

1 BRISTOL BAY FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
3
4 PUBLIC MEETING
5
6 VOLUME I
7
8 Dillingham, Alaska
9 March 24, 2008
10 1:00 o'clock p.m.
11
12
13
14 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
15
16 Randy Alvarez
17 Pete Abraham
18 Alvin Boskofsky
19 Molly Chythlook
20 Dan Dunaway
21 Thomas Hedlund
22 Boris Kosbruk, Sr.
23 Nanci Morris Lyon
24 Dan O'Hara
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 Regional Council Coordinator - Clifford Edenshaw
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Recorded and transcribed by:
45
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
47 700 W. 2nd Avenue
48 Anchorage, AK 99501
49 907-243-0668/907-227-5312
50 jpk@gci.net/sahile@gci.net

1 P R O C E E D I N G S
2
3 (Dillingham, Alaska - 3/24/2008)
4
5 (On record)
6
7 CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Before we get
8 started here, I'll ask Pete Abraham to do the
9 invocation.
10
11 MR. ABRAHAM: (Invocation)
12
13 CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Okay. We'll call
14 the meeting to order at about 1:10.
15
16 Cliff, would you do the roll call.
17
18 MR. EDENSHAW: Good afternoon everyone.
19 My name is Cliff Edenshaw, and for the record, I'm the
20 coordinator for the Bristol Bay Council. And for those
21 of you who are going to provide testimony, we do not
22 have a speaker system, so once you come up here, the
23 main thing is Meredith's going to have the mic here,
24 and, you know, she's here to record the transcript and
25 provide it for us, so just speak a little bit louder
26 when you come up here if you have any questions or
27 you're going to address the Council on the proposals or
28 any other business that we have.
29
30 Randy Alvarez.
31
32 CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Here.
33
34 MR. EDENSHAW: Dan O'Hara. Mr. Chair
35 and Council. We understand he should be in route. He
36 had some business to take care of.
37
38 Dan Dunaway.
39
40 MR. DUNAWAY: Here.
41
42 MR. EDENSHAW: Boris Kosbruk, Sr.
43
44 MR. KOSBRUK: Here.
45
46 MR. EDENSHAW: Nanci Morris Lyon.
47
48 MS. MORRIS LYON: Here.
49
50 MR. EDENSHAW: Peter Abraham.

1 MR. ABRAHAM: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)
2
3 MR. EDENSHAW: Molly Chythlook.
4
5 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Here.
6
7 MR. EDENSHAW: Thomas Hedlund.
8
9 MR. HEDLUND: Here.
10
11 MR. EDENSHAW: Alvin Boskofsky.
12
13 MR. BOSKOFSKY: Here.
14
15 MR. EDENSHAW: And, Mr. Chair, we have
16 one vacant council, and we hope after this year's
17 nominations to fill that. Mr. Chair. There is a
18 quorum.
19
20 CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thank you, Cliff.
21 Okay.
22
23 I'd like to welcome everybody to the
24 spring meeting of Bristol Bay Regional Council dealing
25 with game, and if we have time, we can propose some
26 fisheries proposals.
27
28 And I would like to welcome guests and
29 Staff members, and remind everybody there's a sign-in
30 list over there that needs to be -- everyone needs to
31 sign in.
32
33 And there's also cards there for those
34 of you that wish to testify. And if you're going to be
35 here the whole time, it might be better to testify on
36 each individual proposal as it comes up. Otherwise, if
37 you are just here and going to leave, you can testify
38 on all of them at once if you so want to.
39
40 I guess I'd like to do the introduction
41 of the Staff, and probably we can start with our
42 coordinator and then work around, and guests also.
43
44 MR. EDENSHAW: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
45 My name is Cliff Edenshaw. I serve as the coordinator
46 for the Council and I work in Anchorage with OSM.
47
48 MR. WOODS: Frank Woods, Bristol Bay
49 Native Association, subsistence coordinator,
50 Dillingham.

1 MR. KLUTSCH: Joe Klutsch. I'm a
2 hunting and fishing guide and live in King Salmon.
3
4 MR. CHYTHLOOK: I'm the Western Joe.
5
6 (Laughter)
7
8 MR. CHYTHLOOK: Joe Chythlook, Fish and
9 Game.
10
11 MS. GREFFENIUS: My name is Laura
12 Greffenius. I'm a wildlife biologist with the Office
13 of Subsistence Management.
14
15 MS. WILLIAMS: I'm Liz Williams, an
16 anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence
17 Management.
18
19 MS. PETRIVELLI: Pat Petrivelli, Bureau
20 of Indian Affairs, subsistence anthropologist.
21
22 MR. LIEDBERG: Paul Liedberg, Togiak
23 National Wildlife Refuge.
24
25 MS. LaVINE: Robbin LaVine, subsistence
26 fisheries social scientist at Bristol Bay Native
27 Association.
28
29 MR. RABINOWITCH: I'm Sandy
30 Rabinowitch, National Park Service, and Staff Committee
31 with the Federal Subsistence Board.
32
33 MS. MCBURNEY: Mary McBurney,
34 subsistence coordinator for Lake Clark, Aniakchak and
35 Katmai.
36
37 MR. MOORE: Ralph Moore, superintendent
38 of Katmai National Park and Preserve and Aniakchak
39 National Monument and Preserve.
40
41 MR. MILLS: Dave Mills, I'm the acting
42 associate regional director for the National Park
43 Service with subsistence.
44
45 MR. KOEPESEL: Mark Koepsel, deputy
46 manager, Alaska Peninsula and Becharof Refuges.
47
48 MR. HARMON: Troy Harmon, Katmai and
49 Aniakchak.
50

1 MR. WATTS: Dominic Watts, wildlife
2 biologist, Alaska Peninsula Refuge.
3
4 MR. BEYERSDORF: Geoff Beyersdorf,
5 Bureau of Land Management biologist.
6
7 MR. ANDERSON: I'm Norman Anderson,
8 originally from Naknek. I'm a commercial fisherman and
9 a subsistence lifestyle person.
10
11 MS. CARTER: Courtney Carter, Bristol
12 Bay Native Association, fisheries education outreach
13 coordinator.
14
15 MR. PROBASCO: I'm Pete Probasco, the
16 assistant regional director for OSM.
17
18 MR. ADERMAN: Andy Aderman, wildlife
19 biologist, Togiak Refuge.
20
21 MR. BUTLER: I'm Lem Butler, wildlife
22 biologist for Fish and Game, units 9 and 10.
23
24 MR. BERG: Jerry Berg, Fish and
25 Wildlife Service out of Anchorage.
26
27 MR. NIELSEN: Dugan Nielsen, Bureau of
28 Land Management, Anchorage Field Office, Dillingham
29 site.
30
31 CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Thank you, guys.
32 And, let's see, that concludes number 3.
33
34 Number 4, review and adopt the draft
35 agenda.
36
37 I've been fighting a cold the last few
38 days, so I'm going to ask that Nanci, Vice Chair, would
39 take over and chair the meeting for the rest of the --
40 at least the rest of the day, and after we do that --
41 Nanci, would you take over and start number 4?
42
43 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Sure. So
44 can we have a motion to review and adopt the agenda.
45
46 MR. ALVAREZ: I so move.
47
48 MR. DUNAWAY: Second.
49
50 REPORTER: Nanci, could you also state

1 who makes the motion, because I can't see everybody.
2
3 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Oh, okay.
4 Yeah. Randy made the motion, and Dan seconded it.
5
6 Alvin.
7
8 MR. BOSKOFISKY: I would like to amend.
9 I would like to add a letter. Mary mentioned a letter
10 that was written up by the SRC.
11
12 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Do
13 you suppose -- I think that maybe should go, what, in
14 front of wildlife proposals for the review?
15
16 MR. EDENSHAW: No.
17
18 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Where?
19
20 MR. EDENSHAW: After the wildlife
21 proposals, under new business or else when we get to
22 number 9 afterwards under the fish proposals.
23
24 Alvin, is it something you want to
25 discuss? If it's something to discuss, I think we
26 could do it under new business.
27
28 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Yeah.
29
30 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Is that
31 where it belongs?
32
33 MR. BOSKOFISKY: I guess.
34
35 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: It won't
36 have anything to with the proposals we're discussing
37 then?
38
39 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Yeah.
40
41 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
42
43 MR. BOSKOFISKY: We can put it under
44 new.
45
46 MR. EDENSHAW: And who's the letter
47 from, Alvin?
48
49 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Pardon?
50

1 MR. EDENSHAW: Who's the letter from?
2
3 MR. BOSKOFISKY: It's from the SRC,
4 Aniakchak.
5
6 MR. EDENSHAW: Okay. Thank you
7
8 MR. ALVAREZ: And that will go where?
9
10 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: New
11 business. Anybody else have any changes or additions
12 or corrections. Yes.
13
14 MR. ALVAREZ: I have been hearing that
15 there's a proposal for closures of some area on the
16 Naknek River for migratory birds in the springtime.
17 Can you bring that up also?
18
19 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Randy.
20
21 MR. ALVAREZ: Molly.
22
23 MS. CHYTHLOOK: There was, but that's
24 been declined. Or not declined, but dropped by the
25 proposer, so it's no longer in existence.
26
27 MR. ALVAREZ: Okay. So that will take
28 care of that then. Okay.
29
30 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Anything
31 else.
32
33 (No comments)
34
35 MR. ALVAREZ: Call for the question.
36
37 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The
38 question's been called for. All in favor please
39 signify by saying aye.
40
41 IN UNISON: Aye.
42
43 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Opposed,
44 same sign.
45
46 (No opposing votes)
47
48 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The motion
49 carries.
50

1 Okay. Let's review and adopt the
2 minutes of the October 1st and 2nd meeting that was
3 held in Naknek. Does anybody want to put that on the
4 floor.
5
6 MR. DUNAWAY: I'll move to adopt.
7
8 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Second.
9
10 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Second by
11 Alvin.
12
13 MR. DUNAWAY: Madame Chair. I would
14 like to suggest a spelling correction on Moraine Creek
15 on about the last page of it. In the book it would be
16 Page 24. It's spelled Marine Creek, and it's spelled
17 M-O-R-A-I-N-E for the glacial moraine.
18
19 MR. ALVAREZ: I seen that.
20
21 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I did, too.
22 There it is.
23
24 MR. DUNAWAY: Just to prove I read it.
25
26 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: How do you
27 spell it?
28
29 MR. DUNAWAY: M-O-R-A-I-N-E.
30
31 MS. CHYTHLOOK: And then, Madame
32 Chair.....
33
34 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah.
35
36 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Under the attendance
37 under BBNA, Frank Woods needs to be listed.
38
39 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Any
40 others.
41
42 (No comments)
43
44 MR. ALVAREZ: Call for the question.
45
46 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The
47 question's been called. All in favor please signify by
48 saying aye.
49
50 IN UNISON: Aye.

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Opposed,
2 same sign.
3
4 (No opposing votes)
5
6 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
7 Minutes stand as amended.
8
9 Okay. Chairman's report.
10
11 MR. ALVAREZ: That's just a report for
12 the Council. Have Cliff read it.
13
14 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah.
15 Cliff, do you want to go ahead and.....
16
17 MR. EDENSHAW: Thank you, Madame Chair.
18 On Page -- if you look under Page 26, it's mainly an
19 .805c letter from the Federal Subsistence Board to the
20 Council in regards to the fish proposals the Council
21 took up at its last, what is that, fall meeting.
22 Actually it was the Board meeting in December, so
23 basically the Board went ahead and adopted the
24 Council's recommendations on Proposals 11 and 12, which
25 if you remember, those were snagging and the other one
26 was the.....
27
28 MR. ALVAREZ: Fish traps.
29
30 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Fish trap.
31
32 MS. WILLIAMS: The fyke net.
33
34 MR. EDENSHAW: Fyke net. There you go.
35 Those were no the consent -- well, not really the
36 consent, but they went ahead and approved those, but
37 there wasn't too much discussion. They were pretty
38 much self-explanatory on that.
39
40 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
41
42 MR. EDENSHAW: And for Randy's
43 information, for both of you, the Board's going to meet
44 the end of April, beginning April 29th to address the
45 proposals, so we need to -- if you're unable to attend,
46 you should talk with Nanci about scheduling that. But
47 that's when they're going to hold the meeting, April
48 29th through May 2nd I believe.
49
50 MR. BOSKOFKY: Where is the meeting

1 going to be held at?
2
3 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair. Alvin.
4 There will be the Federal Board meeting in Anchorage.
5
6 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Yeah. Where at?
7
8 MR. EDENSHAW: Is that going to be at
9 the Egan again?
10
11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, West Coast.
12
13 MR. EDENSHAW: West Coast.
14
15 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
16 Is that it then for that, Cliff?
17
18 MR. EDENSHAW: Yes.
19
20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. And
21 then does any of the Council member have a report that
22 they'd like to share with the Board of anything going
23 on in their area or things we should be made aware of.
24
25 MR. ALVAREZ: Nanci. There's some
26 letters from.....
27
28 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Do you want
29 me to share those now?
30
31 MR. ALVAREZ: Just pass them around for
32 the guys.
33
34 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Go
35 ahead and pass this down, Alvin. I don't think Molly's
36 seen it.
37
38 MR. ALVAREZ: Some of you have read it.
39
40 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah, some
41 of us have read that. We can pass that around and look
42 at it as we go along here I think.
43
44 Okay. Let's move on then. Does
45 anybody else have anything else they want to share.
46 Okay. How about -- oh, go ahead.
47
48 MR. ABRAHAM: Just one thing I'd like
49 to say. Let's try to avoid the holidays on the RAC
50 meetings, you know, this being Easter weekend, Easter

1 holiday over here. It's hard on some of us, you know,
2 trying to attend the church services. So let's, you
3 know, plan more carefully next time.

4

5 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah, I know, Pete.
6 Originally we had to move this meeting, change this
7 meeting twice, and originally we were supposed to meet
8 in.....

9

10 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: February.

11

12 MR. ALVAREZ: February, about the first
13 or second week. And then we changed it back one week,
14 but then we found out that there were already two other
15 Councils meeting in that, so we moved it back to this
16 date. And I didn't realize that Sunday was Easter.
17 And then once we found out, we had it moved back from
18 Monday morning. So consequently we're going to have to
19 do -- we're still trying to leave tomorrow afternoon,
20 so we're probably going to have to work late tonight.

21

22 MR. ABRAHAM: Yes.

23

24 MR. ALVAREZ: So we can get done by --
25 we need to be out of here by four, because we're
26 supposed to travel back at five tomorrow, and I'm sure
27 some of you guys are probably also about that time, so
28 we need to be done around 3:30 tomorrow afternoon. So
29 we'll probably end up having to work late tonight.

30

31 MR. ABRAHAM: Well, and I have an
32 appointment tomorrow, Tuesday, with the eye doctor,
33 because I had cataract surgery that's happened, so by
34 12:00 o'clock tomorrow or 1:00 o'clock.

35

36 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. We'll
37 keep that in mind then, for especially the things we
38 need to vote on. Hopefully by then we'll be into
39 reports.

40

41 Dan, did you have something, too?

42

43 MR. DUNAWAY: Well, I didn't know if
44 this is the place to bring it up, but with that
45 shuffling our meeting schedule was a little frustrating
46 to me. And I noticed last night going through my notes
47 that we'd had to reschedule last fall's meeting. And
48 it seems like we try pretty hard to pick a good date
49 that works, and then we get -- totally have to change
50 it again.

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I agree.
2 That's been going on for a couple years. Who do -- I
3 mean, where do we take that problem or issue to,
4 however you want to ask that question, Cliff.

5
6 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair, Mr.
7 Probasco can answer that, but I think in the past, only
8 up until recent budget cuts, and I think more so back
9 in our office, with our publishing team who puts
10 together these booklets, in the past we've had at times
11 four meetings in a week, and it's just a little
12 daunting to ask a couple of people to put together 6 or
13 700 books, and them mailed out and stuff, especially
14 for our Staff, Liz and Laura, myself and others that,
15 you know, may be overlapping those regions. And we had
16 a change recently where we'd only like to have two
17 meetings during the week, and the meeting that Randy
18 mentioned, we had three meetings during the week, so we
19 were sort of like the odd ones out that had to shuffle
20 and find an alternate meeting date.

21
22 And I wanted to thank Randy and
23 everyone else, because when I called, I've been able to
24 get ahold of all of you guys, and Dan, and some of you
25 - I think half of you by emails and the others I called
26 by phone.

27
28 And the other time -- the difficulty
29 that we had rescheduling this meeting we're here at now
30 is, you know, Randy wanted to accommodate some of the
31 others who wanted to be here for the meeting, and so
32 that was another part of the advance frustration is
33 that, you know, we want to accommodate the others and
34 the main thing is hopefully after this meeting, as you
35 can get to maybe that portion at the end of the book,
36 you know, you're not going to see three meetings in a
37 week with any of them. There's only going to be two,
38 and hopefully we will have addressed that.

39
40 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: So, Pete,
41 that is a problem that's pretty much been addressed?
42 Because I thought last time when we picked these dates
43 last fall and stuff, those meetings were already
44 clarified in the calendar, too, and we scheduled around
45 what meetings we saw were available.

46
47 MR. PROBASCO: The difficulty, to add
48 to what Cliff was saying is, one, we have a court
49 reporter contract, and going beyond two a week makes it
50 difficult, particularly if we're travelling any

1 distance within the State. The other reason is Staff,
2 like Cliff was saying, is providing adequate Staff at
3 these meetings. It depends upon when your meeting
4 occurs. Like now, you're to have the ability to review
5 the other Councils and the dates they've selected, so
6 hopefully we can avoid that, because we should have
7 that information here at this meeting. We can tell you
8 what dates those Councils selected, and then take a
9 look at the calendar.

10

11 The other thing that -- you can also --
12 we've been moving a week on each side of the calendar
13 windows to allow more flexibility, and we will continue
14 to that. But two is about our max. We get into three,
15 and then those years we've have four, it's.....

16

17 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Well, I
18 think we certainly all understand that, and we
19 appreciate Staff being present at these meetings and
20 the things that they can bring to the table, you know,
21 by being here, so I certainly have full appreciation
22 for that, as I think everybody does here. But like I
23 say, you know, when we looked at the schedule that we
24 had been given before, I know that what was there, we
25 tried to work around so that wouldn't happen. And
26 then, you know, when things feel awry, they really went
27 awry. But hopefully now in the future we're going to
28 fight that so much?

29

30 MR. PROBASCO: I hope not.

31

32 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. We'll
33 certainly do our part.

34

35 MS. CHYTHLOOK: I've got a question,
36 too.

37

38 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Go ahead,
39 Molly.

40

41 MS. CHYTHLOOK: I'm a new board member
42 here, and I don't know what the process is for like a
43 work session to train a new board member like me. I
44 feel pretty green, and I read through some of the
45 material. And my suggestion would be to have some kind
46 of a training work session for new board members.

47

48 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: They used
49 to. Do we not do that any more?

50

1 MR. EDENSHAW: There is a PowerPoint
2 slide, and I also have book in my bag for you that
3 gives a brief outline of the program and stuff. And at
4 our next meeting I'd more than happy to go through that
5 with you. But I can give you a book in regards to
6 information that the Council members receive, new
7 Council members.

8

9 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Uh-huh. Okay.

10

11 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: No. Yeah,
12 Molly, we certainly welcome you, and we had a training
13 opportunity when we first came on board, and, you know,
14 it took the better part of half a day I'd say, and it
15 certainly helped us out. So I can understand your
16 feelings, but don't hesitate to ask us questions or
17 anybody questions when you feel the need, and we'll be
18 happy to help.

19

20 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah, I forgot to welcome
21 you, Molly. If you have any questions on how we
22 operate, just ask Joe.

23

24 (Laughter)

25

26 MR. ALVAREZ: He's been to all our
27 meetings.

28

29 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Yeah.

30

31 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
32 Enough said about the calendar issue then. Let's move
33 on to the annual report.

34

35 MR. EDENSHAW: At the last meeting, the
36 Council didn't have any issues for the annual report.
37 And I know at the upcoming -- and there's still time
38 for the Council if they so choose to add some issues.
39 But the Board will meet, I think it will be normally
40 with the nominations portion in the summer to address
41 the nominations and the annual reports, so if the
42 Council has any issues between now and the close the --
43 you know, when the meeting adjourns prior to tomorrow,
44 for our annual report, we can still do that. But if
45 you'll recall from our last meeting, we went through
46 this before and asked the Council for annual report
47 issues, and there wasn't anything that was.....

48

49 MR. ALVAREZ: We can when we're
50 progressing through this meeting, we can -- when they

1 come up, we can them, you know, put them onto our
2 annual report.....
3
4 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Oh, yeah, a
5 good idea.
6
7 MR. ALVAREZ:that the Board will
8 be, when they meet in April, the end of next and early
9 May.
10
11 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Good
12 idea.
13
14 MR. EDENSHAW: The Board will address
15 the annual report issues at a later meeting. The
16 meeting in April is mainly to address proposals, and
17 other issues that may.....
18
19 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: So if we
20 wanted to formulate them further then as they're
21 brought up.
22
23 MR. EDENSHAW: Correct. Correct.
24
25 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
26 That's good, but we should still make a side list maybe
27 of things we want to go.
28
29 Okay. We want to go ahead and open the
30 floor. Should we open the floor as we go along for
31 them.
32
33 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah, let's follow this
34 -- yeah, there might be somebody that wants to speak
35 and then leave, you know.
36
37 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Okay.
38
39 MR. ALVAREZ: Follow the agenda.
40
41 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Well, yeah,
42 well, that was what I was doing, I just wanted to know
43 if we wanted everybody to come up at once, or if we
44 want to them as we got proposals in front of us.
45
46 MR. ALVAREZ: Well, just state that.
47
48 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. We're
49 going to open the floor to public comments on the
50 Federal Subsistence Program. And we're going to be

1 reviewing these proposals. And I know that some of you
2 are here that would like to give testimony on the
3 proposals that are going to come in front of us. And
4 if anybody is under time constraints and would just
5 like to give testimony on anything in general or the
6 proposals in front of us, I would welcome you to come
7 up now. If you have the time and the ability to be
8 here to address proposals as they come before us, I
9 would welcome you to go ahead and give your testimony
10 at that time. If that makes sense to you. So if you
11 have time as we go through the proposals, we'd love to
12 hear from you. If you don't, please come up now and
13 we're happy to.....

14
15 MR. ALVAREZ: Sounds like you've been
16 practicing.

17
18 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: No, I
19 sounded like I was talking in circles here. Okay.

20
21 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair.

22
23 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yes.

24
25 MR. EDENSHAW: Just for clarification,
26 for any of those members from organizations, I think
27 what Nanci is -- Madame Chair is expressing is under
28 number 7, if you have comments towards our program in
29 general, I think it's an opportunity for you now to
30 come up and provide the Council with concerns or
31 comments you have for the overall. And what Nanci,
32 Madame Chair, is disgusting for wildlife analysis, for
33 those of you who came to provide input to individual
34 proposals, there will be an opportunity for you at that
35 time when we go through our protocol to provide
36 comment. But if you have some general comments
37 regarding the Federal Subsistence Program or how the
38 Council conducts its business, you may come up and do
39 so now.

40
41 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
42 Yeah, that's exactly what I was saying.

43
44 MR. EDENSHAW: And then, excuse me,
45 Madame Chair, but on the back here, people took all
46 these booklets, and we only provide copies -- we bring
47 about 10 to 100 extra we order, but they're all gone.
48 I had about 12 of them, but when we get into the
49 proposal analysis, I printed out individual copies of
50 the proposals on there, so if any of you just want to

1 look at individual proposals, there's some copies over
2 there on the table for that.
3
4 Thank you.
5
6 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Thank
7 you, Cliff.
8
9 Then let me go ahead and I'll go ahead
10 and just read this. Isn't that what you usually do,
11 Randy?
12
13 Public comments are welcomed for each
14 agenda item. We ask you to fill out the testimony card
15 that Randy told you about, or be recognized by the
16 Chair. Time limits may be given on testimony to allow
17 opportunity for all to testify and to remain on
18 schedule. This opportunity continues throughout the
19 meeting, so please fill out the testifier's form at the
20 sign-in table.
21
22 That's kind of the protocol we go
23 through. As a general rule, we don't have that many
24 people testifying, so we don't limit your time, but
25 please be aware of others' time as well when you do
26 testify.
27
28 Okay. Wildlife proposal review and
29 Regional Council recommendations. And we're going to
30 start with our usual procedure for our proposals by the
31 introduction of the proposal and its analysis. Then
32 we'll hear from the Department of Fish and Game, then
33 Federal, State and tribal agency comments, InterAgency
34 Staff Committee comments, Fish and Game Advisory
35 Committee comments, we'll go through written public
36 comments, then we'll have public testimony, and then
37 the Council will deliberate.
38
39 So let's go ahead and get stated on
40 Proposal WP-08-27a.
41
42 MS. WILLIAMS: Excuse me just a second.
43 I'm going to turn this around so I'll have a place to
44 put my legs.
45
46 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Please,
47 yeah, remember to identify yourself, too, here. Yeah,
48 that would have been kind of tough.
49
50 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Madame Chair.

1 And members of the Council. I'm Liz Williams.

2

3 And we are going to start with Proposal
4 WP08-27a. And this analysis starts on Page 30 in your
5 book.

6

7 As you know, this proposal was
8 submitted by you, the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory
9 Council, and it requests a positive customary and
10 traditional use determination for brown bear in Unit
11 9C. And it requests this determination for residents
12 of three communities in Unit 9B, which are Igiugig,
13 Kokhanok and Levelock. And the season and harvest
14 proposal that will go with this will be in the next
15 proposal analysis, which is 27b.

16

17 So right now residents of Unit 9B have
18 C&T for brown bear in Unit 9B. And residents of Unit
19 9C have C&T for brown bear in Unit 9C. Currently
20 there's no Federal open subsistence season for brown
21 bear in Unit 9C.

22

23 The primary areas that this hunt would
24 take place would probably in the Katmai National
25 Preserve and other Federal public lands in Unit 9C. 84
26 percent of Unit 9C is Federal public lands. 70 percent
27 of these public lands are Katmai National Monument,
28 where, of course, there is no subsistence hunting. The
29 other Federal public lands in Unit 9C are Katmai
30 National Preserve, which are about 8 percent, Alagnak
31 or Branch Wild and Scenic River, 3 percent, and small
32 portions of Becharof Wildlife Refuge and the Bureau of
33 Land Management which are 3 percent.

34

35 Since the start of the Federal
36 Subsistence Management Program there have been numerous
37 proposals about C&T for brown bear throughout Unit 9,
38 and especially 9C. Many of these proposals were
39 deferred for years and years, and finally different
40 parts of 9C have C&T and others don't. And some of you
41 have been on the council throughout a lot of that.

42

43 For Unit 9C, and I think the main
44 difference is that when the Federal program started,
45 the State's C&T determinations were adopted, so for 9C
46 there was no Federal -- State determination of C&T for
47 brown bear in 9C. However, in 1999, the Federal Board
48 made a positive customary and traditional use
49 determination for brown bear for residents in Unit 9C.
50 However, they never made a season for 9C.

1 In earlier analysis, it says that the
2 establishment of Katmai National Park, which
3 predominates Unit 9 and no subsistence harvesting of
4 brown bear in the Park may be why there is no Federal
5 season for 9C.

6
7 Also, there was a person strongly led a
8 charge to get a hunt in 9C, but he mainly wanted it on
9 his Federal allotment. And when he found out that a
10 Federal C&T determination wouldn't help him on private
11 lands, it just kind of dropped.

12
13 But those are some of the reasons that
14 maybe why there was no Federal harvest season in Unit
15 9C. There is, however, a State registration hunt with
16 a limit of one brown bear for every four year.

17
18 Now, 9B -- instead of Unit 9B, I'm just
19 going to say 9B. Unit 9B, the Federal Subsistence
20 Program again adopted the State's C&T determination,
21 and the State did have a positive C&T determination for
22 brown bear in 9B.

23
24 And currently there are two Federal
25 subsistence brown bear seasons in 9B. There's one in
26 Lake Clark National Park portion of 9B. For resident
27 zone residents here's a year-round Federal subsistence
28 hunt for brown bear. And for the remainder of Unit 9B,
29 there's a Federal subsistence season for September 1st
30 through May 31st with a limit of one brown bear per
31 year by State registration permit.

32
33 The State has two brown bear hunts in
34 Unit 9B. One is a State registration hunt with a limit
35 of one bear every four years in alternating spring or
36 fall seasons. And the other is a State subsistence
37 hunt that's under the terms of the Western Alaska Brown
38 Bear Management agreement, and the limit is one a year.

39
40 And if you look at the 2008 State
41 hunting regulations, it says to qualify for the State
42 subsistence brown bear hunt, you have to go to King
43 Salmon in person. However, at one of our meetings with
44 the State, they said this isn't really the case. You
45 can do it by mail, but they did acknowledge that
46 reading that in the regulations may discourage people
47 from doing it, unless they were right near King Salmon.

48
49 Let's see. The customary and
50 traditional uses of brown bear by residents of Unit 9

1 throughout Unit 9, as I mentioned, are well documented
2 in a least 10 past analyses, and I brought a couple of
3 those if you would like to look at them.

4
5 Brown bear harvests in this area are
6 generally low. Bears are taken opportunistically.
7 It's not the primary resource that depend on. Most
8 often they're harvested in fall or spring, although
9 harvests occur year round when necessary. Brown bear
10 have been and are used for their fat, their meat, and
11 their hides. And in the Iliamna Lake subregion, both
12 spring and fall bear hunting frequently occurs
13 opportunistically during travel or while harvesting
14 other species. And that's a quote for a Division of
15 Subsistence paper.

16
17 If you look on Page 36 in the book, we
18 just took Division of Subsistence harvest data so you
19 could get an idea how many bears each community
20 harvests. And Subsistence Division data only
21 represents one harvest year. These are three different
22 years for each community, and so you can kind of see
23 that how much -- or how many brown bears each community
24 harvests varies and fluctuates over years. You can
25 also see in this table that sometimes even when people
26 don't necessarily harvest bear in a community, they may
27 receive it from another community, because it shows
28 that maybe they use bear, even if they didn't harvest.

29
30
31 So I don't know if you have any
32 questions about these data, but Division of Subsistence
33 asks, did you use it, did you try to harvest it, did
34 you actually harvest it, you received it, or you shared
35 it. And so you can look in there, let's say in the
36 middle, Kokhanok, 1983, nobody harvested, but 16 people
37 received. So that's the kind of information that even
38 if people don't harvest it, they still use it.

39
40 Data from the ADF&G brown bear sealing
41 records are only available from 1983 to 2004, and these
42 don't show any reported brown bear harvest from Igiugig
43 of Kokhanok in Unit 9C, although there are records of
44 three harvests of brown bears by residents of Levelock
45 in 9C.

46
47 So if you turn to Page 32, you can look
48 at Map 2. And this map did not copy very well for the
49 book. But we broke down 9B and 9C by UCU where we had
50 records of harvest, and two of the Levelock harvests

1 occurred in 9C in UCU 0701 and 0601. And you can
2 barely tell that there are dots in those UCUs, and
3 those indicate Levelock harvests. And those appear to
4 be pretty close to Preserve lands, if not actually on
5 them.

6
7 For Igiugig, the brown bear sealing
8 data shows harvests of two brown bears in UCUs in 9B.
9 And for Igiugig, the lines on the map go this way. And
10 you can see that in UCU 202 and 0301 they got two brown
11 bears in one of each of those UCUs. And these UCUs, as
12 you can also see, are right on the boundary of 9C.

13
14 For Kokhanok, the brown bear records
15 show three bear were harvested in Unit 9B, all in UCU
16 0301. And those are cross hatched lines, because
17 Igiugig and Kokhanok have both harvested bear in there.
18 But again that's another UCU of 9B that abuts 9C.

19
20 So what I'm trying to show is that
21 Levelock hunted in 9C, Igiugig and Kokhanok have hunted
22 right along the border. And these are just the bear
23 sealing records. It may not represent all the
24 harvests.

25
26 During the October 2000 Bristol Bay
27 Subsistence Council meeting last year, the Council
28 discussed and planned for this proposal and people on
29 the Council mentioned hunters from Igiugig, Kokhanok
30 and Levelock, and their routes to Katmai Preserve in
31 Unit 9C for the harvest of brown bear. They said that
32 Kokhanok is most accessible to the preserve, and that
33 Igiugig has to wait until freeze up to travel to the
34 Preserve, and that Levelock goes up the Branch River,
35 the Alagnak River, and takes bears.

36
37 And I passed this out to the Council,
38 but I'll pass this out to anybody here that wants to
39 look. There is a 1986 technical paper from Division of
40 Subsistence, and even though we couldn't find direct
41 evidence of brown bear harvests in 9C by Igiugig and
42 Kokhanok, if you look at these two maps in here, they
43 show the 1982 general subsistence harvest areas for
44 Igiugig and Kokhanok. And if you look at those, I
45 don't know how to pronounce the names of those two
46 lakes, but I think people here will recognize them and
47 know what I'm talking about, and I believe those lakes
48 are in the Katmai Preserve. So this is just something
49 that shows that people do go in those areas from
50 Igiugig and Kokhanok to harvest the range of everything

1 that they harvest.

2

3 And what this kind of also suggests is
4 that the subunits of Unit 9 appear to be arbitrary
5 boundaries for subsistence users who have described
6 their harvest patterns across these boundaries as noted
7 in the testimony I read to you just a minute ago.

8

9 And as I said, brown bear harvests are
10 typically small. We're not going to see a huge amount
11 of reporting on these, but they are nonetheless a
12 component of the subsistence resource repertoire of all
13 three of these communities, and for these reasons, the
14 OSM preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal WP08-
15 27a.

16

17 Thanks. That's the end.

18

19 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
20 Go ahead, Randy.

21

22 MR. ALVAREZ: I've got a question for
23 you, Liz, concerning the map on 32.

24

25 MS. WILLIAMS: Uh-huh.

26

27 MR. ALVAREZ: I didn't think this was a
28 very accurate depiction of the harvest areas. And if
29 you look at the Levelock -- for instance, the Levelock
30 area, all the dotted area, you know, a lot of that's in
31 the National Park which is -- which you can't hunt in.
32 So, you know, having that area all dotted like that when
33 they can't hunt there, that doesn't seem right, because
34 they can't hunt there anyway, although they can go in
35 there, but -- and I know that there used to be an old
36 village. There's a Branch River village that's vacant
37 now and nobody lives there any more, but a lot of those
38 people that used to live there, they moved to Levelock
39 and Igiugig. And if you look at the Native allotments
40 along the Alagnak River there, most of those allotments
41 besides what the village -- besides what Levelock
42 Native Corporation owns and Igiugig Native Corporation
43 own in 9B, those Native allotments that are there, most
44 of -- or probably a big percentage of the Native
45 allotments that are there are from people that live in
46 Levelock and Igiugig, because it has been a usage
47 area. And this map really doesn't depict the true uses
48 in my opinion. And I just wanted to point that out.

49

50 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you,

1 Randy. Go ahead.

2

3 MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chair. Thank you.
4 That's a really good point. We get what we can. The
5 UCUs were all filled in, and some of that is Park land.
6 And I would imagine that the bears were taken outside
7 of Park land, but maybe there's an interplay between
8 UCU and Park land there, but Preserve as well in that
9 UCU. Our map guy said I was making map too
10 complicated. But, yeah, these harvest data that we
11 take from the sealing records are limited. We know
12 that all harvests are not reported there. So we just
13 put in what we can.

14

15 MR. ALVAREZ: Thank you.

16

17 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Cliff.

18

19 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair. Perhaps
20 Randy could talk to Liz and provide the names of people
21 who could provide clear -- show on a map where brown
22 bears were harvested, because on up through the Staff
23 Committee, she has that time to amend her analysis to
24 provide perhaps something more clear on the maps.
25 Because one of the things that we're always looking for
26 is individuals out here in the region to provide, if
27 you want to call it TEK or else, you know, just actual
28 harvest knowledge from years past of use, you know, on
29 the land and of the resource.

30

31 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah, I think can do
32 that.

33

34 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Anybody else
35 have any questions of Liz.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.

40 Lem.

41

42 MR. BUTLER: Ms. Chair. Members of the
43 Council. Lem Butler with Fish and Game, wildlife
44 biologist for Units 9 and 10.

45

46 Hopefully you've received copies of the
47 State comments. I think they're missing from the
48 original packet. We've gone to a new format. I'll
49 just read you some pertinent sections from this.

50

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I think
2 you'll have to, because I don't think we have them.
3 Give us a second, please.
4
5 MR. EDENSHAW: Probably to ahead, Lem.
6 I've got a copy of those with me from the most recent
7 information that the
8 Department.....
9
10 MR. BUTLER: Okay. Well, I'll read the
11 pertinent sections and summarize as much as I can for
12 you.
13
14 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah. Just
15 be thorough for us, please.
16
17 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. Not a problem. I
18 think for this proposal, the State's still waiting for
19 some additional input. We're interested in hearing
20 what the Council members have to say.
21
22 Generally we feel like no strong
23 evidence has been presented that indicates the proposed
24 change is needed to provide for continuation of
25 subsistence uses of brown bear on Federal lands for
26 Federally-qualified subsistence users.
27
28 If adopted, and provided as an
29 additional harvest beyond what the State of Alaska has
30 identified to be sustainable under State regulations,
31 another user hunting under State regulations during
32 fall and spring seasons could be impacted if the quota
33 is reached. And that probably pertains particularly to
34 like the Katmai Preserve where we're already seeing
35 large harvest. So if a lot of people go in there and
36 begin taking additional animals, the State season may
37 need to be closed by emergency order. So that's just
38 something to keep in mind.
39
40 If Proposal WP08-27a is adopted and a
41 Federal subsistence bear hunting season is opened in
42 9C, the preliminary conclusion in the Federal Staff
43 analysis for WP08-27b contains provisions that will be
44 important for administering this hunt. Close
45 monitoring will be essential to ensure that harvests
46 are sustainable and to enable managers to evaluate the
47 effects of the additional opportunity.
48
49 Some points that were mentioned that
50 need to be clarified, currently if this is modeled

1 after the current brown bear regulations in 9b under
2 the Federal subsistence regulations, in 9B there's
3 sealing requirements if the bear is removed from the
4 area. If it's not removed, then I believe -- let's
5 see, the sealing isn't required, but it may have a
6 devaluation, I'd have to check on that, where the head
7 and claws are removed from the hide.

8

9 It should be noted that the State
10 subsistence brown bear hunt in 9B, we get absolutely no
11 interest in anyone wanting to partake in that hunting
12 regulation.

13

14 The few inquiries that we do have when
15 we mention that the meat needs to be salvaged, people
16 just decide not to partake in that hunt.

17

18 We do offer it in all the villages. I
19 know it says in King Salmon. That's never been a
20 problem for anybody, you know, troopers go out. All
21 the information out there that's available says we'll
22 bring that permit to you wherever you are, aside from
23 the hunting reg. That will be clarified this go
24 around.

25

26 But I guess the point of that is just
27 saying that, you know, in our experience dealing with
28 subsistence brown bear hunting regulations in this
29 area, there seems to be absolutely no interest from
30 communities to partake. I get two takers from Port
31 Alsworth each year, but that's it. And that
32 opportunity again seems to be provided under State
33 regulations. We're already offering this permit for
34 anywhere in 9B.

35

36 So on that note, you know, expanding
37 these communities in 9B and offering them customary and
38 traditional use of brown bears in 9C doesn't seem to
39 offer a significant advantage to those communities
40 since that opportunity is already offered in 9B
41 currently, and it's not being taken advantage of.

42

43 But again, those are our general
44 observations, but we're not taking a definitive stance
45 on this proposal. We're leaving that up to you and
46 waiting to hear more from the Council.

47

48 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
49 Preliminary Comments to the Regional Advisory Council.

50

1 Wildlife Proposal WP08-27a:

2

3 Expand the customary and traditional
4 use determination for brown bear in Unit 9C to include
5 residents of Unit 9B in the communities of Igiugig,
6 Kokhanok, and Levelock.

7

8 Wildlife Proposal WP08-27b:

9

10 If a customary and traditional
11 determination of brown bear use in Unit 9C is made for
12 the communities of Igiugig, Kokhanok, and Levelock,
13 then the proponent requests an October 1 May 31
14 federal season to be administered by federal
15 registration permit in Unit 9C, which currently has no
16 federal open season. Under this proposal, each permit
17 would authorize harvest of one brown bear and the
18 season would be closed by the Superintendent of Katmai
19 National Park and Preserve when 10 brown bears have
20 been harvested.

21

22 Introduction:

23

24 Only rural residents of Unit 9C
25 currently have a customary and traditional use
26 determination for brown bear in Unit 9C. The federal
27 regulations currently authorize brown bears to be
28 harvested only in Units 9B and 9E.

29

30 Impact on Subsistence Users:

31

32 Increased opportunity to subsistence
33 hunt brown bears would primarily occur in October
34 before brown bears begin to den and after they exit
35 their dens in May. Adoption of this proposal would
36 also enable rural residents of Unit 9C to hunt brown
37 bear in Unit 9C, as they already have been found to
38 have a customary and traditional use of brown bear in
39 that subunit. Adoption of WP08-27a would substantially
40 increase the pool of eligible rural residents for this
41 hunt. The federal staff analysis does not address the
42 potential impacts of this expansion of federally-
43 qualified subsistence hunters in the Unit on the
44 smaller pool of currently eligible rural residents. In
45 addition, no evidence is presented indicating that the
46 proposed change is needed to provide for continuation
47 of subsistence uses of brown bear on federal lands for
48 federally-qualified subsistence users.

49

50 Opportunity Provided by State:

1 The Board of Game found that there are
2 no customary and traditional uses of brown bears in
3 Unit 9C. State regulations allow residents and
4 nonresidents to harvest one brown bear every four
5 regulatory years in the Remainder of Unit 9C, which
6 excludes the Naknek River drainage. Hunting is
7 authorized October 1-21 in odd-numbered years and May
8 10-25 in even-numbered years. Residents of Igiugig,
9 Kokhanok, and Levelock have reported sealing only six
10 brown bears in Units 9B and 9C since the State
11 instituted mandatory sealing of brown bears in 1962,
12 and no residents of these communities have obtained
13 registration permits for the subsistence brown bear
14 permit hunt in Unit 9B. The Department of Fish and
15 Game Division of Subsistence technical reports document
16 some harvest of brown bears by Igiugig, Kokhanok, and
17 Levelock, but the reports present no evidence
18 indicating that the brown bears were taken in Unit 9C.
19 The state regulations already provide the residents of
20 Igiugig, Kokhanok, and Levelock with the opportunity to
21 harvest brown bear, but residents of these communities
22 have only minimally utilized the opportunity provided.

23

24 Enforcement Issues:

25

26 Differences in federal and state
27 regulations resulting from adoption of this proposal
28 create enforcement issues in areas with mixed land
29 ownership. Federally-qualified subsistence users
30 hunting under terms of a federal registration permit
31 would be required to salvage the hide, skull, and
32 edible meat of brown bears taken in Unit 9C. State
33 regulations in Unit 9C require that within 30 days of
34 harvest, the skull and hide (with claws and evidence of
35 sex attached) of a brown bear must be taken to an
36 officially designated sealing officer to be sealed. If
37 this cannot be done, the hunter must complete and sign
38 a temporary sealing form that can be obtained from the
39 Department of Fish and Game.

40

41 Jurisdiction Issues:

42

43 Katmai National Park and Preserve
44 constitutes the majority, but not all, of the federal
45 lands in Unit 9C. The Park is closed to all
46 subsistence uses. If a federal season is opened in
47 Unit 9C, it would apply in Katmai National Preserve, a
48 small part of the Becharof National Wildlife Refuge,
49 and Bureau of Land Management lands.

50

1 Other Comments:

2

3 No evidence is presented indicating
4 that the proposed change is needed to provide for
5 continuation of subsistence uses of brown bear on
6 federal lands for federally-qualified subsistence
7 users. If adopted and provided as an additional
8 harvest beyond what the State of Alaska has identified
9 as sustainable harvest by State regulations, then other
10 users hunting under State regulations during the fall
11 and spring seasons could be unnecessarily impacted if
12 the federal quota is reached.

13

14 If Proposal WP08-27a is adopted and a
15 federal subsistence bear hunting season is opened in
16 Unit 9C, the Preliminary Conclusion in the federal
17 staff analysis for WP08-27b contains provisions that
18 will be important for administering this hunt. Close
19 monitoring will be essential to ensure that harvests
20 are sustainable and to enable managers to evaluate the
21 effects of the additional opportunity being provided in
22 federal regulation.

23

24 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. I've
25 got a quick question for you, Lem. How close is the
26 State hunts getting to their limits in these, like last
27 fall's hunts and the spring before in those areas? You
28 said they were getting close. How close is close?
29 What percentage of them are getting filled out?

30

31 MR. BUTLER: You know, it's going to
32 really depend on the area, but generally speaking, I
33 really don't want to see an increase in brown bear
34 harvest in much of Unit 9. We're about where we feel
35 comfortable given our management objectives and
36 mandates to maintain high density, high quality
37 populations. If 10 additional animals were harvest in
38 again particularly the Preserve, I think that would
39 trigger a season closure for the spring bear hunt. You
40 know, if this -- while, it will provide additional
41 opportunity for locals, it should just be noted that
42 this isn't going to be an opportunity to increase the
43 total brown bear take in the area. We're going to have
44 to keep some limits on the brown bear harvest in
45 general.

46

47 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Randy.

48

49 MR. ALVAREZ: Thank you, Madame Chair.

50

1 Lem, I don't -- or, Nanci, I don't
2 think there would be that many additional harvest. For
3 instance, probably -- my uncle always hunts bear if he
4 can. In Igiugig, he lives in Igiugig, so that's one
5 there, and there will probably be a couple in Levelock.
6 In Kokhanok, I'm not sure, probably one or two. So it
7 probably wouldn't even -- if all the people that went
8 out, it probably would be less than half a dozen.

9

10 But, you know, the reason why we asked
11 this was because there was no Federal season.

12

13 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Opportunity.

14

15 MR. ALVAREZ: Opportunity for
16 subsistence hunting, and the subsistence hunt is
17 different than the State hunt, because the State hunt,
18 they keep the hide and leave the carcass there. This
19 the opposite, the other way around.

20

21 And I was going to ask Lem, is it
22 against the law -- would it be against the law to leave
23 the skin there and take the meat, like we do with moose
24 and caribou?

25

26 MR. BUTLER: With the subsistence hunt,
27 it's a meat harvest requirement that we offer. And,
28 for example, the communities, like Levelock, that are
29 hunting the lower Alagnak, that's going to be State
30 lands, and they'd have to hunt under the State
31 subsistence brown bear permit in that area. So again,
32 it is an opportunity that's already provided that way.
33 We have our regular seasons, general season hunts that
34 require skull and hide salvage. But there's not
35 sealing requirement for the hide. It's just if you
36 take it out of the unit. Se deface it if you take it
37 out of the unit under our registration brown bear
38 permit. So it's really set up the same way. And again
39 it's already being offered for communities like
40 Levelock, Igiugig, Kokhanok, and we're not seeing any
41 interest.

42

43 So on that basis, I agree with you. I
44 really don't expect there to be any real use of this.
45 I'm just saying, just note that if there were a run on
46 bears in Katmai reserve, that's going to result in some
47 season curtailments elsewhere.

48

49 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah. I
50 remember that, too, Randy, because we had talked about

1 it, just wanting to be able to offer the opportunity
2 more than anything else. That somebody had heard from
3 somebody up there that they had said that.

4

5 Dan.

6

7 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Madame Chair. I
8 think I had a hand in stirring this issue up a little
9 bit, partly in response to the televised bear shooting
10 thing last fall, and my understanding there's a lot of
11 pressure from other groups to reduce hunting
12 opportunity, restrict hunting opportunity in preference
13 for bear viewing. In fact I heard something on the
14 news today about it again, people worrying about bear
15 viewing. And one of the thoughts I had was I want to
16 make absolutely certain that subsistence users in that
17 area don't get forgotten in the bigger debate. And if
18 making a C&T finding preserves that, their toe in the
19 door, that I didn't see it as a need to increase
20 harvest, but to protect especially those villagers
21 living close by, that they don't just get lost in the
22 bigger issue.

23

24 And to turn this into a question maybe,
25 Lem, do you know where that debate is going at this
26 stage? I didn't pay any attention to the most recent
27 Board of Game meeting, and I don't know what was
28 discussed there, but maybe you could bring us up to
29 date.

30

31 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. We didn't really
32 cover the Katmai Preserve bear hunt at the Board of
33 Game meeting that just happened in Fairbanks. We
34 covered it under the last Board of Game meeting, March
35 of 2007.

36

37 Currently, you know, from a biological
38 point of view, we're comfortable with where the harvest
39 is now. Again, we don't want to see that increased,
40 but given the bear distribution, we seem to be doing
41 okay currently.

42

43 Recently we met with Park Service
44 regional Staff, as well as the Katmai office folks. We
45 pulled in a few of the interest groups, National Parks
46 Conservation Associate, a representative of Audubon
47 Society was there. Sierra Clubs also had some
48 interaction with Katmai Park, and maybe those guys
49 could tell you a bit more.

50

1 Generally what we're -- where things
2 are headed right now is we're trying to develop a work
3 group to try to resolve some of the user conflict
4 issues associated with that hunt, and just getting
5 general awareness out there of some of the facts that
6 are pertinent to the situation that often seem to get
7 muddled in the media.
8
9 So again, currently, you know, we're
10 still on for a spring bear hunt. And we're hoping to
11 make some progress with that working group to resolve
12 the tension.
13
14 MR. DUNAWAY: Madame Chair. So would
15 some person from, say, the subsistence community be
16 invited to be part of the work group, or who's forming
17 the work group?
18
19 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. Fish and Game is
20 going to have a pretty active role in putting the work
21 group together, bringing the key players to the table.
22 I imagine Park Service will also be involved.
23
24 One of the things that was emphasized
25 was that we do need local representation on that
26 working group as well as, you know, members --
27 sportfish and bear viewing, bear hunting
28 representatives, et cetera. So we're going to try to
29 bring as many of the key players together and good,
30 strong representation for everybody.
31
32 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. Well, I think that
33 was what I wanted to.....
34
35 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Good. Okay.
36 Yeah, I'm glad to hear you're going to make sure you
37 pull in everybody.
38
39 Molly, please go ahead.
40
41 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Thank you, Madame
42 Chair. I didn't hear the answer that I think Nanci was
43 asking about the total limit of harvest of bears.
44 Wasn't that your question?
45
46 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I wanted to
47 know a percentage, but what is your total limit?
48 That's a good question.
49
50 MS. CHYTHLOOK: A percentage. I didn't

1 hear that.

2

3 MR. BUTLER: It's going to depend on
4 the area. It really depends on where the harvest is
5 being drawn from, you know. And to be honest, it's a
6 moving target. In a lot of cases it's -- I'm looking
7 as much as harvest indices as I am at total brown bear
8 harvest in relation to the density of animals that we
9 believe are in an area. But given the nature of brown
10 bears in particular in this area, they tend to be
11 highly mobile. They move around with seasonal
12 resources, so it's just going to depend on the season.
13 And again right now the main concern is in the Katmai
14 preserve area where we have seen some higher harvests
15 in general.

16

17 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: What was
18 your number for last fall?

19

20 MR. BUTLER: Last fall we ended up with
21 21 bears being taken from that area.

22

23 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah,
24 there's another.....

25

26 MR. HEDLUND: Out of the Preserve?

27

28 MR. BUTLER: Out of the Preserve, yeah.
29 Uh-huh. Yeah, the last two open regulatory years we
30 had -- in 2003/04 season we had 34 bears taken total.
31 In '05/06 we had 35 bears taken. Right now, based on
32 the fall harvest, we're tracking to have a lower
33 harvest total for this regulatory year. But it's still
34 a situation that we want to keep tabs on and monitor
35 closely.

36

37 MS. CHYTHLOOK: And I had another
38 question. My understanding is the -- I guess the
39 sports hard, the requirement is just the head and the
40 skin versus subsistence hunt where they're required to
41 take the meat?

42

43 MR. BUTLER: That's right.

44

45 MS. CHYTHLOOK: What's the difference?

46

47

48 MR. BUTLER: Well, under the sport
49 hunting regulation, the general season is how we
50 typically refer to it, the hunter has to have a locking

1 tag. They can only hunt in a very restricted window
2 every other year, two weeks in the fall, two weeks in
3 the spring. We offer the subsistence brown bear hunt
4 every regulatory year with a much more liberal season.
5 And again the main requirement there is the meat
6 salvage requirement that it's used -- if the hide
7 remains in the unit, it can be processed in the
8 village, doesn't need to be sealed.

9

10 MS. CHYTHLOOK: That's for subsistence?

11

12 MR. BUTLER: That's a subsistence --
13 under State regulations, right. Subsistence brown bear
14 hunt. And then.....

15

16 MS. CHYTHLOOK: And then the sports
17 hunt, is the season about the same time, but the
18 salvage is not required for the meat?

19

20 MR. BUTLER: The seasons will overlap,
21 but the subsistence hunt's going to run from September
22 until May, whereas the general season hunt is a very
23 limited window, every other year from October 1st to
24 the 21st, and then May 10th to May 25th. So again the
25 general hunt's much more restricted, and that hunt does
26 not a meat salvage requirement. It's just a skull and
27 hide salvage.

28

29 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank you.

30

31 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Does that
32 help. Are we done?

33

34 MR. DUNAWAY: It just occurred to me,
35 another one is that I recall -- get a sense that -- in
36 the past I've heard people that live in the area,
37 because of their frustration at the lack of moose, and
38 maybe bears harassing their fish racks and stuff,
39 there's been some loss of local support for the trophy,
40 large bear management. And there's been times where
41 I've wondered -- I've hear enough -- it's been a while,
42 but I've heard enough that there might be some real
43 push to say, to heck with the trophy management, we
44 want less bears and more moose.

45

46 If you were not managing for large
47 trophy type bears, could the population sustain a
48 higher harvest without really threatening the, say,
49 overall viability of the population?

50

1 MR. BUTLER: Yeah, you can pretty much
2 manage a population, probably much like fish for
3 several different regimes. If you did a maximum
4 sustained yield harvest where you were just taking
5 every bear you could, and not wanting to affect the
6 density, you could do that, but as you mentioned, you
7 would compromise the quality of the population, the
8 trophy value, et cetera. And right now it is a problem
9 for Unit 9. We're given conflicting directives from
10 the State. So what the State tells me to do is manage
11 for high density, high quality brown bears as well as
12 high yield of ungulates for human consumptive use, and
13 balancing those two can be problematic.

14
15 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I can
16 appreciate that. Anything else, Dan.

17
18 MR. DUNAWAY: That's all. Thanks.

19
20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Anybody else
21 got questions for Lem.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
26 Okay. Federal, State and tribal agency comments.
27 Should we start with the Park Service, do they have --
28 is that what we usually do?

29
30 MR. ALVAREZ: I don't know. I think
31 they just usually come up. Somebody will do.....

32
33 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Just open it
34 up to them.

35
36 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah.

37
38 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
39 Anybody with any Federal, State and tribal agency
40 comments, please.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 MR. ALVAREZ: I'm seeing none.

45
46 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
47 Seeing none, let's move on to Fish and Game Advisory
48 Committee comments, do we have any.

49
50 MR. ALVAREZ: Interagency, on the form.

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Oh, did I
2 miss one? InterAgency Staff Committee comments.
3
4 MR. RABINOWITCH: None.
5
6 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: None. Okay.
7 Then we'll go on to Fish and Game Advisory Committee
8 comments.
9
10 (No comments)
11
12 MR. ALVAREZ: None.
13
14 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I don't see
15 any
16
17 MR. CHYTHLOOK: I guess, Madame Chair,
18 just for the record, usually advisory committees deal
19 with game issues on the years the Board of Game's on
20 cycle. So this year, most of our advisory committees
21 in Bristol Bay did not meet on any game issues, because
22 the Board of Game cycle for Southcentral and Western,
23 Southwestern I guess is off this year. The call for
24 proposals will be probably November/December for 2009
25 spring meeting. I imagine whatever action you guys
26 take or Federal subsistence takes on any issues will
27 probably be followed up by the State Advisory Committee
28 System at that time.
29
30 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
31 Okay. Cliff, can you give us a summary of the written
32 public comments.
33
34 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair and
35 Council. If you turn in your book to Page 40 and 41,
36 there was one written public comment by the National
37 Parks Conservation Association, and they oppose
38 Proposal 27, even though it doesn't stipulate 27a or b,
39 but it just says 27. And then Ken and Chris Day from
40 Homer, we are opposed to this proposal currently in
41 front of the Federal Subsistence Board. And a third
42 one was by the AWA, Alaska Center for the Environment
43 and Defenders of Wildlife, and they also opposed the
44 proposal. So the three written proposals [sic] on
45 Pages 40 and 41 oppose the proposal.
46
47 Madame Chair.
48
49 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Thank
50 you.

1 MR. EDENSHAW: And then for the record,
2 Lem was up here providing the agency comments, and I'll
3 just leave it at that. I had copies. I'll have to
4 look for them afterwards. But anyways, I appreciate
5 Lem being able to provide those. But I did make copies
6 of the State comments, I'll try to find those.

7

8 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.

9

10 MR. EDENSHAW: And then I just wanted
11 to remind the Council, Laura Greffenius is going to
12 provide the biological analysis on 27b, which addresses
13 harvest. So on 27a we're just looking for information
14 for those eight factors that would allow, you know --
15 if the Council makes a recommendation supporting a
16 finding of C&T, we're looking for information for those
17 communities that would allow them to go into the
18 Preserve. You know, we can get a -- we can tend to get
19 away from the harvest information, but that's going to
20 come up in Proposal 27b. When Liz provided her
21 analyses, we were looking for more TEK or information
22 from residents who go into the preserve, whether
23 they're in Kokhanok, Levelock, or.....

24

25 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: So this
26 part's just to justify the hunt?

27

28 MR. EDENSHAW: Correct. And listening
29 to the Council, and you guys talk about harvest
30 information, certainly it's important, but we want to
31 try and stay towards Proposal 27a, which is we're
32 looking at information that would provide, just as you
33 suggested, for those communities to go into the Park,
34 because Laura's going to provide 27b which is where the
35 Council made a proposal at their last meeting for
36 harvest.

37

38 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
39 Randy, did you have something?

40

41 MR. ALVAREZ: No, I changed my mind.

42

43 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Good.
44 Thank you for that clarification. I was wondering why
45 they were split out. Now that makes perfect sense.

46

47 Okay. Written public comments we just
48 did.

49

50 Public testimony. Do we have -- please

1 go ahead.

2

3 MR. EDENSHAW: And, Madame Chair,
4 before Joe provides -- Joe provided copies of his
5 testimony.

6

7 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yes. Thank
8 you very much for that, too. You guys will find that,
9 it's dated March 22nd. We need one more over here.
10 Alvin didn't get one.

11

12 MS. CHYTHLOOK: I don't have it.

13

14 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Molly didn't
15 either. I guess two on this side of the table got left
16 out. Let's see if we can get another -- do we have
17 another copy over there? Thank you, Cliff.

18

19 Thanks for waiting, Joe. Yeah, Go
20 ahead.

21

22 MR. KLUTSCH: Thank you, Madame Chair
23 and members of the Committee. For those of you who
24 don't know me, I'll just tell you a little bit about
25 myself, which is in the opening of the letter that I've
26 submitted to you.

27

28 My wife and I have lived in the Bristol
29 Bay region for 40 years now. And I really appreciate
30 the opportunity to attend these meetings and share my
31 views on the future of wildlife management, and the
32 allocation of the resources both for the short term.
33 and for the long term. And I'm very much concerned
34 about how this wildlife will be managed and what's
35 going to be here for future generations.

36

37 A couple years ago, two or three years
38 ago, I had to call Joe Chythlook to find out how many
39 years I've been on the Naknek/Kvichak Advisory
40 Committee. I think we looked it up, and it's over 25
41 now. And in all those years, it's really given me a
42 great opportunity to, you know, learn so much about the
43 area and the wildlife management, and kind of sit on
44 the sidelines during commercial fish fights. That's
45 been interesting.

46

47 I spend extensive time out in the field
48 every year in my hunting camps and my fishing camps.
49 I'm also hunting late falls and early springs on Kodiak
50 Island.

1 At any rate, one other thing you'll
2 notice in my letter, and I did comment on WP08-01 and
3 WP08-05, and that is not on the agenda. I did read the
4 Staff analysis on those proposals, however. And I
5 guess that relates to predator management, and maybe at
6 some point, if I had an opportunity, I'll make some
7 comments on those proposals.

8
9 With that being said, and you can let
10 me know at your discretion or read what I have to say
11 there, but it does deal with predator management and
12 particularly the issue of predator control and wolf
13 control, which has been one of the dominating issues at
14 the Board of Game during its last two cycles.

15
16 And now my comments on the proposal
17 we've been discussing, the 27a proposal. It requests a
18 positive C&T determination in 9C for residents of
19 communities of 9B. There didn't appear as I looked
20 through the regulations to see any identifiable
21 restrictions under current regs, both State or Fed to
22 impede harvest of brown bear. And given the reported
23 harvest during the last 20 years, one can conclude that
24 there's not a problem with opportunity to harvest bear
25 under existing State and Federal regs. There have been
26 minimal requests for registration permits to hunt for
27 these bears.

28
29 We need to be aware of the
30 ramifications of unreported harvest, which has
31 historically been significant. And I can't speak to
32 the Levelock corridor, of which you're very familiar
33 with, Randy, but we know what we've seen in the Naknek
34 corridor and some other areas, and I'll talk a little
35 about that later. Avoiding conflicts with bears is
36 essential to conserving the species. Continued
37 liberalization of hunting regulations without adherence
38 to reporting responsibilities, seasons and bag limits
39 will result in the loss of opportunity for future
40 generations due to the lack of conservation-based
41 management. And I hope the Council would be careful to
42 stipulate who can participate in this hunt, and that
43 there's some way to monitor it should you choose to
44 adopt the proposal.

45
46 Just a brief comment on the issue of
47 nuisance bears and habituated bears, there's been a
48 growing problem in the lower river area, particularly
49 on the Naknek, with garbage and fish waste and a lot of
50 bears have been shot and wounded and killed randomly,

1 and a lot of them don't get reported. It's just
2 something that's been going on there. And we brought
3 it up at our Advisory Committee meeting, and it may be
4 something that we'll have to take up with the Borough
5 about people doing a better job or managing their
6 garbage and fish waste along that riverfront.

7

8 And the last comment on this that I
9 make is it's interesting if you take note of who
10 opposed this proposal. The Alaska Center for the
11 Environment and the Defenders of Wildlife. And one of
12 the comments they make was that this could jeopardize
13 quality sport hunting, which if you weren't at the
14 Board of Game cycle last December or last spring, the
15 last thing they were interested in or concerned with
16 was the quality of sport hunting in the Preserve or
17 Unit 9B. They wanted it closed. That's what they were
18 battling for. So I just thought it was interesting to
19 see that comment put in here.

20

21 So I defer to the judgment of the
22 Council. And I'm not concerned with over-harvest on
23 this. And I think what Randy said is correct, that
24 based on historical use, I don't think it's going to be
25 a biological issue. I'm much more concerned about the
26 bears that are getting randomly shot along the river
27 down at the Naknek end and up there.

28

29 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Thank
30 you, Joe. Questions.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 MR. ALVAREZ: Thank you.

35

36 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Does
37 somebody want to put this one on the table.

38

39 MR. ALVAREZ: I move we adopt Proposal
40 WP08-27a.

41

42 MR. HEDLUND: I'd second it.

43

44 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Second.

45

46 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
47 Discussion.

48

49 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. The way it's split
50 out, and the way this started from where I was concern.

1 I just want to double check and whoever's out here that
2 could maybe answer it, because to me right now, I'm
3 inclined to support granting a C&T finding. I don't
4 know if we can do that, or if support that they seek
5 that. Again, to preserve their opportunity depending
6 on how all these other issues shake out in the future.
7 But I'm just wondering if there's any negative
8 ramifications from that, because the way I'm seeing
9 this more and more is this 27a doesn't necessary
10 increase the hunt or change the hunt a whole lot, but
11 hopefully addresses my concern to preserve the rights
12 of Kokhanok, Levelock, and Igiugig to access those
13 bears if it does come down to a problem of who gets to
14 hunt them. And am I correct on that? I don't know if
15 I could ask Lem or -- I was kind of hoping that Ted
16 Krieg might be here.

17

18 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: That's my
19 understanding. I mean, this is -- we're determining --
20 this one is just for the right to hunt. This is the
21 C&T.

22

23 MR. BOSKOFISKY: It's just the C&T.

24

25 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Correct. Go
26 ahead, Randy.

27

28 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah. You know, all we
29 can do is support. We can't pass that they can. You
30 know, our Council's going to take this up to either
31 support or oppose this proposal. And then it goes
32 before the Federal Subsistence Board. But, you know,
33 like I stated to Lem before, you know, it's not going
34 to be a big amount, but if -- the reason why I asked
35 for this, or, you know, brought it up, this proposal,
36 why we have it before us, is because, you know, there
37 is -- this has been a traditional area that -- for
38 harvesting brown bear by these three villages, and it's
39 -- and it hasn't been on the books. And I felt that
40 if, you know, it wasn't on there, say 20 years from
41 not, it might not be -- we might not be able to do
42 something that we've always been able to, speaking
43 about the Kokhanok, Igiugig, and Levelock people. So
44 I'm open for questions if you guys have any for me, but
45 I think it's -- you know, I think myself it's pretty
46 much open and closed, because the evidence is there,
47 and the OSM supports it, and if there happens to be a
48 shortage of bears in the future, it shouldn't -- it
49 would eliminate Levelock, Igiugig and Kokhanok from
50 being able to harvest. In my opinion, they would still

1 be able to, and the harvest reduction probably would
2 have to be on the big game side. Because if it -- if
3 we didn't have this proposal come before us, and if we
4 didn't have it, and there has to be a reduction, I
5 don't think the people in Igiugig would fair very well,
6 or the three village would fair very well. So that's
7 kind of my comments on that.

8

9 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Anybody
10 else.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I tend to
15 agree. I mean, I guess I see this more as an
16 acknowledgement of historical use than I do as a, you
17 know, acceptance of a hunt or a regulation. And so I
18 know for that reason I'll be voting in favor of it.

19

20 MR. DUNAWAY: Question.

21

22 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The
23 question's called for. I like it. All those in favor
24 please signify by saying aye.

25

26 IN UNISON: Aye.

27

28 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Opposed same
29 sign.

30

31 (No opposing votes)

32

33 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The motion
34 passes.

35

36 Okay. Let's move on to Proposal WP08-
37 27b. Laura. Take your time.

38

39 MS. GREFFENIUS: All right. My name is
40 Laura Greffenius. I'm a wildlife biologist with OSM.
41 So there's no microphones to turn on?

42

43 REPORTER: No.

44

45 MS. GREFFENIUS: Okay. All right.
46 Just to clarify it.

47

48 All right. So we've already -- you've
49 discussed 27a, and as you've already talked about, this
50 proposal, WP08-27b, the b portion addresses the seasons

1 and the harvest limit for this proposal. So I'll go
2 into that, and as you know, the a portion was just the
3 C&T part.

4
5 So this one was submitted by the
6 Council, and it requests that the brown bear season be
7 established in Unit 9C from October 1 to May 31 with a
8 limit of 10 years. And the Council requests that the
9 Federally-qualified subsistence users -- that
10 Federally-qualified subsistence users have an
11 opportunity to hunt brown bear under Federal
12 subsistence regulations in Unit 9C.

13
14 This proposal for the subsistence brown
15 bear hunt is for all of Unit 9C, and not exclusively
16 for the Preserve. I just wanted to make that
17 clarification as noted under the discussion.

18
19 Currently there's no Federal open
20 season in Unit 9C, and it has been closed since the
21 inception of the Federal Subsistence Management
22 Program.

23
24 There are two State seasons in Unit 9C
25 for hunting brown bears by both residents and non-
26 residents.

27
28 The proposed regulation's on Page 43 in
29 your book, and it indicates one bear by Federal
30 registration permits only, and the season October 1 to
31 May 31. And as it states, the season will be closed by
32 the Katmai National Park and Preserve superintendent
33 when 10 bears have been harvested. And that's as it
34 was proposed by the Council.

35
36 On Page 45 is the map showing the area.
37 As has been mentioned, there's no subsistence hunting.
38 It's not authorized -- subsistence hunting is not
39 authorized in Katmai National Park, so there areas that
40 are being talked about would include Katmai National
41 Preserve and some Bureau of Land Management lands and a
42 small portion of Becharof National Wildlife Refuge.

43
44 And presently -- we've talked about C&T
45 for those 9B villages, but presently residents of Unit
46 9C have a positive customary and traditional use
47 determination for brown bear in Unit 9C.

48
49 As I mentioned, there's been no Federal
50 open season for brown bears in Unit 9C since the

1 inception of the Federal Subsistence Management Program
2 in 1990. And under State regulations, there are fall
3 and spring seasons for brown bear which are opened to
4 residents and non-residents.

5
6 In a similar area geographically, just
7 to mention, in Unit 9B to the north, current Federal
8 regulations address comparable resource conditions as
9 are considered in this proposal by including similar
10 permit conditions. In Unit 9B, Lake Clark National
11 Park and Preserve, there's a harvest of one bear by
12 Federal registration permit only. And also there the
13 season will be closed by the Lake Clark National Park
14 and Preserve superintendent when four females or 10
15 bear have been taken, whichever comes first.

16
17 Under the biological section of the
18 analysis, I just wanted to mention -- well, you all
19 have read it, and just as far as the details, I won't
20 go into all the specific numbers, but just that there
21 have been surveys done by the National Park Service and
22 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Over time, the
23 patterns that have emerged indicate that the bear
24 population is healthy, and in recent years there's been
25 aerial surveys in Katmai National Preserve in August
26 2006 and 2007 along major salmon streams where bears
27 congregate for a way of being able to assess the
28 population. So some numbers have been derived from
29 that, but as far as, you know, data analysis, several
30 more years of data are required before any trends can
31 be assessed as such. So there is recent work going on
32 to be able to look at population numbers in the area.
33 It's not easy with brown bears just because of their
34 seasonal transience and their solitary nature and their
35 wide-ranging movements, so it's difficult to assess and
36 monitor their trends and densities and compositions.

37
38 There's also been some other
39 cooperative work that's been done by Park Service and
40 ADF&G and some reports that have been cited in this
41 section.

42
43 As far as the harvest history, there's
44 been no Federal subsistence harvest regulations in Unit
45 9C, so the harvest information for brown bears is
46 available solely from the State sealing data.

47
48 The bear harvest in Katmai National
49 Preserve specifically has increased as we discussed in
50 the previous one, the harvest information that came up.

1 I will refer you to the summary table at the top of
2 Page 47, that gives some information for the Preserve.
3 And it currently averages 29 bears per year. The bear
4 harvest in the Preserve has increased and currently
5 averages 29 bears per year. Comparing recent harvest
6 data with the 25-year average shows similar patterns of
7 percent resident and percent non-resident hunters.
8 It's similar, the percent males and females harvested,
9 but the actual number of bears harvested and the number
10 of hunters has increased.

11
12 Also, I just want to mention there had
13 been some questions as far as Naknek and King Salmon
14 residents. We reviewed harvest records from the 1960s
15 through 2002. Naknek and King Salmon residents have
16 not harvested brown bear in the Katmai National
17 Preserve portion of Unit 9C since 1991. So those
18 residents have harvested elsewhere, but just looking at
19 specifically the use for the Preserve. So there's not
20 heavy use. There had been some questions, there's not
21 heavy use by Naknek/King Salmon residents for that part
22 of 9B.

23
24 If adopted, WP08-27b would provide
25 Federally-qualified subsistence users the opportunity
26 to hunt brown bear in Unit 9C from October 1 to May 31.
27 The Federal subsistence and State general hunting
28 seasons would coincide during the months of October and
29 May. Non-Federally-qualified subsistence users would
30 have the same opportunity to harvest brown bears under
31 State regulations as before.

32
33 The harvest of brown bears in Unit 9C
34 could increase by up to 10 bears per regulatory year.
35 And given that the bear population in Unit 9C is
36 considered healthy, and that harvest is expected to be
37 low, the additional harvest is not considered a
38 conservation concern. But if only females were
39 harvested, resource managers did express concerns about
40 the effect on the population.

41
42 And for clarification, I did want to
43 mention a lot of times when there's an a component of a
44 proposal and a b component, a lot of times they pro --
45 just circumstantially, whatever the situation is, they
46 proceed in unison. In this case the scenario could be
47 -- in unison meaning that if the a part's adopted, then
48 it's kind of given the b. But in this case, that's not
49 necessarily the situation. If a is adopted by the
50 Federal Subsistence Board, the three communities under

1 consideration are small and the harvests are expected
2 to be low. If the a portion is rejected, is not
3 adopted by the Board, the regulatory language proposed
4 in 27b could still be implemented as there is an
5 existing positive customary and traditional use
6 determination for residents that's already in place of
7 Unit 9C for hunting brown bears in Unit 9C. So I just
8 wanted to mention that for clarification.

9

10 MR. ALVAREZ: So if this passes, then
11 Naknek, King Salmon, and South Naknek would be able to
12 hunt this also?

13

14 MS. GREFFENIUS: Residents of 9C
15 already have the positive.....

16

17 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah, but there's no
18 season.

19

20 MS. GREFFENIUS: Right. And if the b
21 portion was passed, right. Exactly.

22

23 So the OSM preliminary conclusion is to
24 support 27b with modification to specify the harvest
25 quota and modify the Federal registration permit
26 conditions. And the modified regulation should read --
27 and I'll refer you to the top of Page 48. It would be
28 the same season as before, October 1 to May 31, one
29 bear by Federal registration permit only. And we made
30 a change for the season will be closed by the Katmai
31 National Park and Preserve superintendent in
32 consultation with BLM and Fish and Wildlife Service
33 land managers, because those are Federal lands also
34 that would be affected, and the other change is when 4
35 females or 10 bear have been taken, whichever occurs
36 first.

37

38 The Federal public lands in Unit 9C
39 have a sufficient density of brown bears to open a
40 Federal season for subsistence users. A maximum
41 allowable harvest of 10 bears per season will ensure
42 harvest is limited to sustainable levels. And also the
43 permit condition would state that the season could be
44 closed by the Katmai National Park and Preserve
45 superintendent in consultation with the BLM and Fish
46 and Wildlife Service land managers.

47

48 The modified regulation which
49 stipulates the season will be closed when 4 females or
50 10 bear have been taken, it's -- and this condition in

1 the modification will further protect the productivity
2 of the bear population that occupies both subunits, and
3 as I mentioned, it mirrors what's in the neighboring
4 geographic area, 9B, to the north in the Lake Clark
5 National Preserve area.

6

7 That's what I have for this one if
8 there's any questions.

9

10 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you,
11 Laura. Go ahead, Randy.

12

13 MR. ALVAREZ: Laura, on Page 46,
14 harvest history, the second paragraph down, it says the
15 harvest records from the 1960 to 2002, Naknek and King
16 Salmon residents have not harvested brown bear in the
17 Katmai National Preserve portion of Unit 9C since 1991.
18 Why is that? Is it that there are no records or what,
19 of harvest?

20

21 MS. GREFFENIUS: We do have the
22 records. I went through and we printed out the records
23 from our database that is provided from ADF&G, from
24 Fish and Game, and then we get it in our database, but
25 we can print it out according to the residents and
26 wherever they've hunted, and the use they use. so
27 there are the records that exist.

28

29 What it is, is that we have some
30 questions and so I wanted to put this in here that the
31 Naknek and King residents -- people were wondering are
32 they going up to that preserve portion to hunt, and
33 there's not a strong indication that that's the case,
34 especially recently. So that's what I meant by that.
35 There is information on it, so I was just indicating
36 that that's not an area -- the King Salmon and Naknek
37 residents hunt elsewhere.

38

39 MR. ALVAREZ: Right in their backyard.

40

41 MS. GREFFENIUS: Right. Close.
42 Exactly. That's what we were -- that statement was
43 just saying that there's not pressure from those
44 communities.

45

46 MR. ALVAREZ: Thank you.

47

48 MS. GREFFENIUS: That question had come
49 up several times.

50

1 MS. CHYTHLOOK: I've got a question.
2
3 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Please.
4
5 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Thank you. With the
6 State records, is that from harvest information from
7 the State, or did you include baseline surveys/studies
8 that were done with Subsistence Division?
9
10 MS. GREFFENIUS: That's a good -- the
11 question as far as what I've noted here from the Naknek
12 and King Salmon residents?
13
14 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)
15
16 MS. GREFFENIUS: It's based on the
17 State's records, the sealing data, and those harvest
18 records. And then it gets turned -- Fish and Game
19 turns that over to our office, and we do some things
20 with it. So it doesn't incorporate what you are
21 saying. It's based solely on the sealing records.
22
23 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Because I know
24 that there were some baseline surveys done over there
25 indicating all resources, and I was just wondering if
26 from those records that there might be some harvest.
27
28 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Some
29 additional harvest information. Yeah.
30
31 MS. GREFFENIUS: Yeah.
32
33 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Information from those
34 baseline surveys that were done in the mid to late 80s
35 and 90s.
36
37 MS. GREFFENIUS: And what I was mostly
38 looking at is just geographically where people are
39 going to hunt, and most of the indications are that
40 people are going -- from King Salmon and Naknek area
41 are going closer by.
42
43 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thanks.
44
45 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Any other
46 questions for Laura.
47
48 (No comments)
49
50 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you,

1 Laura.

2

3 Okay. Lem.

4

5 MR. BUTLER: Mr. Chair. Members of the
6 Council. Lem Butler.

7

8 I apologize. I may have been the one
9 that got us started on WP08-27b during the last time I
10 was up here. I didn't realize that we were
11 distinguishing the two. So essentially my comments
12 from the last proposal apply to this one as well. I
13 can answer any additional questions you have.

14

15 I did note that it was -- we were
16 wondering where the Naknek/King Salmon folks were
17 hunting bears these days, and as Laura mentioned, it's
18 in the Naknek drainage.

19

20 You know, what appears to be the case
21 to me at least, I obviously wasn't around in the 80s
22 and 90s to know what level of interest in bear hunting
23 there was at the time for local residents, but again
24 now there's not very much interest at all. You know,
25 people really are reluctant to even shoot a DLP bear.
26 They just don't want to deal with it for the most part.
27 And the few people that we do have hunting from
28 Naknek, King Salmon are going to get their registration
29 brown bear hunt along the Naknek River. In very few
30 cases do we have people actually travel to the Preserve
31 or another drainage. I think the opportunity's just
32 there locally for those communities.

33

34 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
35 Preliminary Comments to the Regional Advisory Council.

36

37 Wildlife Proposal WP08-27a:

38

39 Expand the customary and traditional
40 use determination for brown bear in Unit 9C to include
41 residents of Unit 9B in the communities of Igiugig,
42 Kokhanok, and Levelock.

43

44 Wildlife Proposal WP08-27b:

45

46 If a customary and traditional
47 determination of brown bear use in Unit 9C is made for
48 the communities of Igiugig, Kokhanok, and Levelock,
49 then the proponent requests an October 1 May 31
50 federal season to be administered by federal

1 registration permit in Unit 9C, which currently has no
2 federal open season. Under this proposal, each permit
3 would authorize harvest of one brown bear and the
4 season would be closed by the Superintendent of Katmai
5 National Park and Preserve when 10 brown bears have
6 been harvested.

7

8 Introduction:

9

10 Only rural residents of Unit 9C
11 currently have a customary and traditional use
12 determination for brown bear in Unit 9C. The federal
13 regulations currently authorize brown bears to be
14 harvested only in Units 9B and 9E.

15

16 Impact on Subsistence Users:

17

18 Increased opportunity to subsistence
19 hunt brown bears would primarily occur in October
20 before brown bears begin to den and after they exit
21 their dens in May. Adoption of this proposal would
22 also enable rural residents of Unit 9C to hunt brown
23 bear in Unit 9C, as they already have been found to
24 have a customary and traditional use of brown bear in
25 that subunit. Adoption of WP08-27a would substantially
26 increase the pool of eligible rural residents for this
27 hunt. The federal staff analysis does not address the
28 potential impacts of this expansion of federally-
29 qualified subsistence hunters in the Unit on the
30 smaller pool of currently eligible rural residents. In
31 addition, no evidence is presented indicating that the
32 proposed change is needed to provide for continuation
33 of subsistence uses of brown bear on federal lands for
34 federally-qualified subsistence users.

35

36 Opportunity Provided by State:

37

38 The Board of Game found that there are
39 no customary and traditional uses of brown bears in
40 Unit 9C. State regulations allow residents and
41 nonresidents to harvest one brown bear every four
42 regulatory years in the Remainder of Unit 9C, which
43 excludes the Naknek River drainage. Hunting is
44 authorized October 1-21 in odd-numbered years and May
45 10-25 in even-numbered years. Residents of Igiugig,
46 Kokhanok, and Levelock have reported sealing only six
47 brown bears in Units 9B and 9C since the State
48 instituted mandatory sealing of brown bears in 1962,
49 and no residents of these communities have obtained
50 registration permits for the subsistence brown bear

1 permit hunt in Unit 9B. The Department of Fish and
2 Game Division of Subsistence technical reports document
3 some harvest of brown bears by Igiugig, Kokhanok, and
4 Levelock, but the reports present no evidence
5 indicating that the brown bears were taken in Unit 9C.
6 The state regulations already provide the residents of
7 Igiugig, Kokhanok, and Levelock with the opportunity to
8 harvest brown bear, but residents of these communities
9 have only minimally utilized the opportunity provided.

10

11 Enforcement Issues:

12

13 Differences in federal and state
14 regulations resulting from adoption of this proposal
15 create enforcement issues in areas with mixed land
16 ownership. Federally-qualified subsistence users
17 hunting under terms of a federal registration permit
18 would be required to salvage the hide, skull, and
19 edible meat of brown bears taken in Unit 9C. State
20 regulations in Unit 9C require that within 30 days of
21 harvest, the skull and hide (with claws and evidence of
22 sex attached) of a brown bear must be taken to an
23 officially designated sealing officer to be sealed. If
24 this cannot be done, the hunter must complete and sign
25 a temporary sealing form that can be obtained from the
26 Department of Fish and Game.

27

28 Jurisdiction Issues:

29

30 Katmai National Park and Preserve
31 constitutes the majority, but not all, of the federal
32 lands in Unit 9C. The Park is closed to all
33 subsistence uses. If a federal season is opened in
34 Unit 9C, it would apply in Katmai National Preserve, a
35 small part of the Becharof National Wildlife Refuge,
36 and Bureau of Land Management lands.

37

38 Other Comments:

39

40 No evidence is presented indicating
41 that the proposed change is needed to provide for
42 continuation of subsistence uses of brown bear on
43 federal lands for federally-qualified subsistence
44 users. If adopted and provided as an additional
45 harvest beyond what the State of Alaska has identified
46 as sustainable harvest by State regulations, then other
47 users hunting under State regulations during the fall
48 and spring seasons could be unnecessarily impacted if
49 the federal quota is reached.

50

1 If Proposal WP08-27a is adopted and a
2 federal subsistence bear hunting season is opened in
3 Unit 9C, the Preliminary Conclusion in the federal
4 staff analysis for WP08-27b contains provisions that
5 will be important for administering this hunt. Close
6 monitoring will be essential to ensure that harvests
7 are sustainable and to enable managers to evaluate the
8 effects of the additional opportunity being provided in
9 federal regulation.

10

11 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Thank
12 you. Dan.

13

14 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. Lem, do you have
15 any sense that there are a number of unreported
16 harvests, even DLP or whatever, occurring now in this
17 area? I'm thinking more of Levelock, Kokhanok, Igiugig
18 area, not Naknek.

19

20 MR. BUTLER: Unreported harvest is
21 always a tough one to get a handle on, but we know that
22 particularly in some villages more than others there
23 can be significant amounts of unreported harvest. I
24 don't know how much detail you want on that, but, you
25 know, like 2004 we had seven bears killed illegally in
26 Katmai Preserve. And, you know, that's just what we
27 knew about, because that -- and that was occurring in
28 an area that was more heavily monitored. What may
29 happen closer to town in the dark of night is, you
30 know, unknown. But, yeah, we do have a sense that a
31 lot of people are probably harvesting bears and not
32 reporting then. Usually it's nuisance bear issues, you
33 know. Bears are coming into town, causing trouble, and
34 people are dealing with them as they see fit.

35

36 MR. DUNAWAY: Well, the thought occurs
37 to me here, Madame Chairman, I wonder if there's a
38 chance if you had a sanctioned hunt like this, would --
39 and maybe Lem can address this, too, is there a chance
40 that maybe you'd get a little more reporting on -- and
41 reduce the unreported take a little bit, or is that
42 just wishful thinking?

43

44 MR. BUTLER: I think it is just wishful
45 thinking. Yeah. You never -- making something legal
46 that's occurring illegally, I mean, is kind of a
47 juxtaposition. I mean, if it's illegal, it's illegal
48 for a reason, usually a conservation reason, so making
49 it legal, while you will hear about it more, it's still
50 that conservation issue to deal with. But what you see

1 a lot of times with these bears that aren't being
2 reported again is that people just don't want to deal
3 with the bear. It's cheap and easy to shoot them and
4 let them run off into the dark and not have to skin
5 them or anything. You know, making it legal, make them
6 salvage the hide, and make them salvage the skull, you
7 know, you're not going to hear about that portion of
8 the bear harvest. You know, if there was -- people
9 that are legitimately taking it for subsistence needs
10 or for recreational support, you know, hunting under
11 the general season, are more like -- those people are
12 more likely to report than your DLP bear issues that
13 are the bulk of the unreported.

14

15 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. I'm sorry if I'm
16 asking an assumed thing, does the Department support or
17 oppose this proposal?

18

19 MR. BUTLER: This proposal, we're
20 waiting to I guess just get a general sense. And when
21 I say we, I'm talking about the State, so it's not just
22 me that's able to offer any perspective on this. As
23 has been noted, we can harvest 10 bears in 9C. That's
24 not an issue. If it becomes an issue when combined
25 with the State season, we may look at season closures.
26 I don't have a problem closing seasons by emergency
27 order if need be. But it does put some people into a
28 bind if that happens -- if the closure happens and it
29 affects the commercial guide, you know, that puts his
30 business into some issues. So it's not really
31 something we want to see done, but, again, if that's
32 the -- if this is the direction the Council wants to
33 go, then there are 10 bears that can be harvested from
34 this area.

35

36 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. One more. So then
37 this would just add more kind of fragmentation to
38 seasons, because I realized reading some of this stuff,
39 I'm not sure I have a real strong grip on it all. It's
40 spread out a lot, but from where the.....

41

42 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Well, your
43 subsistence hunt runs those same dates I thought you
44 said, isn't that.....

45

46 MR. BUTLER: In 9B we have a season I
47 think from September 1st until May 30th every year,
48 requires meat salvage. That's the registration brown
49 bear hunt for 9B. 9C, we have a nuisance brown bear
50 hunt in the Naknek drainage, but we don't have anything

1 in the Branch River drainage or Katmai Preserve. So we
2 -- there's already kind of a convoluted permit and
3 season system.

4
5 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. So
6 that's just that one area. Okay. Okay.

7
8 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. That's all I had
9 for Lem. Thanks.

10
11 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Molly.

12
13 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Well, the first
14 question you answered, and that was the one that Dan
15 asked you.

16
17 But, you know, as far as people
18 harvesting bears, I know when I worked up in Igiugig,
19 there were bears in the village, and they were -- they
20 could be easily harvested. But people didn't want to
21 harvest the garbage -- they call them the garbage
22 bears, because they're coming into the city garbage,
23 eating, and they weren't going to harvest those bears
24 to eat.

25
26 The people up in Igiugig prefer the fat
27 of the bear over even seal oil.

28
29 And so that's -- and so even if the
30 bears are available right there in their back yard,
31 they may kill them to protect their winter harv -- or
32 winter food, you know, the fish that they're drying and
33 whatever else that they're processing for winter use.
34 But they're not going to be harvesting bears that are
35 coming into the communities eating their garbage for
36 home use.

37
38 MR. BUTLER: If I could ask a question,
39 what period of time was that, just out of curiosity,
40 that you were in Igiugig?

41
42 MS. CHYTHLOOK: For baseline surveys?

43
44 MR. BUTLER: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

45
46 MS. CHYTHLOOK: It was probably in the
47 late 80s, 90s. Late 80s early 90s. That's why I was
48 asking her about the baseline information.

49
50 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Well noted

1 though, Molly. I agree a lot of people aren't
2 interested in the garbage bears.
3
4 Any other questions for Lem.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
9 Federal, State and tribal agency comments. Do we have
10 any.
11
12 (No comments)
13
14 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Let's
15 go on to InterAgency Staff Committee comments.
16
17 MR. RABINOWITCH: None.
18
19 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: None. And
20 we don't have any Fish and Game -- can we pretty much
21 say none on that, too, Joe?
22
23 MR. CHYTHLOOK: Yeah.
24
25 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Summary of
26 written public comments.
27
28 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair and
29 Council. There weren't any written public comments for
30 27b.
31
32 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: They only
33 addressed the a one. Okay. Public testimony. Joe?
34
35 (No comments)
36
37 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: No? Okay.
38 Shall we take a close look at it? Does somebody want
39 to put it on the table.
40
41 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah. Madame Chair. I
42 move we adopt Proposal WP08-27b.
43
44 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Do I hear a
45 second.
46
47 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Second.
48
49 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Seconded by
50 Molly. Discussion. Go ahead, Randy.

1 MR. ALVAREZ: On Page 46 in our
2 booklet, biological background. And if you look on the
3 second paragraph down, you know, it talks about aerial
4 surveys in Katmai National Preserve during August 2006
5 and 7. They counted 331 bears and 581 bears
6 respectively. It's -- that is a large amount of bears.
7 And then also down at that last paragraph before
8 harvest history, it says during 2004 and 5, work survey
9 by National Park Service and ADF&G estimated 2,255
10 bears. That's plus or minus 306 in a much larger
11 portion of 9C, so, you know, I don't think -- you know,
12 just looking at these numbers, the population is
13 extremely high in my opinion.

14
15 And then on the next page over, on 47,
16 on that graph right there where it talks about the
17 harvest of bears, it shows you the 25-year average and
18 the average since 2000 and then the 2005 average.
19 Well, the age of the bears have been going up, and also
20 the harvest numbers. So if you're harvesting more
21 bears during this time, and the age of the bears are
22 going up, there must be a lot of bears available in my
23 opinion. Because the harvest is going up and the age
24 of the bears is going up also. So it must be real --
25 you know, it has to be a healthy bear population to be
26 able to do that.

27
28 And I'll be supporting the proposal.
29 Madame Chair.

30
31 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
32 Any other comments.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Question.

37
38 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Let me make
39 one comment. I would tend to agree with you, too,
40 Randy. I think as long as we have safeguards in here
41 as far as the ability to close it if necessary in case
42 for some reason in the future, you know, if our fish
43 don't come back or something, we don't have the
44 numbers, we've got safeguards in there to protect our
45 populations, I don't have a problem with this either.

46
47 But I guess I would wonder, too, if we
48 wanted to hear some discussion on the proposed changes
49 that OSM made as opposed to the way it's written. Does
50 anybody have anything they'd like to comment as far as

1 that goes.

2

3 Dan.

4

5 MR. DUNAWAY: I'd be inclined to
6 support those changes. And with all due respect to
7 Molly's call for the question, I.....

8

9 MS. CHYTHLOOK: I can.....

10

11 MR. DUNAWAY: I'm also kind of
12 thinking, I'm seeing two bear guides, one right here on
13 the Council, and one sitting in the audience, but I
14 don't see any really strong objection to having this
15 kind of hunt. And I think Randy made a really good
16 point that slipped by me in my reading here, that
17 they're harvesting more bears, but the average age is
18 older. That's kind of interesting. So I'm inclined to
19 support it, albeit I really feel torn about fragmenting
20 the hunting and fishing regulations in this state.
21 It's so fragmented I'm uncomfortable with it, but to
22 preserve some opportunity, I'm inclined to -- it also
23 looks like Lem's anxious to say something, so I'll cut
24 my comments short.

25

26 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Cliff.

27

28 MR. EDENSHAW: Yes. Madame Chair and
29 Council, if you look on Page 47 and 48, Randy's motion
30 was to adopt, but on Page 47 there's modifications, and
31 the Council's original proposal was to harvest 10
32 bears, so on Pages 47 and 48, the OSM preliminary
33 conclusion is to modify it, and if you look on Page 48,
34 it has the stipulations or the modification. And
35 perhaps Laura can come up here and answer some
36 questions, but I'm pretty sure that when the Council
37 made a proposal last year, it was for 10 bear. And so
38 this is modified in here. So Randy's motion should
39 address whether it's with modification or the original
40 proposal by the Council, which was 10 bear, and the
41 season.

42

43 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Do you want
44 to address that first, Randy.

45

46 MR. ALVAREZ: Sure. Our original
47 proposal was for 10 bears, but this is a modification.
48 The difference is 4 females or 10 bears.

49

50 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah, and

1 the superintendent plus BLM and Fish and Wildlife
2 Service. So there's two.

3

4 Where did Laura go? Just to save you
5 from coming up again, those were the two changes in the
6 modification, correct, that all three agencies would be
7 brought together on the closure of it, and the 10 bears
8 or 4 females. Those were the two changes to the
9 original proposal, is that correct?

10

11 MS. GREFFENIUS: Yes, the season's the
12 same. It's the Park superintendent could do the
13 closure, but in consultation, right, with the other
14 agencies.

15

16 I wouldn't say it's an or. It's when 4
17 females or 10 bears have been taken, whichever occurs
18 first, so -- there's or in there, but there could be 10
19 bears or it could be only 4 bears. It's not a 4 or 10
20 bear decision, whichever comes first in those
21 reporting. So that's -- and you need to clarify
22 whether you're voting on -- if you're adopting the
23 original proposal from the Council or the modified.

24

25 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Cliff, did
26 you have something else you wanted to add?

27

28 MR. EDENSHAW: Yes. I was going to
29 just add what Laura said. With Randy's motion, I just
30 need clarification if that's to adopt the Council's
31 original proposal versus.....

32

33 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The
34 modified.

35

36 MR. EDENSHAW: Mainly that's what I
37 need to know, is if that's the original proposal,
38 Randy.

39

40 MR. ALVAREZ: I'm thinking about that.
41 If I want to move to do it like that or keep the
42 original proposal. Four females. That could -- you
43 could eat up the harvest in a hurry if they shot all
44 females, so and I don't -- with the amount of bears, I
45 don't see a problem with harvesting more than four
46 females. I don't like the four female part.

47

48 Is there a reason for four females.

49

50 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Mary, do you

1 remember the history behind that for up in Lake Clark?
2 Or, go ahead, Sandy. Sure. Please.

3
4 MR. RABINOWITCH: Good afternoon. I'm
5 Sandy Rabinowitch with the Park Service.

6
7 And I was involved in the development
8 of the regulation many years ago, actually not in this
9 room, but in King Salmon for Lake Clark, that Nanci was
10 just asking about.

11
12 And in a nutshell, it was a
13 conservation concern for Lake Clark. The population, I
14 can't remember the numbers from 1994 very well, but the
15 concern was that the overall numbers of bears were
16 fewer than what you're talking about here, and they
17 didn't want to over-harvest. So they added in the four
18 females as a conservation concern so that they didn't
19 run into over-harvest problems, because in that case
20 they were proposing a year-round season. If you look
21 at the season for Lake Clark, it's 365 days a year. So
22 it was kind of a weighing and balancing of different
23 components of the hunt.

24
25 What I would tell you, the Park Service
26 experience in Lake Clark, and let me say I can't
27 guarantee that it would transfer here. I mean, it's a
28 different place, different villages. But the
29 experience there is they've never closed that hunt
30 because of reaching 10 bears, and they've never closed
31 it because of reaching 4 females. So what I'm saying
32 is, the demand in that hunt, which is five villages,
33 has been very small.

34
35 Now, we didn't know that 10 years ago
36 or 15 years ago when it started, but that's what it's
37 turned out, that the demand's been very small, and the
38 harvest level I think's been at the most maybe four
39 total in any one year. So whether that would transfer
40 to this area or not, you all are a better judge of
41 that, you know, than I am. I don't know. But that's
42 why the four females in that case.

43
44 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you,
45 Sandy. Do you have question for him, Randy.

46
47 MR. ALVAREZ: I guess I need to clarify
48 my motion. I could go along with the modification
49 except for the 4 females, when 10 bears have been
50 taken. Well, or six females My original -- I thought

1 maybe it shouldn't be any more than six bears. But
2 four, if they shot four bears, which, you know, that
3 could happen rather quickly, and the season would be
4 over. I just didn't think that was enough. So I
5 guess.....
6
7 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Well, I
8 guess I would like to see a little bit of a door stop
9 there again in case there's conservation issues in the
10 future, so maybe -- I mean, I think I could live with
11 six. I see exactly what you're saying. And I guess
12 I'd like to see a little buffer zone there somehow.
13
14 MR. ALVAREZ: Well, I could amend my --
15 if you'll agree, I would amend my motion -- or withdraw
16 my motion and make it so -- with this amendment with
17 six females. Should we discuss that?
18
19 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah. Who
20 was our.....
21
22 MR. DUNAWAY: I think Molly was the
23 second.
24
25 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Who was our
26 second?
27
28 MS. CHYTHLOOK: I am.
29
30 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Would you
31 agree to that.
32
33 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Yes.
34
35 MR. ALVAREZ: Okay. So I can.....
36
37 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Let's
38 discuss it then.
39
40 MR. ALVAREZ: Should we discuss it
41 before I change the motion?
42
43 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: No, go ahead
44 and change your motion.
45
46 MR. BOSKOFKY: You're redoing your
47 motion with modifications.
48
49 MR. ALVAREZ: Okay. Madame Chair.
50 I'll restate my motion. Adopt Proposal WP08-27b with

1 modification, and I would recommend with six females or
2 10 bears have been taken, and that it can be closed by
3 the National Park Service superintendent or the BLM and
4 Fish and Wildlife managers. But just change instead of
5 four, six. The same writing as there, but six.

6

7 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. So to
8 clarify it, Meredith, as written on Page 48 with the
9 exception of four females, six females. Is that
10 correct, Randy.

11

12 MR. ALVAREZ: (Nods affirmative)

13

14 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay A
15 second.

16

17 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Second.

18

19 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Alvin.
20 Okay. Discussion.

21

22 MR. DUNAWAY: Nanci, I think it looks
23 like a few bureaucracy kind of folks have been buzzing
24 back here. I think Lem stood up at one point. I see
25 Jerry. And I guess would be real interested to hear
26 anything those folks want to speak to before we get
27 much further.

28

29 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The
30 microphone's yours.

31

32 MR. BERG: Thank you, Ms. Chair. Jerry
33 Berg with Fish and Wildlife Service for the record.

34

35 I just wanted to want to point out that
36 typically we have in many instances in our regulations
37 where we delegate the authority to the land manager in
38 consultation with the other agencies. We typically
39 include ADF&G in that consultation, and for some reason
40 it was left out on this one. So you just may want to
41 think about including ADF&G in that consultation.

42

43 Thank you, Ms. Chair.

44

45 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I wondered
46 about that.

47

48 MR. ALVAREZ: So move.

49

50 MS. CHYTHLOOK: The second?

1 MR. BOSKOFISKY: (Nods affirmative)
2
3 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Thank
4 you. Lem, did you have anything you wanted to add,
5 too?
6
7 MR. BUTLER: Only if you want to keep
8 talking about harvest, I can help you. But if you're
9 done with the discussion about harvest.....
10
11 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Well, did
12 you have some comments between the four to six females?
13
14 MR. BUTLER: For the record, Lem
15 Butler.
16
17 You know, the only question I had was,
18 and maybe Molly can help us with this, is what are the
19 customary and traditional uses of brown bears? Does it
20 tend to be more of a male preference or a female
21 preference? Is there a preference? Is it more of a
22 spring issue or a fall issue when it comes to harvest?
23 To some degree, that plays -- as the bear hunt manager,
24 you know, that makes a big difference to me how those
25 questions would be answered in terms of how I answer.
26
27 MS. CHYTHLOOK: I'm not a bear eater,
28 but.....
29
30 MR. ALVAREZ: There's a bear eater
31 right there.
32
33 MR. BUTLER: Yeah.
34
35 (Laughter)
36
37 MR. HEDLUND: No, it doesn't make any
38 difference.
39
40 MR. DUNAWAY: The length.
41
42 MR. HEDLUND: The fur in the fall and
43 the biggest they can get.
44
45 MR. BUTLER: So probably a male
46 preference in that.....
47
48 MR. HEDLUND: Because of the fat. It
49 is, but you can't tell which is which. I mean, there
50 -- it's impossible. So, I mean, you know, I've been

1 trying for 40 years to try to figure out if it's a male
2 or female, and it's a 50/50 chance.

3

4 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. Yeah. And
5 typical.....

6

7 MR. HEDLUND: But they prefer the
8 bigger, because it's usually more fat, and that's what
9 they're after.

10

11 MR. BOSKOFKY: Growing up, they used
12 to get them in the springtime. They weren't as strong
13 I guess or something.

14

15 MR. BUTLER: Uh-huh. A typical fall
16 harvest is 50 percent male, 50 percent female. So, you
17 know, that would -- if the preference is for a fall
18 harvest, you know, you're not really talking that much
19 of a difference. In the end, when you combine the
20 spring and fall harvest, we want to have a 60 percent
21 male harvest, but typically your spring harvests are 70
22 percent male, 30 percent female, and it kind of washes
23 out. So if you're talking about again a fall harvest,
24 you know, something close to 50 percent seems
25 reasonable to me.

26

27 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.

28

29 MR. ALVAREZ: Lem, what do you think
30 about this six, changing it to six instead of four.

31

32 MR. BUTLER: Again, you're so close to
33 50 percent right there that I don't have an opinion.

34

35 MR. ALVAREZ: Thanks.

36

37 MR. HEDLUND: As a rule, I don't like
38 seeing, you know, sows shot, because they are the, you
39 know, bear producers. And so I had no qualms about the
40 four count.

41

42 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah, but you just got
43 done saying it's hard to tell the difference.

44

45 MR. HEDLUND: You can't tell. But like
46 I said, I mean, I don't like seeing sows shot, and
47 that's kind of why I supported that four count. That's
48 the reason.

49

50 MR. BUTLER: And probably worth nothing

1 there, too, if the female has cubs, there's probably
2 going to be some selection against females if you're
3 going to adult body sizes.
4
5 MR. HEDLUND: Yeah. Yeah.
6
7 MR. BUTLER: And just -- so there's a
8 good chance that you end up with a good ratio even with
9 a relatively unselective harvest.
10
11 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Anybody
12 else.
13
14 MR. WOODS: Just a quick -- Frank Wood
15 speaking. On the reporting.....
16
17 REPORTER: Would you come up to the
18 microphone, sir.
19
20 MR. WOODS: Frank Woods, BBNA. I just
21 wanted to point out that subsistence uses -- or the
22 density of bears I don't think is the problem. I think
23 just allowing it to happen is -- and how we do it is
24 like -- and I agree with Randy and you both, but I'm
25 more akin to the subsistence user, and if they don't
26 report on time, and the fifth person that gets a
27 female, how are we going to regulate that person and
28 manage for keeping that number four for females,
29 because we don't want to make criminals out of the
30 subsistence users. So that's a cautions I'd like to
31 present.
32
33 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
34
35 MR. ALVAREZ: Call for the question.
36
37 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The
38 question's been called for. All those in favor please
39 signify by saying aye.
40
41 IN UNISON: Aye.
42
43 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Opposed,
44 same sign.
45
46 (No opposing votes)
47
48 MR. ABRAHAM: Nanci, time out.
49
50 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Time out.

1 Pete says time out. What do you want, 10 minutes,
2 Pete.
3
4 (Off record)
5
6 (On record)
7
8 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Let's go
9 ahead and get started. Laura, could you bring us WP08-
10 28, please.
11
12 MS. GREFFENIUS: all right. Thank you.
13 My name is Laura Greffenius with the OSM.
14
15 This one begins on Page 49 in your
16 book.
17
18 MR. ALVAREZ: 49?
19
20 MS. GREFFENIUS: Page 49.
21
22 MR. ABRAHAM: 29.
23
24 MR. ALVAREZ: 49.
25
26 MS. GREFFENIUS: And we're on WP08-28.
27 And I'll just mention in the subsistence regs, if
28 you've got them right in front of you, if you want to
29 just refer, it's on Page 18 in the right-hand column.
30 This proposal is dealing with what under these -- most
31 of you have it back there. So Page 18. This
32 proposal's dealing with what's in the right-hand
33 column, headed designated hunter. So it would be
34 changing that right there. So just letting you know
35 that that's where it is. It's not unit specific.
36
37 MR. ABRAHAM: On page what?
38
39 MS. GREFFENIUS: Page 18 in the right-
40 hand column, the green heading that says designated
41 hunter. So the language in this proposal would be
42 changing that first line of that.
43
44 MR. EDENSHAW: Alvin, she's referring
45 to the regulations.
46
47 MS. GREFFENIUS: Page 18. I'll go
48 ahead and get started while you're looking for that.
49
50 This proposals been submitted by the

1 Bristol Bay Council, and it requests that residents of
2 the Bristol Bay region in Units 9A, 9B, 9C, 9E and 17
3 be included in the general provisions allowing
4 designated hunter provisions statewide for deer, moose
5 and caribou. And these units are the only units in the
6 State where there's not a general provision allowing
7 for designated hunter permits for deer, moose and
8 caribou.

9

10 And in your books, for the proposed
11 regulation, on the top of Page 51, I just want to point
12 out, we have the existing regulation, and then the
13 proposed regulation. The first line when it says -- it
14 should read, hunting by designated harvest permit in
15 Units -- it should be a strike through. It didn't come
16 through on here. It should be a strike through and say
17 Units 1 through 26 in bold. The way it is in your
18 book, the existing and the proposed are the same.

19

20 So what we're proposing is that it
21 would be Units 1 through -- it would read, hunting by
22 designated harvest permit in Units 1 through 26 if you
23 are a Federally-qualified subsistence user, et cetera.
24 So that's what the proposed regulation is. It was
25 correct in the proposal book, and it was an error in
26 here and I wanted to make sure that was pointed out.

27

28 Since the Council submitted this
29 proposal, then you know that you'd like eligible
30 residents in the region to be able to hunt moose or
31 caribou under the designated hunter provisions that are
32 already established in all other units throughout the
33 State. And as you know, deer are not available in this
34 region, so it would not apply here.

35

36 Currently the provision is for all
37 other units except 9A, 9B, 9C, 9E and 17 in this
38 region. The change in the regulations would provide
39 the same benefits to Federally-qualified subsistence
40 users in the Bristol Bay region that others receive
41 statewide when harvesting moose and caribou, and would
42 provide uniform opportunity to all subsistence users.

43

44 Designated hunter permits are currently
45 allowed through unit-specific regulations for
46 harvesting caribou in Units 9C, 9D, 9E, and 17A and C.
47 So when we say unit specific, it means when you just go
48 to the units and that page, then it has the designated
49 hunter information for caribou, whereas this one is --
50 this proposal is pertaining to the general provisions,

1 like I mentioned on, Page 18.

2

3 There are no designated hunter permits
4 currently allowed in Units 9A and B and 17B for
5 harvesting moose.

6

7 So if this proposal is adopted, it
8 would provide the same designated hunter provisions to
9 Federally-qualified subsistence users, subsistence
10 hunters in the Bristol Bay region for harvesting moose
11 and caribou that are provided in all of the other units
12 statewide. And it would also provide a uniform
13 designated hunter provision to all subsistence users.

14

15 And extending this designated hunter
16 provision to moose and caribou in 9 and 17 should not
17 have a significant impact upon the resources, and the
18 designated hunter permits are currently allowed for
19 harvesting caribou in much of Units 9 and 17, and this
20 action would provide this opportunity to subsistence
21 users to harvest or benefit from the harvest of the
22 deer, moose and caribou in all areas of the State.

23

24 So essentially, like I said, it's going
25 to say Units 1 through 26, and it won't be excluding
26 any areas at all.

27

28 So the OSM preliminary conclusion is to
29 support the proposal. And the justification as I had
30 mentioned is providing the same benefits for
31 subsistence users in the Bristol Bay region that others
32 are now having statewide. And the designated hunter
33 permits are already allowed through unit specific
34 regulations for harvesting caribou in Unit 9C, D, E and
35 17A and C, so it would just be adding the moose and no
36 significant affects on the resources are anticipated

37

38 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
39 Anybody have questions.

40

41 MS. GREFFENIUS: Any questions on that
42 one.

43

44 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Go ahead,
45 Dan.

46

47 MR. DUNAWAY: Do we know why they were
48 excluded in the first place?

49

50 MS. GREFFENIUS: Well, in the

1 regulatory history there was just a comment in what I
2 was reading through this. I just didn't go into all
3 the details of the past. At the time when -- let's
4 see, I'll refer you to Page 52. There's that
5 paragraph. And it talks about when the designated
6 hunter proposals came about, it looks like in 2003, and
7 the Council, this particular Council apparently chose
8 -- and there was also 2005. This particular Council
9 preferred to have designated hunter provisions to be
10 put in place by units. And so that's -- it looks like
11 that's the reason. So it can just be changed to make
12 it so it's the same throughout the State.

13

14 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Anything
15 else, Dan?

16

17 MR. DUNAWAY: No.

18

19 MS. GREFFENIUS: Any other questions on
20 this proposal.

21

22 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Molly.

23

24 MS. CHYTHLOOK: So Unit 9A, B, C and E
25 didn't have the designated hunter? Or is it the other
26 way around, in 17.

27

28 MS. GREFFENIUS: Right now, under
29 existing Federal regulations on Page 50, or if you're
30 looking at your book, you can see that 9D is the only
31 one for Unit 9 that's included.

32

33 MS. CHYTHLOOK: That has the designated
34 hunter.

35

36 MS. GREFFENIUS: That's presently in
37 place. Uh-huh. Yeah. So this would be including the
38 other subunits of 9 and then including 17.

39

40 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Well, this looks like
41 it's writing down something that's been happening.
42 It's already in place that people normally do.

43

44 MS. GREFFENIUS: It's in place for
45 caribou in your area, but not for moose. So it would
46 be adding that.

47

48 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: So this
49 would basically just expand it to moose, too.

50

1 MS. GREFFENIUS: Uh-huh. And it would
2 just make it -- it would read Units 1 through 26.
3
4 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
5
6 MR. DUNAWAY: Well, that might be moose
7 are so touchy. A concern.
8
9 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I don't
10 remember the history. Anybody else, questions.
11
12 MR. ALVAREZ: I'll bring it up when we
13 come to deliberations, but that brings a point. Remind
14 me.
15
16 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. I
17 will. Thank you, Laura.
18
19 MS. GREFFENIUS: Uh-huh.
20
21 MR. BUTLER: Ms. Chair. Members of the
22 Council. Lem Butler.
23
24 The State hasn't taken a stance on this
25 proposal either. We're again waiting to hear more from
26 the Council and what's said here.
27
28 But in our comments, we do note that no
29 evidence is presented indicating the proposed changes
30 are needed to provide for the continued subsistence use
31 of moose and caribou on Federal lands for Federally-
32 qualified subsistence users.
33
34 And we'd also note that, of course,
35 this is going to only apply to Federal lands. There
36 are differences between the State's proxy system and
37 this Federal designated hunter, and, you know, it's
38 just really important to stress that with -- for the
39 people participating in this so they don't violate
40 laws.
41
42 That's all I have for you.
43
44 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
45 Preliminary Comments to the Regional Advisory Council.
46
47 Wildlife Proposal WP08-28: Expand
48 designated hunter provisions in Units 9 and 17.
49
50 Introduction:

1 By extending the federal designated
2 hunter provisions to portions of Units 9 and 17 where
3 they are currently not in effect (to include residents
4 of Units 9A, 9B, 9C, 9E, and 17), the intent of this
5 proposal is to authorize federally-qualified
6 subsistence users from these units to harvest moose and
7 caribou for other federally-qualified subsistence
8 users. The unit-specific federal regulations already
9 authorize designated hunting of bull caribou in Units
10 9C and 9E and of caribou hunts administered by federal
11 registration permit in Unit 17A and in that portion of
12 Unit 17C consisting of the Nushagak Peninsula south of
13 the Igushik River, Tuklung River, Tuklung Hills, and
14 west to Tvativak Bay.

15

16 Impact on Subsistence Users:

17

18 Designated hunting, as proposed, would
19 provide somewhat more opportunity for federally-
20 qualified subsistence users than is available in the
21 State of Alaska s proxy hunting provisions and in the
22 current federal regulations. In both instances, the
23 goal is to help ensure that wildlife resources are
24 available to residents who are unable to hunt for
25 themselves.

26

27 Opportunity Provided by State:

28

29 State regulations allow an Alaska
30 resident to hunt for another Alaska resident who is
31 blind, 70% disabled, or 65 years of age or older.
32 State proxy hunting is allowed for all deer hunts, most
33 caribou hunts, and some moose hunts across the state.
34 For the specific areas referenced in this proposal
35 (Units 9A, 9B, 9C within the Alagnak River drainage,
36 and 17B and 17C), proxy hunting is allowed for
37 Mulchatna herd caribou after November 1. Proxy hunting
38 is also allowed for moose in these units and in Unit 9E
39 where the legal animal is any bull moose or an
40 antlerless moose.

41

42 Enforcement Issues:

43

44 Differences in federal and state
45 regulations resulting from adoption of this proposal
46 will create enforcement issues in areas with mixed land
47 ownership. Hunters, as well as state and federal
48 administrators, may have difficulty distinguishing
49 between state and federal lands in Units 9 and 17.

50

1 to get me one caribou. Well, that took care of my
2 immediate family. I would have loved the opportunity
3 to be able to share more, to send more to Port Heiden,
4 and to one grumpy old man I know down in Perryville.
5 But anyway, that -- we didn't have that opportunity.
6 And I know my children would appreciate that
7 opportunity. And we have done that for generations.

8
9 And I would -- one request for the
10 State people, that I wish they would leave the term
11 deer in there, because with -- envisioning a new
12 species and things, there may become a time where we
13 will see deer on the Alaska Peninsula. Moose is the
14 same thing.

15
16 Only with moose, you get so much more
17 usable product out of there, that we're able to share a
18 great deal.

19
20 And I think the most important thing is
21 that to allow us to -- if you are going to continue to
22 use the term subsistence, and that be exactly what that
23 is, the way we view it, is the eager take to sustain
24 and to share.

25
26 And so I know that you have a lot of
27 work to do, and I just took time to come in. I
28 appreciate your consideration, and I hope that there's
29 a positive outcome of this, and we're able to provide
30 for those who don't have caribou.

31
32 Thank you very much.

33
34 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
35 Any questions.

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
40 Go ahead, Frank.

41
42 MR. WOODS: Yeah, Frank Woods, BBNA, in
43 support of the proposal before you.

44
45 We have a decline in the Mulchatna
46 herd, and we have a local Peninsula herd down in Cape
47 Constantine. This would pertain to our Unit, it looks
48 like 18 through 26. In behalf of, you know, like the
49 elderly and handicapped, I know that personally I could
50 possibly -- and that would be hunting on Togiak

1 National Wildlife Refuge. And the State, like Lem
2 pointed out, does have them provisions, but it isn't
3 specific enough to allow me to harvest for say like my
4 grandmother and my mom. So as a subsistence user, an
5 avid subsistence user, I'm in favor of this to allow
6 for that provision.
7
8 Thanks.
9
10 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
11 Dan. Go ahead.
12
13 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Frank.
14
15 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Frank, a
16 question.
17
18 MR. DUNAWAY: I'm not -- you might be
19 able to answer this question for me. This map's really
20 handy in remembering where the Federal lands are, but
21 were you working with Mr. Asplund over in Naknek? He
22 made a request to us about some sort of a special
23 season.
24
25 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: That's kind
26 of how this got initiate.
27
28 MR. ALVAREZ: That's how we brought up
29 this proposal, because that's what he was asking.
30
31 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. And so that's what
32 I was wondering. Would this kind of answer what Mr.
33 Asplund was asking?
34
35 MR. ALVAREZ: I think so.
36
37 MR. WOODS: This would streamline it on
38 Federal lands. I don't know where it would be on State
39 lands, but he'd have to piggyback their program. I
40 know there's a proxy hunt I think it is, I believe.
41 But this would kind of, on Federal lands, make it a
42 little more user friendly I would think.
43
44 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. Great. Thank you.
45
46 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Thank
47 you.
48
49 Do we have any public written.
50

1 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair and
2 Council. The Aniakchak SRC met and they wrote for
3 Proposal WP08-28 to allow designated hunters in Units
4 9A, B, C, E, and 17, they support the proposal.
5 Sharing is a key value embodied in the subsistence
6 lifestyle. This proposal supports the spirit of
7 subsistence by allowing subsistence users with the
8 ability and means to harvest animals to provide meat
9 for those who do not.

10

11 And that was it.

12

13 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
14 Joe.

15

16 MR. KLUTSCH: Thank you, Madame Chair.
17 I would agree wholeheartedly with the things that Norm
18 has said and some of the other folks regarding the
19 tradition of sharing and the importance of sharing;
20 however, my concern with this proposal is the potential
21 for certain individuals to be more than just
22 competitive on a given species. It's a tremendous
23 amount of power could be conveyed to one individual,
24 one or two individuals, if there not any guidelines or
25 any limits on how many designated -- how many hunters
26 that this individual could take out. And regrettably,
27 there are certain individuals and certain personalities
28 out there that would take this thing and run with it.
29 And that could provide -- could result in competition
30 between subsistence users. Especially if you've got
31 some of the folks with the airplanes that are tached up
32 and ready to go, they can get on a creek drainage if
33 it's right, and if they -- and there are some of them
34 that will do it. They're going to hit it and hit it
35 hard, and that's going to make it tough for those other
36 people who want to go out there and do their own
37 hunting. Just a thought.

38

39 And I know that from my own experience
40 in Kodiak where they have a registration goat permit
41 over there, you have to show up in person to get the
42 registration permit and you can hunt by proxy. And
43 that has worked pretty well.

44

45 But there are -- there's one individual
46 in particular that by his own -- I mean, he'll just
47 tell you, if I can get -- the more of these
48 registration permits I get, and I -- he'd just shoot
49 every goat he could draw a bead on. I mean, he'd just
50 tell you that. And that doesn't settle well with a lot

1 of the other people in the village, but that's what he
2 does. And the only thing that's keeping him in check
3 are the State proxy hunting provisions.
4
5 And so that's just a thought. And that
6 concludes my comment.
7
8 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you,
9 Joe. Any questions.
10
11 (No comments)
12
13 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Shall
14 we bring it to the table.
15
16 MR. ALVAREZ: Madam Chair. I move we
17 adopt Proposal WP08-28. And is there any modification?
18 I guess not.
19
20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Just with
21 the corrections that Laura gave us is probably good
22 enough.
23
24 MR. DUNAWAY: I'll second.
25
26 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Dan
27 seconded. Go ahead, Randy.
28
29 MR. ALVAREZ: You were supposed to
30 remind me.
31
32 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I've got it
33 right here. Randy.
34
35 MR. DUNAWAY: That's why she called on
36 you first.
37
38 MR. ALVAREZ: As it was written, you
39 know, we asked that Units 9A, B, C, and E and 17
40 included. You know, why put all Units 1 through 26 in
41 there? Because we don't know the circumstances of what
42 happens, what's going on elsewhere. If there's a
43 problem somewhere with this, having a proxy system, we
44 could end up with nothing. And if we just left it the
45 way it was, and those that already have the system,
46 wouldn't that be much better?
47
48 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I think what
49 they did is just rewrite this one, the one they have in
50 place, because we were excluded from it. And now we're

1 a part of it.

2

3 MS. PETRIVELLI: Madame Chairman. My
4 name is Pat Petrivelli.

5

6 In 2003, I got to write the analysis
7 when these regulations were adopted. And, of course, I
8 didn't attend the Bristol Bay meeting, so I don't know,
9 but at that time they were looking at all the
10 designated hunter provisions across the State, so the
11 reason it would change to 1 to 26 is that you would add
12 the ones who were missing, and the only ones that were
13 missing would be 9A, B, C, and E and 17. So all
14 throughout the State they said they would take -- you
15 know, have the designated hunter provisions.

16

17 And, of course, the changes that are
18 unit specific, like in some areas they allow -- the
19 statewide provision allows just in possession two
20 harvest limits at the most. But in some areas, because
21 of distances traveled, they make unit specific
22 provisions for certain species that have three harvest
23 limits in possession because of fuel and other
24 considerations. And then Unit 6, the Southcentral
25 Council decided to have the State provisions that say
26 for Unit 6 moose, that it has to be -- you have to be
27 over 65, the same exact provisions as the State allows,
28 and not just a general Federal.

29

30 So that each region was allowed to take
31 into account local areas. But the reason Laura wrote
32 it as Unit 1 through 26 is that by adding Bristol Bay
33 in there, then the whole State would allow designated
34 hunter provisions that are not just -- well, that would
35 just be -- that's why you're not make a recommendation
36 statewide, but you're just -- by adding 9A, B, C and E
37 and 17, then it would be statewide.

38

39 MR. ALVAREZ: That solves that. Or
40 answers it.

41

42 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah. And
43 then I have a question just for clarification to make
44 sure I've got it right. And without us writing
45 specific provisions at this time, our default is to
46 this right here where the designated hunter.....

47

48 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah. Yeah, it would
49 be the default. So you would be going default with,
50 you know, just anyone that -- you know, anyone who

1 requests, you know, so anyone like in some areas
2 there's single mothers that want, you know, to have a
3 designated hunter. But then in other areas, I think
4 it's the Western Arctic Caribou Herd where there's a
5 very high caribou population, that they allowed the
6 three harvest limits in possession. But you know, it's
7 just -- and in some it is just only one harvest in
8 possession. If there's resource concern, you know,
9 those smaller populations, the goats and the others.
10 But you have the ability to make those recommendations
11 if you want, but it was felt that for caribou, moose
12 and deer, that general set would work. But you have
13 the ability to make whatever recommendations you want.

14
15 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Thank
16 you. That makes sense to me, because to me, I mean,
17 it's a place to start. If we find later it needs to be
18 expanded or retracted, then a person.....

19
20 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah. There's already a
21 limit there of how many.....

22
23 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Correct.

24
25 MR. ALVAREZ:how many permits,
26 designated hunter permits a person can have. And I
27 don't think we need to.....

28
29 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: At one time,
30 so they have to -- yeah, it's a common law.

31
32 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah, at one time. And I
33 don't think we need to limit it to 60 elders, you know,
34 because like she stated, there might be a single mother
35 that could -- you know, that doesn't have the means to
36 go out and do it.

37
38 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I agree.

39
40 MR. ALVAREZ: Or maybe it's somebody
41 that's disabled and not old enough.

42
43 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Correct.

44
45 MR. ALVAREZ: And I think it would have
46 to be, you know -- leave it the way it is here. It
47 looks good to me.

48
49 MR. ABRAHAM: (In Yup'ik)

50

1 MR. DUNAWAY: Do we have more testimony
2 to call up?
3
4 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: No, we're
5 deliberating.
6
7 MR. ALVAREZ: We're on deliberation.
8
9 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. Well, then I.....
10
11 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: We wanted
12 clarification, that's why we brought in Pat. So,
13 please.
14
15 MR. DUNAWAY: All right. I'm ready to
16 go. Does somebody else -- I have a question.
17
18 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Please.
19
20 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. Well, sitting here
21 thinking about it, wondering about why 9 and 17 aren't
22 in here, I suspect that knowing some of the leaders
23 formerly sitting on here in the Dillingham area, that
24 there probably was a real concern about the super moose
25 hunter especially. But I'm looking up here, there's
26 not lots of Federal land close to the Dillingham area.
27 And second to come, is there anybody in any of the
28 agencies out here that has experience, this has been
29 going on for several years in other parts of the State.
30 Do we -- Joe brought up the goat hunters in Kodiak, but
31 do we have any other places in the State where maybe
32 there's like one -- a problem with super hunters so to
33 speak. Can anybody speak to that that's in attendance
34 here?
35
36 MS. PETRIVELLI: Madame Chairman. I'd
37 just like to make a comment. It was in 1995 when they
38 first tried to make the exception and just to let
39 anyone do it. And for the Federal program to be ready,
40 I think they printed out like 6,000 designated permits
41 for Units 1 through 5, and I forget how many. And they
42 issued 100.
43
44 I think there was one hunt this year
45 that I heard someone complain about where they issued
46 70 permits in one area, but I think it was because the
47 limit's too low for that resource. But I've never
48 heard anyone complain about issuing too many designated
49 hunter permits.
50

1 There was that initial fear when the
2 Federal program took over from the State, and to be
3 prepared they printed out those thousands and thousands
4 of permits. And because it is -- as much as the
5 thought is nice, it is hard to get someone else to hunt
6 for you. But maybe someone else would have -- know
7 more specific knowledge.

8
9 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Sandy, do
10 you have something you'd like to add.

11
12 MR. RABINOWITCH: In response to your
13 question, one example I could tell you about is up in
14 the Kotzebue area, the NANA region. There was -- and
15 the Park Service has a lot of land in that area, so I
16 spent time up there. There was a problem dealing with
17 sheep, Dall sheep, and so if you look in here in Unit
18 23, what that Council went to is a designated hunter
19 may hunt only for one recipient in the course of a
20 season, all right, and may have no more than two
21 harvest limits, their own and that other one in
22 possession at the same time. They had trouble with
23 school teachers who typically come from out of their
24 region and teach school, and there was, you know, some
25 unhappiness in the community over multiple harvests
26 going on one year, so they came back and discussed it
27 just like you all are, and they came up with a little
28 tighter regulation. They did that only after they had
29 a problem. And the sheep hunt in the area, there's
30 been a lot of issues for a long time, so it's something
31 they've spent a lot of time on. So anyway they
32 tightened up when they had a problem, and that's how
33 they did it.

34
35 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Any other
36 questions or comments.

37
38 MR. ALVAREZ: I see another hand
39 popping up back there.

40
41 MR. BEYERSDORF: Geoff Beyersdorf with
42 the BLM.

43
44 And to the Chair and the Members of the
45 Council. Prior to my position with the BLM I was with
46 the Fish and Wildlife Service for the last several
47 years, and have experience both in issuing permits on
48 the Federal side for fisheries and for game management.
49 In both of those arenas we've issued the designated
50 hunter permits, and I've worked in the middle Yukon

1 area, the Galena/Huslia/Hughes area for the last
2 several years, and then also down on the Kenai, and we
3 haven't had an issue with the designated hunters in
4 those areas that I've been exposed to, both for
5 fisheries and for moose.

6

7 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.

8

9 MR. BEYERSDORF: Thanks.

10

11 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Frank.

12

13 MR. WOODS: I'd like to point out that
14 the regulation of the proposal says that it limits it
15 to deer, moose and caribou. You know, I think that the
16 concerns of Joe and the gentleman before talking about
17 the super hunters and the goats and the -- I think
18 traditionally for Native people, that we not only hunt
19 for our elders, but our people that can't hunt for
20 themselves. And I think that we live in pretty
21 moderate right now fuel prices. And, you know, right
22 now we're living off of \$56 barrel oil. That's from
23 last fall. It is now going to be -- this next barge
24 we're buying at the market price right now is \$100 a
25 barrel. So we're looking at a 40 percent increase. As
26 time goes on.....

27

28 MR. ALVAREZ: A point of order. We
29 were trying to discuss, we wanted to know if there's a
30 problem elsewhere, Frank. So we're in deliberation,
31 and can you close up here in a minute?

32

33 MR. WOODS: Okay. I'll close it up.

34 Thanks, Randy.

35

36 But I just wanted to point out that
37 people, you know, band together and harvest what they
38 need, and traditionally, you know, subsistence, that
39 was the uses, and I'll let you get back to business.

40

41 Thanks.

42

43 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.

44 Pete.

45

46 MR. PROBASCO: Madame Chair, I'll make
47 it real quick. Questions regarding the goat hunt on
48 Unit 8 in Kodiak, those would fall -- it's a State
49 registration hunt, and they would have to fall under
50 the State's proxy hunt, which is more restrictive than

1 the Federal. The Federal permits -- there are no
2 Federal permits for the Kodiak goat hunts. That's a
3 State hunt.

4
5 MR. ABRAHAM: (In Yup'ik)

6
7 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The
8 question's been called for. All those in favor signify
9 by saying aye.

10
11 IN UNISON: Aye.

12
13 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Opposed same
14 sign.

15
16 (No opposing votes)

17
18 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: It passes.

19
20 Let's move on. Let's see. Laura,
21 you're on again. WP08-29, please.

22
23 MS. GREFFENIUS: Okay. This one begins
24 on Page 54 in your Council book. And this one was also
25 brought forth by your Council last fall. And just -- I
26 will refer you to, since this is what we would be
27 changing, if you've got it right in front of you, on
28 Page 53 in your subsistence regulations.

29
30 So what we would be addressing in this
31 proposal, the second-hand -- the right column, the
32 second paragraph, the one that starts, all edible meat,
33 where it refers to 9B. So this proposal we're talking
34 about would change that paragraph right there. So just
35 to make it specific.

36
37 So WP08-29, it requests that a
38 regulation requiring all edible meat of moose and
39 caribou harvested in Unit 9 prior to October 1 must
40 remain on the bone until the meat is removed from the
41 field or is processed for human consumption.

42
43 Local concerns of waste from spoilage
44 of meat that was improperly cared for in the field
45 prompted this Council to request a meat on the bone
46 requirement for caribou and moose taken on Federal
47 public lands in all of Unit 9. Current Federal and
48 State regulations require this practice for Unit 9B
49 only.

50

1 So the proposed regulation is on Page
2 56 in your book, and you can see the strike through at
3 the top half of the page there, is through 9B and in
4 bold is Unit 9. So it would be inclusive for all of
5 the units.

6
7 And then on Page 57 is a chart. It
8 just shows about salvage requirements under State
9 regulations, and Unit 9B is the only one that's
10 applicable to this area.

11
12 So as I said, the local public concerns
13 about meat spoilage from caribou and moose harvested
14 during July through September favor additional
15 transport restrictions for Unit 9.

16
17 The effect of this proposal would be
18 that it would promote a reduction in meat spoilage for
19 meat harvested -- for meat taken from the harvest site.
20 A meat on the bone requirement would align with local
21 harvest and transport methods that refrain from
22 deboning the harvested meat. The adoption of this
23 proposed regulation would not adversely affect
24 Federally-qualified subsistence users. And adoption of
25 this proposed language would also make the Federal
26 regulations more inclusive for the whole unit compared
27 to the State regulations as said was for 9B only.

28
29 So the OSM preliminary conclusion is to
30 support Proposal WP08-29, and as I've said, it would
31 promote a reduction in meat spoilage and it would have
32 a meat on the bone requirement for caribou and moose in
33 all of Unit 9.

34
35 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
36 Questions anybody.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 MS. GREFFENIUS: Thank you.

41
42 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you,
43 Laura.

44
45 MR. BUTLER: Ms. Chair. Members of the
46 Council. Lem Butler.

47
48 For this proposal, the State hasn't
49 taken a position. It's likely that we will remain
50 neutral since this really doesn't have any conservation

1 consequences.

2

3 Why this would be proposed is a bit of
4 a mystery since it places additional restrictions on
5 locals. There's to date no issues with meat salvage
6 have been identified for local users. Potentially if a
7 local were to inadvertently remove meat from the bone
8 on one of these hunts, it could result in a violation
9 and loss of that subsistence meat from that household.
10 So again it just seems like it isn't solving a problem,
11 and no obvious benefits and potential consequences, so,
12 you know, it's again a bit of a mystery why we'd want
13 to have this on the Federal side.

14

15 The issues associated with non-locals
16 and meat spoilage need to be addressed for the Board of
17 Game through the State process, and there's no
18 guarantee that the State will follow suit, you know,
19 that the Board of Game would actually pass something
20 like this for non-locals. So again odds are you're
21 going to end up with a restriction for locals that
22 isn't applied to non-locals. And it's a mystery to me,
23 but nonetheless that's what we have for this proposal.

24

25 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
26 Preliminary Comments to the Regional Advisory Council.

27

28 Wildlife Proposal WP08-29:

29

30 Add salvage requirement to caribou and
31 moose harvested prior to October 1 in Unit 9A, 9C, 9D,
32 and 9E (this requirement already applies in Unit 9B.

33

34 Introduction:

35

36 The proponent believes that retaining
37 all edible meat on the bones of the front quarters and
38 hind quarters of caribou and moose harvested in Units
39 9A, 9C, 9D, and 9E prior to October 1, until the meat
40 is either removed from the field or processed for human
41 consumption, will help hunters avoid meat spoilage.

42

43 Impact on Subsistence Users:

44

45 Divergent state and federal salvage
46 requirements complicate the regulations for subsistence
47 users in Unit 9, which consist of a mixture of state,
48 federal, and private lands. The proposed salvage
49 requirements may impact subsistence users who don't
50 currently dress caribou and moose meat as would be

1 required if this proposal is adopted. However, if meat
2 spoilage has been identified as an issue among hunters
3 in the affected subunits, then this proposal recommends
4 a potential solution.

5
6 Opportunity Provided by State:

7
8 State regulations for Unit 9B require
9 that the meat of moose and caribou taken before October
10 1 remain on the bones of the front quarters and
11 hindquarters until it is removed from the field or
12 processed for human consumption.

13
14 Enforcement Issues:

15
16 Enforcement of divergent federal and
17 state meat salvage requirements may be an issue,
18 particularly in areas where there is a mixture of
19 federal and state lands and different federal and state
20 regulations.

21
22 Other Comments:

23
24 If this proposal is adopted, federally-
25 qualified subsistence users will need to be informed of
26 the differences in state and federal salvage
27 requirements in Unit 9.

28
29 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Questions.
30 Go ahead.

31
32 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Yeah. Right now the --
33 what's the requirement by the State? Is it just the
34 legs and the -- removal of the legs and leave
35 everything else out in the field?

36
37 MR. BUTLER: This proposal would expand
38 the salvage requirements currently in place in 9B to
39 the rest of Unit 9, so the rest of the Alaska
40 Peninsula. Currently resource users just have to
41 require the meat of the legs, the ribs, the neck, et
42 cetera. But there's no requirement that it remain on
43 the bone. This would place a requirement that it be
44 left on the bone for local users participating in
45 Federal hunts, but again it wouldn't apply to anyone
46 else. It would just solely apply to subsistence local
47 users.

48
49 MS. CHYTHLOOK: So the sportshunters
50 just remove the meat, and leave the rest?

1 MR. BUTLER: That would be the only
2 requirement.
3
4 MS. CHYTHLOOK: And then the
5 subsistence hunters are meat on bone?
6
7 MR. BUTLER: Right. If this were to
8 pass.
9
10 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: And Molly,
11 for clarification, wasn't this also one of Alvin's
12 complaints from last fall about meat being brought in
13 from sporthunters off the bone that was spoiled?
14 Wasn't that part of our initiation on this?
15
16 Go ahead, Randy.
17
18 MR. ALVAREZ: Lem's referring to the
19 proposal, says for the hunters, the local Federal
20 hunter, but the way I see the proposal is written, and
21 what we meant was for all hunting on Federal land. It
22 doesn't say anything about the Federally-qualified
23 hunter in the proposal here, does it, Lem?
24
25 MR. BUTLER: Ms. Chair. I can answer
26 that, or someone else can. But essentially it's a
27 matter of jurisdiction. Federal regulations don't
28 apply to non-local hunters, they only apply to
29 Federally-qualified subsistence users on Federal lands,
30 so there's no way to alter this proposal to affect non-
31 local hunters, or to submit it through the Federal
32 process. It would have to again go through the State
33 Board of Game if it were intended to be applied to non-
34 local hunters.
35
36 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
37 Molly, did you have any more questions.
38
39 MR. ALVAREZ: Cliff had something.
40
41 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Cliff.
42
43 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair. When the
44 Council raised the proposal last year, I think the
45 concern that Alvin or others brought up was that they
46 were concerned about air transporters who bring hunters
47 back in, and that was the impetus for having the
48 proposal submitted and asking, because some of them
49 have drop off points where they leave meat and it would
50 be spoiled, so it was -- so that's why. And part of

1 the other thing was the Council, you know, they could
2 have asked the Refuge to stamp on their permits that
3 they issue to air taxi operators and others to possibly
4 ask them to do that, but that was one avenue and that
5 wasn't taken up with the Refuge.

6

7 And Lem's correct. One of the
8 biologists in our office asked if the Council was going
9 to submit a proposal to the Board of Game so that they
10 would be aligned versus just as Lem said, the current
11 proposal would be more restrictive for local residents
12 here in the region.

13

14 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
15 Anybody else.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you,
20 Lem.

21

22 Okay. Federal, State and tribal
23 agency. Are you going to comment for BBNA?

24

25 MR. WOODS: Just a BBNA subsistence
26 user, I think a point well made at Lem that there's
27 already laws in place, but -- well, four years ago when
28 the State had a lot of money to monitor upriver moose
29 hunt, the person that -- one of the troopers came and
30 test -- he landed right next to one of our moose kill
31 sites, and he was amazed that we had taken everything
32 but the gut pile. And I told him, yeah, we'd rather
33 eat the bones than the horns. And that was just a
34 joke, that he had.....

35

36 But as a subsistence user, the concern
37 is, I can see exactly where this has come from. I was
38 at the meeting that the guy testified last year, is
39 that we utilize everything, and that the sporthunter's
40 only required to debone the meat, the back strap and
41 the ribs, and that's a waste in our eyes. So in order
42 to streamline the processes, that we're going to be
43 doing this anyway. And Lem's concern is that we're --
44 why do something that we're not already doing. We're
45 already doing it. I don't know a subsistence hunter
46 that debones meat in the field. But -- and it's to
47 streamline for the sports, just to keep them in check,
48 especially the fly-in and fly-out hunters that come and
49 drop off meat.

50

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Any
2 questions.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
7 Any other Federal, State or tribal agency comments.
8
9 (No comments)
10
11 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
12 InterAgency Staff Committee.
13
14 MR. RABINOWITCH: None.
15
16 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
17 We know Fish and Game's out of their -- written public
18 comments.
19
20 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair. For the
21 record, there were two written.
22
23 One is submitted by the Lake Clark SRC.
24 The SRC supports preventing waste by leaving the meat
25 on the bone.
26
27 And then the other one was to require
28 for Unit 9 that edible meat be left on the bones of the
29 front quarters and hind quarters before removing an
30 animal from the field or processing it for human
31 consumption. Opposed. While the SRC understands
32 concerns regarding meat spoilage and waste, this
33 proposal is not necessary for subsistence users in Unit
34 9. Most subsistence hunters use the bones of caribou
35 and moose for human consumption and do not debone their
36 meat in the field.
37
38 That concludes written public comments.
39
40 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you,
41 Cliff.
42
43 Public testimony. You didn't write it
44 down, Joe, but would you like to testify on this one.
45
46 MR. KLUTSCH: I'll be brief. Thank
47 you, Madame Chair.
48
49 My only concern with this one was that
50 there are exceptions at time out there in the field

1 where you may have a bloodshot quarter, you may have a
2 long pack that might warrant deboning. And I just
3 thought that it would -- in the case of an exception,
4 you might find people getting themselves in some
5 trouble that they otherwise wouldn't get into.

6
7 And going along with what the gentleman
8 from BBNA said, just bring it all out. That's what we
9 do in our hunting camps, but we do have to debone for
10 some of the packs.

11
12 And so that was my thought on that.
13 The principle is a good one.

14
15 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
16 Questions.

17
18 (No comments)

19
20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Let's
21 put it on the table.

22
23 MR. ALVAREZ: I'll put it on the table.
24 Let's see. I move we adopt WP08-29.

25
26 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Second.

27
28 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Discussion.
29 Randy.

30
31 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah, I'll start. I
32 think this is good proposal. Most people, local people
33 that I know, do it anyway, because otherwise it's too
34 hard to transport the meat around, and otherwise you
35 end up with putting it in a plastic bag. And that's
36 how this proposal got started even in State lands is
37 because the meat that was being given away in some
38 areas was not edible, because it was in plastic bags,
39 and that's the whole idea is keeping it out of plastic
40 bags because then the meat will last a lot longer. And
41 I know bloodshot meat, you can -- you know, it's a lot
42 easier to pack a piece of meat on your backpack when
43 it's got the bone on it than when it's all in pieces.

44
45 So I still think is a good proposal so
46 I'll be supporting it.

47
48 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I agree with
49 that. But I guess I'm wondering if we're not going to
50 miss the mark of what were originally trying to do if

1 it's not going to apply to State hunters hunting on
2 Federal lands. And I guess I'd like to hear some
3 discussion about that.

4

5 Thomas.

6

7 MR. HEDLUND: Yeah. I agree with you
8 on that, but I think it opens the door for the
9 subsistence, State -- on the State level to see if we
10 can get the State to go along with leaving the meat on
11 the bone. And if there is a few people out there doing
12 it, I mean, you know, it will clean that up, even on
13 the Federal level if we do it anyway. So I don't think
14 it's wrong or bad doing it, and I think it maybe will
15 set a precedent for the State to follow.

16

17 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Go ahead,
18 Pete. I'm going to assume you've got something for us.

19

20 MR. PROBASCO: Yes. Thank you, Madame
21 Chair.

22

23 The issue of Federal regulations on
24 Federal public lands applying to other users, in other
25 words, other non-rural users, has always been a
26 question of debate between the State and the Federal
27 programs. And I'll take you to a most recent example
28 where we dealt with proposals dealing with gear
29 restrictions on Federal waters on the Yukon. The
30 interpretation at that time from the Solicitor's Office
31 is that if the Board elected to pass regulations
32 defining gear depth and mesh size, it would apply to
33 both rural users and non-rural users. In other words,
34 both Federally-qualified or non-Federally-qualified.

35

36 I want to stop at that point, because
37 this here talks about an issue not related to gear, but
38 it's still in the same concept, and I would probably go
39 back to the Solicitor's Office and ask for a
40 clarification, because if you look at the current regs,
41 it includes units in addition to Unit 9 where the
42 regulation already pertains to. And so I would go back
43 and ask that question for clarification. If you look
44 at how the regulation's drafted, it's requesting the
45 Federal Subsistence Board on Federal lands to make this
46 regulation apply. So I would seek that clarification,
47 similar to what we did on the Yukon, with the
48 understanding to this Council that the State and the
49 Federal programs are already in a difference of opinion
50 on how those regulations apply to other issuers.

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you
2 very much, Pete. That's very helpful for me.
3
4 Anybody else. Dan.
5
6 MR. DUNAWAY: I was around when they
7 first instituted that requirement in the State
8 regulations for along the Nushagak. And I thought -- I
9 had some real doubts, because I used to do some boning
10 where I had to carry caribou off the tundra a ways.
11 But it's worked really well. And the enforcement guys
12 seem to like it a lot better. They can really figure
13 out whether you've got one moose or two, and so on.
14
15 (Dan O'Hara arrives)
16
17 MR. ALVAREZ: How are you doing, Dan?
18
19 MR. DUNAWAY: I'm inclined to support
20 this with maybe the encouragement that we should also
21 submit a proposal to the State Board of Game to get the
22 State regulations in alignment. Usually we follow the
23 State, but in this case we might be getting out ahead
24 of it. And I'm just kind of wondering what the Council
25 would consider, partly for consistency.
26
27 I had supported a Togiak drift fishing
28 effort the same way with the condition of let's try to
29 get the State regulations behind it.
30
31 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I would say
32 we should put that under issues and talk about creating
33 a State proposal doing the same if this passes.
34
35 MR. DUNAWAY: Right. Along with
36 following Pete's recommendation.
37
38 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: For
39 clarification.
40
41 Go ahead, Randy.
42
43 MR. ALVAREZ: Well, I think this
44 Council should submit a proposal to the State, because
45 Bristol Bay is coming up a hear from now. The State
46 Board of Game about a year from now will be meeting on
47 Bristol Bay game issues. So we could probably generate
48 a proposal now.
49
50 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah. The

1 deadline is when, Lem? When is the deadline?
2
3 MR. BUTLER: For the State Board of
4 Game?
5
6 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yep.
7
8 MR. BUTLER: It's probably going to
9 November of 2008.
10
11 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: So we'd
12 better do it now. It would be too late in the fall.
13
14 MR. ALVAREZ: So we could generate a
15 proposal right now and then Staff could write it up and
16 submit it for this coming cycle.
17
18 MR. DUNAWAY: I got so used to it now,
19 I assumed it was already in place over there.
20
21 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah. Any
22 other comments.
23
24 MR. ABRAHAM: (In Yup'ik)
25
26 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The
27 question's been called for. All those in favor please
28 signify by saying aye.
29
30 IN UNISON: Aye.
31
32 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Opposed same
33 sign.
34
35 (No opposing votes)
36
37 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The motion
38 carries.
39
40 MR. O'HARA: I'm just going to hold.
41
42 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: We're
43 starting a new one now, so I think you can.....
44
45 MR. ALVAREZ: We're talking about bone
46 soup.
47
48 MR. O'HARA: Oh, that sounds good to
49 me.
50

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: We were on
2 the bone on meat, Dan. Get you up to speed here.
3
4 Okay. Do we want to talk about the
5 proposal to be created now or should we put that under
6 new business?
7
8 MR. DUNAWAY: Probably new business.
9
10 MR. ALVAREZ: New business.
11
12 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I think so,
13 too. Okay.
14
15 Laura, do you want to read -- are we
16 going to do both of these together, these next two, 30
17 and 31?
18
19 MS. GREFFENIUS: Have you already
20 voted?
21
22 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yes, we
23 have.
24
25 MS. GREFFENIUS: I'm sorry.
26
27 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: That's okay.
28 We're not dragging our feet today. WP08-30 and WP08-
29 31.
30
31 MS. GREFFENIUS: It begins on Page 60
32 of your Council book. Okay. Laura Greffenius with
33 OSM.
34
35 And this one, I'm going to go into some
36 -- a little more background information on how we came
37 to the conclusion that we did. So I'll answer
38 questions at the end, or if there's anything during
39 this one.
40
41 So this one was also submitted by the
42 Bristol Bay Council in the fall. We had discussed this
43 one, so Proposals 30 and 31, since it applies to the
44 same areas and it's dealing with moose, they're dealt
45 with in the same analysis here. Both pertain to moose
46 regulations in Units 9B and C.
47
48 So Proposal 30 would shorten the fall
49 and winter seasons in Unit 9B from specifically August
50 -- it is now August 20th to September 15, the proposal

1 is for September 1 to September 15. And for the winter
2 seasons it's now December 1 to January 15, and
3 shortening it to December 15 to January 15. This would
4 align the Federal and State seasons for that harvest.

5
6 Proposal 31 requests that Federal
7 public lands in Unit 9B and a portion of Unit 9C be
8 closed for the taking of moose by non-Federally-
9 qualified subsistence users.

10
11 And under the discussion here, I just
12 want to make mention of just what the Council members
13 have talked about. For the last several years the
14 Council members and area residents have repeatedly
15 expressed concerns about the decline of the moose
16 population in Units 9B and C. And discussions by the
17 Council convey that local residents are having
18 difficulty meeting their subsistence needs, and this
19 difficulty is compounded by the lack of the
20 availability of caribou. The Council advocates that
21 shorter seasons and a closure of Federal public lands
22 to non-Federally-qualified subsistence users will
23 likely reduce the number of moose harvested.

24
25 So as I said, Number 30 would shorten
26 the fall season by 11 days and the winter season by 14
27 days. And 31 would lose Federal public lands in Units
28 9B and Unit 9C for that portion draining into the
29 Naknek River from the north, and Unit 9C remainder for
30 moose hunting to all but Federally-qualified
31 subsistence users.

32
33 So just to clarify, it would not
34 include that part of Unit 9C, the portion draining into
35 the Naknek River from the South. We worked that out
36 with Daryle Lons when we discussed this in the fall.
37 So that's why I put that in there specifically.

38
39 I also want to mention what we refer to
40 as the closure policy, considerations regarding closure
41 of Federal public lands are outlined in the policy
42 adopted by the Federal Subsistence Board in 2007. It's
43 titled Policy on Closures to Hunting, Trapping and
44 Fishing on Federal Public Lands and Waters in Alaska.
45 Consistent with Title VIII of ANILCA, the Board is
46 authorized to restrict the taking of fish and wildlife
47 by non-Federally-qualified subsistence users on Federal
48 public lands when necessary for the conservation of
49 healthy populations, or to continue subsistence uses of
50 such populations.

1 In recent years, Council
2 representatives have maintained that local residents
3 have experienced increasing difficulties in meeting
4 their subsistence needs for moose. The proposed
5 closures of Federal public lands may thus be necessary
6 to provide a meaningful preference for Federally-
7 qualified subsistence users.

8
9 And also, an additional factor to
10 consider is the lack of alternative resources, and
11 specifically we're talking about caribou. As you know,
12 the Northern Alaska Peninsula Caribou Herd, that
13 season's closed, and there's declining numbers for the
14 Mulchatna.

15
16 And on the bottom of Page 61, just to
17 point out that we had inadvertently omitted the
18 Council's request was for the closure of Federal public
19 lands in Unit 9C remainder. This was to be all of Unit
20 9C except for, as I said, that portion draining into
21 the Naknek River from the south. In the proposal book
22 we had not included 9C remainder, and so we made that
23 correction and put it in in December of 2007. The
24 proposal book comes out in the early part of December,
25 we made that corrections a couple weeks later to make
26 sure everyone had advanced notice. It was on the web
27 site and sent out on the list serve, so there was, you
28 know, advanced notice for everybody. And what's in the
29 book right here reflects the request put forth by the
30 Council.

31
32 So the proposed regulation would be
33 found on Page 62, the bottom portion of that page. You
34 can see the strike-throughs and the bold is what the
35 proposed regulation is. We had discussed that at quite
36 a bit of length in the fall.

37
38 And now I'd like to just refer to Table
39 1 on Page 66. So right now the current moose
40 populations in Unit 9 are considered at low density and
41 stable compared to past population peaks. In Units 9B
42 and C summary tables, the moose data presented is a
43 composite of trend areas, and are representative of
44 that entire subunits. And the population densities
45 have declined in all three subunits by a small amount,
46 and the -- overall, the management objectives for the
47 bull to cow ratios are within the ADF&G management
48 objectives are being maintained.

49
50 There's also some work that's being

1 done in Lake Clark National Park area, but some future
2 surveys will need to be done in order to ascertain
3 population trends in this area. And so I've noted that
4 just in general more data needs to be collected to
5 better assess moose population trends in Unit 9B and C,
6 and the biological information appears to be mixed
7 across these units. However, local residents
8 consistently express difficulty meeting their
9 subsistence needs.

10

11 As far as the harvest history, we've
12 got a summary on Table 2 on Page 67. And just to point
13 out some things on this one, since 1988, the majority,
14 about 87 percent, of the reported moose harvest has
15 occurred in September with aircraft and boats being the
16 most common transportation modes. And during
17 regulatory years more recently, from 2000 to 2006,
18 residents of the unit account for 28 percent of the
19 reported harvest in 9B, and residents of Unit 9C
20 account for 50 percent of the reported harvest. That's
21 of interest since we're talking about some closures to
22 non-Federally-qualified subsistence users.

23

24 Council members have expressed, as I
25 said, in October, at the last meeting, Council members
26 have expressed increasing difficulties in harvesting
27 moose for their subsistence needs. And I just made
28 note of some of the comments in the analysis of what
29 was expressed at the meeting.

30

31 On Page -- at the top of Page 68, we
32 have a paragraph that we're calling other management
33 options. We just wanted to make note that in the
34 closure policy, that now is what we're following, that
35 the Federal Subsistence Board has adopted, that we need
36 to identify the availability and the effectiveness of
37 other management options. And just so they can be
38 considered as part of the entire picture, just to avoid
39 or minimize the degree of restriction to subsistence
40 and non-subsistence users. So when local residents
41 state that they're having difficulty meeting their
42 subsistence needs, since they are seeing and harvesting
43 less moose, and there's also fewer caribou as I
44 mentioned. Comments are often accompanied by concerns
45 of continuing a non-resident harvest if the
46 availability of the resource appears to be declining.

47

48 One alternative management option to
49 minimize the degree of restriction would be to retain
50 access to Federal public lands for non-Federally-

1 qualified subsistence users, but to eliminate the
2 harvest season for non-residents. And that would be
3 through the Alaska Board of Game, but this is still
4 proposing other management options, and so we're just
5 making everyone aware of that as something to consider.

6

7 Another alternative management option
8 to avoid the closure of Federal public lands is to
9 consider longer seasons for Federally-qualified
10 subsistence users in conjunction with shorter seasons
11 provided under the State general harvest, particularly
12 in September when the majority of harvest occurs.
13 Again that would be a combination of both issues would
14 need to be dealt with through the Federal Subsistence
15 Board and the Alaska Board of Game.

16

17 For the effects of the proposals, for
18 No. 30, that would be for the harvest of moose in Unit
19 9B, the fall season would be shortened by 11 days, and
20 the winter season would be shortened by 14 days. If
21 adopted, the Federal and State seasons in Unit 9b would
22 align, providing no preference for Federally-qualified
23 subsistence users to harvest moose before the general
24 hunt begins. And the shorter seasons would likely
25 reduce the number of moose harvested in each regulatory
26 year.

27

28 For No. 31, if adopted, this proposal
29 would implement a closure to non-Federally-qualified
30 subsistence users consistent with ANILCA and the
31 Federal Subsistence Board's policy on closures as
32 necessary to ensure the continuation of subsistence
33 uses by Federally-qualified users. The proposed change
34 would not restrict users as they would -- Federally-
35 qualified users as they would continue to have the
36 opportunity to harvest moose. However, if adopted,
37 non-Federally-qualified subsistence users could not
38 hunt moose on Federal public lands in Unit 9B and a
39 portion of Unit 9C.

40

41 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
42 support Proposal 30. As I've summarized, the Council
43 has expressed conservation concerns about the moose
44 population in Unit 9B and difficulties harvesting
45 enough moose to meet their subsistence needs. The
46 Council has recommended shortening the Federal season
47 in an effort to reduce harvest numbers and align with
48 the State fall and winter season. This measure, No.
49 30, supports the Council's intentions to address their
50 conservation concerns by shortening the seasons for

1 subsistence users.

2

3 For No. 31, it's support Proposal 31,
4 and local residents state there is a conservation
5 concern with the populations in Units 9B and C, and
6 have -- they're experiencing seeing and harvesting
7 fewer moose in recent years. These observations, and
8 as I'll express again, as stated in the closure policy,
9 combined with the closure of the Northern Alaska
10 Peninsula caribou harvest and the decline in the
11 Mulchatna Caribou Herd, thus making another important
12 subsistence resource unavailable, support the position
13 of local residents who maintain they're experiencing
14 increasing difficulties in meeting their subsistence
15 needs. While the biological data is limited and has
16 mixed interpretations, some of those data and local
17 observations indicate that the moose population has
18 declined. And closure of Federal public lands is
19 consistent with ANILCA and Federal policy as necessary
20 to continue subsistence uses of moose in Units 9B and
21 C.

22

23 That's the summary of that one. I'll
24 answer any questions.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Questions.
29 Randy.

30

31 MR. ALVAREZ: Laura, why did -- you
32 said you were talking with Daryle about with the
33 exception of Unit 9C, that it wouldn't be closed for
34 non-resident harvesting. What were the reasons? Did
35 you state that? The reason why this Unit 9C, Naknek
36 River drainage from the south, can you tell us why?

37

38 MS. GREFFENIUS: Well, from what I
39 recalled of Daryle saying, and I know there's somebody
40 else here from the Refuge, but Daryle had commented
41 that there'd been a lot of work in working out with --
42 to get what's in place here. It's on Page 54, if you
43 happen to have your book right in front of you. Unit
44 9C, that portion draining into the Naknek River from
45 the South. There was a lot of work that went into
46 getting this particular regulation in place, and it
47 looks like Federal public lands are closed during
48 December for that area, but Federal public lands are
49 open during August 20 to September 15th season. So I
50 believe that was the main reason on that one is keeping

1 it open to non-Federal users for the fall season, but
2 it already has a closure in place for the December
3 season.

4

5 MR. ALVAREZ: Thank you.

6

7 MR. O'HARA: Madame Chair.

8

9 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Please.

10

11 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. I apologize for not
12 being here. I had a medical this morning at 9:30. The
13 noon flight was full, and the 2:00 o'clock flight was
14 open.

15

16 The proposal says that there was an
17 agreement on the south part of the Naknek River. That
18 must mean going up Big Creek drainage? Obviously
19 there's nothing about the South Naknek River.

20

21 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah, and
22 Smelt Creek isn't in there, so it almost has to be Big
23 Creek.

24

25 MS. GREFFENIUS: Yeah, the Federal
26 public lands in that area are the Becharof Refuge, and
27 that's what Daryle had spoke about.

28

29 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. The Big Creek, and
30 it runs into the Refuge and that's where they can still
31 hunt, but not in the upper part of 9C and 9B.

32

33 MS. GREFFENIUS: He just -- from what I
34 recollect is that he just said there had been a lot of
35 work to negotiate what was already in place, and so he
36 had requested that that area not be included in this
37 particular proposal, and the Council, you know, had
38 gone along with that.

39

40 MR. BOSKOFKY: And basically
41 shortening our season we put in last year.

42

43 MR. O'HARA: The second part of that is
44 it seemed to me like -- do you have the December moose
45 survey they did up there on Federal lands? Because I
46 think it was Dale Meyers did the flying for the Federal
47 people, and they found a good amount of moose between
48 Sugar Loaf and the upper part of Big Mountain in the
49 December survey. I don't know if anyone's here from
50 that area that did that survey.

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Lem might be
2 able to.
3
4 MS. GREFFENIUS: Well, I'll let --
5 yeah. For the recent survey information, I'll let the
6 local agency folks answer that one.
7
8 MR. O'HARA: Can he answer that now?
9
10 MS. GREFFENIUS: I can't myself,
11 but.....
12
13 MR. O'HARA: He's sitting here, can he
14 answer it?
15
16 MR. ALVAREZ: He's coming up next, Dan.
17
18
19 MS. GREFFENIUS: Yeah, sure. I don't
20 know if you want to wait until.....
21
22 MR. ALVAREZ: He's up next.
23
24 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Fine. We'll wait
25 for him.
26
27 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Molly, did
28 you have a question.
29
30 MS. CHYTHLOOK: I just need
31 clarification. On Page 67, on the non-unit resident.
32 I know what the non-resident is, but what's non-unit
33 resident.
34
35 MR. ALVAREZ: Alaska residents that
36 aren't part of our unit.
37
38 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Anchorage
39 people that fly out.
40
41 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Oh, okay. Okay. Got
42 it.
43
44 MS. GREFFENIUS: Yeah, just anybody
45 that's a state resident, but not from the area.
46
47 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thanks.
48
49 MR. O'HARA: It doesn't mean they're
50 Federally-qualified.

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Any other
2 questions for Laura.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 MR. ABRAHAM: (In Yup'ik)
7
8 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
9
10 MS. GREFFENIUS: What's that? Okay.
11 Thank you.
12
13 MR. BUTLER: Madame Chairman. Members
14 of the Council. Lem Butler. For this presentation, I
15 actually put together a few slides to present the
16 biological data, if you would be interested in giving
17 me a little bit of time to set up a projector, and
18 maybe that would eliminate a little bit.....
19
20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yes. Five
21 minutes. Just five this time, you guys. Just let him
22 get set up and we'll get back at it.
23
24 (Off record)
25
26 (On record)
27
28 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Everybody
29 ready? Lem, you've got the floor.
30
31 MR. BUTLER: I've got the floor. Well,
32 thank you, Ms. Chair, members of the Council, for
33 giving me a little bit of time to set up here. I'm
34 hoping that this will help bring us onto the same page.
35 It's seems that there are differences of opinion as to
36 how some of this information is interpreted, and with
37 any luck, I'm hoping with a visual display of some data
38 graphs and harvests, we can at least all come to a more
39 mutual agreement of what moose populations in 9B and 9C
40 look like, as well as harvests.
41
42 Proposals 30 and 31 as Laura mentioned,
43 30 is going to shorten the winter season for locals in
44 9B and align it with State regulations currently in
45 place, and 31 is going to close Federal lands to non-
46 Federally-qualified subsistence users, or non-locals.
47 And primarily what we're talking about is Park Service
48 lands. Lake Clark Preserve, Katmai Preserve and
49 Alagnak Wild and Scenic, which is managed by the Park
50 Service, as well as scattered parcels of BLM land in 9B

1 and 9C, which are often, you know, difficult to
2 distinguish when you're actually out in the field, and
3 because of that, they pose some law enforcement
4 challenges.

5
6 This is a map that just depicts what
7 we're talking about. Again, the dark grey is going to
8 be your Federal lands. Everything within the red
9 boundary here that distinguishes the dark gray is going
10 to be Federal lands that would be closed to non-
11 Federally-qualified subsistence users. Again we've got
12 Lake Clark, Katmai Preserve, Alagnak Wild and Scenic,
13 as well as these scattered BLM lands throughout 9B
14 primarily, but it's also in 9C.

15
16 And if you look around the room,
17 there's a couple of other land status maps that may
18 show these lands slightly different, particularly the
19 BLM lands. And that's one of the challenges is that it
20 seems like there are many recreations of these land
21 status maps, and to some degree, they seem to be a
22 dynamic based on land selections and what have you, but
23 there's also again just mixed opinions in some cases to
24 where these boundaries actually fall. I'm sure a
25 surveyor and someone really familiar could identify
26 these areas clearly, but in terms of the average hunter
27 in the field, in terms of a law enforcement officer out
28 in the field trying to actually enforce these, it can
29 become quite challenging.

30
31 But you'll see that what remains in the
32 light gray is still a large amount of lands that will
33 be open for non-Federally-qualified subsistence users
34 to come out and hunt, so guys from Anchorage can still
35 hunt along much of the lower Alagnak River, along the
36 Kvichak River, as well as around much of Iliamna Lake,
37 all of which have been discussed as being important for
38 local hunters.

39
40 So the effect of this proposal is going
41 to be that we're essentially going to see an increased
42 competition between locals and non-locals, primarily
43 because this doesn't exclude non-locals entirely from
44 key areas of 9B and along the Branch River. And, if
45 anything, it redistributes and concentrates them in
46 areas that have been discussed in the past at these
47 meetings.

48
49 Current moose harvests are low in these
50 areas. So we're not really going to see any response

1 from the moose population that would benefit locals in
2 terms of productivity Bull to cow ratio as mentioned
3 is typically within the management objectives. And the
4 population status is going to be unaffected, primarily
5 because again we're not going to see an increase in the
6 population. We're not -- currently harvest isn't
7 limiting the population.

8

9 This again translates into increased
10 user tension, which means that it's not going to -- the
11 lack of any response from the moose population means
12 that it's not going to facilitate customary and
13 traditional uses of the population, and, if anything,
14 local hunter success could arguably suffer if there is
15 increased competition on State lands. So this should
16 all be taken into consideration when we're discussing
17 this.

18

19 Just a couple of things that I'd hope
20 you'd consider as you think about this proposal. Of
21 course, you know, as has been mentioned, there are
22 local concerns that have been repeatedly expressed, and
23 I hear them, too. Lake Clark has heard them. I'm sure
24 Fish and Wildlife Service has also heard these local
25 concerns that people aren't seeing as many moose in the
26 field, or they're having difficulties harvesting moose.
27 You know, to some degree I don't know how to rectify
28 that with some of the population data I have. I can
29 tell you that it's a concern expressed across the State
30 of Alaska. It seems like there's really hardly a
31 situation where there's hardly a situation where
32 there's enough, except perhaps when we get into high
33 numbers of caribou, to fully satisfy all the needs and
34 wants out there. But nonetheless, we again do have
35 local concerns in this area that at times appear to
36 differ from population trends and some of the harvest
37 information that we have.

38

39 And keep in mind, too, that there's
40 alternatives to a complete land closure, and I'll try
41 to walk you through some of this over the next couple
42 of slides.

43

44 This slide is meant to just simply show
45 you that, you know, it's been repeated several times,
46 and I see it in the current Staff analysis, that we
47 don't have moose data. Well, we do have moose data,
48 and we have quite a bit of moose data actually to go
49 on.

50

1 The other thing you see here, this is a
2 graph of moose densities in Unit 9. And you see that
3 there's a wide variety. There is no place that's
4 absolutely average. We have some areas that are going
5 to be lower density than others, some areas that are
6 going to be higher densities than others. And, of
7 course, we have a mixture across the Peninsula of what
8 is actually moose habitat and what isn't moose habitat.
9 Places you'd expect to find moose, places you'd expect
10 not to find a moose.

11
12 So there again -- we do approach this
13 with some information.

14
15 Here's a look at what I can put
16 together of historical trends on the Peninsula. This
17 is extrapolated from a lot of reports with U.S. Fish
18 and Wildlife Service prior to statehood, a lot of ADF&G
19 reports following statehood. What we know is that in
20 journal entries in 1904, there weren't very many moose
21 in the Alaska Peninsula. They were typically found in
22 scattered pockets. By 1930 there was a noted increase
23 in the population that continued through the 40s and
24 50s until we eventually peaked about 1950 at
25 approximately 1.5 moose per square mile. And that
26 density remained largely unchanged until about the
27 early 70s when people started noticing decreases in
28 moose productivity, over-browsing indicators, a lot of
29 heavily browsed willow, et cetera, decreased
30 productivity of the moose population. And all of that
31 came about at a time that we started seeing a decline
32 in the moose population. That decline continued until
33 about 1980, and based on our survey work since 1980,
34 we've been looking at pretty much a stable moose
35 population.

36
37 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Lem, I've got a
38 question.

39
40 MR. BUTLER: Uh-huh. Sure.

41
42 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Were your survey tools
43 and methodology the same throughout the years>

44
45 MR. BUTLER: A good question. Again,
46 prior to 1980, maybe I could have made this clearer,
47 that's extrapolated from reports, trying to summarize
48 what was being observed. Again, 1904 was just a
49 journal entry. 1930s, 50s and 60s, we have various
50 Fish and Wildlife Service reports, but they're not the

1 same areas that I'm currently surveying today. So much
2 of this is extrapolated. Currently the population has
3 declined by about 60 percent since 1960, so again this
4 is just generalized trends. It's not hard and fast
5 numbers.

6
7 MS. CHYTHLOOK: So 1900 to 1950s is
8 just whatever was.....

9
10 MR. BUTLER: That's based on the
11 reports, with as much consistency as we can find in
12 reports. So again, this is just to give you a picture
13 of what we're talking about.

14
15 But when we actually get into moose
16 data, this is what we're looking at for Units 9B, 9C
17 and 9E. When I say relatively stable, this is what I'm
18 talking about. We've got three subunits here. You do
19 see fluctuation in these numbers, and that's to be
20 expected. You know, some survey years are better than
21 others. We get different changes in pilots, there's
22 moose movements, and there's variability within the
23 sample itself.

24
25 But in terms of a moose population for
26 what's, you know, almost a 30-year period represented
27 here in some cases, that's about as stable as stable
28 gets. You know, there's no such thing as a flat line
29 in the population.

30
31 And you'll notice some of these
32 fluctuations may result in some of the differences in
33 averages that Laura pointed out. But the important
34 thing to note is that the averages in the table
35 presented by the Fish and Wildlife Service analysis for
36 this proposal, those differences really aren't
37 distinguishable on a statistical basis.

38
39 And, in fact, we can put a regression
40 line to these points, and come up with another way of
41 looking at it. This is a technique that scientists and
42 statisticians across the world would agree would be a
43 way to approach this question. What we see here when
44 we apply that regression line, it's the best fit line
45 for those points. We get a slope of negative .0006.
46 Or .006, excuse me, which is not significantly
47 different from zero. That means that as best we can
48 tell with this data, there has been no change. Again,
49 granted, there is some fluctuation if you look really
50 close, but statistically speaking, we can't detect a

1 change in the moose trend in 9B.

2

3 Similarly, for the Branch River in 9C,
4 we see some variation, particularly a high point in
5 1989 that leads to that high average in 1980 on the
6 table presented by Federal Staff. but with this
7 scattering of points, we can't detect a difference.
8 The densities that we're seeing in the early 80s, we're
9 still seeing in 2000. So no statistical difference.
10 In fact, in this case we have a positive .001, which
11 I'm not going to tell you is an increase in population,
12 but it's a positive. So that just shows you that, you
13 know, we're really not seeing big changes in the moose
14 in the areas that we repeatedly survey.

15

16 Here's a look at the bull ratios.
17 Again, our management objective is 40 bulls per 100
18 cows. There's fluctuation in this just as there is
19 with anything else, but we're consistently on average
20 hovering around 40 bulls per 100 cows, which means that
21 we have plenty of bulls to reproduce the population.
22 There's no limits imposed by the current harvest. And,
23 more importantly, this 40 bulls per 100 cows comes
24 about as an opportunity to satisfy hunter needs. So
25 with 40 bulls per 100 cows and low density situations,
26 hunters are typically satisfied that when they go out
27 there and hunt for moose, they're seeing enough males
28 as they encounter moose in the landscape.

29

30 You'll note that many of you have
31 hunted the Mulchatna herd, which has a really low bull
32 ratio right now. And frequently people express
33 disappointment going out in the field and not
34 encountering enough bulls. And that's what this
35 essentially is trying to prevent, that sort of hunter
36 dissatisfaction in the number of bulls they're seeing.
37 So typically speaking, 40 bulls is what you want to see
38 in these situations, and again that's what we have been
39 seeing.

40

41 MR. BOSKOFISKY: On 9E I see you're down
42 to, what, about 30?

43

44 MR. BUTLER: Uh-huh. That's right.
45 You'll notice there's fluctuation, so any one given
46 year we may be below. If we're below the harvest
47 objective for three consecutive surveys, we get really
48 concerned. If we're below for one, it may just be a
49 survey anomaly. So that's certainly a situation I want
50 to continue to look at.

1 MR. BOSKOFISKY: It looks like a pretty
2 good sized drop though.
3
4 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. And.....
5
6 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Going from 50 down to
7 30 in 9E. I would say that would be some kind of a
8 shortage of moose?
9
10 MR. BUTLER: Well, it would be, if we
11 could tell for certain that that's not just an artifact
12 of the survey. I mean, again this is a snapshot of the
13 moose. And some of these surveys get pushed up against
14 the point in which moose start to lose antlers, and
15 that's the only way we can identify moose antlers -- or
16 males from females from the air. So you get biases in
17 these sex ratios.
18
19 I'm going to get back out there in 9E,
20 I really want to. I had to work on 9C and 9B this
21 year, because that was where this proposal was driving
22 at. So I was the one that was out in the Kukaklek
23 Ridge area surveying moose with Dale Meyers. And we
24 quickly encountered over 100 moose in that area in 9B,
25 and that area had a good bull ratio. Similarly, 9C,
26 we're up to 45 bulls per 100 cows. Amazing number of
27 yearling bulls out there this year. It looks like we
28 had a really good calf productions, so I'm really
29 encouraged by what we're seeing in both 9B and 9C at
30 this time.
31
32 Now, in terms of hunter satisfaction
33 and success and what's available, what we consistently
34 see in Unit 9 is that we are detecting a decrease in
35 harvest. Harvest here is located as the vertical bars
36 on the bottom of the graph. The dotted line across the
37 top is the number of hunters. So we are seeing a
38 decrease in harvest, but we're also seeing a decrease
39 in hunters, and those two things seem to be directly
40 related. You'll see that many of the high harvest
41 years correspond to high hunter years. Really not a
42 big change in success to speak of in a lot of subunits.
43 To some degree we do -- we saw a little bit of
44 increased success in the 80s with cow harvest in
45 particular, but, I mean, not a big change. And again
46 most of what we're seeing is directly related to hunter
47 effort. And this is looking at all user groups. So
48 this is non-locals, locals, et cetera.
49
50 Here's another way of looking at hunter

1 success more directly. The Y axis here is percent
2 success, so we're looking at about just under 40
3 percent success rate for hunters in Unit 9, and you'll
4 see that that is pretty consistent back into the late
5 80s at least on this graph.

6

7 Now, where do we fare in terms of the
8 rest of the State? Well, Unit 9 is above average for
9 hunter success. We're in the top 30 percentile shown
10 in the -- with Unit 9 showing at the dark blue bar
11 there. So really -- and I should note that success is
12 a surrogate in many cases for moose abundance. In a
13 lot of places where they can't survey moose, they look
14 at success rates of hunters, and if they detect a
15 decreased success, they assume that there's -- it's
16 because there's fewer moose in the landscape for those
17 hunters to encounter. None of those warning signs are
18 being detected in Unit 9.

19

20 Looking at local hunters success, and
21 this compares local hunter success in Unit 9 to local
22 hunter success throughout the rest of the State, we're
23 also above average. And shown in yellow here are the
24 three subunits that are designated as being important
25 for high production of moose. The far left is 9E which
26 is showing just over 30 percent success rate for
27 locals, 9(B) is the middle yellow, and 9(C) is the
28 yellow on the right. So pretty good on a statewide
29 perspective in terms of what we have for moose here.

30

31 Looking at moose harvest in 9B gets a
32 little bit more difficult to distinguish. Typically
33 for the population, the reported harvest, which is
34 shown in most years as black, grey or white bars, is
35 fairly low given the population size, you know, and it
36 tends to vary. We are seeing a decrease in non-
37 resident hunters for the most part in 9B, primarily
38 probably associated with a decreased number of hunters
39 hunting caribou. We'll see how that plays out in the
40 future. You'll see that local moose harvest fluctuate,
41 around 10 on average.

42

43 But the big unknown, and what's alluded
44 to in the 2001 subsistence report, is a very high
45 unreported harvest by local communities in 9B. And
46 that's a big question, particularly in trying to
47 rectify moose population, survey data to local
48 concerns. You know, we really don't have a handle. If
49 this is the real harvest shown in 2001 with the
50 straight bar in the subsistence report, it may start to

1 explain some of what we're seeing. Most people are
2 skeptical of that bar, whether it's -- the true value
3 is somewhere between the black bear, which depicts
4 local harvest and the straight bar, where it would fall
5 out in that spectrum is just difficult to say. But
6 typically again, harvest in 9B are, you know, below
7 what's sustainable for moose based on our surveys.

8
9 Just to show you what local hunter
10 effort and success looks like again, since I don't want
11 to just make you think that I'm only showing you -- or
12 I'm trying to incorporate non-residents too much into
13 this perspective. Again, this is the same idea. Local
14 hunters shown at the dotted line, local harvest shown
15 as the bars. And again pretty much a direct
16 relationship between hunter harvest and success and
17 hunter effort, or the number of hunters afield.

18
19 So we're really not seeing, from our
20 data any decrease in harvest, and no decline in
21 customary and traditional opportunity or use that seems
22 to me to be perpetuated.

23
24 Branch River moose harvest, so again
25 this is the Alagnak, 9C, and, you know, again it's
26 pretty low. Every comparison here, local, non-local
27 harvest is below 10 since about 2001. You do see
28 fluctuations in the local harvest. But what we again
29 see is that what we're really detecting is just a
30 decrease in hunter effort. In fact, in 2006 we only
31 had two local hunters report from this area and both of
32 them were successful, so we have 100 percent success
33 rate for locals in 2006. 2005, pretty good success
34 rate, 2003, pretty good success rate. So again this is
35 just trying to picture what we're seeing with this
36 data. And this is part of why we have such a hard time
37 rectifying some of the information that's presented at
38 these meetings.

39
40 But right now, if you close the Branch
41 River to non-local, non-Federally-qualified hunters,
42 we'd be doing it for what's reportedly two or three
43 locals hunters.

44
45 Which brings us to some of these
46 conservation issues and concerns. So how -- I was
47 trying to think how can we try to bring these two
48 concepts together, the local perspective from some of
49 these 9B villages that says moose are becoming less
50 frequent, and survey data, and harvest data that seems

1 to give a different picture. And one of the key things
2 that comes out from the subsistence household surveys
3 is that there's potentially a high cow harvest in some
4 of these areas. About 39 percent of the reported
5 harvest in the household surveys in 2001 was cow
6 harvest. And you can see that these eight different
7 communities that were surveyed, in some cases, it could
8 be pretty high.

9

10 And there's some support for this
11 outside of just the household survey, including law
12 enforcement reports, local rumors, as well as
13 discussions with Council members.

14

15 Similarly, that study points to a lot
16 of harvest outside of the normal hunting season in
17 February, March, April, May, June, July, October and
18 November. Some villages more so than others. But
19 again, all these things potentially could reflect some
20 problem particularly in areas that are more easily
21 accessed by locals.

22

23 So where does this leave us. It leaves
24 me at least with the conclusion that we're not going to
25 see a resolution of local concerns through these two
26 proposals. The season reduction as proposed in
27 Proposal 30 will likely be not recognized by many local
28 hunters, in which case we aren't really going to see a
29 reduction in harvest in some of these areas, if that's
30 the intent. It's not going to improve the moose
31 population by excluding non-locals. We're probably
32 going to have increased user conflicts, if anything,
33 which leads to the idea that there's no direct benefits
34 to local users. And it doesn't enhance customary and
35 traditional opportunity.

36

37 But there are still potential solutions
38 that we can try to arrive at, and just trying to think
39 of what we could do to try to resolve this issue, it
40 seems like one of the key things that we need is going
41 to be local participation amongst the communities, more
42 than just the members of this Regional Advisory
43 Council. We really need some of these -- some local
44 community buy-in and support and development of a
45 working solution. And part of what I think needs to
46 happen is that communities -- and part of that, what
47 comes out of that is some compliance with whatever
48 solution is developed, which, you know, is going to
49 have to try to find that balance between customary and
50 traditional uses in this area, and the needs of the

1 moose population in particular. Again, it just has
2 limits that can't be exceeded.

3

4 For my end of that, you know, I do want
5 to see increased monitoring, particularly in Lake Clark
6 National Park where they had that low survey, and
7 increased survey coverage of State and BLM lands where
8 we may be not -- we may be missing some change in the
9 moose population that's occurring in areas that are
10 again more utilized that aren't being surveyed
11 regularly. And I guess what I would like to see is try
12 to work with Council and communities to put a working
13 group together for moose, and I'm sure that maybe BBNA
14 or some of these other agencies would be interested in
15 getting involved to really identify what the issues
16 are, what the local concerns are, what the needs of the
17 moose populations are and try to get the resource users
18 as a whole to help develop these solutions as opposed
19 to, you know, just going with proposals that while I
20 believe they're well intended, I don't think that
21 they're going to get the response that's expected down
22 the road in terms of, you know, opportunity for locals
23 and decreased user conflict and satisfaction.

24

25 And that's I guess my take on those two
26 proposals.

27

28 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
29 Preliminary Comments to the Regional Advisory Council.

30

31 Wildlife Proposals WP08-30 and WP08-31:

32

33 WP08-30 proposes to shorten the fall
34 and winter federal moose hunting seasons by 11 days and
35 14 days respectively in Unit 9B. The corrected WP08-31
36 proposes to close federal public lands in Unit 9B and
37 in all of Unit 9C except for that portion draining into
38 the Naknek River from the south to moose hunting by
39 non-federally qualified subsistence users.

40

41 Introduction:

42

43 The Bristol Bay Regional Advisory
44 Council submitted these proposals based on local belief
45 that the moose population is declining. The Council
46 recommends shortening the federal season in order to
47 slow that perceived decline and recommends closing
48 federal public lands to non-federally qualified hunters
49 in Unit 9B and a portion of Unit 9C to reduce hunting
50 pressure. WP08-30 would align federal regulations with

1 the shorter state season in Unit 9B to help slow the
2 decline of the moose population without affecting the
3 opportunity to harvest moose by subsistence users.
4 WP08-31 would close the federal public lands in Unit 9B
5 and in those portions of Unit 9C not already closed to
6 moose hunting by non-federally qualified subsistence
7 users.

8

9

Impact on Subsistence Users:

10

11

The Council believes the opportunity
12 for federally-qualified subsistence users to hunt moose
13 in Units 9B and 9C would be unaffected by the shortened
14 season. Federally qualified subsistence users would
15 still have a 15-day fall season and a 32-day winter
16 season on federal public lands.

17

18

The Council proposes the closure based
19 on the belief that it will reduce the number of moose
20 harvested and may help slow the decline of the moose
21 population in this area. The proposed closure of
22 federal lands would shift hunting effort by non-
23 federally qualified subsistence users to State and
24 private lands, which would increase hunter effort and
25 conflict in areas preferred by many local residents
26 (e.g., lower Alagnak River, King Salmon Creek, Nikabuna
27 Lakes, and Yellow Creek). In the long term, adoption
28 of this closure will impact both the federally-
29 qualified subsistence users and state subsistence
30 users. Thus, the need for adoption of proposal WP08-31
31 is not supported by substantial evidence and could be
32 detrimental to the satisfaction of subsistence needs of
33 federally-qualified subsistence users.

34

35

Opportunity Provided by State:

36

37

State regulations for Unit 9B authorize
38 residents to harvest one bull moose from September 1-15
39 or December 15 January 15. In Unit 9C, that portion
40 draining into the Naknek River, residents can harvest
41 one bull from September 1-15 or December 1-31.
42 Nonresident hunting in these two areas is limited to
43 September 5-15 for one bull with 50-inch antlers or
44 antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one
45 side.

46

47

Conservation Issues:

48

49

The staff analysis appears to be
50 relying too heavily upon a recent survey in one part of

1 Lake Clark National Park and Preserve as a basis for
2 recommending closure of federal public lands in Units
3 9B and 9C. The Department of Fish and Game has no
4 evidence that moose numbers have declined generally in
5 Unit 9B or that portion of Unit 9C draining into the
6 Naknek River from the north. Local residents report
7 seeing fewer moose in their traditional hunting areas,
8 which may be attributed to localized declines and lower
9 moose densities in heavily hunted areas. Bull:cow
10 ratios are within the Department's management
11 objectives. State seasons in which nonlocal hunters
12 participate have antler restrictions that significantly
13 reduce harvest opportunity, and such harvests often
14 occur in areas not usually accessed by federally-
15 qualified subsistence users.

16
17 Nonlocal hunters harvested an average
18 of 22 moose annually in Unit 9B between 2003 and 2006,
19 which constitutes 1% of the moose population. Nonlocal
20 hunting effort and harvest are trending downward in
21 this subunit. Nonlocal hunters harvested an average of
22 15 moose annually between 2003 and 2006 in Unit 9C, or
23 about 2% of the moose population. This comparative low
24 level of nonlocal harvest cannot be construed as a
25 significant source of competition for local residents.

26

27

28 Enforcement Issues:

29

30 Differences in federal and state
31 regulations resulting from adoption of WP08-31 would
32 create enforcement issues in areas with mixed land
33 ownership.

34

35 Other Comments:

36

37 Closing federal lands to non-federally
38 qualified users will not increase the moose population
39 or improve success for local hunters. Trend data for
40 these subunits are comparable to other areas of the
41 state, and composition data collected in 2007 clearly
42 indicate that moose harvests are sustainable at current
43 levels. There are no advantages gained by excluding
44 from Units 9B and 9C the few non-federally qualified
45 subsistence users, whose numbers are minimal and
46 declining. The light harvest is not a factor for moose
47 populations in Unit 9B and 9C, which, similar to other
48 portions of Unit 9, are limited primarily by calf
49 recruitment and habitat availability. The current
50 moose population in Unit 9 is at an appropriate level

1 for its habitat availability.

2

3 Recommendation:

4

5 Support WP08-30. Oppose WP08-31
6 because it would unnecessarily close federal lands to
7 non-federally qualified moose hunters in Units 9B and
8 9C. Such a closure would shift moose hunting by non-
9 federally qualified subsistence users to non-federal
10 lands closer to local communities and increase
11 competition for moose in those areas. Adoption of
12 WP08-31 is not required to ensure continuation of
13 subsistence uses by federally-qualified subsistence
14 users on federal public lands in Unit 9B and 9C.

15

16 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Thank
17 you. Questions, anybody.

18

19 MR. ALVAREZ: I've got a question.

20

21 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Go for it.

22

23 MR. ALVAREZ: Lem, I've got some
24 questions on some of your slides.

25

26 MR. BUTLER: Sure.

27

28 MR. ALVAREZ: You know, in that one
29 slide on Page -- on this one here, on Page 3 on the
30 bottom where it show the big subsistence harvest, how
31 did you come up with that? You know, the one with the
32 high spike, almost over 150?

33

34 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. I'll show you that
35 on the slide behind you so people in the back can see.
36 That's taken directly out of the table in the household
37 surveys from 2001 for the communities. And to be
38 honest, you know, that's -- you know, I'm -- again I'm
39 not trying to defend it, I'm just saying that that's
40 the estimated moose harvest for those communities,
41 those eight communities as concluded by the Subsistence
42 Division through their household surveys. Whether that
43 is an accurate reflection or whether that number is
44 high or low in relation to the true harvest is unknown.
45 And that's something that I think every agency in this
46 room represented would agree that we aren't sure how
47 certain we can be of that particular value. And the
48 only reason why I show it, again, is to just depict
49 that there's some unknowns here. And that may be part
50 of what we're missing when we try to rectify the

1 concerns expressed by individuals in these communities
2 with what's being collected, you know, again with our
3 moose population surveys and our harvest data. It's
4 really difficult again, since we're not seeing any big
5 changes in the moose population, and the harvest
6 doesn't appear to be very high, you know, why it is
7 that people are telling us that they're having a harder
8 time getting a moose. Again -- especially when our
9 reported moose harvest by locals doesn't seem to
10 reflect that. So it's just trying to figure out how we
11 can merge these concepts, that at least at first blush
12 aren't obviously in synch.

13

14 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah. That doesn't make
15 any sense to me, you know. 9B -- with that kind of
16 harvest, that's everybody that -- every hunter that
17 goes out would have to get one, in 9B, Levelock,
18 Igiugig, and the villages around the lake up in Lake
19 Clark. I don't know if there's 150 people that went out
20 and hunted. And so I don't have much faith in that.

21

22 MR. BUTLER: I have no problem with you
23 not having much faith in that.

24

25 MR. BOSKOFKY: These other years,
26 there was no surveys put out.

27

28 MR. BUTLER: That's also right. Yeah.
29 Well, actually, you know, Subsistence Division did do a
30 follow-up survey in 2004/5 and I was trying to track
31 down that table. It's not in print yet, so I wasn't
32 able to download it off the internet. But this is just
33 again public information off the internet. And, you
34 know, again I'd agree with Randy. But, you know, it
35 may not be every hunter takes just one moose. It may
36 be some hunters taking more than one moose. I'm not
37 going to even try to defend how they did that.

38

39 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Well, could
40 it not also be -- I mean, you probably don't know how
41 the survey was asked, but couldn't it also be
42 households sharing moose and then all of the same ones
43 reporting the moose.

44

45 MR. BUTLER: Another good explanation.
46 Yep. Yeah, there -- I think in another community
47 situation, with 9E communities, it seemed like possibly
48 to some degree moose were donated by a guide. There's
49 certainly potential. And, again, all I'm trying to do
50 here is depict that we're really -- there's a big

1 question mark here in terms of what's happened in some
2 of these situations.

3

4 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Well, there
5 is, because even if you stack all the little blocks
6 together that are to the right of it, it doesn't even
7 begin to reach the top of that block.

8

9 MR. ALVAREZ: And I've got another one
10 on page one on Branch River, local hunter effort and
11 success. You said there was -- what was it, zero? You
12 mentioned zero?

13

14 MR. BUTLER: I mentioned two people
15 reported hunting in 2006 I think it was, and two of
16 them reported taking moose. 100 percent success. And
17 you can see that again it fluctuates.

18

19 MR. ALVAREZ: Well, I hunt Branch River
20 every year, but apparently I guess I didn't write where
21 I hunted, but mostly I just put down Kvichak drainage
22 on my return card and I guess probably it didn't get
23 interpolated right. But every year I go up there. And
24 last year -- this last year we got one out of -- one
25 little bull out of -- there was five of us. And the
26 year before that, let's see, I didn't -- I was up
27 there, but we didn't get anything, and I went back up
28 the Igiugig and we got one up the Kaskanak. But I
29 always -- my son and I always go there, but I guess
30 since we didn't probably right it on our green card
31 that we were there, it didn't get reported that way.
32 And maybe a lot of other people, too, because I know
33 there's quite a few people from Levelock that go up
34 there. That's where -- Levelock, Yellow Creek and
35 Branch River there is their -- that's where they go.
36 And I know that getting those guys -- getting everybody
37 to turn their report cards in.....

38

39 MR. DUNAWAY: Report, yeah.

40

41 MR. ALVAREZ:I think, you know,
42 if we're going to get a working group together, that's
43 the main issue right there, you know, getting accurate
44 returns.

45

46 MR. BUTLER: Absolutely. And from my
47 point of view, trying to assess and recommend changes
48 that we can make to the regulations that will have a
49 positive effect for locals and the population as well,
50 if I don't have good information, it's impossible to

1 arrive at a solution. And that's -- I think -- maybe I
2 didn't say that clearly enough in this presentation,
3 but that's -- I mean, that's -- it's identifying that
4 there is a problem, what the problem is, and those are
5 the first two steps in resolving any problem. And
6 that's right, Mr. Chair.

7

8 MR. HEDLUND: You've got to send a
9 handful of those cards out to each one of the villages,
10 because Kokhanok I know doesn't have access, you know,
11 to those green cards. I don't think Igiugig has, Pedro
12 Bay doesn't.

13

14 MR. ALVAREZ: We do. We've got --
15 there's a lady in our office sells licenses and tags.

16

17 MR. HEDLUND: Kokhanok doesn't I know.
18 Nondalton doesn't. And so in turn they don't have a
19 way of reporting. And I know they hunt.

20

21 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Got to get
22 them reports.

23

24 MR. O'HARA: Madame Chair. Don't they
25 get a tag like the rest of us get a tag, in Pedro Bay
26 and all those places?

27

28 MR. HEDLUND: No, they don't. They
29 don't have access to it, so they say, don't need one.

30

31 MR. O'HARA: Well, yeah, you'll never
32 get a report then.

33

34 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. You know, they're
35 required to. And that's what we need to identify,
36 because if that's the case, if it's just a lack of -- I
37 mean, we've got -- the State will fly to these villages
38 and issue -- I mean, I'd stay there for three days
39 making sure that everyone had a hunting license and a
40 harvest ticket. That's not a problem. What we need to
41 identify if that is the problem.....

42

43 MR. HEDLUND: Well, that is a problem.

44

45 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. And that's really
46 good, that's what I need.....

47

48 MR. HEDLUND: I mean, you know, I hear
49 it all the time. We don't have it, so, you know, why
50 report it. There's nothing to report it on.

1 MR. BUTLER: That's really good to
2 know.
3
4 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: It doesn't
5 mean they don't have to eat just because they can't get
6 a card.
7
8 MR. BUTLER: No. That's right. And if
9 it's that simple of a solution to try and, you know,
10 again get the right information.....
11
12 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: It's
13 probably not that simple, but it's certainly a start I
14 would say.
15
16 MR. BUTLER: It's a start.
17
18 MR. O'HARA: Well, you know, Madame
19 Chairman, when they first started the Federal program,
20 and C&T findings went out, Levelock wasn't even a
21 qualified subsistence user, because they never turned
22 the cards in. We didn't know they were hunting.
23
24 MR. BUTLER: Right.
25
26 MR. O'HARA: So they all of a sudden
27 found out that there was.....
28
29 MR. BUTLER: And I'm sure the people
30 from the subsistence agency would tell you that that's
31 an important part of reporting from their perspective
32 is documenting that historical use so that it can be
33 maintained and preserved. So there's a lot of reasons
34 why reports are beneficial to locals.
35
36 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah. It's also
37 dumfounding that they can't get them. I remember we
38 had that problem in Togiak. I kind of worked with Pete
39 on getting it fixed it fixed a little bit. Juneau
40 wasn't going to send any cards out there, because
41 nobody ever sent them back. Something like that. I
42 said, no, we're not going to take this.
43
44 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Molly, did
45 you have something?
46
47 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, I had the
48 question on Page 3, that spike, you've got GMU 9B, so I
49 assume that the harvest was in 9B. And normally when
50 Subsistence Division does baseline surveys or surveys,

1 the surveys have a map to go with them. So did this,
2 the information you got, were you assured that there
3 was a map attached to the harvest that was coming from
4 9B, or were they other -- harvest from other units.

5
6 MR. BUTLER: The table is for 9B
7 specifically. The majority of this harvest was
8 depicted on the map as coming from 9B specifically.
9 The exception to that would be the Community of
10 Levelock which to some degree does show itself using
11 the lower portion of Alagnak River. I couldn't tell
12 you. I'd have to look at the map and see where the
13 harvest was located. But nonetheless 95 percent of
14 that bar in particular is 9B specific, giving a
15 comparison of that.

16
17 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Mainly from Levelock,
18 the Village of Levelock?

19
20 MR. BUTLER: Levelock, may have been
21 one or two, possibly more.....

22
23 MS. CHYTHLOOK: And what other
24 villages?

25
26 MR. BUTLER: Let's see. We've got Port
27 Alsworth, Nondalton, Newhalen, Iliamna, Pedro Bay.

28
29 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Kokhanok.

30
31 MR. BUTLER: Kokhanok. And there's two
32 others. Igiugig and Levelock.

33
34 MR. ALVAREZ: If you take that into
35 account, the average is probably around 20, 25 -- less
36 than 25, so if you've got 9 villages harvesting 20 to
37 25 moose a year, we have a problem.

38
39 MR. BUTLER: Well, again that's the
40 point of this, is that we aren't really sure that
41 that's all they're taking. I mean, I'm not trying to
42 say that it's as many as in 2001, but, you know, one of
43 the frustrations I have is I show a graph like this,
44 and everyone for some reason assumes that that reported
45 harvest is absolutely definitive for locals when they
46 compare it to non-locals and non-residents. But they
47 ignore what everyone seems to agree, is, you know, it's
48 probably an under-reporting error. And I'm not -- and,
49 again, I'm just trying to say that -- you know, I'm not
50 trying to say that that straight bar is reality, but

1 I'm just trying to relay the information.
2
3 MR. ALVAREZ: This is what's reported
4 -- Lem, this is what's reported?
5
6 MR. BUTLER: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)
7
8 MR. ALVAREZ: Have you figured out what
9 it could be counting, unreported?
10
11 MR. BUTLER: Impossible to do. The
12 nature of unreported harvest is that people are
13 typically trying not to let you know in a lot -- in
14 some cases, and in other cases they may be -- they may
15 have no history of reporting in the past. So I say
16 even who a hunter might be, or how many hunters come
17 from any one village. It's lost in the mix. You know,
18 all we can get out of it is success rates of the people
19 that are complying with the system, how many of them
20 are saying they're successful, how many of them are
21 saying they aren't successful, and we're really not
22 seeing a big change in success rates based on people
23 that are compliant with the hunting regulations and
24 reporting system. And that's all we know. We don't
25 know much at all about the people that aren't
26 complying, whether they're having a harder time getting
27 a moose or whether they're getting more moose than
28 they're supposed to. We just don't have any resolution
29 on that.
30
31 MR. DUNAWAY: Well, that sounds like
32 you desperately need a working group just to get some
33 of these basic things ironed out, because I know from
34 my experience working in the office here in Dillingham
35 that Eunice Dyasuk, she calls up every individual that
36 hasn't turned in a card in this part of the area, and
37 they've I think benefitted, and Togiak has, too, from
38 getting really involved with their moose and protecting
39 them. And now, shoot, we had a nice, pretty generous
40 season in Togiak, and they're spreading off to
41 Goodnews. And it kind of took a group agreement to not
42 shoot cows and report data and work on in it.
43
44 MR. ABRAHAM: Well, after the hunting
45 season is over, I call Dillingham, how many, you know,
46 reported ticket are, and then they give me the names.
47 I go around and kick butts over there, hey, bring --
48 send them back.
49
50 MR. BUTLER: You know, I mean, one of

1 the frustrations I see, just being an area manager, it
2 seems like Togiak's had really good success with
3 hunting just males, is that right, and you've seen a
4 real good increase in your population?

5
6 MR. ABRAHAM: Yeah, because I bug them.

7
8 MR. BUTLER: Because you bug them.
9 And, I don't know, it would be nice to get maybe
10 someone from your area to talk to some of these local
11 communities about, you know, the benefits of a male
12 only harvest. And, you know, I don't -- again I think
13 this has to be -- come from the resource users.

14
15 MR. ABRAHAM: Well, you know, no matter
16 where you go, there's always black sheep, you know,
17 doing something different, yeah.

18
19 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. Right. Right.

20
21 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Go ahead,
22 Randy.

23
24 MR. ALVAREZ: You know, I got a call
25 last fall from Kokhanok, the president of the Kokhanok
26 Village Council there, and he was asking that they
27 extend the -- he wanted me to ask you guys to extend
28 the moose season last fall, because they hadn't even
29 got a moose they said at the end of the season. And,
30 you know, so I gave them that speech, what you were
31 asking Pete, to go to the villages to do. And, you
32 know, that doesn't go over very well, but what I
33 basically told them was, you know, you need to -- that
34 to inform all these guys, all the people in the
35 villages there, they have to quit shooting cows,
36 because, you know, they used to shoot a moose, and I
37 told them, you know, if they -- you guys don't have any
38 -- if you're not getting any moose any more, it's
39 because you're running out of moose, because you have
40 this past history, and it's probably getting -- I'm
41 sure it's getting less, because there's less moose, of
42 shooting anything. And I said, pretty sure you're not
43 going -- you're not getting any moose, because there
44 aren't any. Extending the season isn't going to do any
45 good. If there's no moose, you can be open all year
46 round, you're not going to get any moose. So I gave
47 them that speech. But, you know, I don't know what
48 else to do. You know, it's.....

49
50 MR. BUTLER: I like to think that's a

1 start. I mean, you're right, you're not going to get
2 a.....
3
4 MR. ALVAREZ: I'm not saying they are.
5 I don't have any proof, but.....
6
7 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. But that
8 encouraging to me that you're just talking to these
9 folks and sharing it, because if it's just me telling
10 people, I mean, they -- you know, you see them just
11 kind of, you know, glaze over. And I'm hoping that's
12 where working groups might come into play. I'm trying
13 to work on hunter education, maybe get out there and
14 talk to the young kids and, you know, just really -- I
15 think it again needs to come from the communities.
16 It's not going to come from me saying it. So I really
17 applaud you for talking to Kokhanok, and sharing that
18 with them.
19
20 MR. ALVAREZ: Because, you know, it was
21 how many years ago, we use to have a cow -- be allowed
22 to shoot cows. And it just -- it takes some people
23 longer to quit doing that. And you've got then people
24 right in King Salmon, you know, that are being watched.
25
26 MR. BUTLER: That's right.
27
28 MR. ALVAREZ: You know, that's just the
29 way it is.
30
31 MR. DUNAWAY: You mean you ratted?
32
33 MR. ALVAREZ: I had to. If I want to
34 sit on this committee, you know, you're going to have
35 to be an example.
36
37 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Dan.
38
39 MR. O'HARA: Lem, you know, you go from
40 -- you did the moose survey with Dale?
41
42 MR. BUTLER: That's correct.
43
44 MR. O'HARA: You had good snow?
45
46 MR. BUTLER: Yep.
47
48 MR. O'HARA: And did you do it in
49 December?
50

1 MR. BUTLER: We typically try to do it
2 in November, but we'll go as late as December 10th, and
3 that's cut off for antlers.

4
5 MR. O'HARA: Yeah, there was a lot of
6 bulls right around Christmas.

7
8 MR. BUTLER: Uh-huh.

9
10 MR. O'HARA: All the way up to January.
11 But you start off at Big Mountain up there in 9B, and
12 you don't see much of a -- I fly that about six days a
13 week, and I look at -- I mean, I fly those lands
14 probably more than a lot of people do. And if I don't
15 do it with PenAir, I do it on my own, or go to
16 Kokhanok, or other places, I go up there in my own
17 plan. And I'm always looking low, just looking for
18 moose. You have a good population of moose from that
19 strip at Big Mountain all the way down to Sugar Loaf,
20 which is below the Branch, Alagnak. And there's just a
21 lot of moose. But notably from Big Alagnak maybe if
22 the snow is just right, and it's early enough in the
23 season, or if it's too late, they're not going to move,
24 you're just not going to get it. That's just a fact of
25 life. Levelock people, they've got 200 moose roaming
26 around there getting away from the wolves in January.
27 They don't have to worry about getting tags. They
28 just walk in the freezer, and they've got a moose. So
29 that's no big deal. So nobody's going to be touching
30 much of those animals, unless the snow conditions are
31 just right. And no one has a float plane in
32 subsistence to go out and do that type of thing. That
33 graph doesn't really represent what is true.

34
35 And you go to Lake Clark, you don't
36 have any moose at all. You know that as well as I do.
37 From your surveys, the wolves have eaten them up while
38 the Park people sat there and watched them and
39 applauded the wolves for doing it, you know. That's a
40 whole different story.

41
42 So those people in Nondalton aren't
43 going to get moose. They've got a 16-foot Lund, the
44 same old story, up the lake, and that river that goes
45 way back, that Long Lake there. What's the name of
46 that lake?

47
48 MR. HEDLUND: Chulitna.

49
50 MR. O'HARA: Chulitna. And it just

1 doesn't happen with subsistence. And so the moose
2 population's, I'm pretty sure, you and I look at the
3 same moose, from Big Mountain to lower Branch is going
4 to be pretty good moose, and up along that hillside,
5 Iliamna, upper Talarik to Nondalton, is there quite a
6 few moose right in there?

7
8 MR. HEDLUND: Not many. There's a few,
9 but not many.

10
11 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. They're hard to get
12 thought. They're hardly accessible when they are
13 there. You know, that's way up -- there's no place to
14 land up there, and you've got to get good snow to be
15 there with a snowmachine at the end of the season.

16
17 MR. HEDLUND: Yeah.

18
19 MR. O'HARA: Those subsistence users
20 are going to be really limited to getting an animal.
21 And I've seen these guys hunting day after day. I
22 mean, they put a lot of gas in those outboard motors
23 and they run those rivers for days, and fortunately
24 were able to get a moose. It's just hard for
25 subsistence people to get a moose, I don't care what
26 you say.

27
28 And the Kokhanok population, I've flown
29 all those areas up there, and they really have dropped
30 down. Maybe they killed them off, I don't know.

31
32 So I guess what you're saying is that
33 just because we close Federal subsistence land to non-
34 qualified users doesn't necessarily help the
35 subsistence people, is that what you're saying?

36
37 MR. BUTLER: That's right. It's a very
38 small harvest, a select harvest of bulls, so no changes
39 in the moose population. As you mentioned, in some
40 cases the non-locals may have access to areas currently
41 that local users can't get to. If you close the
42 Federal lands, you're likely to see a shift onto areas
43 that are more likely to be utilized by local users.

44
45 I haven't seen the big declines in some
46 of the Lake Clark areas. When I was up there, there
47 were a lot of moose last -- but, yeah, I mean, there's
48 differences from all across that subunit. Some areas
49 again are good moose habitat, some areas are poor moose
50 habitat. And I'm saying that part of what you're

1 saying may be the problem is that again locals have
2 certain tools available to them to access the area.
3 And primarily it's going to be both snow machine and to
4 some degree four-wheeler. And there's probably areas
5 again that are going more use than others, and if --
6 even if we again take some of these ratios, not looking
7 at the total harvest, but just the percent cows being
8 taken in some cases, or the percent out of season, that
9 sort of noncompliance, and particularly that cow
10 harvest, makes me wonder if areas that are easily
11 accessed by locals aren't in a different situation than
12 what I'm detecting at large in some of these other
13 areas. Again, it looks like from my surveys, 9B's
14 doing fine, can sustain the harvest.

15
16 If we redistribute that harvest onto
17 these areas that locals are already accessing, it's
18 just going to be increased conflict, no real change in
19 the harvest, no change in the population. I just see
20 more tension. And that's why I'm saying, I'm not sure
21 that these proposals are the solution for what we're
22 talking about here. And I would strongly advocate that
23 we go with more of a working group approach and try to
24 identify areas that are key for locals, try to
25 redistribute the survey effort to try to encapsulate
26 more of what locals are reporting, or at least get a
27 representative of some of those areas, and go that
28 route as opposed to this, what we're seeing now.

29
30 Like you say, from Big Mountain south,
31 there's a really good moose population, and we've got a
32 proposal right now to close a lot of that area to non-
33 local hunters. And the reported harvest, the non-local
34 harvest, it's all minimal. It's so minimal, and the
35 bull ratio is excellent. There's no reason not harvest
36 those moose. They're just going to die and become
37 maggot food if you close these areas, and you're going
38 to shift the pressure increasingly into areas that are
39 more important to locals. And that's why I'm saying I
40 don't see these proposals as a winning solution to what
41 we're talking about.

42
43 MR. O'HARA: Give us an example of
44 where the pressure's going to be at that come off of
45 that ridge up there?

46
47 MR. BUTLER: Say again?

48
49 MR. O'HARA: Will the pressure be in
50 Igiugig on State lands, or pressure will be on.....

1 MR. BUTLER: So you've got lower
2 Alagnak.
3
4 MR. O'HARA:Kokhanok on State
5 lands and Levelock?
6
7 MR. BUTLER: Yeah. Lower Alagnak
8 River. You've got, yeah, Kvichak River. I tried to
9 get a sense of where the non-locals were harvesting
10 moose, and it's spread out. Some of them were up in
11 Katmai Preserve.
12
13 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Go ahead.
14
15 MR. ALVAREZ: Well, last year we
16 submitted a proposal, you know, for corridors along
17 Alagnak River, Yellow Creek, and, you know, along on
18 Federal lands. And we even asked to do it on State --
19 we sent a proposal to do it on State lands, but you
20 guys didn't support it. So now we're at this stage
21 right here, you know. And in my opinion, that made
22 better sense, having corridors where the locals along
23 the rivers and creeks where the locals are accessing,
24 you know. Doing this will get you there, but there may
25 be, you know, a lot of moose along the hills back where
26 the locals can't get to them. But it doesn't make much
27 sense to me to allow non-residents or people that have
28 a lot of money to fly in with a float plane, can hire a
29 guide or an outfitter, to go and hunt those moose and
30 keep them at a low density -- or keep them low enough
31 to where they're not going to expand out into the
32 regions that the locals can get some harvest out of
33 them.
34
35 MR. BUTLER: The productivity of this
36 population isn't such that you'd ever see an expansion
37 out. And then again, the harvest is so minimal that
38 we're not -- the harvest isn't keeping this moose
39 population from doing anything. And what we're talking
40 about here is allocation of the resource, which, you
41 know, if there's population issue, there's no harvest
42 issue, we're talking about allocation of this resource.
43 And the moose that the locals can't get to, I mean,
44 it's -- I don't see how that should be a.....
45
46 MR. ALVAREZ: They move around. You
47 know, when we were coming over here, I seen a moose out
48 in the middle of the flat. It was 10 miles from any
49 trees, and he was just talking around. You know, they
50 move around.

1 MR. BUTLER: But as an allocation issue
2 again, I think if we had a working group get together
3 and try to develop a solution, I think that we could
4 actually pass that through the Board of Game. What the
5 Board of Game -- why they didn't act was because the
6 harvests are so low and insignificant, and the
7 population is doing fine, so the Board had nothing to
8 act on. But if we could get a working group to develop
9 a solution and present it to the Board as a solution to
10 local conflict and tension, I think we could have
11 success with that approach. But as long as it's -- you
12 know, there's no data to support it, that there's a
13 problem, and it's allocative in nature.....

14
15 MR. ALVAREZ: There's data.

16
17 MR. BUTLER: That says that there
18 aren't many hunters hunting. I mean, the data says
19 that there aren't many hunters hunting.

20
21 MR. ALVAREZ: Well, the data -- the
22 harvest reports said they're not harvesting much.
23 So.....

24
25 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Joe, you had
26 something.

27
28 MR. CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, I guess as a
29 public, it occurs to me (indiscernible, away from
30 microphone)

31
32 REPORTER: We need him to come up to the
33 microphone.

34
35 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Oh, do you
36 want to come up and use a mic, please.

37
38 MR. CHYTHLOOK: I just wanted to
39 comment.

40
41 REPORTER: I know, but I need to get it
42 on record.

43
44 MR. CHYTHLOOK: My name is Joe Q.
45 Public.

46
47 (Laughter)

48
49 MR. BOSKOFKY: Mr. Chair, are we
50 meeting tomorrow?

1 MR. CHYTHLOOK: Yeah. For the record,
2 my name is Joe Chythlook, and I'm just making a public
3 comment, Madame Chair or Mr. Chair. I tend to agree
4 with Dan in his observation of what i think might be
5 happening with the moose. And I don't know if the idea
6 that Lem is presenting, even with the public folks
7 getting together, can solve the problem. As long as
8 you have Federal lands within 9B, you're going to
9 continue to have predators that I think will eat a lot
10 of moose. And I know the Board of Game's been
11 wrestling with predator control issues for a number of
12 cycles now, but every time we -- every time they almost
13 come to some sort of solution which might have an
14 effect or do something with predator control, we have
15 other folks that have other lands that object it to I
16 guess, and, of course, you know, probably rightly so,
17 because they have a bigger public number of people that
18 they have to listen to.

19
20 And just for -- I guess also just for
21 information, this last year the Board of Game had to
22 put a limit on public comments that they receive from
23 some of these people whenever somebody says wolf. We
24 used to get thousands and thousands of comments about,
25 well, don't touch the wolves. And I guess to cut down
26 on paperwork and Staff time, the Board made a limit on
27 how many pages an individual can submit as they comment
28 on the wolves.

29
30 So I guess I'm not trying to bog
31 anything down, but one other thing, one other issue.
32 Even if the RAC or the Federal Subsistence Board were
33 to address this, and if it comes before the Board of
34 Game next cycle, Mr. Butler here is going to have the
35 same information, and based on that same information,
36 because it hasn't changed from the last cycle, I can
37 almost guarantee the Board of Game isn't going to take
38 a real action to change, you know, what's going to be
39 happening there.

40
41 Well, maybe this idea of a working
42 group might work if everybody including the folks that
43 have the land within the area, are, you know, part of
44 that and everybody chips in.

45
46 The reason why Unit 17A and onto up
47 into Unit 18 I think has potential of becoming a
48 success story is because everybody has been working
49 together the last few years to try and enhance the
50 moose population and educate the people that it's

1 important to make sure that there's good habitat,
2 there's moose, cows and calves and all that, you know.

3

4

5 But anyway, predator I think is one
6 issue that it seems like every time it comes up before
7 the Board of Game, that people just don't pay much
8 attention to it. I think there's more to it than.....

9

10 And I just wanted to comment as public
11 person. As an observing person from seeing the process
12 for a year or two.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you,
17 Joe.

18

19 Yeah, Pete was next.

20

21 MR. ABRAHAM: Working group and
22 education. (In Yup'ik)

23

24 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Any
25 other questions for Lem.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Thank
30 you, Lem.

31

32 MR. DUNAWAY: Thanks for the thorough
33 presentation. It's a real help.

34

35 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah. Thanks. We might
36 need it again for deliberations.

37

38 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Any
39 Federal, State and tribal agency comments. Frank.

40

41 MR. WOODS: Frank Woods, BBNA. It's
42 getting kind of late here. I'll just make it short.

43

44 Thank you, Lem, for a wonderful
45 presentation. I think that it was well put together.
46 When you put a subsistence user against a scientist,
47 the missing piece is the traditional ecological
48 knowledge is missing from this -- kind of his
49 presentation.

50

1 A lot of the -- and I like your
2 comment, Dan, about when you're up there, there's
3 nothing here, and how they access the resource.

4
5 The proposal before you is to keep the
6 subsistence user using the resource and eliminating the
7 non-subsistence user. The State has a different
8 objective, and that's to manage for all users it looks
9 on a management strategy and a plan. It doesn't
10 segregate and prioritize subsistence over any user.

11
12 And I know that BBNA supports the plan
13 -- and I like Lem's idea of a working group. I've been
14 put in charge of helping address the caribou and moose
15 declines, so I'd love to keep working on that idea. I
16 don't know where Lem's at -- there he is.

17
18 So, yeah, I think I'll cut it short,
19 and BBNA is in full support of the proposal before you.
20 Thank you.

21
22 E is included in this last section? We
23 had a call from the Chigniks that they're having the
24 same issues and same trouble down in Perryville on the
25 lower peninsula in E, they're having the same issues as
26 B and C is having, and that's access to resource and
27 being able to harvest enough to feed their families.

28
29 Thanks.

30
31 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
32 Any other Federal, State and tribal agency comments.

33
34 MS. MCBURNEY: Thank you, Madame Chair.
35 For the record, my name is Mary McBurney with Lake
36 Clark National Park.

37
38 And while I don't have a comment to
39 make to the proposal that is before you in the book, I
40 do want to make a commitment on behalf of the Lake
41 Clark subsistence program, that if there is a working
42 group, I will do everything I can to support that and
43 the work of the members. So if that is something that
44 you decide to forward with, count us in.

45
46 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
47 Thank you very much. Go ahead. Questions.

48
49 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Mary, we were
50 talking to Lem about his survey. How do you conduct

1 your survey up in B in the Lake Clark National Park?
2 Does your personnel and your airplanes do the Lake
3 Clark and the pass and all the way to Cooper Bay? Do
4 you guys do your own survey, or do you take the State
5 of Alaska's survey?
6

7 MS. MCBURNEY: This past year Judy
8 Petera and, let's see, I -- and Staff from Lake Clark
9 did survey some of the UCUs around Port Alsworth. And
10 that is probably -- that's the most recent survey that
11 we have done. There have been Park-based surveys that
12 have been done in the past, but they have not been done
13 consistently, partly because snow cover has, you know,
14 been pretty spotty over the past several years. And
15 other factors as well.
16

17 Unfortunately, I'm probably not the
18 most qualified person to really answer that question
19 with any detail, but, you know, I'd be happy to chase
20 down that information for you if you'd like me to.
21

22 MR. O'HARA: Madame Chair. What kind
23 of a report do you get back from Nondalton, Iliamna,
24 Pedro Bay, Kokhanok on -- I guess Kokhanok and Pedro
25 Bay both are in State lands. So your Federal lands
26 would be -- I mean, the most usable area for harvest is
27 going to be like Nondalton is in the Park?
28

29 MS. MCBURNEY: Nondalton is just
30 adjacent to the Preserve area.
31

32 MR. O'HARA: But I assume they going
33 into the -- up in the lake, then they're into the Park?
34

35 MS. MCBURNEY: That's correct.
36

37 MR. O'HARA: What kind of a response to
38 you get or what kind of reports do you get back on
39 harvests on subsistence or moose from Nondalton, or is
40 that maybe something you should ask someone else?
41

42 MS. MCBURNEY: Well, what we do get
43 from people that we just talk to, you know, they have a
44 difficult time getting the moose that they need.
45

46 MR. O'HARA: But don't they harvest
47 their an -- don't they report their animals when they
48 harvest them? You've got a reporting system?
49

50 MS. MCBURNEY: The park does not have a

1 reporting system. We use the reporting system that the
2 State uses. So our data is the state's data
3 essentially with respect to harvest.

4
5 MR. O'HARA: Yeah, that's what I
6 wondered.

7
8 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Something
9 needs to be done about that. That's not the first time
10 we've said that.

11
12 Any other questions.

13
14 MR. O'HARA: That's a good point, Mary.
15 We do appreciate that.

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you,
20 Mary.

21
22 Okay. InterAgency Staff Committee
23 comments.

24
25 MR. RABINOWITCH: No comments.

26
27 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
28 Summary of written public comments.

29
30 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair and the
31 Council. The Lake Clark SRC submitted a public written
32 comment on No. 30 to shorten the hunting season for
33 Unit 9B. Opposed. The SRC discussed the proposal
34 after the Lake Clark wildlife biologist reported on the
35 moose study in the Park. The SRC does not support
36 decreasing moose hunting opportunities.

37
38 And on WP08-31, to close the lands in
39 Units 9B and C to non-Federally-qualified subsistence
40 users, the SRC supports measures that improve
41 subsistence opportunities.

42
43 And those were the written public
44 comments, Madame Chair.

45
46 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
47 And then public testimony. Joe's the only one I've got
48 here. Yep.

49
50 MR. KLUTSCH: Thank you. Madame Chair

1 and members of the Committee.

2

3 Just listening to all of this, I've got
4 to tell you I've got a real sense of relief right now.
5 I was concerned prior to this meeting that I hadn't had
6 an opportunity to talk to any of the Council members
7 and share some of my thoughts. Just gathering all the
8 information to get ready to come here and try and say
9 something that was knowledgeable wasn't easy to do.

10

11 A lot of the household survey data that
12 we've been discussing, or you've been studying and
13 questioning, in fact all of it, comes right out of this
14 report. And I got a hold of this report last week, and
15 I have read and reread and gone through that thing.
16 I'm not a graphs and numbers and dots and all that kind
17 of stuff type of a person, but this is quite a report
18 and well worth your time to read, because it will talk
19 about the methodology, how the household surveys were
20 conducted, who conducted them. I mean, it goes into
21 detail. How the individuals who did the interviewing
22 were trained. Margins of error. A lot of the
23 questions that you have, Randy, about the unreported
24 harvest can be in part answered in here.

25

26 I actually intended to talk about this
27 a little later, but on the issue of the high levels of
28 unreported harvest, this isn't unique to Unit 9B. This
29 is coming out of household surveys all over the State.
30 There were just amazing spikes in unreported harvest
31 numbers, especially in Unit 19A and Unit 19B on the
32 upper Kuskokwim when they got into that. They ended up
33 with a moose management plan. I mean, they were down
34 to Tier I virtually. Ultimately it ended up centering
35 on a predator control program in that area, but we're
36 seeing the same thing in Unit 12, in Unit 13, and a lot
37 of the statistics that Lem showed you, it's a statewide
38 issue.

39

40 And some of the information in my
41 written testimony comes directly from the graphs and
42 the information in this study. Again, if you get a
43 copy of this and can stand to wade through it, it's
44 pretty fascinating stuff.

45

46 So in the interest of time, I'll just
47 get on with what I'd written to get it on the record.

48

49 The two comments appear to be written
50 to compliment each other. We know that 30 would

1 shorten the current fall and winter seasons in the aim
2 of conserving moose, but carefully reading this paper
3 that I just cited indicates serious problems with
4 adherence to current seasons as well as bull only
5 requirements. To the extent that they can be relied
6 on, household survey data is very revealing. Tables 22
7 on Page 58 and 59 indicate that very high percentages
8 of moose are being taken out of season and without
9 compliance with harvest reporting requirements.

10

11 Additionally, on average 30 plus
12 percent of the moose harvested are cows, based on the
13 survey data. And in some areas, in several of the
14 villages, the ratio of cows harvested, these are
15 household surveys, what people are telling the
16 interviewers, 50 percent of the animals harvested were
17 cows. They'll also break down in there the percentage
18 of people interviewed, and the percentage of people
19 that were successful, and the ones that were
20 unsuccessful and the reasons why they were
21 unsuccessful. I mean, there's a lot of info in there.

22

23 From a conservation standpoint, this
24 will have serious long-term consequences, the cow
25 harvest, I'm just certain of that, especially in a low
26 density population like this. At the same time, I
27 completely appreciate the need to be able to harvest
28 for food. I mean, it's a tough decision when you don't
29 have what you're looking for there and there's an
30 opportunity. Believe me, I understand that.

31

32 The significant lack of adherence to
33 current regulations should lead us to question the
34 merits of shortening the season since compliance does
35 not seem to be a limiting factor in reducing harvest.
36 Ramifications of this level of cow harvest alone will
37 reduce future opportunity to hunt healthy moose
38 populations. Based on the information in the study,
39 shortening the season in regulation will have little or
40 no effect if current use patterns and attitudes
41 persist.

42

43 On WP08-31, if this was adopted, it
44 would close, as you know, 9B and portions of 9C,
45 insuring continuation of subsistence uses. Given the
46 very low level of harvest by non-local days hunter
47 during an 11-day fall season. That's what non-local,
48 non-resident hunters would have. And given the very
49 high level of out of season harvest mentioned above,
50 this proposal will not have any measurable effect on

1 conservation of moose.

2

3 Information in Table 25 on Page 67
4 indicates that competition with other hunters is not
5 reported as a significant factor. That's what it says.
6 And it will give it to you village by village. The
7 highest of percentage of people that have reported
8 having competition with other hunters was 7.5 percent
9 of the people in Kokhanok. That was the highest
10 percentage. The average of all the villages in Unit 9B
11 was 1.4 percent. Only 1.4 percent said competition
12 with other hunters was an issue. This was done in
13 conjunction with the State Division of Subsistence and
14 the Federal Subsistence Division.

15

16 Most hunters listed a lack of game or
17 personal reasons for not meeting needs. And I remember
18 a survey from some years ago on this. Again, you're
19 going to have to look at these graphs. In a lot of the
20 cases, 40 to 60 percent of the people that didn't get
21 moose said it was for personal reasons. What do
22 personal reasons mean? I don't know.

23

24 But a lack of game near villages may be
25 due to localized hunting pressure. There's no question
26 in my mind that that increased ATV use in the proximity
27 of villages has resulted in less game close to these
28 areas. And, Randy, you were talking about the
29 situation there maybe, we can only speculate, in and
30 around Kokhanok, maybe that was part of the issue
31 there.

32

33 Then I'm just reiterating what you've
34 already heard, ADF&G population data does not indicate
35 health of this population is as bad as has been
36 suggested. Bull to cow ratios are good. Reproductive
37 capability is there. It just doesn't seem there's any
38 biological justification for eliminating non-local
39 hunting in 9B.

40

41 And this one I mentioned in my
42 testimony earlier when I spoke first today, and, Dan,
43 you weren't here. I actually commented on WP08-01 and
44 WP08-05 which relates to predator management. And I
45 was greatly relieved to hear Joe Chythlook and then Dan
46 following on your observations in upper Lake Clark. I
47 don't know how we can carry on a conversation about
48 moose management, maybe it's a part of the workshop or
49 whatever you guys decide we're going to do, but I don't
50 know how you can carry on this conversation or a

1 dialogue without discussing predators. And I believe
2 -- I'm jumpy about them, Randy, you know what we're
3 seeing down in Naknek, and, Dan, you know it. And I've
4 been watching this. Now, on the one hand we have the
5 Department telling us that the population isn't showing
6 -- it looks like everything is fairly stable, but I'm
7 seeing more wolves than I've ever seen. And there's no
8 doubt in my mind that these are a significant --
9 there's a significant predator issue going on out
10 there.

11
12 Is it to the threshold that it would
13 require predator control? I don't think so at this
14 point, but I think we'd better be thinking about other
15 options that would keep us from going to that
16 threshold. And that might be more active trapping
17 programs, a number of other things, actively getting
18 out there and getting after these wolves. It's a
19 factor.

20
21 And again the Federal Board -- I was
22 reading in that Proposal 01, adopted a policy I think
23 in '04, of not dealing with predator control. Predator
24 control is not about, that's the policy. The policy.
25 It doesn't have anything to do with subsistence.

26
27 I hope we don't reach a threshold where
28 you have to have control, but including predators in a
29 management plan in my view sure as hell does have
30 something to do with providing for subsistence needs.
31 You just can't ignore their role in a management
32 equation in a management equation and expect to be able
33 to meet your subsistence needs. And that is a.....

34
35 I'm going to get off that soap box, and
36 maybe we can talk about that later.

37
38 To effect a closure, it has to be
39 supported by substantial evidence that a closure is
40 required to insure a healthy population and that
41 continued opportunity for subsistence harvest cannot be
42 maintained without a closure. These thresholds have
43 not occurred and the tests to justify closure cannot be
44 met.

45
46 This is not to say that we don't have
47 problems out there. As stated earlier, we need active
48 management to include predators, particularly wolves in
49 my opinion. Next, to insure better populations of
50 moose both short and long term, we must work to comply

1 with hunting regulations.

2

3 And I go on to say I think the workshop
4 idea would be a great idea and get people with local
5 knowledge and expertise. And following what the
6 gentleman said from BBNA, that having a scientist over
7 here and a subsistence user over here and there's this
8 gap in there. And that's really important stuff I
9 think. And then other interested parties and
10 stakeholders.

11

12 I recommend that these proposals be
13 deferred in favor of the work group and meaningful
14 conservation measures which will ensure future hunting
15 opportunities.

16

17 And with that, I'll conclude my
18 remarks.

19

20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you,
21 Joe.

22

23 Questions. Go ahead.

24

25 MR. ALVAREZ: Joe, thanks for your
26 report. According to what I understand, it's to get
27 predator management on Federal lands, we have to work
28 with the Federal managers. It's not the Federal
29 Subsistence Board. We have to work with either Fish
30 and Wildlife Service or Park Service or BLM, whoever's
31 got jurisdiction over that land, that Federal land. So
32 that's how that's going to work. It's not for the
33 Federal Subsistence Board.

34

35 You know, if -- you know, like Lem had
36 stated, you know, I believe that the bull to cow ratio
37 is fine, but you stated that the calf ratio is. Well,
38 not according to the table in our book on Page 66. On
39 top there, in the 80s there was on the average of 22
40 calves per 100 cows. And if you look at that column,
41 it just gradually less and less until last year, 2007,
42 composition, they average about 2 calves per 100 cows.
43 Well, that's -- we're not thinking that is a very good
44 outlook on what kind of reproduction, replacement we
45 have, you know for the moose that we -- that are out
46 there now. And even over there on the first slide, the
47 density per square mile is getting less and less in 9B,
48 and, you know, it sure doesn't look good to me, you
49 know, especially with the calf ratio being so low.

50

1 You know, we need to do something. We
2 tried last corridors year, you know, and doing nothing,
3 leaving it the way it is, is in my opinion, not our
4 best interest.

5
6 And, I agree, we need predator
7 management, you know. It's just -- that one there is a
8 real hard pill to swallow for some people I think.

9
10 MR. KLUTSCH: Mr. Chairman. If I may,
11 it sure is. And it's a very complicated subject, and
12 it has just dominated Board of Game actions in the last
13 two cycles.

14
15 There are a number of things that I
16 think we need to keep in mind, or you may be aware of.
17 There will be a ballot initiative this summer in August
18 on predator control. And essentially what that ballot
19 initiative says, that it would authorize predator
20 control only at a threshold of biological emergency and
21 then it could only be conducted by the -- individuals
22 employed by the State.

23
24 The problem I've got with that is that
25 by the time you reach a point of biological emergency,
26 there isn't anything left. There isn't any more --
27 we're Tier I.

28
29 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Reactionary
30 time is too slow.

31
32 MR. KLUTSCH: And that's where we're at
33 in Unit 9E, and that's why -- or in D on the caribou,
34 and that's why the Board of Game authorized that hunt.
35 But by then, if you get into that, they call it a
36 predator pit, the same thing that happened in Unit 19.
37 It might take 15 years to recover. So that ballot
38 initiative is going to be real important one for
39 everyone in rural Alaska to vote for. The Ditman
40 polls, they've done some serious polls on this, because
41 there's been two ballot initiatives that were lost.
42 They believe what may make the difference is absentee
43 voters from the rural areas, because we all know what
44 we're all going to be doing in August. Who wants to go
45 to a polling booth or a voting booth in August. So to
46 get people to get absentee ballots and vote, that will
47 be a critical one.

48
49 There are two other things that are
50 going on in the Legislature. One is a bill that's

1 called Wildlife Assets. And it would designate in
2 statute that game animals are an asset of the State,
3 which links it to a provision in the State constitution
4 that says it's illegal to allocate State assets by
5 ballot initiative. So that would get us out of the
6 ballot initiative quagmire that we keep finding
7 ourselves back in. Will that bill make it? Right now
8 it's about half way. And they got scared after
9 Defenders of Wildlife ran some ads on Channel 2 News,
10 that legislators did. And that's what their intent
11 was. Really weird stuff connecting -- making a claim
12 that the same legislators that made dirty deals with
13 big oil are now trying to take away your right to vote
14 on how wildlife is managed. Anyway, that's one bill.

15
16 Another one is called the Wildlife
17 Asset Bill, and this one might make it. And what this
18 would do, would direct the Board of Game and the
19 Department of Fish and Game to revise and build
20 management plans for identified populations of
21 ungulates and engage in predator management activity
22 before you reach that low level equilibrium is the
23 fancy term for it. Before you end up in the predator
24 pit. You've got to include them. And this would
25 direct the Board in conjunction with the Department of
26 Fish and Game to do that. And that one I think could
27 be pretty helpful. But knowing what the Legislature
28 will do is anybody's guess.

29
30 At any rate, in my written stuff that I
31 gave you, you'll see my -- you can read my comments on
32 the predator stuff, and I don't have to say it again.
33 I pretty much got it out of my system.

34
35 But if I may, I'd just like to pose a
36 question to you, Randy. I heard what Dan said. What
37 do you think about wolves in Unit 9B?

38
39 MR. ALVAREZ: Well, there's a lot of
40 them, you know, but there's not as many as there used
41 to be, because we don't have the caribou there. You
42 know, they tend to follow the caribou around. But I
43 fly back and forth from Igiugig to Naknek, and I see
44 most of the wolves down by Naknek, because that's where
45 all the caribou are.

46
47 MR. KLUTSCH: Yeah.

48
49 MR. ALVAREZ: And people have been
50 getting quite a few of them, you know, with

1 snowmachines. But there's still wolves. They got one
2 dog about a month ago, probably two months ago, in
3 Igiugig, that was tied up on a chain. And I even shot
4 at one by my house, but my shooting isn't what it used
5 to be.

6

7 (Laughter)

8

9 MR. DUNAWAY: I should have invited you
10 over for Beaver Roundup this year.

11

12 MR. ALVAREZ: You know, I think there
13 seems to be a multiple of things, you know. One
14 management tool is -- it's going to take more than one
15 tool to fix the problem. That would probably be
16 limiting harvest, you know, for some user groups,
17 shortening the season like we suggested. You know, I
18 don't -- the Lake Clark SRC, they opposed shortening
19 the winter season, but I suggested that at our last
20 meeting, because, you know, if you're going to
21 eliminate one user group, I thought it would be right
22 to shorten the winter season, and kind of align it with
23 the State season to show that, you know, we are trying
24 -- you know, are cutting ourselves back also. But if
25 the Federal Board doesn't want to support 31, I see no
26 reason to change 30 either.

27

28 So that's -- Madame Chair, that's all I
29 had to say.

30

31 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Any other
32 questions for Joe. Go ahead, Dan.

33

34 MR. O'HARA: I think the bear
35 population is really, really difficult with the moose,
36 too. That's a known factor. It's a guide use unit.
37 And the State of Alaska has issued permits now I think
38 for getting a wolf along with your bear hunt, which is
39 a pretty unique tool. And you'll take out two bear
40 hides and a wolf hide. I mean, I fly to all those
41 camps. I see what's coming out out of there.

42

43 And Title VIII, and, you know, just as
44 a comment to our superintendent out at Katmai National
45 Park, they've worked hard to allow ATVs into the park
46 areas for people to do subsistence. So when we jump on
47 you, we're kind of nice to you at the same time a
48 little bit. Not necessarily just jumping on you.
49 There's levels of management that go way beyond what
50 Katmai and Lake Clark does. It comes out of the

1 headquarters of the Park Service. And so we're dealing
2 with a pretty large animal there. And the reason I say
3 that is because I do respect working with these actual
4 Park Service people and Refuge people, because if they
5 had their way, the whole system would change to, you
6 know, something different.

7

8 But I guess, maybe, Title VIII is a
9 very, very important part of the act of Congress. Some
10 sharp lawyer would probably take that and say, you know
11 -- not even too sharp a lawyer, might take that and
12 say, you might want to tweak this a little bit to make
13 sure subsistence is taken care of on this issue. So I
14 think it's a long-standing thing that we need to hurry
15 along one.

16

17 And I appreciate your comments.

18

19 MR. KLUTSCH: Thank you, Dan.

20

21 MR. DUNAWAY: Would you like
22 deliberations, or would you like to see.....

23

24 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: If we get it
25 on the table, we can.

26

27 MR. ALVAREZ: I guess I'll move we
28 adopt Proposals WP08-30 and WP08-31.

29

30 MR. O'HARA: Second the motion.

31

32 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Discussion.
33 Randy.

34

35 MR. ALVAREZ: I think, you know -- let
36 me go back again to my proposal.

37

38 MR. BOSKOFISKY: This proposal is pretty
39 much taking away the proposal that we put in last
40 winter, wasn't it?

41

42 MR. ALVAREZ: It was two years ago.

43

44 MR. BOSKOFISKY: I thought it was just
45 last winter it was -- when we extended the subsistence
46 season.

47

48 MR. ALVAREZ: Well, two years ago we
49 opposed a proposal by -- was it.....

50

1 MR. DUNAWAY: That was Chignik.
2
3 MR. ALVAREZ: Chignik, to close 9E for
4 moose for non-residents. And this would basically do
5 the same thing, but also in A and B and C.
6
7 MR. ADAMS: But it also, the way it's
8 stated, it's cutting that late season back again. And
9 that's the one we just put in.
10
11 MR. ALVAREZ: That's only in 9B.
12
13 MR. BOSKOFISKY: In 9E. 9E is in there,
14 too.
15
16 MR. ALVAREZ: Okay. I see. Yeah. 9E,
17 the Federal season is open. I remember we changed that
18 last year. The Federal Board moved it into end of
19 January.
20
21 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Yeah. And now this is
22 basically going against that proposal that we put in.
23 And we're, like Dan says, you know, Title VIII, we're
24 here to benefit our subsistence users.
25
26 MR. ALVAREZ: This proposal, Alvin,
27 like maybe it's written up wrong, because if you look
28 at the top there, we -- Proposal 30, moved to change
29 the dates in Unit 9B, so you got the August 28th and
30 December 1st stricken out. But there's nothing
31 stricken out on the bottom part, 9E. Maybe it wasn't
32 written up right.
33
34 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Cliff, do
35 you.....
36
37 MR. BOSKOFISKY: This proposal needs to
38 be really.....
39
40 MR. EDENSHAW: Would you repeat that
41 again, Randy?
42
43 MR. ALVAREZ: Last year we supported a
44 proposal, and the Federal Board passed it, to lengthen
45 the winter season in 9E to the end of January, right?
46 What does the book say?
47
48 MR. DUNAWAY: You've got a walking book
49 out here.
50

1 MR. ALVAREZ: Lem, do you have
2 something?
3
4 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Lem
5 Butler.
6
7 I'm not sure where you're looking right
8 now, but just discussing this with Laura Greffenius,
9 the Proposal WP08-30, which shortens the winter season,
10 only affects the winter season in 9B as in boy. It
11 doesn't affect the winter season in 9E as in echo. So
12 it has ramifications for who qualifies there, et
13 cetera, that may list E, but it's purely the season in
14 9B as in boy that's being affected by Proposal 30.
15
16 MR. ALVAREZ: Okay. So it's just
17 written up wrong right there where it says.....
18
19 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: And 31.
20 Yeah.
21
22 MR. ALVAREZ:January 15th,
23 because the book says January 31st.
24
25 MR. BOSKOFISKY: I still feel that, you
26 know, these subsistence users are having a hard time
27 getting their moose. They need to have a time period
28 that they can get out and get them.
29
30 MR. O'HARA: What page are you on?
31
32 MR. ALVAREZ: Page 60 on our proposal
33 book, and then Page.....
34
35 MR. DUNAWAY: Page 54.
36
37 MR. ALVAREZ:54 in the regulation
38 book.
39
40 MR. DUNAWAY: And it shows it as new,
41 they've got it highlighted as January 31. I think that
42 means new
43
44 MR. ALVAREZ: Because that -- yeah,
45 that was changed last year. Cliff.
46
47 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Go ahead.
48
49 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair. Perhaps
50 if we could ask the Council, for Randy to -- in his

1 motion to adopt Proposals 30 and 31, perhaps we could
2 just take 30 first, which is shortening the seasons,
3 and so we wouldn't get mixed up with the closures on
4 the different subunits and just go ahead and deal with
5 30 which is shortening the seasons.
6
7 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah, but my
8 worry is that he's not going to want to put that one on
9 the table unless 31 happens from what I heard him say.
10
11 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah.
12
13 MR. DUNAWAY: They're pretty closely
14 intertwined.
15
16 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah.
17
18 MR. DUNAWAY: That's why I puzzled over
19 this last night.
20
21 MR. ALVAREZ: I talked to Tenny (ph)
22 about it a little while ago. Lake Clark SRC adamantly
23 opposed shortening the season, you know, and if we
24 can't -- if there aren't support 31, I don't want to
25 support 30.
26
27 MR. PROBASCO: That's why you should
28 separate them.
29
30 MR. ALVAREZ: That's why we should
31 separate them?
32
33 MR. PROBASCO: Yes. If you want to do
34 what you're doing, Randy, do Proposal 31 first. Then
35 whatever you do on 31 will determine what you're going
36 to do on 30.
37
38 MR. DUNAWAY: I could speak to it. I
39 don't know if you all want to speak to it a little bit.
40
41 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah, let's
42 continue a little bit of discussion here and see where
43 it takes us. Dan, you can be next.
44
45 MR. DUNAWAY: It might clarify things.
46 I puzzled over this until I just went to bed last
47 night, actually early this morning. After seeing Lem's
48 presentation, I'm really inclined to vote against both
49 of them. I know there's a problem, and I thought when
50 we made this proposal, we were going to try to take a

1 run at doing something, and something does need to be
2 done. But I'm flabbergasted to find out that folks
3 can't get harvest tickets, and maybe even licenses in
4 some of these villages, that we've got data gaps that
5 are so big that we're trying to make decisions without
6 enough information. And so I'm just kind of -- I want
7 to do something, but I'm not sure this is effective.
8 And I'd be inclined to support the working group idea
9 and just grit our teeth and suffer through for a couple
10 years without taking this kind of action.

11
12 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I would add
13 a comment to that, too, Dan, that one of my -- I would
14 like to hear some of the other people's comments about
15 as well, is one of my biggest concerns was actually a
16 comment that Dan made. I'm not sure that closing those
17 particular Federal areas is going to help the
18 subsistence hunter. It sounds like perhaps only the
19 Village of Nondalton is going to benefit from that, and
20 not the rest of the villages. So could we -- if
21 anybody has some discussion of that also, could we hear
22 it.

23
24 MR. O'HARA: Well, I guess, Madame
25 Chair, I guess one of the concerns I have is, of
26 course, we want to give the residents a chance to do
27 the first right of refusals. The State of Alaska, and
28 if you look at the map there on Page 51, and there's a
29 huge amount of white land in 9B, 9C, and that's State
30 land. And I can't imagine the Board even thinking
31 about doing a rural preference when the constitution of
32 Alaska says it's, you know -- we can do it on Federal
33 lands, not a problem. I mean, that's our privilege.
34 The Federal Board will pass it. But if that proposal's
35 going to include all of those areas, I just can't
36 imagine how the State of Alaska can go ahead and
37 approve that proposal. So if you think there's a
38 chance, hey, I'll support it big time, but if it's not
39 going to work, then we'd better start working on, you
40 know, a working committee, or a predator control
41 program or something. If somebody's not reporting the
42 amount of animals they're taking, we're never going to
43 get control over it.

44
45 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Well, I
46 guess part of my concern with looking at that map and
47 seeing what areas are affected for subsistence users,
48 we could very well have the old effect where our public
49 lands, which are easier for us to access, are going to
50 have what pressure there is out there from non-local

1 users by doing this. Is that really what we want to
2 do.
3
4 Go ahead, Randy.
5
6 MR. ALVAREZ: Well, you know, what
7 report was that that Joe was taking his information off
8 of?
9
10 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, that's a good
11 question.
12
13 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: He'd got it
14 in here.
15
16 MR. ALVAREZ: Was that from -- who made
17 that report, Joe?
18
19 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Subsistence.
20
21 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Harvest and
22 Uses of Caribou, Moose, et cetera, by Communities of
23 Bristol Bay.
24
25 MR. ALVAREZ: Who put that together?
26
27 MR. KLUTSCH: The State Subsistence
28 Division in conjunction with OSM I believe.
29
30 MR. ALVAREZ: Lem?
31
32 MR. BOSKOFISKY: How come those things
33 aren't brought into the meeting?
34
35 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Joe, is that the one
36 that's still ongoing?
37
38 MR. KLUTSCH: No, this was a 2001/2002
39 study, and it was done -- Davin Holen, Ted Krieg,
40 Robert Walker and Hans Nicholson, collaboration with
41 BBNA, prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
42 Office of Subsistence Management, Division of
43 Subsistence, ADF&G, and it was jointly funded. So it's
44 something else to read.
45
46 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah, that's five, six
47 years ago.
48
49 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Too bad
50 Ted's not here.

1 MR. ALVAREZ: You know, I've kind of
2 been listening to what's going on, you know, living
3 there and hunting all fall, and Kokhanok called up and
4 said they hadn't got a moose at the end of the season.
5 And Igiugig, I'm thinking there was two bulls shot.
6 And there was no cows shot. I can -- well, I'll swear
7 on that. Levelock, I think there was one that I know
8 of. And they were having difficulties, too, I don't
9 know. But they might have got one later on, but -- and
10 I know I was with some relatives from Naknek, we went
11 up Branch River, and out of five of us, we got one, but
12 I didn't shoot it. Another guy did. And then the one
13 in Igiugig, my uncle shot that one, and I helped him
14 with that one. But, you know, I just -- there wasn't
15 that -- I know there wasn't very many moose harvested.
16 And I don't know what Tenny saw up there on the lake
17 there.

18
19 MR. BOSKOFISKY: At the lake, I think
20 they were lucky if there was maybe two, three.

21
22 MR. O'HARA: Chickenfoot (ph)?

23
24 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Yeah.

25
26 MR. HEDLUND: I know of two in Iliamna.
27 In Nondalton, I don't know if they got any, you know,
28 during the open season.

29
30 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Port Heiden
31 said they got zero.

32
33 MR. BOSKOFISKY: They never got hardly
34 enough to even supply the village, even there isn't
35 that many people left.

36
37 MR. ALVAREZ: We need to do something,
38 and this is all we've got before us, to I'm intending
39 to support this, you know, and then if we can go -- if
40 it -- it's going to go before the Federal Subsistence
41 Board, and then, you know, maybe they can come up with
42 another plan to do something themselves, but this is
43 what we have. And I guess I could support separating
44 the two, you know, to do it -- that would

45
46 MR. BOSKOFISKY: I would have this put
47 back and have it redone.

48
49 MR. ALVAREZ: What's that?

50

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Cliff, he
2 doesn't.....
3
4 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Like he said, have it
5 redone. Separate it -- I mean, send it back to whoever
6 wrote it up.
7
8 MR. ALVAREZ: We don't have the time.
9 The only thing that.....
10
11 MR. DUNAWAY: We can amend it now.
12
13 MR. ALVAREZ: We can amend it here.
14 The only thing you were worried about is closing
15 the.....
16
17 MR. BOSKOFISKY: I just don't want to
18 cut our subsistence, period.
19
20 MR. ALVAREZ: I think that -- in my
21 opinion, that was a typo. That should have been,
22 instead of January 15, the last date there, 31st,
23 because that's what the book says. And there's no date
24 that's.....
25
26 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Well, you look at
27 existing regulations. It's August 20th to September
28 15th. But if you go down to what they're stating, it's
29 cutting it back to September 1st to the 15th. That's
30 taking it away from them.
31
32 MR. ALVAREZ: Well, we can amend it,
33 but my opinion, we didn't ask that when we proposed
34 this. Because it's not --if you look at the top up
35 there, where it says August 20th and December 1st,
36 they're stricken out, there's a line through. We're
37 asking to change that. There's nothing down on the
38 bottom that shows that, so we're not asking to change
39 that. I think it just got written up.....
40
41 MR. BOSKOFISKY: If we throw this out,
42 it would stay at the same as what it was, August 20th
43 to September 15th.
44
45 MR. ALVAREZ: No, just don't throw it
46 out, just write it up like it is in the book, the same
47 thing, so it wouldn't change.
48
49 MR. BOSKOFISKY: See, they're asking to
50 switch it.

1 MR. DUNAWAY: We didn't ask them to
2 switch it.
3
4 MR. ALVAREZ: But we didn't propose
5 that though. Not as far as I know.
6
7 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I don't
8 remember that we did.
9
10 MR. ALVAREZ: It got written up like
11 this, Alvin, but we didn't propose it.
12
13 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Yeah. I know. I know
14 we didn't. That's what I say, if we vote it out, they
15 can't change it.
16
17 MR. ALVAREZ: No, we'll amend it.
18 We'll amend it.
19
20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Go ahead.
21
22 MS. GREFFENIUS: I was wondering if
23 there's something I can help clarify, because
24 there's.....
25
26 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah, I think so.
27
28 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: There is
29 confusion on the way that we've got 30 written up and
30 then we've got 31 down here with different dates, and
31 the dates are not only different from what 30 was
32 written as, but they're also different from what's in
33 the reg book.
34
35 MS. GREFFENIUS: Okay. So we need to
36 look at these as two separate, because 9B, there was a
37 proposal for shortening the seasons.
38
39 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Correct.
40 That part we've got no problem with. It's with 31.
41
42 MS. GREFFENIUS: Right. So then on 31,
43 I'm looking at Page 62 of the book. So 31 is
44 specifically dealing with the closure of Federal public
45 lands. If 30 were to pass and 31 were approved, then
46 all the dates would be changed. But right now 31 is
47 only addressing what's in bold. We've got two separate
48 proposals.
49
50 (Whispered conversation)

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: So you're
2 saying if we pass 30, then the dates will automatically
3 change on 31, but they're still wrong.
4
5 (Whispered conversation)
6
7 MR. BOSKOFISKY: It's confusing. Very
8 confusing. If you read it here, it tells you that
9 you're okay for subsistence from August 20 to September
10 15th.
11
12 MS. GREFFENIUS: We're reading it
13 wrong.
14
15 MR. ALVAREZ: Are we reading it wrong?
16
17 MS. GREFFENIUS: Okay. For 31, I was
18 about to get to this part. So for 30 we've got the
19 strike through, and then in bold what the shortened
20 seasons, that was the proposal that the Council put
21 forth.
22
23 Then for 31, we've got that first line
24 is Unit 9B, one bull, and then it has in bold Federal
25 public lands, et cetera, except by rural Alaska
26 residents of 9A, B, C, and E, because those are the
27 people who have C&T.
28
29 There's no -- there's nothing for Unit
30 9E, because the Council put forward a proposal for
31 Units 9B and 9C. So I heard people talking about
32 January 31, but that's for Unit 9E in the regulation
33 book. There's nothing in this proposal pertaining to
34 9E. It's only per -- the only reason 9E is mentioned
35 is because those residents of A, B, C, and E have C&T.
36 So 9E is not part of this. Does that help?
37
38 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. So
39 it's not included, the land of 9E. It's including the
40 9E.
41
42 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Yeah, I know, but my
43 argument is why cut the subsistence users off, you
44 know, make their hunting period shorter, and align it
45 with what the State hunt is? That's what I'm getting
46 at.
47
48 MS. GREFFENIUS: Okay. So that's for
49 30. So does that help? Does anybody have any other
50 questions on that? We're not talking about Unit 9E.

1 MR. BOSKOFISKY: See, they're trying to
2 cut it down so that it aligns with the State. Then you
3 have more conflict.
4
5 MR. ALVAREZ: Well, we're going to have
6 to amend it, it's written up wrong. We'll have to
7 change it.
8
9 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. What
10 are the wishes? Do you guys want to separate them?
11 What do you want to do here?
12
13 MR. ALVAREZ: Okay. I'll move we
14 separate them then, and.....
15
16 MR. O'HARA: No. Make an amendment.
17
18 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah.
19
20 MR. DUNAWAY: Just rescind your main
21 motion and start over.
22
23 MR. ALVAREZ: I guess I'll rescind my
24 first motion and who was the second? You were.
25
26 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Dan was.
27
28 MR. O'HARA: I was.
29
30 MR. ALVAREZ: You were.
31
32 MR. O'HARA: So are you just going to
33 take the motion off the books?
34
35 MR. ALVAREZ: (Nods affirmative)
36
37 MR. O'HARA: Okay. That's fine with
38 me.
39
40 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah. It was recommended
41 that we separate them so it would probably be best. So
42 I guess -- so then we need to take them up one at a
43 time, right?
44
45 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Go ahead.
46
47 MR. ALVAREZ: All right. So I move we
48 adopt WP08-30.
49
50 MR. O'HARA: I'll second that motion.

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
2 Discussion. Randy.
3
4 MR. ALVAREZ: Call for the question
5 unless anybody.....
6
7 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Discussion.
8 Anybody.
9
10 MR. DUNAWAY: So this is all Federally-
11 qualified hunters on Federally-managed lands.
12
13 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: No, this is
14 for Unit 9B only.
15
16 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay.
17
18 MR. O'HARA: Shorten the season.
19
20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The season
21 will be shortened to September 1 through September 15th
22 in the fall and December 15th to January 15th in the
23 winter.
24
25 MR. DUNAWAY: On Page 60?
26
27 MR. O'HARA: And that would comply with
28 State regulations then? Is that setting it the same?
29
30 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yes. Laura,
31 that does align them with State regs, is that correct?
32
33 MS. GREFFENIUS: For 9B. Those are the
34 dates that were discussed at the fall meeting, and
35 would align.
36
37 MR. O'HARA: Why are we shortening the
38 dates?
39
40 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Is there a conservation
41 issue?
42
43 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Yeah, that's what I'm
44 saying. This would need to be opposed. We're dealing
45 with subsistence. They're aligning with the State reg.
46 And it's cutting the subsistence users chances of.
47
48 MR. ALVAREZ: Let me expand. I asked
49 for it, because I figured, well, if we're going to --
50 we feel that there's not enough moose, so we felt we

1 need to do something. And one of the proposals is
2 eliminate non-Federally-qualified users. And to show
3 justification, we also -- I supported shortening the
4 winter season to mirror the State season on that.
5
6 MR. O'HARA: You're dealing with this
7 on Federal lands now?
8
9 MR. ALVAREZ: Yes.
10
11 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Okay. Because we
12 can do that. Okay.
13
14 MR. ALVAREZ: I asked for this just to
15 show that the locals were willing to take part in
16 conservation, if we're going to ask that the non-
17 Federal user not be able to -- the season be closed.
18 That's why this is it.
19
20 MR. BOSKOFISKY: I really think -- I
21 don't think that was the way it was really brought out.
22 I had people mention it too, but they want to restrict
23 the non-resident moose hunt, but not restrict the
24 subsistence hunt, you know, and that's the way I've
25 heard people talk.
26
27 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Daniel.
28
29 MR. O'HARA: Let's see, the thought
30 was.....
31
32 MR. ALVAREZ: Alvin, we're talking
33 about 9B.
34
35 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Yeah, I know, but
36 still, you know, that's -- I don't feel right having to
37 cut subsistence users off.
38
39 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay.
40 Daniel, got it back again?
41
42 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. The Lake Clark,
43 Tenny, Thomas, opposes shortening the time? They want
44 the full time?
45
46 MR. HEDLUND: They want the full time.
47
48 MR. O'HARA: Yeah.
49
50 MR. HEDLUND: But then again I don't

1 know anybody that uses that preserve for hunting, you
2 know, the early days. Maybe some at Port Alsworth, but
3 Nondalton don't. Iliamna, there's a couple of them,
4 but they're not, you know, locals.

5
6 MR. O'HARA: Well, but would it be
7 satisfactory to still hunt to January 15th? Would it
8 be better to hunt until the end of January?

9
10 MR. HEDLUND: Yeah, I think it would
11 be.

12
13 MR. O'HARA: Because of the conditions
14 for snowmachines and whatever?

15
16 MR. HEDLUND: Yeah. Yeah, it would be.
17 And then, you know, on from August, opening it up in
18 August, I mean, I don't know of any local that ever
19 hunted there.

20
21 MR. O'HARA: Well, if they run across a
22 moose, they can kill it, okay.

23
24 MR. HEDLUND: Uh-huh.

25
26 MS. CHYTHLOOK: This is all of Unit 9B.

27
28 MR. HEDLUND: That's just the Preserve.
29 Federal grounds.

30
31 MR. O'HARA: Federal ground, yeah.

32
33 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: There's
34 limited lands that are there.

35
36 MR. HEDLUND: And it isn't very much.

37
38 MR. O'HARA: We can live with that.
39 I'd like to see another 15 days in there. That's okay.
40 We're showing an effort to be conservationist, that's
41 fine. It's on Federal land. We can handle it. I
42 support it.

43
44 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Any other
45 discussion.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 MR. ABRAHAM: Question

50

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The
2 question's been called. Should we do a poll on this
3 one?
4
5 MR. DUNAWAY: Roll call you mean?
6
7 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah.
8
9 MR. O'HARA: Sure.
10
11 MR. ALVAREZ: How about a show of
12 hands?
13
14 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Either or.
15 I don't care. Cliff, do you want to take roll call or
16 do you want just a show of hands.
17
18 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair. This will
19 be a roll call vote for support of Proposal WP08-30,
20 which is to adopt the Staff analysis to shorten the
21 season as written in our Staff analysis.
22
23 Dan O'Hara.
24
25 MR. O'HARA: Aye.
26
27 MR. EDENSHAW: Randy Alvarez.
28
29 MR. ALVAREZ: Yes.
30
31 MR. EDENSHAW: Pete Abraham.
32
33 MR. ABRAHAM: Aye.
34
35 MR. EDENSHAW: Thomas Hedlund.
36
37 MR. HEDLUND: Yeah.
38
39 MR. EDENSHAW: Boris Kosbruk, Sr.
40
41 MR. KOSBRUK: Yes.
42
43 MR. EDENSHAW: Dan Dunaway.
44
45 MR. DUNAWAY: No.
46
47 MR. EDENSHAW: Nanci Morris Lyon.
48
49 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: No.
50

1 MR. EDENSHAW: Alvin Boskofsky.
2
3 MR. BOSKOFKY: No.
4
5 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair and the
6 Council members, the motion.....
7
8 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: You haven't
9 voted Ms. Molly yet.
10
11 MS. CHYTHLOOK: You forgot me.
12
13 MR. EDENSHAW: Molly Chythlook. Sorry.
14
15 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Yes.
16
17 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair and
18 Council. The motion passes.
19
20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
21
22 MR. ALVAREZ: What was the vote?
23
24 MR. EDENSHAW: Six/three. And we have
25 one vacancy.
26
27 MR. ALVAREZ: Madame Chair. I move we
28 adopt WP08-31.
29
30 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
31
32 MR. ALVAREZ: And I would like to make
33 an amendment that the date match what the book says on
34 Page 54.
35
36 MR. PROBASCO: Randy, may I say
37 something before you do that?
38
39 MR. O'HARA: Wait a minute, we've got a
40 motion on the floor.
41
42 MR. ALVAREZ: He's trying to clear it
43 up here.
44
45 MR. PROBASCO: Where we made the
46 mistake as a Staff, and if you're looking at Page 62,
47 is that what you're looking at?
48
49 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yes.
50

1 MR. PROBASCO: Let's all get on Page
2 62. And where Alvin's getting confused, and I would
3 get confused, too, Alvin, is that if you look on Page
4 54 of your reg book, everything's the same until you
5 get up to 9C and then there's nothing mentioned for 9D
6 and 9E. The Staff forgot to include what's going to
7 happen for Units 9D and 9E. So you don't need to amend
8 that. The 9E season still is that part that we're
9 talking about, December 1 to January 31st. That top
10 portion does not affect the season in 9E. So what we
11 need to do when we get this before the Board is we will
12 take this section, and we will add both Units 9D and
13 Unit 9E to it so it gives you the complete picture for
14 the entire Unit 9. Okay?

15
16 MR. BOSKOFISKY: No, I understand what
17 you are saying, but I just got the idea, you know,
18 we're here to vote for our subsistence users. Why cut
19 their season off.

20
21 MR. PROBASCO: This wouldn't. That's
22 what I'm telling you, Alvin, your season doesn't change
23 with this motion that's in the book.

24
25 MR. BOSKOFISKY: I don't mean my season.
26 I mean, 9B and 9C.

27
28 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Well, it's a done
29 deal.

30
31 MR. PROBASCO: It doesn't change it.
32 This focuses on the seasons for 9B and 9C only.

33
34 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: So, Randy,
35 do you want to continue with your amendment?

36
37 MR. ALVAREZ: Not if we don't have to.

38
39 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: It sounds
40 like we don't.

41
42 Go ahead.

43
44 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair. What the
45 Council may also consider adding is we heard from Lem
46 and other Council members, reporting requirements. And
47 you may include language or ask the agencies to somehow
48 implement or try to improve the reporting requirements
49 by having them go up there and take permits or however.
50 But This would probably be a good opportunity in your

1 motion if you're going to adopt 31, with some caveats
2 to improve reporting requirements, because how else are
3 you going to -- you know, as we heard earlier,
4 determine how many moose are being harvested.

5
6 MR. O'HARA: Madame Chairman. You're
7 saying take 31 and now put an amendment to it to the
8 Federal Board or Staff or whoever, to include not only
9 Federal and State lands that we have rural preference,
10 but now we want to put a stipulation in there that
11 there be some kind of a -- this is where the committee
12 might emerge, too, you know. Because what's going to
13 happen, I guess -- let's see, we're on discussion,
14 okay?

15
16 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Now, we're
17 not. We still need to get a motion on the table first.
18 Let's finish that up.

19
20 MR. ALVAREZ: okay. Let me finish that
21 I guess. Okay. I move we adopt WP08-31. And
22 apparently we don't need an amendment.

23
24 MR. O'HARA: Second the motion. Now
25 we're in discussion.

26
27 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Now we have
28 discussion. Who wants the floor first.

29
30 MR. O'HARA: The maker of the motion
31 gets to speak to it.

32
33 MR. ALVAREZ: You know, I supported
34 this last time when we came out with it, because we
35 need to do something on it. That's the way I feel
36 about it. And we tried some things the last couple
37 years, and it -- apparently they were -- they didn't
38 pass. The corridors didn't pass the Federal or the
39 State, but now in my opinion, we have more information
40 from better reports that shows what's been reported,
41 although, you know, it might not be real accurate
42 information, but that's what we have to go by, you
43 know, and I feel like the rest of you guys, we need to
44 work on getting better information. I'm not exactly
45 sure how that's going to happen, but until then, I
46 still feel we need to do something, you know. And if
47 the State feels this is a bad way to go, and, you know,
48 maybe we get corridors, that would probably -- it's
49 what we asked for last year, and we didn't get that,
50 because they felt that it didn't meet the ANILCA

1 regulations. I'm going to support it, because we need
2 -- I don't want to do nothing.

3

4 Madame Chair. I'm done.

5

6 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: You know, I
7 want to throw something in here, too, for discussion
8 that I heard when I was attending down there, the
9 Chignik meetings, that was thrown out by Lem actually
10 was the one who brought it to the table. Another
11 option that a person can always consider in some of
12 these areas, and I thought that it was a good creative
13 one that the State had come up with, and I don't
14 remember where it was, Lem, but anybody that harvested
15 animals in that area had to destroy horns and/or
16 antlers, and basically turned it into a meat only hunt
17 that way. Where was that?

18

19 MR. BUTLER: Koyukuk River.

20

21 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Where?

22

23 MR. BUTLER: Koyukuk.

24

25 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. And I
26 guess that had been met with a great amount of success
27 on both State and Federal lands, and I'm going to throw
28 that out there as an option, too, because I'm still
29 worried if we're doing a greater benefit or detriment
30 for subsistence users by passing this.

31

32 Any other discussion. Dan, go ahead.

33

34 MR. DUNAWAY: Just a question here,
35 since the amendment on season dates changed in the
36 previous proposal, Number 30. Do we need to address
37 those season dates in this proposal or not? It's more
38 of a technical question.

39

40 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Mr. Techno
41 says no.

42

43 MR. PROBASCO: Your action on Proposal
44 30 would carry into Proposal 31, because the topic on
45 Proposal 31 deals with who qualifies on those areas of
46 Federal public lands.

47

48 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay.

49

50 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Randy, you

1 were next.

2

3 MR. ALVAREZ: You had a good idea. You
4 know, I didn't make it to the Board of Game in
5 Fairbanks last month, but, you know, I was real
6 concerned about the Mulchatna caribou, not enough
7 bulls. And there was some people -- I was working in
8 Bethel, and I ran across a couple of the Bethel people
9 going up to the meeting, and they were concerned about
10 the same thing, and I felt -- I told them that, you
11 know, there's 45,000 is the last estimate for the
12 Mulchatna caribou, which is my opinion more -- is
13 adequate. But the ratio of bulls per cows is so low
14 that we need to do something to protect the bulls. And
15 in the same meeting is allow the non-residents to
16 harvest moose or caribou, but eliminate the bull for
17 caribou, the bull season for caribou, have them -- if
18 they want to shoot at a caribou, let them shoot a cow.
19 The same idea as what you're saying, is if they're not
20 -- another way of doing, not eliminate the non-resident
21 moose, but have them destroy the antlers, which is what
22 they're after. But, you know, I don't know if that's
23 going to fly with this Board or the Federal Subsistence
24 Board.

25

26 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: We have
27 somebody from the audience that wants to make a quick
28 statement.

29

30 MR. BEYERSDORF: A quick statement.
31 Again Geoff Beyersdorf with BLM.

32

33 And Koyukuk/Nowitna is where I came
34 from prior to this. And I was there when they
35 implemented that cutting the antler restriction. And
36 depending on the area, whether you're on the Koyukuk or
37 on the Nowitna drainage, it cut our non-resident -- or,
38 excuse me, our non-local hunters almost in half. So on
39 the Koyukuk River we went from about 700 and some
40 hunters down to 400, and on the Nowitna River we went
41 from a high of 200 down to 90. Just so you have the
42 information.

43

44 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Thank you.

45

46 MR. BOSKOFISKY: What would be the
47 reason for doing away with the antlers on the
48 subsistence side?

49

50 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The trophy

1 hunters.

2

3 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Trophy hunters. Non-
4 resident hunters.

5

6 MR. ALVAREZ: For non-resident hunters
7 that are mainly just there to take the horns home. You
8 know, they'll take some meat home, but give most of the
9 meat away.

10

11 MR. HEDLUND: That's the only way I get
12 my meat.

13

14 (Laughter)

15

16 MR. DUNAWAY: Didn't Joe Shoemaker
17 propose something like that for some part of 9 a couple
18 years ago?

19

20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I don't
21 remember.

22

23 MR. DUNAWAY: Something about saw the
24 antlers off or something.

25

26 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Sandy, did
27 you have something to add quick?

28

29 MR. RABINOWITCH: Just along the lines
30 of what Geoff was just saying, bringing some thoughts
31 from other parts of the State. My experience with all
32 the different Councils around the State tells me that
33 when you get into trophy destruction, that it's really
34 worth having a careful discussion of that, because in
35 some cases it's been implemented one year and not
36 worked very well, and taken away another. Geoff's
37 example maybe it works pretty good in an area. So I
38 don't think one size fits all. And my two cents is it
39 might be a good thing to sleep on it a little bit and
40 bring it back tomorrow morning. You've all had a long
41 -- I mean, I'm just making a suggestion that you might
42 pause, sleep on it, talk some, come back tomorrow
43 morning when you're fresh, see what other comments you
44 might gather. It's just a place to be real thoughtful,
45 because you think through the effects of how to -- you
46 know, how it would play out in your region and all our
47 users.

48

49 That's my comment.

50

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Thank
2 you. Lem.
3
4 MR. O'HARA: It must be a good
5 proposal, they're coming to the podium.
6
7 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah.
8
9 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Ms. Chair.
10 Members of the Council. Lem Butler.
11
12 I guess when I threw that out there
13 originally it was just an idea that the working group
14 could possibly develop as a solution as just an
15 example. It has worked in other parts of the State.
16
17 I would remind you that since this is a
18 Federal regulation, there may be some question out
19 there, but as of right now, we'd argue that it doesn't
20 apply -- Federal regulations don't apply to non-local
21 users. So I think it's something that could be
22 developed through a working group, and that the Board
23 of Game would adopt if it was a group decision as a
24 solution to the problem. And, you know, the corridors
25 in Unit 17 were an example of the work group coming
26 together and resolving user conflicts that way.
27 Koyukuk River the same way. There were a lot of moose
28 up there. The issue was user conflicts, and that was a
29 solution that worked in that area. And it's possible
30 that the working group could again develop a solution
31 like that and the Board of Game would endorse it if the
32 users were coming together. It's again just an
33 example. I don't think it really has any bearing on
34 what you do at this meeting immediately other than
35 that's an example of a potential solution that could be
36 developed.
37
38 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Go ahead,
39 Randy.
40
41 MR. ALVAREZ: Pete had said earlier,
42 you know, an example, I was at the meeting last May, at
43 the Federal Subsistence Board meeting where they talked
44 about fish, and relating to the lower Yukon River
45 fishery. Well, Pete mentioned that if we do pass this,
46 you know, they would probably have to -- the Solicitor
47 would probably have to make some kind of a ruling on
48 whether this would be justified or would be legal or
49 not where the non-Federal user group would be affected
50 or not. Is that right?

1 MR. PROBASCO: Yeah. We'd have to get
2 an opinion from the Solicitor's Office, and I think the
3 examples that have been put forth from the Nowitna and
4 Koyukuk are very good, but I think from my opinion why
5 they're successful is because they apply both to the
6 State and Federal lands. Anybody hunting there, if
7 they didn't get a permit, are just going in on a
8 regular hunt, they have to leave the antlers, do some
9 destruction. It's not just Federal. It's everybody.
10
11 MR. ALVAREZ: Because they did, for
12 instance, was the ruling on the fishing in the lower
13 Yukon. Well, part of the lower Yukon was Federal land
14 and part of it was State land, so the ruling covered
15 both. Am I not wrong?
16
17 MR. PROBASCO: They didn't pass it.
18
19 MR. ALVAREZ: They didn't pass it?
20
21 MR. PROBASCO: No.
22
23 MR. ALVAREZ: Well, okay. I was gone.
24 They were talking about it anyway.
25
26 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I see your
27 point though, yeah. I see your point.
28
29 MR. ALVAREZ: They would have to make a
30 ruling on it, if we passed.
31
32 MR. HEDLUND: Is that 31?
33
34 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah.
35
36 MR. HEDLUND: If we pass 31?
37
38 MR. ALVAREZ: Yeah.
39
40 MR. HEDLUND: If we pass that, it would
41 really help. You know, I think it would help my area a
42 whole lot more than anybody else's area probably,
43 because it would stop, you know, the outside hunting.
44 And it would give those locals a lot more chance.
45
46 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: In the
47 Federal land, but how do you -- what do you think,
48 Tenny, for the.....
49
50 MR. HEDLUND: Well, Federal land is --

1 Chulitna has whole lot of Federal lands in the mouth of
2 Chulitna, and all around Lake Clark on the shores. And
3 that's where, you know, like he was saying, they use a
4 boat, you know. And when you've got an airplane come
5 in that could land, you know, any place where there's a
6 moose, that, you know, potential local hunters, you
7 know, you cut that off, it does help my area.

8

9 MR. ALVAREZ: It would make a big
10 difference in the Branch River, too, because on that
11 land, you know, there's those lodge guys that come in
12 there, and they're there all summer, and, you know,
13 they're from the Lower 48 some place. Or even from
14 Anchorage. But they're not qualified user groups, and
15 they have a big advantage, because they're there all
16 summer long guiding, and they know where the moose are.
17 And it doesn't -- a day or two into the season, they
18 have -- last year I was told by one of those other guys
19 upriver that they'd hauled two moose down the day
20 before we got there. And it would eliminate that from
21 happening.

22

23 MR. HEDLUND: Well, that's the same
24 with my area. Because a lot of my area is -- or up
25 around Lake Clark, Nondalton there, you know, that's
26 Federal lands.

27

28 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Lem, go
29 ahead.

30

31 MR. BUTLER: I'd just remind you that
32 it wouldn't eliminate those boaters from the Alagnak,
33 they'd still be able to hunt there. This is just
34 dealing with Federal lands, uplands, and a lot of that,
35 particularly that lower Alagnak is State lands, both
36 sides of the river clearly falling under State, so
37 that's where people are more likely to end up, is in
38 conflict with you on that section of the Alagnak.

39

40 MR. O'HARA: Lem, along that same line
41 there, Madame Chair, the upper part is still protected,
42 because one-third of that is Federal lands.

43

44 MR. BUTLER: Well, wild and scenic,
45 yeah, you'd have a jurisdictional issue there.

46

47 MR. O'HARA: That is a preserve. Yeah,
48 so they would be able to -- yeah, we'd push them down
49 there, but that's the issue.

50

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Sandy, one
2 more real quick one.

3
4 MR. RABINOWITCH: Yeah. I'm sorry.
5 But I want to add on to what Pete said. In terms of
6 the Federal Board's authority to make closures, this is
7 part of what you're talking about. There's 20 to 30 of
8 these in place. So I think there's no question that
9 the Federal Board's done this kind of thing in the past
10 and has the authority. I'm not trying to support it
11 or, you know, argue for it or against it. I'm just
12 talking about the ability of the Federal Board to close
13 Federal public lands to non-subsistence users. I think
14 that's a rock solid thing that the Board's done a
15 number of times. Just as a point of information.

16
17 The other thing I would add is that
18 we've also discussed this work group that Lem brought
19 up. You can do whatever you want with both of these
20 proposals. You can still go on the record if you want
21 and support that concept regardless of what you do on
22 these two proposals, if you choose.

23
24 MR. BUTLER: Ms. Chair, we don't
25 dispute the ability of the Federal government to close
26 lands that they have jurisdiction over. Again, lower
27 Alagnak is State land, so that's where it wouldn't
28 apply.

29
30 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Correct.
31 Yeah, and I wanted to hear, too, from Randy and Tenny
32 both, what do you guys think? I mean, my biggest
33 concern is still, you know, I know what I see, I won't
34 claim to have as much knowledge in the hunting area and
35 avenues as I do the fishing, but I've definitely seen
36 closures in fishing put pressure in other areas. What
37 about people from Kokhanok and even Igiugig that have
38 an awful lot of State land surrounding them, that the
39 pressure could very well head to. What is it going to
40 do to those villages' ability for subsistence? That's
41 wherein my concern lies, because that land is so
42 polkadotted with Federal and public lands. Please.

43
44 MR. HEDLUND: I think that it would
45 actually work to the advantage of the villages. It
46 would drive the moose back towards the village instead
47 of away from them. Because nobody's going to hunt
48 right around the village other than a local. If you've
49 got an airplane, you're going to go out away from the
50 village. I mean, people do it. They just do it. And

1 it will probably work, you know, towards the advantage
2 of the village. That's the way I'm thinking. It would
3 drive the moose back toward the village.

4

5 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Randy.

6

7 MR. ALVAREZ: A lot of land around the
8 villages is managed by the State, but most of the land
9 around the villages is owned by the village Native
10 corporations. And right now they're under State
11 jurisdiction, but, you know, there's talk about putting
12 Native lands under Federal jurisdiction, you know. And
13 I talked to the special assistant to the Secretary of
14 Interior at the last May meeting and he had mentioned
15 that, brought that up to me, and asked me how I felt
16 about it, and I told him, we feel that it should be
17 under -- native lands should be under Federal
18 jurisdiction instead of right now it's managed under
19 State. So, you know, the village corporations could
20 have their lands posted no hunting for, you know, non-
21 residents or whatever, but the State wouldn't -- you
22 know, according to State rules, it would be open for
23 them to harvest, and if it was the other way around, it
24 would be more land under the State system. And it
25 would probably benefit I think us.

26

27 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Under Federal. Uh-huh.
28 It should have been that way a long time ago, from the
29 time it came out.

30

31 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Dan.

32

33 MR. DUNAWAY: Well, I think the village
34 has right to manage trespass on their lands whether
35 they're under Federal or State jurisdiction. In fact,
36 Choggiung does it here. I have to buy a permit to go
37 camp up there. I'm eternally grateful that Choggiung
38 at least allows me to buy a permit. My understanding
39 is, if I lived in Iliamna, I couldn't get a permit to
40 go picking berries.

41

42 MR. ALVAREZ: Well, for instance,
43 Levelock owns land up in Yellow Creek and up in the
44 mouth of Branch River up quite a ways, but they don't
45 have the money to have people patrol, you know, a
46 trespass officer. So there's nothing done about it.
47 And it's open under State regulations. It gets hunted,
48 you know, but if it was under State -- if it was under
49 Federal jurisdiction, then it would be closed, so then
50 it wouldn't be -- they wouldn't be hunting.....

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Okay. Let's
2 go back to the motion here.
3
4 MR. DUNAWAY: We can address a lot, but
5 just to clarify, I don't think you need to be under
6 Federal management to manage your own land.
7
8 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Any further
9 discussion. Comments.
10
11 (No comments)
12
13 MR. ABRAHAM: (In Yup'ik)
14
15 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The
16 question's been called.
17
18 MR. O'HARA: He's really the Chairman.
19
20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Oh, yeah.
21 Okay. Everybody in favor of WP08-31 please vote by
22 saying aye.
23
24 IN UNISON: Aye.
25
26 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: All those
27 opposed, same sign.
28
29 MR. BOSKOFISKY: Aye.
30
31 MR. DUNAWAY: Aye.
32
33 MR. ALVAREZ: How about a hand raising.
34
35 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Let's have
36 hands, yep.
37
38 MR. DUNAWAY: I'm opposed.
39
40 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: One opposed?
41
42 MR. O'HARA: Two opposed.
43
44 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Two, okay.
45
46 MR. O'HARA: You guys are buying
47 dinner, by the way.
48
49 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Now how
50 about doing something about making a recommendation

1 about the working group.

2

3 MR. ALVAREZ: Okay. Raise it.

4

5 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I would
6 entertain a motion, if somebody would like to make one
7 concerning a working group getting put together for
8 that area. I think it would be.....

9

10 Go ahead, Molly.

11

12 MS. CHYTHLOOK: I've got a comment.
13 Right now the subsistence coordinator for BBNA is in
14 the process of putting a working group together. And
15 the plan is, and I think he's -- I don't think he's
16 started contacting, but he has actually organized to
17 get a small working group together that includes the
18 regional chairs and a few people from here to start the
19 discussion. So probably within a month we should have
20 that working group going.

21

22 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Is that a
23 motion for this Board that you would like to see us
24 support that?

25

26 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Yes.

27

28 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Any seconds.

29

30 MR. ALVAREZ: Do you want to state that
31 again, Molly?

32

33 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Right now the
34 subsistence coordinator, Frank Woods, is in the process
35 of coordinating a small working that's going to include
36 some of the regional chairs, like the local advisory
37 groups, group chairs, and then some from the community,
38 like some from Nondalton, Togiak, and other locations
39 covering the -- I think there's going to be like three
40 main ones, so that every -- because all the regions are
41 different, the resources are different, their issues
42 are different, so there's going to be a group from like
43 the Nushagak, this area, a group from Iliamna area, and
44 then another established group from the Peninsula.

45

46 MR. ALVAREZ: To discuss what?

47

48 MS. CHYTHLOOK: To discuss similar
49 issues that we're dealing with today. And he's going
50 to start small, at least to have one small group

1 started.
2
3 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Is he going
4 to include agencies?
5
6 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Yes, there's going to
7 be agencies included, as well as advisory groups,
8 advisory chairs.
9
10 MR. ALVAREZ: Is that what we're
11 looking for?
12
13 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: We're
14 looking for a second, yeah, to support participation in
15 such a group.
16
17 MR. DUNAWAY: Would that be in the form
18 of a resolution that we're supporting it or.....
19
20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: What's the
21 easiest way to do that, Cliff?
22
23 MR. EDENSHAW: For?
24
25 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: For us
26 to.....
27
28 MR. ALVAREZ: For a working group.
29
30 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON:
31support. Should she make it out as a motion, does
32 she make it as a resolution? How would you like to see
33 that. I think we would like to see that formed. Am I
34 incorrect in making that statement?
35
36 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair. I think
37 we could -- probably a motion and however the Council
38 goes in that direction. Probably specific language
39 would be easier for me in terms of a motion, and
40 specific language to develop a working group. I know
41 from what I heard from the Council there has been
42 discussion regarding moose in 9B and C. So if we're
43 going to have a working group, certainly there should
44 be some.....
45
46 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Maybe a priority.
47
48 MR. EDENSHAW: A priority.
49
50 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Priority locations. Or

1 priority districts or regions.
2
3 MR. O'HARA: Well, our priority is B, C
4 and D. And that's all we want, but, you know, that's
5 going to be totally different than what Alvin's doing
6 down below I think.
7
8 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: But he has
9 the same issues down there. I think he wants his
10 prioritized, too.
11
12 MR. BOSKOFISKY: It's all the same.
13 We're part of Bristol Bay just like Iliamna, Igiugig,
14 Levelock, any other places.
15
16 MR. O'HARA: Well, no, the resource is
17 different in our area, and it has to be -- your's
18 differently. And I'm not.....
19
20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Well, how
21 about if we could just support a working group that
22 would benefit subsistence users for the areas in our
23 region.
24
25 MR. O'HARA: Let me give an example.
26 We had what we called, I don't know, maybe there's one
27 original member here that was on the Council when we
28 did it, but Sunshine Valley and that moose issue over
29 in Togiak. There was 90 to 100 moose, and they just
30 kept killing them off all winter long and.....
31
32 MR. ABRAHAM: With my hammer.
33
34 (Laughter)
35
36 MR. O'HARA:finally we went ahead
37 and worked up an organization that worked over there,
38 and then a couple of young guys goes out and they kill
39 a couple moose and leave them out there. Well, that
40 got to be a huge issue, you know. And so this working
41 group began working on this moose issue over there, and
42 it had to go through Togiak, and it had to be a
43 permitting system, and it was pretty restrictive. And
44 how many animals do they have there how?
45
46 MR. DUNAWAY: Seven, 800 now.
47
48 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 1100.
49
50 MS. CHYTHLOOK: 11, yeah. There's

1 quite a few.

2

3 MR. O'HARA: 11, 1200 animals. So
4 whatever you're going to do is going to have to work
5 for -- if you've got to go all the way to Lake Clark in
6 a twin to get a permit, then you may not want to get a
7 moose out of Lake Clark. So whatever working group's
8 going to work, it's going to have to work.....

9

10 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Well, I
11 guess that's what we're looking for is a proposal to
12 support that concept or a concept like it for these
13 conflicts in these areas. Just to show Board support
14 for it.

15

16 MR. O'HARA: That was something Staff
17 will have to be working up on. If we make a motion and
18 Staff worked with BBNA or whoever they want to work
19 with, is fine with me, but as long as it pertains to
20 those rights.

21

22 MR. EDENSHAW: Madame Chair. The
23 Council can back a motion, and then we at OSM can
24 develop the resolution to submit to the Board.

25

26 MR. O'HARA: You've got a skeleton. If
27 we give you a skeleton, you put the bones on it?

28

29 MR. EDENSHAW: Yes.

30

31 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Do I hear a
32 skeleton?

33

34 MR. O'HARA: I so move and I think
35 including in that motion what Molly is saying here with
36 this working group is ideal. We probably should have
37 let -- but I think the gist of the whole thing would
38 have to come out of the Federal Staff.

39

40 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Is there a
41 second.

42

43 MR. DUNAWAY: Well, I'll be happy to
44 second a resolution that asks for a working -- or
45 encourages a working group for moose management in Unit
46 9.

47

48 MR. O'HARA: That's okay. Yeah.

49

50 MR. DUNAWAY: Something like that. I

1 was kind of waiting for somebody over there to do it.
2
3 MR. O'HARA: I will add that to the
4 motion. Yeah. I'll add that in the motion. And that
5 would be certainly involving Molly's group to.....
6
7 MR. DUNAWAY: It might work better if
8 it comes out of BBNA.
9
10 MR. O'HARA: Well, we'll let Staff deal
11 with that. Did you second.
12
13 MR. ABRAHAM: (In Yup'ik)
14
15 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: We got our
16 second, yes.
17
18 MR. O'HARA: Question.
19
20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: The
21 question's been called. All those in favor please
22 signify by saying aye.
23
24 IN UNISON: Aye.
25
26 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Opposed same
27 sign.
28
29 (No opposing votes)
30
31 MR. DUNAWAY: Do I hear a recess now?
32
33 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: I heard it
34 about 15 minutes ago.
35
36 MR. O'HARA: There's one hour left for
37 eating time in the restaurants.
38
39 MR. ALVAREZ: We have three more
40 proposals. Hey, Cliff, how long are we going to --
41 what do you figure, how long is it going to take us to
42 do this tomorrow? We've got three proposals.
43
44 MR. EDENSHAW: I think statewide 1 and
45 5 are repeats, so that should go pretty easy depending
46 on Laura's dissertation. And 32 is.....
47
48 MS. GREFFENIUS: Liz will be going
49 that.
50

1 MR. EDENSHAW: Liz. Liz isn't here. I
2 mean, 1 and 5 are.....
3
4 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Let's do it
5 in the morning again at 9:00, do you think? 9:00
6 o'clock.
7
8 MR. ALVAREZ: We did six already. We've
9 got three left, plus all the Staff reports. We should
10 be able to get down by 3:00 o'clock tomorrow.
11
12 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: That's what
13 I'm thinking, too. But I think what we really need is
14 to be here for Pete, so Pete can leave when he needs to
15 leave for his doctor's appointment. He needs to get
16 out of here.
17
18 MR. ALVAREZ: What time is.....
19
20 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: 1:15 or
21 something like that.
22
23 MR. ALVAREZ: Oh, we should have these
24 done by noon.
25
26 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: That's what
27 I'm thinking, too. So let's do 9:00 o'clock.
28
29 MR. ALVAREZ: 8:30.
30
31 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: 8:30? Okay.
32 I'm fine.
33
34 MR. O'HARA: I've got to work tomorrow
35 morning.
36
37 MR. ALVAREZ: That's all right. We
38 have enough.
39
40 MR. O'HARA: These are your two
41 contentious one.
42
43 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Yeah. We've
44 got enough. That will be fine. Okay. So let's do
45 8:30. Okay. Let's meet at 8:30 in the morning.
46
47 MR. O'HARA: Recess.
48
49 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Recess.
50

1 MADAME CHAIR MORRIS LYON: Recess until
2 8:30
3
4 (Off record)
5
6 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and
for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer
Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through
172 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the
BRISTOL BAY FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY
COUNCIL MEETING, VOL I, taken electronically by
Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 24th day of
March 2008, beginning at the hour of 1:00 o'clock p.m.
at Dillingham, Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 31st day of
March 2008.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 03/12/12