have an interpreter? Tim, why don't you ask them if they need to have an interpreter, do you mind?

MR. WONHOLA: (In Yup'ik)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Could we have a name, please?

MR. PAUL: (In Yup'ik)

MR. J. ANDREW: This gentleman over here are our elders, he said his name is Willie Paul, he's from Manokotak. Right before he came up to the table when he was asked by the other gentleman if he understood what was being said in front of the Council, he got up before -- Andy Sharp got up and said, he's thanking for the gentleman that testified and the Chair recognizing the need for a translator.

And he said, at his village, at their Council meeting

he -- that during the Council meeting there was another person -- another elder that was supposed to -- he wanted for him to attend, his name was Wassilie Baville, from his village of Manokotak, but instead he elected him to go.

MR. PAUL: (In Yup'ik)

MR. J. ANDREW: He said, again, he'd like to thank the first testifier for recognizing the need for the elders to have an interpreter in this meeting. He said, at times it's not easy, not very encouraging to attend a meeting where sometimes it's a confusing world for the elders to listen to, especially if they can't talk in the foreign language.

When he was selected to go attend this subsistence meeting and he was not exactly sure what the exact purpose of this meeting was, that was his question at the end. What is the subsistence meeting?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. We've come here today for the purpose of having reports on Fish & Game in the Bristol Bay area. And we also are here to make proposals for whatever the subsistence needs might be throughout the region. In other words, we would like to know how the Fish & Game system is working in the Manokotak/Twin Hills Togiak area, as well as over Naknek, Chignik Lakes, Iliamna area also. So we're here to listen to what the people have to say on subsistence needs. Helga, was there anything else that maybe we should pass on so that they'd be a little bit better informed on why we're here today?

MS. EAKON: For the purpose of this particular area, he might interested in Proposal #36, I guess, Unit 17(A) moose. Also the explanation by Rosa Meehan on subsistence fisheries management that's going on.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Also, you know, one of the areas -- just let me add one more thing, okay, John. You know, we dealt with that moose issue coming out of Sunshine Valley. There's not too many left and we got to make sure we don't kill them all off so we still have some animals left, so we're kind of concerned about the resource, too, and making sure those caribou that come over from that other herd, what's that herd over there? We know the Mulchatna herd, what's the other herd? Kilbuk, yeah. You know we take as many animals as we can from the Nushagak, but we got to be kind of careful with the Kilbuk herd because we don't want to kill them off. So we got to take care of the resource as well as, you know, try to make sure that we have subsistence as well.

MR. J. ANDREW: (In Yup'ik)

MR. ABRAHAM: What he forgot to mention was Proposal #39 that would effect 17, that will include Manokotak. At the same time, I'll say it in Eskimo.

(In Yup'ik)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Thank you, Peter. At this time, if we don't have any other questions, John, we're going to go on with the next public testimony. And that's going to be Fritz George.

MR. J. ANDREW: (In Yup'ik)

MR. PAUL: (In Yup'ik)

MR. J. ANDREW: He said that speaking towards the Chair and as a group, he said he highly recommends the Federal subsistence program, especially the subsistence priority issues, he said, he just recognized that the job is very -- this job is very important to our people of this region. He's very grateful, he's got that understanding.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Thank you. We're going to have an interpreter from now on for everything that's said.

Helga, we're going to have to have an interpreter now for -- right, John? Could you interpret for us this evening?

MR. J. ANDREW: I'd rather take a break for now. But he could do some of it because we're from a different region.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Could you.....

MR. J. ANDREW: And we have a gentleman over here, Jon Dyasuk.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. J. ANDREW: He does our local dialect.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Also, Fritz, can you do both English, so that the elders in the back can understand, too, tonight, would that be okay?

MR. GEORGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. But please accept my apologies for submitting that purple form to you and I'd like to save my comments to Item D(3)(b) remarks by the member of the YK-Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Give us that agenda item again would you please, Fritz?

MR. GEORGE: I'm supposed to be giving my remarks sometime tomorrow on Item D(3)(b). I'm sorry about submitting that form too early, I was informed to submit it in order to be recognized for tomorrow's remarks.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: You would like to talk tomorrow?

MR. GEORGE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. That will be fine.

MR. GEORGE: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Where's John? John, how would you feel about interpreting tonight?

MR. DYASUK: Yeah. I wouldn't mind.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Well, what we're faced with is when people testify don't have any other -- are there any other pink or purple cards tonight? I guess we don't have anyone else to testify tonight. But when we give the reports and in fairness, John, for the elders that are here tonight, they need to know. It's going to take a long time, but we've got a long time.

MR. DYASUK: What I should do is probably get together with the men.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yes, yes, you can do that. Tim?

MR. WONHOLA: Is it all right to right now?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yes. We're open for public testimony now. Would you like to come up to the mike? Helga, we'll put this one on hold until tomorrow for Fritz, thank you. Give us your name, please, Tim?

MR. WONHOLA: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen and Board, the key people back here, I guess behind me. My name is Tim Wonhola, representing New Stuyahok subsistence. I'd like to give a testimony on the Mulchatna herd you referenced, you know, the Mulchatna herd, how the wanton waste come to be in that area this fall. I know Larry Van Daele has made a survey that the Mulchatna herd is growing in large numbers, but, you know, the wanton waste is always a factor. In some places where, not generally in Stuyahok, but at the very site of the old historical site of New Stuyahok, the Old Stuyahok, there was an incident this fall after the caribou season, the late one was open. I think it was from the 15th to the 30th, I'm not sure, but there was an incident where, I guess, some of these sport hunters come in, not only from Anchorage, probably from the Lower 48 where the other guides like Rusts' the flying guides. What they do is they get a drop-off point and a pick-up point at the other end when they're hunting by rafting and it's pretty hard to police. I know the regulation says that you have to take every bit of the meat home, including the antlers if you want -- if you're a sport hunter, but in cases -- in this case, it wasn't that way.

I'm assuming because, the people when they go caribou hunting, they want and they don't waste, the subsistence users. But the sport hunters, on the other hand, are a little different because they can claim that they bought the meat. There was a -- my niece -- my youngest brother, he's a mayor in New Stuyahok, also my niece, his daughter got a picture of these if you people want a picture of those animals that were, I guess illegally, should have been dealt with. I guess this is a good time to present this, because you're in need of -- I know you Board are in need of input from the surrounding villages. I like -- you know, the State on the other hand has

been here for what now, 1959 was the Statehood Act and then this is 1996, so that would make it 37 years, but you know, it's always broke. They claim they can write to -- they can do things, but they're limited with money wise. What I'm saying is, I guess, is that maybe we should police or do something with these people because I know they would have to be the flying time, from the day it opens to the day it closes, that's the deadline, it doesn't go beyond that, caribou season. So they must have to take to the pick-up point -- going back to the pick-up point now, drop-off point, pick-up point. It had to be somewhere in there because they -- in Old Stuyahok that's where Wesley Hanson, Sr., from New Stuyahok got his land up there. And there's a Frenchman that, you know, I guess leased the land or something. It happened right at the mouth of Old Stuyahok just about less than 500 yards away, it's visible from -- as you come by, the mouth of Old Stuyahok. So I stopped there to observe what was going on because there was a pile of meat right on the sand bar, healthy meat, too, the kind you want. But the bad thing was that their heads were cut off, six inch by three inch in rectangular shape off the antlers and the rest was nice healthy meat. I got pictures of that if you people want or I'll send it to Robyn or Dan, at BBNA. Maybe we can do something with these during the next opener. I'm thinking of down the years like, I guess that's why we sit here. To think of the future of what's going to be happening down, as far as the rest of the subsistence users that observe things or see things are not here today to give testimonies, like I'm doing now.

Is there a way that we can do this in partnership, maybe with the State people? Because, you know, the State people they've been around since the Statehood Act, that's 37 years ago. Now, the Federal people come in, I'm really happy that they did because, gee, we -- you know, there might be a lot of laws, regulations, it tells you what to get, what not to get and certain times it opens and certain times it closes. A certain number of people are calculated. Certain permits are issued out. No matter how many regulations that the State might give me or I have to live by, if my stomach says I'm hungry I won't follow the regulations. I will feed it any way I can. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Thank you. Who's going to interpret that testimony now?

MR. J. ANDREW: John.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: He's doing it, okay. Could we ask you some questions, if you would, please, would you mind answering a few questions? We always give the Council an opportunity to.....

MR. WONHOLA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA:we appreciate you -- really appreciate you taking the time to come here today and sharing with us this information. Any questions from the Council

members?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Tim, as you're well aware of, the lands up where your village is located, New Stuyahok is basically surrounded by State lands.....

MR. WONHOLA: Yes.

MR. SAMUELSEN: ...and village corporation lands. Tim also, I believe, represents New Stuyahok on the State Fish & Game Advisory Board.

MR. WONHOLA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: You serve on the Fish & Game Board?

MR. WONHOLA: Yes.

MR. SAMUELSEN: And we have talked about this issue, not only on the local level through the local Fish & Game Advisory Boards, but I think it's just -- it just goes to show, Mr. Chairman, that when we had our meetings in other communities throughout Bristol Bay, one of the main things that the village people brought up was the wanton waste of the resources, namely, moose and caribou. And as a resident of this community and a hunter on the Nushagak River villages, I think it was three days into the season this year there was two dead moose without -- perfectly healthy moose with the heads removed. And that, not only drives the up river villages crazy, but it drives everybody crazy that subsistence harvest moose on the river, as well as the ethical hunters in the area.

But I think the wanton waste problem is by and large a problem out in Bristol Bay. Bristol Bay has always been the playground of the rich and famous and now it's turned -- it's done a flip-flop here in the last few years and basically the prices are so low to come out and hunt and sport fish that we're seeing it turn into a Ronny McDonalds playground for your average Joe Blow from Minnesota. And we're seeing a mighty big influx, not only on Federal lands, but on State lands the sport hunters and sport uses, we're seeing a decrease in State funding protection and other departments, you know. And somewhere these crossroads got to meet and the problem's got to be taken care of. In the near future here, next month in the officers and directors workshop for all the villages in our region, one of the main topics is going to be land use management. And I could guarantee you that when the village people get together collectively and start talking about these problems and realize that they're not just isolated problems, you know, if things don't get -- if the State doesn't correct the problem and if the Federal government doesn't correct the problem, then we're probably going to see village corporations shutting down their lands to non-Natives to cross their lands, to Sno-Go across their lands or whatever, because they feel like their back is up against the wall. They've been coming to meetings and meetings and

I've been going to them too and I hear the same complaint, we've addressed that issue, wanton waste. Our Chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board has addressed this issue with -- in Anchorage, you know. And I think it's time for us to do something. Surely over in your area, when I was a kid 13 years old, you went over there and if there was a moose or a caribou south of you, a quarter of a mile off the lake you didn't shoot it because that was too far to pack, that's what Henry Shade told me when we were over there. We had to land and shoot when we were right alongside the lake there were so many, you took your pick. Well, that day has come and gone and we never thought we'd deplete that resource over there. I think what we're seeing up in these villages and around these villages with the influx of the sport fishermen and sport hunters, the people are realizing that there's a limit to everything. And one thing they will not tolerate is the wanton waste of resource, whether it's by a local person or by a guy from Minnesota.

So I think we need to address this issue and we need to keep stressing to the Federal Subsistence Board people, we need to resolve this issue. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other questions of Tim? Yes, Robert.

MR. HEYANO: Not a question, Mr. Chairman, just some information for Tim. It looks like the Nushagak Advisory Committee has a meeting scheduled for the 20th of this month and that's one of the items on the agenda. And also the Colonel from the U.S. -- not the U.S., the State Fish & Wildlife Protection out of Anchorage will be at that meeting to discuss some of these issues with him, so we look forward for you guys to be at the meeting so he can hear direct, you know.

Mr. Chairman, you know, the thing with the -- there's plenty of wanton waste laws, I think it's just the lack of enforcement. And, you know, that's a problem that the State faces and the Federal people face, there's just not enough people out there checking.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other questions?

MR. ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay, go ahead.

MR. ABRAHAM: (In Yup'ik)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Are you going to interpret for us?

MR. WONHOLA: (In Yup'ik)

MR. ABRAHAM: Yeah. What I said was, you know, to tell them what he said.

MR. WONHOLA: (In Yup'ik)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Thank you, Tim. I wanted to ask you a question if I could. Excuse me, down here there was a question. Robert.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I just had this idea, why don't we put in a proposal for the Minnesota moose hunter where, when he comes up here he be responsible. If he turns in a moose tag, he'd be responsible for the meat, that will stop a lot of people from coming up here to hunt when they got a little responsibility. Instead of using this for a playground, he'd have to be responsible, not the guide. Now, it's just a slip of paper saying, you know, you could buy that off easy and that's what they're doing.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: I believe, Tim, if they kill an animal, they're supposed to, like you said, they're supposed to take it all out.

MR. WONHOLA: It's the law.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. And then when they get to the airport for some reason or another, either the bear got it or it spoiled or something, you know. And as a subsistence user all of my life and all of your life, we've never lost any game. We've always taken our meat home.

MR. WONHOLA: If I was a sport hunter, by God, you wouldn't even see the house it'd be so full of antlers.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: I guess maybe the State biologist and the Federal biologists are here tonight, Tim. There's a time in October where you can't eat a bull period. I mean a dog won't even eat it. You could give it to a dog and he won't eat the meat, and yet, the State of Alaska has a proposal on both Federal and State lands, if I understand correctly, Larry, where we still do have the hunting of bull caribou during the rut season. And I don't know how to correct that other than making it a law, which maybe we'll ignore, but it's a concern to me and I appreciate you talking to us today. To take the time, thank you.

Any other comments from the Council members? Thank you very much, we really appreciate you coming here. Any other public comments today? I think this would be probably a good place to take a break for about 10 minutes, if we could then and we'll come back and we'll start into our reports.

(Off record)
(On record)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Helga, we're under old business?

MS. EAKON: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All right. I don't know if we've had anymore people come in that might want to testify tonight, but we're going to go on with reports if we don't have anyone

else turning in one of these cards.

The section of reports that we have here tonight, the April 30th through May 3rd Federal Subsistence Board meeting in Anchorage. Council members, let me give you just a brief rundown, Helga, if I could?

MS. EAKON: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: The first proposal that we had was #1, which is the one they did not support us on and that's under Tab 8(a) as in alpha. The first one, Proposal #1, we wanted to be able to do airborne on Federal lands, if I am correct, to take wolf, same day as airborne. And we find that the biggest number of chairs of the Federal Subsistence Councils throughout Alaska did not support that, so we did not get our way on that. And Council members need to realize that whereas in this area with a lot of open country, we use airplanes. And by the way, we use an airplane, you know, before we ever had a chain saw, so we go a long ways back on using airplanes with wolves, into the '40s. But we still did not get that. And the people up in the interior, other parts of Alaska, use snowmachines, they don't have access to airplanes, they have a lot of timber. So it works out best for them, so we didn't get that.

The next proposal was #29 and that was the brown bear in Bristol Bay Unit and it was unanimously adopted. #30 and #31 talked about the Iliamna area for permits to harvest in Unit 9(B), bear harvest and that was passed okay. #32 and #33, we find that this was the Togiak Advisory Committee on the caribou in the area of which the time frame came in with 3,000 animals and we received unanimous consent on that.

#34, also the Nushagak herd -- for our two new members here today, they took caribou from over on the Alaska Peninsula and they brought them over there, that Nushagak area and this was a Federal, State and a local effort that took place. And it's my understanding, I think, Larry and other biologists here that that herd is doing quite well still and it's been a very successful program because the local people participated in it as well. And we have met success with that.

The next proposal, #35 there, we had dall sheep in Unit 9(B), we're still working on that. But the proposal that we put before them for Iliamna, Newhalen, Nondalton, Pedro Bay, Port Alsworth, we're not going to give up on Kokhanok and possibly Igiugig as being part of that system, but we did get consent from the Board on that also.

#36, the Quinhagak situation in 17(A), which we have people here tonight that are going to be helping with us as the meeting goes on to better address this issue. We did not support it because we did not have the input to do that. We did not have the necessary information of those user groups, so we said we'd put that on hold and the Federal Board agreed with us on that.

#37 and #8 we were successful in that also. And that was to moose hunt in 17(A), which is a pretty touchy subject, but we got consent on that. And #39 beaver trapping which was extended with unanimous and that is our report.

So the work that the Advisory Council did on all these proposals, with the exception of same day as airborne, we were 100 percent successful. Any questions?

MR. ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yes.

MR. ABRAHAM: On Proposal #37 and #38, I had talked to the traditional council about this a little bit on the last meeting. They were supposed to submit their proposal in writing, evidently they did not. This particular proposal we were asking for Togiak drainage only because there is no other access to it from outside. You take, like Goodnews Bay, Quinhagak or the surrounding areas, because there was no other way unless the people come in by air to go hunting there. I think that's just about how much -- I mean how they were writing it, eventually they didn't send it in.

I'll translate into Eskimo. (In Yup'ik)

That's all, thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Thank you, Peter. Before we go on any farther with another report, we have a very distinguished gentleman here with us today, Harvey Samuelson is here. And Harvey we're glad to have you with us today. We got into our meeting and didn't have a chance to introduce you. But we're glad to have you here today.

All right. Yes, Mr. Samuelson?

MR. SAMUELSEN: On Proposal #1, did they not include aircraft? The way I read it, the Board adopted the proposal as written. I know the Northwest Arctic and Eastern Interior Regional Councils wanted to exclude them, but it looks like the Board opted to adopt the proposal as written, rather than make exceptions. Maybe Helga could.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Helga.

MS. EAKON: This proposal was, indeed, supported by all of the 10 Regional Councils in the State, although two Regional Councils, Northwest Arctic and Eastern Interior wanted to exclude aircraft from the proposed regulatory action. However, the Board did adopt the proposal as it was written.

MR. SAMUELSEN: So airplanes are included then? You got motorized land or.....

MS. EAKON: It would allow the taking of wildlife from a motorized, land or air vehicle on Federal public lands as

long as that vehicle is not in motion.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Well, Helga it's my understanding that Congress had passed a law not allowing same day as airborne hunting on Federal lands for wolves, now, am I wrong on that?

MS. EAKON: This speaks to that recognized object being in motion. What you're talking about is same day a airborne.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yes.

MS. EAKON:as that is in effect on, for example, the National Wildlife Refuges. And when Tony comes up, maybe you could ask him to elaborate on that if you have a question, Tony Booth. There's a distinction between the two.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Well, all right, if you can't hunt with airplanes, it doesn't make any difference whether it's in motion or not. But we can certainly be -- figure out, you know, I think they gave us something that we can't do anyway. That's my understanding. Go ahead.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't think this is tied into same day as airborne.

MS. EAKON: No.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. SAMUELSEN: I think that's a whole different arena to be in. But I don't know for simplicity sake, I guess we should say air vehicles is an airplane. But the way I read this proposal and maybe staff could correct me if I'm wrong, that the proposal passed to include motorized land or an airplane, although two Regional Councils wanted to amend it. So airplane is included as a.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: As a vehicle?

MR. SAMUELSEN:well, we'll include it, yeah.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. All right, good. Thank you.

MR. SAMUELSEN: It would be allowed for the taking of wildlife.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: I stand corrected on that then. Any other comments from the Council members? Okay. The next report that we have on the agenda is the Federal Subsistence Board meeting, July the 16th. Helga, are you going to give us that report?

MS. EAKON: There's a little green tab in your notebooks that's called 8(A)(2), this is not germane to your particular region. But if you're interested in what's going on with the Kenai c&t issue, it just tells You that when the

Board met on July 16, that the Board reversed its earlier decision and did grant a positive c&t finding for four communities on the Kenai Peninsula to harvest moose in -- on Federal public lands in Unit 15 and they also did establish a subsistence season. This is just an update.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Any comments Council members? Thank you, Helga. The next report that we have this evening is from the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Federal Subsistence Management. And who is.....

MS. EAKON: Rosa Meehan.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Rosa, you're going to be giving this report?

MS. MEEHAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Go ahead.

MS. MEEHAN: Hi. Thanks for the opportunity to speak with you tonight. I'm Rosa Meehan. I mostly wanted to introduce myself and also Pat McClenahan, which some of you know, both of us are new to the subsistence program and we're both delighted to be in the program. And I just -- if you're interested in how the office is setup and where we fit within the office, your Tab 8(A) (3) has this green chart in it, which for anybody in the audience that's interested in seeing this I'd be glad to share it.

My position is as Chief of Resources Division. And I work with the biologists and the anthropologists primarily with the analysis of proposals. And as I mentioned, I'm glad to be here doing this. Just to let you know, I'm not new to Alaska, I came up here in 1976 from California and decided I just couldn't go back down south again. And similarly, Pat McClenahan was most recently in California and she, too, decided that Alaska was too good not to come back to. And Pat McClenahan, who stood up earlier has joined our staff as an anthropologist and she will be working with you folks in this region.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any questions? Well, thank you very much, we appreciate that.

All right, we have next, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Alaska Peninsula and we have a stand-in tonight for Ron Hood.

MR. POETTER: My name is Rick Poetter, I'm the deputy refuge manager for the Alaska Peninsula Wildlife Refuge. My congratulations to Dan for winning the election and to the rest of the Board members, I appreciate you coming and being here. I appreciate it.

I'm going to try and be as short as I can. Basically we put before you, the staff of the Peninsula refuge -- primarily our subsistence biologists put together a visitor information bulletin, this was the brainchild, I should say of

Ron Hood. He wanted for us to show and get some information out to our constituents as to what we've been doing the past year. So we put this together and we sent it out to the various borough assemblies, village councils, Native corporations and hopefully you've seen this already, but just for your information we handed out some extras for you to look at. And we'll have some of these available for anybody in the audience that wants to look at these also. And I probably should back up and say, Ron Hood would have been here, but he's on a leave for a month back to Texas. He was headed for the Togiak meeting, but as you all know, it got canceled, so that waylaid his plans.

Just running down through this, the fall moose season that we had for Unit 9(C), and that's the portion draining from the south, Big Creek, from the Becharof Wildlife Refuge. We had six permits issued for the early subsistence season, August 20 to 31. Unfortunately we did not have any moose taken under that program. We do plan on having about -- this coming December, continuing with the five antlerless moose permits to be issued again. And that program has met with some successes in the past. Several years ago, the Board asked us to workout some conflicts with users in the Becharof Lake area, the Island Arm, in particular, and this is the second year of that. And we had only two air taxis that utilized the area this year. It's a restricted, basically a drawing is what we held. We invited the air taxis to come in and solicit their interest in taking clients into those areas, and these are all nonFederal subsistence users that we're talking about. Anybody else that's a Federal subsistence user can go in there at any time they want, whether by air taxi or boat, private airplane. Anyway, we have seen again a reduction in use in conflicts in that area, so the program has been working. You know, we need to get some good moose surveys in that area just to see what the population's doing, but -- this year we noticed a change in concentration of the hunters away from the area between the two lakes, Becharof Lake and Ugashik Lake, more down towards the Mother Goose Lake area. And so the air taxis are sort of limiting themselves as to where they go. And I think in the future that will continue. They'll just work over an area, find maybe their clients were happy or not, and move them around. And, of course, they're flying around all the time, and they're pseudo-guiding by, you know, having known where things -- animals are at, and so they'll take clients into where they've seen animals and that. But they're all operating with -- under the law as it's written right now.

The Northern Alaska Peninsula caribou herd status, we put this bit of information in here for those of you, 'cause I know you have a big interest in it, but these figures come from Dick Sellers with the -- the State biologist in our area. And basically he's saying that the population's stabilized around 12,000, so that's good to see. And it looked to me recently like the Mulchatna herd has invaded our area up there, which Dick Sellers like to see that this time of year, so that our Peninsula herd is not hammered, as well as there's an intermixing so to speak of the two herds. And when

somebody does come in from outside, or anybody that's local, and they take a caribou, potentially they're getting a Mulchatna herd, which helps our southern -- or the Peninsula herd, Northern Peninsula herd out.

You can read yourself some of the law enforcement activities, but basically in a nutshell, the moose season for the nonresident hunters continues to be a problem as you've already picked up on from previous testimony tonight. You're right, we're very limited in the amount of people we've got to out and enforce the laws and regulations, and -- but we work real close with the State enforcement, and we've made -- helped them make, and they've assisted us in making quite a few cases this year again. And some of those investigations are on-going.

But it still comes down to the nonresident hunter flies out with an air taxi, and is basically getting in over his head and ends up killing a moose too far away, doesn't realize how much work he's got ahead of him, and tries to cheat the system, doesn't take all the meat. And we've been pretty good at catching up with most of them that do that. And the reason we're able to do that is because the air taxis are talking to us. They're giving -- they're going in there, checking on the camps, and they're saying, yeah, they've got some antlers, but they don't have much meat. Better go check it out. So those really help us out over there. And without their help we'd be a lot further behind on that effort.

Probably one of the important hirings that we've done this year is to take Refuge Information Technician for the Port Heiden, Chignik, Perryville, Ivanof area, Orville Lind, and he successfully bid on a new job that we advertised for a local hire refuge ranger for the Chignik area, basically for our Chignik Unit. And what our intent on the position is for Orville to become basically a unit manager down there. So he's going through a fairly rigorous training program for three to five years up in the King Salmon area, and once he's built on his skills and abilities towards our ways, the Federal Government ways of doing business, then he'll relocate back down to the Port Heiden, Chigniks, wherever he wants to live. But his current home's in Port Heiden. And, you know, once he does that, he'll basically be that unit manager. And that's a big plus for that unit, because, you know, we've had him there as the refuge information technician for, what, about three, four years, and that's been a big help. But this is a step further.

And along that line, you may want to take back to your villages especially in that area, we're going to be looking for a replacement for him so that announcement will probably be coming out within a month or so, and we'll advertise locally and down the Peninsula, of course. So keep that in mind.

Our final public use management plan, the changes that were made to current refuge regulations, have been published. They were published in the Federal Register June 11th, '96 of

this year. And your outline highlights some of those changes, and if you've been following our public use management plan, you'll be fairly versed in what's going on there. Most of it has to do with camping limits, and ORV type access, which is allowed for subsistence uses. But it does put some size restrictions, so that you don't get these -- I saw going down the highway a truck with the tracked vehicles -- tracks on it, which obviously would tear up the tundra pretty devastatingly, so.....

We've continued with the spring waterfowl watch on the Naknek River primarily. We spread that survey into the Nushagak and on down into the Egegik, and there are some other rivers that we have concerns over, and hopefully will get funding to expand even further. This survey is important as far as the spring migration.

As you probably are well aware, the waterfowl depend on our area for the spring staging they come up there in the early part of the season, spring, as breakup is going on. The river opens up first, and they're able to get nutrients and get some valuable rest there.

Unfortunately along that line, the information that we've been putting out, collecting subsistence harvest waterfowl surveys information has gone both ways. We're collecting information and we're also providing information, and that information is the policy towards enforcement of the spring waterfowl hunting. And in essence, what happened is we saw an increase in the number of hunters. Well, with that increase is the increase in disturbance, which is disturbing to use, because it can potentially offset some -- or create some problems for that resting period. So these birds going on up into the Yukon Delta may be a stressed, a more stressed factor from being harassed in our area, and potentially cause some problems, but, you know, it's a lot of speculation, nothing concrete, but it is raising our concern, and we wanted to let you know that we are concerned.

One of the other big programs that we're doing with cooperators is monitoring migratory land birds, which are basically neotropical, which are birds that migrate from South America, Central America and North America. And we've had a lot of success, a lot of volunteers with the Earthwatch program are coming and helping us band some birds, there's -- you can read the information here at your leisure. But it's been a pretty successful program. A lot of birds are being banded.

Of course, we're pretty proud of the King Salmon Interagency Visitor Center, between the two boroughs there and the Park Service and Fish & Wildlife. We've seen a vast increase, about 15 percent, in the number of visitors this year. We've got our exhibits on line. There's an interactive video display that really, you know, a touch screen that really promotes the local communities, some activities that you can do and the two agen- -- and all the representative agencies, the boroughs and the Federal agencies.

During National Wildlife Refuge Week, we had some live raptures in from Anchorage, from the rehab center, and that was a big draw on the school, and brought in a lot of people into the visitors center, and seemed to have been well received.

And, in fact, the Bristol Bay Borough was experiencing some financial difficulties, and had pulled out their financial backing. They were still supportive of the visitors center, but financially were withdrawing about \$10,000. And we recently found out that they were able to reinstate themselves that way. So they are now back in, full partners again. And we would have missed them if they weren't able to do that.

And then just finally in wrap-up, there's a listing of ecosystem type projects that were funded and completed -- or at least started anyway, not necessarily completed, but it gives a listing that you can read later. These projects are partnerships between Fish & Wildlife and other partners, whether they be state agencies or other Federal agencies, and we're always looking for other partners, corporations, et cetera.

So with that, I'll answer any question.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any questions of Council members for Rick Poetter?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Your 12,000 in the caribou herd, when was your last count of 12,000?

MR. POETTER: Well, again that was Dick Sellers'.....

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Uh-huh.

MR. POETTER:figures. To be honest with you, I'm not really sure. Heather, do you know when the last count was?

MS. MOORE: He did a census in late June or early July.

MR. POETTER: Late June or early July she said.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. That's after they had their young ones. But it still seemed low. You know, it seemed like it's even dropped, you know, from -- it was 12,000 a couple years ago, and it still seemed like we're dropping more. You know, we've seen the big drop, you know. That was noticeable, but now we see a decline from when we see -- I was expecting to see more caribou come, you know, they straggle through, this fall everybody got their caribou. But by now we should be seeing the hundreds in the herd, the big herds, and they haven't, you know. Very little coming through this winter, you know. If there was a decline, more decline.

And then another thing I want to get to you is it

seemed to hinder me when you say that you're training Orville to be the Federal way, the way you guys want it to be in your eyes, you know. You know what I mean?

MR. POETTER: Well, what I'm saying.....

MR. CHRISTENSEN: It's, well, we've got this guinea pig, now we're going to get all those boys in Port Heiden all doing a legal shoot and stuff, you know, but still we've got to still hunt on our own way. But we've got him there now. We've got -- we're going to brainwash that dude. Do you see what I mean? It's.....

MR. POETTER: Well, you must know Orville better than I, but I don't think you can brainwash him.

MR. LIND: I've never been brainwashed before.

MR. POETTER: No, what I really meant was a course in.....

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I know what you meant.

MR. POETTER:so that he would understand our way of doing business so that he's a much better proponent of what you want and what your needs.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Yeah. I'm just.....

MR. POETTER: Giving him heck.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: The State side and our way, you know what I mean, is what Sid said earlier.

MR. POETTER: Yeah.

MR. SAMUELSEN: There's two different ways always.

MR. POETTER: We're hoping at some point in time, and some things have to change, and that's Federal regulations on.....

MR. SAMUELSEN: Yeah.

MR. POETTER:standards for position descriptions, but eventually to see somebody from the local communities become the refuge manager for that refuge, and have even more authority.

MR. SAMUELSEN: No, I just said the way you said it.

MR. POETTER: Yeah.

MR. SAMUELSEN: You know what I mean?

MR. POETTER: Yeah, I understand.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Well, I think though, you know,

Robert is -- Bob is -- Orville certainly has a grasp for the local needs, and can be certainly in touch, and that's very, very important.

Any other questions for Rick? Yeah, Robin, and then Robert?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Yeah, it seems like during the only complaints you get judging by your report are over the aircraft radio. Can you tell me how many U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service law enforcement officers we have out in the field?

MR. POETTER: Yeah, we have -- at the.....

MR. SAMUELSEN: At that time?

MR. POETTER:refuge in King Salmon, we have stationed Bill Smoke, who's our airplane pilot. He does the bulk of our enforcement. Then there's myself as a collateral duty officer. We're all collateral duty officers, we're not full-time officers. We have -- his job is piloting and running the permit program. My job, of course, is the, you know, over-all management of the wildlife refuge, and staffing and cranking out all that paperwork that the government puts out. And then we also have a wildlife biologist that has law enforcement authority. And then beyond that, we have special agents in our Anchorage regional office, and they come out and give us a hand every so often. They may spend about, like this year I think we had a couple of them for a week at a time.

MR. SAMUELSEN: On the average probably about six.

MR. POETTER: And not full-time at all, no. So it's pretty minimal. We do as best we can, but, you know, when you have other duties to do, you don't get full -- we have put a proposal in to our regional office for a full-time refuge officer at our station. Where that's going at this point, I really couldn't say.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Robert, you had a question?

MR. HEYANO: Yes. What's your harvest doing on the North Peninsula caribou herd?

MR. POETTER: I couldn't help you on that, because Dick Sellers is the one that tracks that. I really don't have any information on it.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Susan Savage probably can.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: He's not available for that, or can we call him on the phone tomorrow? Does anybody know if he's in the office or.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He's flying moose surveys.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: What's that?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He's flying moose surveys.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Oh, he is right now doing that?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Susan should have that possibly.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Susan might. Susan, do you have any information on the harvest of caribou?

MS. SAVAGE: No, I haven't been tracking that this year, so I couldn't.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. POETTER: Do you know anything, Heather, that would be of help?

MS. MOORE: No.

MR. POETTER: I didn't think so.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Okay. Anything else, Robert?

MR. HEYANO: Yes. On your -- in the refuge there, you don't have the regulation where it prohibits you to carry the antlers out before all the edible meat is out of the field?

MR. POETTER: We do, and in fact that's how we make most of the cases is -- or we used to anyway. If a bear gets their meat, then we ask them, okay, what happened, what's the story, and amazing, some of them will just spill right out that, well, we started, we hauled some meat into the camp, and then we hauled the antlers in, and then the bear got the rest of the meat. And we go, well, weren't you supposed to bring the antlers in last? And they go, oh, I didn't know that. You know, well, here's your ticket.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: How many tickets did you issue last year on the Peninsula? Smokes?

MR. POETTER: We.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: How many citations did you issue last year?

MR. SMOKE: I work with State Fish & Wildlife Protection.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Wait a minute. Okay.

COURT REPORTER: You'll have to move up to the mike.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. We'll take him in a minute then, but we need to know, you know, there were citations issued. I mean, in the refuge, what kind of enforcement took place that put pressure on these guys to bring the meat out I guess is what we'd like to know.

MR. POETTER: Oh, we -- what was it, about eight of them roughly? How many, Bill, citations?

MR. SMOKE: That would to be about right.

MR. POETTER: And these weren't just run through our Federal system, they were run through the state system with Gary Folger, because he gets better fines than we do. So -- and he gets quick justice.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. POETTER: You know, he gets it served right away.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Good.

MR. HEYANO: What.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Go ahead, Robert.

MR. HEYANO: One more question I guess. You said you were concerned about harassment of the spring waterfowl?

MR. POETTER: Uh-huh.

MR. HEYANO: What type of harassment?

MR. POETTER: Well, harassment being the birds are disturbed. Any time that a bird is disturbed, we -- and I guess I used probably the wrong term. I should have been disturbance, but, you know, when a hunter goes out, a bird, you know, comes to an area to feed and land, and the hunter will either chase it way by shooting at it, or, you know, by it's activity, running a boat up and down the rive, et cetera. And that's what's giving us that harassment on the birds. We get similar harassment, you know, when the military jets were taking off and on, and we'd been tracking some of that, and doing some recordings and surveys on that, just to watch it.

So we're concerned about if every subsistence user which under our policy, the Fish & Wildlife policy was any resident of a subsistence waterfowl community, which King Salmon is debatable in some aspects, but Naknek for sure, if everybody went out and started using the area more, because we've been asking people to hold off until the treaty got amended, then that extra disturbance could cause some problems.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Robin?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Do you have any harassment problems with sport fishermen running up and down the river?

MR. POETTER: Not during that time of year. I mean, you get a little bit, people going out, but we had been documenting the previous use, and I think a lot of that was more local, it wasn't the guided types.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. Any other questions of Rick?

MR. BOSKOFISKY: Yeah, who are you protecting the birds from? Who are you protecting them for?

MR. POETTER: Well, we're concerned about the population over-all. And like I was saying, if they're disturbed on their resting areas, they'll get to their breeding grounds in a lesser -- less energetic state. As to what extent, again, we don't have any studies at this point in time to say.....

MR. BOSKOFISKY: The subsistence users been using them for years.

MR. POETTER: Uh-huh.

MR. BOSKOFISKY: And I turned across one program on the TV there down in the States where these birds fly back down there, and they're laying, people laying in these corn fields shooting them. And we raised the stuff, and we can't touch them.

MR. POETTER: Yeah.

MR. BOSKOFISKY: And it don't seem fair.

MR. POETTER: I guess all we're concerned about is the increase in use along that portion of the river. The hunting that has been going on in the potholes and stuff is less likely to make that major effect, because you don't have the boat running the river, disturbing them as they go, and another one comes along to get to the hunting site. It's just something that we want to keep an eye on.

MR. BOSKOFISKY: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other questions, Council members? I have a couple for you, Rick.

MR. POETTER: Okay, Dan.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: The other day -- well, quite a while ago, in fact this goes back to Tim's testimony, too. I was the D&D trying out some of the world's best pizza, and I heard some of these real high muck-muck guys right next to me. I mean, like they talked about, you know, Clinton like he was their neighbor or something, and so they were very high up in Washington, D.C. And they had -- I didn't realize the guy that was with them was a pilot for, oh, what's the guy's name there? Right on the river at Naknek?

MR. POETTER: Cusack's?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: No, the other one. Frank O'reara (ph). Yeah, that's the outfit. And so they said, well, what

are we going to do if we kill an animal quite a ways away, or we'll get it out they said, they didn't -- they weren't planning on leaving it there. But they said, what are we going to do with the meat when we get it out, because we don't really want to take it home? And so I finished my meal, and I walked around, and I said, hey, you know, if you don't have any use for that meat, you know, Katmai Air will bring it in, or we'll go get it and bring it in, and we'll give it to the people who need it. And lo and behold, about three weeks, two weeks later I got a call, and they brought and they brought six caribou in. I mean these things were boned out. Those were bull caribous in August with inch and a half thickness fat on the rump, and they brought the rump, they brought the rib cage, the front should- -- they brought everything in. And they had it all bagged up in nice cloth, black pepper on it, and they called me up, and said come get this meat.

Now there's a good use, rather than just let it go and throw it away, say some animal got it. They brought it out and then we took it around and gave it to the people who don't get a chance to go out, who don't have a boat or an airplane to go get it. So I think that's a real good testimonial of people who -- and if we could between all of us, including every organization here, could get that message across to the air taxis and your guides and your outfitters, and there are outfitters still, whether they're legal or not, we'd get a lot more meat out of that. And in fact I told them, I said, I'd carry meat out just to get it. I mean, I don't care whether you kill the moose or I killed a moose, but we do want the meat. And so that was real good.

The second thing I want to mention to you is I've been talking with some of the guys from Lower Peninsula about the possibility on the refuge -- let's see, the Becharof Refuge and then going on down further because the Alaska Peninsula Refuge, is.....

MR. POETTER: Right.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA:that what it's called?

MR. POETTER: That's right, yeah.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: And we were thinking about an August 20th to September 5th resident hunt, and I know that you haven't had too many animals taken in the refuge. Why? There just hasn't been much success or not that many animals or.....

MR. POETTER: You're talking moose now?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Moose, yeah.

MR. POETTER: That's where most of this use is coming from in the law enforcement effort, so I'm not sure where you're getting the numbers, but -- are you talking subsistence again, or.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah, subsistence only. I mean that

just.....

MR. POETTER: Oh, okay. You're talking about this.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA:(Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) subsistence, August 20th to September 5th, something like that, at the end of new business and at the end of this session, we may -- by the way, Helga, we still can put proposals in, because we missed our deadline in Togiak, and so we still have November time to put in proposals?

MS. EAKON: Yes. You will have time to put in proposals during this meeting, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Thank you. Rick, that's all I had to say, and I just kind of.....

MR. POETTER: Were you asking about the early season for the Big Creek area basically, why not the success?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: No.

MR. POETTER: Oh, okay.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Oh, no, no. I guess it just didn't seem like there was that many moose taken on the entire Peninsula.

MR. POETTER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah, you know, like there was up in the Nushagak area, and probably in the Kvichak area, just a horrendous amount of good moose hunting up there this year. But we're looking to go on up Peninsula. They may be possibly thinking about an early hunt for subsistence use.

MR. POETTER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: But we don't want to impact the resource, but we might want to impact the sports hunter. You never know.

MR. POETTER: Right.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other questions? Thank you, Rick. Appreciate it.

MR. POETTER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. Togiak National Wildlife Refuge.

MR. ADERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, my name's Andy Aderman. I'm a wildlife biologist for Togiak National Wildlife Refuge. I'd like to welcome the new council members, and also the rest of you.

For the benefit of our new members, I wanted to

mention that Togiak National Wildlife Refuge is diagonally split between two regional councils. The west side, that area that drains into Kuskokwim Bay is in the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Region, and everything east of that, of course, is in your region.

The refuge has worked primarily in three areas, those being public use management, fisheries and wildlife. Our assistant refuge manager, Donna Stovall, will address the public use management plan revision tomorrow. She's on the schedule. With fisheries, our program focuses primarily in three years, these being resident fish population and habitat inventory, androgenous fish inventory and monitoring, and education and outreach.

With the resident fish program, we have worked cooperatively with the Quinhagak Village Corporation, and Kanektok River Safaris to sample resident fish in the Arolik River. We continue to document age and length structure and movements of resident fish within four tributaries of the Togiak River. I also wanted to mention that a report has been completed by BBNA entitled fresh water fish subsistence harvest survey of Togiak and Manokotak.

With the androgenous fish, we annually fly a number of the refuge streams. We do this in coordination with the State, so there's no duplicate effort. These results are presented in both the Dillingham and Bethel annual management reports.

The refuge has been involved with three escapement projects with the first is through a cooperative agreement with ADF&G. The refuge has provided funding and purchased all the materials to replace a rigid weir on the Goodnews River with a floating weir. We also provided support to the Quinhagak IRA to operate a combination counting tower and weir on the Kanektok River. And the third project the Service has been involved with is a counting tower on the Kalukik (ph) River.

With education and outreach, we do a number of presentations here locally. Or most are locally here in Dillingham. We have expanded into Quinhagak a little bit this last summer. The primary the program here locally is termed the Squaw Creek Project where it involves kids in grades six through 12, making fisheries part of their science curriculum.

Moving over to wildlife, the work has primarily focused on walrus, sea birds and caribou this past summer. We had field camps at both Cape Peirce and Cape Newenham to monitor walrus, seals, sea lions, sea birds, waterfowl, and public use. Our walrus numbers were low this year at Cape Peirce. Our peak was right at about 3,100 in early October. At Cape Newenham, we had a peak of 1,300 animals in mid June.

Once again this year we documented real low production and numbers of black leg kittiwakes (ph), the seabird that nests on cliffs at both Cape Peirce and Cape Newenham.

Also out at Cape Peirce we had an environmental education camp in early June involving high school students from Goodnews Bay where we involved them with the work that we do out there. And we're also hopeful to get a similar camp going on the Nushagak Peninsula involving local students from Dillingham, Manokotak, and the main focus of that camp would be caribou.

Mr. Chairman, you said that the Board had passed this Council's proposal last year in regards to caribou west of the Togiak River in 17(A). Based on a flight that we did on October 16th, we counted just over 11,000 caribou that had moved into that area. Subsequently Refuge Manager Aaron Archibique opened the season the very next day. And then on the following day Larry and Aaron issued a joint announcement notifying that both the state and the Federal was opened for caribou in that area.

A little more recently we've observed numerous caribou in 17(A) east of the river, the majority of which are Mulchatna/Kilbuck, and I'll let Larry speak to that when he gives his presentation.

The Nushagak herd is doing good. It numbers between 1100 and 1500. We are seeing some expansion off of the Peninsula primarily over in the Twin Hills area. We've had documented calving now for the last three years by a few of our radio collared animals. Calf survival this year was real good. We had our first August this year, with a reported harvest of five. Hunting will begin again December 1st and go until March 31st. In last winter's hunt, 52 caribou were harvested. And we plan to have a Nushagak Caribou Planning Committee meeting this Thursday up at the refuge office.

Moving on to moose, we weren't able to do a lot of work with moose this last winter, because of survey conditions. However, we did count moose in some of those higher drainages where there was a little bit better snow. And over all it appears that the moose population is about the same as the winter previous when we conducted a survey and estimated 100 to 150 moose.

Aaron mentioned to me today that we have a commitment from our law enforcement people in Anchorage and we'll also be working with Fish & Wildlife Protection to step up enforcement activities in 17(A) in regards to moose this winter.

That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman. If you have any questions, I'll try to answer them or direct one of my cohorts in the back to try and answer them.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: (Indiscernible)

MR. ABRAHAM: Got a question. Is it possible for you to send out activity reports, sort of like a newsletter to traditional councils, even bimonthly or trimonthly, so this way the local people can understand you more, what you guys are actually doing? I had thought about it for quite a long

time. With more understanding, they will work with you I think more freely, and they would be more open to you people.

MR. ADERMAN: Yeah, that's a good point, Pete. We had a meeting last week and we addressed this very subject, and I believe the outcome, or one of the outcomes of that meeting was to have a quarterly newsletter, you know, four times a year. But we could certainly look at if we need to make it every other month.

MR. ABRAHAM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Excuse me. Yeah, Jon, did you have a question back there?

MR. DYASUK: (Indiscernible) comment. (Indiscernible) (Comes up to microphone) What Pete was asking about is survey reports that we've been sending out to the villages, usually getting that report from Mike, and oftentimes I usually send it to the village council members, and that's what Pete was asking about. Sometimes that survey -- just a survey report that he -- sometimes accompany our biologist pilot. And usually we send that to the village members.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Could you translate that?

MR. ADERMAN: Could you translate, Jon?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Jon, could you translate that?

MR. DYASUK: (In Yup'ik)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Jon.

Any other questions of -- let's see, your name is Andy, what's the last name?

MR. ADERMAN: Aderman.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Aderman. Okay. Any other questions? Yes, right here, Robert?

MR. HEYANO: Mr. Chairman, any guesses as to why your bird population is decreasing at Cape Peirce and Newenham?

MR. ADERMAN: We suspect it may be a feeding -- related to the feed in that they're not getting as much fish as they have in the past, and so subsequently they have to spend a longer time away from the next. And when that happens, then that nest can become exposed to predation by namely ravens. Also, you know, if the body weight isn't up on the chicks, it takes them longer to grow their feathers and, you know, make it off in time before winter hits. But that's just one possible explanation, that it's been documented wherever seabirds occur, that it's usually a forage, a fish forage problem. And what's causing a shortage, if there is a shortage in the types of fish they eat, I couldn't answer that.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other questions, Robert?

MR. HEYANO: Yeah. What type of fish do they eat or feed on?

MR. ADERMAN: The kittiwakes eat a lot of sand lance. They have been known to eat the smaller capeland, and I believe also juvenile pollack.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other questions, Council members?

MR. HEYANO: One more, Mr. Chairman,.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. Sure. Yeah.

MR. HEYANO:I've got. I guess I'm -- I think I read, yeah, it was in the paper I think that you had some walrus go over the cliff again? Any more idea why they do it or do they -- has it been documented in other haul-outs?

MR. ADERMAN: To my knowledge this has only occurred at Cape Peirce, and, you know, why they go up there, it's really hard to say. You know, they have been up there two times previously. Some of those animals have made it down okay. And whether they think it's safe to go up there, it's really hard to say.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah?

MR. ABRAHAM: One more question.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Pete.

MR. ABRAHAM: A question on the walrus at Cape Peirce climbing. I guess if they climb once, they start doing it again, but last week or a couple of weeks ago when I was over here, I had watched the tape, the video tape we've got in the office. I noticed the person or the party that were taking the movie of that thing, they were upwind of those animals and that is wrong. I didn't mention this in the office because I wanted to mention it here today. Any animal, the people or the local people here knows or even you know, the animal can smell you at long ways. That can easily scare the animals down the cliff. So I think you should mention that to the people or the party down there.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Good. Thank you. Appreciate that comment. Yeah. Want to come up and state your name? No, don't leave yet, Andy.

MR. HANKS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, Mike Hanks. I'm the pilot/biologist at the Togiak Refuge.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. HANKS: Just to kind of expand on that a little

bit more. If you compare pictures in the past of the dunes there and what they are like now, at one point those animals were unable to get up there on the cliff. There was a good sized dune that was pretty steep, and it was a barrier for getting up on those cliffs at all. You had rock, and then these sand dunes. Over the years, the dunes have changed quite significantly, and if you look at it now, there's almost a ramp that goes up onto the grassy tundra that's above the cliff. And we believe what's happening is they're getting up there now. They're just -- as the numbers, they just push up on the beach and they get up on the grassy slopes and then when they get back down to the water, you know, they really can't see the cliff. They see the water out there, and they just attempt to take the short cut down, and they don't quite remember the way they got up there. And I think they get part way down those hills, and as you can see in the film, they try to turn around lots of the time, and they just -- it's just too steep any more. So it's just that they're -- you know, they've kind of lost their way, the good way to get back down. And then the other way that they fall off is when they do get up there and up against the cliffs, they start crowding a little bit and some animals are pushed off that way.

And I mean that just may be a little bit of insight. But the dunes have changed significantly, you know, since the earlier times when they first, you know, started hauling out there again in the early 80s.

MR. ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman? On that last video I watched, the animals are up on top already. But the party that were taking the video of that were upwind of those animals. That's what -- because I can notice that, the way the grass was blown by the wind. And that's very dangerous.

MR. HANKS: I don't think any of animals going off the cliff have been attributed to anybody out there, from whatever the wind was. They've gone up there at night, they've fallen off at night, and it's generally falling off in an attempt to get back down to the beach and the water, or being pushed off when they're kind of crowded up against the beach.

MR. ABRAHAM: Yeah, I understand that. But the people seeing it in the video will notice that right away, so what I suggest was a while ago next time the party that's taking the video try not to do it from upwind, because the old people will notice right away, and then they'll blame it on the parties that are doing it. That was my point.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Well, thank you, we appreciate your comment. Any other questions from the Council members? Yeah, Robin?

MR. SAMUELSEN: I just have a comment because we're over in the Togiak area, Mr. Chairman. I also sit on the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, and that council in reaction to the Magnuson Re-authorization Act has instituted ecosystem management. I sit on the committee, namely the Bering Sea Ecosystem Management Committee.

And one of the places we're looking at is the Togiak area, because of the yellow fin sole fishery that takes place over there. And I guess what I'd like to see out of U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service is a coordinated effort I guess amongst the grownups in Anchorage that would put some real people before a regulatory body, such as the North Pacific Fishery Management Council. You know, we're looking at potentially a 60 percent decline in harbor seals. You've got bird populations that are on the decline. We have a trawl fishery happening basically at the doorstep. So, you know, somehow we need to get your information funnelled through to this committee and into a regulatory body such as the North Pacific Fishery Management Council. And I know it's pretty cumbersome, but seeing that we're all wearing the Federal hat, and one agency, you know, we need to figure out how to flow that information through. And I know I've talked to Aaron about it, but when we closed the yellow fin, most of the yellow fin sole fishery trawl, the waters of Bristol Bay to trawling, it was because of the sensitive shallow draft ecosystem that we have in Bristol Bay, and this happened from Stroganof over to Cape Newenham that we closed the waters. Just that little area down on the Peninsula here is open for trawling to yellow fin.

But, you know, I was hoping that I'd get a lot of comments out of U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service in support of that closure, but I guess because of the different agencies and what not, there wasn't a real coordinated effort, flow of information coming out of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, i.e., Togiak, through the Regional Office, then back out through the Council. But I think it's something that we need to work on. If we're going to protect that system over there, we've got to look at the whole system over there, and not just think about targeting certain sectors.

That's all I have, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other questions?

MR. ABRAHAM: Yes. As to Robin over there, our harbor seals over there are declining, or has been declining for a long time, but after we had that oil spill in '89, a year later the shore birds declined alarmingly fast. And then the fin trawlers already started, I can't remember the year, the harvest seals over there declined, I mean, just terribly. In the fall time when we have a southwest wind, I used to count, driving along the beach with a truck, I used to count easily in a half hours time 20 seals popping up on the beach. Not any more. Last week I tried it when we had that same wind. I didn't even see nothing. Yesterday some people out seal hunting, about this time of year, because there's a lot of feed over there, a lot of smelts in the bay. You can see in a half hour's time 10 to 15 seals popping up. All day long they seen only four. I mean, the decline is very -- I mean, it's scary right now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Any comment or anything? Okay. Any other questions from Council members? Just a couple of questions. You're the biologist for the Becharof --

I mean the Togiak Refuge?

MR. HANKS: Yeah, pilot/biologist.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Does your count of the walrus -- do you do the walrus count, too, or -- do you do the walrus count?

MR. HANKS: We have usually seasonals that are stationed at Cape Peirce that do the counts.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Does the Togiak Refuge count all the walruses in the area?

MR. HANKS: Fish & Game does the counts on Round Island.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. HANKS: We do Cape Peirce, Cape Newenham, and Marine Mammals Management out of Anchorage sometimes gets down to Cape Siniavin, or we get reports from local pilots or the guide down there.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. I notice there's been some, a little bit of decline in the Siniavin area. We've flown, you know, -- you've got a rule, you've got to fly so high and so many miles away, but you can still see the animals. And sometimes they've had an observer there on the bank, you could see the tent. But there has been a decline, and I don't know, maybe just lack of food, but they have a high mortality rate, too, you know. There's been a lot of them washing up on the beach.

And the other thing is, Andy, you said that you're going to have a meeting of the Nushagak Peninsula herd?

MR. ADERMAN: The planning committee on the.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. Why are you having it in Dillingham? Is the biggest number of members in Dillingham or --? Why not Manokotak or Togiak or Twin Hills or --?

MR. HANKS: Well, the biggest number is in Dillingham, but it's we tied it in with the meeting that was going on here, figuring that these folks would be in town also.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. I think it's pretty important that we include them if you possibly can. I know you've got budget constraints, but if you could possibly get into those villages and have a meeting with those people, and, you know, take an interpreter. You've got to get message across. I think that's been a very successful program. I think it's just incredible that you've had that much success, because the local people have participated all the way up to this point.

Any other questions? Yes, Robin?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Yeah. Andy, I guess and you've gone

out -- since you're going to have a stepped up enforcement program, you've gone out and met with the traditional councils and made them aware of it?

MR. ADERMAN: I was just informed of this today.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Oh, okay. So I guess you'd be doing that?

MR. ADERMAN: Probably myself along with Jon Dyasuk and Peter.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Peter?

MR. ABRAHAM: I guess, yeah, that's the question I was going to ask, Robin, that will probably -- thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: No further questions? Okay. Yes? Okay. Would you mind coming up to the mike and address a question here if you'd like? Do you have question of the biologists?

MR. CAOLE: Actually, excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I'm a little out of order. This is my first time to an advisory meeting, and I'm not familiar with the protocol, but I had a question for Rick while he was up here, and I wasn't sure whether I could ask it or not,.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Poetter, not the (indiscernible, simultaneous speech).

MR. CAOLE:concerning hunters scaring the migratory birds.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. CAOLE: And I was wondering if I could ask that question.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. Did you give your name so that we could.....

MR. CAOLE: Anthony Caole.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. It's important that she gets a recording of it.

MR. CAOLE: He said that the hunters -- or he has a concern with hunters scaring the birds, and the possible impact that that might have. And what I would like to know is, is this such a concern that the resource managers would adopt a policy or practice of using aircraft to disperse birds from heavily hunted areas? Because we have reports in Quinhagak of aircraft intentionally disbursing birds from Jack Smith Bay and other hunting areas, and we'd like to know if that's a policy or an adopted practice or not?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: A management tool?

MR. CAOLE: A management tool. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay, Rick?

MR. POETTER: From our aspect around -- Rick Poetter, Alaska Peninsula Refuge again. From our aspect around on the Naknek River, no, we don't do anything like that. We'll do an aerial survey probably once, maybe twice of each system, just to try and get us some figures to make our counts more valid from the ground. In other words, you can see a lot more from the air, and so you do a survey and count them. But I think maybe that's -- you know, I don't know for sure, but I don't know if that's what they're seeing is the surveys that are coming along and counting the birds to get the total population count or not. Or is this like a continuous thing? From our management aspects, no, we try to cut the disturbance down to you fly in and get your survey. You may -- you'll probably flush the birds, because you're flying at a fairly low level, but you continue on and get out of the way, and then they can come and rest. The disturbance is fairly low key.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Those birds, Rick, are fairly concentrated in that area on a regular annual basis. I mean, they come back there every year?

MR. POETTER: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: And it gets to be a problem with people running the river and the birds in the river too. So it's kind of a -- I don't think they're out there shooting a lot of birds, but they're using the river, and it's mostly a local effort, because the river's open now, the birds are there, and they're going up the river, and you've got a problem. And I don't know how you're going to correct that. Yeah?

MR. SAMUELSEN: I think we have a perceived problem, Mr. Chairman. I haven't seen any documentation that it's a problem, that the locals are harassing birds.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: You only saw six Canadians?

MR. POETTER: Yeah. That -- maybe Heather can come up and -- Heather, why don't you come up here.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: That's okay. I just want to say there probably are that many in the freezer probably before.....

MR. POETTER: It's sort of an unusual sighting for our area.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah.

MS. MOORE: Seven Aleutian Canadians (indiscernible,

not close to a microphone)

MR. POETTER: Aleutian. Heather Moore, our subsistence biologist, helps with the surveys. Seven Aleutian Canadian.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. That's fine. I just -- I was just curious. But thank you very much. I appreciate that. Okay.

MR. POETTER: Okay. I hope I answered the question.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. We don't have any more questions now of the Togiak Refuge people?

We're going to take a -- the next agenda item is going to be upland game hunting, lead poisoning waterfowl, Alaska Refuges approach request to control wolves. An interesting one next. Let's take a ten-minute break, and then we'll come back.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. We'll call the meeting back to order. We have Tony Booth this evening dealing with an agenda item, refuge upland game hunting, lead poisoning of waterfowl, Alaska refuges approach to a request to control wolves and increase moose and caribou population. Possibly if time permits, a leg-hold trap on refuge lands I believe. A slide presentation. A fun agenda item. You're on.

MR. BOOTH: Okay. I'm on?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Tony?

MR. BOOTH: Okay. Okay. As far as the first issue item concerning steel shot, I should be able to glide through this pretty fast here.

As you well -- I'm sure you're all aware that since 1991 the Fish & Wildlife Service has banned the use of lead shot for hunting waterfowl in Alaska. And this is because of we for a long time -- for a long time, the Fish & Wildlife Service has well documented that there's been an extensive amount of waterfowl mortality nationwide due to lead poisoning, and the source of the lead is from the deposits from lead at -- from waterfowl hunting. And beginning in the late 80s we began to phase in a ban, and ultimately by 1991, Alaska was one of the last states, but it became illegal to use lead shot for using -- for hunting waterfowl.

Now, since that time, we do know that in the Lower 48 where there's an intensive amount of use of refuge areas down there, they're still hunting for wildlife other than waterfowl, upland game hunting in and around wetland areas, still occurs, and there's still some incidences of, you know,

lead deposition in wetland areas that are used by waterfowl, even though the -- it's deposited by people hunting things other than waterfowl. And the Fish & Wildlife Service is looking at a nationwide effort right now to look at all refuges systemwide and determine which and where there are areas where we need to implement regulations that would prohibit the use of lead shot for hunting upland animals as well as waterfowl.

And as a preliminary look in Alaska, we don't think there's a need for it, but nonetheless, we still -- we have been asked to use the best available information, and go out and see if there's any areas where there might be a problem in Alaska where we might want to look at prohibiting use of lead shot for upland game hunting, as well as waterfowl.

And I might tell you, too, that we do -- we are aware that the coastal area in Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta, there is some -- we have documented some lead contamination, lead poisoning of spectacle eiders, but the source of that lead contamination is not from upland hunting. It's still the use of lead for hunting waterfowl, which is still illegal. As we all know, it still occurs up here to some degree.

So anyway, I would just leave it for you if there's anything that you think we might have overlooked. We're not going to recommend anything for your region, but nonetheless, we'll let you know, and invite you to make any recommendations if you think there's something we've overlooked.

MR. ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah?

MR. ABRAHAM: A question, Tom. You said the lead shot in Alaska is prohibited now totally or.....

MR. BOOTH: No, just for hunting waterfowl. It's been illegal since 1991.

MR. ABRAHAM: Okay. What about the sale of lead shot in the stores? Because I see a few in Togiak still.

MR. BOOTH: You bring up a very good point. It's not illegal to sell it or manufacture it. But it's still illegal to use lead shot for hunting waterfowl. The reason it's not illegal to sell is technically you can always say that they're selling lead shot -- they can -- you know, you can use lead shot for things other than waterfowl, so it's not -- you know, the manufacture or sale of it's not band. It's just use for waterfowl.

MR. ABRAHAM: Another question I've got is the comparison between the ounces in the shots, like two shot and four shot, when you compare it to two shot lead and four shot lead, what's the experience on the steel?

MR. BOOTH: As a general rule, and, you know, I might

have to ask for some help from some better technical experts on it, but generally if you're going -- for going to steel shot, you want to drop down a size or two. For example, if you routinely use number four lead shot for ducks, you want to go to number two steel as a general rule in steel, because steel is lighter, a little bit lighter. But, anyway, as a general rule, you want to go a little bit -- excuse me, I say drop down a size. Go to a bigger shot size, a smaller number. Okay.

MR. ABRAHAM: Yeah, that's -- thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: You had a question, Andrew?

MR. BALLUTA: The lead shot, do the birds get poisoned by getting wounded from lead? Or how -- how do they get poisoned?

MR. BOOTH: That does occur, but the primary cause of lead poisoning is lead that's deposited in the wetland areas, and ducks pick it up by feeding on the bottom. But, you know, there's always some incidents of lead being embedded in the tissue of the bird that can carry over time. But that's not the primary cause. It's primarily they pick it up feeding and it's ingested, and over a period of -- I think it usually takes a few weeks, three to four weeks, before the bird may succumb to that. And it's hard to document it, because it's not like you have a massive die off where you're going to find a large number of birds, but, you know, it's gradual deterioration of the body condition as that bird becomes poisoned, and it's a chronic poisoning problem where they ingest lead and it gets dissolved, and the lead salts that are dissolved into the body over a period of time, and the body just starts to degenerate. And before they die, usually a scavenger -- a predator or something will pick them off before they, you know, die or something. Because they get sick and too weak to get away.

MR. BALLUTA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other questions? Yes, Robin?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Well, just a comment, Mr. Chairman. Recently U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and BBNA had a steel shot seminar here in Dillingham. A number of villages were involved in that seminar, and it was an educational seminar with very limited funds, but we had I think the maximum amount of participants. I wasn't able to attend the meeting. I was out of town. The BBNA staff attended the meeting, and coordinated the workshop with a \$3,500 grant from U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. And from what all I hear, it was very successful and educational not only for BBNA personnel, but also village personnel from a number of villages.

MR. BOOTH: Thank you, Mr. Samuelson. I hope we can continue those efforts, too.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: What is your next item there, Tony?

MR. BOOTH: Well, the next item is wolf control, and if you want to give me just a minute to get the slide projector set up, and we're going to dim the lights here. Do you want to go -- are we done with steel shot?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Pardon?

MR. BOOTH: Are we done with steel shot?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yes, we are.

MR. BOOTH: Okay.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Well, while you're doing that, the reason why I was late this evening, Mr. Chairman, was there was a Houston/Laker game on, and it went into a double overtime.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Priorities.

MR. SAMUELSEN: And I couldn't stay for the second overtime, but I called my wife, and the Lakers won.

(Off record conversations)

MR. BOOTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I get into this, let me -- it may be better to explain why this put together, and a little bit of background, so you understand what's going on here.

Over the last couple of years, one region in particular, there are certain members of the regional council, and other members of some of the communities out there, who were concerned about the number of wolves they're seeing out there. And they were -- there's been a lot of discussion and increasing interest in pursuing wolf control, or they're coming and asking us what -- if there's a possibility in doing wolf control on Federal lands. And it was decided we -- we put together a team of people, and we even brought in a couple of regional council chairs from both Eastern and Western Interior, and take a look at what we need to do as an outreach about it. Wolf control is a very controversial issue, as you well know, and especially when you start talking about Federal lands, and we all know what the State's gone through when they tried to implement it on state lands.

And so we -- we put this together primarily for the Western Interior and it concentrates mostly on moose and wolves, and basically to -- when we talked -- we talked to the regional council members, they wanted a little bit more than the wolf control. They wanted a lot on just the general aspects of managing or administrating refuges. So this gives you somewhat of an overview of what the refuge was created for, some of the laws that we work under, and at the end of it I'll go into how this applies to whether or not we would ever do any wolf control on refuges and under what conditions.

(Presents slide show)

And as you well know, moose are one of the most important animals in Alaska. They're important both in the subsistence lifestyle in many parts of Alaska, and as you well know, they're also a very popular game animal for sport hunters. Hunting of moose occurs on most of the national wildlife refuges in Alaska, and some people who depend upon moose for food are concerned that there are too many wolves -- or that too many moose are being killed by wolves, and wolf control is being discussed as a possible action to improve hunting success in their areas.

There are many agencies that manage fish and wildlife on public lands in Alaska, including the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, and the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, as well as the Fish & Wildlife Service. And each agency has a different mission and often different approaches to accomplishing their missions. And we hope by this slide show that we can help you understand the significance of Alaska's national wildlife refuges to Alaskans and to Americans, and what they're here for, and our approach to resource and people management. In addition, we'd like to familiarize you with the process and considerations that refuge managers have to make for management decisions, such as whether to do wolf control on refuges.

The national wildlife refuge system consists of more than 500 national wildlife refuges across the United States, and they're managed by the Fish & Wildlife Service under certain laws, and our purpose is to preserve a national network of lands and waters for the conservation and management of fish and wildlife and plant resources. And it's all for the benefit of present and future generations of people.

The first national wildlife refuges in Alaska were established in the early 1900s to protect nesting seabirds. In 1980, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, or ANILCA, we all know about, added land to seven existing refuges, and created nine new refuges in Alaska. And just as important, ANILCA established new purposes, rules, and guidance for managing Alaska's refuges. Among other things, ANILCA requires us to ensure that customary and traditional access and uses would be maintained, and that rural residents engaged in subsistence lifestyle will be allowed to continue to do so.

The 16 national wildlife refuges in Alaska vary from a little over 300,000 acres, which is Izembek, to almost 20 million acres in size. From a national systemwide perspective, Alaska refuges are unique in both their large size and the fact that they typically contain entire or nearly entire healthy ecosystems. In comparison, the refuges in the Lower 48 are for the most part pockets, just small pockets of critical habitat that must be managed very intensively to make up for habitat that has been lost or destroyed for development. And as I mentioned before, Alaska's refuges on the other hand provide very large areas of undisturbed fish

and wildlife habitat.

ANILCA details at least four purposes for each refuge up here. These purposes are cornerstones of our management programs. And despite whatever personal opinions we may have, we must manage our refuges in Alaska according to these purposes.

The first and primary refuge purpose is to conserve fish and wildlife populations and habitats in their natural diversity. We cannot allow any activity to occur on a refuge that has a negative effect on this purpose. This requires us to know a lot about the fish and wildlife resources on the refuges. And that's why refuge employees are continually learning about fish and wildlife populations from biological studies and surveys, and from local residents. And Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils such as this are an excellent way to obtain the needed information we need about fish and wildlife resources and local uses of refuge resources, and for local residents to have a meaningful role in refuge management and decisionmaking.

In addition to animal populations, refuge employees are learning about habitat, what animals need to live, because the quality of habitat directly effects animal populations. Once again, the local knowledge you and village elders have would give us a much needed historical perspective and greatly help us understand the data from our studies really means to us.

The second refuge purpose is to fulfill the international treaty obligations of the United States with respect to fish and wildlife and their habitats. The United States holds international treaties concerning migratory birds with Canada, Mexico, Russia, and Japan. There are also international treaties concerning protection and conservation of endangered species, polar bears and salmon.

The third refuge purpose is to provide the opportunity for continued subsistence uses by local residents. With the exception of the Kenai refuge, every Alaska refuge has this as one of its purposes. And, again, refuge employees can learn from the local residents what subsistence uses are important to the local area, when, where and how they have taken place, and what may be needed to maintain your customary and traditional uses of each refuge.

And the fourth purpose is to ensure water quality and necessary water quantity within the refuge. This is why Fish & Wildlife -- let's see. Is there a way to -- I'm looking for a little bit of focus here. I got it. Okay. This is why Fish & Wildlife hydrologists and biologists are documenting stream flow and the lake levels on many refuges, but much more work needs to be done in this area.

I need to mention, too, that the third and fourth refuge purposes must be consistent with the first and primary purpose of conserving fish and wildlife populations and

habitats in their natural diversity.

So these four purposes guide managers in determining what uses and how much of each use can occur on refuges. Title VIII of ANILCA as you well know further details the importance and obligation of the Federal agencies up here for continuing subsistence uses on all Federal public lands in Alaska, but the law also says that subsistence use must be consistent with sound management principles and the refuge purpose as indicated above.

ANILCA clearly says that the opportunity for rural Alaska residents who practice the subsistence way of life will have a priority over other hunting and fishing by other users. And, for example, should it become necessary to reduce harvest levels to maintain healthy populations of an animal, we would limit sport hunting opportunities prior to limiting any subsistence use.

ANILCA allows for reasonable access to refuge lands for subsistence uses, and use of traditional transportation such as airplanes, motor boats, and snow machines to conduct subsistence activities is permitted.

Refuges are used by many people, Americans and people from all the world visit refuges. Subsistence and recreational hunters and fishermen, campers, guides and others spend time on refuges. Some take fish and wildlife, others do not. Some uses impact habitat and others do not.

One of the refuge manager's most important jobs is to ensure that what happens on refuges does not negatively affect or interfere with our responsibility toward conserving fish and wildlife resources. When a new use is proposed, the refuge manager must decide if it can be allowed on the refuge. A compatibility determination requires us to take a close look at the impacts any use in relationship to the purposes of the refuge before a decision is made about whether the proposed use is compatible with the purposes, and may be allowed. Refuge managers also periodically review the impacts of all uses to ensure they are compatible with refuge purposes. And these decisions have to be documented in writing.

There's been growing interest expressed by local residents about wolf control on some national wildlife refuges in Alaska. What happened here?

(Indiscernible conversation)

MR. BOOTH: I was about almost to the end there. I think we'll just have to forego the slides there anyway. Very sorry about that. That's kind of embarrassing, but anyway.....

The Service has been involved in wolf control in the last -- was involved in wolf control in Alaska in the 50s. I'm sure many people remember this, and there's still people around that remember the days when the Fish & Wildlife Service

did it. And that's prior to much intention or concern about environmental concerns. And the way it was done in the old days, as probably a lot of you know, is just poisons were thrown out of airplanes and everything else, with very little regard to what the impacts were on the ground.

And since that time, there's a legal and social climate regarding wolf control has changed, to say the least. To consider wolf control on national wildlife refuges today, managers would need to go through a very difficult process and consider a number of legal as well as ecological issues. Today we have to look at the ecosystem as a whole, not just focus on the wolf and the moose, and we must consider a lot of factors such as habitat conditions, other predators, other prey, weather conditions, and human factors. We'd need to know if moose and other prey populations are at unhealthy levels, and if they are, then we need to determine if the wolf predation is causing the low numbers, or there are other ecological or human factors that need to be considered. We also need to consider the wolf population status and that of other predators, such as bears. Perhaps poor or declining habitat quality may be causing nutritional stress, resulting in high winter mortality and low reproduction and calf survival, or there may be a high mortality from other predators such as bear, or there may be excessive illegal human harvest.

We'd also need to determine whether wolf control would be effective and ensure that healthy populations of moose and other animals in their habitat could be maintained. There's no long-term benefit in wolf control if habitat conditions will not allow any growth of the moose population.

We also need to consider other management alternatives to wolf control, such as liberalizing wolf hunting and trapping seasons, reducing harvest pressure on moose, or moose habitat improvement.

And, of course, we'd have to do a compatibility determination to make sure that a wolf control program would be consistent with refuge purposes, and we need to make sure that wolf control would be consistent with the goals and objectives of state and refuge management plans that are in place.

And probably the hardest one to -- loophole to jump through, is we have to satisfy the National Environmental Policy Act requirements, which would probably require an environmental impact statement and extensive public comment. There's a high probability that both administrative and legal challenges would occur which would tie up the process for many years.

And then another factor we look at for any activity is we have to evaluate how any program or use would affect subsistence uses and needs. Under Section 810 of ANILCA, it requires us to make this evaluation.

And these are just some of the main issues that the Service would consider prior to starting wolf control on a refuge. The situation is much different now than it was in the 50s, and we have a lot of other laws and environmental things and considerations that we have to look at. A decision to begin wolf control -- begin a wolf control program on a national wildlife refuge cannot be easily or quickly made. It is certain that any proposed wolf control on a wildlife refuge would be very controversial. I suspect you're all aware of the bitter and widespread objections and controversy the State encountered when they attempted to do wolf control only on state lands, and you could expect a whole lot worse controversy and legal challenges if wolf control were proposed or attempted on refuge lands.

So I guess in the end I guess our job is to manage Alaska's national wildlife refuges for all American people and their children, and for you and your future generations.

Thanks. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Comments, Council members? Robert?

MR. HEYANO: One of your mandates is to manage for a subsistence opportunity. How are you going to do that if it's determined that predators are having an impact on those people's ability to meet their subsistence needs?

MR. BOOTH: The subsistence priority or purpose is one of our purposes. I guess basically the bottom line is there's nothing that prohibits us, directly prohibits us from doing wolf control, but you cannot do it just for the sake of increasing the number of animals. If you're already -- basically I guess a way to say that is you can't -- our primary purpose is conservation of fish and wildlife resources, and subsistence is another purpose. And we can't just do it to increase the number of animals for people to shoot. That's not the only reason. There also has to be a reason, a biological reason for it, too. You have to document that wolf control is really needed. I'm not saying that it can't be -- the law doesn't prohibit any wolf control, but it has to be well justified. And in this day and age, I guess one of the things I'm getting is even if there's a situation where we wanted to do wolf control, I think the legal lawsuits would tangle us up for years and years.

I could give you a couple of situations where we might want to do wolf control is if you had a population of wolves that was infected by some kind of contagious disease or parasite, it may be in the best interest of the wolf population in general to get rid of the infected population. You know, a situation like that.

Or another more classic one where the State's been trying to grapple with is if you have a predator -- what they call a predator pit situation, where you had a very low prey population, moose population, and you've got it well documented that wolves are the primary cause of keeping that

population very low. And if over a period of years, if you eliminated all hunting pressure, and the population still hasn't rebound, there may be a serious -- you know, may be a consideration of trying to do wolf control under that.

But I could say the main message is it's not going to be an easy choice, it's not going to be an easy thing to get done. I'm not saying we wouldn't.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any further questions?

MR. HEYANO: I don't think it's a question, just a comment then that those people who live on refuge land, or depend on moose and caribou in refuge land, and those populations decline for whatever reasons, and I don't think it's going to be for one specific purpose you know. Maybe you're going to have -- you have a high hunting pressure, you have weather conditions, and you have predator problems. The first user to go is going to be the, quote/unquote sport hunter. You'll eliminate his season. Then if I understand you correctly, the subsistence user will be eliminated. And then at that time you'll really go through your information and criteria to see if predator control program is warranted or not. And if it's documented that the leading cause isn't predators, you probably wouldn't implement a control, but those subsistence users depending on those resources will have to find alternative resources, because you wouldn't allow them to hunt on refuge lands. That's in reality what you're telling us here tonight?

MR. BOOTH: I think in the situation where the population became so depleted that you might have to eliminate all hunting, too, but wolf control would not necessarily be the first thing we'd do.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other comments, Council members? Yeah, Robin?

MR. SAMUELSEN: I think before the Federal Government implements any kind of wolf control program, Armageddon Day will come before then. Public.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Oh, I don't think.....

MR. SAMUELSEN: I mean, they've used it, I mean, it's turned into a political fiasco. It's nothing to do with resource any more, it's nothing to do with people any more. It's a battle cry from, you know, that we've just had in the state elections here. It's public sentiment, and, you know, I think what we need to do to change people's mind in Alaska and the Lower 48 to where we need wolf control to boost depressed populations is an educational program. And it's clearly evident to me that the people out there that are strongly opposed to wolf control by and large don't understand the severe consequences that the wolf population could inflict on depressed stocks. I mean it only makes common sense, but, you know, when -- we just went through a state election here and looking at the amount of dollars that the pro-wolf advocates

poured into this election versus the people that wanted to go out and control wolves, it was pretty astronomical to me. It's damn near a religion now.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah, Robert?

MR. HEYANO: Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, along those same lines, I think if you -- if the people responsible for those animals, or that game in that refuge actively managed them all, and looked at them as a whole, you would have regulations that would potentially increase the take of whatever animal was preying, to try to bring those numbers down, and you would manage them both altogether. And I think if you did that actively, and you did it successfully, you should -- there should be very little times when you'd actually need a predator control program, because you'd keep track of your moose and caribou numbers, you'll know what the human harvests are, you'll know what your wolves and bear populations are, and you would never get one or the other out of balance, or too far out of balance. And I think that's probably the best protection for the subsistence user, because Robin's right, you know. To even think about a predator control program on Federal lands is -- probably never happen. But, you know, at the same time, I think we need to look to ways that we protect those subsistence users on those Federal lands, so things don't get so far out of balance that they're -- that they can't hunt any more.

MR. BOOTH: Yeah, you make a very good point, and I probably failed to make it. When I talk about wolf control, maybe I'm thinking of direct agency involvement in going out and chasing animals, or making a deliberate attempt to reducing. There's other less direct ways of managing predator populations. You can -- such as liberalizing seasons and bag limits, doing other kinds of -- the State's tried to do trapping education programs. One of the problems we've had statewide is just less and less interest from the lay- -- from the standpoint of local people to even try to trap any more. A lot of that's just no economic incentive in it any more. You know, the market has not been all that good. But, you know, it's not -- there may be other options to, you know, to the most direct methods, and I think we would -- you know, that we would certainly encourage other means of inducing or, you know, encouraging the public to harvest more animals. Go back to the harvest levels that they'd done in the past.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other comments? Well, Tony, I think it boils down to a philosophical issue. And I think, you know, the way this Council sits here and looks at what you're talking about tonight, is the fact that -- and we're going to get into a real interesting situation when we come to the Katmai National -- not in the Katmai National Park, but when Sandy talks to us about Lake Clark. I think we have these Federal lands and these regulations and everything else that you gave up here on the screen tonight in your presentation, that these lands are mainly maintained for animals, not for people use. And that's kind of the way I feel about it. In other words, I look at that moose and

caribou and wolf and bear out there for my use. It's not for America to come look at. But I feel like the Federal people are not going to tackle the popular idea that we're not going to deal with the wolf. They don't want to do that. And they may never win that, either. But the purpose of that animal out in that refuge or the park is for us to use, not for you to preserve. That's where we come across a big philosophical difference between what we sit at this Council for, and what you manage game for.

I'll give an example. There were three moose in Lake Clark Pass two weeks ago. There was six bears and eight wolves. Today there are six bears and eight wolves, and three less moose. And I kind of wonder what they're going to do about the wolf and bear population when you see maybe 80 percent of the animals being taken by moose -- 80 percent of the moose population in some parts of our game management units, not necessarily Lake Clark, 80 percent of the animals taken by bear alone. And then you go to Congress and say we're going to do something about this game management, because our native people need to have subsistence. You know, it gets to be a real tough issue.

And I think the issue lies very carefully between the fact that most Federally-controlled lands deal with taking care of the animals, and if I happen to get one, maybe that's okay. Now, I could be wrong. What do you think?

MR. BOOTH: Well, first off, you're very correct. And it's as much or more -- more than a biological issue.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. BOOTH: It's a very emotional, social issue, ethical issue, and it's basically we live in a different world today where there's a lot of public interest. I think the last -- the wolf to a lot of Alaskan -- not Alaskans, excuse me, a lot of Americans,.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah.

MR. BOOTH:especially in the Lower 48 kind of symbolize something. It almost has a spiritual significance, and it was something that was almost eliminated from the Lower 48, and people are thinking we're darn sure not going to let that happen in Alaska, and they're going to -- and they probably have some perceptions that the wolf can be endangered up here, and they just don't want it to happen.

I think most of you probably are willing to live with -- accept the fact the wolf is a natural component of the system and we need to live.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: No, we need.....

MR. BOOTH:we live with, and I don't think anybody wants to eliminate them.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: We want them, yeah. We need to have them.

MR. BOOTH: But it's a dilemma, it's a management dilemma, and I'm not sure I have the right answers, and I don't want to try to.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: No, I don't think.....

MR. BOOTH:you my opinions.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA:we're going to get them tonight either. And let me -- you know, I see Larry sitting here with the State of Alaska, Department of Fish & Game, and Ken Ferrell, who's a very good friend of mine, and he and I have talked about this issue. And, I mean, he's -- I mean, they -- I don't think he even goes out at night any more because of the terrible attitude that people have toward an individual who really wants to balance the system and take care of subsistence, too. It's not an easy issue. And that caribou herd where the wolf population kept, you know, taking the caribou herd down, and due to the fact that, you know, one of the problems -- one of the problems was the fact that there wasn't enough good nutrients in the food that the caribou was eating at the time, summer months, and then they get pregnant and lose the calves in the wintertime, and it wasn't subsistence, or it wasn't even the wolves. It was just an issue that was dealing -- was dealt with that probably nobody could win at,.....

MR. BOOTH: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA:and certainly not the subsistence user. So it's not an easy issue. But I think this Council is going to have to deal with tough issues, and we're just going to have to work with you to see that we can do the best. Fortunately, we do have a lot of fish and game.

MR. BOOTH: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Well, you certainly started us off on a good leg. What else do you have for us tonight? I can hardly wait. Increased moose and caribou population?

MR. BOOTH: Well, that's.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Or have you finished the other one?

MR. BOOTH: That's the bottom, the.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Oh, the same as here. Okay. Okay. All right.

MR. BOOTH: Yeah, that's just a page break at a bad place there.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. All right. Go ahead.

MR. BOOTH: The next issue is going to be controversial as well, and it's not one I like to -- I squirm and fidget up here a lot when we talk about the same-day-airborne. And I'm not going to go into any detail at all on this. I think mostly I'm just prepared to try to answer whatever questions you have.

But just to give you a real brief recap of what's been going on, you know, you're all aware of this. It's been a very controversial issue with the state's management for a long time. It's an issue that's been around for a long time. I think in 1992 the state finally prohibited all land and shoot taking of wolves for a year. And then in 1993 they came back with a regulation that allows you -- a person with a trapping license, or a trapper, to land and shoot a wolf if it's 300 feet -- provided that person's at least 300-foot from the airplane for shooting.

Fish & Wildlife Service has been on record on with the State for some time there of opposing land and shoot. The concerns that we have it are several fold. Largely it's, number one, we have what's -- the Airborne Hunting Act. It was passed in 1971. It's a Federal law that prohibits hunting from an airplane. And I think we're all pretty much aware that that law exists. Now, there's some -- the other components of that law that people aren't as aware of, and that's it not only prohibits you from hunting or assisting a person hunting from an airplane, but it also prohibits any harassment, disturbance, any kind of disturbance of an animal with an airplane. And a lot of the Service's concerns with this come from our law enforcement division where they have found that they've tried to prosecute a lot of cases, they've had a lot of investigations going, and they say, any time you have a land and shoot law, allow -- a law that allows you to land and shoot wolves, even with the 300-foot provision, and, you know, that's an improvement over the original, but even with that, it's an encouragement, it's almost a trap to lead people into to violate the Federal Airborne Hunting Act, and it makes enforcement of the Airborne Hunting Act very, very difficult.

And basically in addition to that, but quite frankly we were getting a lot of political pressure, a lot of interest and letters from people everywhere, including people from within Alaska, saying, contending it's just an unethical practice. There's a lot of resentment against same-day-airborne up here, even from hunters. And it's just a difference of opinions, and, you know, it's an ethical issue, number one. It's a law enforcement issue.

And therefore in 19 -- I think in December of 1993, we published a proposed rule to prohibit same-day-airborne take of wolves on national wildlife refuges, with some exceptions. The only exceptions being if you're riding in a commercial airlines, or it would allow you to land and shoot an animal that's already been legally caught or snared on a trapline, the same-day-airborne. But otherwise -- we passed that. We banned -- we went to a proposed rule and received a

lot of public comment on it. Very extensive public comment on it. And we went forward with a final rule that went into effect I think September 1st, 1994. A rule went into effect that prohibits same-day-airborne take of wolves and wolverines on national wildlife refuges in Alaska.

And it was a very controversial thing we went through. All I can say is, you know, we did get a lot of public comment on it. The vast majority of public comment was in favor of it. Yes, a lot of the comments came from the Lower 48. We even got comments from other countries.

And the comments or the feedback we got from among the regional councils was a little bit different. This regional council came out most against it of any council.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. (Indiscernible)

MR. BOOTH: Very strong, yeah,.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Continue it.

MR. BOOTH:I was aware of that, too, yeah. So anyway, and that's just to give you -- that's sort of where we are on it, other than we all are also aware of what happened just the other day at the polls, and that should tell you what we had been receiving. You know, the public input we've been getting all along on this thing is that the public is -- really finds same-day-airborne offensive.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any comments from the Council members? Yeah, Robert?

MR. HEYANO: Same-day-airborne hunting. How about same-day-airborne trapping?

MR. BOOTH: As far as landing and running a trap line the same day airborne, there's no rest- -- there's no prohibition on this. Our regulation only prohibits use of firearm. The reason it's a little bit more confusing is Alaska's unique in that in Alaska with -- you can buy a trapping license and shoot an animal. That's a legitimate means of trapping. That's not the case anywhere else that I'm aware of, but I guess when I say trapping -- we just -- our regulation just pertains to -- prohibits same-day-airborne take, whether you call it trapping or hunting, but take with a firearm.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other questions?

MR. HEYANO: So I guess, yeah, along those same lines, you know, the Council members heard me say this before, but, you know, trapping is a legitimate subsistence activity, in this area in particular. The same-day-airborne taking of wolves with an airplane has a long history of documentation.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: To the 40s.

MR. HEYANO: So what I'm hearing you saying is that public opinion can prohibit subsistence activities on Federal lands.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other Council comments?

MR. HEYANO: I'd like an answer.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. All right.

MR. BOOTH: That's a hard one to respond to, as you well know. All.....

MR. HEYANO: Well, isn't that.....

MR. BOOTH:I can say is.....

MR. HEYANO: Isn't that what happened.

MR. BOOTH: Well, subsistence is a purpose of refuge - you know, is certainly a purpose of refuges in Alaska. However, we -- the paradox is, is these are public lands that belong to everything, and we can't ignore public opinions of everybody else.

MR. HEYANO: Well, and that's just my point, you know. I think people around here need to be real careful about subsistence management on Federal lands is that there's a lot more people in the Lower 48 than there is us up here in the villages. And they sway Federal management on Federal lands, you know.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: To a point I think that's true.

MR. BOOTH: That's -- it is true to a point, I can't -- but on the other hand, you've to keep in mind, too, that there was no unanimous or consensus among rural users, there are some regions where people, even the rural communities, do not -- really don't -- didn't support same-day-airborne either. They look at any use of aircraft as bringing in outside people. They're more traditional, on the ground type users, snow machines, and they don't have the same attitudes towards use of aircraft that you guys do. But.....

MR. HEYANO: You know, not only was the take of the wolves prohibited on refuge land, but also the taking of spring waterfowl was prohibited with an aircraft, you know, and that's another use in this area that has a long history and practice. You know, and Federal -- you know, the good thing about Federal subsistence is that they can give priority to rural residents and name those rural residents. So it's not like the state system where you allow everybody in the state to take part in it. We could go right down to the communities and identify those people who are eligible to partake in that activity, so you're not opening the door to everybody.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other comments? Well, Tony,

let's get back to the hard issue again of the Federal Government, which is you, making a rule, I guess an arbitrary rule, you on your own, whoever you are, decided that you would -- there would be no airborne, same day as airborne hunting on wolves. Okay. Let's look at it this way: You have Title VIII which gives us certain privileges, which is a law. Okay. And I don't know if you're in compliance with that law or not by doing that. I guess we'd have to have a legal department figure that out.

But when you -- when I go from here, from this meeting to Anchorage, and I sit before that Federal Subsistence Advisory Board, I would venture to say there's going to come a day when all of those heads of the Federal Government are no longer going to be that advisory board, the main Federal Board. We want the chairs of the Region to be that Board. And in fact it's going to have to be that way if this system is going to work, you know. Why should you take a Federal department head and put them up there in front, and have them make rules for we the people who have this Title VIII program. And I know that's not a very good point to bring up to the Federal people, because I don't see anybody jumping for joy when that's been brought, but the chairs when they do meet -- they do now have a native chairing it, you know, so we're going to look carefully at -- who decided to make this rule in the first place? It was the Federal Government. Does that Federal Board have enough power, if it does change hands to reverse that decision? I think that's a real interesting thing to look at in the long term. And, you know, that's way down the road.

And I guess that's why when you see government arbitrarily doing some of these things that we may just look a little askew at what they do.

But I think that's probably enough for tonight. Do you have another good item? Did you have anything else? Oh, hey, one more thing you had real quick like that, another shining bright point. Help us out here, Tony. This is going to be good. Now, this next one's going to.....

MR. BOOTH: I thought I was going duck and get out.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Hey, we'd be bored if we didn't have these fun times.

MR BOOTH: I'm sorry, yes, it wasn't on the agenda. There is something it's worth knowing about that.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Just something to gnaw on tonight.

MR. BOOTH:last summer when they were drafting the Interior appropriation bill language, the House draft bill language had some very strong language in there that would prohibit use of leg-hold traps on national wildlife refuges nationwide. Of course, it came through -- you know, when it came through, we commented on it that this is not at all good for Alaska. In fact this is -- you'd better check with our

Congressional delegation and everything. This is a little bit ridiculous. Anyway, the bottom line is there was certainly an effort to ban the use of leg-hold traps on refuges. A very strong effort. And it was even in the draft language.

The final language that came out, certainly they had dropped the prohibition on use of leg-hold traps, but they left some language in there and -- which, instead of prohibiting it, it required the Fish & Wildlife Service to create a task force to use to look at the use of leg-hold traps in refuges, to look at aspects such as humaneness, the need, the impacts on resources, and things like this. This task force is to prepare a report back to Congress by March 1st, 1997, and we're in the process right now of formulating that task force, and I know that we are asking that Alaska be well represented on this task force. The task force has specifically been -- Congress has asked us to include outside interests on this task force, so it's going to be varied interests, and we want to make sure that local users will be represented on this thing. I don't know who it will be. They're in the process of formulating that right now. And that's just for your information.

I don't have much else to tell you rather than this is actually kind of a shocker. We don't know where that language -- well, you can pretty much guess where the language came from, or the -- but surprised it got this far, but that's something we're dealing with right now.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. Any comments?

MR. BOOTH: Thank you.

MR. HEYANO: Yeah. I'm not at all surprised, Mr. Chairman. I probably could tell you exactly where that language came from.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Well, at this time I think.....

MR. SAMUELSEN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yes?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Maybe I could ask Tony on that chart, where do you fit in, because I'd love to see your position after Don Young and Senator Stevens gets a hold of this.

MR. BOOTH: On what issue is that?

MR. SAMUELSEN: On leg-hold traps, you know. I mean, they're going up against Fish & Wildlife Service. The Congressional delegations made no bones about it. I don't think you guys are on their good side. And leg-hold traps, even the talk of banning leg-hold traps raises the ire of Representative Young. You know he yelled down in Congress. And if this rule comes out of U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, it's going to be pretty interesting.

MR. BOOTH: This -- the language that went in there

didn't come from here.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: No, it came from the Outside interest groups,.....

MR. BOOTH: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA:we understand that.

MR. BOOTH: Yeah. Okay.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: And we appreciate.....

MR. SAMUELSEN: Oh,okay.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah, we appreciate -- no, they carried water for us actually, to go to the U.S. -- our delegation to bring this thing down. And.....

MR. SAMUELSEN: Oh, okay. I misunderstood it.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA:we appreciate it.

MR. BOOTH: No, no, we.....

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: We don't want to beat you up too bad all night here, Tony.

MR. BOOTH: There's plenty of other things to beat me up for.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Tomorrow morning, 8:30 at City Hall. We'll recess until such time. Thank you, Tony.

MR. BOOTH: Again, I'm sorry for the slide show. I don't know what happened.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: It was great up to that point. It was wonderful. Thank you.

(Meeting recessed)

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Salena Hile, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R & R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 72 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, Volume I, meeting taken electronically by me on the 12th day of November, 1996, beginning at the hour of 7:00 o'clock p.m. at Dillingham, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by Meredith L. Downing and me to the best of my knowledge and ability;

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 27th day of November, 1996.

Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 11/5/98