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CHAIRMAN WILDE: Last night we left agenda item number 7, Proposed Rule: Federal Subsistence Fisheries Management. Bill, will you go over again. Give you this opportunity again for what we left off with last night.

MR. KNAUER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you know, the Federal government is under a court order to implement an extension of Federal jurisdiction for subsistence for fisheries in those areas where there is what we call a Federal reserve water right. And that is association with lands that the Federal government already manages, such as National Wildlife Refuges. And out here that would be all waters within the external boundaries of the Yukon-Delta National Wildlife Refuge.

And we are conducting some 31 public hearings around the State to receive comments. Each of the 10 Regional Councils is also being asked to provide their recommendations on this Proposed Rule. Now, the aspect of whether Federal jurisdiction occurs or State jurisdiction continues is not a matter of decision, that has already been told to us by the court. And whether or not the State regains their jurisdiction will be a matter dependent upon whether or not the State Legislature can come to some mechanism where they comply with Title VIII of ANILCA.

And you folks heard a presentation last night and comments from the public. In fact, many of you offered your own comments also, but now is an opportunity as a Council to provide your recommendations to the Federal Subsistence Board. But I would also provide you this special opportunity to ask any questions also.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Lester?

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I'm still a little concerned and I think there will be a lot of people concerned about the -- probably if we had a crystal ball we'd be able to tell just exactly how the situation along the coastal areas work as far as State and Federal control of subsistence in that area. Is there going to be a method where the government has the management person out in the coastal areas, especially in those areas where Fish and Wildlife control?

MR. KNAUER: Refuges?

MR. L. WILDE: Refuges, yeah. How that's going to come about? Because there's a lot of people out there that are
concerned about some of the rumors coming around, that people
are saying, you know, if the State doesn't take over, if the
Feds take over this management of this area we're not going to
be able to fish. We need somebody to come out and say, oh,
yes, it'll be carried on the same way, because there's a lot of
misunderstanding out there. And I think that should be an area
where some more information could be let out. That's why we
have the radio station over here and we have the newspapers,
and it might be a good idea for somebody from your department
or the department that's responsible might be able to put forth
some information in that area.

MR. KNAUER: What I can say now is that the Proposed
Rule that we have, that we're starting with, uses the State's
Subsistence Regulations, the existing Subsistence Regulations
for fishing as their basis. So in that regard there would be
very little change. It would be things that folks are already
familiar with. And subsistence is not going to be cut out
because the Federal government steps in.

MR. L. WILDE: We need that information to be put out.
There's a lot of misunderstanding out there. You heard some of
it last night.

MR. KNAUER: Right.

MR. L. WILDE: And I know those of that understand,
we're not worried about it so much, but it's the people that
don't understand that's worried about it that should be --
where their thought should be addressed. That's what I'm
asking; is there some method or means where you might be able
or the Department might be able to come out and report that
information so there won't be anymore misunderstanding and
concern out there?

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, Taylor Brelsford.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: I think this is very sound advice from
the Regional Council. You're now advising us on some
misunderstandings in your region and I think we want to respond
with either a letter or some news media to answer the very
question that was raised last night and again by the Council
members. That's where you help us do a good job. So I think
this is very important advice and proposal for action by the
Federal Subsistence Board in order to clarify that question.

I'm not exactly sure what we will do in response,
whether it will be a letter or a news release or some other
form of clarification in the region, but I think you've asked us to take some action on it and we can certainly do that.

MR. L. WILDE: Yeah. That's what I'm asking because where I come from and the area where I come from, and even out of the areas, wherever there is a coastal area, that question keeps coming up. People come up and they're saying, hey, wait a minute, you know, we're afraid we're going to lose our right.

MR. BRELSFORD: We need to respond.

MR. L. WILDE: And I think we need to let them know.

MR. BRELSFORD: Okay.

MR. L. WILDE: No, you're going to still have the same rights you had before.

MR. BRELSFORD: Right.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: David?

MR. DAVID: For the State to take over on subsistence, who will be the one to decide who to manage the resources in the area?

MR. KNAUER: If the State were to take over, first off, they would have to comply with Title VIII of ANILCA. And then the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture would be the ones that ultimately make the decision as to whether or not they have complied. Whether any laws they pass or State Constitution complies. And that would be looked at by the lawyers for the Department, for the Secretaries, and then it would be the Secretaries that make the final decision.

MR. DAVID: And with the information you gather from the Regional Council, not only this, if the Council want the Federal to manage the resource, would Secretaries still go on if you want to have the State take over on the resources in the area?

MR. KNAUER: No. If the State does comply with Title VIII and protects the subsistence priority, and are able to regain management, the Secretaries would provide that transfer to the State.

MR. DAVID: In answering the questions will you try to use simple words because I'm asking you questions and you're answering me with the words that I don't even understand. What's the word comply means?
MR. KNAUER: Meet the requirements. So the short answer is no, the Secretary would not continue to manage if the State could do it.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Johnny Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: I was the one that brought that up. So if there is any language wherever you could find include that so everybody could understand the language of that section.

MR. KNAUER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Anyone of the Council? Anybody over here? I think it's very important to the people out in -- where we couldn't get to them, they need to have some kind of information, especially down in the mouth of the Yukon, like affecting subsistence. I am on a Yukon River with Yukon Drainage Fishermen Association, I'm on a co-chair and we deal with subsistence and commercial both. There's a lot of use of subsistence I suppose in both rivers. And it's very important to the people in the areas, not only in the Yukon, but mouth of Yukon River or mouth of Kuskokwim, the people get to use that.

I think these people have to be really completely understand what will happen if Federal take over. I think that those people should understand so they wouldn't be worried. I've been hearing the people worried about if the Federal did take over they may quit subsistence, even though they never commercial down in area. Some kind of notices maybe have to go out from the Department to the villages. Bill?

MR. McCANN: I think the same way what you people think. I think it would be better to let the villagers understand how it's going to run before it happens. Then give them a booklet how it's going to take care of, how it's going to manage. Each village, they should have a booklet and the IRA Councils. So that way I guess all of them will understand what's in the book and how it's going to run. If something happens, like usually sometimes they say we going to do this and we're going to do this, you go the other way sometimes.

So if we got the booklet how it's going to exactly run and send them out to the villages, then the villages can look at it and if something happens they can get to us or get to you and correct it. I think that would be the best. Make sure, let them understand before it happens. Because sometimes when something happens before we even know, that hurt us. If we do that before it happens, exactly what's going to happen when it comes, make sure that everybody understand.
I guess if you let the villages -- well explain to the people out there, because we can't go out there, explain what we hear, so much of it.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah. Paul?

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Paul John) We Yup'ik people, sometimes we have misunderstanding about the management systems that the Federal and State have. And sometimes the proposals are something that they think that are already has been made, but it's been about 10 years since I have finally understood and it's been about 10 years since they start talking about the issues on the subsistence. And a lot of the people have difficult time understanding what the papers are all about when they first arrive.

And they like to go ahead -- want to make any comments towards these proposals and sometimes it's difficult for the people to understand that they can make comments on these proposal. And if they know and understand what's going on, then they'll be able to make comments on these. And an example is the tags that people now have to work on. And if we take some of these issues and problems and present them to the people that work on this issue, then it would be much more easier for the people that are working on this to understand.

And I understand that if the State is not taking care of our subsistence management, but I feel that maybe the Federal do a lot better. And before the State took over resource management the Federal had taken care of these resources before and I am in support of Federal management.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: David.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (David O. David) And even if the State is able to manage subsistence and be able to work with these things, but these people in the villages, if they are in support of Federal management -- he's asking when they make comments from the villages supporting whatever action is taken, will the Federal government be able to listen to their recommendations?

MR. KNAUER: We will be receiving comments from villages and people all over the State and we will be trying to make changes that modify the Proposed Rule where we can. You know when we started out with the wildlife regulations we started out with the ones that were patterned after the State. And you folks have told us that in certain cases you wanted to see change. And that the regulations have been changed based on the recommendations of the people and based on the
recommendations of these Regional Councils. So if the Federal management does occur, then we will be providing opportunities for the public and the Councils to recommend changes.

MR. DAVID: For the Federal to manage the resources?

MR. KNAUER: If the Federal government manages the resources, Congress may not let us. We don't know.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Lester.

MR. L. WILDE: I think one thing that is forgotten a lot of times, in most cases when discussing subsistence, is that the Federal subsistence requirements require that there is a rural preference. And the reason way the State doesn't have control of fish in this area would be because they do not have that clause in their proposals. So I think that we sometimes forget that there is a difference between the State, and the only difference in most cases is that the State requires rural preference and -- I mean the Feds require rural preference and the State doesn't. I think that should be clearly understood.

MR. KNAUER: That's absolutely it in a nutshell. You've got it right exactly the reason why.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: David.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (David O. David) He wants to make a motion for the Fish and Wildlife to make sure that there is a representative for Fish and Wildlife Service and to make sure the information about the Proposed Ruling management of subsistence fisheries and to make sure that people understand what this Proposed Ruling is about.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: I think David of David explanation that we need more to go out to the villages, the people that we represent. And a lot of people out there, they don't very well understand some writings like me. If it's a plainer, you know, it would be easier. Who will second it?

MR. JOHN: Second.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Paul John second it. Discussion?

John.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Johnny Thompson) I foresee something here. We've been talking about salmon last year but nobody seems to listen to us, but this is the way we are. For last years I have heard that it is not toward the salmon but I
I have heard about the caribou, that they're using the airplanes to scare them off. These animals, probably because they know which way to go, they go where they feed. And we are also in the subject of using salmon, sometimes even when we want to it seems like we are being chased away from things that we want because of rules and regulations.

All these regulations are not that strong and these animals, we need to manage them by looking at how they are, especially with our salmon. And the definition, they used that as a weapon. Although sometimes these are our definitions too. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Any more questions? Comment?

MR. DAVID: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (David O. David) These papers that are being sent, like what Paul John said, before they become reality, we would like to understand very well and know what your plans are so in time we can have feedback to you people how we use the resource, as well as to let you know how the resource is managed. That's the reason why I move to have you inform our people in our villages before you make any move.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: I think it's well enough understand what Council decide to hear. Is any more discussion from the Council? If there are no further discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Call the question.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Question's been called for. All who favor it say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Opposed say no.

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Motion carried, that recommendation. Thank you, Bill.

MR. KNAUER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: We'll go to our next agenda. We're going into agenda number 8, Proposals. We're going into proposals now.
INTERPRETER HUNTER: (John Andrew) He's explaining that Proposal number 62, it's in the book here at Tab T, number 1. I will present the proposal. There is two of them for Unit 18, 62 and 63 and also Proposals number 51 to 60. You can find those proposals in the book on Tab T.

The first one is from Akiak and Akiachak. They want to be recognized that they have hunt caribou within Game Management Unit 18. And those people that are working with this will be explaining it.

(Interpreter Hunt interjecting) Right now at the present time I am totally lost of where this is. I'm lost, you were talking about Proposal number 62, and then you went immediately to 63. I don't know where you are at the present time. I don't think anybody knows where you are at the present time. Well, why don't you go over Proposal 62, it'll be a lot better for everyone to understand. If I can't understand it, then nobody can understand it.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: I think right now, Pat, we start with Proposal 62?

MS. McCLENAHAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm Pat McClenahan, the Staff Anthropologist for Fish and Wildlife Service. As I'm starting Proposal 62, I would like to tell you about the fact that we have a number of proposals for Akiak and Akiachak that I'll be presenting today. I'll be presenting them in order according to this list that you have in your book. They are Proposals 62, 51, 52, 53, 58, 64, 66, 68 and 72. And the reason that I'm mentioning this is I'd like to give you some general information as I'm presenting Proposal 62, and it will be relevant to these other proposals. In the interest of time I will not repeat that information again, but please keep it in mind as we address those other proposals.

These proposals were a series of backlogged proposals that have been on the books for a while and we're trying to take care of them this year and finish them up. Likewise, Proposals 54 and 67 are backlogged proposals that were introduced to us a number of years ago by AVCP. Those will be considered together in the analysis with the Akiak and Akiachak proposals.

Proposal 98-62, submitted by Akiak and Akiachak IRA requests a positive customary and traditional use determination for caribou in Unit 18 for residents of Akiak and Akiachak.
Proposal 62 wants to add to the existing customary and traditional use determination for caribou the communities of Akiak and Akiachak. These communities already have recognized
I want to show you some general use area maps and some specific caribou use area maps that were drawn up by Ron Thuma who was a Staff Anthropologist in Fish and Wildlife Service in 1985. He did this in conjunction with development of the Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Refuges in 1985. This is a general use area for Akiachak according to Thuma's map. This is not specifically caribou, but all resources. That's for Akiak.

This is Thuma's map for Akiachak for all resources. In addition to this information we have use area maps that were developed by Mike Coffing here from ADF&G for Kwethluk, a neighbor, and they have close ties with Akiak and Akiachak and the other Kuskokwim region communities. I'd like to also show you the maps for caribou use for Akiak and Akiachak. Keep in mind this was for 1985. And please keep this in mind for future proposals. You can see Unit 18.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Excuse me. It is possible for you to go out there and point out exactly where you're talking about so people can understand where you're at on the map.

MS. McCLENAHAN: I think so. Okay. This is Unit 18, here is Akiak and Akiachak. This is Unit 17(B), 19(B), 19(A). Okay. And that was for Akiachak. This is for Akiak. Now, keep in mind this is in 1985 and that, of course, we all know caribou move around a lot. There is not very much written information about Akiak and Akiachak and their use of resources. There is a great deal of information, but it's oral tradition. And in our research we have been working with Akiachak and Akiak to try to get some information about their use.

And so this analysis is based on Ron Thuma's work, on Mike Coffing's work in Kwethluk, which is the neighbor, on my communications with Akiak and Akiachak during the last year and a half. And we have good information about Akiak and Akiachak's use of Unit 17(A) and 17(B). By 1867 the caribou that lived on the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta had disappeared, had gone and were only left in small pockets around the area. Between 1900 and the 1930s people from neighboring Kwethluk went to the mountains east of them in September and October to hunt caribou and reindeer and bear and squirrels and to fish, according to Mike Coffing's report.

According to the subsistence use area map they also went as far north as the north shore of the Yukon River in the
north eastern part of Unit 18 to hunt. From the 1920s until
the 1940s, the Lower Kuskokwim traditional
seasonal round of activities was interrupted for families who
took part in reindeer herding. Herders had to be with the herd
continuously to deter recruitment by the wild caribou and to take
care of predators and to accompany the caribou to food, to good
food for them.

Herders were encouraged to kill male caribou and
caribou calves were taken for their skins. These practices
help to further diminish the remaining caribou herd. Some
herders settled on the other side of Togiak and in Levelock and
they never returned to the Kuskokwim area. Lower Kuskokwim
families have relatives in Unit 17. And those communities
would be Clarks Point, New Stuyahok, Aleknagik, Manokotak and
Dillingham. And this is according to Fritz George who told me
about this at one of our meetings.

Residents of Akiak and Akiachak appear to be in a
resources exchange network. That includes the Kuskokwim
communities and Togiak at least, and perhaps there are other
communities I don't know about. Throughout Unit 18 caribou and
other large mammals are very important to the subsistence life
way of the Lower Kuskokwim people. According to the ADF&G
records that I was able to get, the written information
indicates that from two to 13 percent of the diet is made up by
large mammals. But an Akiachak informant said that for some
families in Akiachak large mammals make up from 40 to 60
percent or more of their resources for the year.

Ron Thuma's maps show that Akiak and Akiachak hunted
moose and bear north of the Yukon River, along the river east
of Saint Mary's in the mid-1980s. His map depicting caribou
subsistence hunting areas for Akiak and Akiachak, those are the
maps I showed you a few minutes ago, in 1985 shows areas in the
southwestern portion of Unit 18, portions in Unit 17 and Unit
19.

Coffing's map of Kwethluk, and that is in your book at
the end of this analysis, this 62 analysis, shows limited
general subsistence use by an unknown number of Kwethluk
residents of the northern Yukon River Banks above Russian River
in the vicinity of Pearl Island. His subsistence use area maps
specifically for caribou in the late 1980's does not show that
people went north of the Yukon River. Some residents of the
Lower Kuskokwim River communities apparently have married
residents of Marshall and have relatives there.

And so for Proposal 62, this is the preliminary Staff
conclusion. Staff feels that while there is information about
where people went, there's not enough information about how long this has been going on and how many people go there. And so the preliminary Staff conclusion is to defer the proposal until c&t studies are completed for these two communities for Akiak and Akiachak.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: What's ADF&G comment to this proposal? Yeah, Mike.

MR. COFFING: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, we support the preliminary conclusions. And one of the reasons is we have been working with the community of Akiachak is and with Pat McClenahan, Fish and Wildlife Service, and through efforts of Fritz George and the Council up at Akiachak. What we hope to do here within the next year or so is to go to Akiachak and do some work in that community similar to the work that we did in Kwethluk, talking to elders, talking to hunters, doing some mapping and documenting subsistence use areas in that community.

So I think at time, you know, probably a year from now or so, we're going to have a lot of good detailed information that can I think strengthen this proposal more and would add to the other proposals as well. So I think I'll leave it at that, unless you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: David.

MR. DAVID: Since you've been working with Akiachak, Akiak or Kwethluk, you must have more information on how the people up there do their subsistence hunting and fishing, or for the areas as well.

MR. COFFING: Is that a question? You're asking me if we have that?

MR. DAVID: Do you have more information than them?

MR. COFFING: Actually, the information we have we shared with Pat McClenahan and the Staff. So they currently have in their hands all that we have. We do have quite a bit of detailed information for Kwethluk because we've done a community study there. We don't have the same level of detail for Akiak or Akiachak. But I think through the efforts with the community and working with Fish and Wildlife Service through some cooperative efforts altogether, I think we can gather that kind of information for Akiachak and perhaps Akiak. So we don't have anything additional now, but we're working right now to get some additional information.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: Any more from Council?

MR. McCANN: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Bill.

MR. McCANN: When they make proposals, our village -- the villages, they know what they do. I don't think you're going to get exactly how many people are using, but they know that everybody use that. That's why they make proposal. I don't think it's necessary to count how many people are using that type. Because the proposal is asked because they know people use that, what they want. That should be clear enough to me. Because if you see few -- I understand a few people use, that's not true, I don't think so. Because we make proposals, what we want for hunting or stuff like that. We know everybody using that. That's why we make proposals. But the way I understand you guys are -- you want to know how many people are using that purpose. I think that's -- I don't go for that. Proposal is to me everybody using that proposal, that's why they asking for it. Maybe I'm saying wrong, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah, Pat.

MS. McCLENAHAN: Pat McClenahan. Mr. McCann, actually one of the Yukon communities wrote a letter questioning our assertion that Akiak and Akiachak had used that area and they said they knew nothing of Akiak/Akiachak people using that area. So we are accountable to you and we are seeking more information.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: May I ask you back here if you could read that letter from Yukon side of the -- yeah.

MR. FISHER: Mr. Chairman, my name is Dave Fisher with the Fish and Wildlife Service in Anchorage. And this letter is from the Natural Resources Department, Mountain Village, Alaska. The letter is directed to Mr. Harry Wilde, Chairman, Region V Advisory Council.

Dear Mr. Wilde: In 1998/99 the Federal Subsistence Regulatory Year Proposals for the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta, there is a joint proposal submitted by Akiak and Akiachak, Proposal number 62. I want to bring to your attention some of the concerns our neighboring villages in Unit 21(E) and Middle Yukon have voiced their opinions regarding customary and traditional land use for subsistence by residents and non-residents.
First of all, subsistence is our priority. We want all Alaskan Natives to continue to subsistence hunt and to practice their customary and traditional lifestyles. It is difficult for me to imagine that Akiak and Akiachak residents come to hunt caribou in the north side of the Yukon River, hundreds of miles away from their traditional hunting areas. Perhaps they can do it now because of easier transportation means, such as by snow machines, airplanes and by boat in the summer.

In recent years the Western Arctic caribou herd have begun to migrate as far south to Kotlik area and headwaters of Andreatsky rivers. During the past 50 years we have not seen or heard of Akiak and Akiachak residents hunting caribou in the north side of the Lower Yukon River. For this reason you should reconsider Proposal number 62, or perhaps table it until customary and traditional subsistence hunting determination can be established for residents of Akiak and Akiachak in north side of the Yukon River.

I won't read the rest of it. They just go on to kind of describe the current regulation and then what the proposal is. With due respect, we want our neighbors in the Yukon-Kuskokwim Rivers to continue to subsistence hunt and we wish them well in their efforts to keep and practice their customary and traditional lifestyles. Sincerely, James Luke, Mountain Village resident.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Fritz.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Fritz George) I will speak in Yup'ik, we have a translator. In 1985 the people that came in and mark on the map where we used to go hunting. We also talked about where we used to go hunting and we wanted to change some of those areas that we was hunting in. I'd like Mike Coffing to go back over there and to look at the -- and outline all of those areas where residents of Akiak and Akiachak do their hunting.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Do you want to respond?

MS. MccLENAHAN: No, I think that that was the idea about trying to have a formal study, because it's difficult for us in our position to be able to do in-depth studies, to go out to the community and stay there and talk to everybody, that's what's required. In preparing the analyses it's very difficult to give it that depth of attention that it needs. And I think that this is a very good idea. We have a little picture of what was going on in 1985. But, as you all know, the population of animals changes, the location of the animals change and people's preferences change over time. And so we
need a modern picture of how people are living now, as well as
the historic picture which I don't pretend that we've even
began to understand.

Akiak and Akiachak members of the communities were so
to me, a whole day they spent with me talking about
subsistence. And the facts that we have here are because of
their efforts, which I'm very grateful for. But we need more
information from elders that we were unable to talk to and
other residents who are hunters and know the areas.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: What does the Council recommend to
this proposal?

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Lester.

MR. L. WILDE: We heard the other day some oral history
by one of our elders stating that in the days when we were out
hunting for food, where there was no commercial stores or
anything within the villages, that we had to go where the food
was, we didn't go just in designated areas. We had to go where
the food was and we were told by our elders that when those
people from other areas come within our area, and within our
immediate area, that we should go out and help them obtain the
food that they need to live on. And with that in mind, Mr.
Chairman, I have absolutely no -- I would support this
proposal.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Only thing I'm having a problem with
this proposal, if the State and Staff -- State and Federal
Staff -- it's my understanding that they want to defer it for
more study. Not only that, if this -- I'm just looking at the
north side of Yukon River. I think we, the Council, we're not
supposed to try to start troubles to other areas. And not only
that, they going to be continuously -- if the study is not
complete work done, I know the State will again sit down. And
I don't know if the Board will approve it, even though the
Council recommend approving it. That's a problem I have.

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, I think what I was trying
to say was that the request for a positive customary and
traditional use determination for caribou in Unit 18 north of
the Yukon River for the residents of Akiak and Akiachak be
defered until sufficient documentation is available. Because
I know what they're trying to do. We went through the same
process. They want to make sure that in the event at some point
in time somebody comes in and says, wait a minute, our resource
is getting down to the level where we're unable to include you, they want to make sure that they're included in there and you want to make sure that there is no -- the reason why you want to get that information is that there is no question later on where this subject will come back up. And I think it would be a good idea to get all that documentation. I have absolutely no opposition to this proposal. But in the light that you put forth and prior to this meeting, I think your suggestion and recommendation is something that should be continued forward.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Bill.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Billy McCann) Yes, I understand this proposal. Because they are saying that the Yukon River is so far away, but in the way that we live, we hunt, we like to go where all the food is available. And these caribou where we go hunting go where the food is, us too when we go out to hunt where the food is available. This proposal we must -- they don't think of all these other people. And I'm thinking like Lester Wilde, I would like to support it, but I am not in opposition to it, if I understand this correctly.

This opposition said that they never saw those people going out hunting around there, but as I see it, people would like to make sure. And the same thing would happen if people from the Yukon River come and wanted to go hunting for caribou, then there will be some arguments about it. But if we work together and let other people from other areas to come to hunt in our areas, that would be better.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (John Andrew) This proposal is this way. We will try to understand it. This proposal and they're asking -- requesting all of the Unit 18, the comments that what the proposal said is that they are not -- they were never be seen hunters from Akiak and Akiachak. But us workers from the subsistence division, what we see here are -- because we don't have enough information the Federal Board will not be able to accept that proposal. And if there is even one opposition to the proposal, it's going to be detriment to the proposal.

We do have some problem here, but we could go ahead and make a recommendation and accept that proposal. The Subsistence Board will have difficulty accepting that proposal. But if there is more information, then it would be much more easier for the Board to accept one.

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Go ahead.
MR. L. WILDE: I think the biggest problem that we've always had is that the areas that we hunt has been divided into sub-districts, you know. When Akiak and Akiachak are talking about Unit 18, within our minds right away we think Unit 18 as a whole, not just that portion of the area of Unit 18 where they are. That's one thing that we've all got to understand. When an area talks about a unit, they don't necessarily talk about the whole unit as a whole, you know, just the areas where they customarily and traditionally used. And that's what is confusing sometimes. I think both sides needs to understand that.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Paul John) Paul John, Toksook Bay. We do say that we don't want to change our ways from the time of our ancestors. We would like to go ahead and like to look at this and say that some of our people that used to use that area are no longer here. I want to give an example. We also see the ones that want to buy fish as the larger organization. Long time ago our ancestor person that go out there is good hunter.

Looking at the other villages, when we see all these people that have a lot of good hunting resources we always look at them as a big business. This proposal, looking at what our people used to do like in the past, I think that we should go along with what our ancestors used to say. And I'm kind of looking at this proposal as being already finished. Many years ago they used to go hunting places even when they're far away where there's food sources available. We do not want to lose anything that our ancestors have practiced and have given to us. I'm in support of this proposal.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Johnny Thompson). Saint Mary's. This is just like most proposal. Not too long ago this one biologist told me when I was speaking with him the things that you are saying are true, that the moose they collared or radio collared and a moose went from the Yukon to the Kuskokwim, went all the way over to the Iditarod River and finally got to Saint Mary's. We could go ahead and have authority over these animals and the way the animals are, they're going to be going anywhere they want to and the Creator can either increase them, can decrease them if He wants to.

We forget that we are always wanting to be boss of things. And looking at Proposal 62, I don't have any problems with it because it's going to be used by all people. We can't go around and try to control all of the animals because they're not ours. Take a look at the beaver, long time ago there was hardly anything here, now they're all over the place. And even today their populations continue to increase. This proposal I
would like to go ahead and support it, but because of the way the management system is I don't want the management system to go ahead and do away with it or to oppose it.

The people that like to go out hunting for subsistence purposes, I really feel it in my heart and in my mind when people want to go out to subsistence hunt and fish, that's why I hardly say anything about it. And how people are trying to live, and I understand that. Today our hunters go very far away to go hunting. And from our village they go all the way over to Kalskag and looking at caribou in that area. And sometimes they don't say anything about who is opposing them. And those people in those other villages have treated them with kindness. And if those people from the Kuskokwim go far north into the Yukon River, they always treat them kindly.

But today there are management systems looking at paperwork. And that is why some of the reasons we run into problems. I would like to support this proposal, but the people that are working for the subsistence management and with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game said that we would like to further examine this and get more data. It would be a lot better.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) I would like to know what you would like to do with this proposal. Is there anybody here that is supporting or making a motion to support this? I thought that there was one a moment ago. We haven't made any motion.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Billy McCann) I make a motion to go ahead and we would like to support this proposal the way it is written. And if they want to get further information and data about this, I really do support this proposal. I make a motion.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (David O. David) Second it.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: There's a motion and a second to Proposal 62. Discussion?

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (David O. David) He saying that those villages of Akiak and Akiachak they are not saying any old way that this is what they used to do, but they were out trying to get food for subsistence purposes. And when we go out hunting for subsistence foods we go just about anywhere to try to get food for our families because we're trying to make sure that we feed our families.

And many years ago, even today, we go out hunting for subsistence resources no matter how far they are. And those
people from Kwethluk when they go out hunting in the spring time, they go almost all the way to my village of Kwigillingok. And we don't think about the boundaries of the unit. The non-Native people, if we go in accordance with the way the unit boundaries are, we too can make boundaries, but we don't do that. Because I spoke about that yesterday. And I said yesterday that people come here to make money.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: My understanding to the motion is accept this the way it's wrote [sic] on paper right now. So I still don't quite understand. Bill, you moved that defer this proposal the way it's written?

MR. McCANN: The way it's written.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Billy McCann) He is making a recommendation and a motion that the way it is written and deferred until such time that information is further gathered, but he is in support of the proposal the way it is written. He is referring to where it says Staff recommendation, defer the proposal until planned c&t studies are completed in the Village of Akiak and Akiachak. He's saying that it seems like nobody seem to understand what his proposal is. He is accepting the proposal as it is written and to make sure that, you know, the proposal is deferred until such time that studies are completed for the Villages of Akiak and Akiachak. He's not opposing it.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Question, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Question's been called. Request for roll call, George. Secretary George, roll call.


CHAIRMAN WILDE: Motion carried. Sixty-three.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Billy McCann) Billy McCann is complaining that we haven't got a break yet.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) Proposal number 63 is Unit 18 - moose south of and including Kanektok River drainages. Kuskokwim River drainages-1 antlered bull. A 10-day hunt (1 bull, evidence of sex required) will be opened by announcement sometime between December 1 and February 28. August 25 to September 25. Remainder of Unit 18-1 antlered
bull. A 10-day hunt (1 bull, evidence of sex required) will be
opened by announcement sometime between December 1 and February
28. The season is September 1 to 30th. And the Staff
recommendation is support. ADF&G support.

MR. FISHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Proposal number
63 was submitted by the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge. And
this proposal would correctly describe that portion of Game
Management Unit 18 south of and including the Kanektok River
drainages within the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge that is
closed to moose hunting.

Let's put a map of 18 up here and I can show you the
areas that we're talking about. Mr. Chairman and members of
the Council, I'm talking about this area here, the Kanektok
River, the Arolik River and the Goodnews River. Those lie
within the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge, but they are up in
Game Management Unit 18.

The way the regulations are written now, the Goodnews
River and the Kanektok River, those lands that are within the
Togiak National Wildlife Refuge, those are presently closed to
moose hunting and they've been closed to moose hunting since
1991. At that time the intent was to also include the Arolik
River drainage. Now, there isn't very much land in the Arolik
River that goes up into the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge.
It would be Arolik Lake and then a little bit of that river
down. Below that, that is Village Corporation lands. So that
land there would be under ADF&G regulations.

The reason these areas were closed in 1991 was to try
and encourage the moose population in those drainages to
increase. There is very few moose in those areas. And at the
time the regulations were put in in 1991, the Arolik River
wasn't included. It was somehow left out. But the intent was
to include it as part of the closed area comparable to the
Kanektok and the Goodnews.

So what we want to do with this regulation is to kind
of clarify and re-word that closed area to include the Arolik
River drainage, but we're only talking those lands that are
within the refuge, those Federal public lands.


INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Joshua Cleveland) Was this
proposal at that time when they close it as a moratorium or
just totally closed?

MR. FISHER: At the time in 1991 when they closed the
two drainages, it was a closure, yes. There was no moratorium. And probably when the moose populations build up then we would reconsider opening those lands to moose hunting. Let me just add just a little bit here.

In Unit 17(A), which is the Togiak drainage, that area has been closed since 1980 because of the low moose population. However, the populations in 17(A) are increasing. We went from just a few moose in the early 80s, the population started to increase in the late 80s, and it continued to increase in the 90s and just recently we counted about 430 moose in 17(A). We had a limited season last fall.

The populations have increased, so we're considering some limited season in 17(A). And we're looking at similar things here for that part of the Kanektok drainage, the Arolik drainage and the Goodnews River drainage, once those populations increased then we would consider and you people would be instrumental in helping us set seasons for moose hunting. The habitat is there in the Kanektok/Arolik and Goodnews River drainages. We have good moose habitat just like we had there in 17(A), but we don't have any moose.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) Joshua Cleveland, do you have anything to say before this proposal, because this is not too far from Quinhagak, which is his village.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Joshua Cleveland) I thank you very much for recognizing me. I was just going to sit here and listen to what everybody had to say. And I work with this proposal and I work with Dave Fisher when he was a Refuge Manager. And when we were working on these regulations, Mr. Fisher was working with us too. He has good understanding of how people work out there.

And he's just saying that I think Mr. Fisher has gone higher up in the echelon and still continues to work with Fish and Wildlife Service. And I heard that those areas are closed to moose hunting, the Kanektok River, and because they know that there are very few moose in those areas. But at the present time the moose populations are increasing. But before here seemed to be an increase of moose populations in those areas, but we really don't know how many there are because there has not been any census surveys in those areas that are closed.

Even though they say that they are closed, we'll go out there and get them because we're not going to stop anywhere for any boundaries when we need food.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: What does the Council recommend?

MR. FISHER: Mr. Chairman, can I add just a little bit more here?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah.

MR. FISHER: In talking to the refuge people there in Dillingham, they are going to intensify more survey work in those areas. And I'd like to thank Joshua for the kind words. I remember when I was in Dillingham, anytime I went to Quinhagak, Joshua was one of the first people I would always try and visit because he was always friendly and he tried to help me in those early years when I was just getting started.

And just before I left Dillingham I went to Quinhagak and the first person I saw was Joshua. I don't remember what the meeting was, but he said after the meeting you come over to my house for lunch. So I said, well that would be fine. So we went over there for lunch and you'd never guess what I had for lunch. Had a big moose steak. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: So this proposal is close that area. That's what my understanding, that Togiak National Wildlife Refuge want to close that area.

MR. FISHER: Well, yes, Mr. Chairman. The intent back in 1991 was to add that area. The way the regulations were worded it doesn't include it. So they're trying to clarify the regulations.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) He feels that at the present time that if we support it, he say to Joshua that if people go out there and hunt for moose in the closed areas he's going to be fined. And if they really close this area, they will be looking around in those areas that are closed, law enforcement will do that. What do the Council think about this proposal? How do you want to make your recommendation? It'll be like setting up trap for the people in the Quinhagak area.

MR. McCANN: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Bill.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Billy McCann) Because Arolik was not included in the closure of those river drainages, does that mean that Arolik is open to hunting? He's wondering what those people in the Quinhagak area think about the way it is. Do they have law enforcement patrols in that area? How has it
been in the last few years? What do people in Quinhagak think
about that regulation the way it is? Do they have law
enforcement patrols or do they ignore it?

The proposal says that they want to continue to remain
open or closed. It has been like that for quite some time but
even though it's like that, we continue to practice our
subsistence lifestyle. There is not too much law enforcement
in that area. It is not too strict in law enforcement patrol
at this time.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Johnny Thompson) I make a
recommendation that that closed area remain the way it is, not
-- what he is saying, that he's not in support of this
proposal.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Are you opposed to this?
MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Second by David O. David. Motion by
John Thompson, oppose Proposal 63. Discussion.

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, I have one question. As
it's been handled before, you've noticed an increase in the
population of moose in that area did you say, or was I kind of
dreaming that you would say that?

MR. FISHER: Probably in the last -- let me just back
up just a minute. We don't have a lot of data for those areas.
The refuges.....

MR. L. WILDE: The data that you do have, does that
indicate that there is some?

MR. FISHER: Yes. The population is starting to
increase, but not very rapid. Not as fast as success we've had
in 17(A).

MR. L. WILDE: Thank you.

MR. FISHER: And our thinking is that if we can get a
good population in 17(A) -- now 17(A) had a good habitat, so
does this part of 18, that possibly some of those animals will
move over from 17(A) into the Goodnews drainages and then
Arolik and Kanektok and so on. Did I answer your question?

MR. L. WILDE: Yes.

MR. FISHER: Okay.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: Any more discussion? If there's not, roll call.


CHAIRMAN WILDE: Proposal 63 is opposed by the Council. We will have a 10 minute break.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN WILDE: (Speaking in Yup'ik).

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, can we hear the highlights of each proposal?

MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman, we have this slide show we can take you through very quickly, if you'd like. At least you'd know the topic and what our proposal was. And if you want to know reasons we can give them.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah, John, go ahead.

MR. THOMPSON: I would like to see it in black and we could withdraw a certain proposal if we need to modify or oppose it.

MS. MCCLENAHAN: Right. There are quite a few of them that the Staff recommends modifying. Quite a few. There are four that we support completely as they are, and then a number that we would like to see modified.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Okay. Staff support, let's look at 51 to 68.

MS. MCCLENAHAN: Proposal 51 is for black bear c&t. And the request for Akiak and Akiachak was for all of Unit 17. You've seen the maps before and we have good information about Akiak and Akiachak using Unit 17 or portions of Unit 17. The first information we got was from the 1700s. BIA took oral histories. And there's a report of a historic battle that took place up in the mountains between Unit 18 and Unit 17. And the Lower Kuskokwim communities were there.

There's a graveyard up there in that area that has
Kuskokwim community people in it from the 1700s. And I'd also mention to you that they have relatives in that area. And people moved over there from Unit 18, Kuskokwim. Here's a picture of Akiachak -- now this is for moose and bear, brown and black bear, their use area. And you can see here that probably the eastern most portion of 17(A) and then part of 17(B) there, here is for Akiak for moose and brown and black bear. Akiak it only shows 17(B). But, remember this is for one year. And their general use area is broader than that.

Here's Akiak's caribou use area. You see it extends into 17(A). And we know that people take a wide variety of resources together and not just go out for moose or go out just for caribou. And so our preliminary Staff conclusion for this one is to support the proposal. And since we have good evidence for their hunting in 17(A) and 17(B), to modify the proposal to read 17(A) and 17(B) for Akiak and Akiachak.

Mr. Chairman, shall I go ahead and do the other support proposals together? Do you want to.....

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah, go ahead.

MS. McCLENAHAN: Okay. Proposal 52 is for brown bear, it's the same situation. Okay. So this is what the proposal would be, to add residents of Akiak and Akiachak to each of the areas there that is already in the regulation. Our preliminary Staff conclusion is to support this proposal, again with modification for Unit 17(A) and 17(B). We have good evidence that they were hunting there.

Okay. Proposal 53 and 54. Proposal 53, Unit 17, rural residents of Unit 9(B) and 17, Lime Village and Stony River, we would be adding the residents of Akiak and Akiachak. We have included in this one Proposal 54, which was submitted by AVCP to add the residents, the rural residents of Unit 18 to provide them a positive c&t for hunting also in Unit 17.

After looking at the information, we have good information that residents of the Lower Kuskokwim River used Unit 17(A) and 17(B). We would like to support this with the modification. Proposal 53 we would like to support the proposal, grant a positive c&t determination to Akiak and Akiachak for Unit 17(A) and 17(B). And then for Proposal 54, which would request for all Unit 18 communities to support the proposal with modification and to grant a positive c&t determination for the communities of Quinhagak, Goodnews Bay, Platinum for Unit 17(A) and (B). So it would be Akiak, Akiachak, Quinhagak, Goodnews Bay and Platinum. Yes?
MR. McCANN: Now, you mentioned just a few villages on those 17(A) and 17(B).

MS. McCLENAHAN: Yes.

MR. McCANN: But you said that those villages can hunt there, but sometimes there is moose hunters from way down coast going up river and caribou hunting also during the winter. That should be (indiscernible) those villages are able to hunt that area. It should be included all of 54 villages.

MS. McCLENAHAN: The reason that-- and I haven't given you my whole analysis, but it's based on the fact that we have written information about those communities already and we have maps for those communities, but I don't have for the other ones. What I would suggest is, if you provide this now, then other communities can propose next time and information can be gathered and presented before this Council another time.

That's one way of dealing with it. You could also defer that proposal and ask for more information for those other communities. And we can take from the Council what communities go out there and should be included so they won't be cut out of the proposal. It's up to you.

MR. McCANN: What happens now? You said something about next time it will with the proposal be included, but now, right now what happens if it's not included?

MS. McCLENAHAN: We are granting a positive c&t for these communities. Those other communities will not be listed at this time. We can either make a new proposal, we can say, wait a minute, we think you're leaving out these other communities and we can look into it. You can recommend to add, you can recommend to modify this proposal and say I want this community included and give information about why and later I can call you and find out about it, or whichever community. And so, you know, it's within your power to modify this.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah. Let me hold you for Carl Morgan. You want to.....

MR. MORGAN: Yeah. I would like to give you a proposal -- what the Western Interior's action was taken on Proposal number 53 and 54. We deferred it to the Bristol Bay Regional Council, providing Lime Village and Stony River mainly their current determination. Because Lime Village and Stony River have close ties with Nondalton and the lake and they go as far south as Togiak -- I mean, excuse me, not Togiak, Tyonek. Those people speak the same language and they got the same real
close ties. Fifty-four, we've got the same determination as 53, providing Lime Village and Stony River are included. We leave it to Bristol Bay because we've got only two villages that are involved. And with their determination, knowing that if they do reject it, then we know that the Federal Subsistence Board would probably. So we're deferring it to Bristol Bay.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: You may continue. Go ahead.

MS. McCLENAHAN: Okay. Do you want me to go on to another proposal then? The next one is Proposal 55, which Dave has.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Dave.

MR. FISHER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Proposal number 55 was submitted by the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge. And what it does, it redescribes and simplifies Sub-Unit 17(A) caribou hunting areas. And the reason it's brought before you today is there's one village in Unit 18 that has customary and traditional use of caribou in Unit 17(A) and 17(B). So that's why it's before you people today.

And basically what this proposal would do, it would reduce 17(A) caribou hunting areas from three areas to two areas. The two areas would be at Nushagak Peninsula area and then it would be the remainder of 17(A). And the Nushagak Peninsula area is for that newly established caribou herd. And that's for residents only of 17(A), to specially hunt those caribou on that Nushagak Peninsula. So it's going to redescribe caribou hunting areas in 17(A), reduce it from three areas to two areas and hopefully clarify it for subsistence users. Make it a little bit easier to understand. And it will somewhat align with current State regulations.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: David.

MR. DAVID: Mr. Chairman, which peninsulas are you referring to because there is one on the east side and one on the west side?

MR. FISHER: The west side of Dillingham. The Nushagak Peninsula or Cape Constantine. That's basically 55 and the recommendation of the Staff is to support that proposal.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: I think before we do some action here, I think we should give public opportunity to comment. Some of these if these, you know, we just can't make decision all by ourself on. I think there's some public here that would like to be involved or like to have a comment certain proposals. So
if you could -- right now I think we're going to open the floor
for the public to make a comment, any one of these proposals
that we're talking about. So far that we are pass only two, or
worked on two. Rest of them here is there are a lot of
proposal to go yet. I think it is fair if we give them
opportunity to -- if anyone here that concern about certain
proposal, what we're working on this morning.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) And if anybody
want to speak about any of those proposals can go up there and
speak about that proposal. We would like to hear what you have
to say. And if you are prepared to speak on any of these
proposal you can come up there and go and present your ideas
about that proposal. You've got to say who you are, your name,
and where you are from.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Teddy Kugstun) Mr. Chairman, my
name is Teddy, I come from Kipnuk. And while you are working
on these proposals, we would like to be -- sometimes we have
sometimes continued to talk about something for a long time.
And I'm talking about these things that -- because we too do a
lot of subsistence hunting and fishing and while you're working
on the proposal and I'd like to (indiscernible) these people
that makes the decisions.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) Who else wants
to say anything about this proposals? Is there anybody else
that want to say anything about the proposals?

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Moses Strauss) This is Moses
Strauss from Kongiganak. I did speak about these proposals, to
take the bulk of the proposals that are recommended to pass and
work on them that way. And then take a look at those that need
to be refined and work on them. If they really need to be
worked on, to work on them. And to support those that are
recommended for supporting or to pass. That's all I have to
say on these proposals.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) These Staff have
already given us and work on those proposals that are
recommended for pass. And to work on those that need to be
supported or refine those proposals that need to be worked on,
or others that are -- to go ahead and support those that meet
proposal or support. And if there are any proposals that have
-- that are not (indiscernible), not to go ahead and support
them. This is what the Staff of Subsistence had said. And
because I am curious as to what these proposals -- the ones
that are not recommended to pass, I would look at the numbers.
I also want people and the Council to know which they are
before we make any recommendations or motions on them. Is
there anybody else that want to say anything? Dave, go ahead.

MR. FISHER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There are several proposals that we oppose.

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, before Dave goes ahead, just in your packet, Proposal 55, 17-caribou movement and area of restriction, could you cover that a little bit, or did you cover that already? Okay. All right.

MS. McCLENAHAN: Here is our list of proposals.

MR. L. WILDE: And just for my mind, could you tell me what the area of restriction was? I don't remember you saying any.

MR. FISHER: Yes. Basically we're talking about 17(A), caribou. And the reason this proposal is brought before you people is there is one village in Unit 18 that has customary and traditional use in 17(A), and that's the Village of Kwethluk. And what the proposal is going to do, it's going to reduce the caribou hunting areas in 17(A) from three down to two. It's going to try and simplify the regulations and more align those with current State regulation to make it easier for subsistence users to understand regulations. So it's reducing caribou hunting areas in 17(A) from three areas down to two areas. And those two areas are basically the Nushagak Peninsula, that would be one area, and then the remainder of 17(A) would be the second area.

MR. L. WILDE: And the main reason is to get in line with State reg?

MR. FISHER: That's one of the reasons. And then simplify the Federal regulations to more or less coincide with State regulations, make it easier for subsistence users to read those regulations and make sure they're in the right area and so on.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Dave, in 17 and 19 and 21, how do the people feel about 17(A)? They know that if we support them they're willing to accept them or what?

MR. FISHER: What proposal are you.....

CHAIRMAN WILDE: I'm talking about what the Staff support, 58 and 59 and 60 and.....

MS. McCLENAHAN: Well, those are the c&t proposals. We met together with three Councils. Three Councils met together
and I did not -- I got the sense that they recognized that the Lower Kuskokwim communities have used Unit 17(A) and 17(B), but I don't think that there was any commitment, was there, Fritz, am I reading this right? I don't think there was any commitment. They did not say they would either support or decline to support those proposals.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Fritz.

MR. GEORGE: Mr. Chairman, when that meeting with the three Councils, there was a recommendation by one of the Council members that our histories have been told orally so far. And they recommended that the villages do a study, a subsistence hunting and fishing study. Then after that they would make a consideration after the study has been made.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Harry Wilde) At the present time our Staff, all those that are supported by the Staff, Proposal 58, 59 and 60 including customary and traditional.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Do you want Council to take the whole one block of those, include RFR?

MS. McCLENAHAN: You can if you want to, or if you want to hear the details about the requests for reconsideration we can do that separately.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: I think it would be better if we take that separate because maybe we could learn something from RFR proposals later on. Only these three proposal now, that 58 and 59-60, that.....

MS. McCLENAHAN: Seventy-five. How about 75?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Include 75?

MS. McCLENAHAN: Uh-huh (affirmative). It's a support.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) The Staff's recommendation is to support and pass these proposals. What do you want to do? How do you want to move on this? What action do you want to take? You want to take them as a block, the ones that the Staff is supporting, or how do you want to take them?

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, on 59 this is open a season on moose. Could you cover a little bit on that, please?

MR. FISHER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Proposal 59 was submitted by the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge. And what
Proposal 59 would do -- when we were talking about number 63, I talked about the moose in 17(A), there was a special action submitted last fall to allow for a fall hunting season in 17(A), a 10 day season. That was carried off. I believe there were 45 permits issued and I think there was actually 15 moose harvested. And that was the first time that they had a hunting season in 17(A) since about 1980. When I talk about the population increasing enough to the point where we could allow a season.

Well, this proposal would change that special action and set up a permanent fall season. And the seasons and the number of animals to be harvested would be determined at the time the season is opened. The refuge people there in Dillingham would get together with the Fish and Game Biologist there in Dillingham and they would say, well, it looks like we can have a 10 day season or a 15 day season and allow x-number of animals to be taken. That's what Proposal 59 would do. And I believe the Staff supported that proposal.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Any more comment on 58, 59, 60 and 75?

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, I move that we support the recommendation of Staff on 58, 59, 60 and 75.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: There's a motion on the floor to support.

MR. CHARLES: I second the motion, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Second by James. Discussion?

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: I want to be sure that we don't leave some important players out of this discussion. We normally have an opportunity for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to offer their comments. And particularly when we go to the motions and start to make motions about a whole block of proposals. I'd like to be sure that we've offered the opportunity for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to contribute their views on this.

Mike Coffing had a doctor's appointment and was going to be back shortly. We can read into the record and provide for the Council members the written comments that ADF&G has sent in, but I think we ought to try and keep a little bit of room for ADF&G in this deliberation.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: So what you would be recommend?

MR. BRELSFORD: Well, if there are three proposals under the current motion I could read to you the written comments from ADF&G for those three proposals in Mike Coffing's absence.

MR. L. WILDE: I took it for granted that you and Department of Fish and Game worked together on these. That's the reason why I.....

MR. BRELSFORD: Your point is well taken, Lester. There's certainly coordination and joint review of the proposals. In many cases the Federal system and the State system look at them exactly the same way, but sometimes there are differences of opinion and we need to provide the Council with the full information in that circumstance. So the proposals included in the current motion again were 58.....

MR. L. WILDE: Well, since we have to live with Fish and Game, Mr. Chairman, I think it might be a good idea to go with the suggestion of Taylor there and listen to Mike's comments.

MR. BRELSFORD: Okay. If Mike's back and able to catch his breath, Mike, the Council is moving in something of a consent agenda, a block of proposals where there is an overall recommendation to support them. And I had asked that we provide some opportunity for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to offer views. So the four proposals currently under a motion are 58, 59, 60 and 75. If you would be able on sort of short notice to provide the Department's written comments or any additional comments, this would be the right time to do that.

MR. COFFING: What's the numbers for that?

MR. BRELSFORD: Fifty-eight, 59, 60 and 75. There is a motion to support those proposals, consistent with the Staff recommendation. That motion is by Lester Wilde at this point.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Mike.

MR. COFFING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you would, give me just a second to organize my material here.

MR. FISHER: Mr. Chairman, can I say a word?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Dave.
MR. FISHER: I think we want to possibly include number 55 in there too.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Fifty-five?

MR. FISHER: That was the 17(A) caribou, to reducing the three areas to two areas.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Okay. Include 55.

MR. L. WILDE: My motion only states 58, 59, 60 and 75.

MR. FISHER: I'm wondering if you wanted to include 55 in there, or talk about it a little later?

MR. L. WILDE: I won't be hard-nose and include it Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Okay. Right now that Proposal 55, 58, 59, 60, 75.

MR. L. WILDE: If it's all right with my second.

MR. CHARLES: It's okay.

MR. COFFING: Mr. Chairman, I think I'm ready to offer you some comments now.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Okay, Dave.

MR. COFFING: Okay. My comments are going to be on Proposals 58, 55, 59, 60 and 75. The State supports Proposal 55. So we have no problem with that. We think that that proposal would essentially be the same thing as the emergency opening regulation that the Board of Game delegated to the Fish and Game Department last spring and would also provide some flexibility there to allow some opportunity for harvesting caribou and protect some of the smaller resident Kobuk caribou herd. So we support that one.

Fifty-nine and 60 and 75, we also support those. We think the Proposal 60, it would again align the Federal seasons in Unit 17 with the changes that the State made last spring. So I think consistency between State regs and Federal regs is something we're striving for and this proposal would do that. So we would support that. The same thing with Proposal 59. It would also provide for the same State and Federal seasons. So we think having the same seasons on both State and Federal would eliminate some of the confusion that hunters have out there. And we would support that. Seventy-five again for the
same reason, it would align the State and Federal seasons, so we would support that one.

Proposal 58 is one that would find customary and traditional use determination positive for Akiak and Akiachak for Unit 17(B), I believe. As I'm looking over the material, I think it's obvious to me at least that the map information that Fish and Wildlife has gathered here shows that certainly Akiachak and Akiak use Unit 17(B) for moose hunting. I don't think we would have a problem with that at all.

I guess just one general comment here. I recall back at the Board of Game meeting, it must have been back about '89 or '88 to 1989, along in there when the State Board of Game found a positive determination for Kwethluk. That determination still stands. That determination was for though only a portion of 17(B), instead of all of it. So I certainly would not oppose a positive finding for Akiachak and Akiak. I think that down the road what we might want to look at is having the areas consistent. That is, rather than having communities that have c&t of all of 17(B), that perhaps having villages have c&t use of the same general areas would be maybe more along the lines of really what is reality.

It doesn't look like the map information supports Akiachak or Akiak's use of all of 17(B) as I look at the map here. The northwest corner of 17(B) is used, but there's a much larger part of 17(B) that is not used. So in general although I'm non-opposed to a positive finding, I think the information support that. I think the information also suggests perhaps only a portion of 17(B) and perhaps not all of it. But I think I'll stop there and just say that perhaps when we get to the -- you know, after we've heard with the Bristol Bay Regional Council suggests, the State may want to suggest amending part of this to have a finding for only part of 17(B). That's my comment. That's not the rest of Fish and Game's comment. I think I'll stop there, Mr. Chairman. Take any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: So you give me your plain English 58, how you look at it? It's okay or on the other hand may be I'd like to get.....

MR. COFFING: Okay. I'll try that, more plain English then.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah.

MR. COFFING: Let's see. I guess it's not going to be a total yes or no. What I'm suggesting is, yes, they use
17(B), the information shows that. There's much of 17(B) that's not used for moose. So I think what I'd suggest here is perhaps supporting the proposal. I think the data shows that, with realization there may need to be some fine tuning of what area of 17(B) they're given c&t use on. And that's something we can do down the road, we don't have to do it all today.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: I understand now that you could fine tune it later on. That's what you prefer or otherwise it's okay for us to accept it the way it is.

MR. COFFING: I think the Council may do whatever it wishes. If it wants to fine tune it now it can, if it wants to wait and do that later on, they can do it later on.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Any more questions or discussion from Council on this three, four, five proposals?

MR. L. WILDE: Question, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Question's been called for. Roll call.

MR. GEORGE: Harry Wilde?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: David O. David?

MR. DAVID: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Paul Manumik? Ilarion Nicolai?

MR. NICOLAI: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Steven White?

MR. L. WILDE: Excused.

MR. GEORGE: Billy McCann?

MR. McCANN: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: James Charles?

MR. CHARLES: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Johnny Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.
MR. GEORGE:  Paul John?

MR. JOHN:  Yes.

MR. GEORGE:  Lester Wilde?

MR. L. WILDE:  Yes.

INTERPRETER HUNTER:  (Fritz George)  Mr. Chairman, the motion has nine yeses.

CHAIRMAN WILDE:  All those six proposals -- five proposals in the block, Council support them. Now that we're going to the next proposal, Dave, RFR 97 to 12 -- 97-12.

MS. McCLENAHAN:  Yes, that's mine.

CHAIRMAN WILDE:  Okay. Pat.

MR. BRELSFORD:  Mr. Chairman, the Chevak Village Council phoned a few minutes ago and asked if we could call him back and discuss them to the discussion for this RFR. With your permission we will put that on the.....

CHAIRMAN WILDE:  Uh-huh (affirmative). Go ahead. We will be glad to hear from them.

INTERPRETER HUNTER:  (Chairman Wilde)  This proposal is to provide customary and traditional use determination for caribou hunting in Unit 22(A).

MR. BRELSFORD:  Good morning. This is the Yukon Delta Subsistence Regional Council meeting in Bethel, and you all had asked that we call when RFR 97-12 was going to be under discussion. So we're at that.....

MR. SLATS:  We would like to make a verbal submission to this Board.

MR. BRELSFORD:  Okay. I think perhaps you're getting radio feedback. Maybe you're going to have to turn down the radio at your site.

MR. SLATS:  We just did that.

MR. BRELSFORD:  Great. If you'd like, the Staff Anthropologist, Pat McClenahan, was just going to offer a brief presentation to introduce this topic, and then I believe the Chairman would invite comments, including for the Chevak IRA Council. So I think what might be smoothest here is if we go ahead with the presentations and then have the comments in a
few minutes time. Is that okay?

MR. SLATS: We will hang on for this.

MR. BRELSFORD: Okay. Thank you. I think we're ready, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Pat, go ahead.

MS. MCCLENAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Pat McClenahan, the Staff Anthropologist for Fish and Wildlife Service and I'd like to speak to the Request for Reconsideration, RFR 97-12. That was submitted by the State of Alaska. This Request for Reconsideration was submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. It would set aside the May 1997 Federal Subsistence Board action to grant a positive customary and traditional use determination to the residents of Hooper Bay, Scammon Bay and Chevak for Unit 22(A) caribou. And it would keep the 1996-1997 Federal determination for Unit 22(A) caribou.

Proposal 97-54 expanded the customary and traditional use determination for Unit 22(A) caribou to include these three communities that are located in Unit 18. The ADF&G was very interested in having more information on our eight factors that we look at. They were concerned because we had not, they felt, submitted enough information on factors one and factors four. And that's what I'd like to do today. I would like to provide you with the information that we have gathered over this last year and present it to you.

The ADF&G requested that the Federal Subsistence Board evaluate the available for these two factors for customary and traditional use determination. The factors address the long term consistent pattern of use of caribou in Unit 22(A) by the communities and the consistent harvest and use near or reasonably accessible from the community or area. At the time the proposal was adopted, the State felt that the information available did not provide a strong enough basis for the Federal Subsistence Board to decide favorably.

With regard to factor one, a long term consistent pattern of use, excluding interruptions beyond the control of the community or area. The State Office of History and Archaeology files reveal documentation by Bureau of Indian Affairs Staff filed after the 14(h)(1) surveys and by Robert Ackerman, that bones of caribou or reindeer and antlers were observed in prehistoric and historic archaeological sites throughout the area documented as being used historically and in modern times by Hooper Bay, Scammon Bay, and Chevak.
residents. And these residents, some of the elders, remembered
the sites and the activities that were carried out there when
they had been interviewed.

Reindeer or caribou bones were located in
archaeological contexts at Qaviniq, a Bow and Arrow War site
near Old Chevak. After the community was destroyed by the
Yukoners, the survivors fled to Kashunuk, inhabited until the
1930s. Kashunuk residents established Old Chevak in the 1930s
and Chevak in the 1940s.

Hooper Bay and Scammon Bay have long histories. The
historic village of Chevak was moved due to flooding sometime
after 1948. The new Chevak Post Office was established in
1951. And so that would make any cultural midden there,
archaeological sites would be less than 50 years old at Chevak
proper.

I'd just like to say that under normal environmental
conditions on the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta there is no need to go
very far away from home to get resources. But the region
experience is very sharp, seasonal and yearly changes,
varyations in resource availability and due to population
fluctuations upscale and down-scale of animal populations,
changing herd, migratory patterns, movements of animals,
weather conditions and available modes of transportation. For
example, you may have a snow machine but you may not have
gotten any money from fish that year to get gas. So that may
be a factor to consider.

For these reasons it's been in the past a necessity for
members of these communities to travel between the territories
usually used by other village groups and it remains so today.
And several members of the Council have remarked on this very
thing during the last couple of days.

Ethnographic sources recorded the distant travels of
and interaction between the residents of Hooper Bay, Scammon
Bay and Chevak, and the Norton Sound Communities, today
referred to as Unit 22(A). Historically, the residents of
Hooper Bay are documented to have gone as far away as Paimiut
Slough (near the border of Unit 18 and Unit 21(E) for
subsistence resources. Edmonds in his historic reports refers
to the travels of people from the community of Hooper Bay or
near the area of Hooper Bay to have gone up to the St.
Michael's region in 1866.

Scammon Bay people and residents of the Unit 22(A)
coastal communities come together yearly in summer salmon
fishing camps at the Black River. And so they know one
another. Black River is just south of the Yukon River. We all
know that the caribou disappeared from the Yukon-Kuskokwim
Delta for the greater part in the mid-1800s, and mostly have
been gone for a hundred years. And so the opportunity to hunt
caribou was limited to small pockets of animals that were
remnants herds in the mountains surrounding the Delta. One of
these areas was the Andreafsky Mountains and the caribou mixed
apparently with local reindeer herds and there were feral
reindeer and caribou in the mountains.

That herd apparently was not much hunted, except in
times of famine according to elders reports. Five or six years
ago the Western Arctic caribou herd overran the area of the
Andreafsky herd and in the last couple of years I guess the
Andreafsky herd can't be found. Maybe it's been captured by
that larger herd.

Chevak, Hooper Bay and Scammon Bay have a positive
customary and traditional use determination for caribou in Unit
18 south of the Yukon River, which indicates that at the time
the determination was made, information was made available that
these communities used caribou and traditionally used them.

Let me show you the map that Chevak, Hooper Bay and
Scammon Bay drew for us. This is a use area map that residents
drew up for us when we visited them a few months ago. John
Andrew and I made a special trip to Hooper Bay to talk to the
residents and to gather information for this response. I think
that to sum up would be best now and then if you have specific
questions you can ask them.

The State's RFR suggests that inadequate information
existed in the initial Staff analysis to fulfill the eight
factors. Additionally, it said that there was negative
evidence because there had been subsistence use studies on some
of the communities there and they did not list caribou, nobody
said that they had been using caribou.

The 1997 Staff analysis presented some evidence that
the three communities used caribou historically. We had
testimony to that fact. And members of the community were
present historically in Unit 22(A). At that time it also
presented information from Native informants. Testimony in
support of the proposal was given by several people in 1997 at
the Federal Subsistence Board meeting. New information in the
form of additional published ethnographic information,
unpublished information from anthropologists from universities
doing field work in the region, public testimony at the fall
1997 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting, information
specific to each of the eight factors from 14 informants given
to Staff anthropologists and to the Region V coordinator at the
A public meeting that was held in Hooper Bay and Scammon Bay in 1998, and written comments and telephone calls received from the communities of Hooper Bay, Scammon Bay and Chevak, also in Stebbins, provided a sufficient amount of information to satisfactorily inform on all eight factors, including a subsistence use area map for Hooper Bay, Scammon Bay and Chevak residents subsistence use of caribou in 22(A). That's this map.

The evidence suggests that caribou were plentiful in the Unit 18 region until sometime in the mid-1800s when they essentially disappeared from the region, except for small pockets of animals that included feral reindeer and caribou in out-of-the-way locations, such as the Andreafsky Mountains. The herd no doubt have fluctuated in numbers and were relied on only in times of great need when their numbers were small. The traditionally mobile residents of these communities no doubt weighed the energy costs of pursuing no longer readily available animals at greater distances when the herd numbers were down. At word of caribou herds flourishing and moving back into the region, or on the fringes of the region, hunters again may have ventured out in from these communities to hunt them with greater promise of success.

A use that was disrupted by the movement of the caribou away from the Unit 18 communities was reestablished both through trade and through hunting activities as the caribou numbers increased and the animals traveled farther south each year. Taken all together, the available information strongly supports a positive customary and traditional use determination for caribou in Unit 22(A) for the three communities. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. I'd also like to give Mike Coffing an opportunity to comment on this. You may be interested in his comments at this time.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Mike, you're in the hot seat.

MR. COFFING: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mike Coffing, Fish and Game Subsistence, Bethel. Actually I think what I want to say at least say initially here is that I think this is where we want to end up with information. When the Board made an earlier determination the State's concern was that we wanted determinations about who has customary and traditional use of resources. To be made with the best and thorough information. And we did feel that there wasn't all of the information that we needed initially. That was a year ago.

I think the result of that, of our concern, was that we've heard that John Andrew and elders in the villages out there and Pat McClenahan have worked together to pull
information here that existed, it just needed to be compiled so that it could be shown what was going on, including the map that we had up here. Initially we had no map information. We did have map information for other villages on the Lower Yukon. And a couple of years before that the Federal Subsistence made a positive determination based on that information. We now have some information for these villages. I'm glad to see that. And I think that's where we want to end up, is having information that could substantiate and support the decision that you're making and the recommendations that you're taking forward to the Federal Subsistence Board. And so I'm glad to see that's happened and that's what we wanted to occur. Outside of that I don't have any additional comments.

I think that perhaps what's happened is that, you know, we've always contended the people in those communities used caribou, we never said they didn't. We always -- we knew they did. The question was where. And now we have information showing that people go up there. We have some map information showing that. We have more thorough information from many people that testified at Hooper Bay last fall, came forth and worked with John and Pat on this. So I'm real happy to see that. I think I'll end right there, unless you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: So are you supporting it or are you opposing it or.....

MR. COFFING: I'm certainly not opposing it. I guess I'm in a position now where I'm not going to -- I mean I'm not in a position to give the State's comments because we need other people to look at it. And I certainly not going to suggest we oppose it. I think the information has been gathered. I think what this shows is that, you know, harvest patterns change over time when you have caribou and when you don't have caribou, as a good example. Sometimes caribou are around and sometimes they leave. And when they leave, they're not there to use.

I think we've seen specifically with the Western Arctic herd is that populations came up over time and they've come for the south. It's obvious that people are going there and harvesting them, using them for food and they are important to them. So I don't disagree with that at all. I'm certainly not going to recommend that we oppose this proposal. I think Council, Council members, the people in the villages and the Staff have done the best job they can at pulling together information. And I think without doubt people are using caribou up there. So I'll end with that.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah, Mike, I'm originally from Hooper Bay. My grandfather and my grandma, they're originally from Hooper Bay by they live in Saint Michael and Stebbins. I am 67 years old today. When I was 13 years old I moved to Saint Michael. My brother over there, that last one is five years old. After our parents died, after we had the hardship that winter, me I tried to take care of my sister and brother. I was only 13. That summer when my grandma came we move up there. So I always say that we have grandfather's right to go hunt in that area. We still have still relatives up there.

So my background it's really lovely to think of. When you need something to eat, when your stomach empty, start feeding your own family out of their clothes it's pretty hard. That's why I never try to talk about the subsistence today. And I'm glad that today it's always been open for someone who could fill his stomach anywhere, anyplace. And I have been thinking about this proposal for quite a while and I have been supporting it, even though there was a problem before. I'm glad that the State had more understanding now more about this certain proposal and I appreciate your comment.

MR. COFFING: Thank you. And I appreciate the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Okay. Thank you. Federal people, I would like to hear from you now what this -- is the Federal Staff opposing it or supporting it or what?

MS. McCLENAHAN: Let me get the exact wording here for RFR....

CHAIRMAN WILDE: It's on page 255.

MS. McCLENAHAN: It's on page 253 is what I want to look at. Page 253 says Staff recommendation is oppose the Request for Reconsideration. We are not opposing the original proposal, we are opposing the Request for Reconsideration that the State submitted.

MR. DAVID: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah.

MR. DAVID: Is the State the one that want to reconsider this?

MR. McCLENAHAN: Yes. They had asked that....

MR. DAVID: I don't believe this should -- remember
yesterday, last night when I testified, newly formed State
organization, the government. And we the people have been here
for years and years and years. To me as Alaska Natives the
State can't tell us how to live our life. If we support this,
that's how it should be. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah. Andrew?

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (John Andrew) John Andrew says
this RFR that State has proposed the proposal that Scammon,
Hooper and Chevak make to remove that, but our Staff said this
proposal only this R -- they're in opposition to RFR. Will
oppose the RFR, our Staff recommendation.

MS. McCLENAHAN: We support the original proposal.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (John Andrew) They support the
original proposal for this. It's more difficult to understand
but they now understand that the original proposal is going to
remain the way it is, but oppose to the RFR.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) If the people in
Chevak is listening at the present time, the State was in
opposition but they have revised their opposition and the
Federal Staff of this RFR but they have not supported the RFR
but they are supporting the original proposal. But at this
time we want to hear what you like to say, go along with the
Federal Proposal, remove the RFR proposal and support the
original proposal. Is this what you want to do?

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Richard Slats, Chevak Council-
via
telephone) We want to thank you very much the support of the
Regional Council, the Chevak Traditional Council and the Tribal
Court. I'm Richard Slats and we have expert witnesses, his
name is George Paniak (ph), Sr., and those people that have
worked on this proposal and the Administrator of the
Traditional Council. The Traditional Council met and spoke
about the proposal and the customary and traditional use of
caribou. And people that used to live in Kashunuk many years
ago and they used to go hunting for caribou and that was also
their food. Presently we don't have any records exactly as to
where they went hunting for these caribou. But in our lands of
our ancestors we see antlers and bones of caribou.

But we have this information because our ancestors
spoke with their sons and daughters and they say that there
used to be caribou in the area. And we have some information
by archaeological findings that these caribou used to be our
food. And our lands we can see some of these antlers on the
tundra. And we can hear all of these stories from our elders,
our ancestors, about how we used to go caribou hunting many years ago. We would like to talk about this. This summer of 1997 our archaeological projects in those areas where they used to stay and they found tools that were made from caribou bones and antlers. And our ancestors have said that there were many, many caribou in our area. And this evidence is clear in the historical places.

And we also had sent a tape to Pat McClenahan to this effect. We want to make sure that you understand this, that there used to be a lot of caribou and then suddenly sometime, a long time ago, their populations crashed. And they used to go hunting for these caribou. And as their population started to diminish, people used to go further and further out to go hunting for caribou. And when they ran out of food they used to go hunting for animals far away out of the range where they generally go hunting. And our young people at the present time are doing the same thing today. When we go hunting for caribou we go very far and we've gone as far as Saint Michael to go caribou hunting.

And we don't go hunting but because there's hardly any jobs around here, most of the meat that we get is usually shared with other people. And he is continuing to say that they go hunting not in close places, but in far away places just to provide food for their families. And when we go hunting we just don't go hunting for ourselves, we also go hunting for immediate family and the people in the village. And when we have potlatches we share this food with other people in the village. We know and understand that the caribou just don't stay in one spot and are constantly moving.

At the present time, because caribou are always looking for their food, that's why they are always migrating in different places. And we do the same thing, wherever the games goes when we go hunting. The people of Kashunuk used to use caribou many years ago. Most of the time we don't depend on store bought food, but to survive on subsistence resources. Our ancestors used to depend on caribou for their food. We want to make sure that people understand this. (Hunt interjecting- He's starting to repeat everything he had said.) And the people in Stebbins have told the people of Chevak that if they want to go hunting within their lands to do so without any problems.

And we have lot of respect for other villages. We are asking you to look at the reconsideration and deny that, but to go ahead and support the original proposal. Richard Slats.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Paul John) Paul John wants to
speak to the people here. Many years ago we used to have our
ancestor talk about those people that were originally that live
in (indiscernible) and that they used to go hunting with bows
and arrows. And not to be skeptical about the existence of
caribou within the Y-K Delta and that those people many years
ago had caribou for their sustenance and there have been many
stories about that. And they went hunting for these caribou
with bows and arrows.

And when I was in New York I saw what was made many
years ago and the wooden bows that have been there. There was
a picture of caribou in the middle. And from that evidence we
can see that these people had depended on caribou for their
food. I thought that this would help out the evidence for
that.

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, can I ask Staff a
question? Now that there is no opposition from the Department
of Fish and Game, what's the process going to be? Are you
going to be reintroducing this back into, or is it already in
the regulation and it would stay?

MS. McCLENAHAN: It's in the regulations as it is now.
We will take this same analysis to the Federal Subsistence
Board with the Staff recommendations, with your recommendations
and the State of Alaska, ADF&G, will make their recommendations
and the Board will then -- we also take comments, and then the
Board will make a decision on it. And they will be speaking to
the Request for Reconsideration. So they will either -- if
they accept the Request for Reconsideration, that means they
would change the regulation back to the way it was originally
in 1996.

If they reject the Request for Reconsideration, the
current regulation that grants Chevak, Hooper Bay and Scammon
Bay positive c&t will stay in place. Mike spoke of support
himself, I think. Right, Mike? And then there will be a
formal comment? Is Mike back there? There will be a formal
comment at the Board meeting, is that right?

MR. COFFING: Mr. Chairman, Mike Coffing. Maybe to
help clarify, the Request for Reconsideration was put in I
guess more than a year ago, well, about a year ago in the
summertime, since then Federal Staff have had it, we had a
meeting at Hooper Bay, we've also gathered additional
information. And so what we're seeing now is that new
information is coming around to the Councils, it's going in
this spring to the Federal Subsistence Board and the Board will
look at the new information and consider what the State's
request was. I feel, you know, fairly satisfied now that we've
Mr. L. Wilde: So would then confidently say that you are going to support this when the Board of Subsistence meets?

Mr. Coffing: Well, I guess the short answer to that is no. And the reason is, because I'm not the person that's going to be at the Federal Subsistence Board meeting.

Mr. L. Wilde: When I said you, I meant your Department. What is the feeling of your department as far as.....

Mr. Coffing: Well, to answer that, Lester, I'm guessing that probably the person that's going to be there is going to be Elizabeth Andrews or Terry Haynes, probably Elizabeth. I'm going to express to Elizabeth what my thoughts are on it, it would be the same thoughts I've shared with you people here, that is we have some good information now. We have the map information. I am not going to recommend the State continue to support its own RFR. I think the point of that was to see new information. I think we have information. I'm not going to suggest that the State does not recognize c&ts for those villages. So, you know, if I were a betting man, I would bet the State is going to go along with what the Council wants to do here. That's about the best I can give you right now.

Ms. McClenahan: Another thing is that Mike Coffing and I have been working closely together during this time. The State has compiled some comments and given it to me, and I've incorporated those comments into this analysis. Hopefully, to their satisfaction. And so we are hopeful together that.....

Chairman Wilde: I think we understand this, what's going on now. I think we need to have some kind of action from the Council here.

Mr. David: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Wilde: David O. David.

Interpreter Hunter: (David O. David) He's making a proposal to remove the RFR and to accept the original proposal for this proposal.

Mr. John: Second.

Chairman Wilde: Discussion?
MR. THOMPSON: Question.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Question's been called for. Roll call.

MR. GEORGE: Harry Wilde?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: David O. David?

MR. DAVID: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Paul Manumik? Ilarion Nicolai?

MR. NICOLAI: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Steven White? Excused.

MR. GEORGE: Billy McCann?

MR. McCANN: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: James Charles?

MR. CHARLES: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Johnny Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Paul John?

MR. JOHN: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Lester Wilde?

MR. L. WILDE: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: The motion has passed.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Right now I think it's time for us to eat. We'll be back 1:00 o'clock. Break for lunch.

(Off record)

(On record)

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) We are starting again and it is now 1:04. I think this time I'll give opportunity, John Burr to say something concerning AVCP
MR. BURR: Mr. Chairman and members of the Council, my name is John Burr. I work with the Department of Fish and Game for the Sport Fish Division. I really appreciate the chance to talk with you today and I appreciate your rearranging your schedule a little bit to let me talk because I do have another commitment tomorrow.

I just have one item that I wanted to bring before the Council's attention. During December of 1997, the Alaska Board of Fish considered a proposal which was submitted by the Association of Village Council Presidents. This request asked the Board of Fish to repeal the prohibition on the use of rod and reel during the summer season for subsistence fishing in the Lower Yukon and Lower Kuskokwim area. Currently under State regulations the use of hook and line for subsistence is restricted to jigging through the ice.

During the Board of Fish's deliberation on this request, a number of concerns were raised and they found that they needed more information. The Board of Fish tabled the request until their first meeting after December of 1998. In the meantime the Board of Fish will be establishing a working group consisting of stakeholders and resource managers to address the concerns that were raised during their meeting. The working group's task will be to gather information and ideas on how they can implement a rod and reel subsistence fishery in the face of the growing sports fishery which is in the area.

This working group will prepare a report for the Board of Fish which hopefully will identify and clarify the concerns that were raised. The report will include any recommendations that the group can offer and help the Board of Fish make a well informed and fair determination. We anticipate that the Department will be sending out letters soon to this Council and to other groups concerning the working group. Potential participants will be invited to bring their ideas and concerns to the initial meeting. And at this point that probably will be sometime in April, although the schedule has not been set.

And that's all I had to share with you. I'd be happy to try to answer your questions.

(Interpreter Hunt interjecting) Chairman Harry Wilde at the present time is just summarizing what John Burr has just said. At the present time he is opening the floor for any questions to ask.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Billy McCann) Not exactly what
you seen, but one of the Quinhagak boys seen that the waters
terminated by feces and urine and stuff like that harm
villages. Do you people have some kind of a role to keep the
land clean for, you know, hookers to keep that land clean?
That should be because that's the people on the stream down,
harming them, just like Quinhagak. Sounds like it's really bad
for health. That should be taken care of by you people if you
want sport fishing. Because little different than the
subsistence fishing. Some of them make fun and let the fish
go. There's a lots of ways to take look at it. That should
been taken care of it and make some kind of rule too, just like
you got the rule what to do on fishing. That should be
included to keep the land clean just account of the people
living. Someday you guy's going to get something about it if
it get worse. It might be money-wise too. I hope you
understand that.

MR. BURR: Yes. Thank you. One comment, that was one
of the issues that was raised before the Board of Fisheries and
that's something that we hope to try to address in this group
that I talked about.

MR. DAVID: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: David.

MR. DAVID: I see that you're from Sport Fish Division.

MR. BURR: That's correct, sir.

MR. DAVID: And AVCP proposal on hook and line
subsistence is different. Have you realized that or do you
know that?

MR. BURR: I don't understand.....

MR. DAVID: Do you know that hook and line fishing is
different from subsistence? Hook and line fishing subsistence
is different from sport fishing?

MR. BURR: Yes, I understand that.

MR. DAVID: And what I never did like is sport fisher
using hook and line, don't let the fish go. If they don't have
that catch and release thing I wouldn't mind, but when it comes
to catch and release, I never did like that because if you as
cut yourself in your mouth, if that's done here you would run
as fast as you can out through the door and run up to the
hospital to have it fixed. But what about the poor fish that
out in wet, in water. They're hurting too. You hurt them, your sport fish people hurt them. And they can't go to a hospital to have that fixed after they're caught and released.
If you can take the fish home to eat it, that's fine.

The sport fishing part for fun is something I never did support or go for. So you can't compare this hook and line subsistence, you can't compare that to sport fishing because we, our people, go out to catch fish for themselves to eat, not to let the fish go after they catch it. So that's my comment to you. I didn't hear your presentation very much but this Sport Fish Division gives me a message that you're one of the people that hurt our fish, our resource in the river. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: I didn't quite understand why you present AVCP proposal hook and line. I didn't quite understand, are you against it or.....

MR. BURR: No. The Board of Fisheries tabled the proposal because they realized or they determined that they needed more information in order to find a way to make this work. Under State regulations all Alaskan people are eligible to participate in subsistence gathering. And the major concern, as I understand it, that the Board of Fish had with this proposal was not what would occur if they legalized subsistence fishing with a hook and reel in this area, but it's the people that would come from outside the area that would also be able to do that under the State regulation.

MR. DAVID: Mr. Chairman, you can't legalize -- it's our right to go out there and fish. You can't legalize that. It's already legal. There's no way you can stick your finger in that thing because it's ours already. I don't believe you should even bring that up. Tell the Board of Fish that it's -- that use you to test you with hook and line and let them see how you feel after you're caught with a hook. And tell them that we don't fish to hurt fish, we fish to catch fish for food.

MR. BURR: I understand.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Anyone else? Thank you.

MR. BURR: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Now we're going back to our proposals. Dave, Pat. Council in front of you you can see a piece of paper, it's says Proposals Staff support with modification. And also Staff oppose certain proposals. So Staff proposed
with modification 51, 52, 53, 54, 64 and 65, 66, 67. I would like to hear from the Staff according to that letter somewhere there. Will you read it to us?

MS. McCLENAHAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is Pat McClennen. Carl Morgan was here from the Western Interior Regional Council, he's the Chairman of the Council, had to leave, but he left a letter that I'd like to read for you. This is from the Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. And it says, Dear Fellow Regional Council Chairs: The Western Interior Regional Advisory Council wants to share with you its current thinking about customary and traditional use determinations for black bears.

The Regional Council's current thinking is if there is no biological reason for reducing harvest of black bears, then the current no determination for all rural Alaskans qualified should remain in effect. What he means is that in the current blue book, the current regulation book, there is no customary and traditional use determination at this time. That means that all rural residents can hunt there. And at this time they see no biological depletion of black bears. There seem to be plenty of black bears.

We desire to keep harvest opportunity opened to all subsistence users and do not need at this time to decide who among rural subsistence users should be allowed to hunt under Federal regulations. Our c&t recommendations should not be taken as ignoring fellow rural Alaskans request for recognition of customary and traditional uses of black bear. We know that your regions have a long history of customary and traditional uses of black bear. The present c&t determination process does not allow for recognition only. In order to gain recognition defining who qualifies for a positive c&t determination, some other qualified rural subsistence user is cut out.

The extensive travel between the regions by our regions' residents and the current healthy black bear population does not warrant a defined c&t determination. Finally, I look forward to discussing c&t determinations at our next Joint Chairs meeting before the Federal Subsistence Board meeting in May. We need to understand each other's thoughts on c&t determinations in order to protect rural subsistence uses.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: So Proposal 51, proposed by Akiak and Akiachak for customary/traditional use determination, Fritz how do you feel about that?

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Fritz George) He said that his Village of Akiachak don't have any opposition to the letter
that was written and read by Pat McClenahan.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) He's asking would it be okay for the Council to deter it?

MS. McCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the letter was in reference to Proposal 64 and 65, and also Proposal 69 and 70. The Proposal 51 is for Region IV and not Western Interior Region. There is already a positive c&t determination in Region IV.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah, okay. I understand. So how will deal with this then? Your Staff, they say support without modification on 51.....

MS. McCLENAHAN: We suggested supporting with modification Proposal 51. That was black bear for Unit 17(A) and 17(B).

CHAIRMAN WILDE: You're talking about this only. How about brown bear?

MS. McCLENAHAN: Brown bear is Proposal 52.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Uh-huh.

MS. McCLENAHAN: We also recommend to support that with modification to change it to Unit 17(A) and 17(B).

CHAIRMAN WILDE: So 53 and 54, and all the way down to 67, those proposals that Staff supported with modification. Which these are after -- from after 53 are modification was added to?

MS. McCLENAHAN: All of them are modified.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: All of them?

MS. McCLENAHAN: Yeah.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) He wants to know how Fritz and the people of Akiachak feel toward the proposal that mostly came from Akiachak?

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Fritz George) He said when he asked those people from Akiachak they had been very supportive of having the Council pass these proposals.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Maybe at this time I would like to hear from ADF&G, Mike. All these proposals, what Federal Staff
MR. COFFING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mike Coffing, Fish and Game Subsistence. What I can give you, and you're asking for me comments, the State position on these Proposals 51 to 67, is that right? I think we've already provided comments to you on 55, 58, 59 and 60. So I'll begin with 51, that's Unit 17 black bear.

Formally, the State did not have any comments. We had deferred our comments. We'd ask for our comments to wait until we had a chance to look at the proposal. And as I looked at the map information for that proposal -- actually, I'd like to talk about Proposal 51 and 52 together because they both deal with Unit 17 -- well, I'm sorry, let me do 51 by itself.

Unit 17 black bear, as I look through the analysis, I think there is information there that shows that residents of Akiachak and Akiak do use a portion of 17 for hunting. I'm not exactly clear whether the information here is for black bear specifically or if it's general subsistence use information.

MS. McCLENAHAN: This is for the general subsistence use area.

MR. COFFING: So it would be for the general subsistence use information. Basically subsistence uses for a variety of resources. I think my comments would be similar to an earlier proposal, and that is for this one, Proposal 51, it looks like there is information to indicate they use a portion of 17 -- certainly 17(B). Now, Unit 17 is made up of three sub-units. As you can see on the overhead, 17(C) which is down here, 17(B) which is this area here, and 17(A). Now, this is for Akiak. And you see on this map a portion of 17(B) is used, there's no recorded use in Unit 17(C) or in Unit 17(A). So I guess my suggestion on this one, I think the State's comments on this one are going to be that, you know, we would probably support a finding for at least this part of 17(B). But currently the information does not indicate there's use in either 17(C) or 17(A).

Now, having said that, I'd also like to remind the Council that we will be gathering information for Akiachak certainly and possibly Akiak. Here's a map for Akiachak that Pat put up. And you can see again there's use in 17(B), a little bit of use in the upper end of 17(A). 17(A) extends down into here, and no use in 17(C). So I expect our comments are going to be that there's use in part of 17(B). Looks to me like we've got a map that shows more subsistence use area for Akiak than we have in the booklet.
Ms. McCLENAHAN: This is a general subsistence use area map.

Mr. COFFING: Right.

Ms. McCLENAHAN: All resources.

Mr. COFFING: So this is.....

Ms. McCLENAHAN: That's moose and bear.

Mr. COFFING: Okay. So it's mislabeled then. So this is moose and bear in the booklet. Okay. Well, the comments I guess would still stand. There is some use in 17(A) and 17(B) for both Akiachak and Akiak, nothing in 17(C). So I think at this point, you know, if we were to give comments it would be that we would probably support a finding in a part of 17(B) and a part of 17(A), information supports that. It doesn't support a finding in 17(C) though. The proposal asks for all of 17. And I wanted to again remind the Council that we hope to be working with the communities and gathering additional information, more thorough information on subsistence use areas. So if that comes about we'll have better information on details here.

I guess as it stands, I don't think we're going to support it as it's written because it includes an area where there isn't any documented subsistence use going on, that is 17(C). I think we can live with a finding in a part of 17(B) and 17(A) though for black bear for these two communities.

Moving on to Proposal 52, which is a c&t finding for brown bear in again Unit 17, I think my comments would be exactly the same. The information shows some uses in 17(B) and 17(A), it does not show any use in 17(C). It does exist in A and B but not in C. So again I think we could live with a finding for part of those units, perhaps not all the units, and we would support a finding for 17(C). However, if we gather information later on that indicates there are subsistence uses in other parts of 17(A) and (B) and 17(C), then we would not have a problem later on if we can get that full c&t determination for that unit.

The next Proposal is 53 and 54, this asks for again a customary and traditional use determination for all of Unit 17 again. And our comments on this one is that we would suggest deferring action on this proposal until we've been able to do the study that we're planning to do with Akiachak and gather additional subsistence information as we've done in Kwethluk and some other communities so that we have documentation, we
have information that can support the finding by the Council
and by the Board.

And 58 through 60 we've discussed already. Proposal 64
and 65 request a c&t determination for black bear up in Unit
19. And, again, we think that there should be a complete
comprehensive review of the information that's out there. There
is some information certainly that's been prepared in the
analysis. We think there might be some additional information
available that's not in the analysis now. And we're likely to
gather additional information during the study in Akiachak on
black bear uses up in Unit 19. Unit 19 is divided up into
several sub-units, A, B, C and D. Some of those extend all the
way up to McGrath, or even east of McGrath up into the
mountains. And at this time, you know, it doesn't appear to me
that the information is complied in a fashion that we can
really evaluate whether, you know, which communities should
have c&t of black bear and what portions of 19 c&t use should
be recognized for which communities. So we would suggest
deferring action on Proposal 64 and 65.

Proposal 66 is a brown bear revised c&t determination
for Unit 19. This proposal would include Akiachak and Akiak
for brown bear in all of Unit 19, 19(D), 19(C), 19(B) and
19(A). Although we haven't developed a formal State position
yet, because we were waiting to see the analysis, I think at
this point my recommendation is going to be similar to the
earlier one, and that is that we suggest a thorough review of
the available information that's there for brown bear in that
unit and also the comments that -- you know, we may suggest
deferring on this one as well until we have gathered
information from Akiachak to document their subsistence use
areas in a thorough fashion.

Mr. Chairman, let me clarify, did you want me to give
you comments on 67 and 68 at this time? That's for caribou in
Unit 19.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. COFFING: Proposal 67 and 68 are caribou for Unit
19(A) and (B). And the request for a revised c&t determination
for that unit. This proposal came in from AVCP and what it's
asking for is a more general application of the c&t
determination, not so much by community but by area. And we
certainly have information that shows that Kwethluk uses 19(A)
and (B), as well as some communities up in Unit 19 where we've
done work. I can't recall off the top of my head what Ron
Thuma's maps looked like for some of the Unit 18 communities,
but I would suspect that some of that map information may not
have extended well beyond the refuge boundary in some instances. So there may in fact not be any map information at this time that can support a finding in much of Unit 19.

On the other hand, I think it's likely that there are residents and perhaps people that are on the Council at the meeting here, those in the audience, that have information that can be added to the existing information. And I think our point here is to just help insure that the Council and Fish and Wildlife Service, Federal Board and certainly the State as well has the best information available, including information from elders and all the map data that's there. Again, we do hope and plan to do some work in Akiachak to gather data that I think will answer the question at least for Akiachak. So for this one I don't have information that I can really give you a firm position one way or the other. And I guess having said that, my suggestion would be to wait until we have a chance to do a complete review of the information, till the Federal Staff have had a chance to do that and compile all the existing information, to get some information from Council members or people in the communities about subsistence uses in those areas, and also roll in information that we got from Akiachak before the Board takes formal action on this proposal to adopt. That is my comments, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah. Mike, seems to me that the State defer most of these proposals right now. However, that Federal Staff support them with modification and you need more information on these, that's the way it sounds.

MR. COFFING: Mr. Chairman, I think you summed it up very well. That's what I would say. Maybe add one other thing. I don't like having to be here in front of you to talk about RFRs like we had to do with Hooper, Chevak and Scammon, it's not pleasant. And what I would like to certainly avoid is the State coming back, you know, if the Federal Board makes a decision the State's not happy with, the State may come back with and RFR. I don't know, they may not, but they might. And, again, what I want to emphasize is that we are interested in, is having the best information that we can get from Council members, from public, if there's any documentation out there that's there that hasn't been pulled into the analysis, you know, that's useful and can support the proposal perhaps. But that's what we're asking, is just give a chance for all the information to be put together. That may involve some meetings in some of the villages or perhaps doing some work as we're doing in Akiachak. We just want to see the decisions based on good information and not done I don't want to use the word hastily, but not done without proper backup material there. Thank you.
INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) As I understand it, these proposals, there is eight of them that we are working on as a group. The Federal Staff said that they would be supporting this with modification, but the State at the present time has said that they want to get further information and data before they make any decisions on whether to support them or not support them, or to have better understanding of these proposals and determination of c&t.

And I wanted to ask those people that may be affected by this Proposals number 51 to 67 if there is anybody that would like to say anything toward these proposals. The floor is now open. He is wondering at the present time what the recommendations are on these proposals by the Council members. David O. David.

MR. DAVID: No comment.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) He's wondering about Fritz George and wanted to know if the people in Akiachak wanted to have these supported or is supporting them?

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Fritz George) When they had worked on subsistence use maps (translator stops interpreting).....

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) I would like to ask to Fritz with the Staff support of each of these proposed with modification, are these okay?

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Fritz George) He says that he does not have any problems with that.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: David O. David.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (David O. David) Mr. David O. David said that if Akiachak don't have any problems with those, they way that it was set, I make a motion to accept those proposals.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) He's saying that all of the Proposals from 51 to 67, the way that the Federal Staff had made the proposals.

MR. McCANN: I second it.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Second by Bill McCann. Any discussion?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Question.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: Question's been called for. Roll call.

MR. GEORGE: Harry Wilde?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: David O. David?

MR. DAVID: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Paul Manumik? Not present. Ilarion Nicolai?

MR. NICOLAI: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Steven White, not present. Billy McCann?

MR. McCANN: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: James Charles?

MR. CHARLES: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Johnny Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Paul John? Paul John?

MR. JOHN: (Indiscernible - Yup'ik).

MR. GEORGE: Lester Wilde?

MR. L. WILDE: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Mr. Chairman, (Indiscernible - Yup'ik).

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Paul John asked to be excused because he had some pressing circumstances he had to attend to. And that's the reason why he left early.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah, he's excused. And motion carried. Staff support with the modification from 51 to 67. Also the Council supported 51 to 67 with modification. Next on agenda is still continuation of proposals. Opposing the proposals, Dave.

MR. FISHER: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, we have two Proposals, 56 and 57. And in looking at 56 I'd like to skip that because
there's nothing there that has anything to do with Unit 18. It would allow for the same day airborne subsistence hunting of caribou on the Nushagak Peninsula.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: So remove the 56?

MR. FISHER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Okay. Council, remove the 56. Okay.

MR. FISHER: Okay. Proposal 57 deals with caribou in Unit 17(A) and 17(C). And again in looking this over, Mr. Chairman, the way this proposal is worded, I believe that's similar to number 56. It's just designed for that Nushagak Peninsula for that special hunt for those animals there that Togiak, Twin Hills, Manakotak, Aleknagik, Dillingham, Clark's Point and Ekuk have special use for those by permit hunt only there on Nushagak Peninsula.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Looking at Proposal 57, I see that Staff recommend oppose this proposal and also ADF&G comment oppose this 57. Also there's one written comment oppose 57. Do you have more information on 57?

MR. FISHER: The only other information I have on 57 would be just to go through and brief you on the proposal, but I see that it doesn't really apply to anyone in 18. So I'd like to lump that with 56 and move on.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. FISHER: Both 56 and 57 deal specifically with that Nushagak caribou herd.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: So we remove 57?

MR. FISHER: Yes. Sorry to bother you with that, Mr. Chairman, but in closer review.....

CHAIRMAN WILDE: That's okay. Next is 68.

MS. McCLENAHAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, 68 was analyzed along with 67 caribou, Unit 19(A) and (B). And the action you took on Proposal 67 makes Proposal 68 moot. We don't have to deal with it. It's been dealt with. Akiak and Akiachak were included in the revised Proposal 67.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: So delete 68?

MS. McCLENAHAN: You can delete 68.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: Okay. Council, delete 68. And we'll go down to 69.

MS. McCLENAHAN: This is one of those proposals we were talking about that Carl Morgan was addressing for black bear in Unit 21. In light of Mr. Morgan's comments, is there anything that you'd like to do about that one? This is the proposal, change the determination from a no determination to a positive customary and traditional use determination for residents of Units 21 and 23 and residents of Tanana, Russian Mission and others who have traditionally hunted the Unit 21.

And then Proposal 70 was the request from Akiak and Akiachak to establish a positive customary and traditional use determination for black bear in Unit 21. This is Region VI and we're proposing here from Region V. We're proposing to change the no determination to a positive customary and traditional use determination. That would narrow the people who could use the Unit 21 units.

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Go ahead, Lester.

MR. L. WILDE: I would like to support the presentation of Mr. Morgan to keep the determination as is because the areas that -- what he said was true, the residents from other areas on the lower river do go up there and do get their black bear whenever they need them.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: What is the desire of Akiachak residents.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Fritz George) They had a meeting over there with an anthropologist to (indiscernible - in Yup'ik - not translated).

CHAIRMAN WILDE: You may go ahead and continue down to the next.

MS. McCLENAHAN: The next one is Proposal 72. The analysis was done for Proposal 72, 73 and 74. Proposal 72 is submitted by Akiak and Akiachak IRA, it requests a positive customary and traditional use determination for caribou in Units 21(A) and 21(E), located in Region VI for the residents of Akiak and Akiachak located in Region V.

The Staff conclusions did not identify the residents of Akiak and Akiachak as among the traditional users of caribou in Units 21(A) and 21(E). The information that we have is in Ron
Thuma's maps that I've shown you before and I'll put them back up. This the map for caribou use by Akiak and Akiachak that was recorded in 1985. I seem to have misplaced Akiak's caribou map.

Let me show you again, this is the general subsistence use area for Akiachak that was recorded in 1985 by Ron Thuma. And you can see that Unit 21(A) is right here. This is the caribou use area for Akiak that was recorded in 1985 by Ron Thuma, this is 21 up in here, this is the area. And this one, this next map is the general resources use area for Akiak. And you can see that a little bit of 19(A) but not 21 is recorded. This is all the information that Staff has to the best of my knowledge.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: The State, Mike Coffing, your comments towards these certain proposals.

MR. COFFING: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mike Coffing, Fish and Game. I guess first let me clarify, are we talking about a block of proposals here or one single proposal? Are we talking about more than one proposal here or just 72?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: If you could do all of them down from 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74.

MR. COFFING: Okay. Well, I don't have any comments to offer you on 69 at this point, Mr. Chairman, black bear c&t determination. Proposal 70, our comments initially, they are in the book, were to defer action on this one. This is for black bear use in Units 21(A) and 21(E). And our concerns, after looking at the initial analysis, was that again we wanted to assure that there was a complete review of all the information. We didn't want a determination to be made, recommended by this Council or by the Board, that then might mean that some people can't go there and subsistence hunt. And that's certainly the potential.

If you determine which communities are in and which ones are out, then it might mean that people that are going there hunting won't be allowed to. I think perhaps the suggestion to wait and essentially let subsistence hunters hunt black bear there the way they have until there's a chance to gather more information or talk to residents in the community that potentially are affected is probably a good move at this point. So on Proposal 70, we're suggesting that you defer action on that one.

Proposal 71 is also bear for the same units. Initially we had no comments. We deferred our comments until we look at
the analysis. I don't have any additional comments to offer on that one. Again, until we have a chance to look at all of the information and hear from other folks, I guess my suggestion is going to be to my supervisor, is going to be to recommend deferring action on that proposal as well.

Proposal 72 through 74 are all for caribou, Unit 21. And I'm looking at the State comments that I have here for those. There weren't any comments. We wanted to wait until we could look at the analysis. I have not had a chance to go through the analysis and look at it. So I have no additional comments to offer you the State's position on those proposals, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) He wants to know the Council members -- what the Staff has proposed or recommended not to pass 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74.

MS. McCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman, Proposal 73 and 74, even though this analysis was done as a group analysis for 72, 73, 74, this region does not have to vote on 73 and 74. It doesn't directly affect this region. Seventy-two is affected, but not the other two.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: So we'll remove 72.....

MS. McCLENAHAN: Seventy-three and.....

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Seventy-two, 73.....

MS. McCLENAHAN: No, 72 is in; 73 and 74 are out.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Seventy-three, 74. What is Council's recommendation? David O. David?

MR. DAVID: (In Yup'ik - not translated).

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Rest of the Council? If there is no recommendation, what action are we going to take for those four proposals?

MR. GEORGE: (In Yup'ik - not translated). (Interpreter Hunt interjecting) I can't hear from here, he's too far away.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) What we would like to do is not to stop these proposals, but to work on them at a later date. Maybe table them. Mr. Wilde does not want to drop these proposals. He's asking the Council -- he wants everybody to wake up and make comments on these.
MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, I move that these Proposals 69, 70, 71, 72 be deferred.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: There is a motion on the floor to these four proposals 69, 70, 71, 72 be deferred. Is there any second?

MR. NICOLAI: Second.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Ilarion second. Discussion?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Question.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Question's been called for. Roll call.

MR. GEORGE: Harry Wilde?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: David O. David?

MR. DAVID: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Paul Manumik? Not present. Ilarion Nicolai?

MR. NICOLAI: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Steven White, not present. Billy McCann?

MR. McCANN: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: James Charles?

MR. CHARLES: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Johnny Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Paul John? Lester Wilde?

MR. L. WILDE: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Mr. Chairman (Indiscernible - in Yup'ik).

CHAIRMAN WILDE: The motion carried. All those four proposal are deferred. At this time we're going to take a break.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: On your agenda you could find the number 9, old business, in your booklet at Tab U. It's annual report, John.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (John Andrew) Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last two meetings we've discussed the talking points on Broadhead whitefish and king salmon and moose, Kuskokwim moose. I would like the Council to go ahead and complete something on this. In the last two meetings that we had, we had already talked about these three problems. I would like for the Council to take a look at these and give us directions as to what we need to do. The third one is Lower Kuskokwim moose. I would like them to make a decision or to make a motion as to how we might be able to work on these. We have spoken about these and give directions to Fish and Wildlife and AVCP and ADF&G to work on these problems.

MR. ANDREW: Within our last two meetings we discussed the talking points on Broadhead whitefish, king salmon and moose. We don't have no authority and jurisdiction -- ordinarily jurisdiction to work on fish. Our Council's not been able to do anything with. But I was going to ask our Council to take action on the Lower Kuskokwim moose issue. Because it's been something that we've heard reports on, been overlooking over the years in the recent years. And if agencies like Fish and Wildlife and the Department AVCP get directions from our Council, they should be able to get something started on this one. And I gave it to our Council to give us direction as to what we can do with it.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Taylor, shall we get more information from you if possible?

MR. BRELFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Taylor Brelsford. The purpose of an annual report, if you remember in ANILCA Title VIII where it talks about the authority, the responsibilities of the Regional Council, it invites you to make an annual report each year to the Federal Subsistence Board, talking about any important changes in subsistence resources or in subsistence needs, meeting those needs with subsistence resources, or any strategies for managing resources to meet subsistence needs.

So this annual report is kind of like an opportunity to look ahead and problem-solve maybe an issue that's going to take a few years to create a good solution. So in the past
this Council has had various issues that you've included in an annual report and over the last year and a half you've had some talking points, whitefish, king salmon, moose, as resource problems. There are some subsistence foods where the populations are not doing so well or there's some kind of little trouble out there. And the idea of an annual report would be a place to draw some attention to this problem and to try and look ahead, try and make sure that the agencies, maybe people in the communities realize that we might have to take some action, make some changes to strengthen the resource population.

So, again, an annual report is a chance to identify problems and to address long term solutions. And then you've had some basic information about three issues, three resource concerns that you might want to draw more attention to by discussing it in your annual report.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Taylor, my understanding that in order to make a good report, need to have more information some of these resource. And also listen to Andrew here, those information on those resource, what were mentioned while ago, it need to be worked on. Is there any way that State and Federal and AVCP could join working together and get more information on these items that we need to get?

MR. BRELSFORD: Yes. Of course coordinated work where the State and the Federal government and local people work together, that's the best way to save resources, to provide security for the future. You guys have done that for many, many years in the Y-K Delta on waterfowl, on Kilbuck caribou, on brown bear. That's I think what everybody wants us to get going on. So what you could do as the Regional Council is to write in your report that you urge coordinated action on Lower Kuskokwim moose, for example. You have heard conservation concerns and you want all of the parties, State of Alaska, Federal government, AVCP and the local villages to work together in an action plan to get more data, more information, and to perhaps have a coordinated management plan to address that conservation problem.

I think what the Council can do is to request action. To say we've heard these concerns and we call on the Federal Subsistence Board to get something started, to get going on addressing this question.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Okay. What is the desire of Council? What kind of recommendation that we're going to give?

MR. DAVID: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah, David.

MR. DAVID: If we move now to ask AVCP and Federal and the State, is it possible for two groups to appoint one of certain people to look after the moose, or will you work together in getting the information on moose?

MR. BRELSFORD: I'm not quite sure I understand your question, but.....

MR. DAVID: Then if you understand it, you heard the message then.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: I think, Taylor, if I understand it, the way you were saying before, you need to have Board approval in order to start information, work together with the AVCP, get resource department and the State also and you. And not only that, if you're talking about the Yukon include James (Indiscernible) got a resource department also. So before you start anything that force have to come from a Board -- Department of Board or if we push it and ask Federal Board that we like to see this study go?

MR. BRELSFORD: Okay. And you want to be sure that each of the groups works together?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Uh-huh (affirmative).

MR. BRELSFORD: State, Federal and Tribal Associations, local people. And, Mr. David, your question was that nobody should push the other ones around, they should all work together?

MR. DAVID: Yes, that's my question.

MR. BRELSFORD: Okay. I think when you write your report to the Board you want to emphasize that you would like to see coordinated action with participation by each of the key groups.

MR. DAVID: That we, this Council, not be expected to make any report. If we ask you to work on it, you'll report to the Board of Subsistence.

MR. McCANN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Billy?

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Billy McCann) Billy McCann said that it would be better not to put it to the Board, but also to
ask people what we would like to do. And most of the time ask the people that are the users. And if that is what action we should take on any of these issues that is the one that is on the talking points. He said it would be a lot better if the -- for the people out in the villages to take care or make the recommendations.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Myron Naning) Myron Naning, President of AVCP. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Together with AVCP, Fish and Wildlife and ADF&G, on talking or looking at this issue of whitefish, king salmon and Kuskokwim moose, it is important -- sometimes they don't look at them as being separate, but together. The State Board of Fish, when they talk about fish they always take care of it as one, king salmon, silvers and chums as one species and not as any other. And they didn't have any problems with that up north because they were taken care of that way. I'm talking about whitefish. When they were meeting in Fairbanks, pike, burbot and whitefish they took care of them as one issue, not as separate species of fish. And lot of times because they are not being taken care of as commercial resources or big game or other things, sport fish. They are taken care of as some other species of fish that are used for subsistence purposes.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Billy McCann) Billy is asking, I understand what you're saying, but looking at the three fish as one group of a problem. He says he's got a problem, maybe it might be whitefish or it might be burbot. He said that it would work as if one of them had a problem, then all of them would have a problem.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Myron Naning) Well, what he's saying is that if there is any problem with burbot, then they will have to include them in as blackfish or pike or whitefish. If the Regional Councils (in Yup'ik - not translated).

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Chairman Wilde) If I understand what they were saying, if I told you why are the droughts in the river -- whitefish, why are they becoming low in their population? What is causing their diminishing in population is that river, are they putting out too many fish in order to get them higher in the population? If they make a report to the Council -- they talk about some of these things need to be checked out such as beaver dams and all of those other things, and it's going to cost a lot of money just to fund the research. And then we'll have to go to the villages to ask them about their use and possible problems and solutions and it's going to end up using a lot of money to do that.

Instead of saying that there's hardly anymore whitefish
and pikes or — but if we take a look at the species one by one, then it'll be much more easier to find out whether that species is diminishing or remaining the same in their population. And how do you think that we should make a proposal or motion so that these problems can be taken care of?

And most of the time when we make a decision, a lot of the times it goes along with the funds for research. And also if AVCP is working on these, they will need some money too to help out. He feels that it would be coming from the Federal government or the State.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Myron Naning) And AVCP is not going to be working on this project alone. It'd be a lot better to have somebody working from those villages with us so that they would be able to help us out in finding out this information.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Johnny Thompson) What I'm going to say may not be worth anything, but I know at the present time these fish that are being surveyed, the chums, the king salmon and the silvers, they are at this time have become an issue. Whitefish, burbot, because they haven't really taken care of them, did any management of them. They haven't said whether their populations are decreasing or not. And all of these things are being taken care of by the Creator who can decide whether they're going to be increasing or decreasing, or disappear. I feel that.....

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Nick Lupie) Tuntutuliak, Alaska. When I was a little boy these rivers just up river from Tuntutuliak used to have whitefish, burbot, sheefish and pike.

And sometimes in the summer, in August when the berries became ripe, and the Galik River — long time ago when they were in the -- went up to the rivers and into the lakes they used to put dams to cover them up so that the fish that are in there won't be able to get out of the river. And then in the fall time what they used to do was set traps after they'd take the middle part of the dam off and use crabs to get the fish. They don't do that anymore, but most of these beavers are now making dams on these small sloughs. And a lot of these at the end of these river at the present time used to be really deep, maybe at least six to seven feet deep but now it's dried up. Well at the present time there's hardly any beavers at the present time and a lot of the lakes that are around there are not as deep as they used to be.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Billy McCann) Billy would like to -- the way he wants to have this taken care of is to go see people and find out what the problem is. And I also go along with all of these -- nobody has any control over the whitefish,
pike and blackfish and burbot at the present time. And he thought that they would start to argue about these resources. And if it gets to that point, when they take of it they don't take care of just one species but as a group. And just like all of the things that they have said, if one of those three species or four species of fresh water fish decline in their population, then they'll turn around and close all of them. I don't feel like taking care of this.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Frederick George) I'm from Akiachak. I look at this river. I have -- I do a lot of hunting and fishing in the fall time and I have gone to certain -- and some of those river have been -- and no more water in many of those areas on this river are getting full of water. There used to be trees and there's no more trees and it doesn't smell very good because of the over-population of beaver in those areas. Most of these things happen because eventually things are going to disappear. And when there's all of these caribou coming into over-population, it means there's going to be famine or all of the animals and the birds and fish are going to be gone.

And another indication is that the sloughs and rivers are going to become shallow. I don't think that it has to do with anything that has to do with those fish. I think it has to do with all of the over-population of beaver in that area. And a lot of these beavers are seen swimming along the sea coast. And my mom is 99 years old at this time. Before there was any of boat motors around here I used to go out to places by using canoe and he used to take care of reindeer in the Goodnews area. And at that time they used to use reindeer for pulling sleds. I think that you understand all of these things from our elders. It's not from using the nets. And this has been affecting the pike and burbot and other fish. The future generations will have to start using money in order to do all of these fishing activities. I am not trying to let you people go according to what I said. I'm just saying what I have heard from my father.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. DAVID: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (David O. David) David O. David just made a motion that they would like to take care of these issues like AVCP President Myron Naning had suggested, to be taken care of by Fish and Wildlife Service, ADF&G and the Fish and Wildlife Service on these three issues, Broadhead
whitefish, king salmon and Lower Kuskokwim moose.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: (Indiscernible - in Yup'ik - not translated).

MR. L. WILDE: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Second by Lester Wilde. Discussion?

MR. THOMPSON: Question.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Any more discussion? Question's been called for. Roll call.

MR. GEORGE: Harry Wilde?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: David O. David?

MR. DAVID: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Paul Manumik? Not present. Ilarion Nicolai?

MR. NICOLAI: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Steven White, not present. Billy McCann?

MR. MCCANN: Abstain.

MR. GEORGE: James Charles?

MR. CHARLES: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Johnny Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Paul Manumik? Lester Wilde?

MR. L. WILDE: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Mr. Chairman, seven yes, one abstain, three (indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Motion carried. The action was for Fish and Wildlife, ADF&G and AVCP to take care of those three issues.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (John Andrew) Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. He is talking about the renewal of the Regional Council Charters in 1998. It is on page -- or Tab V in your books. During the winter of 1998 meetings, the Regional Councils asked to provide recommendations on the charters. These recommendations are forwarded to the Board, which will meet in June 1998 to provide advice to the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. New charters will be signed in September '98.

The charters require under the Federal Advisory Committee Act to provide the guidelines for Regional Council structure and procedures. The charters expire on December 2nd, in even number years. The Secretary of Interior, with the concurrence of Secretary of Agriculture, must renew the charters by December 2, 1998, to continue the Regional Councils.

Many Councils have requested alternates for regular members. The requested provision is found in Section 9, under membership. Regional Council Chairs have forwarded a standing request regarding compensation for members. The Board has forwarded two requests to Secretary Babbitt regarding compensation, but no decision has yet been made. Draft language on compensation is found, for some regions, in Section 9, under membership.

One Regional Council suggested that a requirement for rural residency for Council members be included in the charter. This question had previously been reviewed by the Regional Solicitor's Office and the National Solicitor, at the request of the Board. Solicitor provided a formal legal opinion in January 1997 saying that a rural residency requirement for Regional Council was not allowed under ANILCA. This correspondence was distributed at the Winter 1997 Regional Council meeting. As a result this proposed change cannot be included in the draft.

One Regional Council suggested a change in the charter to provide that if a member is obliged to relocate from the region for work or medical care, the member should be allowed to serve out the remainder of his or her appointment, rather than being obliged to resign. Based on involvement in specific situation, the Regional Solicitor's office has advised that temporary absences would not change a member's eligibility to serve, but a permanent change in their residence would disqualify continued membership. As a result this proposed change is not included in the draft charter for that region.

The Charter for the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. This is on the charter. The
Council is expected to exist into the foreseeable future. Its continuation is however subject to rechartering every biennial anniversary of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of December 2, 1980. The Council shall take no action unless the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act has been complied with.

The Council reports to the Federal Subsistence Board, Chair is also appointed by the Secretary of Interior with the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture. Administrative support for the activities of the Council will be provided by the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior. The Council possesses the authority to perform the following duties:

(1) initiate, review and evaluate proposals for regulations, policies, management plans, an other matters relating to subsistence uses of fish and wildlife on public lands within the region;

(2) provide a forum for the expression of opinions and recommendations by persons interested in any matter related to the subsistence uses of fish and wildlife on public lands within the regions;

(3) encourage local and regional participation in the decision making process affecting the taking of fish and wildlife on the public lands within the region for subsistence uses;

(4) prepare an annual report to the Secretary containing the following:

A. An identification of current and anticipated subsistence uses of fish and wildlife populations within the region;

B. An evaluation of current and anticipated subsistence needs for fish and wildlife populations within the regions;

C. A recommended strategy for the management of fish and wildlife populations within the region to accommodate such subsistence uses and needs;

D. Recommendations concerning policies, standards, guidelines and regulations to implement the strategy;
(5) make recommendations on determinations of customary and traditional use of subsistence resources;
(6) make recommendations on determinations of rural status; and
(7) provide recommendations on the establishment and membership of Federal local advisory committees.

Seven: The Council shall perform its duties in conformity with the Operating Manual for Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils.

Annual operating costs of the Council are estimated at $100,000.00, which includes one person-year staff support.

Eight: Meetings: The Council shall meet at least twice a year at the call of the Council, Council Chair, Federal Subsistence Board or designated Federal official, with the advance approval of the Federal Subsistence Board Chair or the designated Federal officer, who shall also approve the agenda.

Nine: Council membership shall be as follows: Eleven members who shall be knowledgeable and experienced in matters relating to subsistence uses of fish and wildlife and are residents of the region represented by the Council.

Members shall be appointed by the Secretary of Interior with the concurrence of Secretary of Agriculture, based upon the recommendations of the Federal Subsistence Board.

Vacancy: Whenever a vacancy occurs among Council members appointed under Paragraph 9, the Secretary shall appoint an individual in accordance with Paragraph 9 to fill that vacancy for the remainder of the applicable term.

Terms of Office: Except as provided herein, each member of the Council shall serve a three-year term unless a member of the Council resigns prior to the expiration of the three-year term or he/she is removed for cause by the Secretary upon recommendation of the Federal Subsistence Board. Members shall be notified of their appointment in writing. If resigning prior to the expiration of a term, members shall provide a written resignation.

Chair: Council members shall elect the Chair for a one year term.

Removal of Members: If a Council member appointed
under Paragraph 9 misses two consecutive regularly scheduled
meetings, the Chair of the Federal Subsistence Board may
recommend that the Secretary of the Interior with the
concurrency of the Secretary of Agriculture remove that
individual.

Compensation: Members of the Council may receive no
compensation as members. Members shall, however, be allowed
to travel expenses, including per diem, in the same manner as
persons employed intermittently in Government service are
allowed such expenses under 5 U.S.C. 5703.

Designated Federal Officer: The designated Federal
Officer, pursuant to Section 10(e) of the Federal Advisory
Committee Act, shall be the Federal Regional Coordinator, or
his/her designee.

Authority: The Council is established by virtue of
authority set out in the Alaska National Interest Lands

I submit my resignation. Is there anybody that want to
make any changes on the charter?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, if I can. I'm sorry that
we've actually read the entire thing into the record. I think
normally we would have summarized it in some way. But I would
like to draw your attention to the question of alternates. And
your Council has in the past put forward a request for two
alternates, one from the Yukon drainage, one from the Kuskokwim
drainage. That language is not included here right now but it
should be. So in your motions, when you make a motion to
recommend the charter, please include the alternates as you
have in the past, and then it would be complete. It would have
your complete recommendation.

(Discussion and motion made in Yup'ik by John Thompson
- not translated)

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Is there a second to the motion?

MR. McCANN: Second.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Bill McCann seconded.

(Interpreter Hunt interjecting) There's a
recommendation that this charter be accepted but have an
alternate for -- one for the Yukon and one for Kuskokwim.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: And discussion to the motion?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Question.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Question's been called for. Request for roll call.

MR. GEORGE: Harry Wilde?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: David O. David?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Excused.

MR. GEORGE: Paul Manumik? Not present. Ilarion Nicolai?

MR. NICOLAI: Yes.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: Fritz, yes.

MR. GEORGE: Steven White, not present. Billy McCann?

MR. MCCANN: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: James Charles?

MR. CHARLES: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Johnny Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Paul John?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Excused.

MR. GEORGE: Lester Wilde?

MR. L. WILDE: Yes.

MR. GEORGE: Mr. Chairman, seven yes, four (indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Motion carried. Okay. Next on agenda is number 10. Number 10, new business, the Wolf Snaring Initiative.

MR. KOVACH: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. My name is
Steve Kovach, I'm with the refuge here in Bethel. I'm the Mammals Biologist. The local Fish and Game biologist could not attend this afternoon, so he asked me to present an update on the progress of the wolf snaring initiative.

The organizers of the petition drive submitted their signatures to the Lieutenant Governor as required. They were short approximately 7,350 signatures of the required amount. They were given as by law another 30 days to collect the signatures that they needed. Their 30 day extension we believe began on the 15th of February, which means that it would extend through the 15th of March. They have 30 days to collect the signatures they need. They had a high number of signatures from people who were invalid as registered voters and that's why they fell short.

If the ratio of valid to invalid signatures holds as what they had through their initial petition drive, they would need to collect 10,500 signatures in order to get the number that they require. In their very best month of collecting people to sign the petitions they only got a maximum of 7,500. Like I said, they have until about the middle of this month to collect the signatures that they need and resubmit to the Lieutenant Governor for verification. So that's all we know at this point in time on that.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Regional Council discussion and action if you need it.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (Myron Naning) Myron Naning of AVCP wants to bring an update on the wolf snaring initiative. At the present time those people that are in Doyon, Tanana Chiefs, they are at the present time collecting more signatures to oppose this initiative. And they thought that it is not only going to be affecting snaring, but leghold trapping. And it will have a detriment affect on the people that do fur trapping.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (John Thompson) Johnny Thompson says that he oppose. He make a motion that he oppose wolf snaring.

INTERPRETER HUNTER: (James Charles) Second by James Charles.

MR. McCANN: Question?

CHAIRMAN WILDE: All who favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: Oppose say no.

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Motion carried. Federal Subsistence program update, Taylor Brelsford. That's on your booklet Tab W. Not Y, but W.

MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. The first item that I would like to talk to you about is closer coordination with ADF&G. And we talked quite a lot about this in Hooper Bay. So I'll just update what has happened since then, rather than going through the whole thing. When we met in Hooper Bay we talked about how important it is to coordinate on data so that we don't have duplication of efforts or we miss out on good information that ADF&G has gathered. So we wanted to be sure that both the Area Biologists and the Refuge Staff, the Federal Subsistence Board had the benefit of all existing information by working together with ADF&G.

So on this top sheet you'll see some specifics about joint review and joint preparation of technical papers, technical analyses. And we've actually been doing that this year. So the papers that you got this time have more involvement from ADF&G Staff. And the one significant change that I would like to draw to your attention, if you'd turn back to page four on this item regarding ADF&G coordination, you'll see the bottom half of the page it says Staff Committee recommendation. And the Staff Committee is suggesting to the Federal Board that ADF&G, this first paragraph says representatives of ADF&G would be invited to participate in Staff Committee meetings when the agenda is a discussion about proposed regulatory actions or other issues with impact on Fish and Wildlife management programs.

Right now the Staff Committee meets in April and they have the technical papers and recommendations from the Regional Councils. But in the past ADF&G did not sit in on this meeting. Now, the Staff Committee is suggesting that ADF&G would sit in on that meeting. In the next paragraph it says representatives of Regional Councils may be invited to participate in Staff Committee meetings on a case by case basis where the Regional Councils have special information or special concerns about proposals, then the Chair of the Regional Council would also come to the Staff Committee meeting. That's the change that's being proposed in this area of closer coordination with ADF&G.

This is in front of you right now to ask for your reaction, your agreement or concerns that you might have about
it. There is a letter up in the front from Mitch Demientieff saying that the Board is ready to go ahead with this change, but they wanted to be sure the Councils were comfortable with that change. So that's the purpose of this agenda item before you, is to inform you of this change in the way Staff Committee meeting would be held and to ask for your agreement or concerns if you have concerns about it. Lester wants to make a motion.

     CHAIRMAN WILDE: Council, what's your.....

     MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept and approve the report by Mr. Brelsford.

     CHAIRMAN WILDE: Is there any second? We're still waiting for the second.

     MR. THOMPSON: Second.


     MR. NANING: (Speaking in Yup'ik-not translated).

     (John Andrew interpreting) He's requesting that the Regional Council should be invited to participate in Committee meetings when the Committee considers proposals or others affecting respective Councils. Is that too much?

     MR. NANING: No, that's good. But I'd like to add that right now we're pushing towards the effort of tribal co-management. And many of the Staff recommendations from both Fish and Wildlife Service or Fish and Game, Alaska Department of Fish and Game will have impacts on our subsistence use of resources. I think that we as subsistence users should be present to work with the Committees to come up with their recommendations because whatever recommendations that they come up may end up being the rules and regulations that are accepted at some point in the future and might negatively reduce the use of resources for subsistence purposes.

     So on the first paragraph it says the representatives of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game should be invited to participate. And on the second paragraph it says, representatives of Regional Councils may be invited. I think if we're going to a tribal co-management and emphasis on protecting our subsistence rights and way of living, Staff recommendations should be that representatives of Regional Councils should be invited.

     UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Will be invited.
MR. NANING: Should be. Yeah, the same wording that they're using for Fish and Game, should be because if you place should be they'll have no other choice but to invite us there to their committee meetings. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Let me ask this to who make the motion and who second it, shall we delete may be, put will invite? Should be? That will be included -- should be included?

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, my intention on my motion was simply to accept the report as it was, but if you want another motion to adopt the recommendations with that included, I guess that would come in the form of another motion.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: So it could be an amendment. Be amendment to the report.

MR. L. WILDE: My motion was simply to accept the report, not to adopt it.

MR. ANDREW: If you accept the report you're pretty much adopting the regulation.

MR. L. WILDE: Not necessarily. But we could work it out. Anyway, I'm open to suggestions.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: So the motion was to.....

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, why don't I just withdraw my motion and then somebody can remake that motion over again. I withdraw my motion, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: The motion is that.....

MR. L. WILDE: There is no motion.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: There is no motion at this time.

MR. THOMPSON: I'll make a motion to accept the recommendation with the correction of should be, and second paragraph.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Not may be? Okay.

MR. McCANN: Second the motion.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: There's a second. Discussion?

MR. NICOLAI: Question.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: Question been called for. Motion is now accept that report with the additional should be not may be. All who favor to the motion say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Oppose say no.

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Motion carried. Now, approve with that additional wording.

MR. BRELSFORD: The next item, Mr. Chairman, concerns the Federal Subsistence Board's restructuring. And this was the suggestion that we talked about in Hooper Bay of adding a Regional Council member, one representative of the Regional Councils onto the Federal Subsistence Board. This task force has been looking at restructuring or changing the makeup of the Federal Board over the past year. They got recommendations or input from all of the Councils in the fall meetings and then met again in January of 1998. And this report tells what they concluded when they met again in January of this year.

Basically what happened is most of the Regional Councils supported Option number 2 that would add one Regional Council member to the Federal Subsistence Board. That was the suggestion of the Y-K Council in Hooper Bay. When the task force met in January they felt that this was not a good idea and they are recommending to leave the Federal Board as it is with no changes. So that at the present time Bill Thomas, the Regional Council Chair from Southeast who worked on this task force, he had some extra concerns that he wrote down on the pages here. They talk about how to strengthen the Council Chair participation at the Board meeting. And he wants to be sure that the Councils don't go backwards in their representation or their influence at the Federal Subsistence Board meetings. So he has written down his idea here. It's like his additional comments on the task force report.

No action is required from you at this time. This is the task force recommendation that will go to the Board and the Board would talk with the Regional Council Chairs in May at the Board meeting. On Monday of the Board meeting week, the 10 Regional Council Chairs meet in work session with the Federal Subsistence Board and they will talk further about this item at that time. So no action is required on your part. This was just to inform you about the task force decisions from January of 1998 and to make you aware, Mr. Chairman, so that when you go to the Board meeting in May you will be able to discuss this
with the whole Board.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: So, Taylor, this is my understanding, it's just a report.

MR. BRELSFORD: Correct.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Okay. We don't have to take no action Council side?

MR. BRELSFORD: Correct.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Okay. Thank you. Go the the next.

MR. BRELSFORD: The next one is a policy statement. Up at the top it says Request for Reconsideration and Special Action Policy Clarification. Basically the issue here is the Board is worried that a lot of RFRs, Requests for Reconsideration, or we might call it an appeal of a Board decision, a lot of those come in and they don't have much content, they don't make a very strong case with alternative information or identifying an error in the Staff information and so on. And so this policy tries to set some standards for appeals. When the State wants to appeal a decision about c&t determination, this would say you have to demonstrate some new information or an error in the information.

And then there's a little bit of additional information about public notice and public involvement and Board special action meetings to be sure that the Councils and the public are aware of these meetings. This is very much a procedural statement. I don't believe that it raises any policy questions that the Councils have been concerned about. It's really focused on having good business procedures for the Board's decisions. And in my opinion nothing is at risk for the Regional Councils. You've had access to Board discussions about RFRs, you've actually had the RFRs come back before you for additional comment and so on. There's no change in the quality of involvement of the Regional Councils in RFR decisions.

What we are trying to do here it to make sure that very request that comes forward have some real content to it, some real substance to it. So this again requires no action. It's kind of a procedural update. If you wanted to understand more about the details of how the Board functions.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Thank you, Taylor. Next.

MR. BRELSFORD: The next one up at the top it says, the Federal Subsistence Board Consent Agenda. And this is also
looking at efficiency in the Federal Subsistence Board meeting in May. This is actually a little bit like what you did today, where you grouped together a bunch of proposals that had a support recommendation, a past recommendation, and you went more quickly through those proposals that had a Staff recommendation of do pass or to support them.

What the Board would do with the consent agenda is to identify proposals where the Staff and the Regional Councils recommend support, and they would decide on those as a block, rather than going through each one with a full presentation and taking additional time. So basically the idea is that where Staff and Regional Councils line up in support of a proposal, those would be moved in a block, a consent block. Again, this is a procedural change at the Federal Board meeting, it is provided for your information. Your Chairman always goes to the Board meeting and so would follow these procedures, but sometimes the Vice-Chair or other members might be there, and this way you would understand how the sequence of decisions would be made. It does not require any action on your part, it's informational only.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Next.

MR. BRELSFORD: And the final item for me to mention to you is the last one in Tab W for wild, and that is to update you on the applications for Subsistence Council Seats. There are help me, John, three seats?

MR. ANDREW: Seven. Three seats are up right now, Steven White, David O. David and Fritz George.

MR. BRELSFORD: Right. So new nominations are coming in and we have a total so far.....

MR. ANDREW: And we've got a total of seven. And I just received within the last three more to send over.

MR. BRELSFORD: So we just wanted to mention to you that the nomination period is still open until March 20th. And if you hear of people in your villages who are interested in applying for the Subsistence Council for these, these will be vacant seats, they can call us for an application or we have some applications here that you could hand on to people who might be interested. This comes up every year. The nominations are opened for those seats that expire within the calendar year. And we just want to be sure that all of the people who are interested would have a chance to submit an application. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I've concluded those items. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: Thank you, Taylor. Next on the agenda is Yukon Fish and Wildlife Service, Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge, Mike Rearden. You're on the hot seat.

MR. REARDEN: Actually, it's kind of cold here, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we won't take too much of your time here, but Steve would like to go over and give you an update on some moose work we've done. And I would like to start it off by kind of filling in the report for Mimi Hogan, which was actually down here on C(3) to talk about the migratory bird management if that's all right with you. So I'll go ahead and to that if that's all right and then Steve will cover these items and we'll be out of your hair.

Mostly this is just information I want to give you since you're all people that deal with subsistence and you'll be in your villages and this is information that's important to pass along to people. As all of you know, spring subsistence hunting has occurred on the Delta for a very, very long time and it's been a controversial subject for a lot of years because in 1916 the Migratory Bird Treaty Act was passed and made it illegal for people to hunt birds between March 10th and September 1st.

Just recently an amendment was made on that Migratory Bird Treaty Amendment that will allow legal hunting of birds in the spring in Alaska by rural people. And this protocol as it's called, this Amendment to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, was ratified by the Senate on October 23, 1997, just this last fall. So we have begun the work now to go through the process to establish legal seasons for spring hunting out here on the Delta and elsewhere in Alaska.

When the Senate said okay this is good, we're going to sign it, it doesn't automatically make the spring subsistence hunting legal. It has to be opened with regulations. And Amendments to the Bird Treaty Act now gives the Service the authority to set these regulations between March 10th and September 1st. And in the meantime we still continue on in this area with the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Goose Management Plan and the Closed Season Policy in the remainder of Alaska. So waterfowl hunting will still continue as it has for years and we'll begin the process of developing the regulations also.

We think it will take several years to go through the process. As we know, it's taken a long time to get to this point and we feel it's very important that it gets done right. And if it takes three or four years to do it, then so be it. At least then we'll have it done properly. The first phase of
setting regulations will be devoted to setting up management bodies. And the protocol mandates that subsistence users will have an effective and meaningful role in the development of implementation regulations through these management bodies.

Now, this Council will not be that management body. It's a separate issue. Obviously you haven't dealt with waterfowl issues and so this is just informational so that you guys will be aware of it. But these management bodies will include Native people, Federal and State of Alaska employees as equals on these boards and will develop recommendations for among other things seasons, bag limits, law enforcement policies, population and harvest monitoring, education programs, research, use of traditional knowledge, habitat projection, all of those things. Village Councils will be involved to the maximum extent. And that's one of the reasons we think it'll take some time because we need to go to all the villages and gather input and information from those people.

Once these management bodies are in place, the management bodies will develop proposals for regulations. That will go to the Flyway Council and the Service Regulation Committee. So once the proposals come out of these management bodies they'll go through the same process that all the regulations do now for waterfowl.

The Treaty language and the Negotiating Report mandated how certain aspects of the subsistence harvest will be managed. And the following elements are in the Negotiating Report. The eligibility is established for indigenous inhabitants of Alaska and that originally was defined in the Negotiating Report to be Alaska Natives who were permanent residents of villages within designated areas where subsistence hunting of migratory birds is customary and traditional. The term also include permanent resident non-Natives of those villages who have legitimate subsistence hunting needs.

When the protocols were ratified in the Senate, an understanding was attached that states the United States understands the term indigenous inhabitants means permanent residents of a village within a subsistence harvest area, regardless of race. The subsistence harvest areas are established to include most village areas in rural Alaska and does not include areas like Anchorage, Matanuska Valley, Fairbanks, North Star Borough and the Kenai Peninsula.

That's about it. We have yet to start the process really. There have been some preliminary meetings of which Myron Naning is a part of it, so if you have questions I'll try to answer them and if I can't I'm sure that Myron can do it.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: Council, you guys have any questions?

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask Mike, have you guys come up with anything as to the cause of the die-off of birds, especially the coastal birds?

MR. REARDEN: The seabirds this last summer? Well, the ones that people in the villages gathered and sent to us that we sent out for a necropsy, or they cut them open and tried to find out why, all of those birds starved to death. And the thought is that because the Bering Sea was much warmer this last summer than it normally is, that the fish the birds depend on to feed on were probably in much lower areas, so the birds couldn't reach them when they were feeding. That's one thought. Nobody knows for sure but that's a suspicion. But the birds that we did send in had starved to death.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Any other questions? Look like that's it.

MR. REARDEN: Okay. Well, Steve has a few minutes here on caribou and moose.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Yeah.

MR. KOVACH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to update you from the information that we presented at your meeting last fall, the reported moose harvest, this is the harvest that's been reported to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, along the Kuskokwim River there were 24 moose taken, along the Yukon River from Mountain Village up to Paimuti, there were 52 moose taken. From Mountain Village downriver there was 19 moose that have been reported taken.

An interesting thing is that section from Mountain Village down to the mouth of the river, this hunt's been going for three years now. This is the third year in a row where the harvest has been the same thing, it's been 19 moose. In the 10 day winter season, that's a to be announced season both for the Federal subsistence hunt as well as the State hunt, zero moose were reported taken during that hunt in Unit 18. Fish and Game also has recently sent out the reminder letter to hunters who picked up a harvest ticket but have not turned them in and they asked me to forward on to you a request for you people when you get back to your villages, if you know people who have harvest tickets and haven't turned them in, to please mail them in. All they have to do is drop them in the mailbox and they go in. And it helps us learn about where people hunt, how much effort they expended and the harvest. It helps us in managing.
With regards to moose, we wanted to do censuses of moose in two different areas. Snow conditions and weather conditions only allowed us to do one of those. We selected an area along the Yukon River between Paimiat and Pilot Station, our count area is approximately 1,600 square miles in size. The count we conducted a month ago in the first part of February was the second time this area was counted. The first time was in March of '92. During the census they observed 625 moose and the total estimate for the survey area was 994 moose. This last month we observed 1,253 moose, or about double what was observed six years ago. The current estimate for this same area is now just over 2,000 moose. It's obvious moose have been growing in this part of the Yukon River.

With regard to caribou in the southern part of Unit 18, traditionally the Kilbuck caribou area, I reported to you at your meeting last fall that we had a fairly substantial migration of caribou into the area in August. Most of these animals left the unit in late September or early October, however, in the middle part of November approximately 15,000 caribou moved back into the area. They came in through the Whitefish Lake area. Between this time and January they basically moved between Whitefish Lake and Three-step Mountain all winter long, then in late January we had more caribou move into the area. These animals seemed to be staying mostly in the hills between the Tuluksak River and Elbow Mountain.

The last count that I completed on these animals was about three weeks ago. At that time I counted 38,000 caribou in the hills. Just to let you know, this is the highest count of caribou that's ever been recorded and in the unit. We have also at the refuge been receiving sporadic reports of caribou on the tundra north of Bethel in December and January. We haven't been able to find them by flying but we are receiving reports that there's small scattered groups of caribou out there, which is very encouraging, it tells us that caribou are using more areas than they have in recent past.

In the northern end of the refuge, in the Andreafsky Mountains, we did have Western Arctic caribou move onto the refuge again in December, just like they did a year ago, and they were present for about a year and a half. We received reports from residents of Marshall that they were harvesting caribou just south of the Yukon River in that area. I did a fly-over in there in the middle part of December and found sign of caribou, but I didn't find any in there.

Another note in our cooperative effort to monitor the caribou with Fish and Game, in early January the Fish and Game Biologist from Dillingham was checking on reports of Mulchatna
caribou along the Yukon River. What he found was a continuous band of caribou and sign of caribou basically from Whitefish Lake up through the Blackburn Hills into the Unalakleet, Innoko and Iditarod River Drainages. Basically what this told us is that for the first time since the turn of the century we have a mixing of Mulchatna caribou and Western Arctic caribou. And that's all we have for now, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Also that I hear east side of Scammon Bay Mountains there was some caribou around there too. Estimate of what I hear is 15 to 20 caribous in that area. So you could see that caribou is getting expanding all over now again now. Do you guys have a question for him?

MR. NICOLAI: Mr. Kovach, has there been any consideration (inaudible-away from microphone).

MR. KOVACH: The fire in the Red Devil area is what you're referring to, correct? That was one of the larger hotter fires that we've had in the State for a long time and we have very little information about how those kinds of fires affect moose. We do know there's a lot of movement of moose. And in and near the fire area. The best information that I have was from the fire in the Big Lake area outside of Anchorage two summers ago. And what they discovered with that fire is within a week after the fire cooling down there was moose moving right back into the middle of the burn area to forage on willows and grasses that re-sprout immediately after the fires goes through.

A fire as large as the Red Devil fire probably caused some temporary relocation of moose, but I would suspect that next summer they'll see moose back in a lot of their original sites. But that's, you know, yet to be seen. We did have a small fire at the Breast (ph) Mountain area on the refuge this summer. Less than a month after the fire was out I observed caribou standing in the middle of the burn going in foraging. And so it really didn't disturb them at all.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Any more questions?

MR. REARDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KOVACH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Thank you. Do we have a Togiak Wildlife Refuge representative here?

MR. FISHER: Mr. Chairman, I'll fill in for the refuge.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: Okay.

MR. FISHER: I don't have very much, but they did want me to pass out this handout to you. I won't bother to go through it. I'd like to have you read it, there's some good information there. And then I just have a couple of brief items and then we'll move on on our agenda. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I mentioned earlier in the day, the Togiak Refuge and Fish and Game had their first moose hunt there in Unit 17(A). This is the first time they've had a moose hunt there since 1980. The animals moved in and there's plenty of habitat there, so things look pretty good. There were 44 permits issued and there was 15 animals harvested. Most of those animals were harvested by people from Togiak and Twin Hills.

Another encouraging thing that happened with moose in 17(A), they counted about 430 animals in late January/early February. So that population is increasing. Another item they wanted me to pass on to the Council was they're in the process of updating and revising their public use management plan. As soon as that's completed they will have a draft out for public review and they do plan on attending and carrying out meetings in those villages that are associated with that plan. And I think probably at our next meeting they'll have a full report for you people and you people probably will get a chance to review the plan.

I think that concludes what I have to say regarding the refuge. And if you have that handout, if you'd take a look at that. And if you have any questions on that, give me a call or call the refuge. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.


MR. BURKEY: Mr. Chairman, my name is Charlie Burkey, I'm the Kuskokwim Area Management Biologist for the State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries Management and Development Division. This report will cover the Kuskokwim area salmon fisheries. The text of this report and its accompanying figures, which I'll be showing you on these overheads here, you have them, I passed them out earlier yesterday in a handout entitled, Pacific Salmon Fisheries in the Kuskokwim Area, Alaska. The cover page looks like that.

This report will provide a geographical description of the Kuskokwim area, an historic overview of the Kuskokwim area
salmon fishery and a description of the Department's salmon run 
assessment program. The Division of Commercial Fisheries 
Management and Development of the Alaska Department of Fish and 
Game is responsible for the management of commercial and 
subsistence fisheries in the Kuskokwim area. The overall goal 
of the Kuskokwim Area Management Program is to manage the 
salmon runs for sustained yield under the policy set forth by 
the Alaska Board of Fisheries.

Subsistence fishing has been designated by the Alaska 
State Legislature and the Alaska Board of Fisheries as the 
highest priority among beneficial users of the resource. And 
Management of the Kuskokwim area salmon fisheries must take a 
conservative approach to maintain the subsistence priority and 
to provide for spawning area escapements to sustain production 
of the resource. The Commercial Fisheries Management Staff and 
the Kuskokwim area includes one are management biologist, 
myself, one research project biologist, two assistant 
management biologists, one field office assistant and 
approximately 25 seasonal employees that are hired annually to 
assist in conducting various management and research projects.

The Staff has also become increasingly involved with 
various Native and non-Native non-profit groups in the US Fish 
and Wildlife Service to develop and operate salmon escapement 
monitoring projects. Hopefully you can follow along with this 
map better in your handout there. This is not a very good 
projection here. The Kuskokwim area includes the Kuskokwim 
River drainage and all waters that flow into the Bering Sea 
between Cape Newenham in the south and the Naskonat Peninsula 
just north of Nelson Island.

Commercial salmon fishing takes place in four 
districts, two in the mainstream Kuskokwim River and two in 
Kuskokwim Bay. District 1 is the lower 146 miles of the 
Kuskokwim River from the mouth to approximately nine miles 
upstream of the Tuluksak River. District 2, the middle 
Kuskokwim River, is 50 miles long, stretching from nine miles 
below Kalskag upstream to Chuathbaluk. District 4, Quinhagak, 
is in the Kuskokwim Bay waters off the Village of Quinhagak, 
and District 5 is the waters within Goodnews Bay.

The Kuskokwim area commercial salmon fishery, it dates 
back to approximately the late 1800s. Most of the commercial 
sales in those years stayed locally within the Kuskokwim area 
and fish were sold as dog food primarily. In 1913 was the 
first year that the Kuskokwim commercial fishery actually 
cought fish for export to other areas. The commercial fishing 
started in District 4 in 1960, and in 1968 the commercial 
fishing just started in District 5. The Kuskokwim Chum Salmon
Fishery, commercial chum salmon fishery, began in 1971 when gillnet mesh size was restricted to six inches or smaller after June the 25th. In Districts 4 and 5 gillnet mesh size has been restricted to six inches or smaller since inception of the commercial fishery. In 1985, the six inch maximum gillnet mesh size was applied to all Kuskokwim area commercial salmon fisheries. The directed chinook salmon fishery in the Kuskokwim River was discontinued in 1987.

Coho salmon are the most important species in the commercial fishery both in terms of harvest numbers and value to the fisherman. The commercial fisheries in all four districts target coho in late July and August. Chum salmon are second of importance being the target species in the Kuskokwim River in June and July. Sockeye salmon are the third most commercially species with directed fisheries for that species in Districts 4 and 5. Chinook catch and value ranks fourth with the only directed commercial fishery on this species occurring in District 4, Quinhagak. And Pink salmon are the least numerous and the least valuable species in the commercial fishery.

This graph here gives you an example of commercial and subsistence catch in the Kuskokwim area, or Kuskokwim River to be more specific from 1988 to 1996. You'll notice on this graph that the black bars or the dark bars, that's the subsistence catch, whereas the light bars are the commercial catch. And notice that for chinook salmon, the subsistence catch greatly exceeds the commercial catch on the river, whereas for the other species, especially chum and coho salmon, the commercial catch greatly exceeds the subsistence catch that species.

Prior to 1983 the management strategy of conservatively increasing the commercial catch harvest guidelines allowed development of the fishery, commercial fishery. The change from a harvest-guideline-based management strategy, or basically a catch quota, to an escapement-objective-based strategy in 1983 has increased the harvest.

And the expansion of the commercial has occurred primarily within the last 20 years and has since leveled off in the last couple of years. Since the peak of 829 permit holders fished in 1995, the number of active permits has declined. Economic factors are believed to be the main cause of this decline in commercial effort within the last couple of years.

Fishing periods in Districts 1 and 2 are usually six hours long, while most periods in District 4 and District 5 are 12 hours in length. And permit holders in the Kuskokwim area
can freely transfer between commercial fishing periods in season.

Now, again I'll apologize for the projection here, but this map will identify the different run assessment projects that the Department uses to assess the strength of the salmon run in season. And they are located in this map and delineated by the dark triangles. And I'll run down them briefly here.

Now, the vast size and remoteness of the Kuskokwim area presents a tremendous challenge to monitoring salmon escapements and assessing run abundance. Table 1, which is listed in your handout, lists the various methods used by the Department to manage the Kuskokwim area salmon fisheries and assess salmon run abundance.

Weirs, towers and sonars are used to enumerate salmon on the spawning grounds. Seven such projects were operated in 1997, they were: The Aniak River sonar, which is located 11 miles from Aniak on the Aniak River. It enumerates chum salmon and it's located on one of the largest chum salmon producing systems in the Kuskokwim River drainage. The Department runs this project and receives staffing assistance from AVCP.

The Kwethluk River tower, up near Three-step, enumerates primarily chinook, chum and coho salmon. It is a cooperatively run project operated cooperatively with AVCP and with assistance from the Department of Fish and Game.

The George River weir enumerates primarily chinook, chum and coho salmon. It is another cooperative project operated with the Kuskokwim Native Association in Aniak area with staffing and technical and equipment assistance from the Department of Fish and Game. It's located near the mouth of the George River.

The Kogruklu River weir enumerates chinook, sockeye, chum and coho salmon and the project is operated by the Department. It's located at Mile 1 of the Kogruklu River near its origin at the Holitna River.

The Takotna River tower enumerates chinook and chum salmon. It's located in the Village of Takotna near McGrath. It is another cooperative project, it's operated by the Takotna Community School and with technical and equipment assistance from the Department of Fish and Game.

Going down to the bay, the Kanektok River tower, located approximately 15 miles from Quinhagak on the Kanektok River. It enumerates chinook, sockeye, chum and coho salmon.
It's a cooperative project operated by the Quinhagak IRA and which has staffing and technical and equipment assistance from the Department.

Our last project here is the Middle Fork Goodnews River weir. It's located approximately 11 miles from Goodnews Bay Village on the Middle Fork of the Goodnews River. It enumerates chinook, sockeye, chum, pink and coho salmon and it's operated by the Department with financial assistance from the Quinhagak IRA and staffing and financial assistance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

I'll move on to another run assessment tool that the Department uses, is aerial surveys. This is a map of the Kuskokwim area and the black lines denotes streams or portions of streams which are regularly surveyed by aerial surveys to enumerate salmon on the spawning grounds. Now, aerial surveys are generally restricted to clear water streams and lakes. The surveys are usually conducted on time each season during a window of just a few days when the maximum number of fish are expected to be on the spawning grounds.

In most cases aerial surveys are best used to index populations of sockeye and chinook salmon because they are the most visible species when they're on the spawning grounds. A few streams are also surveyed for coho salmon, but weather conditions seldom allow reliable aerial surveys during the coho season. This figure shows the location of those streams and the sections on which aerial surveys are flown on a regular basis.

Daily in season assessment of salmon run strength and timing is also available from a drift gillnet test fishery operated on the Kuskokwim River near Bethel. Twice a day gillnets are fished in a standardized manner. The test-fish catch from each tide is speciated and counted. And the catch statistics for chinook, sockeye, chum and coho salmon are presented as daily catch per unit of effort. Comparisons are made with test-fish results from previous years to assess the abundance and run timing.

Management of the Kuskokwim area salmon fisheries also rely on salmon age-sex-size sampling, commercial catch statistics and verbal reports from subsistence and sports fishers to augment escapement and test-fish data. This concludes my oral report. Be happy to answer any questions.

MR. NICOLAI: My name is Ray Nicolai from Kwethluk. I'd like to know how old your sonar equipment is.
MR. BURKEY: Well, basically our sonar equipment, there's only one sonar presently on the river right now, it's on the Aniak River and that system has basically been in operation for two years. I can't tell you exactly when it was purchased or what have you, but it's basically considered up-to-date as far as its technical capabilities and its usefulness. So I could say that the equipment that's being used on that river presently has been there for the last two years. And now the Kuskokwim River sonar, we used to have a main river sonar near Bethel. That project has been discontinued temporarily and that also uses basically very sophisticated up-to-date equipment that the industry and technicians -- it gives us good reliable information as to fish passage.

MR. NICOLAI: In this day and age if we were to make something electronically, tomorrow it's outdated. And I'm aware that there is new counting equipment that don't require such weirs, that when you go up you'll smell them a mile away. And even if there's one fish that didn't make it up the tributary, that's like thousand eggs that didn't spawn. My question was that is there a way that you an keep up-to-date on the counting equipment?

MR. BURKEY: Mr. Chairman, the Department has technical staff that monitor this equipment. They regularly service this equipment, they regularly consult with industry sellers and vendors of this equipment and basically the equipment is maintained and up-to-date and technically competent for the job that it is asked to do. And, like I say, we have a staff of people who are paid to make sure that this equipment is operating correctly that the data it gives us is the best that is available.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Any other questions? Thank you.

MR. BURKEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Next on our agenda is B, Unit 18. Roger Seavoy here or Mike?

MR. COFFING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Roger Seavoy is not here and I'm not on the agenda but I'd like to take maybe an opportunity to provide some information to the Council. Ida Alexie was also on the agenda and Ida is in Nome attending a Board of Fisheries meeting, so she won't be able to be with you today.

What I wanted just to briefly update you on, is I wanted to be sure and mention that the Department and Staff
here in Bethel continue to work cooperatively with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with AVCP, as well as villages and advisory committees on projects here. And I just wanted to assure you that we certainly feel like that's the way we want to proceed, getting involvement from the communities through participation in the brown bear working group, or Kilbuck caribou or moose management plans. They have certainly been fruitful in the region and we've come a long ways doing that. We want to continue that kind of effort.

One cooperative project that I'm pursuing now and have been working on is dealing with marine mammals. And although you're not in the process of managing marine mammals with this Council, I thought I still wanted to update you on that and let you know what we're doing with that because many of the village here do hunt and rely on marine mammals.

The Subsistence Division is working with some communities along the coast to gather information on seals and sea lions, specifically. We were asked essentially by the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Federal agency that regulates seals and sea lions, to try to find out more about subsistence uses, to go out and talk to the people in the communities and learn more about where people are harvesting. And it's important to get input from residents on their observations of marine mammals, specifically seals and sea lions, to learn from hunters, to learn from people in the communities how they feel the populations are doing. Do they perceive there to be any problem with the populations of seals and sea lions, or the health and condition of animals that they're harvesting.

So in that effort a couple weeks ago I went to Quinhagak and worked cooperatively with Joshua Cleveland and residents there in Quinhagak and we did some interviews with elders and younger hunters to talk about seals and sea lions and gather information. And I hope to go back there in another week or so to actually hire a couple of individuals in the community who through the Natural Resource Department there will collect additional information on subsistence uses of seals.

A week ago I was in Emmonak doing the same sort of thing with the Natural Resource program in Emmonak there through the Tribal Council. And we did some interviews with both elders and some younger hunters to learn about what time of year they see animals, what type of seals do they have, and their observations on the health of the animals and also to get their perceptions on how they feel the population of those animals are doing now and how were they doing before, to get...
some indication of whether there's any problem with seals.

There's been a fair amount of discussion and concern about what's going on in the Bering Sea. We've heard of birds starving to death, we've heard of concerns about fish and there has been a concern raised about sea lions as well. Talking to local folks will give us some additional information about the seals, identify what's there, how is it doing and how the local folks perceive those populations to be today.

I hope next week to get up to Hooper Bay and working through the Council there, hope to do the same sort of thing there. So we're continuing to work cooperatively with communities. Through these efforts we hope to be able to also provide some employment, to hire some people in those communities to help with this, to involve them directly in it and provide some job opportunities in the communities out there.

Lastly, I want to mention to the Board regarding fish and to this Council regarding fish. And it's primarily just an update to you on what's happened with customary and traditional use determinations for fish in this region. Last December in Fairbanks one of the topics that the Board of Fisheries listened to that we provided information on were subsistence uses of fish in Kuskokwim area and in the Yukon area. We provided information on what fish are harvested, seasonality, those eight criteria that you're so familiar with in your process. We used that process to describe this to the Board of Fisheries.

And after meeting they adopted customary and traditional use determinations for all fresh water fish in the Kuskokwim area and in the Yukon area, actually recognized customary and traditional use for all fresh water fish. They also adopted a positive finding for marine fish for the Kuskokwim area and for the Yukon area, and also shellfish. So currently under State regulations, State codes there is a positive customary and traditional use finding for basically all fish and shellfish throughout the Kuskokwim and Yukon areas.

That's noteworthy in that the Board had not dealt with that for some time. And I think those of you that have been involved in the work process can appreciate how the Board that we have now that is sitting there with John White as the Chairman has really invited and opened up their Board process to the public participation. During the Board process they set up sub-committees that work on these things, there's open discussion. The public, anybody that's there that wants to sit
in can discuss them, bring their ideas forth and it goes back
to the Board of Fisheries for deliberation.

So it was a long meeting but it was a rewarding process
for me to see that happen and more open opportunity for public
involvement in that. I think that's all I have. I'll end with
that. Thank you very much for your time today.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Any questions for Mike? Thank you,
Mike. Next on our agenda is D, Association Village Council
President Myron Naning.

INTERPRETER ANDREW: (Myron Naning) He's stating that
he already gave his report yesterday right before this Council.
A while ago he provided a handout to the Council members coming
in from another source. The handout was requesting for
information on subsistence as related to religion and our way
of life as described in our area. He's the last one on the
agenda. Myron is explaining what that paper was requesting.
AVCP is part of the Federal takeover and the Federal management
of subsistence fisheries because they know that any resource,
if you start it in limited in numbers the Federal agency is
more favorable and more liberal in granting rural preference.

Like he said earlier, they're in support of the Federal
takeover on Federal subsistence fisheries. He's describing
that in the way that proposal came up, when it came up the
proposed subsistence fishery rules are modeled after the State
regulations. If the Federal takeover does occur and they
should follow what's already in the Proposed Rule.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: We're getting there. There's no other
reports, no other new business. Time and place. On your tab,
your booklets X,Y,Z, you go back there. 1998 Regional Advisory
Council Meeting Window. September 8 to 23, 1998. The whole of
September is kind of busy month.

(Council discussing selection of next meeting date - in
Yup'ik - not transcribed)

MR. L. WILDE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the next
meeting be held October 6 and 7 in Kwigillingok.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Is there any second to the motion?

MR. McCANN: Second.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Second by Billy McCann. Discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Question.
CHAIRMAN WILDE: Question's been called for. All who favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Oppose same sign.

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN WILDE: Motion carried. October 6 and 7 at Kwigillingok. One thing I'd like to remind Staff, we're supposed to have a workshop, you know, this time and we didn't because of weather. So next time you guys please remember that we will have a workshop. Because some of our members that don't quite understand some of the English, you know, and we have to make sure this operational manual is -- it's very important in that meeting. It should be highlighted, let our rest of the Board understand. Like some of them didn't quite read the English like me. John make a motion to adjourn. Is there any second?

MR. CHARLES: Second.

CHAIRMAN WILDE: All who favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

(Off record)
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