

1 WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6
7 VOLUME II

8
9 Galena, Alaska
10 March 2, 2011
11 8:40 a.m.

12
13
14 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 15
16 Jack Reakoff, Chairman
17 Ray Collins
18 Timothy Gervais
19 Donald Honea
20 Carl Morgan
21 Jenny Pelkola
22 Pollock Simon
23 Robert Walker
24 Eleanor Yatlin

25
26
27
28 Regional Council Coordinator, Donald Mike

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Recorded and transcribed by:
45
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
47 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
48 Anchorage, AK 99501
49 907-243-0668
50 sahile@gci.net

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Galena, Alaska - 3/2/2011)

4
5 (On record)

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good morning. This
8 Western Interior Regional Advisory Council's coming
9 back to order and Council is seated. We're going to --
10 we need to accelerate the meeting a little bit. We
11 have the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council
12 coming in and so we need to tighten up our schedule
13 here. We want to finish by the end of the day. We
14 have wildlife issues, State proposals to review and
15 some other things with State management that affect
16 subsistence in this region.

17
18 The fisheries -- Yukon River, I think
19 we've covered it fairly thoroughly, all the biological
20 stuff. We need to designate the customary trade
21 designees to attend the subcommittee and then we have
22 the -- in our packet here, it's titled WIRAC-01 and
23 it's the questionnaire that I've developed for the
24 Council to review. And this needs to be submitted to
25 the Office of Subsistence Management to facilitate
26 information that the Council is seeking and this should
27 also go to the other two Councils, Eastern and YK-
28 Delta, and so the outline is -- I could quickly read
29 through it.

30
31 The three Subsistence Regional Councils
32 for the Yukon River have been asked by the Federal
33 Subsistence Board to define what is normal -- the
34 normal amount of subsistence-caught king -- chinook
35 king salmon that are sold for cash. The cash sale of
36 salmon is referred to as customary trade. This is not
37 fish that are traded for other items or given away to
38 friends or family. The reasons for the survey is to
39 determine what local village people feel is the normal
40 amount of chinook salmon sold in customary trade. This
41 survey will help the Regional Councils define and
42 protect traditional sales of subsistence-caught chinook
43 salmon. We are not asking for names of individuals,
44 just what your tribe or community feels is the normal
45 sale amount where you live or if you purchase chinook
46 salmon for your own use from the Yukon River
47 subsistence fishers.

48
49 Does your village -- (1) Does your
50 village have members that harvest

1 chinook king salmon and sell some of
2 their catch for cash not including --
3 included in trading for other items or
4 given away to people.

5
6 (2) If there are several people working
7 together to put up fish, divide the
8 number of raw pounds sold for cash by
9 the number of people that will receive
10 money. This could be -- also be the
11 number of fish. What approximate
12 amount of subsistence-caught chinook
13 salmon are normally sold in -- we could
14 -- instead of pounds, we could end raw
15 fish. And so we're wanting to know the
16 amount of fish that people typically
17 would sell. Please give a range of
18 fish as there are various variations
19 from year to year with run size.

20
21 If your tribal community does not
22 subsistence catch and process chinook
23 salmon or catches very few, do people
24 buy chinook salmon from fishers on the
25 Yukon River.

26
27 These questions are very important to
28 protect the customary and traditional subsistence uses
29 of chinook salmon. Customary trade sale of chinook
30 salmon is recognized as an important part of how
31 subsistence takes place in rural villages. The Federal
32 Subsistence Board needs to know what is the normal sale
33 -- what its normal sales are. Large numbers of chinook
34 sold above normal amounts will be considered commercial
35 sales. To protect chinook salmon and the normal
36 subsistence use amounts, we need to you to discuss this
37 questionnaire at your next tribal council meeting.

38
39 And so Polly tells us that there's a
40 whole process that this questionnaire would have to go
41 through, but we need to have these questions answered
42 and so we're at somewhat of a quandary and it will
43 increase the amount of time.

44
45 Do you have any comments on that,
46 Polly, go ahead.

47
48 DR. WHEELER: I do, Mr. Chair. Again I
49 think that for this issue to be resolved in a way
50 that's satisfactory to all the three Councils and come

1 up with one -- kind of one response to the question
2 rather than three -- because that's what we had with
3 the set of proposals that we had this last go-round --
4 we've got to get everybody onboard. The YKRAC just
5 announced their -- or just selected their two people
6 last week at their meeting. So we've got now a full
7 cadre. Eastern Interior's meeting tomorrow and Friday
8 in Fairbanks. So then we'll have the subcommittee set
9 and then the subcommittee as a group needs to move
10 forward and that's what I had said yesterday is that we
11 need to be -- move a little -- I appreciate this
12 questionnaire, but I think in order to come up with
13 something that all three groups can agree to, it really
14 needs to go down that road.

15
16 And as I promised yesterday, once you
17 have something that the three groups -- the whole group
18 with representatives of the three Councils -- we can
19 facilitate it. I've talked to Pat Petrivelli with BIA,
20 they have means at their disposal that they can
21 utilize. So I think we have a venue that we can work
22 through, but I just caution you that we -- you know
23 this is a sensitive issue and you know it's been pretty
24 contentious between the different RACs, so you want to
25 make sure that everybody's onboard before -- so there's
26 not the perception out there that one RAC is driving
27 the bus.

28
29 And I guess that's my cautionary note
30 there is that I think in order to come up with
31 something that everybody can agree to, everybody needs
32 to feel like they have an equal partner in all of it.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. That's
35 -- I would -- I also would like to see cohesion among
36 the RACs, but we have to get things on the table and
37 this document needs to go to all -- to the subcommittee
38 to be -- well, we have to get something on the table
39 and I would like this Council to approve this document
40 or a semblance of this document so that there's
41 something. Did the YK-Delta come up with a document
42 itself or -- on a proposed questionnaire or any way of
43 alleviating these -- deriving this information from the
44 tribal councils?

45
46 DR. WHEELER: No, but, Mr. Chair, as
47 you know they did come up with three different
48 proposals to address this issue last go-round, so they
49 had pretty clear ideas of what's around. So I think
50 that it's a great idea to bring something like this to

1 the subcommittee.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

4

5 DR. WHEELER:and then the
6 subcommittee can tailor it to how they think will work
7 out and then we can kind of deal with the details down
8 the road. So I was under the impression that you
9 wanted this to go out to the tribes immediately and I
10 was just urging some caution there.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, that -- no. I
13 may have went a little bit too fast. I do want the
14 subcommittee to review this. I wanted it sent to them.
15 I do want the -- this -- it's the intent of the Federal
16 Subsistence Board to expedite this. I don't want any
17 feet dragging either. And so there are certain Board
18 members that wanted this more expeditiously executed
19 and so we need to have something on the table before
20 the subcommittee. I feel that this questionnaire --
21 they can review the questionnaire. I would like to
22 know what the Council feels about question 2 in the
23 questionnaire. Instead of raw pounds just inserting
24 fish -- numbers of fish in the question.

25

26 Any comments from the Council.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I also want to know
31 from the Council, does the Council feel that this
32 questionnaire should go out to the tribes. Have any
33 comments, Robert.

34

35 MR. WALKER: Go ahead.

36

37 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
38 feel this is kind of intrusive and, you know, to be
39 realistic, I, myself -- and this is my opinion that,
40 you know, I'd rather have something before a
41 subcommittee than to actually go and question the
42 tribal councils. It's not going to be a very
43 comfortable thing for whoever does this and that is my
44 opinion.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It is a very
47 sensitive issue, and -- but this is the question that
48 the Federal Subsistence Board has tasked the Councils
49 to come up with and they want tribal council
50 involvement. And if the Council can think of a

1 different way of answering the question, what is -- the
2 question is what is a significant commercial
3 enterprise. That's the question. And how do we go
4 about getting the answer to that question. That's the
5 subcommittee's task and we can't weasel out of it.
6 That's what we have to do.

7

8 So how would you go about -- Robert.

9

10 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. But
11 I don't -- you know, I'm reading this here and I don't
12 want to commercialize it. I don't want to have them --
13 a lot people go and be getting stainless steel because
14 this is pretty much directive on what your personal
15 thought is and I thought what the start was that we
16 were going to ask them, you know, how much do they need
17 and this and that. This is too direct. It is good in
18 a sense here, but I don't want to be pushing the tribes
19 saying that we are telling you and I don't want to go
20 that route. I just want to go and ask them not tell
21 them.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This is a -- just a
24 question. This is asking for commercial or anything.
25 This is defining what is commercial. What is -- what
26 we want to know is what is the level of normal sales.
27 So if the -- Polly, you got a comment?

28

29 DR. WHEELER: Yeah, Mr. Chair. If I
30 could maybe offer this as a suggestion. I think that
31 when the subgroup gets together, this can be offered as
32 a -- sort of, you know, this is one example of how you
33 can maybe get at the question. How do you think that
34 -- what do you guys think and sort of offer it as an
35 example, not that this is the way. It's either this
36 way.....

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

39

40 DR. WHEELER:or nothing's going
41 to be asked and just say this is an example. This is
42 one shot at it. How do you guys think it'll work. So
43 then -- and you're right. I think sometimes it's
44 helpful to respond to something rather than say there's
45 this question out there, how do you want to answer it.
46 So I think this is -- this provides a starting point.
47 It may not look like this at the end and people may
48 work through it in a different way, but I think that
49 this can be offered as a starting point, Mr. Chair, and
50 then the group -- the subcommittee can move forward

1 with it.

2

3 And I just want to go back. You had
4 said, you know, the Federal Subsistence Board is very
5 interested in getting a solution really quickly and I
6 think that some of the people -- and I don't mean any
7 disrespect by this, but some of the people that were
8 saying that at the Federal Subsistence Board meeting
9 don't always have a good understanding necessarily of
10 how difficult some of these issues are and how
11 sometimes crafting a good solution takes a longer
12 period of time and you may come up with something
13 really quick, but is it going to work.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

16

17 DR. WHEELER: And I think our goal here
18 -- our collective goal is coming up with something
19 that's going to work for everybody. And if that takes
20 a year, if it takes whatever, I mean the last customary
21 trade working group took several years. So I caution
22 the Federal Subsistence Board and maybe I'm out of turn
23 here, but I think that it's important to give everybody
24 the time to work through this in a way that they're
25 comfortable with to come up with something that is
26 actually going to work.

27

28 Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate that.
31 My intention -- personal intention is to try and get
32 something going. It's like go to a working group.
33 What are we talking about. I feel that we need to
34 start throwing some stuff on the table and like, okay,
35 let's get the discussion points. If the Council
36 doesn't like the three points that I have here, we can
37 strike those. How do you feel about the first and last
38 paragraph. Just for the subcommittee.

39

40 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.

43

44 MR. COLLINS: Why don't we just give
45 that draft to the subcommittee and let them take it to
46 it because if we finalize something here, then we're
47 saying as a group this is what you think you should do
48 and I don't even -- I think it would be better to just
49 let this is what we worked up and you could put
50 alternates on there or whatever and let them carry it

1 to the subcommittee.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's good.

4

5 MR. COLLINS:because then the
6 points would be before the subcommittee for
7 discussion.....

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

10

11 MR. COLLINS:and I think that
12 might be the way to go. It would show that we were
13 working on the issue and they would have something to
14 put on the table.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

17

18 MR. COLLINS: But it would be done in
19 that venue instead of us doing it as a group here,
20 saying this is our position.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: True. Is the
23 Council comfortable of submitting this as an example of
24 what the direction that needs to -- if not, we'll just
25 plane our Committee members and move on and so -- go
26 ahead, Tim.

27

28 MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair. Yeah, I think
29 as far as a document to the people that go to
30 subcommittee can just bring this and say this is one
31 way we could go about it and then they can hash it out.
32 It's not -- there's nothing concrete. We're not
33 telling anybody anything. It's just a -- says a
34 potential form or potential types of issues that are --
35 can be brought up. So I don't see where that's --
36 causes trouble.

37

38 It's just a suggestion.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It just lays out the
41 issue. You know, there's a lot of confusion about what
42 is customary trade. You know, a lot of people think
43 that it entails barter. Well, it doesn't entail
44 barter. It gives more definition to what the customary
45 trade issue revolves around and so it's trying to bring
46 people -- understanding what we're actually talking
47 about. I was at the Federal Board. I knew what the
48 Federal Board was and I wrote this document and so if
49 Council members feel strongly that questions -- pointed
50 questions need not be in here, that's -- you know, that

1 would be fine to take those out.

2

3 Don.

4

5 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
6 reason I say -- I mean, you know, we bring it before
7 the tribal councils and all, it -- a lot of tribal
8 councils are kind of small and don't have a hunting or
9 fishing department, whereas, you know, someone would
10 not undertake this. So just as a suggestion, you know,
11 we have the ACs out there too. So, you know, maybe we
12 could get input from the ACs, then to the subcommittee.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, the Secretary
15 of Interior wants the tribal councils to be involved in
16 this process and so that's why the tribal councils are
17 being discussed.

18

19 Carl.

20

21 MR. MORGAN: Yeah. That's what I was
22 going to bring up because it seemed like the emphasis
23 on this letter is that tribal consultation. It's --
24 because I think they're different borough meetings
25 where they must go through this process of tribal
26 consultation before they can continue because they are
27 -- a lot of the tribes are under Federal jurisdiction.
28 And I think -- when I -- just take this preliminary
29 reading on this -- on the Federal Board and then one of
30 the other reasons, it said the reason for this survey
31 define what local villages -- people feel to be amount
32 chinook salmon sold in customary trade. So I think --
33 seem like this letter is based to go to the local
34 tribal people before we take it up.

35

36 Tribal consultation -- the tribal
37 consultation regarding this issue needs to be posted
38 before the subcommittee of the tri-RAC.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, the -- to get
41 the information back to the subcommittee, this type of
42 information has to go to the tribal councils. And so
43 the subcommittee could develop this -- use this or just
44 part of it and then come up with the -- there has to be
45 something that has to be transmitted to the tribal
46 councils. They answer the questions. Those questions
47 go back to the subcommittee. The subcommittee works it
48 out and then all three RACs review the results. And
49 then the Federal Board then deals with the whole --
50 what the subcommittee and the RACs have developed.

1 But we need a starting point and this
2 is part of a starting point because we're not going to
3 meet probably before this process may be actually
4 starting into play with the -- the subcommittee's
5 actually going to meet and so the subcommittee needs
6 something to work off.

7

8 And so -- Robert.

9

10 MR. WALKER: Chairman. I mean we have
11 to start here somewhere, but the point is, like I said,
12 all -- whoever's going to working with this -- it's not
13 a working group, but who's going to be on this
14 Committee is going to sit down and have to figure out
15 who's going to be working where and then we send the
16 fliers out, break for probably two -- two months. Send
17 the fliers out to the tribes, see what they say, get it
18 back, and do the analysis, see what happens, see what
19 everybody's thoughts are and then start again. That
20 was my thought and that was -- you know, the second
21 time around, we get the Federal Fish and Wildlife
22 agency, get the State Fish and Wildlife Protection, get
23 these people in there, sit down, and see what the --
24 this was our intent, was it last year where we sat down
25 in the McGrath and we discussed these issues.

26

27 I don't want to jump ahead too fast and
28 have to say uh-oh, we did something wrong here, we're
29 going to have to go back and it costs money. I'd like
30 to do it thoroughly just one or two times and have a
31 good read-over, have it pass through all the tribes and
32 see what they think. If that's -- if 67 percent of
33 them say this is a good idea, then go for it.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

36

37 MS. PELKOLA: Mr. Chair.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

40

41 MS. PELKOLA: I also think that, you
42 know, if we sent this out to the councils too soon,
43 they may just feel like that they have to answer these
44 questions or get something -- you know, and they may
45 not even think about it. So I think if we go the other
46 route, just let the subcommittee take care of this and,
47 you know, we go from there. And like Robert said, next
48 time around we'll probably be -- you know, we'll be in
49 tuned.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we're going --
2 we need to appoint our representatives. One of one,
3 Mickey Stickman, is no longer on the subcommittee,
4 designated. Do you have a question there, Pollock.

5
6 MR. SIMON: I had a comment. I also
7 sit on the Allakaket Tribal Council and the customary
8 trade being a touchy issue I think the feeling of the
9 Allakaket Tribal Council is that they want to stay out
10 of it. There's going to be a subcommittee, they
11 probably thinking, you know, leave it up to the
12 subcommittee. So I guess you can the questionnaire
13 out, but maybe not all the tribes will bother to answer
14 it.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Well, that's
17 -- but the Secretary of Interior's office wants the
18 tribal councils to have an opportunity -- at least they
19 have an opportunity. They don't have to -- we're not
20 requiring them to respond, but they should at least be
21 consulted like what's your feelings and some people
22 might have real strong feelings.

23
24 Do you have a comment, Joy.

25
26 MS. J. HUNTINGTON: Just a real quick
27 suggestion. I definitely think that the tribes would
28 like to have options on how to participate. One thing
29 that I think this questionnaire assumes is that
30 questionnaires are the best way of communicating with
31 people in the villages or -- or I mean and this is
32 definitely one way of doing it, but I think with the
33 options that I would like to see presented to the
34 tribes is that, you know, would you like to have a
35 questionnaire, would you like a one-on-one conversation
36 or a phone call. Like what is the best way of talking
37 to you so that you don't feel defensive.

38
39 Personally if I got this, you know, as
40 human beings, we pick a few words to read and, you
41 know, we might see, you know, normal amount of chinook
42 salmon and that immediately tells me maybe I'm not
43 selling the normal amount or there's a few words that
44 might be pulled out and then kind of that -- the
45 response may not be as -- you know, as productive I
46 guess. So I guess what I would like to see if kind of
47 pulling back a little bit and saying how does your
48 community want to give this information.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

1 MS. J. HUNTINGTON: If a questionnaire
2 is best, let's do that. If you'd rather sit down and
3 talk to one of -- you know, one of the members that's
4 in your community, you know, kind of gauging what's
5 going to best get the right information. So that would
6 be my recommendation and then this -- if it's a
7 questionnaire that they want, this could be a starting
8 point, but I think the question needs to be asked also
9 how do you best communicate on a touchy subject like
10 this.....

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

13
14 MS. J. HUNTINGTON:where defenses
15 might -- you know, we've been fighting for our
16 subsistence rights for a long time, so it's not a huge
17 jump to think that this might cause some -- you know,
18 people, you know, running off and not wanting to fill
19 this out I think so.....

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Excellent
22 point.

23
24 MS. J. HUNTINGTON: That's my one
25 comment. Thank you.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Let's -- I just
28 drafted this us just so we could get something on the
29 table as a discussion point. I'm not forcing this down
30 anybody's throat here. I'm not -- don't get the idea
31 that I'm making this Council do anything. I wanted
32 something on the table to talk about and so I -- we
33 need to have something before this working group and so
34 this brings some discussion points and so this Council,
35 I would be inclined to -- for the working group to ask
36 communities how they would like to participate in this
37 question.

38
39 You know, the first parts of this --
40 the paragraphs here actually outline the issue and I
41 think we need to outline the issue because there's a
42 lot of confusion about what customary trade is.
43 There's a perception that bartering is part -- no,
44 that's not the question. It's strictly cash sales.
45 And so we need to really define what the issue is and
46 the working group can work on that. And so this could
47 just be another document that's floating around at the
48 working group and they can deal with it however they
49 may. I'm not even -- I'm not on the working group.
50 And so we're going to select another member. And so

1 how does the Council feel about this being carried
2 along to the working group.

3

4 Eleanor.

5

6 MS. YATLIN: I think it should go to
7 the working group, but I also feel that, you know, the
8 tribal councils don't meet like every month -- some of
9 them, but then what kind of time are we on because, you
10 know, we've been talking about this from one year ago.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

13

14 MS. YATLIN: And now we're down to the
15 time where we need to pick some people out to see who's
16 going to be on the working group. But then we also
17 need to have the tribes be aware of it. So just -- I
18 don't know about all these -- you know, like asking
19 them about how much -- you know, what this Christian --
20 how they define customary trade or how much, you know,
21 fish they get. I don't know about those Christians,
22 but the first part I agree with. That they need to --
23 the tribes need to be aware of it because we're going
24 to get input from the people from the villages that
25 this is going to start. But make them aware of it at
26 the tribal level, but this should just go to the
27 working group.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. This is just
30 a document to be used by the working group as a
31 starting point or some -- just to get one -- something
32 on them. I don't think YK Delta actually -- you know,
33 they made their appointments, but they didn't have --
34 they don't have a document -- any kind of an idea where
35 -- and so we need to have -- yeah. The working group
36 has to develop a methodology, working with
37 anthropologists to -- and Joy's suggestions that asking
38 the tribes, these -- this is a question that needs to
39 be answered and how would you like to answer these
40 questions.

41

42 That would be -- it's a sensitive
43 issue. That's an excellent idea. I appreciate --
44 really appreciate that.

45

46 MS. PELKOLA: Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Jenny.

49

50 MS. PELKOLA: Our Second Chief would

1 like to make a comment on this issue. Fred Huntington.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Since we're
4 kind of just in discussion here.

5

6 MR. F. HUNTINGTON: Thank you, Jenny.
7 Thank you, Mr. Chair. I know you're working on this
8 thing and lot of thought's been going into it. I have
9 some views of -- you know, if a working group came to
10 my smokehouse and decided to ask me these questions,
11 I'm going to ask where did it come from. Why didn't it
12 come from the horse's mouth before it comes to you, you
13 know. That's -- that will be my first opinion. The
14 other question I'm going to ask is what originated this
15 -- what's the origin of this survey. Well, it's
16 management and fish, where we're running low on our
17 chinook salmon.

18

19 Rather than pointing in all that kind
20 of direction of customary trade, I think we're going in
21 the wrong direction. I know we have problem with
22 customary trade and low salmon returns. I think you
23 need to look at the whole picture that a lot of our
24 salmon is due to catching in the Bering Sea with the
25 pollock fisheries. I think with all the views you
26 have, you're doing good, but you need to let
27 Legislature know that there is something wrong out
28 there. If it's not the pollock fisheries, then it must
29 be the subsistence user, I think that's the wrong way
30 to go. You're pointing the finger here at the
31 subsistence users and avoiding what's out in the high
32 seas, whether it be the pollock fisheries or some diet
33 crash or some -- there's a lot of stuff going on in the
34 high seas. The walrus are declining. The food chain's
35 declining. Weathers are changing, but we're still
36 going to be eating fish as long as there's fish,
37 whether we're buying it, sell it, or trade it.

38

39 The thing we need to do is work with
40 our government, our State government and our Federal
41 government. When you say you want to hear from the
42 tribal councils, they'll be glad to work with you.
43 However, the tribal councils have been left out for a
44 long time and we've been fighting for our subsistence
45 use continuously and we're going to continue fighting
46 until there's no more fish left. When there's no more
47 fish left, it's going to hurt our children and
48 grandchildren more than it did us.

49

50 So I urge you, this Board, to go toward

1 Juneau and hit them up with some questions, send them
2 the survey instead of going to my smokehouse and say
3 look, we want you to fill this out.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Fred, we would like
6 to go to Juneau and talk to the Legislature and
7 Governor about this issue, but there's laws that
8 preclude this Council from actually talking to any
9 political entity. It's called the Hatch Act. That's
10 why we have those socks stuffed down our throat. So we
11 can't talk to any political interest on this issue. We
12 can talk to the Federal Subsistence Board and then any
13 other letters have to go through a review and so -- and
14 then we can't talk to political entities. And so
15 that's -- we're stuck with that.

16

17 MR. F. HUNTINGTON: Tribal councils are
18 political entities, Native tribal council. They're the
19 same as the government in Juneau or in Washington. We
20 run a Council just like this Board runs a Council.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

23

24 MR. F. HUNTINGTON: If we could work
25 together, we could get something, but when something
26 like this come out -- not only me. I mean the first
27 thought is we've been cutting fish -- let's say you
28 came to my smokehouse and I'm cutting fish and you
29 start asking questions and I start answering them just
30 as fast as I'm cutting fish. And by the time you get
31 done, I might have you cutting fish, you know. And
32 when -- well, like Jenny, for instance. They go to
33 Bishop Mountain and it's a whole family unit working
34 together to harvest our salmon for the winter. We'd
35 like to take more than we need, but that almost never
36 ever happen. We take what we could get while it's
37 there. And, you know, from the kids on up to the
38 grandparents are working that harvest and the fish
39 there. Each of them has a job, whether it be
40 babysitting the little ones or hanging the fish up, but
41 it's a family situation where you're working together
42 constantly around the clock to produce the fish for the
43 winter.

44

45 I'm not saying this is wrong or
46 anything. I say it's a point of view you have, but in
47 the real world, you know, somebody's going to ask well,
48 why don't you come to my smokehouse and ask me these
49 questions politely and we'll just go through them and
50 you could work with your working group or whoever you

1 do so, but in the end, we're still beating our heads to
2 the wall and not getting nowhere because the low return
3 is evident and that's what we need to focus on not
4 customary trade or anything. In the end, we want our
5 children and grandchildren to have some of the
6 resources we have today.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Everybody wants the
9 kind salmon on the Yukon River to come back, but this
10 Regional Council's an arm of the Federal Subsistence
11 Board and the Federal Subsistence Board has told this
12 Council that we -- we're a part of the answering what
13 is considered -- you know, as a boatload of strips
14 going up to Fairbanks, is that a significant commercial
15 enterprise. They want to know what people feel is okay
16 and what people don't -- feel is not okay. That's why
17 this working group is formed. It's not my decision.
18 I'm not pushing this. That's what the Federal
19 Subsistence Board told us to do. So we're trying to
20 facilitate with the tribal councils.

21

22 If you don't this document, we'll just
23 designate our two subcommittee members and move on.
24 And so we need to move on because we got a lot of
25 agenda here and so we need to -- I appreciate your
26 comments, Fred, but we can't do anything about -- we're
27 going to talk to the Bering -- to the North Pacific
28 Fisheries Management people later on, but this is an
29 issue that the Federal Subsistence Board told us to
30 work on. This Council has to do that. And so we have
31 to designate our subcommittee seats.

32

33 And so I just threw this on the table.
34 People don't like it, we'll move on.

35

36 MR. F. HUNTINGTON: Well, just one
37 comment. My comments are to you guys and I hope it
38 goes to the Federal Subsistence Board as I just said it
39 because in our view as a tribal government, we have a
40 right to continue what we've been doing to protect our
41 rural Native tribal members. The fishing they do is
42 their right which was passed down from the generations
43 before us and we want to be able to pass that on down
44 to our kids without any paperwork involved. And that's
45 a view from our tribe and we'd like to continue and
46 we'd rather you don't hear us, the Federal Subsistence
47 Board do hear us and the tribal council.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What the Federal
50 Subsistence Board and this Council is interested in is

1 what you feel is customary and traditional -- customary
2 trade, what -- we're not trying to make you do anything
3 that you haven't done. We're trying to find what the
4 abuses are. And so that's what the issue is.

5
6 MR. F. HUNTINGTON: Well, I could give
7 you a history of.....

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We can't -- we don't
10 have.....

11
12 MR. F. HUNTINGTON:do you have
13 that kind of time, but -- you know.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm sorry I got to
16 cut you off, but I've got so much agenda today and I
17 can't keep talking about customary trade all day. I
18 have a tremendous amount of agenda to keep going here.
19 So if -- we're just going to -- I want the Council to
20 -- we had Mickey Stickman on our subcommittee working
21 group. He's off the Council. We need to designate --
22 who's our other -- are you our other representative?
23 So who are the primary? You were primary and then
24 Mickey was a primary. And you were alternates. And so
25 we need to designate the primary and so we want to
26 nominate the primary working group seat. And -- who
27 would like to be the primary? Would you like to
28 be.....

29
30 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No -- looking at
31 Ray.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: When we talked about
34 it at McGrath, we wanted to have -- designate fishers
35 from the Yukon.

36
37 Tim.

38
39 MR. GERVAIS: Jack, didn't -- I thought
40 we appointed the people and the only people we need to
41 reselect is a replacement for Mickey.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we need one
44 more appointment, but we need to designate who the
45 primary is since we're in session. No. Mickey was the
46 primary. Robert's the primary. We need to designate
47 that primary. I want that primary designated by the
48 Council. And so would you like to be the primary
49 representative, Jenny?
50

1 MS. PELKOLA: If you need one from the
2 Yukon.
3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would prefer to
5 have a Yukon fisher on that working subcommittee.
6 Since we have Robert and if you would like -- if you
7 will agree to be primary, I would appreciate that. How
8 does the Council feel about -- we have another
9 nomination?
10
11 MR. HONEA: Oh, yeah, I'd like to
12 nominate Jenny as primary coming up from alternate.
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
15 discussion on Jenny being the primary other seat.
16 Robert is one primary seat on the working -- on the
17 subcommittee, Jenny being the second. Any other
18 further discussion.
19
20 Go ahead, Tim.
21
22 MR. GERVAIS: I just was second --
23 second the motion.....
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, second. Okay.
26
27 MR. GERVAIS:Don's motion to put
28 Jenny on as a primary.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
31 Jenny being our primary seat and Robert Walker is the
32 other, signify by saying aye.
33
34 IN UNISON: Aye.
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign.
37
38 (No opposing votes)
39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And we need a
41 nomination of an alternate. We have -- we're down to
42 one alternate. And so Ray was our alternate.
43
44 Eleanor.
45
46 MS. YATLIN: I'd like to nominate Don
47 for the alternate.
48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Accept nomination,
50 Don?

1 MR. HONEA: Yeah.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And Don has been
4 nominated.
5
6 MS. PELKOLA: Second.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded. Those in
9 favor of Don being the alternate for the Customary
10 Trade subcommittee signify by saying aye.
11
12 IN UNISON: Aye.
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
15 sign.
16
17 (No opposing votes)
18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And the
20 questionnaire language can be round filed or carried
21 along in your brief, however you want to you do it, but
22 it was just suggested language and so we need to move
23 on in this agenda.
24
25 Polly.
26
27 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
28 One other item -- and I don't want this generate a lot
29 of discussion. I just wanted to note a point of
30 clarification on -- there were several things said on
31 the record yesterday about what customary trade is and
32 it's -- you know, covers all fish species. But it's
33 important to remember that customary trade regulations
34 don't preempt laws regarding the processing and sale of
35 food. Those -- it's the position of the Federal
36 Subsistence Program that all foods sold for human
37 consumption must comply with food safety laws and
38 that's where that little disconnect comes in. So I
39 just want to make that clarification for the record. I
40 assure you we'll be talking about it a lot at the
41 Customary Trade Subgroup or subcommittee. So this is
42 an ongoing conversation.
43
44 But I just want to make that point of
45 clarification for the record, Mr. Chair.
46
47 Thank you.
48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks Polly. I
50 would like the -- one statement I would like to make to

1 the working group primaries is that, you know, I feel
2 that Joy's recommendation that, you know, asking the
3 tribes how these questions should be answered should
4 be, you know, brought out at that working group. And
5 -- so I think that was a very important point in our
6 discussion this morning.

7

8 And so we're moving down to the annual
9 report, and Donald has passed out the annual report.
10 It should be in front of you. And so these were action
11 items that our Council had developed last fall at our
12 McGrath meeting and as the -- has the Council reviewed
13 the -- this annual report.

14

15 I'm going to -- go ahead, Donald.

16

17 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. At
18 the McGrath meeting, the Council brought up annual
19 report issues and there were 16 issues and one
20 resubmittal from the annual report of 2009 that the
21 Council wanted to resubmit as a -- for the baseline
22 study for subsistence on Middle Yukon in Koyukuk River
23 villages. That's one resubmittal. And there were some
24 issues that I need some clarification on, on issue 1
25 and issue 5 and issue 15. So when you get a chance,
26 maybe you can make note of those and.....

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

29

30 MR. MIKE:get them to me and I'll
31 get those incorporated into the annual report.

32

33 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thanks
36 for that clarification, Donald. Issue one was in
37 regards to the Pittman Roberts funds. We found out at
38 their meeting that that -- this Council cannot address
39 that issue, so we'll strike issue one from this annual
40 report. Issue five I don't recall issue five.
41 Reallocation of OSM 809 funds from a State liaison to
42 support wildlife studies and.....

43

44 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, those were items
45 I took note of at our McGrath meeting and then.....

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

48

49 MR. MIKE:I reviewed our
50 transcripts and I couldn't find any reference to 809.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, I don't --
2 that might have been in the discussion, but I don't --
3 I'm not sure what this is about, how it.....

4
5 MR. COLLINS: Maybe what we're talking
6 about was just all research is.....

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

9
10 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I think
11 maybe that relates to the fact that all of the research
12 funds have been going into fisheries and there are no
13 wildlife studies being done and their issues are coming
14 up and so we wanted them to examine looking at having
15 some of that available for wildlife studies.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Right. That
18 is right.

19
20 MR. COLLINS: And that's all I think we
21 were saying that the fact that there's no funding for
22 wildlife studies and we need some to deal with some of
23 the issues.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. So it's
26 moving funding from fisheries toward the wildlife
27 studies.

28
29 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's right. I do
32 remember that now. Thanks for jogging my memory. And
33 so I do think that's an important issue and we should
34 retain issue five. Any other comments on the annual
35 report from the Council on these. There's climate
36 change, the chinook salmon population and abundance,
37 and various issues here that affect this region and
38 these annual reports go into the record to the Federal
39 Subsistence Board.

40
41 Go ahead, Ray.

42
43 MR. COLLINS: Well, I was thinking we
44 need to look at that title. I don't know if they need
45 to -- we'll tell them to take them from the State
46 studies to go to the wildlife. I think all we need to
47 say is that some of the 809 funds need to be directed
48 to wildlife studies.....

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

1 MR. COLLINS:because there is --
2 we need some information there. Let them decide, you
3 know, how.....
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Strike the three
6 words from State liaison.....
7
8 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:to support
11 wildlife studies? Okay. So is that clear to the
12 Council. Other issue five, it should read reallocate
13 OSM 809 funds to.....
14
15 MR. COLLINS: Some 809 funds.
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh. Some 809 funds
18 to support wildlife studies. Is that language clear to
19 the Council.
20
21 (Council nods affirmatively)
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other discussion
24 on the annual report.
25
26 Robert.
27
28 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead.
31
32 MR. MIKE: On issue eight on Donlin
33 Creek Mine barge traffic impacts on salmon habitat, the
34 Council, at it's McGrath meeting discussed to include
35 Yukon River impacts on salmon habitat and there was
36 some discussion about barges coming up the Yukon River
37 from the mouth of the Yukon River up to Holy Cross and
38 the Council requested that be included as part of this
39 issue in number eight.
40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.
42
43 MR. MIKE: And I inserted the language
44 including the Yukon River at the last paragraph.
45
46 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, I remember
49 that. That was an issue you had, Carl. These barging
50 and wake turbulence.

1 MR. MORGAN: That was some. But it
2 came Robert, I think.
3
4 REPORTER: Carl. Please.
5
6 MR. MORGAN: Yeah.
7
8 REPORTER: Uh.
9
10 MR. MORGAN: Yes, I'm sorry.
11
12 (Laughter)
13
14 MR. MIKE: It was part of the
15 discussion at McGrath, Member Walker brought that issue
16 up. There are some concerns about fuel barges up the
17 Yukon River.
18
19 Thank you.
20
21 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. The
22 main point I think is that one is baseline data is
23 needed now to determine how important it is that
24 habitat is to the use of salmon and is there any
25 difference between the timing. I don't think they have
26 baseline data about how the salmon are using that. Are
27 they all going out in the spring? Is it all summer
28 long that it's vital habitat and so on. I don't think
29 there's enough information in that area and that's the
30 one we felt should be answered because if they ask for
31 permitting, we can't respond to say how it's going to
32 impact salmon if there are no -- if we don't determine
33 now what the use of that habitat is.
34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.
36
37 MR. COLLINS: So that's -- that was the
38 main point of.....
39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.
41
42 MR. COLLINS: Yes.
43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Issue 12 is
45 redundant now. We inserted need for Yukon working
46 group on customary trade. Well, that's -- we just
47 covered that issue and so that is not -- no longer
48 needed in the annual report, so we should strike
49 issue 12 from the annual report.
50

1 MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.
4
5 MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair. Issue 15,
6 hatchery stock competition with wild salmon stocks on
7 the high seas, I would request we change that language
8 so it just says -- I think of high seas as being beyond
9 the 200 mile mark. So I would just say in the -- maybe
10 saltwater -- marine environment is good.
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good comment.
13 Strike high seas and insert marine environment. Other
14 than that, striking issue 1, clarify language in issue
15 5, striking issue 12, inserting marine environment in
16 issue 15 instead of high seas. Any other comments on
17 the annual report.
18
19 Motion to adopt the annual report.
20
21 MR. HONEA: So moved.
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion to adopt.
24
25 MR. GERVAIS: Second.
26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded.
28
29 MR. MORGAN: Question.
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's called.
32 Those in favor of the annual report as modified signify
33 by saying aye.
34
35 IN UNISON: Aye.
36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
38 sign.
39
40 (No opposing votes)
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so we're down to
43 Council charter review. Donald.
44
45 (Pause)
46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Page 33 in the book.
48
49 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This
50 is an opportunity where the Council will get a chance

1 to review their charter and the charter review happens
2 every five [sic] year and the Council have -- you know,
3 they can make comments or make recommendations to the
4 Secretary as far as duties of the Council, membership,
5 on vacancy and removal of members, elections of
6 officers.

7

8 Mr. Chairman, if the Council members
9 have any recommendations for -- to make changes to the
10 language, this is an opportunity for the Council to
11 provide those comments.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Donald.
16 Council comments on the charter. The charter's been
17 working well. It was modified slightly over the years,
18 but currently it's working well.

19

20 Robert.

21

22 MR. WALKER: Thank you. This new
23 change of composition to Federal Subsistence Board
24 going from our membership, number 9, it says from 10 to
25 12 now. We have to change that?

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. No. This is
28 our charter.

29

30 MR. WALKER: Our charter.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Our charter for the
33 Western Interior Council is comprised of ten. The
34 Federal Subsistence Board change is under a different
35 heading. Any discussion on the charter.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The charter looks
40 good to me. Those in favor -- a motion to adopt the
41 charter as written on Page 33 through 35 in the.....

42

43 MR. GERVAIS: So moved

44

45 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion to adopt the
48 charter as is currently in place.

49

50 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny.
2 Further discussion.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 MR. HONEA: Question.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's called.
9 Those in favor of maintaining the Western Interior
10 Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council's charter
11 signify by saying aye.
12
13 IN UNISON: aye.
14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
16 sign.
17
18 (No opposing votes)
19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so we're moving
21 down to wildlife closure review, and Chuck is going to
22 give a quick briefing on what that entails and there's
23 one review.
24
25 Go ahead, Chuck.
26
27 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. For the
28 record, my name's Chuck Ardizzone. Hopefully everybody
29 did their homework last night. On Page 36, there's a
30 briefing covering the closure reviews.
31
32 Basically we're directed by the Board
33 to review wildlife closures every three years on a
34 rotational basis and this year we have one to review
35 for this Council. The important factors are we want to
36 get the RAC's recommendations and feelings on our
37 recommendation on the closure and then since it's the
38 call for proposals, if someone in the RAC, the
39 audience, whoever wants to submit a proposal based on
40 this closure review, now's the time to do it.
41
42 On Page 37 is the policy that the Board
43 put together on closure reviews and on Page 41 is the
44 closure review we need to go over.
45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: At this point, has
47 the Council reviewed the closure review policy? I read
48 through the closure review and it's -- that's the
49 Federal Subsistence Board's policy on closures. So the
50 Council is clear with the closure review process.

1 (Council nods affirmatively)

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Chuck, on
4 the WCR10-39.

5

6 MR. ARDIZZONE: Okay. In the interest
7 of brevity, Mr. Chair, WC10-39 addresses a moose
8 hunting closure in part of Unit 19. That portion you
9 can see at the top of Page 41.

10

11 I won't read it, but it's basically a
12 moose closure in that area to all users. This closure
13 was established in 2007 based on conservation concerns
14 for the moose population in that area. Fish and Game's
15 management objectives for Unit 19A moose are to achieve
16 a population of 7,600 to 9,300 moose in Unit 19A, to
17 maintain a fall post-hunt cow -- or excuse me --
18 bull/cow ratio of 20 to 30 bulls per 100 cows and to
19 maintain a cow/calf ratio of 30 to 40 calves per 100
20 cows.

21

22 In 2007, composition counts indicated
23 that there were 35 bulls per 100 cows and 45 calves per
24 100 cows which are within the management objectives.
25 However, the most current population estimate done in
26 2008 for the affected area of Unit 19 is there's only
27 1,225 to 2,181 moose in that area, which is a density
28 of .44 moose per square mile. This is an increase from
29 2005 when the density was only 2.8 -- or excuse me --
30 .28 moose per square mile. However, the population
31 needs to reach approximately .75 to .93 moose per
32 square mile to meet the population objective which is
33 -- you know, that's 7,000 to 9,000 moose range.

34

35 So therefore the OSM preliminary
36 conclusion is to maintain the closure.

37

38 This moose population exists at a very
39 low density in this area and we consider it premature
40 to open the season to hunting at this time.

41

42 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Chuck. The
45 moose population is recovering and in the progress of
46 recovering and I would point out to the Council that
47 the 35 bulls per hundred cows is why that moose finding
48 -- it came back up to where it has a breeding component
49 again after going down to eight bulls per hundred cows.
50 And so the moose population is in recovery, but we're

1 still on subsistence restrictions and anytime there's
2 significant subsistence restrictions I'm reluctant to
3 -- I'm in favor of maintaining the closure until those
4 -- until that moose population achieves its -- what
5 would be considered healthy. And then I would be very
6 concerned about going back into a full-on hunt on that.
7 I feel that there should be -- Alaska Department of
8 Federal -- correction -- Board of Game if this was
9 released should be cautionary on too much hunting
10 pressure exerted against the moose population too soon.
11 So I'd be concerned about regulations that would expand
12 too rapidly. That's -- Aniak is right in the middle of
13 that moose population and there's heavy, intensive air
14 taxi use and various user groups that can access --
15 easily access that in competition with local people for
16 a relatively high human population there.

17

18 And so I'm in favor of maintaining the
19 closure of Council discussion.

20

21 Carl.

22

23 MR. MORGAN: Yeah. I'm in favor of
24 that too because we're -- it's from the George River --
25 on the east side of the George River from there all the
26 way up the Swift River. Both sides of the river is
27 closed, both State and Federal, and the west side of
28 the George River on down to Lower Kalskag, it's a
29 permit hunt only and there's only so many permits they
30 can give and once you give that -- but it's a permit
31 hunt only. And I'm in favor. Where generally villages
32 along that -- along the river are in favor of that
33 because we realize we need to rebuild and we've got a
34 serious problem on moose.

35

36 So I'm in favor of this closure.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Carl.

39 Input. Further discussion.

40

41 Ray.

42

43 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, is predator
44 control going on to get -- try to boost up the calf
45 survival rate or not? Is that part of the recovery
46 plan?

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, there is a
49 predator control project there. Do you have comments,
50 George.

1 MR. PAPPAS: Yes. The Department does
2 support this closure. The population does not have a
3 harvestable surplus at this time.

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. And so
6 just an off-the-cuff question here is what kind of --
7 how many wolves are being taken in the predator control
8 project in that?

9
10 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, I'm not
11 aware of how many wolves are being taken and I don't
12 know if there's a Fish and Game biologist here that can
13 speak to that question.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I just -- you know,
16 Ray brought up this predator control, and so -- good.
17 Fine. Further discussion.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does -- a motion to
22 maintain the closure on the 19A moose population or
23 those in favor in WCR10-39, maintenance of the closure
24 in Unit 19A.

25
26
27 MS. PELKOLA: So move.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion -- I need a
30 motion to adopt.

31
32 MS. PELKOLA: Yes. I just moved to
33 adopt.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Move to adopt.
36 Those -- a second.

37
38 MR. HONEA: Second.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Further discussion.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
45 maintaining the closure in 19A signify by saying aye.

46
47 IN UNISON: Aye.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
50 sign.

1 (No opposing votes)
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Hearing none, the
4 closure is maintained by the Western Interior Council.
5
6 MR. ARDIZZONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks Chuck.
9
10 MR. GERVAIS: Wait. I had a question.
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, you got a
13 question?
14
15 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
16 I'm not so familiar with the wildlife closure process,
17 so could -- you or Chuck could give me some guidance
18 here about -- whereas we have this -- the Yukon king
19 population at half or less than half, it's historic
20 levels. We have missed that spawning escapement goal
21 for three of the past four years. Would it be possible
22 under this mechanism to limit the amount of time that
23 the drag fleet can be in the Bering Sea to six months
24 or less per year where they're -- at this time they're
25 out there for ten months?
26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: As far as I know, we
28 don't -- Western Interior's advisory and the Federal
29 Subsistence Board doesn't have extraterritorial
30 authority. That falls under the North Pacific
31 Fisheries Management Council.
32
33 MR. GERVAIS: Okay.
34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That'd be nice.
36
37 (Laughter)
38
39 MR. GERVAIS: I just saw the Federal
40 lands and waters in Alaska and I didn't know where they
41 stop, Alaska.
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's delineated by
44 the waters associated to Federal conservation units and
45 how three -- is it three miles or -- a short distance
46 offshore -- not too far offshore. And so now we don't
47 -- we can't close down the Bering Sea trawl fishery.
48 We'd like to, but -- so be it. Any other -- that
49 suffice for your answer?
50

1 MR. GERVAIS: (Nods affirmatively)

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks.

4 Chuck.

5

6 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, would you
7 like me to sit here. If there's any proposals, I can
8 take some notes.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. We're moving
11 into the call for proposals for the Federal subsistence
12 wildlife regulations and there's one -- this action
13 item on the customary and traditional use determination
14 for 21E and there hasn't been a working group. At this
15 time, I would like to talk about that working group.
16 First off, Polly, with the Council, the status of
17 Robert and various 21E people commented to the Federal
18 Subsistence Board last May on this -- the need to have
19 a working group to develop comments on the C&T
20 determination for residents of 19A.

21

22 Go ahead, Polly.

23

24 DR. WHEELER: Well, Mr. Chair, you're
25 correct. At the May 2010 Board meeting, the Board
26 deferred that specific proposal which that proposal was
27 to add residents of Unit 19 to the customary and
28 traditional use determination for moose in 21E and
29 there was a contingent of people from the GASH area
30 that came in and asked that that proposal be deferred
31 and put to a working group so the working group could
32 hash out some of the issues because there was some --
33 they were looking at maybe a portion of 21E, not the
34 whole unit. There hasn't been -- the work group has
35 not gotten together. My recommendation would be that
36 you consider having a -- adding a day to the fall
37 meeting because keep in mind the proposal is still on
38 the table, so that proposal can be acted upon by the
39 work group.

40

41 So rather than set up a separate
42 meeting, it might be a good use of everybody's time to
43 add a day to that meeting, preferably at the beginning
44 of the meeting so that then the other members could
45 come in and figure out a way to address that issue.
46 That's one thought.

47

48 I mean we could do a separate meeting,
49 but there's a lot of meetings that are starting to
50 materialize and so it may be, you know, day, day and a

1 half, something like that. Might be worth considering.

2

3 Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Polly. That
6 was basically my suggestion that the Federal
7 Subsistence Board have the working group meeting
8 immediately preceding the RAC meeting and I'm always
9 ahead of myself. I thought maybe that could happen
10 last fall in McGrath in a neutral zone, but at this
11 point, we will be working on wildlife proposals in
12 Aniak is our meeting for this next cycle. And so we --
13 I feel that we should have the working group. The
14 Council will be there. The working group
15 representations from all of the communities -- affected
16 communities would be invited -- a representative from
17 each community and the Advisory Committees -- local
18 Advisory Committees is what I would like to have seen
19 at that working group. And then discuss this whole
20 customary traditional use determination for 19A.

21

22 And so does that sound like a good plan
23 to the Council?

24

25 Carl.

26

27 MR. MORGAN: I agree.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And any other
30 comments from the Council on that 19A working group C&T
31 one day prior before the RAC meeting.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You got a comment,
36 Donald.

37

38 MR. MIKE: Yes, Mr. Chair. Thank you.
39 As far as the working group coming up in Aniak, if the
40 Council can provide me a list of who's all going to be
41 participating, that way I can prepare a correspondence
42 and just notify the villages or those that are
43 affected.

44

45 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There would be the
48 GASH communities, correct, there are four
49 communities.....

50

1 MR. WALKER: Yep.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:that would be
4 invited. It'd be the communities that are slated to be
5 -- have the customary and traditional use determination
6 would be the other communities in 19A. It'd be the
7 Advisory Committee chair for the GASH and be the --
8 what do they call that Middle Kuskokwim or -- that
9 Advisory Committee at Aniak, Central. Central
10 Kuskokwim Advisory Committee chair and then the Western
11 Interior Regional Advisory Council. But possibly, what
12 would OSM think about representation from YK-Delta.
13 Didn't they have input on this issue, or do you feel
14 that they should have representation on this working
15 group?
16
17 DR. WHEELER: Well, the 21E moose C&T
18 includes the GASH area villages and then Russian
19 Mission. So -- and Russian Mission is actually covered
20 by the YK RAC. So we'll figure that out. We'll let
21 them know and they'll probably have to meet by
22 teleconference to select a representative.
23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.
25
26 DR. WHEELER: But we can do it.
27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't want to
29 preclude another Council from entering into the
30 process. I want it to be an open process. And so does
31 the Council feel comfortable with a YK-Delta
32 representative at the working group?
33
34 (No comments)
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Further discussion
37 on the working group. Do you have a comment, Robert?
38
39 MR. WALKER: No, Mr. Chair. Last time
40 we met, I think it was Bobby Aloysius was there.
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh, yeah. So
43 further discussion.
44
45 MR. MORGAN: Just for your information
46 Kalskag and Upper Kalskag are under the Yukon-
47 Kuskokwim.
48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Right.
50 So at this time, does the Council feel comfortable with

1 a meeting -- one-day meeting prior to the RAC meeting
2 in Aniak with the representatives that we discussed on
3 the record. Any further discussion.

4
5 (Council nods affirmatively)

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We need a motion to
8 adopt that working group meeting date and
9 representation.

10
11 MR. HONEA: I so move to that effect.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Got a move. Got a
14 second.

15
16 MR. COLLINS: I'll second it.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray has second.
19 Further discussion.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
24 the motion signify by saying aye.

25
26 IN UNISON: Aye.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign.

29
30 (No opposing votes)

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so -- okay. We
33 got an extra day of work this fall. And so at this
34 time, we're in call for proposals for Federal
35 subsistence wildlife regulations.

36
37 I personally don't have any proposals.
38 Does Council members have any proposals that they would
39 like to see submitted from the Western Interior
40 Regional Advisory Council.

41
42 Go ahead, Ray, you got one.

43
44 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chair. In
45 relation to this closure there, the thing that turned
46 the population around in McGrath was getting higher
47 calf survival and they used a number of things. We
48 liberalized the bear season, took off the requirement
49 for tags on grizzly bear, liberalized the black bear
50 harvest and encouraged more harvest. Are measures like

1 that in place in this area? In other words, is there
2 any proposals that would enhance and encourage people
3 to be taking more black bears and others that may be
4 preying on the calves out there, that would be the
5 question. It may be in the plan already. I don't
6 know.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I think there was
9 significant liberalization by the Board of Game on bear
10 harvest down there and so I don't know that there could
11 be a whole lot more done for that area. They got an
12 August 10 to June 30th brown bear season down there
13 and.....

14

15 MR. COLLINS: Was the fee waived on the
16 requirement for a tag?

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Department.....

19

20 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe it
21 is as long as you're a subsistence hunter not sports.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Yeah.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so I think that
26 there's not a whole lot more they can do. They have an
27 intensive management program going there. They have,
28 you know, really liberalized harvest of bears and so I
29 personally don't have any Federal proposals does any
30 Council members have proposals they would like to
31 submit to the Federal Subsistence Board from the
32 Western Interior?

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim.

37

38 MR. GERVAIS: No.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You seem to be
41 thinking about something there. At this time -- at any
42 time, Council members, if they go home and an issue
43 arises, when is the closing date of the Federal
44 subsistence call?

45

46 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, I believe
47 it's 24 March.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 24th of March.

50 Between now and the 24th of March, you can send a rough

1 draft proposal to OSM and in our fall meeting, we can
2 review that proposal and can we put our name on that
3 proposal? If a RAC member makes the proposal, can we
4 put our name onto that proposal? I'm not sure about
5 that.

6

7 MR. ARDIZZONE: I think if it comes in
8 before the 24th and has someone's name on it, that's
9 whose name going to stay on it.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So -- but we
12 will deliberate the proposal and so if any RAC member
13 thinks of a proposal, a Federal proposal and would like
14 to submit that on the run, we will entertain that
15 proposal at our meeting. I don't have any myself. And
16 so is the Council comfortable with moving along in the
17 agenda?

18

19 (Council nods affirmatively)

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we don't have any
22 proposals this year ironically. Probably the first
23 time this Council's not actually submitted a proposal.

24

25 We're moving in -- under -- I inserted
26 agenda Item B, State call for proposals, and I also
27 want to go over State Proposals 222 and 223 and so we
28 have the area biologist Glenn Stouts here and so I'll
29 have him come to the mic. And 222 and 223 will be
30 heard by the Board of Game imminently in March and I'm
31 not sure about exactly the date that the -- and.....

32

33 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, just by your
34 reference.....

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:in our packet,
37 we have -- let's see, where is that one. We have it in
38 our packet here. 222 and 223 is -- go ahead, Donald.

39

40 MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair, in your package,
41 just by your Western Interior Regional Advisory Council
42 dash 04, those are the two State Proposals, 222 and
43 223, and if you turn the page over, there's comments
44 from the Western Interior Advisory Council.

45

46 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47

48 MR. REAKOFF: I wrote some preliminary
49 comments on these proposals, just draft language, but
50 then I'll have Glenn kind of go over these two

1 proposals because they're very important proposals that
2 affect how the moose hunting is executed in this type
3 of controlled use area, in 21 and other units -- 21B,
4 21D, and 24D. And so these are very important
5 proposals. These Proposals 222 and 223 were
6 promulgated or proposed by the Board of Game and so I'm
7 concerned about these.

8

9 Go ahead, Glenn.

10

11 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
12 Glenn Stout with Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

13

14 I've got a slide show here when I can
15 just go over briefly the presentation that I'm going to
16 be making at the Board of Game meeting here probably at
17 the end of next week and just to cover some of the
18 information, what the Board.....

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What's the date of
21 the Board meeting?

22

23 MR. STOUT: It starts on I think the
24 3rd or 4th and we expect this proposal to come up on
25 either the 9th or the 10th for consideration. It'll be
26 part of the Interior proposals that they're going to
27 review that proposal and so. Just so you know, as far
28 as the two proposals, Proposal 222 deals with proxy --
29 destruction of -- or nullification of the antlers on
30 proxy hunts. In a certain way, that doesn't really
31 apply to us because Galena Management Area has a
32 special regulation and the way it reads for the Galena
33 Management Area any of the 21B, C, D, or 24 hunts,
34 actually drawing permit hunters are precluded from
35 proxy hunting on those drawing hunts. So having that
36 additional nullification on those is a little bit moot
37 for us in that area, but it does apply to certain other
38 areas on that hunt and, you know, you could always
39 imagine that we could lose that regulation and so it
40 would basically be a fall back on the effectiveness of
41 those drawing hunts.

42

43 223, what it is, is it's a proposal to
44 review the discretionary permit hunt conditions that
45 apply to any of the permit hunts that we have and that
46 would be like tier hunts, drawing hunts, or
47 registration hunts. And in codified, what it is is
48 there's several different discretionary authorities
49 that the Department has and basically what that means
50 is the Department can decide to use those. The Board

1 has authorized them. We may choose or choose not to
2 apply them to any one of those drawing or registration
3 permits that we have.

4
5 Typically, the process that we go
6 through is we don't just implement it without going to
7 the Board of Game and in fact that's exactly what we
8 did with the registration permit hunts in this area.
9 The RM832 and the RM834 permits are where we have the
10 antler destruction discretionary authority right now in
11 place. In all the cases where we changed or
12 implemented that antler destruction, we put it through
13 the full public process. We went to the Advisory
14 Committees. We came to the working group and talked
15 about it when we had the moose hunters working group
16 and we also came to the RAC and talked about that and
17 then we went to the Board of Game and said okay, we're
18 going to apply this hunt and here's this application of
19 this nullification that we're going to apply here.

20
21 And for instance, we went from where
22 originally in the RM832 permit hunt area -- and I'd
23 better -- I'm starting to talk to my slides here. I'll
24 pull that up real quick. Okay. So in the case of the
25 RM832 permit which we have in the Koyukuk Controlled
26 Use Area, that was first implemented in 1996 and the
27 application at that time was where you cut below the
28 burr on the antler and then the hunter was allowed to
29 keep the antler. In 2000 after a lot of discussions
30 Koyukuk moose hunters working group, we changed that to
31 where we cut through the middle of the palm. The
32 hunter was still allowed at that time to keep the upper
33 half of the antler.

34
35 We saw some people basically
36 circumventing the rule and they were still hunting and
37 prioritizing antlers as part of the hunt in that case
38 and we wanted disincentive. We wanted to discourage
39 hunters that were putting that as a priority. So we
40 stepped up the disincentive in 2002 and we required
41 those hunters to forfeit that upper half of the antler.

42
43 In 2004 then, a proposal was made to
44 expand the registration permit hunt area and it was for
45 several different reasons. First of all, we had
46 concentration of hunters on the primary river
47 corridors. Our bull/cow ratios were declining in the
48 river corridors, yet we were still supporting high
49 bull/cow ratios outside the corridor, so we want to get
50 better distribution of hunters. And so we had to

1 create a disincentive within the corridors and so we
2 implemented the RM834 permit in 2004 and like over in
3 21B, the downriver portion of 21B and then around the
4 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area and all of 21D and part of
5 the reason was because when we implemented those strict
6 regulations within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, it
7 started deflecting that. It worked. It was a
8 disincentive and it deflected a lot of those hunters
9 outside the area and we started seeing some of the same
10 problems that we had in the controlled use area
11 spreading out. So we wanted to kind of manage the
12 problem for the whole game management unit.

13

14 Now, we can show that it was pretty
15 effective and I'll just show you real quick here some
16 of the slides. I'm not going to give you the whole
17 presentation, but basically when we first implemented
18 it and through the '90s, we had a steadily increasing
19 harvest of moose going on until 1999. That was the
20 last year that we quit cutting below the burr and
21 really all the measures we had implemented at that
22 point weren't very effective at controlling the number
23 of hunters and the moose coming into the area. And
24 what you can see in this slide, the green part of the
25 bar is how many moose were harvested on the green
26 harvest ticket. And in the Koyukuk Controlled Use
27 Area, we had two registration permits at the time. We
28 had the RM830 permit which is the black part and the
29 RM832 permit which is this gray one.

30

31 And if you remember, the way that RM830
32 permit worked at the time was we had a cap of 200
33 hunters that were allowed and those guys didn't have to
34 cut the antlers on the RM830 permit. The reality is it
35 never really worked because there seemed to be some
36 threshold right around 200. It just happened -- and
37 we'd always have a bunch of hunters. As soon as, you
38 know, we got pretty close to 200, usually five, ten
39 hunters would come out and so five or ten more could go
40 back in. And so it really never helped reduce the
41 harvest in the area.

42

43 So that's when we got rid of the RM830
44 permit and we went to the drawing harvest and right
45 away we had a pretty dramatic decrease in the number of
46 moose harvested in this case and it was also the number
47 of hunters obviously. And then you can see the change
48 here in 2004 then when we went to the further expansion
49 of that RM834 area and where our harvest came down
50 there.

1 In 2010, you can see the total harvest,
2 the drawing permit hunt, and then this little bit of
3 green harvest that's left over now. Basically that
4 isn't under that authority. That ends up being about
5 -- I think it's about 125, 130 moose were harvested
6 last year out of 450 some moose. What it ends up being
7 is it's about a 25 percent-75 percent ratio of hunters
8 that didn't have to cut their antlers versus hunters
9 that did. And I -- I don't know, just kind of my gut
10 feeling is is that's a pretty reasonable ratio to
11 expect in an area where we actually are try -- part of
12 the moose hunters working group, we try to maintain
13 opportunity for subsistence users first but also for
14 other use in the area, people that would put a higher
15 priority on the antlers, say, or at least that was an
16 important part of the hunt at the end there. It wasn't
17 exclusive of course, but it was an important part of
18 their hunt.

19
20 And that seems to have reached a pretty
21 good level. I think that's working for us now. We've
22 stabilized the harvest. In fact you can see there's a
23 little bit of an increase the last several years as
24 we've managed this situation and we've improved our
25 bull/cow ratios and got a better distribution of
26 hunters. Our harvest is actually -- we're allowing it
27 to come up a little bit because we've built our
28 bull/cow ratios up. So it's been pretty effective in
29 that way. I'll go through a lot of these.

30
31 One of the really important things to
32 understand about this and why this works as a
33 disincentive is to appreciate the demand for the area
34 and this is the number of permits that are issued.
35 It's -- it doesn't even include the number of permits
36 that people are applying for draw permits, but you can
37 see just the number of permits issued were up around
38 1,800 hunters in the area. So the potential number of
39 hunters that could come into this area where we have
40 this RM834 or 832 permits is very high. In fact it
41 would exceed our sustainable yield in this population.

42
43 So understanding that that's a really
44 important part of this issue is the demand for this
45 area. It's high notoriety. That's pretty key to this
46 issue. There are several different other aspects
47 besides just antler cutting that we have to consider
48 when we're talking about -- this is a total package if
49 you will for this program. We closed cow seasons. We
50 have in the key bottlenecked areas, we have check

1 stations at the Koyukuk and Nowitna. We've also -- at
2 that time we implemented the meat on the bone or the
3 four quarters and the ribs. We had at one point
4 salvaged the entire head in the Koyukuk Controlled Use
5 Area. That was repealed in 2010.

6
7 We have the 13 drawing permit areas
8 which obviously offer some choice. They offer some
9 opportunity for hunters if they don't want to cut their
10 antlers. We have the resident and nonresident locking
11 tags and that was a measure that we implemented and I
12 would call it fine tuning measure to make sure that
13 hunters weren't hydrating their moose or they weren't
14 bootlegging moose out of the area. We called it
15 bootlegging because what we had seen at the early point
16 in that process where it became a good incentive is
17 they would go into a general harvest ticket area, hunt
18 on their general harvest ticket supposedly. Then they
19 would go in like near the Gisasa, near the Koyukuk
20 Controlled Use Area. They would go hunt in the
21 controlled use area, take their moose in where -- an
22 area where they should have been cutting the antlers
23 but then reported on their green harvest ticket and
24 that was another reason to expand the area.

25
26 We also had -- drawing permit hunters
27 are not eligible for the two subsistence permits.
28 That's part of the package that we have now and it was
29 talked about yesterday. We had the split seasons
30 within the controlled use area, an early ten-day hunt,
31 a late ten-day hunt, and then no proxy hunting on the
32 drawing permits which goes to what I talked about
33 earlier.

34
35 Now as far as the effectiveness, one of
36 the key things to see is that we've been increasing our
37 fall harvest in our local villages and that's been
38 going up very steadily since 2000 when we implemented
39 it. And that was a key component of our program was if
40 we felt if we can improve the fall harvest by our local
41 residents, it would put less need for those winter
42 hunts and the reason we wanted to decrease the demand
43 for those winter hunts by our local residents is
44 because we knew if we had a winter hunt, the bulls
45 would shed their antlers and we were seeing about 60 to
46 65 percent of the harvest was in the way of cows. So
47 we wanted to reduce that dependency on those winter
48 hunts. We did that. It's been very effective and I
49 heard at least three different members talk about it
50 yesterday where things were going pretty good in the

1 fall hunts and I think that's a testimony to where this
2 program has been working really well in that regard.

3

4 So we're addressing the human need and
5 then at the same time we're addressing the bull/cow
6 ratio issue that we were seeing -- the example, just
7 because the long-term data set there on Three Day
8 Slough, you can see that through the '80s and '90s, our
9 bull/cow ratios were steadily declining, bottomed out
10 in 2000. That's when we implemented the strict cutting
11 on the antlers and since that time, we've been building
12 up to where our management objective is 30 bulls per
13 hundred cows within the controlled use area. This is
14 one -- just one trend area within the controlled use
15 area. If we add all the controlled use area together,
16 we get -- for just the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area,
17 what I do is I add the five primary trend count areas
18 that are done in that area and you can see the last
19 four years, the bull/cow ratio has been above our 30
20 bulls per hundred cow objectives. This year was -- you
21 know, just like 30.5 or something like that, just above
22 it. But anyway, it's been effective at meeting our
23 objectives and we're able to issue just the right
24 number of permits. We haven't had to restrict any of
25 the subsistence or registration permit hunt but provide
26 just enough drawing permit opportunity for guys that
27 don't want to cut their antlers.

28

29 This was also the case since we
30 implemented in 2004, as I said, on the RM834 permit.
31 In the Nowitna Mouth trend count area, we were seeing
32 bull/cow ratios as low as 10 to 12 bulls per hundred
33 cows. They had gotten very low over on the Nowitna,
34 but since that time, this last year we're up nearly 25
35 bulls per hundred cows. That feeds right into that
36 mechanism we were talking about. If there's more bulls
37 out there in those high areas where locals are using
38 the river corridors, that means their success rate's
39 going to be better in the fall. So it really helps our
40 local hunters to improve their fall success rate and
41 you go up a little bit further up at the Novi-Slatna
42 trend count area and in fact there are over 30 bulls
43 per hundred cows this year and you can see since it was
44 implemented in 2004, it's been going up. If you add
45 those two together, it's going up.

46

47 One thing just to demonstrate the
48 effective of this proposal in terms of hunting, there
49 are the check station, we've seen about a 30 percent
50 reduction in the total number of hunters -- or total

1 number of moose that are taken out there at the check
2 station and this is -- basically the check station is
3 checking the moose that are coming out of the Nowitna
4 River corridor. It's not these fly-in hunters. So we
5 reduced the harvest on the Nowitna corridor by 30
6 percent and that's just this area, basically this five
7 miles either side of the corridor because there's
8 really not much boat traffic access off this five miles
9 if you're on the lower Nowitna corridor.

10

11 But if you look at 21B total, because
12 we've deflected those hunters out and we've got a
13 better distribution of the hunters, our total 21B
14 harvest has actually stayed just right about the same.
15 We're shooting about the same number of bulls, but
16 we're just taking them out of a different component or
17 a different area in 21B where we had bull/cow ratios,
18 you know, somewhere around 45, 50 bulls per hundred
19 cows away from the corridor. So it's just really a
20 better management of the distribution of hunters and we
21 had the resources out there all along. We were just
22 kind of mining them out of the areas where hunters are
23 -- particularly local hunters are kind of stuck
24 hunting. They don't have planes. They have boats. We
25 wanted to make it a better situation for our local
26 hunters and I think it's worked pretty effectively.

27

28 So in summary, we've reduced the
29 harvest on the river corridors. We've improved the
30 hunter distribution. We've improved our bull/cow
31 ratios especially within the corridors. Our fall
32 harvest is improved for local hunters. We've reduced
33 the demand of local hunters for those winter harvests.
34 Therefore fewer cows are harvested. This is feeded
35 into another one of our management objectives, not just
36 having bull/cow ratios, but to have more moose. If we
37 reduce the harvest of cows, that will help in our
38 reproductive component of the population obviously.
39 The population is stabilized. The harvest opportunity
40 is increasing within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area
41 because our bull/cow ratios have actually been going up
42 and we still provide a choice for resident hunters.
43 We've maintained opportunity for all resident hunters
44 because as you know, under State regulations, a State
45 managed hunt, all State residents qualify for that
46 subsistence permit. But they've got a choice. You
47 know, they aren't totally thrown out as far as guys
48 that want to keep the antlers and also we've seen a
49 reduction in the illegal guiding and that was another
50 big concern during the Koyukuk moose management working

1 group.

2

3 Because we've implemented this drawing
4 permit, we really don't have to worry about guiding as
5 an issue anymore in the controlled use area because
6 it's just like Jack pointed out yesterday, we control
7 the number of permits and if you control the number of
8 permits, you really don't have to worry about how the
9 hunters are getting in there. If they don't have a
10 permit, they can't hunt in there. It doesn't matter if
11 they want to be guided or unguided. We control the
12 permits, so I think that's been a really effective
13 aspect of it. So anyway, that's all there is on this
14 proposal and that's Proposal No. 223 on the State side.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Glenn. That
17 was a very good presentation. Does the Council have
18 questions on Glenn's presentation.

19

20 Don.

21

22 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23 Glenn, I guess actually this is just a proposal to
24 review the thing, but the original intent I believe,
25 wasn't it, to try to get the numbers down, to keep it
26 -- to destroy the trophy and to kind of make it -- and
27 you brought the number of hunters down and stuff like
28 that and so you got the bull and the -- the bull to cow
29 ratio up and everything. I mean I'm just looking at
30 justification why is the -- why bring this back up
31 when, you know, the numbers are good now. I mean is
32 that justification to initiate this?

33

34 MR. STOUT: Yeah. Through the Chair.
35 Mr. Honea, the proposal was submitted by the Board of
36 Game and the Board of Game operates differently than
37 the Department of Fish and Game. They're the ones that
38 promulgate the regulations and we make recommendations
39 based on that. So they wanted a review that for all
40 statewide trophy destruction. There are several
41 different other hunts that this applies to; for
42 instance, that discretionary authority applies to the
43 Northwest Brown Bear Management Area where we've had
44 that RB601 hunt where if you shot under that
45 subsistence permit, you'd have to cut the claws and the
46 head off the hide if you took it outside the area.

47

48 It also applies to the Seward Peninsula
49 muskox hunt where if you take a muskox skull off the
50 Seward Peninsula area, you would have to cut through

1 one of the horns on that. So it's a general regulation
2 that applies statewide if the Department wants to apply
3 that and the way that the proposal has been presented
4 that they want to review that basically to eliminate
5 that. The Board of Game wants to eliminate it and so
6 this proposal -- or this presentation that I gave here
7 today is basically the presentation that I'll make to
8 the Board of Game to try and convince them we still
9 need this. We still need this.

10

11 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Glenn. I guess
12 so actually it's not coming from local. I mean there's
13 -- so part of this, it's maybe coming through -- to the
14 Board from the urban areas.

15

16 MR. STOUT: It's actually coming from
17 the Board itself. The Board itself made this proposal
18 and I took this proposal -- I talked to Advisory
19 Committees about this. I went to the Koyukuk River AC,
20 the Middle Yukon AC. We went to the Tanana Rampart
21 Manley AC, and I went to the Fairbanks Advisory
22 Committee. At this point, all four Advisory Committees
23 have voted to oppose the proposal and I think it speaks
24 a lot to demonstrate that even Fairbanks Advisory
25 Committee recognized the value of this antler cutting
26 as a tool that we want to keep in the Department's
27 toolbox. It's really valuable. It's always -- it's
28 obviously worked. Let's just not get rid of the tool.
29 It's tough enough to manage things as it is. Why get
30 rid of another tool.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Glenn.
33 Other questions. Tim.

34

35 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair,
36 Glenn. First of all, I'd like to congratulate you for
37 a really high rate of success on your management
38 strategies. I know our community appreciates it quite
39 a bit, moose being one of the main pillars of our
40 subsistence economy.

41

42 I had a question. When you -- back one
43 slide, you talked about estimated harvest. How do you
44 calculate estimated unreported?

45

46 MR. STOUT: That number there I get
47 from the subsistence door-to-door surveys. I use that
48 as one aspect of it. Basically back in the end of the
49 '90s, early 2000s, they did door-to-door household
50 surveys and there was a pretty consistent

1 underreporting rate of what we got back from the
2 statewide harvest tickets -- those mechanisms versus
3 what -- the data that they got when they did the
4 household surveys. And that differential is what I add
5 in there. In this case, it ends up being about 25
6 moose.

7
8 And so that 25 is a constant that
9 across all those. So if you just took out that data
10 and just eliminated 25 across the board and the
11 reported harvest would be somewhere around 75, 80
12 moose. And so there's additional -- it's a constant
13 that I add in there of about 25 moose.

14
15 MR. GERVAIS: All right. Thank you
16 very much.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Glenn.
19 Eleanor.

20
21 MS. YATLIN: I just wanted to state
22 that the time for like other people to comment or the
23 member for Huslia Tribal Council.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I will get to
26 comments. I was letting the Council.....

27
28 MS. YATLIN: Okay.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:ask questions
31 of Glenn's presentation at this time.

32
33 MS. YATLIN: Well, actually my question
34 was pretty much the same as Don's, so I got that
35 answered.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any other
38 questions from the Council on the presentation.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, I would
43 like to let the public comment on the proposal also and
44 so -- and we'll move into that other part of your
45 presentation after that. We'll deliberate this
46 proposal first.

47
48 And so I got Fred wanted to talk about
49 antler destruction. You want to talk about this antler
50 destruction issue. I see you got on your green sheet

1 here. You want to talk about that.

2

3 MR. F. HUNTINGTON: Thank you, Mr.
4 Chair. Before I start off, my name is Fred Huntington.
5 I'm a Galena resident and hunter for the last umpteen
6 years. I grew up in this area and I understand what
7 Glenn is saying.

8

9 I'm on the Middle Yukon Advisory
10 Council and we discussed the issues of destruction of
11 antlers. You know, when they first implemented it a
12 few years ago, we had an influx of hunters up the
13 Koyukuk River by large numbers from out of the State
14 and the rest of the State on the road system. They
15 come down by boats, 3- or 400 boats per season go the
16 Koyukuk River. So right away our moose population was
17 in decline and in jeopardy of some of the families in
18 the villages not able to harvest their moose in the
19 fall time.

20

21 Well, we had the winter hunt and that
22 put a lot of pressure on the winter hunt. More people
23 were -- you know, maybe half of the local hunters were
24 going out and harvesting moose during the winter and
25 mostly cow moose. It was a choice -- antlerless moose
26 and, you know, a guy like me that's been used to
27 hunting moose in the wintertime knows which is a cow
28 moose and a bull moose regardless of the antlers.

29

30 So when the -- we started cutting back
31 on the winter hunt, we needed to have reasons to
32 initiate cutting back on the winter hunt. And so
33 through management of Glenn Stout, decided to get with
34 the working group to do the antler cutting to
35 discourage trophy hunters. And since that's been
36 applied, our moose population stabilized, but they also
37 got larger over the last three years where the average
38 moose antlers taken are a little bit larger than they
39 were three years ago. Maybe three years ago, we were
40 taking, you know, in the 20s and 30-inch racks.
41 Recently we've been taking them in the 50.

42

43 And so what Glenn is absolutely saying,
44 from my point of view, I truly support destruction of
45 antlers and recommend to the Board that they do the
46 same.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Fred.
49 Appreciate that. Darrell, want to come up and talk to
50 the Council on the antler nullification issue.

1 MR. VENT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This
2 proposal was brought up before a Fish and Game meeting
3 there in Huslia and there was a lot of discussion on
4 it. I think that some things that we have to consider
5 through the discussion was, you know, the increase in
6 size of our village. Our population is increasing and
7 those things weren't discussed and the predation is
8 increasing. So, you know, we have to -- our studies
9 will have to be considered some more. They have to
10 study -- see, you know, if we can support any more
11 hunting. Plus also we have more guided hunters coming
12 i down on the Dalbi River area. I don't know how
13 that's considered into it. I don't have no numbers on
14 that. I see some people from Kaltag that's coming up
15 and guiding hunting in our area. I don't know whether
16 they have a decrease in moose down there. That was
17 some of the discussions that we had.

18
19 You know, so the increase's all over,
20 whether it's going to take effect, you know, whether
21 we'll reach a limit and it's going to be going down or
22 maybe the studies have to be continued. You know,
23 people discuss that in our village and I come here to
24 bring -- you know, present you with these things. And
25 I support Glenn on opposing the -- to keep the
26 destruction of antlers.

27
28 And let's see. You know, the cost in
29 our villages is increasing for gas, for food, and we
30 have to, you know, depend -- with the increase in our
31 population, we have to depend more on doing some of the
32 winter hunt to support our families. And, you know,
33 the population is not decreasing in our villages, so I
34 imagine that we're going to have to try to, you know,
35 request for increase on the spring hunt instead of the
36 fall hunt because it stabilized our economy because of
37 inflation.

38
39 So those are some of the considerations
40 that were brought up by the people in the village.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for your
43 comments, Darrell. Does Council have any questions of
44 Darrell on that.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Bringing these
49 bull/cow ratios back up to good levels helps everybody,
50 the subsistence users and everybody, and so the

1 management plan -- the Koyukuk Management Plan is
2 working perfectly as far as providing bulls for -- and
3 breeding bulls and so forth. And so the Board's
4 proposal would absolutely destroy the Koyukuk moose
5 plan. We'd be back to square one. So I appreciate
6 your support for antler destruction on the Koyukuk. I
7 know it's a touchy issue. People want to be able to
8 sell antler, but it's the way we maintain subsistence
9 use of moose in this area.

10

11 Don.

12

13 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Darrell. I have
14 no questions for you, but I appreciate your input and I
15 -- you know, if this is an action item to the Council,
16 then I'd like to hear what Middle Yukon and, you know,
17 I'm glad to see -- you know, the views expressed by you
18 guys.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. That is
23 a good question. What did Middle Yukon -- Fred, are
24 you in Middle Yukon? You might want to come to the
25 mic.

26

27 MR. F. HUNTINGTON: Thank you, Mr.
28 Chair. Actually I am on the Middle Yukon Advisory
29 Board committee and so is Patty Noner (ph) and a couple
30 weeks ago, we had our Advisory meeting down in Kaltag
31 and which Glenn spoke of and we were in support of the
32 destruction of antlers. You know, one of the things
33 you mentioned with the sale of antlers -- and I
34 explained this at our meeting in Kaltag. Over the
35 years, I've been stashing away antlers in the
36 smokehouse and it's a rainy day project and it got to
37 be where it was, you know, kind of getting in the way
38 all the time. So I always go into Fairbanks. I
39 bundled up a bundle enough to handle and brought it
40 with me and went to the airport and my friend, Woody
41 Simon, was down here campaigning and he had his
42 airplane and he said he was going to Fairbanks and I
43 told him, well, I got a big load of antlers up here.
44 He said, well, bring it down and I'll take it to
45 Fairbanks for you. So I brought the whole thing to
46 Fairbanks, and, you know, I think I might have got 6-
47 or \$700 for the total, which it ranges from 3- to \$5 a
48 pound.

49

50 But those were antlers that was chopped

1 up in little pieces, you know, those kind of situation.
2 It was no -- my boys got a moose last fall, a 71 and a
3 half inch rack. And they carried it out of the woods
4 for two or three miles and lo' and behold, they want to
5 save the rack. My thought was no way they're going to
6 save it. They're going to get themselves in trouble,
7 jeopardize their hunt for next year, and so I talked
8 them in to cutting it up and they did and the rack was
9 sold for like \$2 a pound.

10

11 So I urge again that from our Middle
12 Yukon Advisory Board that we did go in support of
13 Glenn's destruction of antlers.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Appreciate that,
16 Fred. That brings credibility to my position on this
17 proposal and thanks for your comments.

18

19 So we're -- I feel that the Western
20 Interior Regional Advisory Council needs to take a
21 position on 222 and 223, 223 in particular to maintain
22 discretionary authority. I've -- in this -- it's
23 titled RAC 04, I wrote out a justification to the
24 Department discussing the nullification of trophy value
25 of the -- it was this antler destruction was part of
26 the Koyukuk moose management plan, as a result of the
27 planning efforts and hunting regulations in the Koyukuk
28 Controlled Use Area significantly changed and that the
29 -- while the Koyukuk moose hunter working group
30 experienced disagreements along the way, members
31 achieved consensus on most of the issues and exercised
32 a great deal of cooperation and compromise. The
33 working group is to be commended for their hard work
34 and dedication to protect the moose resources in the
35 Koyukuk Drainage and the recommendations included in
36 Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan are designed to
37 maintain opportunities and balance, the interests of
38 all users within the sustained yield and requirements
39 of the State and Federal law.

40

41 And this language I'm using in this
42 justification is coming out of the moose plan and so
43 the Western Interior -- end paragraph is the Western
44 Interior Regional Advisory Council is a major part of
45 the moose hunters' planning effort to stabilize the
46 moose population in Game Management Units 21 and 24D.
47 The current management of Koyukuk Controlled Use Area
48 is exemplary of the Koyukuk River Moose Management
49 Plan's balance and intent to sustain the moose
50 population. The bull/cow ratio is healthy. The use is

1 diversified and the hunter satisfaction is much better.
2 If Proposals 222 and 223 were to be adopted, hunter
3 crowding and overharvest of the bull moose will again
4 occur. Nonresidents will need to be eliminated to
5 favor all resident hunters that will be attracted to
6 this area and residents of Alaska are all Alaska
7 residents, not just locals.

8
9 We recommend retaining discretionary
10 authority for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
11 biologists to require trophy nullification of certain
12 hunts the Board of Game determines necessary. And so I
13 would like to use those justifications and would like a
14 motion to adopt in the positive with the intent of
15 opposing Proposals 222 and 223.

16
17 You're to the mic, do you have a
18 comment, first, Glenn?

19
20 MR. STOUT: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
21 Chair. I think at this point -- and just seeing the
22 way it's -- the discussion's going, I think it would be
23 probably pretty worthwhile to talk about one more
24 aspect of it.

25
26 There's the part about sending a
27 message to the Board of Game what you want them to do,
28 but I think it would be pretty important too to talk
29 about a message to the local users about how important
30 it is and your ability as a representative body here to
31 talk to them and encourage them of why this is
32 important and really going back to the communities and
33 telling them.

34
35 And one of the things that I've noticed
36 about this issue over time is I think the antler
37 destruction has to some degree become a victim of its
38 own success. And there's a couple things that I've
39 noticed.

40
41 First of all, with the increased
42 bull/cow ratios, I think it's led to the perception of
43 abundance again. Once again our population is -- we're
44 seeing more bulls. So I think just like Fred said, see
45 more larger bulls and I think there has been a local
46 letting down and there has even been talks about, well,
47 you know, really we don't need it anymore. And I think
48 it's really important that the representatives here as
49 they go back to their community reinforce that this is
50 still a very active tool that's working right now and

1 we take it away and that effect is taken away
2 instantly.

3

4 Also and to speak specifically to what
5 Fred said about seeing larger bulls, one thing we've
6 seen is we had some really good cohorts in 2003 to
7 2005.k Those bulls now are the 50- to 60-inch class
8 bulls now. I think that's a pretty important
9 understanding where those are. Well, when you have
10 more bulls, that means hunters weren't as challenged I
11 think psychologically with the disincentive of having
12 to cut a 30-inch bull. It's kind of easy to cut
13 through a 36-, 40-inch bull, but when all of a sudden
14 you're shooting a 40- -- or a 55-, 60-inch bull, it's a
15 little bit more challenging psychologically to destroy
16 that antler.

17

18 Well, I think that's one more thing we
19 kind of have to reinforce that this has to still apply
20 to large antler bulls just like it did to those little
21 bulls and we can't let off the pedal on this and we
22 have to get compliance locally and of course, you know,
23 the Troopers can't be everywhere. And so there has to
24 be a little bit of local policing to help make sure
25 this stays in place because I can tell you, if the word
26 gets out that, you know, the people locally aren't
27 having to comply, they're going to get the word back to
28 the Board of Game and the Board of Game's going to say,
29 hey, you know, this is only working for one segment of
30 the population. It's really intended for everybody.
31 And so I think we want to just make sure we get that
32 message back to all our communities. I think with time
33 too people have forgotten this has been in place for
34 now for 10 or 12 years and with time, people have
35 forgotten about the number of hunters that used to come
36 out here. It's quite a ways removed. They've
37 forgotten about the low moose numbers and the hunter
38 conflicts and that declining population and we kind of
39 have to remind ourselves of what it was like before we
40 had that.

41

42 And then last of all, I think also it's
43 another psychological effect that we have been
44 increasing our harvest because of those increasing
45 bull/cow ratios and because there's more bulls being
46 harvested, there's more people having to cut antlers
47 and it gives more a perception. I think it's one of
48 those perception issues that we're having to throw away
49 more. You know, I'm -- the truth is I send out more
50 pallets of cut antlers now than I used to and it seems

1 like a bigger deal, but I think that shows that we've
2 actually succeeded in getting moose meat into the local
3 communities.

4
5 So I would just like to encourage you
6 to not only send a message to the Board of Game, but
7 send it to our local communities as well.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Those are
10 pertinent points, you know, the compliance issue needs
11 to be -- everybody may -- we might have to send out
12 like a position paper why it's necessary to continue
13 cutting antler and how it saves -- actually it
14 increases the amount of moose availability for local
15 hunters, reduces their amount of effort, and it helps
16 reduce cost is what it actually is doing. It's
17 actually helping people get moose easier and it's an
18 integral part of management. And -- so that can be a
19 -- I would encourage the Council to send -- that we
20 should send out a letter to the communities on the
21 value of antler destruction and I could work with the
22 Council coordinator on a brief description of the
23 effects of that.

24
25 Is that agreeable to the Council.

26
27 Polly.

28
29 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. One thought
30 that I had is that the Office of Subsistence Management
31 has a newsletter and this might -- this kind of topic
32 might be a prime piece to put in the newsletter because
33 it would reach a broad sector of communities and this
34 issue is important as Glenn had said, Units 22 and 23
35 for their muskox hunts, Unit 12, 24, 21. So there's
36 broad application and it might -- and it's timely
37 because of the proposals to the Board of Game. So I'm
38 not -- I don't remember offhand when our next volume is
39 going to go out, but that might be something we could
40 put in there just sort of an outreach piece. Just a
41 thought.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I appreciate
44 that avenue of getting the information out to the
45 communities. I would work with your writer on that
46 issue. And -- you got a comment, Ray?

47
48 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I
49 was glad to hear too the comments that those parts are
50 still salable for poundage for use for handicrafts and

1 so on and people need to know that too. Maybe some
2 people think that when they cut them, they can't sell
3 those parts anymore.

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

6
7 MR. COLLINS: And so that would --
8 they're not selling them as trophies, but they're just
9 selling them as antler for crafts.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

12
13 MR. COLLINS: That they could still do
14 that, get that word out too.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I'd like to
17 entertain a motion to adopt State Proposals 222 and 223
18 that will be heard this coming week at the Board of
19 Game meeting in Wasilla and I intend to oppose these
20 proposals. Do I have a motion to adopt.

21
22 MR. HONEA: Motion to adopt.

23
24 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded.

27
28 MR. MORGAN: Question.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Discussion on the
31 proposals. Is the Council comfortable with my
32 justification that I wrote here in the -- on these
33 proposals?

34
35 MR. GERVAIS: Yes.

36
37 (Council nods affirmatively)

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Affirmative on the
40 justification. The question's being called. Those in
41 favor of the proposal signify by saying aye. The
42 motion is to adopt the proposal and so it's -- if
43 you're opposed to the proposals, you vote the proposals
44 down. So those in favor of the proposals signify by
45 saying aye.

46
47 (No aye votes)

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to
50 Proposals 223 and 222, same sign.

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:opposed to the
4 proposal. And so unanimous votes in opposition to the
5 proposals. And all are opposed to the proposals.
6 Proposals 223 and 222 fail and our justification should
7 immediately be transmitted to the Board of Game through
8 the Board liaison, Chuck Ardizzone. And so then now at
9 this point, we'll go to break.

10

11 (Council nods affirmatively)

12

13 (Off record)

14

15 (On record)

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've had a request
18 for one comments from the public here. So we like to
19 accommodate public opinion. That's what the RACs are
20 designed to be a platform for public opinion. And so
21 state your -- turn the mic on there and state your
22 name.

23

24 MR. KORTA: My name is John Korta,
25 resident of Galena. Lived in rural Alaska for 17 years.
26 Appreciate you guys coming out. I'm sorry I'm sort of
27 going off topic here, but I wanted to just give you a
28 little bit of my comments about salmon fishery. I'm
29 sure you guys realize how important salmon is to people
30 on the Yukon River and in rural Alaska. Over the last
31 several years, it's gotten harder and harder to get
32 fish. Two years ago, they were asking folks to
33 voluntarily lay off the kind salmon run, to let them go
34 through and we did that, and they said, you know, hit
35 the silver run in the fall.

36

37 Well, then that silver run tanked too
38 and, you know, had it not been for moose, a lot of
39 people would have been in rough shape. I think a lot
40 of people understand that the run is hurting and we
41 need to take some measures to help it along, but I
42 think it's important to make sure that that is being
43 applied across the board and not just put on one group
44 of users. Here on the Yukon, I mean we're towards the
45 end of the line and it's disheartening when you're
46 taking food from people's table when the perception is
47 that people on the ocean are really just lining their
48 pockets. I mean it's not a hardship for them. They're
49 maybe making less money, but here people are feeding
50 their families.

1 And so I just urge you to consider -- I
2 know you have a lot of proposals before you and again I
3 think people understand that if we have to lay off the
4 fish, we have to lay off, but apply it across the board
5 and do understand when you're asking people to not fish
6 here, you're taking away more than just food from their
7 families. You're taking away a positive activity, a
8 way of life that is important and if that's gone, we're
9 losing a lot more than just the fish. So thank you for
10 your time.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We appreciate your
13 comments. Does anybody got questions for John on his
14 statement.

15
16 (No comments)

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you.

19
20 MR. KORTA: Thanks.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Appreciate that.
23 And so now we're going to go back to Glenn Stout's
24 going to make a presentation on intensive management.

25
26 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Once
27 again my name is Glenn Stout. I'm the Galena area
28 biologist for Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The
29 presentation that I have here refers back to that
30 feasibility assessment document that I saw was
31 available to the committee here and this feasibility
32 assessment will be a packet that I'm going to be
33 talking to the Board of Game about next week and the
34 Department has kind of restructured how we go through
35 intensive management now and what we have is three
36 different templates.

37
38 We have this feasibility assessment
39 template and then we have a 92-125 plan template and
40 then we actually are going to have a -- the actual
41 intensive management plan template. And so we kind of
42 have a three-step process on implementing intensive
43 management.

44
45 At this point, the feasibility
46 assessment we're going to take to the Board is we're
47 going to make a recommendation to the Board that they
48 move forward with intensive management in the Upper
49 Koyukuk village management area which is a term we've
50 coined. It's basically a 1,360 mile -- square mile

1 area around the villages of Alatna and Allakaket and
2 this feasibility assessment will be to review the
3 biological issues, the economic and the social issues
4 associated with the concerns we have up there,
5 primarily with our decline in our moose population and
6 the predation effects that we see affecting that
7 population.

8
9 So just to make sure we're all on the
10 same page, we're going to be working up in Unit 24B
11 right around the villages of Alatna and Allakaket and
12 it will primarily include the Native corporation lands
13 around Alatna, Allakaket, and the State lands off here
14 to the west. And so if we look at that more
15 specifically, this red line being the boundary of the
16 intensive management area that we're proposing -- and
17 make sure I just let you know this what we're
18 proposing. This is not set in stone. We're looking
19 for comments at this time, so if anybody has any
20 comments or would like to see some changes, we're
21 definitely in the open comment phase, the input phase,
22 that if you have any input that you want to provide,
23 we're definitely in that part of the process.

24
25 This green area here, those are all
26 corporation lands. It's lands that are managed by the
27 State as far as the wildlife -- the wildlife are
28 managed by the State, and then all this light blue area
29 here is all State land. There are a few townships here
30 that are actually Refuge land. Any predator control
31 activities would not take place on those Refuge lands.
32 One of our key concerns obviously is we have low
33 harvest in the area and we're trying to improve our
34 harvest in there to meet the needs specifically for the
35 village of Allakaket and Alatna and I'll get into the
36 feasibility assessment and if you just -- if there's
37 anything you read, the document, it's like 20 pages
38 long. It's kind of ridiculous, but that's the way
39 these templates are.

40
41 But executive summary, the first page,
42 gets into the heart of the issue. And there are seven
43 unique aspects to this plan that are unique compared to
44 all the other areas that we've implemented intensive
45 management plans.

46
47 And there's a question.

48
49 MS. YATLIN: I didn't get that door to
50 door. Is that -- what's that?

1 MR. STOUT: Yeah. What this data here
2 is, is the door-to-door survey is this green harvest
3 that was estimated using the door-to-door subsistence
4 surveys that they conducted in '97 through 2002.

5
6 MS. YATLIN: So it wasn't -- it's not a
7 graph where it's actual hunters or no?

8
9 MR. STOUT: No. This is just the
10 village of Allakaket. Alatna's that -- they went there
11 and they asked them how many moose were harvested
12 during those years. The orange bars here are how many
13 moose are reported on the harvest tickets that we had
14 at the time or the permits which we have now. So
15 there's always been a decrease there and this is
16 usually where I go into a spiel about reporting rates,
17 trying to get people to report, but that's not part of
18 this talk, so I'm going to skip that.

19
20 MS. YATLIN: Okay..

21
22 MR. STOUT: But this issue here that I
23 just presented in the previous slide, we've been
24 improving things down river. We've seen a lot of
25 successes in the program on the lower part of the
26 Koyukuk River and the Middle Yukon. And so the
27 Department is trying to shift our efforts on to helping
28 things go along up there in the area of Alatna and
29 Allakaket, Bettles area, Hughes will be affected by
30 this I think as well.

31
32 So what we've had to do is over the
33 last several years, you know, I've come to you guys
34 several times and we've talked about this process that
35 we implemented, starting really in 2004. We subdivided
36 Unit 24 and the reason we subdivided it is because part
37 of the intensive management process is -- and codified
38 in the regulations of the State, we have intensive
39 management harvest objectives and population
40 objectives. And the population objective was set for
41 all of Unit 4 and the problem was is Unit 24D -- which
42 we call 24D now, had so many moose down there in the
43 lower area down by Huslia that realistically we could
44 never meet that threshold of implementing the
45 thresholds for intensive management. And so that's why
46 we subdivided Unit 24, to isolate the problems where
47 they were and that was the area around Allakaket. We
48 had to isolate it. So when we isolated it, we showed
49 how low the population is there and how much more we
50 needed to grow and it gives us a leg up on going to the

1 Board of Game and saying, hey, look, we've got a
2 problem here, here's our numbers, we need to build it.

3
4 So that was one of the first steps.
5 We're also building our biological understanding of the
6 area and the first thing I'll talk about is the habitat
7 information. This is all foundational information to
8 demonstrate to the Board biologically that there's a
9 need. Obviously everybody knows that there's a lot of
10 fire history that goes on up around this area and
11 within the intensive management area that we're talking
12 about, there's this area around Henshaw Creek and just
13 kind of keep an eye on this area as we go through the
14 slides. This area wasn't burned -- or burned less
15 clear back in the 60s and so a lot of this area is
16 grown with spruce, a lot of black spruce in there
17 pretty thick stuff, whereas up here on Henshaw Creek,
18 we have a lot of willow and young birch that's
19 available and that's actually starting to get on the
20 long end of being a productive burn area because it's
21 somewhere around 25 years old now.

22
23 And so that's an important aspect of
24 it, looking at the habitat and the availability of good
25 browsing component within those communities. But if
26 you look at that, it's still a productive area and
27 you'll see the distribution of moose in that area.
28 This is also another aspect. We have remote sensing
29 information, looking at habitat communities and you can
30 see this fire scar here. Unfortunately the satellite
31 telemetry data that was done by Ducks Unlimited ends
32 right in the middle of our area, so we didn't get the
33 full coverage. But it still shows, you know, a pretty
34 good mosaic of different habitat types and the
35 different forages that are available to moose, for
36 instance.

37
38 We want to talk also to the Board of
39 Game and let them know in terms of feasibility. What
40 kind of snow we get in there because snow depths of 36
41 inches or more can be pretty limiting to moose
42 productivity. In the area up there where I'll talk
43 about the population levels, you can see that really
44 we've had pretty mild winters on a long-term basis
45 since about 1997. We've only had three -- this year is
46 probably going to go over that, but we've only had
47 three of those years that actually had a sustained
48 period of more than 36 inches of snow. So we've really
49 had favorable conditions for an increase in the
50 population, but in fact as you all know, the population

1 declined and so that tells there's another problem
2 besides snow depth being one of our considerations.

3
4 We also did -- Tom Peragi (ph) one of
5 our habitat biologists in Fairbanks worked with Lisa
6 Saperstein with the Kanuti, they went out and they did
7 browse assessment. What they showed that of all the
8 areas in the State now that they've done a browse
9 assessment, this area up there on the Kanuti has the
10 lowest browse removal rates of any other area they've
11 ever surveyed. What that basically says is 5.3 percent
12 of the browses that they've measured, only 5.3 percent
13 of the brow mass was removed. That means 95 percent of
14 it was left untouched. That just shows that habitat
15 is not a limiting factor in that area. It gives us one
16 more reason to find out what the limiting factor is
17 and, you know, I think it's not too much of a mystery.
18 I'm going to point towards predation. So that's one of
19 the issues that we're going down.

20
21 Another aspect of that, we've --
22 because of the collaring study that we've been doing up
23 there, we've been able to go out and count enough cows
24 in the spring when they're dropping calves to find out
25 twinning rates and we're getting more than 50 cows with
26 calves out there. And in fact we're showing pretty
27 much the biological maximum. We're looking at 58 to 60
28 percent twinning rates on our cows out there first
29 thing in the spring. That's another good indicator
30 that cows are in really good body condition. They're
31 not limited in terms of productivity in that
32 population.

33
34 So going to the population data then,
35 some of the foundational information, there's a couple
36 different surveys that we've been doing in the area.
37 We do the trend count areas which were long-term areas
38 up at Middle Fork, Henshaw Creek, and Kanuti Canyon,
39 and over the last ten years, we've kind of shifted away
40 to emphasis on those trend areas going to our
41 population estimation surveys which is a statistical
42 sample of a larger area. When we did trend areas, we
43 counted every one of these units and really the
44 composition data was all we got out of it. Well, when
45 we do our population estimate, we actually get a
46 population level and we get the composition data. So
47 it's a little bit more useful for us in that terms.

48
49 If you look at those old trend count
50 areas though, you can see really kind of a similar

1 pattern that if you remember back to those bull/cow
2 ratios on Three Day Slough, most of our peaks were in
3 the '89, '90, '92, '93 and that was really pretty much
4 the same whether you're on the Nowitna, the Lower
5 Koyukuk, or the Upper Koyukuk. And obviously what
6 happened in '92, that was the last year same day
7 airborne. It had a pretty major effect on our ability
8 to manage the predators in the area.

9
10 Since '92, the Kanuti Canyon declined
11 in density. Like I said, composition data is the best
12 -- the most important factor for our trend areas, but I
13 think it's pretty telling. Henshaw Creek, also our
14 peak was '92. Middle Fork area, late '80s, that was
15 our peak. It declined basically half what we were back
16 at that peak period of time. As I said, we've shifted
17 to these areas here now are the surveys where we do a
18 population estimation survey and this is all the
19 surveys combined and I just want to kind of describe
20 this map a little bit, see if I can boost that up one
21 more notch. This just shows you where the
22 concentrations of the moose that we count when we do
23 those surveys. And we don't count every block in this
24 whole Kanuti Refuge every year and what I've done is I
25 combine those high counts every year and the number of
26 moose that we've observed in the areas, if it's blue
27 here, we didn't see any moose when we did an intensive
28 survey in that block. If it's this light blue, we saw
29 one to four moose. If it's red, we counted somewhere
30 between 5 and 32 moose or the gray ones here, we didn't
31 survey at all.

32
33 Well, you can see really clearly where
34 the pockets of moose are in the Kanuti Refuge. This is
35 that Henshaw Creek area, the map I showed you area
36 where you had that burn that's about 25 years old. The
37 Kanuti Canyon, that's in decline. It's more than 30
38 years old. This, we're starting to see a decline in
39 the number of moose we count in there, but this area
40 over here up above the Kanuti, that's actually a pretty
41 good pocket of moose now. It's probably if anything
42 we're seeing a decline in numbers here and an increase
43 in the numbers there because of recent burns in that
44 area. It's becoming real productive. It's less --
45 it's right around six, seven years old I think. Mike
46 may set me right on that.

47
48 But anyway, we got some great habitat
49 over there. It benefits the area. And if you look at
50 our moose densities there, same number that they

1 presented. Our peak, '93, we're up around .7 moose per
2 square mile. We're down about half that right now in
3 the Refuge. So just more baseline information. I
4 wanted to show you again just kind of a depiction of
5 where we see the moose. I think this is kind of a good
6 picture on where we actually saw moose groups in those
7 survey areas and you can see some of these moose -- you
8 see a little picture of a moose here. Some of those
9 are actually groups of four or five moose and so this
10 is not one little picture of each moose. It could be
11 four or five, but it's obvious there's pockets of moose
12 in certain areas.

13

14 Well, why this is an advantage for the
15 area we're talking about treating is because we have
16 some good habitat in the area. We have good potential
17 for improving the moose population in this area and
18 certainly up -- that (Indiscernible) Surcreek area,
19 there's also a lot of potential there too, all along
20 the Alatna River. We've got a lot of potential in this
21 intensive management area that we're proposing for
22 growing the moose population.

23

24 Just to give you some idea of the
25 results in there. Within just the Upper Koyukuk
26 Village Management Area, we estimated 405 moose. Our
27 bull/cow ratio was excellent, just like we've always
28 seen, 52 bulls per hundred cows. Our calf/cow ratios
29 were actually down a little bit this year. We've
30 typically been seeing about 45 calves per hundred cows
31 and as well our yearly bull/cow ratios, usually we're
32 seeing 14, 15 yearling bulls per hundred cows. To give
33 you an idea, I told you about the twinning rates was 60
34 percent twinning rates. In the spring when we do that
35 survey, then here's what to think and what's happening.
36 We've got about -- with 60 percent twinning rates, so
37 you got about 140 -- 140 calves per hundred cows
38 hitting the ground in the spring. Five months later
39 when we do this survey, we're already down to 33 to 40
40 calves per hundred cows. So that means we lost in five
41 months basically a hundred calves per hundred cows just
42 in that five-month period.

43

44 Well, obviously we can attribute that
45 mostly to bear predation and there's going to be a
46 really prickly issue here when we start talking about
47 the nuts and bolts of this program because bears are a
48 key issue. But bears up in the Allakaket area are food
49 and so to talk about bear removal is really not an
50 option in this program because we want to create more

1 food in the terms of moose but we don't to at the same
2 time remove food by eliminating bears. But what I'll
3 demonstrate here is I think we can still create an
4 effect of the population of moose by treating just the
5 wolf component.

6
7 Another aspect of it that I think is
8 important to consider in this program that we're
9 talking about here is it's a unique aspect. Typically
10 we try to achieve those intensive management
11 objectives. This program, because it's only 1,300 in
12 all of 24B, it's about 13,000 square miles, it's 10
13 percent of the area, we don't really realistically
14 expect to increase this population up to that
15 objective. The way we see it is just a reallocation of
16 the resource from wolves to people. We're just
17 reallocating that resource. We're removing the wolf
18 component in a small area. If you look at the 24B wolf
19 population, we're really not going to have a
20 statistical, measurable effect. But in that small
21 area, if we remove them all, we reallocate that moose
22 resource from most people.

23
24 So that's kind of a really important
25 character of this program that we really haven't done
26 anywhere else in the State. And so it's going to be
27 kind of a challenge actually to tell you to convince
28 the board, convince detractors of predator control
29 programs that this is a program that will work. But
30 that's one aspect of this program that's pretty key.

31
32 Some of the other foundational
33 information as you know, I already talked about our
34 collaring study, looking at distribution of cows within
35 the area and it's helped our twinning rate surveys.
36 We've done the distribution looking at hunting patterns
37 in the area and this is based on stuff that Terry
38 Haynes did in the area back in the '80s looking at
39 bear/moose hunting patterns in the area. It's really
40 important to note too many of the intensive management
41 programs that have been implemented by the State have
42 focused quite a bit on providing nonlocal opportunity
43 and nonresident opportunity. Because of the Federal
44 closed use area and the State no fly zone area, we
45 understand up front that the benefit of this program is
46 primarily going to be just to the people of Allakaket
47 and Alatna. And that's kind of a unique aspect to go
48 to the Board of Game with and I think you know -- you
49 know, the tendencies the Board has -- they really try
50 to emphasize all users in the State. And so it's a

1 little bit of an uphill battle, but this is one of
2 those aspect that's unique to this program.

3
4 We've also got of course the wolf
5 survey data and we plan to get out there. We're
6 scheduled the week after next to go do another wolf
7 survey data. Not surprisingly if you look at this area
8 here, that's where some of our best habitats are.
9 Henshaw Creek Drainage here, Kanuti Canyon, that's
10 where they saw the most wolves. That's why we are
11 convinced that we can do an effective wolf control
12 program and get a response.

13
14 So just briefly -- and I'm going to go
15 through this real quick. I talked about how we
16 subdivided 24B and I'll focus in must on the 24B area.
17 Our estimated harvest percentages, our population
18 estimate is about 2,600 moose. Our current harvest
19 estimate -- and this is a very liberal -- I'm shooting
20 high on this. At the most, I think there's 82 moose
21 being harvested currently. That's a harvest rate of
22 13.2 [sic] percent of the observable moose. It's a
23 very low harvest rate. It's very manageable. We're
24 not overharvesting the population. That's the point
25 here.

26
27 Even if we went up to a harvest rate of
28 5 percent, which is actually in Koyukuk Moose
29 Management Plan, we have a harvestable surplus estimate
30 of 130 moose. If you look at the IM objectives, our
31 current estimate like I said was 82. Our IM objective
32 in the book is 150 to 250. We're way below that. So
33 obviously it tells the Board of Game we need intensive
34 management to meet our objective. Same with the
35 population. Our current estimate, 2,600, this is what
36 the codified IM objective is in the regulation. This
37 is based on a very achievable number. It's not an
38 outrageous expectation because it's based on that 1993
39 survey. That's all it is. I didn't go any higher than
40 that .7 moose per square mile. We've already been
41 there before. We know it's a reasonable expectation.

42
43 So within just the Koyukuk -- or that
44 Upper Koyukuk Village Management Area, then our current
45 estimate of moose, 405, which I told you earlier, our
46 proposed objective would be to get somewhere around 750
47 moose. If we get that, then that will meet our need
48 that we've already demonstrated through those
49 subsistence surveys of about 40 moose to meet the needs
50 of Allakaket. We're not shooting for the moon in this

1 program. We're just shooting for enough moose to meet
2 the needs there in Allakaket. Not only will this
3 provide the needs in real terms as far as number of
4 pounds of moose, but it'll also decrease the catch per
5 unit effort metrics that we talk about. It's not just
6 more moose. It's easier moose. That's really an
7 important aspect of this program too is that we measure
8 that effect.

9
10 And once again in our estimate just in
11 that management area, we're figuring there's somewhere
12 between 30 and 40 moose -- or wolves. Our proposed
13 objective is we want to get down essentially to zero
14 wolves. We plan on cleaning out the wolves in there.
15 We're not going to wait like in all the other IM areas.
16 They wait till the spring to go out there to give
17 trappers in the area a chance to effect this. We're
18 going to go out in the fall. We're going to do it
19 during our moose surveys that we do in the fall and in
20 that way those wolves aren't killing moose all winter
21 long. We've already talked about this issue up at
22 Allakaket and we said hey, you know, are the trappers
23 in the area going to be losing out and they felt no.
24 Go get them. Let's take care of the moose situation.
25 That's a more serious issue for us at this time and so
26 I think that will make the program more efficient, more
27 cost effective.

28
29 Our estimate of black bears in there,
30 we don't do surveys on black bears or grizzly bears,
31 but we're estimating somewhere around 75 black bears
32 and 25 grizzlies. So if we looked at this and modeled
33 this population based on those 30 wolves in about four
34 packs, 75 black bears, 25 grizzly bears, and ran a
35 model on that and this population declined as what we
36 matched up with our population decline since the '93
37 survey, our peak, and so we matched up. We got all our
38 parameters lined up in the model and the we repeated
39 it. After we removed the packs and we got down here,
40 we tried to stay conservative. If we only got rid of
41 20 of those 30, but got down to just one pack left and
42 didn't touch the bears, we got a response in the
43 population. So this is the evidence to us that we can
44 just flip wolf control, effect the change in the
45 population that we're trying to achieve.

46
47 So some of the key components -- and
48 I've covered many of these, but first of all, this is
49 going to be a wolves only program, no black bears or
50 grizzlies. You know, obviously there's a lot of

1 cultural issues. We've talked about the people in
2 Allakaket and Alatna, their concerns about us bothering
3 grizzly bears. They don't want us to bother black
4 bears because those are food. There's a lot of
5 cultural taboos concerning predators. One of the
6 issues that we're going to have to be very sensitive to
7 is if we go out and shoot wolves out of helicopters,
8 making sure those animals are skinned, the carcasses
9 handled appropriately, cutting the joints, things that
10 people up there are really -- feel are important.

11
12 It'll be a small program. It will not
13 change populations as far as the 21, 24B population.
14 It's reallocating that resource. The population and
15 harvest are below IM objectives, but it's likely
16 because of the size of this program and it won't be
17 met. We'll probably have to go out there several years
18 in a row and it may be a long term program. The truth
19 of it is, it may be a long-term program. Because of
20 that expectation, we got to make this work cheaply. We
21 got to be able to make it cost effective and make be
22 able to sell this within the Department of Fish and
23 Game that we can actually afford to do a program like
24 this.

25
26 The treatment area does not include
27 Fish and Wildlife Service land, but it does include
28 Native corporation lands. I've already had meetings
29 with Coylotzna (ph). They're supportive of it. One of
30 the key issues we want to make sure we can land on the
31 ground and pick up these wolves and they have to give
32 us permission to do that and we've gotten their
33 support. We've gotten a lot of good support from
34 Allakaket tribal members. The predator control
35 response monitoring will be limited. In the past, many
36 of our intensive management programs have been focused
37 on having the biological measures to evaluate whether
38 these programs are being effective. If we're doing
39 this cost effective, we're not going to be able to go
40 out there with half a million dollars like they did
41 down in McGrath and demonstrate an increase in the
42 population. And so what we're going to have to
43 emphasize is harvest being the key indicator of the
44 success of the program and so that's going to really
45 fall upon then the local village to help us out in that
46 terms.

47
48 We want to make sure that we're getting
49 really good reporting on this and probably what we're
50 going to do is have -- I talked to Caroline Brown just

1 this last week -- have her come up there, do a one-year
2 pre-treatment survey and then probably four years post-
3 treatment and look at all the same things that they've
4 done there in the past that add into this -- aspects of
5 this catch per unit effort issues that we've talked
6 about to make sure that it's not just more moose, it's
7 easier moose. It's more cost effective moose and those
8 are going to be important things to measure to show
9 success on this.

10
11 And as I said before, the program will
12 emphasize efficiency and cost effective and the bottom
13 line is this. We're just talking about reallocating
14 moose from wolves to people. It's a small scale. It's
15 a different kind of paradigm that we're talking about
16 for this program. So I recommend the process then that
17 I go and I'm going to present this next week at the
18 Board of Game is that first of all, we want to
19 incorporate the Board of Game's comments. We want to
20 incorporate people here today, their comments,
21 suggestions, way we can improve this program, talk
22 about some of these issues that are pretty touchy
23 issues truthfully. There's people outside the State
24 are going to really balk at this idea that I'm shooting
25 wolves when I know bears are a primary cause of our
26 productivity or survival of our calves, but that's an
27 issue.

28
29 And depending on the comments, then our
30 next step in the process will be to complete the
31 intensive management plan and last of all, we'll be
32 submitting a 92-125 plan and submit that as a proposal
33 for the 2012 Board of Game meeting. And what I've done
34 already and I passed around my email to several of the
35 Federal offices, is we've got a placeholder proposal
36 for the 92-125 plan that deadline, you know, is -- for
37 the State proposals is April 1st. Obviously I'm not
38 going to have that 92-125 plan finished, but I'm
39 putting in and the region has agreed on this that we're
40 going to put in a placeholder proposal. It'll be kind
41 of a skeleton of this 92-125 plan, so when it comes
42 next March that we can submit that 92-125 plan and get
43 this thing off the ground.

44
45 So that's all I have.

46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks a lot,
48 Glenn. That was an excellent presentation and data
49 display. Does Council members have questions for
50 Glenn's proposal -- IM proposal and data presentation?

1 Eleanor.

2

3 MS. YATLIN: Thank you for the
4 presentation, Glenn. Mr. Chairman. I have a question.
5 In any of this, does those outfitters out of Bettles
6 have any effect on all the moose. Because when we're
7 living up there, I saw the effects that they had in '90
8 -- from '90 to '98 -- '89 to '98. I saw all those
9 outfitters. Sometimes there were up to four in the
10 summertime and all those different businesses that take
11 the -- you know, they would start way up in Alatna
12 River and go all the way down to (indiscernible) Jack
13 -- and then they -- that's where they take their
14 outfitters. You know, they bring them in with their
15 rafts and they land there one spot and it takes three
16 days to go down to this other place where they pick
17 them up and we see -- you know, I sell mostly horns
18 because I work for Frontiers for two years up there and
19 I know that a lot of those planes -- Navajos was all
20 moose horns.

21

22 So I just wanted to -- you know, if
23 that's being taken into effect and that -- and I know
24 it still is going on because I get calls from people
25 and affect 24B.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 MR. STOUT: Yeah. Through the Chair.
30 Member Yatlin, yeah, the one information that I showed
31 that showed our harvest rate around 3 and a half
32 percent and then the bull/cow ratios of 50 to 60 bulls
33 per hundred cows are really pretty clear indicators to
34 me that harvest is not the issue here. And that's a
35 really important issue that when we go to the Board of
36 Game that we don't have a mixed message as far as what
37 happened to the decline in this population.

38

39 I'm convinced it didn't have anything
40 to do with human harvest and those two indicators to me
41 are really clear indicators that that's the case. And
42 so I'm really not going to get focused on that harvest
43 issue, who's to blame for some of that. I know like
44 around the Wild and the John River, there were
45 localized areas that we did see some decline in the
46 Alatna, but they didn't cause the decline in the
47 population and I think that's just such an important
48 thing to understand that it wasn't hunting that got us
49 to where we are.

50

1 And so the response is not more
2 conservative harvest; the response is predator control.

3

4

5 MS. YATLIN: One more comment. Is that
6 -- now I lost my train of thought. They do move
7 around. We always hear that from the elders that they
8 do move around. You know, they don't stay in one spot
9 to be counted, so that's the other issue I wanted to
10 bring up and they probably do move up north to where
11 they -- you know, transporters could take them out. So
12 that's the other comment I wanted to make.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Eleanor.

17

18 MS. PELKOLA: I had a comment.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jenny.

21

22 MS. PELKOLA: Glenn, I thank you for
23 your report. I was just wondering when you talk to the
24 people up there, was it the elders that were against
25 getting bears? Because eventually, you know, you have
26 a new generation coming up and are they -- you know,
27 will they eat the bear too, the little kids?

28

29 MR. STOUT: Yeah. Through the Chair.
30 Member Pelkola, probably Pollock would be the better
31 one to answer that and their concerns. I think those
32 issues are issues that we take real seriously. I would
33 tell you from a personal perspective, I think nowhere
34 else in my area are those cultural concerns about bears
35 as strong as they are in Allakaket and Alatna and maybe
36 at that point, it'd be best to Pollock to tell you what
37 their feelings are as far as bears.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Pollock.

40

41 MR. SIMON: Okay. We're at -- there
42 was a meeting with Glenn and if there's no meat, no
43 moose, then peoples harvest black bears. We do eat
44 black bears. That's the reason to -- you know, these
45 black bears -- leave the bears alone and then get the
46 wolves first.

47

48 Thank you, Jack.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock.

1 Other comments from the -- yeah.

2

3 MR. HONEA: I've got a question.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.

6

7 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Glenn, for the
8 presentation. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I've seen on the
9 graphs kind of a rosy picture with the elimination of
10 wolves and then on the one hand, you said we're not
11 going to use the measures that we used in the McGrath
12 area. We're going to use local resources and stuff and
13 I was just wondering what kind of measures you're
14 talking about. Are you talking about maybe wolf
15 snaring, wolf trapping, things like that?

16

17 Because I know in the past when we
18 discussed this, we said this had to be a local thing.
19 The State is not going to come in there and, you know,
20 impose something that we want, like what happened in
21 McGrath, and -- because -- and I think we just have to,
22 you know, take care of our own area whether it be like
23 incentives from the tribal council or something like
24 that. You -- we could, you know, maybe put a little
25 bounty or something. I was just wondering what kind of
26 measures you -- you know, you're planning on actually
27 doing.

28

29 Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Glenn.

32

33 MR. STOUT: Yeah. Through the Chair.
34 Member Honea. Yeah. There's probably two different
35 issues I was talking about and I'm always nervous when
36 I'm talking. I tend to talk too fast and kind of blur
37 over some of those issues. The measures of evaluating
38 the success of the program, there's a lot of different
39 ways we can measure that and we'll continue on with our
40 normal management measurements, doing moose surveys,
41 doing wolf surveys, monitoring harvest, but like down
42 in McGrath, one of the measures that they used to
43 evaluate success of the program was they put out
44 collars on a whole bunch of calves and yearlings and
45 they looked at what the predation effect on those
46 changed. And so pre-treatment before they have wolf
47 control and bear removal, you know, they had whatever
48 it was, the survival rate of their calves, and then
49 after treatment, they had this improvement in survival
50 rate and they documented and they demonstrated to

1 detractors in the scientific community and they said
2 okay, look, predator control had a measurable
3 scientific effect on this population.

4
5 Well, that cost a lot of money to do
6 that program and to do this cost efficiently and to
7 have this more of a long-term program, we're just not
8 going to be able to afford to do it. And so we're
9 probably going to deemphasize some of those aspects of
10 it, but we're going to emphasize the harvest as a
11 measure of effectiveness of the program.

12
13 Now as far as public involvement, kind
14 of the second part of your question, we are still going
15 to try and get public buy-in to this. The more people
16 out trapping, we're going to try and encourage even
17 more black bear harvest. People utilize the black bear
18 resource, more grizzly bear harvest. Any type of buy-
19 in into that, we were going to -- one of the things
20 we've already talked about is going to TCC and seeing
21 if they would be willing to come up with money for a
22 wolf incentive program and we're glad to do snaring
23 programs. Any of those other measures that we want to
24 include into this to help reduce the predator load is
25 obviously going to benefit it and we're going to
26 proceed with those aspects of it too.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Pollock.

29
30 MR. SIMON: Yeah. I've made a few
31 comments. Several years ago, there was a lot of
32 caribous around Allakaket area and then the wolves had
33 a lot of pups that spring and then what happened is the
34 caribous never come back for ten years and pretty soon
35 you can see that the wolf population has dropped -- I
36 mean the moose population has dropped because the
37 wolves have to eat something.

38
39 In recent years, not too long ago,
40 there was only 13 moose taken at the one fall season.
41 There's maybe 30, 40 families in Allakaket, Alatna, so
42 you can see that meat is distributed pretty -- there's
43 some freezers that's been empty of meat for a couple
44 years because not everybody is successful every time.

45
46 But I think, Jack, we need support from
47 this letter from this Board -- letter of support so
48 that we can get this item off the ground and get it
49 going because the local trappers, who haven't been very
50 busy aren't going out because January -- December,

1 January is pretty cold. In fact in January a couple
2 days was 70 below and you can't do any more than keep
3 the wood stove going, packing wood in and then it warm
4 up and then snow came down and you can't see the tree.
5 You can't go anyplace and around Allakaket there's a
6 lot of rolling hills with tick spruce and four feet of
7 loose snow. You can't very well chase wolf anyplace or
8 have time going to your trap line cabin, you don't go
9 anyplace, you have to walk in snow shoes or something
10 and the price of gas is at \$7 a gallon in Allakaket,
11 and us trappers have to think before we go any place,
12 you have to buy 20 gallons and at \$7 a gallon and go
13 out and set traps but for awhile you never bring
14 nothing back then it'd be kind of difficult to go buy
15 20 gallons again and go out again. So I'd like to see
16 this -- we've been talking this intensive management
17 and Koyukuk issue for several years now and I'd like to
18 see it get off the ground.

19

20 Thank you, Jack.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Appreciate your
23 comments, Pollock. Ray, you got something.

24

25 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Glenn, I like that
26 idea of using the economy of effort as a measure for
27 success and one thing you could encourage is people to
28 keep track of how much gas they're using to hunt this
29 fall and each year to see that, see if they're having
30 to use less or not because that makes a difference
31 because I know if your incentive is to get a moose, you
32 keep going until you can, but how much effort you have
33 to put into it is really a good measure of how easy it
34 is to get a moose or how hard.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ray. That's
37 an excellent way to quantify unit of effort is in
38 actual gallons of gas and expense and that's one of the
39 eight criteria of subsistence is economy of time,
40 effort, and expense. And so that's -- those were
41 criteria developed by the Board of Game back several
42 years ago also. And any further comments.

43

44 Robert.

45

46 MR. WALKER: Just a question that I
47 read here a while back here about how to ranchers in
48 Montana and Wyoming and Colorado took care of their
49 wolf problems with their cattle. They hired people to
50 bring Parvo in there and to take care of the wolves

1 there, which I think was very effective on the wolves.
2 It eliminated a lot of packs there and it took them
3 like probably 10 to 15 years to recover. I mean this
4 is called chemical warfare I think if you're going to
5 try something, but that was just something that I read.

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Robert. I'm
8 not sure if the Department's got approval for germ
9 warfare yet.

10
11 (Laughter)

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My comments on the
14 presentation is I am happy to see that the Henshaw
15 Drainage and that large pack that's static in the
16 Henshaw Drainage. That pack has access to -- there's a
17 lot of chums that go in that drainage and they get
18 those fish to raise those large litter of pups and then
19 they can effectively hunt down large moose and any
20 moose and especially calves. And so I'm glad to see
21 that that -- the treatment area entails the Henshaw
22 Drainage. There's also that Sarik area is another area
23 where there's quite a few wolves will be early in the
24 winter.

25
26 Those deep snow spikes -- most of the
27 interior of Alaska doesn't see the kind of deep snow
28 spikes like we see in the South Slope of the Brooks
29 Range and so some of those, they might be fairly low in
30 frequency, but when we get those real high snow packs,
31 those wolves just really go after those moose calves
32 and so they can really be very effective on moose
33 calves when they have those deep snow spikes. And so
34 that's kind of an issue that we have and so the people
35 of Allakaket and Alatna for many years have talked
36 about this program. Glenn has worked -- I can has
37 spent many hours on this -- developing this program and
38 I feel that for the people of Allakaket who are not
39 achieving their subsistence needs that this treatment
40 -- intensive management treatment is necessary. I feel
41 that this Council needs to write a letter of support
42 entailing the underachievement of subsistence needs
43 being met, that the -- it's a chronic issue of
44 increasing catch per unit of effort, and with
45 escalating cost of fuel, it's become too burdensome for
46 local people to effectively harvest the wolf numbers in
47 this area.

48
49 Those would be the three points that
50 the Council should make to the Board of Game and this

1 letter should be high on the docket of action items
2 that has to be produced within the next few days.
3 Probably by the end of this week, these comments have
4 to be before the Board of Game. Also would like to cc
5 this letter to Evansville tribal council, Alatna tribal
6 council, Allakaket tribal council, Huslia tribal
7 council, and Tanana Chiefs to please send letters of
8 support for the intensive management plan for the --
9 what are you calling it now? What's the -- for the
10 Upper Koyukuk Village Management Area and Unit 24B.
11 And so those -- there's need for letters of support
12 from the local communities and the reason I'm reaching
13 out to those other -- Huslia, those -- Hughes is
14 another one. Those other, there's many family members.
15 It's a homogenous population, so there's letters -- so
16 family members that live in Allakaket and Alatna that
17 need support from the other communities. And so
18 there's -- this proposal needs a broader based support
19 than just this Council and Advisory Committee.

20

21 And so at this time, the Chair will
22 entertain a motion to transmit a letter immediately
23 posthaste to the Board of Game and the affected
24 community regions for the Unit 24, Upper Koyukuk
25 Village Management Plan. Have a motion.

26

27 MR. HONEA: I so move for the letter of
28 endorsement.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Don.

31

32 MS. YATLIN: Second.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Eleanor.
35 Further discussion by the Council on support of the
36 intensive management plan for Unit 24B.

37

38 MR. WALKER: You forgot Hughes.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And Hughes. I --
41 yes. Hughes is included in the cc.

42

43 MR. WALKER: Question.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's called on
46 the motion. Those in favor of the motion, signify by
47 saying aye.

48

49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
2 sign.
3
4 (No opposing votes)
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Unanimous support
7 for the intensive management program and endorsement to
8 the Board of Game.
9
10 Thanks for your presentation, Glenn.
11
12 And do you have something to say there,
13 Darrell.
14
15 MR. VENT: We were talking about the
16 predation. One of the things that I know that we
17 haven't touched upon is that we always talk about the
18 harvest of moose and everything. We're not talking
19 about, you know, what the village's harvest for wolves
20 or the village's harvest for bears. If we're going to
21 present this proposal, I think it would probably be a
22 good idea that they also include the harvest from the
23 village side. That way, you know, when he presents his
24 document to make it look like we're working from both
25 sides to achieve success of this intensive management.
26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's an excellent
28 point, Darrell. I think that in quantifying catch per
29 unit of effort of moose that we also have to document
30 the predator or the big animal harvest that the local
31 people -- that should be included in the survey how
32 many bears are being taken to offset the predator
33 factor for the moose population.
34
35 That's a good point.
36
37 Thank you.
38
39 MR. VENT: Yes. Because we usually
40 don't consider that when we're talking about
41 management.
42
43 Thank you.
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Got a frog in
46 my throat.
47
48 (Laughter)
49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so at this time,

1 we're -- has our lunch arrived? I haven't seen lunch.
2 But we're.....
3
4 REPORTER: It'll be here.
5
6 (Laughter)
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Salena's taking care
9 of lunch for us again today so it'll be here.
10
11 (Laughter)
12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I wanted to have the
14 North Pacific Fisheries Management Council come up
15 after lunch to make presentation and dialogue with the
16 Council. And so do we have anything real brief to
17 cover before our lunch break here?
18
19 (Pause)
20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Donald. Do we have
22 any real brief item or information or.....
23
24 MR. MIKE: Oh, yeah. Brief item I was
25 going to suggest is have ANSEP presentation, but I
26 don't see ANSEP staff here. I don't know if they made
27 it on this morning's flight.
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And -- is
30 Louden Tribal Council here to make any comments. I see
31 that on the agenda.
32
33 REPORTER: Lunch is here.
34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, it's here.
36 Lunch is here.
37
38 REPORTER: Okay, lunch is here.
39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're out of the
41 woods.
42
43 (Laughter)
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so we're going
46 to go break for lunch. We'll be reconvening right at
47 -- about 1:05 or so.
48
49 (Off record)
50

1 (On record)
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So one request from
4 Koyukuk/Nowitna was if there's anybody that needs a
5 shuttle ride I think by 3:00 o'clock or around that
6 time, just let them know. Is Brad here? Brad Scotten.
7 But anyways, if somebody needs a ride, just let the
8 Koyukuk/Nowitna Staff know.
9
10 MR. HONEA: Who is that?
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That would be Brad
13 Scotten who was here -- oh, he's back here.
14
15 MR. HONEA: Oh, that's him, okay.
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Back in the back
18 there.
19
20 And so we're on -- the North Pacific
21 Fisheries Management Counsel has traveled all the way
22 here to Galena to speak to us and so we welcome you to
23 the meeting and look forward to your presentation and
24 we are very interested in the bycatch issues that
25 affect the Yukon and Kuskokwim Drainage within our
26 region. So got that. You have the floor. Go ahead.
27 Donald. Okay. Okay. The PowerPoint is in focus, so go
28 right ahead.
29
30 MS. KIMBALL: Okay. My name is Nicole
31 Kimball. I'm a fisheries analyst for the North Pacific
32 Fishery Management Council. Our offices are in
33 Anchorage. This is Dr. Diana Stram. She's also a
34 fishery analyst and we have ourselves. Diana's the
35 lead analyst on this action in front of the Council --
36 ongoing action and we'll walk you through where we are
37 in this and what is on the table for the North Pacific
38 Council in terms of chum salmon bycatch. We also have
39 two Council members here. Do you want to introduce
40 yourself.
41
42 MR. HULL: I'm Dan Hull. I am one of
43 the State of Alaska representatives on the Council. I
44 live in Anchorage and I fish out of Cordova.
45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you.
47
48 MR. TWEIT: And I'm Bill Tweit. I sit
49 on the Council from the State of Washington and this is
50 my first visit to the interior of Alaska. So I want to

1 thank you very much for your hospitality and for the
2 opportunity to see the Yukon River frozen and wide.
3 It's really impressive.

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, thank you and
6 appreciate your attendance at the meeting.

7
8 Go ahead.

9
10 MS. KIMBALL: So we have tried to pare
11 down the PowerPoint presentation a little bit. We also
12 have copies of it, handouts for you. They didn't make
13 it on our plane, but they're coming any minute so we
14 can hand them out and people can follow along. We also
15 have as a handout for your Council the management
16 measures that are on the table right now for the North
17 Pacific Council, all the alternatives that they'll be
18 considering at their June meeting, all the alternatives
19 that will be analyzed in the first formal draft of the
20 analysis that comes out.

21
22 This is a February 2011 version and I
23 think maybe in your books you have a June version
24 because we just had this meeting in early February and
25 I'm not sure it was available for your books. So
26 that'll be a handout as well. It's coming off the
27 plane.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I think the
30 version that we have is on Page 24. Is that correct,
31 Donald? 23.

32
33 MR. COLLINS: It starts on 19.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, on 19.

36
37 MR. COLLINS: On the chum?

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, yeah, right back
40 here. Okay. On Page 18. Yeah, it was incorrectly
41 printed in the agenda. So Page 18 so everybody's on
42 the same sheet of music. Go ahead.

43
44 MS. KIMBALL: Okay. So we were asked
45 today to give a brief overview not just on chum bycatch
46 management which is what's in front of the Council
47 today, but also a brief overview of what the Council
48 did on chinook bycatch management in the Bering Sea
49 pollock fisheries and that's under Amendment 91 to the
50 Council's Fishery Management Plan. So they refer to it

1 as Amendment 91.

2

3 Really briefly because I know we have a
4 short timeframe here, but just to clarify that the
5 North Pacific Fishery Management Council works in
6 tandem with the National Marine Fishery Service. They
7 manage the Federal fisheries off Alaska, so anywhere
8 from 3 to 200 miles offshore. So clearly we're not the
9 management authority for salmon. That's the State of
10 Alaska. The State of Alaska does obviously sit on the
11 Council. The Commissioner of Fish and Game has a seat
12 on the Council and there are several Alaska
13 representatives.

14

15 But we then have the authority to
16 manage the salmon bycatch in the ground fish fisheries
17 which we are authorized to manage. So that's why we're
18 here with this issue. The Council makes a
19 recommendation to National Marine Fishery Service or
20 the Secretary of Commerce, so it's not the final say on
21 any action, but it is -- well, the Secretary of
22 Commerce has to approve every action the Council takes.

23

24 Everything that the Council does is
25 governed by the Magnuson-Stevens Act and Diana will
26 speak a little bit about the objectives for the bycatch
27 action and the national standards that we need to -- so
28 just to recap. There are 15 total members on the
29 Council. 11 of those are voting members. There's some
30 designated members and that's the head of National
31 Marine Fishery Service in Juneau, the Commissioner of
32 Fish and Game, and then both the Washington and the
33 Oregon Departments of Fish and Wildlife. So like Bill
34 Tweit here is the Washington designated seat.

35

36 There are also seven appointed seats.
37 Five of those are from Alaska and two are from
38 Washington State and those are appointed. The Governor
39 of Alaska or the Governor of Washington would put in a
40 name on the Council or put in several names and then
41 the Secretary of Commerce would approve who that is.
42 But it basically comes from the governors of each of
43 those states.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Technical
46 difficulties.

47

48 (Laughter)

49

50 MR. TWEIT: This is your hottest

1 PowerPoint ever.

2

3 (Laughter)

4

5 MS. KIMBALL: Well, the handouts are on
6 the way, so it'll be easier to follow along, specially
7 with Diana's stuff when that comes along, but we do
8 have several meetings a year, five meetings a year, and
9 this is just to give a background on the kind of public
10 participation and potential RAC participation even. We
11 have three meetings in Anchorage, one in a fishing
12 community. It's typically either Kodiak or Dutch
13 Harbor or Sitka, and then one in Seattle or Portland
14 since we have seats designated on the Council for those
15 states. Each meeting is about eight days and it's all
16 open to the public.

17

18 There's also newly available an audio
19 link for all of our meetings. We didn't have that
20 previously. So especially -- and this was done to
21 allow communities in rural Alaska to better participate
22 and understand what the Council was doing. So there is
23 a realtime audio link for the entire length of the
24 meeting now that you can click on and listen if you
25 have Internet access. So that's fairly new.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Excuse me. Is that
28 on your website?

29

30 MS. KIMBALL: That is on our website.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

33

34 MS. KIMBALL: Yeah. It'll say right
35 before the meeting, it'll be a big, bright yellow
36 thing. It says audio link

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

39

40 MS. KIMBALL: You click on that and you
41 just put in your name and you're done.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thanks.

44

45 MS. KIMBALL: Where we are as far -- in
46 terms of -- I have one slide here on Council decision
47 progress. Anybody can propose a proposal to the
48 Council. The Council would then initiate an analysis
49 of alternatives and I'm going through this to just kind
50 of let you know where we are in the process of chum

1 bycatch analysis. We're in the very early stages of
2 that analysis. The Council's got a preliminary review
3 draft in February. So they clearly have a suite of
4 alternatives that they're looking at, but they're not
5 going to see their first formal review of an analysis
6 until June and that's part of the reason for us trying
7 to be here and to hear back from the RACs what kind of
8 their input would be on this action or the suite of
9 alternatives in front of the Council because we're in
10 that first process under analysis proceeds through.
11 Initial review of that analysis would be in June.

12

13 It can take several meetings to get
14 through this process and get to a final action, but the
15 earliest possible final action for this analysis that
16 we'll be talking about is October or December of this
17 year. So it's really timely to get your input and I
18 appreciate being on your agenda when I know this is not
19 normally a Fish agenda, but definitely appreciate that.

20

21 I think we'll just go right into the
22 issue and -- now that we have this and our handouts
23 should be here soon.

24

25 DR. STRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
26 I'm going to walk you through a little bit of the
27 background in terms of our chinook action, the trends
28 in chum and chinook bycatch and then walk through what
29 the alternatives in front of the Council are and then
30 kind of what our -- the analysis that we're in the
31 process of doing. Again this is all a work in progress
32 right now and our intention is to have an analysis
33 completed for Council action in June of 2011.

34

35 So the Bering Sea pollock fishery then
36 catches salmon as bycatch as you're aware and we catch
37 -- the pollock catches chinook and chum bycatch. They
38 don't catch any of the other species in any kind of
39 quantity. And the bycatch when it's caught in the
40 trawl fisheries has to be counted, but it cannot be
41 retained or sold. So some of it is donated to food
42 banks, but the majority of it or a large proportion of
43 it -- none of it can ever ben retained or sold and some
44 of it is donated.

45

46 As Nicole already mentioned, one of the
47 guiding acts is the Magnuson-Stevens Act. There is ten
48 national standards that the Council and NMFS have to
49 consider in taking any action. The three that are most
50 pertinent in terms of this action are those that deal

1 with minimizing salmon bycatch to the extent
2 practicable, preventing overfishing while achieving
3 optimum yield from each fishery, for example, the
4 Bering Sea pollock fishery, and providing for sustained
5 participation and minimizing adverse impact on fishing
6 communities.

7
8 So just to give you an idea of that in
9 terms of this is the management area in the Bering Sea.
10 All of these numbers and I've got some slides that'll
11 show you better where the pollock fishery itself
12 operates. The pollock fishery, just as a brief
13 overview, there's two seasons. They're called a winter
14 seasons and a summer season. So the winter season then
15 is the A Season fishery. The summer season is the B
16 Season fishery. There's four different sectors in the
17 pollock fishery and the quota is divided amongst those
18 sectors. So there are shoreside catcher vessels,
19 offshore catcher processors, mother ships that have
20 catcher vessels that deliver to them, and then the CDQ
21 fishery that operates on catcher processors.

22
23 So in all total in the last several
24 years, it's been about a hundred vessels, so about 15
25 catcher processors, three mother ships, and then about
26 70 of the catcher vessels that are either delivering to
27 the mother ships or shoreside catcher processors, and
28 again the quota for the pollock fishery is allocated
29 between these two seasons and amongst those four
30 sectors.

31
32 Just to give you an idea then, so A
33 Season is the winter fishery; B Season is the summer
34 fishery. And this just shows you in terms of the A
35 Season operates closer to shore on this Unimak Island
36 right here and up here, the Pribilofs. When you get to
37 the B Season and the pollock fishery's operating, it's
38 always up along the shelf break and they often are
39 operating in the B Season much, much further to the
40 northwest, close up here to the Russian line. So it is
41 an offshore fishery. It's operating on this shelf
42 break right here and just in this near-shore area.

43
44 In terms of trends, this graph just
45 gives you the annual bycatch mortality by species. So
46 chinook over here, these numbers from zero to 122 on
47 the left-hand side and on the right-hand side is chum,
48 again a different scale, zero to 700,000 here and these
49 are the trends from 1991 through the present. And as I
50 walk through briefly in terms of our management

1 measures, the Council often begins a new management
2 measure as we reach any of these peaks where the
3 current management measure doesn't seem to be working.
4 We hit a peak, we try to change course again.

5
6 So the Council's been managing -- has
7 been developing management measures for salmon bycatch
8 since the mid 1990s and these have usually been time
9 area closures which I'll show some graphs of in the
10 Bering Sea. These fixed-time area closures, however,
11 that we have been using since the mid '90s were fairly
12 unresponsive to changing conditions at present and the
13 Council started developing new management measures
14 based on more recent data. We took -- the Council took
15 these actions separately, the chinook action that was
16 completed in 2009 and is currently in the process of
17 the non-chinook action which is for chum salmon and
18 that's what we're talking about right now.

19
20 In terms of old measures then, this is
21 how we used to manage chinook. This is the chum salmon
22 savings area in the Bering Sea and so it was a time
23 area closure here, large-scale closure that when
24 triggered, the fleets could not go into that pink area
25 and could fish outside of it. That was put into place
26 way back here in the early '90s when chum bycatch
27 levels increased. Then there was an increase here in
28 the chinook bycatch levels later in the '90s and then
29 chinook salmon savings areas, similar concept, were
30 added to the Bering Sea with a separate trigger. So if
31 that was triggered, the fleet had to move and operate
32 outside of it.

33
34 Then when we get to 2005, this is when
35 we had the highest year for chum when the pollock
36 fishery caught about 700,000 chum salmon. At that
37 point, it looked like based on recent data that the --
38 when those closures were going into place, it was
39 pushing the fleet out into areas where the bycatch
40 rates were actually higher than they were inside the
41 area closures. So the Council looked at a different
42 measure and this is actually how chum is currently
43 management in the Bering Sea.

44
45 The fleet, if they participate in a
46 rolling hot spot program, is exempt from the large-
47 scale area closure that you saw before and what they're
48 subject to then are three- to seven-day closures that
49 are put into place by an outside agency under a
50 contract that they all belong to. So it's not a

1 voluntary closure. It's only voluntary not to be
2 subject to the broad closure. So the rolling hot spot
3 closures that they have to -- they are subject to are
4 three- to five-day closures that are on a smaller scale
5 than the large broad closure and are moving based on
6 realtime data on where the highest amount of bycatch is
7 at that time.

8

9 So what this picture's meant to show
10 you is that over all the years of that program, these
11 are all the closures that were put into place just, for
12 instance, in August. So they are these kind of boxed
13 closures or even more refined at times and then parts
14 of the fleet are subject to them at various points in
15 time. That's how chum is currently managed.

16

17 For chinook, following the Council's
18 action in 2009 under Amendment 21, we now have -- I'm
19 sorry -- 91, we have hard caps on the pollock fishery
20 for chinook. This picture just shows you during the
21 Council action on chinook in April of 2009. And this
22 program that I walked through very briefly was
23 implemented in 2011. So the fleet is currently
24 operating under a new hard cap system that was just put
25 into place that began on January 20th.

26

27 The Council's policy goals in taking
28 this Amendment 91 action are to reduce chinook bycatch
29 below a target level and to provide incentives at a
30 vessel level for reducing bycatch so that the salmon
31 bycatch reduce under all abundance conditions on the
32 fishing grounds and also provide opportunities for the
33 pollock fishery to catch their quota. The system then
34 is a two-cap system. There's a high cap overall, an
35 annual high cap of 60,000 chinook. That cap is
36 allocated over the two pollock seasons and across the
37 two -- the four pollock sectors, so it's allocated on a
38 much finer scale at the aggregate overall cap of
39 60,000. And in order to be a part of the program under
40 that 60,000 cap, the sectors must participate in an
41 incentive program.

42

43 The objective of the incentive program
44 then are that the bycatch stays consistently below a
45 lower cap number of 47,591 across all. That also has
46 it's own provisions to it that if any one sector
47 exceeds its portion of that lower cap three times in a
48 seven-year period, they would be stuck with the lower
49 cap from there forward regardless of having any
50 incentive program at all. So that's part of the

1 conditions of that program as well.

2

3 I won't go through these now that I see
4 you have your handouts, but there's more information in
5 the handouts than we'll talk through in the interest of
6 time. There's a lot of other provisions of Amendment
7 91 one of which was to increase the observer coverage
8 on the shoreside fleet so that everyone in the pollock
9 fishery has at least a hundred percent observer
10 coverage and effectively that was the shoreside catcher
11 vessels that were under the hundred percent coverage.
12 So there's now mandatory hundred percent observer
13 coverage on all vessels in the pollock fleet and one of
14 the things that this does, while the precision of our
15 estimates of salmon were very high before, having even
16 more observer coverage allows for this really small
17 scale management program to be put into place in order
18 to count the salmon at the level that it's being
19 managed now.

20

21 Okay. Going on then to just briefly go
22 over what the alternatives are for chum. Again this is
23 the same picture you saw before. This is the current
24 management is by this exemption and the fleet closure
25 system. The management measures that are being
26 considered -- and this is an action -- these were
27 modified last by the Council in February at our last
28 meeting. There's four different alternatives, the
29 first being the current management program, the second
30 being a range of hard caps on the pollock fishery. I
31 should mention that because the pollock fishery only
32 takes chum bycatch, it's only a summer season bycatch.
33 They don't get any chum bycatch in the A Season, so
34 this is a summer season measure that we're talking
35 about.

36

37 So the hard cap range is from 50,000 to
38 353,000. There's no incentive program being considered
39 in conjunction with that at this time. And then
40 triggered time area closures that I'll walk through in
41 terms of monthly closure systems that are based on
42 historical bycatch and the caps for those triggered
43 closures range from 25,000 to 200,000. And then the
44 final alternative is an updated exempted area closure
45 system.

46

47 And the part that we're in the middle
48 of right now is one of the things that we do is once
49 the Council has finalized their draft alternatives,
50 then we go through an analysis of the impact of those

1 alternatives so that the Council, before they take
2 their initial review action in June, has an analysis of
3 both here's the range of alternatives you're
4 considering, here's the impact of the bycatch
5 currently, and here's what we estimate the impact would
6 be under any of these additional management programs
7 and that's looking at the impact both on returning
8 salmon as well as the impact of the bycatch on
9 subsistence salmon harvest, communities, commercial and
10 sport, personal use.

11
12 In terms of the area closure
13 alternatives, this is looking at a more updated way of
14 managing chum bycatch by area closures and the way this
15 is framed is that there's three different benchmarks
16 for covering historical bycatch and what we're looking
17 at are different area closures in the blue by month.
18 So up here in the far left would be the closure that
19 would go into place in June. In July, you'd have these
20 two boxes closed. Again the fleet can fish outside of
21 those but cannot fish when those boxes themselves are
22 closed.

23
24 Down here is August, September's up
25 here in the right, and October is down here. Each of
26 these closures -- this closure system is meant to cover
27 40 percent of historical bycatch by area and month.
28 There's three options then. If you move to this one,
29 it would be a 50 percent bycatch closures and then the
30 final option is the 60 percent bycatch closures. So
31 depending policy-wise which of the three you're trying
32 to do, you would have larger closures by month in the
33 Bering Sea.

34
35 The final alternative then is similar
36 to the way status quo is currently framed. It would be
37 looking at a very large-scale closure and this one
38 represents 80 percent of the historical bycatch over
39 the last ten years and the fleet then would be exempt
40 from that broad-scale closure if they're participating
41 in this fleet-based hot spot system that closes again
42 those areas from three to seven days.

43
44 So what we're in the process of doing
45 right now is analyzing what the impact of those
46 different alternatives would be on the current bycatch
47 and I'll just go through this very quickly because I
48 know you want to focus on more on the alternatives and
49 the current situation. This is just an overview of how
50 we go about doing this analysis and mostly what we're

1 trying to do is get an estimate of what the actual
2 impact of the bycatch is in terms of the adult
3 equivalents. We know that not all of those fish that
4 are caught as bycatch will return to the rivers in that
5 year.

6
7 So we look at some of the information
8 such ocean mortality, how many of them would have died
9 in the ocean, what the age of the fish is in the
10 bycatch to look at how many would be mature in any one
11 year, and then on estimate of the maturity by river
12 system so that we know what percentage by age would go
13 back to any rivers.

14
15 Some of the information that we get
16 from the observer program, this just gives you the
17 length by year of all the samples that are counted and
18 this is how we get an estimate of the age of the fish
19 and just for the most part for chum, it's about four-
20 year-old fish that are caught in bycatch and it's
21 pretty consistent by year. One other thing that we
22 look at then is by month. So this is the same
23 information but looking at it by individual month and
24 even though these are all about the same age and
25 they're all about four years old, the -- what we found
26 is that we get bigger fish earlier in the B Season and
27 this starts to match up somewhat with the genetics that
28 we get in that the Western Alaska fish are more common
29 earlier in the beginning of the season in June and
30 July.

31
32 And so we see that in terms of they
33 look to be different size fish as well even though
34 they're the same age. So then this just gives you an
35 idea in terms of looking at the same information. In
36 the blue, you have the actual bycatch that we see in
37 numbers by year, so up here's the high year in 2005,
38 700,000. And then once we discount for those things,
39 for maturity, for mortality, what you end up with is
40 your adult equivalent here in green. It's a lower
41 number in the highest years, but it can be a higher
42 number the following year given that you have a lag
43 defect. So if you get all of that bycatch in one year,
44 you're actually impacting that year. It's less than
45 you might think given the overall number.

46
47 But what's going to happen is even if
48 you catch no bycatch the following year, you're still
49 going to have a lag defect because you caught some fish
50 the year before that would have gone back a year later.

1 So those are the kind of things that we try to estimate
2 in order to figure out what the impacts of these
3 different measures are on different fisheries.

4
5 In terms of genetics, this just shows
6 you overall right how the way that the genetics are
7 broken out. We do have information of stock of origin
8 of chum. They're broken out in really broad groups, so
9 we've got two Asian groups over here. There's one
10 broad Western Alaska group. There's the Upper and
11 Middle Yukon. There's the Alaska Peninsula and then
12 there's this other group that goes everywhere from
13 Prince William Sound all the way down the Pacific
14 Northwest and British Columbia.

15
16 More information that we get from the
17 geneticists right now in general, this just shows you
18 from '91 to 2010, the proportion of the bycatch from
19 these broad areas and what you see is in blue here, the
20 majority of the chum salmon are coming from Asia. A
21 much smaller proportion here in the dash lines are
22 coming from Alaska and then the rest from that large
23 broad grouping. And one other thing that we see again
24 is that the proportion from Western Alaska is higher in
25 the earlier months of the year and then drops off in
26 the August to October time period where you have a much
27 higher proportion of Asian fish.

28
29 So right now we're right in the middle
30 of doing this analysis, but preliminary results are
31 that about 17 percent of the chum salmon from the
32 pollock fishery would have returned to Western Alaska
33 rivers a kind of plus or minus 5 percent and comparing
34 that to total run sizes, it ends up being less than
35 about 1 percent on average. And again the main thing
36 is that the majority of the bycatch is attributed to
37 Asian hatcheries.

38
39 Other things that we will be looking at
40 that we'll have a report on in the analysis that will
41 come out, again we'll try to estimate the impact of the
42 bycatch by river systems. We're stuck with some broad
43 regional groupings at this point right now. We also
44 look at how effective those area closures might be in
45 reducing bycatch overall over different years. We're
46 looking at some more restrictive caps earlier in the
47 season because that seems to be that the policy goal is
48 to protect Western Alaska chum, having more stringent
49 measures earlier in the B Season when that's when we
50 see more of the Western Alaska fish is one of the

1 things that's part of the framework of the
2 alternatives.

3

4 And then we look at what the impact of
5 the caps are on the pollock fleet compared to area
6 closures as well as the impact on salmon subsistence,
7 commercial, and personal use fisheries. One important
8 aspect here that we weren't -- wasn't at the forefront
9 of the chinook action is now we're talking about the
10 same fishery and we're trading off the policy
11 considerations for reducing chum bycatch and reducing
12 chinook bycatch. They have different seasonal and
13 spacial trends. Again this is looking just at the B
14 Season, but what you see is basically over the B Season
15 starting here on the left in early June and ending at
16 the end of October here on the right. In green is your
17 pollock catch over that whole season. In blue is the
18 chum catch and in red is your chinook catch.

19

20 And what we know is that the chum catch
21 increases as you start to get into August. That's when
22 the majority of the chum starts to increase and stays
23 fairly constant then. But chinook is different. The
24 pollock fleet doesn't catch chinook until they get into
25 early September and so they get into early September to
26 October and that's when they catch the majority of the
27 chinook. So we're trying to look at if you move the
28 pollock fishery into areas late in the season, you
29 might actually make your chinook situation worse and
30 that's not your goal. Your goal is to try to reduce
31 bycatch of chum, but also maintain the same incentives
32 to reduce the bycatch of chinook as well. So this is a
33 trade-off the Council will be facing on there.

34

35 And just to show you over three
36 different years, 2003 in the top, 2005 in the middle,
37 and 2007, just the location of where the pollock
38 fishery is and the fact that it really varies by year.
39 There are some areas where you get a lot of chum and
40 you're not hitting chinook in those areas. There's
41 other times where those are going to be the same areas.
42 So what we find is that for the most part we can close
43 some areas for chum and that ends up being effective
44 for both. So an area closure for chum seems to be
45 working and some measures for both, but we're also
46 under the first year of this Amendment 91 program and
47 so this is the very first season. So any fleet
48 behavior changes and any bycatch changes that we see as
49 a result of that, we will have an update on in June
50 based on the first season of fishing under it and

1 then -- and the B Season will be the first time that we
2 face it there.

3

4 Did you want to go through this.....

5

6 MS. KIMBALL: Yeah. To provide the
7 context for where we are again. So the Council got
8 this kind of preliminary information in February and
9 then revised the suite of alternatives to what Donald
10 just handed out, the February 2011 version. So as I
11 said, we do have alternatives that they're considering,
12 the ones that Diana just went over. We're trying to
13 talk to people in February and March time frame when
14 people are doing all their meetings so that we can have
15 input or people at least know this is on the Council
16 agenda for June. And the June meeting's actually going
17 to be in Nome. We haven't held a meeting -- a Council
18 meeting there before, but there was a big push for
19 several of the agenda items, not just cum. So we will
20 be in Nome and that will be the first formal review of
21 this analysis. So all of those slides that said
22 analysis in progress, that's the summary of those kinds
23 of things that we'll have in June.

24

25 And at that point, the Council could
26 modify the suite of alternatives that's on the table.
27 That's like the -- you know, one of the last times they
28 would do that would be in June so that the analysts can
29 have, you know, a kind of set suite of alternatives for
30 the final action document. And as we said before, they
31 could also select a preliminary preferred alternative
32 in June. They did that for chinook where they tried to
33 show the public where they were headed in terms of what
34 ended up being a hard cap. But they may not do that
35 for chum. You may just go through the June analyses,
36 make changes, request new data, that kind of typical
37 thing that happens at initial review and then not see a
38 final document or final decision until October or
39 December of this year. That would be the earliest
40 possibility.

41

42 So I won't go through it because it's
43 in your handout, but there -- we're trying to talk to a
44 lot of people on chum, some of the same people with
45 chinook, but also some different ones. We did a
46 statewide teleconference in May that had several
47 villages along the Yukon River that participated. It
48 was just a call-in where we went through a PowerPoint
49 presentation and tried to let people know that this was
50 coming on the Council agenda. We've been talking to

1 the Yukon River panel. We give regular presentations
2 to them. And again we'll be in Nome in June.

3
4 The people that we're talking to out in
5 Western Alaska and the interior and the RAC system,
6 these are the four RACs that we're trying to talk to.
7 We'll be in Fairbanks tomorrow to attend the Eastern
8 Interior RAC meeting. We unfortunately couldn't get to
9 the Seward Peninsula RAC meeting because it conflicted
10 with another meeting, but we did present the same
11 presentation at the Bering Sea Strait regional
12 conference in Nome last week and of course we'll be in
13 Nome again in June, so I think there'll be a lot of
14 ability or opportunity for public participation through
15 that meeting. And then we'll also be at the Tanana
16 Chiefs Conference in Fairbanks middle of the month
17 under their bycatch agenda item.

18
19 And then the last thing is how to
20 provide public input to the Council. We always end,
21 you know, with this, but I think, you know, your system
22 has been very good in sending us letters and
23 resolutions and providing public comment, so this isn't
24 new information for you. But we did also bring these.
25 I left them with Donald if you're interested. It's
26 these little booklets that you could give to anybody in
27 your community that just says how to participate if you
28 can't actually be at a meeting in person.

29
30 So that's it for our presentation.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. The Council
33 has questions on the presentation. Ray.

34
35 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. My first question
36 is the approach of the caps. Isn't that in fact an
37 allocation? And especially if they can move it from
38 season to season and I can see in the high years that
39 cap may -- when there's lots of salmon out there,
40 they're going to reach that cap and it may shut it off
41 sooner, but where you had historically low cash years,
42 you're going to allow them to over fish in the year
43 when there are fewer out there to catch, if it's
44 strictly an allocation. How are you going to factor
45 that in? Because it looks like you'd have more impact
46 on the low years when you want to be able to be
47 protecting them.

48
49 MR. TWEIT: We were very concerned
50 about that particularly with chinook, where we know in

1 the lower years, that's probably when they need the
2 most protection and certainly that is the biggest
3 problem with the hard cap. And that's why as we
4 described and maybe Diana can scroll back to it, but we
5 actually adopted a two-pronged approach.

6
7 We put in a hard cap to do exactly what
8 you said which is cut it off in those big years, put a
9 fence around the problem. But then the second part of
10 what we did is -- and that's through the incentive
11 programs, requiring the incentive programs, but this
12 still doesn't quite get to it. This describes the
13 fence and that was sort of the important backstop, just
14 to make there was an upper number that under all kinds
15 of imaginable problems, they couldn't go past that.

16
17 But then the other part of it is the
18 individual vessels are expected to minimize their
19 bycatch. So we told the industry we wanted them to
20 develop a program under which a vessel was always
21 penalized for -- even if it had only caught a few
22 chinook. Every single additional chinook should in
23 essence give the skipper of that vessel heartburn, even
24 if they only have a few. And so that's the other part
25 of the program that we've put in place and it's a lot
26 harder to describe because it is truly experimental.

27
28 Everybody knows how hard caps work and
29 they do exactly what you said. On the one hand, they
30 put an upper limit on it, but then they don't control
31 behavior inside that and so that's why we went with
32 this two-pronged approach. 2011 is the first year
33 where the fleet themselves has been controlling their
34 behavior to avoid chinook no matter what their bycatch
35 levels are.

36
37 They ran it on a pilot -- part of the
38 fleet ran it on a pilot program last year in 2010 and
39 overall we were very pleased with how it worked and
40 they were pleased with how it worked as well. But
41 these individual vessel incentive programs are
42 specifically designed by the fleet themselves because
43 we can't really regulate how an individual skipper
44 behaves out on the water. We can have observers
45 onboard to monitor what they catch and what the results
46 of their behavior are, but you can't -- as you well
47 know, you can't regulate individual behavior very well
48 when you're trying to encourage good behavior.

49
50 You can outlaw very bad behavior, but

1 you can't try to encourage good behavior and that's
2 really what we're doing with the other. So we'll tell
3 you and we'll keep telling you how that part of it's
4 working, but that's the other essential part of the
5 Council's program is that program to encourage every
6 skipper, no matter how many chinook they've got that
7 year, whether they're up near their limit and they
8 ought to be nervous or whether they've only got a few,
9 they should be equally nervous about that next chinook
10 that comes onboard.

11
12 So that's the two-pronged program and
13 that was specifically designed to get at that problem
14 that you noted because the last thing we wanted was to
15 set up a race to the hard cap and that's easily what
16 you can do. If you put a hard cap in wrong, you'll set
17 up a race to the hard cap and that number won't become
18 a cap anymore. It'll become an annual expectation and
19 we know with chinook in particular because chinook are
20 all U.S. stocks. Many of them are from stocks that
21 clearly have long-term conservation and yield issues.
22 We knew we didn't want to set up any number that
23 fishermen would fish up to and so we chose that
24 two-pronged approach and so far it's working very well,
25 but we haven't had another year of high abundance yet.
26 So that'll certainly stress it differently, but it --
27 the proportion of the fleet that worked it last year on
28 a voluntary basis found that it worked really well and
29 we'll tell you how this year goes at the end of the
30 year.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you.

33
34 DR. STRAM: It helps also at the
35 beginning of this year, just in terms of behavioral
36 changes that we've already observed that the fleet
37 stood down for the first two weeks of the season
38 voluntarily on their own basically because everybody is
39 very nervous now about running into chinook bycatch and
40 so the season opened on January 20th and the majority
41 of the fleet waited out the first ten days because in
42 the past those have been times of high chinook bycatch
43 and so they all stood down and waited and the bycatch
44 so far is at about 2,400 chinook.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Other
47 questions from the Council. Tim.

48
49 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
50 have a question on a handout. It's called North

1 Pacific Management Council's evaluating measures to
2 limit chum salmon bycatch in the Bering Sea pollock
3 fishery and it has this chart that shows your chum
4 bycatch. I'm at second -- end of the second paragraph,
5 it says North Pacific Council's required by the
6 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Act to balance minimizing
7 salmon bycatch to the extent practicable with allowing
8 full harvest of the pollock to allowable catch.

9

10 Can you go into more detail on what the
11 determining parameters are on that and how does the
12 Council evaluate the priority over what's more
13 important, the reduction of bycatch or that the pollock
14 fleet can get all of their TAC.

15

16 DR. STRAM: In terms of where those
17 come from those are actually the national standards.
18 There's ten national standards under the Magnuson-
19 Stevens Act and so the Council considers all ten of
20 them in any action. How they prioritize and balance
21 between them, I would look to the Council members to
22 answer.

23

24 MR. TWEIT: Okay. I think you probably
25 want to hear from both Council members. Right now
26 obviously we each have our own opinion as Council
27 members and until we take that final vote, can't tell
28 you exactly how we will balance.

29

30 What I can tell you, when I think back
31 again to chinook, how we balanced it on chinook was the
32 belief -- at least my belief and I think this is what
33 the Council ended up all agreeing to was that there was
34 no reason not to try to really achieve both. Continue
35 to achieve the full yield of pollock because that's
36 very important for a lot of reasons, but at the same
37 time expect individual fishermen to constantly be
38 working to minimize, always aware of the problem of
39 bycatch of chinook and to be constantly working to
40 minimize that and then we'd sit back and see over time
41 whether that really got it down to the point where it's
42 just acceptable background level given -- you know, if
43 you get it down to a small enough number, it'd spread
44 across a huge range of Western Alaska and Alaska
45 Peninsula stocks, whether at that point it was
46 essentially not -- it'll never be zero. We know that
47 in the real world, but to the point where it's
48 functionally zero, where the subsistence users in
49 Western Alaska just don't notice it.

50

1 That was my goal was to actually try to
2 fully achieve both and I think that's really the
3 Council's goal with chinook. I can't tell you for sure
4 how we'll balance it for chum. There's a lot of
5 differences. Chum as you saw a huge portion of that is
6 Asian. They flood that Bering Sea. We don't have
7 control over how many hatchery chum they put out.
8 Should we be having to take the same degree of caution
9 with that? At least my personal thought is probably,
10 but we also recognize the real importance to Western
11 Alaskans of chum for subsistence.

12
13 So I would hope that as the Council
14 we'll be able to again arrive at a solution that I
15 believe really achieves continuing to optimize the
16 yield of pollock and at the same time taking the
17 harvest of the chum that matter particularly to the
18 subsistence users, bringing that down to a level that
19 is functionally low enough that again it's part of the
20 background noise and that it's not something that's
21 detracting directly from subsistence fisheries.

22
23 Does that mean we have to stop catching
24 all chum though? My personal view is no, I don't think
25 so. There's a lot of Asian chum out there and others.
26 So the question is how do you bring it down enough and
27 again I can't tell you how we'll get there, but that's
28 my personal views.

29
30 MR. GERVAIS: Can I follow up.....

31
32 MR. TWEIT: Well, let Dan chime in and
33 then certainly.

34
35 MR. HULL: Go ahead.

36
37 MR. GERVAIS: So you're saying that
38 under the guidelines of the national standards then you
39 as individual Council members decide -- you have kind
40 of a free style approach within those national
41 standards to develop a program that's similar to
42 the.....

43
44 MR. TWEIT: Yes. Yeah. That to the
45 extent possible, the better a job it does at addressing
46 all those standards, then obviously the better we feel
47 about our recommendation and then the more likely the
48 Secretary of Commerce is to agree with us and adopt
49 that recommendation.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

2

3 MR. HULL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bill
4 has gone through this exercise with chinook bycatch
5 which -- and I would -- this is my second year on the
6 Council and the Council took action on chinook before I
7 was on the Council. So this is my first time through a
8 bycatch problem of this magnitude and I think I would
9 agree with Bill's approach of trying to achieve both,
10 trying to achieve reductions of bycatch as much as
11 possible, recognizing that chum are extremely important
12 to all the communities along the rivers, the Yukon,
13 Kuskokwim, and at the same time, try to achieve pollock
14 fishery's ability to take their TAC.

15

16 But there will be different factors to
17 consider in chum I think than chinook. And I guess at
18 this point, I'm not -- we haven't seen the analysis
19 back yet for me to know in greater detail about how to
20 think about this particular problem, but I can assure
21 you that I recognize the importance of chum in the
22 communities along these rivers, and so that's going to
23 be a particularly important part of my considerations
24 when I read the analyses.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Another
27 question, Ray.

28

29 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. What is the
30 driving incentive to try to maximize pollock catch
31 because I think this year they're talking about
32 extending it, giving them more time because they didn't
33 achieve it last year. It seemed to me if we look at it
34 historically, all the fishers, we try to maximize it,
35 eventually those things going to crash. What is the
36 problem of letting more of them go and having the
37 expectation of something lower than maximum catch. And
38 again I think of what happened in Oregon when they
39 started allowing the catch based on let's say all the
40 chums, even if they are Asian, if that's the number out
41 there that's accounting for the high and so on, what is
42 happening then to escapement on the wild stocks because
43 they turned around and looked and all of a sudden, they
44 had -- their wild stocks were just about disappearing
45 because they were allowing the catch based on all of
46 those hatchery fish that were other there.

47

48 So even with chums, even -- we say,
49 well, most of those Asian, they're out of hatchery
50 there, we may be having more and more impact on that

1 lower number of wild stocks there. So why not crank
2 that maximum allowable down somewhere where you won't
3 get into that problem instead of them always wanting to
4 try to push that number up as far as they can.

5
6 MR. TWEIT: Thank you. The first
7 question, which was about maximizing the harvest of
8 pollock, that's a very good question and certainly
9 something in my own career in fisheries, I've seen
10 exactly what you've talked about over and over and over
11 again. We've sort of gone to what we call maximum
12 sustainable yield and taken and taken it and taken it
13 and found out it was a little too high.

14
15 One of the big differences between how
16 pollock is managed and many of the other world's
17 fisheries are managed is that we've actually learned
18 our lessons in many ways with pollock. I don't want to
19 say that I can predict confidently it'll be a success
20 forever. Mother Nature always has a way of throwing
21 you a curve, but pollock is one of the most
22 conservatively managed healthy, abundant fisheries in
23 the world. There's a handful of others like it, but
24 instead of taking what we would call MSY or maximum
25 sustainable yield for pollock, we actually --
26 recognizing that first off, because pollock is a
27 longer-lived species and so if you underharvest a bit
28 in one year, it's not that big of deal. You can always
29 recognize it the next year with your stock assessment
30 and take advantage of that.

31
32 Anyway, we set our pollock harvest
33 rates very conservatively and the further Congress
34 mandated a cap on overall yield out of the Bering Sea
35 of 2 million metric tons and at low levels, that
36 doesn't act to really constrain us. We take up to what
37 we call the -- sort of the full harvestable amount of
38 pollock which is still set very conservatively, much
39 more conservatively than your typical MSY.

40
41 But in most years, that 2 million
42 metric ton cap requires that we then further adjust the
43 pollock harvest down. Last couple years, it hasn't
44 come into effect, but most years it does and we'll
45 often end up, I don't know, 20, 30 percent lower some
46 years because of that 2 million metric tons. We have
47 sort of a double buffering. First off, our pollock
48 harvest framework is more conservative than most
49 harvest frameworks and then secondly, the Congressional
50 cap of 2 million metric ton cap often causes us to take

1 a second step.

2

3 So we do back it way back with pollock.
4 Industry doesn't actually complain about that very much
5 because first off that's one of the reasons certified
6 globally as a sustainable fish, which then they can
7 market it as sustainably certified and that actually
8 gives them some extra sort of credit and some extra
9 price and value. And secondly, because they know for
10 the long term we're doing the best job possible of
11 stewarding -- and this is just -- this is sort of
12 typical white fish. So it competes on the world market
13 against a lot of other fish stocks elsewhere. But they
14 kind of know sort of like maybe an oil cartel knows.

15

16 We've still got a lot of oil in the
17 ground. Maybe those folks want to pump all their oil
18 out right now, but we're pumping out enough to keep us
19 going right now and we'll still have oil when everybody
20 else has run out. Well, I think our pollock industry
21 thinks relatively similarly. We'll still have pollock
22 when many of the other world's fish are overfished and
23 they take a lot of comfort in that. They know that
24 they're here for the long term as well.

25

26 I hope that gives you some sense of the
27 answer back on that. Then you asked a question about
28 sort of mixing hatchery and wild stocks and also that's
29 an extremely good question. And you're absolutely
30 right. You don't want to let the presence of the
31 hatchery stock sort of blind you to the conservation
32 needs of the wild stocks. And so what I hope I
33 conveyed but may not have conveyed all that well was my
34 sense that I just hoped that we would not end up
35 trading off pollock harvest because of the presence of
36 large numbers of Asian hatchery fish, but I do believe
37 that it is a more appropriate question to ask, well,
38 are there times when you should balance pollock with
39 the conservation needs of Alaskan and particularly
40 Yukon but some of the other stocks of salmon -- chum
41 salmon that are particularly heavily dependent on for
42 subsistence.

43

44 That is indeed a different thing and I
45 hope I didn't sound like I was implying that somehow we
46 would in essence trigger everything off the presence of
47 large numbers of hatchery fish because you're
48 absolutely right. Other times we done that, it's
49 proved to be a failure. You'll be glad to know Oregon
50 natural coho have actually recovered very well in the

1 last few years and so the decade and a half or two
2 decades' worth of overharvest because of the large
3 number of hatchery fish doesn't appear to have caused
4 terminal problems and they're actually recovering
5 pretty well, but it sure caused a lot of trouble during
6 the recovery period. We had to dramatically
7 restructure fisheries in order to correct that problem.
8 And we're not -- none of us are interested in trying to
9 repeat that.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does that answer
12 your question, Ray?

13

14 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, it does I guess,
15 but another thing we need to watch besides just the
16 basic minimum if we're trying to rebuild stock is that
17 every year that the -- we don't get the escapement we
18 need, we're actually depleting the ability of that
19 stream to produce fish in the future because that's
20 putting nutrients back into that stream and if you go
21 through a number of low years on there, you've lowered
22 the whole production of that system, making it even
23 harder to recover.

24

25 So there's really got to be a strong
26 effort to keep these returns healthy if we're going to
27 have long-term and healthy returns I think. So that
28 has to be factored in somehow too of what is the impact
29 of a number of low years on the productivity of that
30 stream because they're learned more about that as time
31 goes on of what they've done to some of those streams
32 and so that's got to be factored in too I guess is what
33 I'm saying, yeah.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ray. My
36 question is of these -- there's AYK stocks of chum that
37 are on -- in real hardship. There's broad and genetic
38 interpretation. I was wondering if the Council's
39 considered funding additional assistance for genetic
40 studies of stocks of concern and so that during the
41 early portion of the B Season, those particular stocks
42 of concern can be avoided at all costs and that means
43 larger closer areas and so forth. And so I was
44 wondering if the Council's contemplated that issue of
45 avoidance of the most critical stocks of concern.

46

47 DR. STRAM: Mr. Chairman, in terms of
48 that's exactly how these area closures are structured
49 currently and we're working with -- there's a group of
50 geneticists at the Auke Bay lab in Juneau and a lot of

1 emphasis in recent years in particular in conjunction
2 with the chinook action has put a lot of emphasis and
3 additional funding towards them specifically to
4 delineate all these stocks of origin for genetics.

5
6 So that kind of funding and pressure
7 has already occurred in conjunction with our chinook
8 action. The Council itself has also funded another
9 portion of that study to get the age information so
10 that we could go forward with this analysis to look at
11 the ages of the fish in the bycatch for chum and we're
12 working with the geneticists at that lab specifically
13 and literally weekly right now to try to figure out to
14 the best of their ability are there areas and
15 congregations that we could draw out based on the data
16 that they have which for the most part is from 2005
17 through 2010.

18
19 And so we're working with them exactly
20 to look at specific areas of concern focusing on the
21 Western Alaska and the Upper and Middle Yukon stocks
22 and where are they at which times of the year and can
23 we use those patterns to try to focus the Council's
24 concerns should they -- or their choices should they go
25 forward with -- that's the benefit of an area closure
26 system is that we know that there are -- there is some
27 consistency in where those stocks are and when in the
28 Bering Sea and if the Council's policy was to avoid the
29 increasing the impact on Western Alaska stocks, that's
30 the kind of information we're trying to pull forward
31 right now.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, I'm more
34 specific as to like the Norton Sound and Southern
35 Chukchi stocks are very concerned right now and so I'm
36 -- is there additional funding being targeted for
37 auxiliary clips and so forth to get more genetic
38 information on those particular stocks not just the
39 broad AYK stock.

40
41 DR. STRAM: Yes. Mr. Chairman, that is
42 ongoing. There's different initiatives. There's the
43 WASUP (ph) program. Currently they are working on
44 delineating those stocks. Right now they don't have
45 the ability to pull Norton Sound out. It gets confused
46 with other genetic stocks, but the work on that is
47 continuing and they anticipate in the next I believe
48 two years they'll have a much finer scale breakout than
49 what we're working with right now.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Appreciate
2 that.
3
4 MS. KIMBALL: Maybe mention the
5 potential finest scale that we could get in this
6 analysis. I know you don't.....
7
8 DR. STRAM: Yeah.
9
10 MS. KIMBALL:but I think you just
11 should say that.....
12
13 DR. STRAM: Unfortunately for our
14 purposes right now, those broad genetic aggregations
15 may be as far as we can go in terms of an aggregate
16 Western Alaska group, an Upper/Middle Yukon group, and
17 a Alaska Peninsula group. What we're trying to work
18 with the area management biologists on is a justifiable
19 approach to take those broad groupings and use run
20 strength to try to give a gross approximation of how
21 much of those groupings are made up of these individual
22 groups.
23
24 We know that we absolutely cannot do
25 that for Norton Sound. The very best situation that
26 we'd be able to produce in this analysis would have a
27 breakout for summer chum, fall chum, Kuskokwim, and
28 then everybody else and we're still -- oh, yeah, sorry.
29 Summer chum on the Yukon and fall chum on the Yukon,
30 the Kuskokwim area and then broad-based everybody else,
31 so that means that you might have Bristol Bay in there
32 with Norton Sound, but that's the best we think we can
33 do. The worst we think we can do is going to be just a
34 coastal/Western Alaska group and Upper/Middle Yukon
35 group and then -- because that's the way the genetics
36 are broken out right now.
37
38 We're waiting for the genetics to go
39 forward to justify the finer scale breakouts, but in
40 the meantime, we're trying to see if we can do some
41 kind of back of the envelope sort of way to just get a
42 gross approximation of those individual breakouts, but
43 we know in particular Norton Sound was the one we've
44 been trying really hard to see if we could look at that
45 one separately given that it is the stock of concern
46 now still, but we can't do it.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thank you.
49 Other comments, questions. Go ahead, Tim.
50

1 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 I'm looking at this slide from the presentation policy
3 considerations and what it leads me to is to recommend
4 as you guys are developing -- I know what your next
5 amendment's going to be, Amendment 94 for the chum.
6 Does that have a name?

7
8 DR. STRAM: It doesn't have a name.

9
10 MS. KIMBALL: It doesn't yet.

11
12 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. I'm seeing where
13 the king bycatch is somewhat manageable up through
14 September. I believe at this time the pollock fleets
15 making tows, what, nine to ten months out of the year?

16
17 DR. STRAM: Well, the pollock fishery
18 operates -- they start in the end of June. They're
19 usually all done their quota by early April.
20 Technically they could fish until June, but for the
21 most part, the quota's taken by late March/early April.
22 Then the pollock fishery starts again in the middle of
23 June, but they don't fish very much until into July and
24 then they've taken their quota usually by sometime in
25 October and it closes in November.

26
27 MR. GERVAIS: So is it potentially
28 possible to get the fleet tied up for the year by
29 September 10th or something and give some protection?
30 I mean that's what -- I just -- when we look at this
31 fishery started '90 or '91 and we just look at our --
32 just at the Yukon king population over that 21-year
33 span, it's just been kind of in steady decline. It
34 could be just a coincidence that it's the trawl fleet,
35 but it had some effects. I mean I know we took some
36 really, really big hits 2006, 2007 that as far as we
37 experience here in our region, the stocks have never
38 been able to recover out of like it took the population
39 down to a level that they just can't -- they're --
40 between that and the way we're -- we've taken our
41 management actions, it hasn't allowed the stocks to
42 recover.

43
44 And I feel like you as the Council, the
45 managers, and the fleet need to take a look at not
46 being on the water for so many months out of the year
47 and give these fish some R and R out there where they
48 don't have a bunch of draggers bearing down on them in
49 such a -- for such a long duration. I mean that's
50 where we have a secondary problem. It's not just the

1 amount of fish coming back, but our age, sex, and
2 length is really diminished in quality and I believe
3 one factor in why we're not seeing the bigger fish back
4 -- I mean I'm quite sure that gillnet fishing has a
5 part to that, but I believe another part is the older
6 fish aren't as abundant because they're out there
7 trying to dodge the trawl fleet for so many more years.

8
9 I mean the king has, what, five --
10 four, five, six, seven years in the marine environment.
11 So if a king has a chance to be in bycatch, the 13
12 percent chance or something per year and then you
13 compound that by how many years as it grows up, then I
14 believe that's one reason why we're not seeing the
15 older fish that are getting back to spawning grounds
16 and that has huge effect on the amount of production
17 we're getting off our spawning grounds.

18
19 We spoke with a fellow that's on the
20 Eastern Interior. I guess you'll -- you might talk to
21 him tomorrow, is that where you're going?

22
23 (Members nod affirmatively)

24
25 MR. GERVAIS: Andy Bassich, and he runs
26 a check station there in Eagle and he's -- he may show
27 you his presentation on fecundity and stuff like that,
28 but basically their average size of their king is like
29 12 pounds, which is tiny, barely sexually significant.
30 So -- or reproductively significant.

31
32 So I would really like to see if we
33 could develop a management strategy that gets the trawl
34 fleet off the water for longer durations of time.

35
36 DR. STRAM: Mr. Chairman, Timothy. I
37 think what you're going to see, likely given this is
38 our first year of operation under Amendment 91, what I
39 think we're going to see is that they are going to try
40 to get their quota and get off the water before they
41 hit the chinook time periods. The problem that you
42 face then is what happens if you fish earlier and if
43 you fish earlier, you're probably going to avoid the
44 chinook, but are you going to catch chum. And I think
45 that's what -- the policy part that's in front of the
46 Council is that as you encourage -- with the
47 prioritization being on chinook and the fleet now
48 having a very expensive cap system in place, they've
49 already shown in the A Season that they are trying to
50 stand down during the times that it's the highest and

1 what that means in the B Season is that they don't want
2 to be catching their quota out in this time period. So
3 they want to catch their quota sooner.

4
5 If we can figure out a way to have
6 areas in the Bering Sea where we think the chum is
7 highest and they avoid those areas while trying to
8 catch their quota sooner, then they might be able to
9 get both, get off the water earlier without catching
10 that chinook but not run into the areas of chum and
11 that's exactly what the point of trying to balance
12 these two is, is as you pointed out.

13
14 MR. TWEIT: Just one other point to
15 remember on that. When we talk about the fleet being
16 out there, remember each vessel has its own quota of
17 pollock and so there may be some vessels still fishing
18 late in the season when most vessels have gone in
19 already because they've already filled up their annual
20 quota. And so different -- as you know, just different
21 companies, different boats, sometimes CDQs versus the
22 other sectors, all have their own fishing plans, and so
23 while you may be thinking of the fleet as a whole, all
24 the boats all being out there for that entire time
25 period, that's actually rarely the case.

26
27 It's more the case in the A Season in
28 that everybody's out there together during --
29 particularly during those first few weeks of the A
30 season, the entire fleet's out there. But one reason
31 the B Season is so long is because individual boats are
32 doing different things in different places at different
33 times and may not be focused much on pollock at all for
34 quite a while.

35
36 And so what you may be thinking of as a
37 large block of effort out there all the time is
38 actually kind of a bit here, a bit there sort of a
39 fishery and while certainly if the chance for chinook
40 to be caught were 13 percent each year in a trawl,
41 absolutely it would explain that.

42
43 MR. GERVAIS: That was average.

44
45 MR. TWEIT: But while we don't know yet
46 what that chance is, I think given what's out there now
47 in terms of fall fishing, you're really not -- you're
48 looking at a fair number of catcher vessels, but even
49 then it's -- the entire fleet is only 100 or so, a lot
50 less than that at any given time. I think the odds get

1 to be pretty low and then of course now we're
2 incentivizing the individual skippers. Each skipper to
3 actively work on further decreasing those odds as well.

4
5 So it's not -- when you look at it up
6 close, it may not be exactly what it looks like from a
7 distance either, would just be the other point I would
8 add to that.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you.
11 Any further discussion from the Council. And.....

12
13 MR. GERVAIS: May I ask one more?

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One more, Tim.

16
17 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
18 The other -- the last thing I'm going to ask about is
19 -- or comment about is the ethics issue. And it seems
20 like the Council makeup for the appointed members is
21 really skewed towards the trawl industry and I feel it
22 would be better for the Council's reputation and I
23 think it would be better for the other user groups,
24 fishery user groups that aren't -- necessarily want to
25 see everything go pollock's way, if you could get some
26 representation from the other sectors.

27
28 I know with this new TAC, they've
29 calculated as 2.75 billion pounds of fish, I mean the
30 pollock fleet is financially very significant, but I
31 feel that there's a lot of different fisheries that are
32 being conducted in the Federal waters and it would seem
33 appropriate to have a more balanced membership.

34
35 And the other part of the ethics thing
36 is I feel there should be some kind of -- you could put
37 in a rule process like -- and I'm just going to pick
38 this out because it's what I'm -- I've read a few
39 articles on and it was like when former Council Chair
40 Stephanie Madsen went from being the Council Chair to
41 being a -- I'm not sure of the job title, but Director
42 of the At-Sea Processor's Association, to me that's --
43 that kind of smacks of corruption. I mean how do you
44 go from a regulatory body directly into a lobbying
45 body. Can you address that? I think you're probably
46 more familiar with the situation, but I -- that was
47 just rotten I believe.

48
49 MR. TWEIT: I just want to start out by
50 pointing out that the Council Chair is not -- first

1 off, not a regulatory position. We do recommend. Now,
2 most of the time, the Agency actually adopts the
3 recommendations that we make but not always and it's
4 the Agency themselves that are actually the regulator.
5 We are truly an advisory body. And we're made up of
6 both State officials and so I am a regulator in my
7 other positions. At home in Washington, I regulate
8 salmon fisheries, for instance, including in-river
9 salmon fisheries.

10
11 But many of our members are not
12 regulators. Many of them are industry representatives
13 and that actually will get back to your first question.
14 And Stephanie Madsen was put on the Council as an
15 industry member. We elected her as Chair because of
16 her abilities to chair a meeting well and because she
17 brought a lot of vision to the council process. I
18 think she brought tremendous value in terms of
19 improving the Council's roll in ecosystem management
20 and did -- Arctic Ocean, setting aside the Arctic as an
21 area to not start by fishing but start by studying and
22 then build fishing, those kinds of things.

23
24 So Stephanie was never on the Council
25 as a regulator. She was always on the Council as a
26 representative of industry. In fact when she was on
27 the Council, she was employed by a different trade
28 association, one of the processors, the Pacific Seafood
29 Processors Association.

30
31 So she's always been an industry
32 representative in her personal life, but I believe as a
33 Council member, she always took her responsibilities --
34 and you take an oath of office. When you're appointed
35 to the Council, you take an oath of office to uphold
36 the Magnuson Act as well as meet the national interest.
37 And again the Magnuson Act requires us to balance the
38 interests of the fishing communities, fishing-dependent
39 people, and that doesn't mean necessarily just folks
40 who make a living off the Bering Sea but folks who are
41 impacted by what we do.

42
43 So I think it's unfortunate that you
44 view that that way. I don't think really either the
45 facts or Stephanie's own accomplishments as Chair of
46 the Council fit with that.

47
48 The question you raised about the
49 makeup of the Council is one that I think Congress has
50 grappled with in the past and will probably continue to

1 grapple with in the future and the Magnuson Act
2 represents a balancing of -- and again because we're an
3 advisory body, because ultimately the authority still
4 rests with the Secretary of Commerce as the regulator,
5 Congress put together what they thought at the time and
6 when they reviewed it most recently, they end up
7 deciding that they like the balance of industry
8 participants and -- as well as government officials
9 like myself.

10

11 One of the things that both Congress
12 and the Department of Commerce are asking us to
13 continue to look at though as councils and asking the
14 state governors to look at each time they make an
15 appointment is the diversity. Are we just catering
16 only to the established interests or are the governors
17 and the Secretary looking for Council members who have
18 broader backgrounds. And we're under sort of
19 continuing scrutiny. Every year the Department of
20 Commerce produces a report for Congress on the makeup
21 of each council in the nation and how many of them are
22 basically -- strictly recreational fishery
23 representatives, how many of them are strictly
24 commercial fishery representatives, how many of them
25 represent other interests, either fishing communities
26 or environmental organizations.

27

28 So there's a continuing dialogue about
29 what that balance should look like, but when Congress
30 reauthorized the Magnuson Act, they chose not to make
31 any direct changes and instead they chose to continue
32 to encourage the governors and as Nicole described
33 early on, it's the governors who nominate to the
34 Secretary. And so a large part of that balancing is
35 expected to start with each state's governor.

36

37 So I guess I'd leave my answer at that
38 for that, that yes, there's a balance there and yes,
39 we're thinking about it.

40

41 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you.

42

43 MS. KIMBALL: And I think maybe, Mr.
44 Chair, we should clarify that every Council's term is
45 three years and we put that up on our website who is
46 represented on the Council and I'm not defending the
47 Council makeup, but to date, you know, right now we
48 have these two Washington representatives. One is from
49 the trawl industry and one of them used to be in the
50 pollock industry and now works for the sustainable

1 fisheries forum. He just took a new position here,
2 John Henderschedt. And then our five Alaska -- you
3 know, not designated but appointed members, you know,
4 one is Dan who is a fisherman -- halibut and sable fish
5 fisherman from Cordova. One is a charter sector
6 operator from the Kenai Peninsula. One is a commercial
7 and subsistence salmon fisherman from Kodiak Island
8 from Ouzinkie, I think. Sam Cotten is a fisherman and
9 has lots of different hats, but in Kachemak Bay, and
10 then of course our Chair right now is Eric Olson from
11 Dillingham who has been a salmon fisherman in the past
12 but now works for a CDQ group.

13

14 So -- but that -- you know, that shifts
15 and changes with each Governor, but that's our current
16 makeup and I probably should have been more specific
17 about that in the beginning.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you for that
20 clarification.

21

22 MS. PELKOLA: I have a question. I
23 notice.....

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: He wants to make one
26 clarification there. Go ahead.

27

28 MS. PELKOLA: Okay.

29

30 MR. HULL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just
31 briefly. A friend of mine commented to me this past
32 winter that she's seen quite a change in the
33 composition of Council members over time and the kind
34 of people who are there at the Council. It used to be
35 that it was primarily foreign fishing companies who
36 were at the Council wanting to get their allocations
37 and then over time as it became more of an Americanized
38 fishery, you saw more of the larger boat American fleet
39 representatives, and currently I think it's gone even
40 to more small boat representation, which I consider
41 myself a part of.

42

43 As far as kind of just general ethical
44 questions or issues, every Council member's disclosure
45 is available on the Council Website for the public to
46 see. So if anybody's interested on what my interests
47 are in the fishing industry or any of the other Council
48 members, you can find that on the Council Website.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Appreciate that

1 clarification. You got a comment, Jenny.

2

3 MS. PELKOLA: I hope I remembered it.
4 I notice you have four -- you have 11 voting members
5 and 4 designated seats and I also notice that most of
6 the members are from a certain area. What are your
7 four designated seats and also would it be possible to
8 get -- since we feel that pollock fishing affects our
9 area, to get a member or a nonvoting member or somebody
10 to sit in on these meetings? I don't know how that
11 would work, but.....

12

13 MS. KIMBALL: Well, if you wanted to
14 have a member on the Council, you'd be looking at one
15 of those five -- there's seven appointed seats -- one
16 of the five Alaska appointed seats and I know that
17 other groups in Western Alaska have talked to the
18 Governor about doing that. Some others have looked at
19 trying to lobby Congress to get a tribal seat on the
20 Council which would take a change to the Magnuson-
21 Stevens Act to do that.

22

23 So I think others have gone the route
24 of talking to the Governor and trying to engage him in
25 a conversation about why Western Alaska needs to be one
26 of the appointed seats in the next round and all these
27 appointments are staggered. So I believe we have two
28 coming up this year and those are always up at the end
29 of August of each year.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for that
32 clarification. We got to wind this up. Go ahead, Ray.

33

34 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I just have one
35 last one. I was at the Kodiak meeting when they were
36 working with setting the caps and so on and I put out a
37 suggestion there and I don't know if it went anywhere,
38 but the thing that we're wrestling with is we have an
39 obligation to get a certain number of escapement into
40 Canada for their subsistence needs and on the spawning
41 grounds and so on. And the upriver people, I mean
42 we've tried this closure all the way up -- tracking it
43 up the river and it worked a couple years ago. So
44 we're making efforts to make sure the spawners are on
45 the ground, but what I suggested was if you were
46 freezing those four-year fish and traded those off
47 either with Canada or the upriver fishermen and allowed
48 one more escape to replace some of the escapers, it
49 might be a tool that would be worth the effort even if
50 there's cost involved in that because you'd get direct

1 payback. In other words, if they could -- some of
2 their fish get frozen up there and eaten.

3

4 If they would trade off some of those
5 frozen fish that were caught out there at the high
6 seas, the four-year-old, and allowed another escapee,
7 you could get a quicker return than what we're getting
8 now by our management thing, but just a tool that you
9 might keep in mind and it might be worth the price or
10 the effort that it would take to do that because there
11 would be immediate gain in escapement up in Canada and
12 the upriver. And they produce over half of the salmon
13 that are in the Yukon, 50, 60 percent or something like
14 that. But just keep those things in mind. There may
15 be another way to getting at this to help with building
16 the runs back up.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: At our -- the North
19 Pacific Fisheries Management Council, Sam Cotten and
20 another guy were at our meeting down in McGrath, I made
21 that comment to the Council that a disincentive instead
22 of destruction of the resource, grinding and throwing
23 it overboard. A disincentive would be retention,
24 freezing, and the transportation back to the rivers of
25 origin by genetic analysis and I feel that that -- it's
26 a waste of the salmon resource to destroy it.
27 Retention and then take a sample from it and throw it
28 away, I feel that that's a travesty and so here we have
29 people that -- in Canada -- Canada is actually buying
30 fish from the coast to protect chinook salmon because
31 of reduced run strengths.

32

33 Another thing I wanted to point out is
34 that the -- as we move our fishers -- our constituency
35 moves away from trying to protect chinook salmon, they
36 have to rely more heavily on chum and so that's
37 actually going to put more burden on those chum
38 returns.

39

40 I feel that all -- both -- all salmon,
41 chinook chum, coho, whatever you might catch, should be
42 processed and apportioned back to the rivers of origin
43 by the industry. It'll be a disincentive to harvest
44 these fish. And so I still will reiterate that -- it's
45 basically what Ray's saying, but I said that to past
46 Council members that were here and so I feel that that
47 should be a contemplation factor, that destruction of
48 the resource should not be occurring and I've always
49 felt that that should not -- it's not sold. It's just
50 donated to communities that would ordinarily be in

1 hardship because their catches were reduced. You know,
2 there's community tribal organizations in all of the
3 rivers. We have 47 different communities on the Yukon
4 River that those could be donated to. I just wanted to
5 throw that out there. And so, go ahead.

6
7 MR. TWEIT: Just one sort of
8 perspective comment on that. Keep in mind that many of
9 these fish, by the time they actually get frozen are
10 very poor quality. They've come onboard. A handful of
11 fish -- I mean you saw the size of one of those trawls
12 full of fish. Now that was a factory trawl. Many of
13 the catcher vessels have smaller trawls, but still
14 they'll come onboard, you know, a handful of chum or a
15 handful of chinook in several metric tons of pollock.
16 By the time they actually get sorted out and then
17 finally actually headed to a place where they can be
18 frozen, they're feeders -- they're active feeders out
19 in the ocean, so even -- you know, once they come
20 onboard, their enzymes are still going and everything
21 else. These -- just remember, there are not the
22 quality of the salmon that you see in the river. They
23 are often immature. They are often a year or two
24 younger and they are active feeders as well and they'll
25 never be handled and treated with the same care or
26 quality.

27
28 So not commenting on the larger merits
29 or not of your proposal and you saw staff writing that
30 down. That's one of the reasons we're here is to take
31 those ideas down, but just remember these fish are not
32 of the same quality that you're able to harvest and
33 deliver in-river.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, they're --
36 yeah, if you just throw them back into the tank with
37 the rest of the pollock, yeah, they would be in real
38 poor shape, but I mean if they're coming out and
39 they're sorted out on deck and dress them and threw
40 them right in the freezer, everybody's got a freezer on
41 these giant ships, and so if you handle them -- we're
42 only talking handfuls, well, it's not that big of a
43 deal really individually, you know.

44
45 MR. TWEIT: But again remember, they're
46 not sorted on deck. What happens is when the trawl
47 comes onboard it's poured in -- directly into the
48 fishhold.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah.

1 MR. TWEIT: And so they're often --
2 some are discovered right away, but we actively
3 discourage sorting on deck because even though we've
4 got an observer onboard, that's how mischief begins to
5 happen and remember each skipper is now in essence
6 penalized. Every fish -- every salmon that comes
7 onboard is now a problem for that skipper and that's
8 what we want to do. We want them to regard each salmon
9 they've caught as a problem.

10
11 And -- but we also want to make darned
12 sure that the tally is honest and accurate. And so
13 we're doing everything we can to discourage sorting on
14 deck. And it's very difficult anyway. We are dealing
15 with several metric tons of fish. What everybody wants
16 to do is get those fish into the hold right away and
17 then back into port.

18
19 Now, the observers are watching, but
20 are they going to see every single crew member and make
21 sure they're not sneaking something over? No. So
22 we're really doing things to discourage deck sorting
23 because we know if we -- we want to make sure we have
24 as accurate a tally as possible of what the true
25 biological impact is first and foremost. The right
26 numbers are fundamental, so.....

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I misunderstood how
29 the trawl fleet worked. That then brings me to the
30 question how -- what's the lag time between catch and
31 actually sorting and apportioning and so you get into
32 uh-oh, you know, you might have the fish -- the salmon
33 are being caught in one area and they're moving and so
34 you close this area, but they've moved into another
35 area and so what's the lag time between catch and sort.

36
37 MR. TWEIT: Good question.

38
39 DR. STRAM: Mr. Chairman, just to
40 clarify. The issue that Mr. Tweit is talking about is
41 a catcher vessel issue, keeping in mind that we have
42 this broad fleet that's catcher processors, catcher
43 vessels, mother ships. So the issue of not being able
44 to sort out the salmon on a line and process and freeze
45 them, although I would note that this has been
46 encouraged and a lot more focus has been on the ability
47 to do that since the chinook action, that is solely a
48 catcher vessel issue where those are the only vessels
49 that dump directly into a hold and then hightail it
50 back to a processing facility.

1 And for those, we do have haul
2 information on where the catch has been taken in terms
3 of it's been sorted at a plant. For all these other
4 vessels, like a catcher processor, it is sorted. It's
5 just not sorted on deck. It's sorted below when it
6 gets to the processing facility and I believe some
7 other ships as well as -- or all the mother ships
8 actually that are processing and then there are some
9 catcher vessels that do have a sorting deck and to the
10 extent possible, those are -- if it can be sorted and
11 there's an ability to pull them off, process them, and
12 freeze them. That's some of the comments that we've
13 been bringing back and some of the increased notice
14 from the previous action to encourage the participation
15 in what's now a voluntary program, the food bank
16 program for salmon, but keep in mind that that is just
17 a catcher vessel issue when you dump directly into a
18 hold.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for the
21 clarification.

22
23 MR. COLLINS: I guess a comment I had
24 was that I've heard the food bank thing and that may
25 help the people that's in that food bank, but it
26 doesn't help escapement. So thinking of getting those
27 back closer to the spawning grounds might have more of
28 an impact all the way around on the health of the
29 fishery.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We have spent
32 quite a bit of time on this issue and we really
33 appreciate your -- and so you're requesting the RACs to
34 review the options and make recommendations to your
35 meeting in Nome and so we would -- I would like to see
36 one of our RAC members attend that meeting and so I
37 would -- so -- but I do appreciate you bringing all the
38 information forward to the Western Interior Council.

39
40 Final comment, Nicole.

41
42 MS. KIMBALL: Just that we would --
43 regardless of whether you send someone or give us a
44 formal, you know, review of the alternatives, we'll be
45 bringing back all of your questions and, you know, the
46 responses back to the Council in June in a report
47 regardless. So anything that you ask here we'll -- and
48 ideas that you came up with we'll be reporting to the
49 full Council in June.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Don's got a
2 final comment.

3
4 MR. HONEA: Thank you. Thank you,
5 guys, for your presentation. I guess you're also going
6 to be at TCC in about two weeks?

7
8 MS. KIMBALL: Yes.

9
10 MR. HONEA: Okay. You know, when we
11 discuss this when -- you know, when this came up a
12 couple years ago, we were just thinking in terms of
13 chinook, you know, the kings and it's kind of alarming
14 to see all the graphs here that the chum is on the same
15 par. The incidental catch is alarmingly high for both
16 of them. I mean they're on par. So, you know, just my
17 whole take on this is that, you know, the importance of
18 the fall chum, summer chum for us if we -- to be able
19 to use that, to be able to harvest it and, you know, if
20 you guys had any -- you know, because I don't -- I see
21 a hard catch -- a hard cap here of 50,000 to 300,000.
22 I mean there's real no number in there. And I don't
23 know who comes up with the number, but, you know, my
24 point is that if we have to give up our chinook salmon,
25 you know, because of the low numbers and stuff, what
26 I'm saying is that -- that chum salmon is really
27 important to people in this area.

28
29 Thank you.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. Okay.
32 Appreciate your presentation.

33
34 MR. TWEIT: Thank you very much for
35 having us.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And I hope that we
38 can work together to better this fishery and protect
39 the chum salmon and appreciate all your work on the
40 Council. I know it's a lot of work.

41
42 Becca.

43
44 MS. ROBBINS-GISCLAIR: Thank you, Mr.
45 Chair, and members of the Council. I'm Becca Robbins
46 Gisclair with the Yukon River Drainage Fisheries
47 Association. I also serve on the Advisory Panel to the
48 North Pacific Fishery Management Council. This is a
49 panel of a variety of different representatives that
50 basically provide advice to the Council in their

1 decisions.

2

3 I'm speaking today on behalf the YRDFA
4 though. And Jason's handing out a couple pieces of
5 paper for you to add to your stack. The first is just
6 a salmon bycatch update that kind of encapsulates a lot
7 of the information that you just heard and so I'll just
8 leave that with you. I'm not going to go through any
9 of that information. And the second is a draft
10 resolution regarding chum bycatch in the Bering Sea
11 pollock fishery and this was prepared by Sky Starkey
12 And it models what the YK Delta RAC adopted last week
13 as a resolution and I would encourage you to take a
14 look at this and consider adopting something similar.

15

16 This particular resolution is
17 recommending that the Federal Subsistence Board work
18 with the Regional Advisory Councils to come up with a
19 recommendation to the North Pacific Council. I guess I
20 would also encourage you to write a letter directly to
21 the North Pacific Council as well as you did in the
22 case of the chinook issue.

23

24 I think at this point we don't have a
25 full analysis in front of us to say specifically what
26 we would recommend as far as a chum bycatch measure. I
27 think there are a lot of complications and the chum
28 issue that you've heard about that make it a little
29 different than chinook and I think for us we certainly
30 -- we want to see sort of more analysis before we're
31 able to really pick out what's going to best reduce
32 chum bycatch while not increasing chinook bycatch at
33 the same time. But I think a letter that kind of
34 expresses the importance of chum salmon within the
35 region and the need to have effective bycatch
36 management measures would be appropriate to have that
37 before the Council at their June meeting.

38

39 And that's all I had for you today.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I do think
42 that it's very important for the Council -- Regional
43 Council to transmit that letter to the North Pacific
44 Fisheries Management Council. I was -- it is a very
45 complex issue and I don't feel that I've -- I don't
46 even know that the North Pacific Fisheries Management
47 Council can actually prioritize the box that we need to
48 go into to protect the chum salmon. But I do feel that
49 the -- this Western Interior Council needs to express
50 and -- to all of the Council members that chum salmon

1 are an integral part of subsistence uses in the Western
2 Interior and the Kuskokwim and Yukon River Drainage and
3 that as I stated, where there's going to be a higher
4 reliance on chum salmon.

5
6 The resolution here that was passed by
7 -- that Becca's presented is the resolution regarding
8 chum salmon bycatch in the Bering Sea pollock fishery,
9 basically stating the amounts that have been caught and
10 the reasons why, whereas -- I'll read the conclusion.

11
12 Now, therefore, be it resolved the
13 Western Interior Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory
14 Council recommends that the Federal Subsistence Board
15 work with the affected Regional Advisory Councils,
16 tribes, and communities to develop a position from
17 among the alternatives before the North Pacific
18 Fisheries Management Council to regulate chum salmon
19 bycatch. The Federal Subsistence Board's position
20 should seek to minimize chum bycatch to the greatest
21 extent practical, therefore ensuring healthy fish
22 populations and subsistence in small-scale commercial
23 fisheries. The Federal Subsistence Board should
24 officially convey this position to the North Pacific
25 Fisheries Management Council before or during the North
26 Pacific Fisheries Management Council meeting in June of
27 2011.

28
29 I will entertain a motion to -- I am in
30 full concurrence with this resolution and I will
31 entertain a motion to adopt this resolution to be
32 transmitted to the Federal Subsistence Board.

33
34 Robert.

35
36 MR. WALKER: What would the number be?

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Resolution No. 11-
39 01. Do I have a motion.

40
41 MR. WALKER: Yes.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion to adopt 11-
44 01. Robert.

45
46 MR. GERVAIS: I'll second that.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Tim.
49 Further discussion on the resolution as presented by
50 Yukon River Fisheries.....

1 MR. WALKER: Question.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question on the.....
4
5 MR. WALKER: No, I didn't call.
6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, a question. Oh,
8 go ahead, sorry, Robert. Go ahead.
9
10 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, I kind of
11 read through it here and I didn't see anything where it
12 would say that we would ask them to shorten their
13 season because as of the last time when Mr. Cotten was
14 here at the meeting in McGrath, he emphasized that the
15 pollock fisheries were fishing longer and longer to
16 fill their quota. That should be something to be
17 considered too.
18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Response is it
20 requests the Federal Subsistence Board to work with
21 tribes and communities to develop a position from among
22 the alternatives before the North -- and so it's in the
23 -- within the realm of the various alternatives to
24 shorten the season or whatever it may take in
25 consultation with the Councils, tribes, and
26 communities.
27
28 Becca.
29
30 MS. ROBBINS-GISCLAIR: Thank you, Mr.
31 Chair. If I could maybe help to clarify. The issue of
32 shortening the season, which I assume was referring to
33 what Tim brought up about the sort of high.....
34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.
36
37 MS. ROBBINS-GISCLAIR:bycatch and
38 towards the end of the season, there's more of an issue
39 with chinook than with chum. So and this -- this
40 action is really addressing chum.
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.
43
44 MS. ROBBINS-GISCLAIR: Sort of chinook
45 -- the current management is Amendment 91 and that's
46 not likely to change until something drastic happens.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. That would be
49 mixing apples and oranges. Thanks for the
50 clarification. But there's a realm of alternatives and

1 the Federal Subsistence Board needs to expend more
2 development of a position in working with the various
3 Councils and communities on taking a position that
4 after analysis and I don't have enough information
5 before me as a Council member to make that decision.

6

7 And so I -- this is more of a broad-
8 based request that they -- this resolution is these
9 fish are very important to our region and we need the
10 Federal Subsistence Board to expend funds and
11 allocation towards working towards that goal.

12

13 Is that clear to the Council.

14

15 (Council nods affirmatively)

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
18 discussion.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Hearing none, those
23 in favor of Resolution 11-01, resolution regarding chum
24 salmon bycatch in the Bering Sea pollock fishery,
25 signify by saying aye.

26

27 IN UNISON: Aye.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
30 sign.

31

32 (No opposing votes)

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Hearing none, motion
35 passes. I think it's time for -- oh, you got a
36 comment, Tim?

37

38 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
39 had one comment for Becca. I'd like to express
40 appreciation for YRDFA's efforts in bringing up
41 interesting points about -- in regards to Marine
42 Stewardship Certification process. It was -- it's
43 really good to see what you're trying to do there and
44 make people aware. I don't -- it doesn't feel like
45 they've listened to what you had to say very well, but
46 we thank you for doing what you did. Making the
47 effort.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'll reiterate that
50 myself.

1 I did receive a note that this Council
2 needs to designate a representative to attend the YRDFA
3 meeting on April 13th and who would like to represent
4 the Council at the preseason chinook planning session
5 that's going to be in Anchorage? Tim.

6
7 MR. GERVAIS: I would be willing to do
8 it, but I would defer to a more senior member if
9 somebody else felt like they wanted to do this.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are there any Yukon
12 River fishers that feel compelled to want to represent
13 the Western Interior Regional Council at the YRDFA in-
14 season -- or preseason planning?

15
16 (No comments)

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So - go ahead,
19 Polly.

20
21 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. Keeping that
22 thought in mind too, this is probably the appropriate
23 time for the Western Interior Council to also think
24 about if they want to send a member of the North
25 Pacific Fisheries Management Council meeting in June in
26 Nome and OSM would support that effort as well. So
27 there's two -- there's the meeting in June and we had
28 discussed the dates yesterday. I think it's about a
29 week in June, but I suspect that like the last meeting
30 in Kodiak, you don't need to be there for the whole
31 meeting. It would be for a couple of days or something
32 like that. It wouldn't be for the entire meeting. But
33 yeah, there's -- OSM will support the -- sending a
34 person to the YRDFA meeting on April 13th and also you
35 should think about if a Council member wants to go to
36 the meeting in June, if you want to have a
37 representative.

38
39 Mr. Chair.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would like a
42 Council member to be present at the Nome meeting also.
43 Tim has volunteered to the YRDFA preseason meeting. Is
44 any other volunteer to attend that YRDFA April 13th
45 meeting?

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, is it
50 agreeable that Tim attends the meeting?

1 (Council nods affirmatively)

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see the Council's
4 affirmative. And then regarding the Western Interior
5 Regional Council member attendance of the North Pacific
6 Fisheries Management Council meeting in Nome in June,
7 do we have a volunteer to attend that meeting?

8

9 MR. GERVAIS: Can you restate the dates
10 on that, Polly?

11

12 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. The meeting
13 is June 6 to 14, 2011, in Nome, but I don't know what
14 the specific days are where they would be taking public
15 testimony. I suspect it's at the beginning of the
16 meeting rather than at the end. I don't know if the
17 Council staff that are here -- oh -- can speak to that.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Nicole.

20

21 MS. KIMBALL: Because it's such a big
22 issues, it's probably one of the first things on the
23 Council agenda and so the AP and Science and
24 Statistical Committee will meet June 6th and 7th. The
25 Council's first day would be the 8th. So the very
26 soonest they could take it up is the afternoon of the
27 8th. So if someone came in on the 8th, you know,
28 they'd probably be looking at public testimony sometime
29 on the 9th.

30

31 Our agenda won't be out until May, but
32 it's likely to be the first issue on the agenda.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you.
35 Does that clarify it for you, Tim?

36

37 MR. GERVAIS: Nicole, I had a question
38 about that meeting. So will there be some further
39 analysis about the factors and whatnot of the actions
40 that are coming up that would be available -- because
41 at this time, it doesn't make much sense to me or
42 probably any other people on this committee about how
43 appropriate these numbers are. So I was interested to
44 know what kind of -- more -- would the announcements be
45 presented in Nome or is it going to be on your website
46 prior to that?

47

48 MS. KIMBALL: Yes. It's targeted to be
49 finished and then -- and mailed out to Council members
50 the end of the first week of May for the June meeting

1 and it would be posted on our website and it would be a
2 full environmental assessment, have all the kind of
3 stock information that you would typically expect to
4 see. It would also have a social and economic impact
5 review, so an impact analysis, pollock fishery, all the
6 salmon fisheries, and that would be incorporated into
7 one big document and put on our Website a month before
8 the meeting. And we could have those -- you know, if
9 it's easier because it's a big document to download, if
10 you want to request -- it doesn't have to be a formal
11 request -- that we mail some hard copies out to you
12 guys, then we could definitely do that.

13

14 And so that would be presented in Nome
15 and staff would go through the whole presentation prior
16 to taking public comment and then they would continue
17 to take public comment until it was finished.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's the dates of
20 7th and 8th?

21

22 MS. KIMBALL: Yeah.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: On that date, a
25 presentation.

26

27 MS. KIMBALL: Probably more likely 8th
28 and 9th would be.....

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, 8th and 9th.

31

32 MS. KIMBALL: And depending on how many
33 people there are to testify, that testimony could go
34 into the 10th. You know, it's just whoever shows up
35 and an organization gets six minutes to testify and an
36 individual speaking on behalf of just himself gets
37 three minutes to testify.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. All right.
40 Does that cover it for the Council on those dates?

41

42 Ray.

43

44 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I'm
45 not interested in going, but having gone to the Kodiak
46 meeting, I think the individual we send should be there
47 in those first two days when the staff is presenting it
48 to the Board so they've got a chance to hear that
49 information before they have to testify and then they
50 could bring that information back to us too. You know,

1 they'd be getting an education to bring back to.....
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But would you be --
4 you're volunteering for that then or.....
5
6 MR. GERVAIS: I would volunteer, but
7 I'd also -- I'll defer to a more senior member and
8 such.
9
10 MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair.
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.
13
14 MR. HONEA: I think -- I mean, you
15 know, to narrow it down, nobody likes to actually, you
16 know, volunteer to go -- volunteer themselves, but we
17 did pick out a couple of, you know, people who are keen
18 on fishing issues and stuff and I suggest that we just,
19 you know, give them the opportunity to represent us.
20 The primaries.
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, the primaries
23 for the customary trade issue was a totally different
24 issue, but would you want to go to the meeting, Robert
25 or Jenny, to represent the Council at the North Pacific
26 Fisheries Management Council. That's the date of
27 presentation and then the comment to the Council on a
28 position and those comments will be more refined as --
29 you know, this analysis will be more refined by late
30 May and so we should be able to take a position. You
31 should be able to comment more clearly by late May.
32 Are you -- Ray, would you be available?
33
34 MR. COLLINS: No, I don't think so.
35 Not in June, I don't think so. I think Tim has
36 been.....
37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim, are you
39 available?
40
41 MR. COLLINS: He's been tracking the
42 issue, I think that if he has the time. I think Tim
43 has been tracking the issue and so I'd feel comfortable
44 with him going if he has time. I was just commenting
45 that having gone to the Kodiak, it's really important
46 to hear that presentation to the Board because that's
47 where you get the information.
48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. So we gave
50 opportunity to.....

1 MR. WALKER: Yeah. I decline.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And so I
4 think the Council feels that you're the most qualified
5 since you've tracked the issue to this depth and have a
6 more thorough understanding and has represented the RAC
7 at the Board of Fish meeting and so forth. So I feel
8 that you're qualified to represent the Western Interior
9 Regional Advisory Council.
10
11 Is everybody affirmative to that?
12
13 (Council nods affirmatively)
14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. All
16 Council members are affirmative to Tim representing the
17 Western Interior Council at the Nome meeting to the
18 North Pacific Fisheries Management Council.
19
20 Thank you, Polly.
21
22 And so we'll go on a break now for
23 about ten minutes.
24
25 (Off record)
26
27 (On record)
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Excuse me. We're
30 going to come back to order again. So Polly's going to
31 come to the table here and she's going to go over OSM
32 -- let's see. Well, we got an update on travel
33 procedure. Do we need to cover that or -- you want to
34 cover that, Donald. Real fast.
35
36 (Pause)
37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's on Page 45 of
39 our book.
40
41 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just
42 for the Council. The information's update on travel
43 procedures. Just that requires that Federal Agencies
44 are required to make travel arrangements through travel
45 control center. So any Council members that are
46 traveling, you know, I'll have to make all the
47 arrangements and if you need to change your flight
48 itinerary, you need to call me. Otherwise if you make
49 your own -- if you make your changes, you'll be
50 responsible for paying the ticket. So it's very

1 important that you contact me if you're going to make
2 any itinerary changes. So -- and if you have any
3 questions, give me a call.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would -- my
8 comment would be that the Council members should be
9 provided a plastic wallet-size card with the cell
10 numbers of the Council coordinator, Ann Wilkinson's
11 cell number and Polly's cell number. You can call that
12 800 number and there's no one there and so I would like
13 to see additional contacts. Since -- if you change
14 your reservation, you can be liable for the ticket and
15 hotel fees or whatever there may be. So that would be
16 my comment on that.

17

18 Is the Council clear on the update on
19 travel procedure, that you have to contact -- if
20 something's going wrong with your flights and so forth,
21 you're going to have to be able to contact OSM to get
22 them to change -- that would be on Page 45 and so
23 that's the update on this travel procedure.

24

25 (Council nods affirmatively)

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're coming under
28 time constraints here because various issues of passion
29 have come before the Council and we need to be out of
30 this hall before the bingo starts, a little after
31 5:00 o'clock. So Polly's going to give us a rundown on
32 the Office of Subsistence Management Secretarial Review
33 Program.

34

35 Go ahead, Polly.

36

37 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
38 I'm going to walk you through some of the key items
39 that have -- that we're asking the Council to respond
40 to based on the secretarial review. So bear with me
41 and I'll try and point you to the right page numbers
42 and tell you when we need action and what we're looking
43 for action on.

44

45 As you all know, at the 2009 AFN
46 meeting, the Secretary of the -- or a review of the
47 Federal Subsistence Management Program was announced by
48 the Secretary of the Interior or his staff. That
49 review commenced after about a year or so. Last August
50 we got some preliminary recommendations based on the

1 review and then in December right before Christmas, the
2 Secretary of the Interior sent out formal letters to
3 members of the Federal Subsistence Board announcing --
4 or directing them to do specific things. A copy of
5 that letter that was sent to the Federal Board Chair,
6 Tim Towarak, can be found on Page 46 in your book and
7 it's a letter from Mr. Salazar, Secretary Salazar, to
8 Tim Towarak, the new Federal Board Chair and as you all
9 know, changing out the Federal Board Chair was one of
10 the actions that came out of the Secretarial review.

11
12 In that letter -- and I'll just --
13 you'll notice that in a lot of these places we black
14 out addresses of people and we block out signatures.
15 That's a Federal requirement. You can't have personal
16 information in things that are disbursed widely. So
17 that's why there's the blackout of Mr. Towarak's
18 address.

19
20 There is specific items that the
21 Secretary is telling the Federal Board that he wants
22 them to act on and those 11 items are on Pages 46 and
23 47 of your book. The Board heard loud and clear -- the
24 Board had a meeting in November, heard loud and clear
25 from Pat Pourchot that the Secretary wanted some action
26 -- some quick action on some of these items. So the
27 Board in executive session on January 5th, 2011 -- and
28 in a full report -- or a report of that executive
29 session, which I'm going to cover the main points on
30 right now, but a written report of that executive
31 session can be found on Pages 61 and 62 in your books
32 and that's just a written summary of who was at the
33 Federal Subsistence Board executive session, what the
34 point was, and what some of the key items were that
35 they discussed.

36
37 I will say that one of the items that
38 came out of the Secretarial review was that people felt
39 like the Board was going into too many executive
40 sessions. So that was an item of discussion at that
41 January 5th meeting. The Board decided that they need
42 to be able to go into executive sessions if they have
43 to discuss personnel matters or legal matters, but from
44 now on, they'll do a report out of when they go in
45 executive session. Who was there, what they talked
46 about, and affirm that they didn't take any specific
47 action items. So they will be doing a written summary
48 of executive sessions from now on so you can expect to
49 see this and we'll publish it widely.

50

1 We're also going to publish the
2 guidelines of the Federal Subsistence Board, just so
3 that people know how the Board operates and what their
4 operating principles are and that'll be in subsequent
5 Regional Council books.

6
7 So at the January 5th meeting, the
8 Board took up some of these key items -- or they
9 identified what key items they could work on and then
10 they're going back to -- they're very aware of the need
11 and they're -- to involve the Regional Advisory
12 Councils in all that they do, but they're also
13 sensitive to the fact that they don't want to burden
14 you. You know, they don't want to throw a bunch of
15 paper at you and expect you to look at it and come up
16 with a response immediately.

17
18 So they're trying to kind of identify
19 some of the higher priority items that they can work on
20 and maybe give materials to you and ask action of you
21 sequentially so that you're not overly burdened.

22
23 So the first item that they identified
24 that they wanted to work on was expanding the Federal
25 Board. As I mentioned yesterday, there was a briefing
26 document that was handed out. I have additional copies
27 in case anybody needs them. Donald I know had them in
28 your packet, but here's some additional items. And
29 basically as I mentioned yesterday, we have developed a
30 proposed rule to expand the Federal Subsistence Board
31 to include two additional members. Those two
32 additional members would be in place to represent the
33 interests of rural Alaska subsistence users and we --
34 the proposed rule was published February 11th. We're
35 taking public -- or public comments will be accepted
36 through April 12th. The Board's going to look at the
37 public comments at a meeting in May and make their
38 recommendation to the Secretary.

39
40 Now, remember I said yesterday, this is
41 about program structure. So it's within the purview of
42 the Secretary and the proposed rule is actually quite
43 simple. On the second page of the briefing, the bolded
44 language is the language that we're proposing to be
45 added. So again it's under the program structure and
46 the proposed rule. Does anybody.....

47
48 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, just for the
49 Council members, it's highlighted in yellow in your
50 packet.

1 DR. WHEELER: So, Mr. Chair, the bolded
2 language that's being added to the current -- the
3 existing language of the composition Federal
4 Subsistence Board is two public members representing
5 rural Alaska subsistence users to be appointed by the
6 Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the
7 Secretary of Agriculture. And I will say, you know,
8 the existing language for the composition of the
9 Federal Board is again the voting members of the are.
10 That's the existing language. There's nothing in there
11 you'll note about process or anything there. So that's
12 the language.

13
14 And we've also -- the quorum is now
15 going to be five members since we're adding two
16 members. So that's the change. Anybody and everybody
17 is encouraged to submit comments. I will say we've
18 already received six comments which is a lot of
19 comments actually for us.

20
21 The first comment that we got was all
22 in capital letters with a lot of exclamation points, so
23 I suspect we're going to have a lot of interest in this
24 from all different perspectives in terms of how the
25 Federal -- how the comment will be received. But those
26 will be summarized. They'll go back to the Secretary
27 of the Interior and he will make the final
28 determination.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: At this time, I
31 would like the Council to make comment on this proposed
32 rule. My comment, it says two public members. I would
33 encourage the selection to be Federally-qualified rural
34 residents that are subsistence users. That's what I
35 would like to see as public members. And I think that
36 was the intention of the original AFN is that those
37 members more represent of Federally-qualified
38 subsistence users and so I would, you know, it's not in
39 the regulation, but I would like that to be clearly
40 understood from my perspective and I would look to the
41 Council.

42
43 Is that the perspective of the Council?

44
45 (Council nods affirmatively)

46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see the Council is
48 affirmative to that same line of thinking. We cannot
49 delineate other issues, but we do feel that the -- that
50 those two members should be representing true

1 subsistence uses and have a thorough understanding of
2 that.

3

4

Thank you.

5

6

DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7 And I would encourage the public that are here to --
8 and any of you as individuals to also submit comments.
9 The addresses and where you can submit the comments to
10 are on this little short briefing, so by all means and
11 I guess I would take it to mean that the Council's
12 unanimously supportive of this notion of -- or of this
13 plan to expand the Board and that you would like to see
14 those -- when the Board is expanded you'd like the
15 selection to be Federally-qualified rural residents.
16 So that's my understanding of your complete statement.

17

18

Mr. Chair.

19

20

(Council nods affirmatively)

21

22

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

23

24

DR. WHEELER: Okay. Moving right
25 along. By all means, tell me slow down if you want me
26 to, but I'm feeling the press of the agenda probably as
27 much as you are.

28

29

Deference -- the second item, deference
30 to Council members on items other than matters of take.
31 This is an informational item. The Federal Subsistence
32 Board, when it met, figured that this action required a
33 little bit more thought on their part, and so they're
34 looking at the big three items that people were
35 concerned about with regard to deference to RACs.

36

37

One was customary and traditional use
38 determinations. As you know, the solicitor's opinion
39 has been that the Federal Subsistence Board must defer
40 to Regional Advisory Councils on matters of take, but
41 that customary and traditional use determinations
42 aren't matters of take, so the Board doesn't
43 necessarily need to defer to the Regional Advisory
44 Councils.

45

46

As a matter of practice, the Board has
47 deferred to the Councils on C&T determinations for the
48 most part, but that's an issue that the Board is
49 looking at and they are very supportive of -- they're
50 supportive of expanding deference to RACs on C&T and

1 they're looking at a policy or possibly rule making to
2 effect that change.

3
4 Rural determinations is another one --
5 whether the Board should defer to Councils on rural
6 determinations. The Board felt when it met in January
7 that they didn't know enough about rural determinations
8 to make a stand either way. So they're having a
9 meeting on April 6th to go over the whole rural process
10 and perhaps after that time, they'll be making a
11 decision one way or the other.

12
13 There is some pretty strong legal
14 advice that the Board should not defer to the RACs on
15 that saying that the courts have found that rural is an
16 absolute term, meaning sparsely populated, so it's not
17 really subject to interpretation, but that's something
18 that'll come down the road.

19
20 MR. WALKER: Question.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

23
24 MR. WALKER: Yeah. Polly, we're
25 talking about adding to the Board. Is it going to --
26 budget's going to be in place for this here or -- as we
27 talked a couple years ago, the budget was being cut.
28 Now we're adding two more?

29
30 DR. WHEELER: Well, that's an excellent
31 question. The question was as I understand it, we're
32 talking about adding two members to the Board, what's
33 going on with the budget. I'll give you a little bit
34 of background. When -- the Office of Subsistence
35 Management pays for the travel of the Chair of the
36 Federal Subsistence Board but not the time. The Office
37 of the Secretary pays for the time. If we expand the
38 Board -- if the Board is expanded to include two new
39 members, then yes, OSM will be responsible for the
40 travel of those two new members and presumably for some
41 level of support.

42
43 I can tell you right now as you
44 probably all know, we're still waiting for a budget for
45 2011. But I guess I heard today that we -- we're not
46 going to go on vacation after Friday because the -- I
47 guess they -- they did -- they continued the resolution
48 for two more weeks, so we have a budget -- or we don't
49 have a budget, but the -- we're holding our breath for
50 another couple of weeks.

1 We don't have a budget yet for 2011.
2 We're thinking it's probably going to be around what
3 2010 was. 2012, we're hoping it's going to be the
4 same. I mean if you've been paying attention to the
5 news, you know that it's not looking good for domestic
6 agencies and we're probably going to be looking at
7 budget cuts down the road. I don't know -- we don't
8 know what our budget looks like for 2012 or 2013.
9 We're crossing our fingers and hoping it stays the
10 same.

11
12 But we have made it very clear, and I
13 don't think I'm talking out of school here, but we have
14 made it very clear that look, these secretarial review
15 items, some of them are going to cost more money.
16 We're kind of maxed out where we are. So we're going
17 to need to think creatively about how to get additional
18 funding or get some funding from the Office of the
19 Secretary. But that will be an ongoing issue.

20
21 MR. WALKER: Okay.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks for
24 that answer, Polly. Continue.

25
26 DR. WHEELER: Okay. Moving right
27 along. On the other item with regard to deference to
28 Regional Advisory Councils or in-season management
29 actions, that's been an issue particularly in Southeast
30 I would say. As you all know, our managers do try and
31 involve the Regional Advisory Councils when and as
32 possible. A lot of -- there's a lot of
33 misunderstanding I think about how much authority an
34 in-season manager has. So one of the to-do items that
35 we have is that down the road we will include the
36 letters that are from the Federal Subsistence Board to
37 the in-season manager that gives the in-season manager
38 the authority. And we thought that would be a useful
39 item for the Regional Advisory Councils to sort of
40 understand the scope of the authority that the in-
41 season managers so.

42
43 So again no action needed at this time.
44 It's informational, but I'm just giving you an idea of
45 what the Board's thinking about.

46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

48
49 DR. WHEELER: And that'll be down the
50 road.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

2

3 DR. WHEELER: Okay. Moving right
4 along.

5

6 The third item is the review of the
7 Memorandum of Understanding. And in your books Page
8 50, there is a briefing document. It's entitled
9 Briefing of the Memorandum of Understanding. I gave
10 you all instructions to read this last night, so I'm
11 going to assume that you did and I won't read it to you
12 and I certainly won't read it into the record. But I
13 will point out that on Page 51 there's a couple of key
14 points. Next steps, the Federal Subsistence Board's
15 review period is now open and will go until May 1,
16 2011, and the Federal Board will review all comments in
17 the summer of 2011 and review what the -- and determine
18 -- excuse me -- what the next steps should be.

19

20 My homework assignment to you last
21 night also was to look over the MOU and come up with
22 specific directions and, Mr. Chair, you had already
23 done that prior to the meeting and you came up with
24 your salmon-colored handout, if you wanted to go over
25 that.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I do want
28 this Regional Council to comment on this MOU. It was a
29 -- I consider the current MOU inadequate to address the
30 intents of Congress and Congress felt that the State
31 managed basically nonsubsistence uses, but also
32 Congress intended of Federal land managers to manage
33 fish and wildlife with -- consistent with sound
34 management principles and conservation of healthy
35 populations of fish and wildlife in accordance with
36 recognized scientific principles.

37

38 And so I've written this. The -- what
39 I feel should be inserted or at least conveyed to the
40 Federal Subsistence Board to be considered in the
41 Memorandum of Understanding is the italicized paragraph
42 at the -- near the top of -- it would be like the
43 second paragraph down. It should be inserted into the
44 Memorandum of Understanding whereas it should read,
45 ANILCA Title VIII requires the Federal land managers to
46 adhere to fish and wildlife management consistent with
47 sound management principles in the conservation of
48 healthy populations of fish and wildlife in accordance
49 with recognized scientific principles and purposes for
50 each unit established.

1 The Federal managers shall
2 scientifically delineate and maintain healthy
3 populations. If a State Management Board's actions
4 jeopardize fish and wildlife population health, Federal
5 managers shall preempt State regulations to assure
6 population health in accordance with ANILCA to protect
7 -- and I want to add into that -- to protect
8 subsistence uses.

9
10 The issues are -- and you could read
11 through. Basically what I'm quoting is directly out of
12 ANILCA Title VIII, .801, and so the Congress is very
13 clear and actually gives in .801.3 this same scenario.
14 In .801.3 of ANILCA Title VIII, it says continuation of
15 opportunity for subsistence uses of resources on
16 public -- and this is at the bottom of the first page
17 -- opportunity for subsistence uses of resources on
18 public and other lands in Alaska that threaten the
19 continuing population of Alaska with resultant pressure
20 on subsistence resources by sudden decline in
21 populations of some wildlife species which are crucial
22 subsistence resources by increased accessibility
23 through remote areas containing subsistence resources
24 and by taking of fish and wildlife in a manner
25 inconsistent with recognized principles of fish and
26 wildlife and I've added the emphasis.

27
28 The reality is Congress realized that
29 there were -- the Board of Game and the Board of Fish
30 may choose and those are politically appointed Boards
31 -- that they may choose to actually violate sound
32 management principles and what the intent of Congress
33 and the intent of this Council in our annual report has
34 been that management plans should be developed using
35 scientific principles to have plans to delineate what
36 is the harvest parameters of caribou and moose and
37 various animals and that the Federal managers, when
38 they see, as an example, Mulchatna Caribou being taken
39 far below any management objective of 35 bulls per
40 hundred cows where they were taken down to 14 bulls per
41 hundred cows, the Federal managers -- it's not an
42 option.

43
44 The Federal managers are under ANILCA
45 Title VIII mandate to close to nonsubsistence use, to
46 protect the subsistence users. And so this italicized
47 part that I am proposing should be included in the
48 Memorandum of Understanding so that it's very clear the
49 Federal managers are under -- the Federal program is
50 under a mandate in Title VIII which the Federal

1 Subsistence Board is managing Title VIII of ANILCA and
2 so I would like the Council to submit this second -- it
3 would be the third paragraph -- italicized paragraph
4 with this justification sheet to the Federal
5 Subsistence Board for inclusion in the Memorandum of
6 Understanding with the State of Alaska.

7

8 Comments from the Council. Eleanor.

9

10 MS. YATLIN: So what you're stating is
11 you want this one -- this one -- you want this one just
12 added into here, right?

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, this language
15 here.....

16

17 MS. YATLIN: Yeah.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:I would like to
20 see included in the Memorandum of Understanding and so
21 the Federal Subsistence Board is going to review the
22 Memorandum of Understanding and we're going to -- we're
23 requested to make comments and so I would like to see
24 this paragraph, the third paragraph on the
25 salmon-colored sheet, included in the deliberations
26 with the justifications which are clear that the law --
27 not regulation -- law requires the Federal managers to
28 manage for health and using scientific principles.

29

30 MS. YATLIN: Okay. The reason why I
31 ask is because what you said about ANILCA and Title
32 VIII and number 3 when adding in there -- I guess the
33 wording is in there, but then they also got it on the
34 key points here too though.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. Well, this --
37 the paragraph basically lays it out clearly that the
38 Federal manager shall preempt State regulations if the
39 wildlife population's health is being violated.

40

41 MS. YATLIN: Okay.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The justification is
44 just in the law itself.

45

46 MS. YATLIN: Okay.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so this is just
49 anytime you make a proposal, you have to have a
50 justification and this is -- the rest of this is just

1 justification portion. Any further discussion on the
2 MOU submittal to the Federal Subsistence Board with the
3 addition to protect subsistence uses at the end of that
4 paragraph.

5
6 Donald.

7
8 MR. HONEA: Oh, yeah, Mr. Chair. So
9 actually you'd like the wording there along with the
10 justification. So we're submitting the whole -- as a
11 whole, both pages.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

14
15 MR. HONEA: Okay. I move toward that
16 effect.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I've got a
19 motion to adopt this language.

20
21 MS. YATLIN: I second it.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Eleanor.
24 Further discussion on the MOU inclusion in the
25 deliberation of the Federal Subsistence Board on the
26 Memorandum of Understanding with the State of Alaska
27 between the Federal Board and the State.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No further
32 discussion. Go ahead, Don.

33
34 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
35 Under discussion, I completely agree with the
36 justifications under there that we are not exercising
37 our maximum power with the State. I mean we kind of
38 have a passive role and so I think anything that we can
39 do to strengthen our language in the MOU on Federal
40 lands is justifiable.

41
42 Thank you.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. One
45 clarification. Where I became the driving force of why
46 I wrote this and researched this was the response to
47 our July 17th response to our annual report requesting
48 management plan strategies to be developed. The
49 response from the Federal Board was we understand that
50 the Council would like to see the development of a

1 comprehensive management strategies region by region.
2 However, the Board has elected to work with the State
3 to coordinate efforts to address population declines
4 and other wildlife issues statewide generally using
5 State developed management plans. The Memorandum of
6 Understanding between the State and the Federal Board
7 and the State of Alaska facilitates better
8 collaboration between agencies and local managers to
9 address wildlife management issues.

10

11 However, the Board has and will
12 continue to manage decisions to ensure there is a
13 subsistence priority. The reality is the Board is
14 telling us that when there's a problem, they will have
15 a subsistence priority. We don't want it to go to a
16 problem. Congress didn't intend there to go to a
17 problem first. They wanted recognized principles to be
18 in place and thresholds need to be set. And so
19 Congress was clear in ANILCA and the Federal Board can
20 review the language with a solicitor and the reality
21 that it's taking a subservient role. This does not
22 violate the State's mandate for sustained yield. As
23 long as the State's mandate for sustained yield,
24 everybody's happy, but when the State Board of Game
25 violates sustained yield and continues to violate it,
26 like Mulchatna is exemplary of doing that, then the
27 Federal Subsistence Board is -- and Federal land
28 managers are under obligation to the ANILCA law to
29 close the season to nonsubsistence uses until such time
30 as we can recover those, just like we have done in 19A
31 and various areas where there was problems.

32

33 And so -- but we don't want it to go
34 there because it puts hardship on the subsistence users
35 and if we maintain sustainability -- Koyukuk is an
36 exemplary plan were we have sustainability. We
37 actually have more catch per unit of effort.
38 Everything is rosy. And so further discussion on this
39 memorandum.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The motion is on the
44 floor.

45

46 MR. MORGAN: Question.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's called.
49 Those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

50

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
4 sign.
5
6 (No opposing votes)
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The record is clear
9 on that.
10
11 And so go ahead, Polly.
12
13 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14 And I would also encourage because there is still some
15 public behind me to -- I would encourage the public to
16 look at the MOU and if they're interested in submitting
17 comments, the Board would also take comments from the
18 public. I mean it's not as formal as the -- as the
19 rule making process, but they're interested in input.
20 There was a lot of -- you know, there were some people
21 that are saying, oh, we don't need the MOU and so --
22 and the Secretary felt like, well, ANILCA does call for
23 coordinated management. So there's some need for this
24 document, but how can it be improved.
25
26 So the Board will be taking all of
27 these comments and looking at them over the summer.
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I personally am not
30 opposed to an MOU. I'm -- I feel that the MOUs are
31 necessary. We have two management bodies and we need
32 to work together and I'm in full favor of coordinated
33 management of the State and Federal systems. I do not
34 feel that the Federal Subsistence Board is subservient
35 to the State system. That's my position on -- and so
36 that should be clear in the MOU.
37
38 And so we can continue with your points
39 there, Polly.
40
41 DR. WHEELER: I'm just taking a note
42 here. Okay. Thank you. Moving along.
43
44 The next issue that the Board discussed
45 at their January meeting was customary and traditional
46 use determinations. There was some criticism of the
47 customary and traditional use determination process
48 that came out of the subsistence review and the Board
49 at its January meeting looked at different options for
50 how it could address customary and traditional use

1 determinations, but the Board decided before going into
2 -- before kind of laying out different options that the
3 Regional Advisory Councils could consider with regard
4 to how customary and traditional use determinations
5 would be accomplished, the Board thought, well, maybe
6 we should just ask the RACs early on, you know, what do
7 you think about the process and could it be improved
8 rather than kind of throwing out everything and
9 starting all over again.

10

11 You know, there's been more than 300
12 C&T determinations made. Probably at this point, the
13 only ones left are the tough ones and probably really
14 no one's going to be happy regardless of how it's done.
15 So should we throw out the process that we've been
16 using the 20 years of the program which admittedly was
17 adopted from the State program or should we, you know,
18 could we tweak it, refine it, so -- but before it went
19 down that road, it would ask the Regional Councils what
20 do you think about the process and is there -- if you
21 think it's okay, great. If you think it could be
22 improved, great. If you think it should be thrown out
23 and something altogether new brought in, let us know
24 that and then we can kind of make our decision and move
25 forward accordingly.

26

27 So here's your opportunity to weigh in
28 on the existing process.

29

30 Mr. Chair.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Polly. Does
33 the Council have concerns with the current customary
34 and traditional use determination process?

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Over time -- I've
39 been on the Western Interior Council since 1993, and we
40 have submitted customary and traditional use
41 determinations to the Federal Subsistence Board for
42 caribou and various bears and various -- over time for
43 moose and so forth and I felt that the Federal
44 Subsistence Board was contemplative. I also felt that
45 the current customary and traditional use determination
46 process, as long as it includes dialogue of the
47 Regional Advisory Councils, which it had to my
48 satisfaction, is a good process. And so the Board has
49 the final authority on customary and traditional use
50 determinations and the Board seems to explore all ways

1 of alleviating conflict and being fair and so it's my
2 -- working with the Federal Subsistence Board like on
3 the 21E moose thing, the Board is very sensitive to
4 local concerns and so far as I'm concerned, I don't
5 feel that there's a lot of problems.

6
7 I don't want to throw the baby out with
8 the bath water because it may actually cause problems
9 for the past customary and traditional use
10 determinations that have already been made, which were,
11 as Polly pointed out, we're using the Board of Game's
12 actual process, and so I don't feel that going --
13 making -- inventing a new system is actually -- it
14 would be counterproductive to what we have right now.
15 And so I feel that maintaining the utilization of the
16 Regional Advisory Councils and local input, the tribal
17 council, and Advisory Committees in the process as
18 ANILCA intends the Advisory Committee and the RACs to
19 evaluate issues, any issue that regards subsistence I
20 feel that as long as the Federal Board includes us, I
21 don't feel that we need to change the system
22 significantly.

23
24 There may be comments that come forward
25 that may tweak it a little bit and so I would encourage
26 tweaking but not major overhaul.

27
28 Any comments from the Western Interior
29 Council on the customary and traditional determination
30 process.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing -- I see no
35 -- nobody here seems to have a problem with the process
36 and I think I've put it on the record what my position
37 as Chair of the Council and working with the Federal
38 Board would be on the customary and traditional use
39 determination process.

40
41 It's on the record, so continue, Polly.

42
43 DR. WHEELER: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
44 Chair. Couple of other items and the first is the
45 rural determinations process.

46
47 I had said earlier with regard to
48 deference to the Regional Advisory Councils, the Board
49 is having a meeting on April 6th to begin -- it's going
50 to be rural determinations 101, kind of get them up to

1 speed on what the rural determinations process is, what
2 it entails. Regional Advisory Council Chairs are
3 invited to that meeting. We're not teleconferencing
4 that meeting because there's going to be a lot of audio
5 -- or visual materials included and it's just difficult
6 to translate that in a -- you know, complex visual
7 materials, it's tough to translate in an audio way. So
8 we're not doing it by teleconference, but Regional
9 Advisory Council Chairs are invited and I would say
10 just stay tuned on that. We haven't gotten the census
11 data yet from 2010, so that process is down the road,
12 but the Board hasn't made any decisions one way or the
13 other. They're just in the learning mode now.

14

15 The next.....

16

17 MR. HONEA: I just want to ask.....

18

19 DR. WHEELER: Excuse me.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.

22

23 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
24 just want to know what actually rural determinations
25 is. I mean is -- are we determining whether some
26 community such as Glennallen or something is determined
27 rural.

28

29 DR. WHEELER: Without getting into a
30 lot of detail because that will probably kill you
31 before the -- in fairly short order today, but yes. I
32 mean as you know ANILCA, the statute speaks to rural
33 Alaskans. So the question is what's rural and every
34 ten years, based on the census, the Board will go in
35 and look at particular areas that are questionable.
36 Now the process is does the Board -- is the Board going
37 to ask for people to raise questions -- areas that are
38 questionable or is the Board going to do a lot of
39 advance Staff work -- or the Board won't do the Staff
40 work, the Staff will do the Staff work.

41

42 But those are the kinds of questions
43 and most areas in the State, you know, are fairly
44 clear, but there's always these issues that pop up.

45

46 Last time -- and the reason why this
47 came up as an issue in the rural review was that Saxman
48 was determined by the Board to be nonrural. Saxman is
49 attached to Ketchikan -- or is close to Ketchikan and
50 that's caused some angst for the people in Saxman. So

1 that was -- it came up as an issue last time on this
2 next -- in other communities it came up that we looked
3 at were Kodiak, Sitka, Delta. So it's different areas
4 of the State. You know, again most communities --
5 would Galena qualify as rural, probably; I'm fairly
6 certain that Galena would continue its status as rural
7 or Wiseman or McGrath.

8

9 So that's -- but it's a Board process
10 that they engage in every ten years following the
11 census.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.

14

15 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman.
16 There has been one weakness in the process in that
17 determining rural is based on communities and
18 individuals outside of those communities that we've had
19 to petition for some. I know in Denali Park, there
20 were people living along the highway, some of them that
21 had been rural using it, but they weren't in the
22 communities listed in the recognition automatically and
23 we had to deal with those on an individual basis.

24

25 I would suggest that that's -- that
26 exists in rural Alaska too. You have some people that
27 don't live in the communities now.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

30

31 MR. COLLINS: Individual families out
32 and isn't there a problem in whether they're rural or
33 not or it isn't a problem with the Board? Okay.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I think you're
36 referring to Park Service eligibility and they would
37 be.....

38

39 MR. COLLINS: That may have been just
40 in Park units.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Nonrural would be a
43 delineated area and if you lived inside of that area,
44 like Fairbanks nonsubsistence area.....

45

46 MR. COLLINS: Okay.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:what it's --
49 you either fall in or outside of those boundaries. And
50 so that's what the.....

1 MR. COLLINS: But one of our problems
2 has been then, okay, in a community you have three or
3 four people that have C&T because of something -- does
4 that qualify the whole community. That's kind of the
5 issue that we're dealing with some of those villages
6 down there in the Yukon that were asking for C&T and
7 the GASH area and so on.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right, right.

10

11 MR. COLLINS: So I don't know if that
12 needs to be further clarified or not, but you have to
13 look at that in the process of how they're making that
14 determination.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: C&T determinations
17 are a little bit different than the nonrural
18 determinations.

19

20 MR. COLLINS: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Nonrural is a, you
23 know, reliance on subsistence.....

24

25 MR. COLLINS: Right.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:and basically
28 it's determining whether it's really urban or a
29 subsistence based population.

30

31 MR. COLLINS: I guess I was going back
32 on this other one that there was a process for C&T and
33 they're going to be looking at that too.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It has to do with
36 the numbers of people and various things and I -- I'm
37 somewhat opposed to grouping large numbers of
38 communities and trying -- and mixing in apples with
39 oranges. I am concerned about that, that Saxman issue.
40 I felt that they're -- they got kind of sucked in there
41 and so I do have concerns with that.

42

43 DR. WHEELER: If I could, Mr. Chair.
44 And I know this is a discussion for a whole other day,
45 but the Board, again, is going to be learning about
46 this. We're at the very beginning of the process and
47 I'm confident that the issues that came up last time
48 with regard to process in terms of grouping and all
49 that other, I think those issues will be addressed, but
50 we're not there yet.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. All right. I
2 appreciate the Board's working on this issue.

3

4 Continue.

5

6 DR. WHEELER: Thank you. A couple of
7 more items. The executive session policy, I already
8 covered that. The Board is going to try and minimize
9 going into executive session, but recognizes that at
10 times it has to and when it does, it will do a report
11 out. So that's informational and we will include the
12 Federal Subsistence Board guidelines in a future
13 Regional Advisory Council book so that you all know
14 what they are and can understand how the Board
15 operates. So that's just an informational item.

16

17 The final item, Mr. Chair, under the
18 subsistence review anyway, is the tribal consultation.
19 It's popped up in discussion over the last couple of
20 days and we just wanted to give you an update of where
21 the Board's at. In your Board book on Page 59, there's
22 a letter that was sent by Tim Towarak -- or signed by
23 Tim Towarak, sent by our Staff to every Regional
24 Advisory Council member. I have spoken to a number of
25 Regional Advisory Council members that claimed that
26 they didn't get the letter.

27

28 I can assure you because at the
29 regional office of the Fish and Wildlife Service, our
30 meter ran out of postage, so we ended hand stamping
31 every letter that went out to every Federally-
32 recognized tribe and every letter that went out to
33 Regional Advisory Councils. I can assure you that
34 those letters went out.

35

36 (Laughter)

37

38 DR. WHEELER: Now, what happened to
39 them after they went out, I can't say, but I can assure
40 you that they were mailed from our office because I
41 actually stamped some of them.

42

43 (Laughter)

44

45 DR. WHEELER: So the Board wanted the
46 Regional Advisory Council members to understand what
47 the process was that they were engaged in and, Mr.
48 Chair, you've hit on a few highlights -- or you hit a
49 few key points, but I wanted to hit on a few key
50 highlights too.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

2

3 DR. WHEELER: Because there -- you
4 know, our program all along, the advice that we've
5 gotten from the solicitor's office has been that
6 because the statute -- because ANILCA is specific on --
7 that it's rural residents that tribal consultation
8 isn't required.

9

10 The -- and -- let me back up. I
11 misspoke. The legal advice has been that because
12 ANILCA speaks to the primary role of the Councils in
13 the process that the Federal Subsistence Board has to
14 defer to the Councils and because the pool of users is
15 rural, that tribal consultation isn't necessarily a
16 step the Board has to engaged in.

17

18 But the Secretary's office and the
19 administration has underscored the importance of tribal
20 consultation to the process and so the Board is very
21 interested in figuring out how to bring in tribal
22 consultation to the process, but at the same time, not
23 undermining the role of the Regional Advisory Councils
24 because by statute, the Board has to defer to the
25 Regional Advisory Councils. So how do you fit -- where
26 do you fit the tribal consultation step in the whole
27 process.

28

29 Towards that end, the Board invited
30 every Federally-recognized tribe and ANCSA corporations
31 to the Federal Subsistence Board meeting in January to
32 both consult on the fisheries regulations that they had
33 to act on at that meeting, but also they invited those
34 same entities to a meeting on January 21st to have,
35 sort of the initial session of how can this program,
36 how can the Federal Subsistence Board consult with
37 tribes.

38

39 And keep in mind, it's consultation
40 between the Federal Subsistence Board and tribes. It's
41 not consultation between the tribes and OSM. We just
42 facilitate whatever it is that the Board does.

43

44 So there was a meeting on January 21st.
45 A number of tribes attended. A number of -- we gave
46 the opportunity to tribes to attend by phone. We had a
47 number online. There were a number of kind of key
48 themes. I would characterize that session on the 21st
49 as more of a listening session. Regional Advisory
50 Council Chairs were there, most of them. You weren't

1 able to attend that, but I would characterize it rather
2 than a real action-oriented meeting, it was more of a
3 listening session and kind of main ideas and themes and
4 some frustrations were expressed.

5
6 That, you know, some of the main themes
7 were tribal traditions and the use of fish and wildlife
8 predate western management systems, and all just passed
9 down through the generations. We need to listen to the
10 traditional knowledge.

11
12 There was some sentiment expressed that
13 the Regional Advisory Councils aren't tribes with all
14 due respect, but there -- and so there is a necessity
15 to consult meaningfully and directly with the tribes.

16
17 And tribes need to be informed of
18 program developments early on. The tribes need to be a
19 partner in the process and tribal participation in the
20 council process needs to be made explicit.

21
22 So those are some of the main themes.
23 We will be producing a summary of -- we actually had a
24 transcript done, but the sound quality wasn't very good
25 because we had a -- the seats were in a circle rather
26 than in table format and we had a roving mic and the
27 roving mic didn't pick the sound up very well, so the
28 transcript isn't the -- it's probably not the best
29 transcript that we're used to -- I mean it's not the
30 quality of transcript that we're used to getting quite
31 frankly, but that was through no fault of the
32 transcriptionist.

33
34 (Laughter)

35
36 DR. WHEELER: It was the sound system
37 that we were using and I was the one that said, oh, we
38 should get a wireless mic, but I should just stick to
39 what I know because clearly it's not technology.

40
41 (Laughter)

42
43 DR. WHEELER: So we are -- you know,
44 the Board wanted the Regional Advisory Councils to rest
45 assured that they're taking this very seriously, but
46 also they take very seriously the deference to the
47 Regional Advisory Councils too, so they're interested
48 in moving forward with this, but they're looking for
49 ideas and they just wanted to let you know that. So
50 that was the point of the letter that was -- what the

1 Board wanted us to express to you and that it's a --
2 it's a moving -- it's in the works. I will say at the
3 same time that the Department of the Interior has a
4 draft tribal consultation policy. So we'll also be
5 looking at that, but keep in mind because we're
6 Department of the Interior and Department of
7 Agriculture, we'll have to -- we've got a lot of
8 interesting things to work through in the course of the
9 next few months.

10

But we're doing what we can.

12

13

Mr. Chair.

14

15

16

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does the Council
have any comments on tribal involvement.

17

18

(No comments)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Thank you.

1 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 With regard to Board action, I don't have anything
3 more.

4
5 The only thing that I would do is point
6 you to on Pages 63, 64, and the very top of Page 65,
7 there is matrix that cover the items that I just talked
8 about. So if I talked too fast and you forget what I
9 actually said, you can look at the matrix and that
10 gives you kind of the action items, the status of them,
11 the next steps, and how the Regional Advisory Councils
12 are to be involved in that.

13
14 And as always, if anybody has any
15 questions, you know how to reach me at OSM and I'm
16 happy to answer them. So we're doing our best to get
17 the word out to be open and transparent in public and
18 everything that good public policy does, so any
19 suggestions for how we can do things better, improve
20 things, whatever, we're all ears.

21
22 So I appreciate you listening to me and
23 I'm sorry we had to do it in such an expedited fashion,
24 but I do encourage people to look at this material and
25 if you have any other thoughts or ideas, by all means,
26 get back to us on that.

27
28 And I did have -- I had one other
29 point. I don't know if you wanted to respond to that,
30 but I know that Sky Starkey -- I talked to Sky Starkey
31 earlier today and he was interested in speaking on a
32 couple of these issues. I believe he's on line. I
33 don't know for sure, but I had spoken to him and he
34 said he was on line. So if he is, he might have
35 something -- I think he has something to say on some of
36 these action items.

37
38 Mr. Chair.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Is -- you
41 want to find if Sky's on that teleconference. If you
42 want to put the mic to the -- right up against the --
43 go ahead, Sky. We can hear you. They're going to put
44 the mic up against the conference call.

45
46 Go ahead.

47
48 MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
49 for this opportunity to talk to the Council. I just
50 wanted to bring to the Council's attention two items.

1 One is a resolution on the tribal
2 consultation issue, resolution that was adopted in
3 largely the same form at Yukon Delta RAC last week.

4
5 Essentially -- I hope you have a copy
6 of that or have been provided a copy of that, but
7 essentially that resolution just asked -- AVCP has been
8 involved in drafting this. Essentially the feeling
9 about tribal consultation is that it's been very
10 difficult for the tribal leaders to formulate a
11 position on tribal consultation because everyone is
12 working in isolation in a sense. And these tribal
13 consultation issues are very important. What's
14 happened in the Lower 48 and the policy developed down
15 there will not really be relevant to what's going on in
16 Alaska because of Alaska's situation, the remoteness of
17 the tribes and the number of tribes.

18
19 So the thought behind the resolution --
20 there are two thoughts behind the resolution. The
21 first whereas would be that in appointing the two
22 public members to the Federal Subsistence Board, that
23 one of those, well, that the tribal participation
24 should be a part of the Federal Subsistence Board.
25 That would mean essentially that the Secretary should
26 consider ensuring that the tribes are represented on
27 the Federal Subsistence Board.

28
29 The second part of that resolution, the
30 second -- now, therefore it be resolved is that the
31 tribes -- before the OSM or the Agency develop the
32 position on tribal consultation, it should help fund
33 with the other Agencies that are doing tribal
34 consultation now, a tribal -- a meeting with tribal
35 leaders so that they could meet amongst themselves and
36 develop a recommendation to the Federal Board on what
37 tribal consultation should look like.

38
39 So that's essentially that resolution
40 and I just wanted to bring it to the Council's
41 attention in case if they wanted to do anything with
42 it.

43
44 The second issue, Mr. Chair, would be I
45 just wanted to make this Council aware that in Nome --
46 in June in Nome, the North Pacific Fisheries Management
47 Council, as you've been -- as you've already heard
48 today will be meeting about the chum bycatch issue.
49 I'll be up there as well as many people from -- tribal
50 leaders and others from Alaska who are interested in

1 preserving these chum stocks and there are other issues
2 at that Council meeting that will draw other tribal
3 leaders. There are trawl boundary issues, et cetera.

4
5 There's going to be a tribal roundtable
6 discussion held in Nome in June during the Council and
7 the purpose of that roundtable will be to basically
8 discuss the involvement or lack of involvement of
9 Alaska Natives and tribes in Federal fishery management
10 and other management, fish and wildlife, and to look at
11 portions of action and recommendations and just get
12 some ideas from tribal leaders on where they want to go
13 from here.

14
15 So I just wanted to make the Council
16 aware of that. I know that there is many leaders on
17 this Regional Advisory Council who have ideas and
18 experience in these kinds of issues and so the notice
19 that you hopefully have before you has my name and
20 address, email, phone number. So, you know, please
21 feel free to contact me at any time if you have ideas
22 or suggestions or questions about this roundtable.

23
24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Sky. The
27 Western Interior Counsel has selected a representative
28 to go to the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council
29 meeting in June and at this time, we haven't developed
30 a specific position on -- without analysis of all of
31 the information on the chum salmon bycatch in the
32 Bering Sea. Reviewing the resolution proposed, does
33 the Western Interior Regional Council want to comment
34 on the resolution that Sky has brought before the
35 Council.

36
37 Eleanor.

38
39 MS. YATLIN: I just had a question.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

42
43 MS. YATLIN: Is this -- isn't this a
44 totally separate thing other than where we're all in
45 sending a representative for -- to testify, you know,
46 we had selected Tim to do that -- to do that, but then
47 I'm just thinking this is a separate thing because
48 they're asking for tribal.....

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I'm not sure

1 how to address that. I mean there's a roundtable
2 discussion on tribal -- discussion on to focus -- a
3 position in advance of the meeting. Tribal
4 representation at the Nome North Pacific Fisheries
5 Management Council meeting. I'm not sure how to
6 address that.

7

8 Pollock, do you have any ideas?

9

10 (Laughter)

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The issue is the
13 Council has selected one member to attend the meeting
14 to take a position -- advocate a position. The tribal
15 representation, I'm not sure how to address that. This
16 Council doesn't have, you know, really -- I'm not sure
17 that we can actually do that, you know. Find another
18 -- I mean we can select a tribal council in our region.
19 How in the world would we even do that. I'm not sure
20 what that -- how that would be accomplished.

21

22 Ray.

23

24 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I'm
25 looking at both of these and like this resolution on --
26 we're getting two new seats on the Board for Federally-
27 qualified rural residents and we've already got.....

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Excuse me. We are
30 advocating for two Federally-qualified rural
31 residents.....

32

33 MR. COLLINS: Okay. Okay.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's actually two
36 public members.

37

38 MR. COLLINS: Right. Right.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: They actually could
41 be an urban dweller and so that's -- so continue.

42

43 MR. COLLINS: Well, I'm saying, yeah.
44 You've got all the Regional Councils already. It seems
45 to me that the tribes ought to be represented. They
46 can nominate people to these Regional Councils and have
47 their voice here at this process so it goes forward in
48 the process which the Board has to listen to. To
49 designate one of those seats as tribal on there, we
50 don't have direct contact with every tribe in our

1 community.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right.

4

5 MR. COLLINS: And, in fact, it was
6 suggested we're not supposed to communicate directly
7 with them on the letter you were suggesting going out
8 there. So it seems like the tribes ought to be
9 represented on the Regional Councils and then the
10 Regional Councils ought to be represented because if
11 there's only two seats, we've got Interior councils and
12 the other ones. I don't see how we could advocate to
13 give up one of those seats -- how would that tribal be
14 chosen when every community in Alaska has a tribe.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

17

18 MR. COLLINS: Every Federal-recognized
19 community.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: So this.....

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Regional Council
26 -- I'm not sure, Sky, the Regional Council is in a
27 quandary as to how we can advocate for any one tribe in
28 particular when we have -- our region represents many
29 different tribal organizations. You have some -- a
30 comment, Becca. We're kind of mired down here. Go
31 ahead.

32

33 MS. ROBBINS-GISCLAIR: Well, I was
34 going to try to help clarify part of it, the issue of
35 the representative for the Nome meeting. I think at
36 this point -- I've been working with Sky a little bit
37 on putting this together and really he's asking for
38 input on the topics of discussion at the roundtable. I
39 think the RAC can still send their representative to
40 the Nome Council meeting and we are planning on having
41 some separate sessions kind of to make sure everyone's
42 on the same page.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So this.....

45

46 MS. ROBBINS-GISCLAIR: From what -- I
47 don't think you have an issue there.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This is basically an
50 invite to the roundtable, to the RAC representative.

1 MS. ROBBINS-GISCLAIR: And I think at
2 this point, Sky's really soliciting input on what
3 should be discussed at the roundtable and what sort of
4 issues we'd want to see at that. So that's really what
5 he's asking for the roundtable at this point.

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I would --
8 like I stated that we don't have a clear definition of
9 the data analysis and so I would encourage Tim to be --
10 seek out the roundtable discussion and work with the
11 tribal organizations if they're present at the Nome --
12 pre-Nome meeting, to get further ideas from tribal
13 representatives that may be present at Nome. The
14 resolution here -- discussion on this resolution
15 advocating for a tribal representative on the Federal
16 Subsistence Board, I'm not sure how this Council can do
17 this. And so I -- I'm a little bit gray on this
18 request.

19
20 I would encourage -- I will state on
21 the record that I would encourage the selection for the
22 Federal Subsistence Board seats to seek out rural-
23 qualified Alaskan residents and I would advocate to
24 prioritize towards Alaska tribal members, but it has to
25 do with the selection of the -- oh, my -- this isn't
26 even my phone -- the selection is up to the Federal
27 Subsistence Board, and so I do not have -- this
28 resolution is not clear to me that this Council can
29 actually take a position one way or another.

30
31 But if the Council feels that they're
32 willing to pass this resolution forward, well, the
33 Chair would entertain a motion to adopt the resolution.

34
35 Polly.

36
37 MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

40
41 MR. GERVAIS: I just wanted to know who
42 Sky was, what his.....

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Sky is an attorney
45 for who?

46
47 DR. WHEELER: When I corresponded with
48 Mr. Starkey earlier today, he said that he would be
49 speaking on behalf of the -- or in this capacity, he's
50 working for the Association of Village Council

1 Presidents, but he's an attorney that works on Native
2 rights issues and natural resource management issues in
3 the State.

4

5 MR. GERVAIS: And he's -- he just runs
6 an office out of Anchorage or so?

7

8 DR. WHEELER: You know, I don't know
9 where he is right now, but.....

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We could ask Sky
12 himself.

13

14 DR. WHEELER: Oh, yeah. I don't know
15 if he's still on.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Sky. If
18 you can fill us on the question as to your -- who you
19 are.

20

21 MR. STARKEY:have an office in
22 Anchorage and, you know, my practice is all pretty much
23 subsistence hunting or fishing cases, either State or
24 for the Federal Subsistence Board. So -- and always on
25 behalf of the rural subsistence users and tribes and
26 Alaska Natives. So that's been my practice for 20
27 years and -- yeah, so that's my practice and I mean the
28 idea of the resolution is not to require the Federal
29 Board to adopt any certain process or otherwise. It
30 simply states that there should be tribes represented
31 on the Federal Subsistence Board, however they want to
32 do it, but, you know, one of these new members or at
33 least -- in some fashion or other on the Federal
34 Subsistence Board, there should be tribal
35 representation of one form or another.

36

37 So, you know, and whether or not the
38 Council adopts it, you know, I understand that there
39 could be differences of opinion about that, but that's
40 the intent of the resolution not that each tribe should
41 be represented or to tell them how to do that, but when
42 they are looking at filling these slots that they
43 should look and make sure that the tribes are
44 represented on that Board.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I appreciate
47 that clarification and your bio. And so further
48 discussion on this resolution of -- you had a comment
49 there, Fred.

50

1 MR. F. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. This tribal
2 consultation originated from Obama's office -- asked
3 tribes of Alaska to go down and meet him in Washington,
4 D.C., a couple years ago and the first meeting was a
5 little short meeting and everybody said something and
6 then went home.

7
8 And the tribes asked, well, what did
9 they get out of it, did they get anything, was there
10 any results. Well, the result was they were asked to
11 come back and start a dialogue with the government --
12 with the Federal -- the United States Government on
13 government-to-government basis with the tribes of
14 Alaska. And that's where that started. The President
15 signed a law and it went into the Department of
16 Interior to all the directors. The EPA director,
17 everybody involved has gotten word from the President
18 to start a consultation with the tribal governments
19 where they could work these things out and -- the issue
20 is be it -- regardless of the subsistence or EPA issues
21 or, you know, one of the things -- large issues is
22 global changes.

23
24 Tribes are able to get grants and some
25 of the policies for getting grants are policies from
26 the '50s which no longer works for a lot of people
27 getting grants. Well, so the government-to-government
28 relationship started through Obama and you're a part of
29 the government system. Therefore, that's why the
30 tribes are already -- all of a sudden playing a big
31 role.

32
33 The way I explained it to myself, the
34 MOU you got, the one you read, you know, when we're
35 doing a tribal consultation, the tribes did not have
36 any say-so except in what Title VIII says. When ANILCA
37 had passed, it was passed on those bases, subsistence
38 user had priority over any State management and so when
39 you read it out, you know -- you explained it to
40 yourself.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I hate to cut you
43 off, Fred, but I'm running out of time here.

44
45 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. That's where
46 the tribal consultation.....

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I know where the
49 tribal consultation is -- the basis of it, but the
50 resolution is requesting this Council to ask for tribal

1 representation. I've asked the Board do they want to
2 make a motion to adopt this resolution to the Federal
3 Subsistence Board, have the prerogative to do that.
4 Does the Council want to adopt this resolution that's
5 been proposed to have tribal representation of some
6 form on the two seats on the Federal Subsistence Board.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've -- is anybody
11 wanting to make a motion to that effect?

12

13 MR. F. HUNTINGTON: Before you make a
14 motion, I wanted to make my final comment. You could
15 table this until you study it. I mean that would be the
16 way I would recommend.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I understand what
19 the resolution's requesting, but the proposed rule does
20 not delineate that. And so we can make a
21 recommendation that the Federal Subsistence Board
22 selection process entail looking at tribal
23 representative, but it's a resolution and so we're just
24 -- we could adopt it and send it to the Federal
25 Subsistence Board as -- for supplementary information.
26 It's not -- we're an Advisory Council and so would the
27 Council like to submit the resolution requesting tribal
28 representation in the selection process to the Federal
29 Subsistence Board.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I cannot garner a
34 motion and so we need to move along in the agenda.

35

36 (Laughter)

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

39

40 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair, I'm done.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Polly, I
43 appreciate that. We've got bingo showing up here and I
44 have a lot of agenda ahead of me. We're at Kanuti --
45 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Kanuti National
46 Wildlife Refuge. We've got our Staff reports and so
47 Vince Mathews. And everybody knows Vince Mathews -- or
48 should know Vince Mathews.

49

50 MR. MATHEWS: I have 98, you know,

1 slides to show and all.....

2

3 (Laughter)

4

5 MR. MATHEWS: No. Seriously it's on
6 Page 66. Please look it over, but let's go a little
7 bit more into that. First off, I want to apologize for
8 using the BlackBerry in the room while you guys were
9 discussing, but I'm tracking an issue in Arctic Village
10 on sheep and I'm hoping that that tribal council will
11 come forward with some thoughts on that issue.

12

13 But anyways, it's on Page 66. I'm not
14 going to go over it. You have a lot to cover still on
15 that, so you can read it. But it does bring up a point
16 that we need to hear from you, the Refuges, and other
17 agencies most likely what topics you would like. And
18 then maybe down the road, our budgets are drying up,
19 that we may need to look at prioritizing within the
20 agenda when these happen so that way Staff can be doing
21 other things. For example, the Refuge manager for
22 Kanuti is now prepping the plane to head up to do his
23 snow survey. So we could maximize by using efficiency.

24

25 So with that the only other thing I
26 have -- I wear multiple hats. I work for Arctic and
27 Yukon Flats -- is later on in your agenda, you have a
28 topic on migratory birds.

29

30 I'm the field coordinator for the
31 migratory bird waterfall survey. Several of you were
32 involved in that survey. I don't know which
33 communities were done in the GASH area. That was done
34 by Clara. But the point of that is, is that that
35 survey may be changing, so we'll try to keep you
36 informed on how that survey may change.

37

38 And I got to make it clear on the
39 record, you don't have a standing in the migratory bird
40 management park, but since we use you to do the
41 surveys, I capitalize on the moment to let you know
42 that.

43

44 So with that, I don't have anything
45 else unless there's a question on the actual
46 presentation on Page -- starting on Page 66.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate the
49 rundown of what Kanuti's -- you know, I don't want to
50 eliminate these presentations. I mean it's each

1 department, you know, your biological staff and various
2 -- should submit to the Council for our -- and I read
3 through this report and I appreciate the report. It's
4 good to have an understanding what's going on with the
5 Refuges and so I do appreciate those.

6

7 Does the Council have any questions on
8 the report or questions for Kanuti in particular.

9

10 Pollock, any questions for Kanuti?

11

12 MR. SIMON: No questions.

13

14 MR. WALKER: Good work.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I feel that
17 Kanuti's doing a good job on keeping the Council
18 informed and do you have another comment there, Vince?

19

20 MR. MATHEWS: The only thing would be
21 is, you know, let us know of topics of desire. This is
22 a lot of material in here because I have to cover a
23 whole bunch of different topics. So it's a lot there,
24 but if this isn't serving your needs or you have a
25 different topic that you want the Refuge to bring up or
26 whatever, let us know and we'll try to fit it in.

27

28 The point I'm trying to get across is
29 this is trying to -- and Glenn as an example are trying
30 to prevent -- what you said earlier, Chair, to prevent
31 it being a problem. All this is keeping you informed
32 so things will not become a problem. But as you all
33 know, serving on different advisory boards, people
34 aren't interested until there's a problem. So if you
35 could help us sort that out so we can get ahead of
36 having it a problem and people at each other's throats.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't have any
39 additional informational needs other than is in this --
40 in the update and the report here to the Council.

41

42 Any further comments to Kanuti.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, thanks
47 a lot, Vince.

48

49 MR. MATHEWS: Thank you.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so we're at
2 Koyukuk/Nowitna and, Boomer.

3
4 MS. BRYANT: Hi. My name is Jenny
5 Bryant. I'm the inventory biology at the
6 Koyukuk/Nowitna Refuge in Galena. I don't have a
7 presentation prepared. Brad was supposed to be here
8 and I think he's bringing people to the airport.

9
10 But I think just real quick one of the
11 things, Kenton Moos is the Refuge manager, and he
12 wanted us to make sure that you knew that we got some
13 staff turnover. We got a new subsistence biologist
14 coming on. He won't get here until March.

15
16 I think that's about it. We're -- a
17 couple of positions, we have a law enforcement position
18 that's open right now and we got a new fisheries
19 biologist which is cool I think for our Refuge. But
20 some of the big questions we usually get are how are
21 the moose doing, how are the wolves doing. So I know
22 Glenn -- we do a lot of our moose surveys are co-op
23 with him, so we show the same information and he's got
24 a presentation coming up. So if there's anything in
25 particular that you want to know, I can answer
26 questions.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any questions
29 for Koyukuk/Nowitna. We saw a data presentation
30 earlier from Glenn on the -- in the overview.....

31
32 MS. BRYANT: The core five.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

35
36 MS. BRYANT: Yeah. And that's pretty
37 much what we have. We also cover Nowitna Refuge too.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any
40 questions. Go ahead, Don.

41
42 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43 Jenny, I just had a quick question. I guess maybe some
44 of your like aerial studies and stuff have already been
45 completed.

46
47 MS. BRYANT: Uh-huh.

48
49 MR. HONEA: And so they're open for
50 review or they will contact maybe the ACs or.....

1 MS. BRYANT: Yeah. Usually what we do
2 is we try to go to all the AC meetings -- try to attend
3 them. It really helps if we get an invite and a heads-
4 up and I know we've been to the Ruby AC several times
5 and we haven't heard, are you guys having one soon?
6
7 MR. HONEA: Tomorrow I believe.
8
9 MS. BRYANT: Tomorrow?
10
11 MR. HONEA: Yeah.
12
13 MS. BRYANT: Wow.
14
15 MR. HONEA: Well, it -- yeah, I mean
16 that's.....
17
18 MS. BRYANT: Yeah. Yeah. If you want
19 us to come and present, we can.
20
21 MR. HONEA: Okay. Maybe a month from
22 now, I guess to be more formally set. Thank you.
23
24 MS. BRYANT: Okay.
25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any other
27 questions.
28
29 MS. PELKOLA: I have -- I don't have a
30 question, but I just.....
31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead, Jenny.
33
34 MS. PELKOLA:but I just have a
35 comment. I'd just like to thank Jenny for coming up
36 and I'm proud that she's locally from Galena and she's
37 working in a, you know, a high capacity area.
38
39 So thank you.
40
41 MS. BRYANT: Thanks, Jenny.
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Appreciate that and
44 I'm glad to hear you have a new subsistence
45 coordinator, subsistence biologist, whatever you want
46 to call him, but I would like the subsistence
47 coordinators to work closely with OSM on disseminating
48 the information that when the issues that are before
49 the Regional Council and the issues for comment back to
50 the Council, to the various communities, in this area,

1 and so I would work -- I would encourage your
2 subsistence coordinator to work closely with OSM on
3 getting an information flow out to the communities.

4
5 MS. BRYANT: Yeah. That's probably one
6 of our biggest bottlenecks is getting -- and, you know,
7 a lot of times, we'll send information out and we'll
8 have either a particular data request or just a, you
9 know, this is what's going on and we don't always hear
10 back from tribal -- you know, the tribal offices.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, there needs to
13 be follow-up either going to the communities and
14 actually.....

15
16 MS. BRYANT: Yeah.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:talking and --
19 going around and, you know, talking with people and not
20 just sending stuff out. It has to -- there has to be
21 follow-up.

22
23 MS. BRYANT: Yeah. I think visiting is
24 one of the -- and visiting for real not just.....

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Getting to
27 know people and getting -- you know, helping people
28 understand what information is -- or proposals and so
29 forth.

30
31 So thank you. Appreciate that.

32
33 MS. BRYANT: All right.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so we're on
36 Innoko, Bo Sloan.

37
38 MR. SLOAN: Mr. Chair, Council. Thanks
39 for the opportunity to speak with you, although I do
40 have kind of a slow southern speech pattern, I will try
41 to cover some things pretty quick.

42
43 And one thing that I just got reminded
44 of in terms of Staff changes, I don't know if you guys
45 realize it or not because it happened about the time we
46 had the meeting in McGrath, but Kevin Whitworth left
47 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service actually to take a
48 natural resources management position with the NP&P
49 there in McGrath. His wife Dara's still a biologist on
50 staff with us, but just so you guys will know, Kevin's

1 -- Kevin's still a good friend and still a member of
2 the McGrath community. He's just not working at Innoko
3 anymore. Might get him to volunteer a little bit
4 though.

5
6 One thing that I really do want to tell
7 you guys about is I hope you remember the last couple
8 years, we've been really trying to get a GSPE survey
9 done in Unit 21A on the Refuge and 21B. 21E as you
10 know, that southwestern corner, we're throwing, you
11 know, everything we got in with BLM and ADF&G and
12 that's where we have our collaring project. And that
13 actual -- that GSPE survey is coming up again next
14 spring.

15
16 Well, anyway, for the second fall in a
17 row, we attempted to try to get that stratification
18 done and then the survey on top of it and we are just
19 absolutely not able to do it. Just, you know, because
20 of the weather and whatnot, we just -- things just
21 aren't lining up. So what we ended up doing, we tried
22 and we got about half of it flown, and then we ended up
23 having to scrap the whole deal and we ended up on top
24 of -- well, when we saw we weren't going to get that
25 done, we said, you know what, we got to regroup. We
26 want to play -- this thing's going out to be a spring
27 survey and we're going to end up and our program's
28 going to consist of a spring GSPE survey and then a
29 calf count, you know, later on and then a composition
30 survey in the fall and that's just what it's going to
31 have to look like and that's okay. You know, so that's
32 the direction we took and we were able to execute that.

33
34 We got the whole thing finished in
35 terms of the stratification. The guys flew 2,300
36 miles, about 30 flight hours, and they really put in a
37 lot of hard work, but we got that done. So I'm just --
38 I'm really, really proud of that.

39
40 Our composition count that we ended up
41 doing a composition survey in 21A, we actually have a
42 bull/cow ratio of one to one or a hundred bulls per
43 hundred cows. Now, with that said, the density in the
44 area is low. I mean they surveyed the upper portion of
45 21A, the whole north half of the Refuge excluding D
46 which is right, you know, on the Yukon there, and they
47 ended up getting 52 moose observed and then they flew
48 -- they covered a lot of ground and ended up, like I
49 say, seeing 52 moose. The ratio ended up being a
50 hundred bulls per hundred cows and the calf/cow ratio

1 ended up being 20 calves per hundred cows. And so,
2 anyway, like I said, it's relatively -- you know, it's
3 not a very dense population, but the ratio is -- like I
4 said, it's one to one or a hundred bulls per hundred
5 cows.

6
7 But I wanted to let you guys know
8 about that stratification because if we hit a big lick
9 I feel like on that. We finally got that monkey off
10 our back. So we'll be able to begin executing the
11 actual survey portion of the GSPE from here on out.

12
13 The -- and I told you guys about the
14 calving survey in the spring. The moose collaring
15 project in 21A continues to go really well. We've got
16 -- you know, originally we had 54 moose collared.
17 Right now we're working with -- there again our
18 partners, Fish and Game and BLM, to go out and we've
19 got to put three back on. We had one mortality and
20 then we had two bull collars that ended getting taken
21 off and had to get them refurbished. We lost -- we're
22 executing the operation to put three of them back on,
23 but that project is going extremely well.

24
25 I know I've probably already talked too
26 long. So I'm going to introduce Jerry Hill. He's our
27 newest biologist. He's going to talk about a couple
28 other things.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you.

31
32 MR. HILL: Mr. Chairman, members of the
33 Council. My name's Jerry Hill. I'm the newest
34 wildlife biologist at Innoko National Wildlife Refuge.

35
36 I'd like to start off by saying I
37 appreciate the opportunity to be here. Being new to
38 Alaska, attending these meetings is a great venue to
39 get introduced to subsistence management, subsistence
40 issues, and all these issues that are addressed and the
41 channels they go through.

42
43 But the Innoko Refuge has been working
44 closely with the BLM and OSM and with considerable
45 assistance from Alaska Fish and Game on the
46 implementation and administering of the Unit 21E
47 Federal moose hunt which is really a new moose hunt in
48 respect that there's changes in season dates and the
49 fact that it's now a permitted hunt with an assigned
50 quota and there's some specific hunt conditions that

1 haven't been there in the past.

2

3 I think probably most folks here are
4 familiar that in the past the hunt has been February
5 1st through the 10th and comments submitted by members
6 of the GASH community and Russian Mission suggested
7 that it was very confining as far as giving them an
8 opportunity to get out and hunt, weather conditions,
9 daylight hours, and such. So the season has been
10 moved. It's February 15th to March 15th which is
11 ongoing at the moment. Excuse me. Like I say, it's a
12 permitted hunt, quota of 40 moose and that 40 moose is
13 in compliance with the Yukon/Innoko Moose Management
14 Plan.

15

16 It's a large number of cow moose
17 allowed under the plan so that's what we set as a
18 quota. And we made -- being that it's a new hunt and
19 new conditions that go along with this hunt. We made a
20 pretty strong effort to get into villages prior to the
21 hunt. We made an initial visit, spent a week in all
22 four of the GASH community villages introducing the
23 hunt and special conditions, 24-hour reporting that
24 we're requiring, one moose per household, and, you
25 know, households that harvested a moose in the fall
26 weren't eligible for a permit for this hunt, so I think
27 that went real well as far as introducing it to each of
28 the villages and then Geoff Byersdorf and Josh Pearce,
29 and myself, Jess with BLM, Josh with Fish and Game, we
30 spent another week issuing permits manually in the
31 villages and again gave folks an opportunity to ask
32 questions and make sure they're clear on the hunt
33 conditions. So we had two weeks in the villages prior
34 to the hunt, so folks got to -- be familiarized with
35 the new conditions and whatnot. So as of Monday
36 afternoon, we've issued 55 permits. 46 of those are
37 registered permits. 9 of those are designated hunters
38 and as of Monday afternoon, we've had one reported
39 harvest from February 15 through February 28th.

40

41 So I talked to all the villages and
42 they say that folks hadn't been out in great numbers
43 hunting because of snow conditions and whatnot. So
44 we'll wait and see how it goes the rest of the season.
45 We have about two weeks left and hopefully folks get a
46 chance to get out and fill their permits.

47

48 The other topic I wanted to touch on
49 which was introduced in the McGrath WIRAC meeting was
50 the furbearer management workshop and trapping workshop

1 that we're developing, which was scheduled to first be
2 presented in the Village of Shageluk. We scheduled
3 that for October and because of conflicts for the
4 agencies, both Fish and Game, Fish and Wildlife
5 Service, we combined to present this workshop and with
6 the villages, it got bumped into February, but we
7 managed to get that workshop in. I think it was a
8 great event. Like Bo presented before, this came about
9 I think regarding predator control in relation to the
10 moose population, but we wanted to present this as an
11 overall trapping workshop to get folks interested in
12 trapping again. And we had roughly 25 participants
13 that came in -- I think we had six solid participants
14 that showed a lot of interest in trapping. So we
15 covered trapping techniques, furbearer biology, fur
16 handling, you know, marketing, subsistence uses, all --
17 a whole mixed bag of everything that goes on with
18 trapping in rural communities. And first run for us
19 and I think it went pretty well and we'd like to do in
20 each of the other three villages and hopefully return
21 to each village once we've made the initial visit to
22 try and keep the interest up.

23

24 So with that, I'll hand it back over to
25 Bo if he has any additional comments from what I said.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I'm glad to
28 hear about that trapping initiative -- schooling. And
29 any Council questions to Innoko Refuge on the
30 presentation.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm real glad to
35 hear that -- oh, you've got one there, Robert.

36

37 MR. WALKER: Bo, are you and Jeff
38 working on this grant here for the four villages there
39 to track a moose with a student there?

40

41 MR. SLOAN: We are, yeah. That's --
42 and there's going to be I think several different
43 facets to that, but the short answer is yes. I mean
44 doing more kind of in the adopt-a-moose project and
45 bringing some of this stuff into the school. Of course
46 Jeff's out right now. He's in Utah on assignment, but
47 we are -- we're working together to do that.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
50 comments.

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm glad to hear
4 about the success of the winter hunt for moose and that
5 we're getting some composition and some refinement of
6 the survey for the moose population in 21E, so I'm
7 happy to hear that. And so appreciate your comments
8 and presentation.

9

10 Thank you.

11

12 MR. SLOAN: Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're down to
15 migratory birds. The handout has been given to the
16 Council. We're up to BLM, Bureau of Land Management
17 and so Shelly Jacobson's going to come and give us a
18 presentation here.

19

20 And I'll give a supplementary here.
21 The Bureau of Land Management has had request for
22 guiding sheep hunters in the Dalton Highway corridor
23 associated to the Dalton Highway corridor management
24 area near where I live and I want the Council to be
25 aware of this issue and ask BLM to bring a presentation
26 as sheep populations decline in supply and demand, the
27 price of Dall sheep hunts increases. There's huge
28 amounts of hunting guides that are wanting to have
29 additional hunting areas and so forth.

30

31 And so that's what all of these
32 handouts and additions are here.

33

34 Go ahead, Shelly.

35

36 MS. JACOBSON: Okay. For the record,
37 my name is Shelly Jacobson. I'm -- normally I'm the
38 field manager for the Central Yukon Field Office and
39 for the last -- since January I've been also acting of
40 the Fairbanks District Manager position that's
41 currently vacant. And with me today is Bruce Seppe who
42 is the biologist for the Anchorage Field Office and I'd
43 just like to thank the Chair and also the Council
44 members for your time and your service. It's been a
45 real joy to be here these last couple of days and very
46 educational for me. So I'm going to go ahead and let
47 Bruce go first. He promised us to be brief, and then I
48 will try to do likewise.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Go

1 ahead, Bruce.

2

3 MR. SEPPE: Mr. Chairman, members of
4 the Council. I'm Bruce Seppe. I'm here in Geoff
5 Byersdorf's position or he's our subsistence
6 coordinator, but as Jerry Hill said, he's down in
7 Price, Utah, on a detail, so I'm just here representing
8 him and bringing stuff forward for the district.

9

10 Just a few bullets here. I noticed our
11 ANSEP representative wasn't here. I just wanted to let
12 everybody know that BLM is actually very involved in
13 the ANSEP program with University of Alaska, Anchorage,
14 and we'll be employing I believe three ANSEP students
15 this summer at Anchorage Field Office, two of them with
16 their summer bridge program and one is what they call
17 university retention student. I'm not sure where the
18 students will be from. ANSEP will decide that, but
19 they'll be there in the months of June and July.

20

21 That program is -- was funded by Youth
22 Initiative funds that were straight from Washington and
23 they're very -- it seems like those are the only thing
24 that's relatively well funded right now, but those
25 programs will depend -- if they go into future years
26 will depend on if we get further funding for them.

27

28 Also this last summer, four additional
29 shelter cabins were built on the Iditarod Trail. Those
30 were located on the north fork of the Innoko River, the
31 headwaters of the Tolstoy, Moose Creek on the Iditarod
32 River, and one that's outside this region -- just
33 outside on the foothills of the Unalakleet between
34 Unalakleet and Shaktoolik. Of course they're probably
35 not as important to the actual dog race as they are to
36 when the dog race isn't going on. They're considered
37 public use and shelter cabins, safety cabins. So we
38 will also have presence on the trail during the
39 Iditarod race and after at Rohn Cabin on the south fork
40 of Kuskokwim and between Unalakleet and Kaltag, our law
41 enforcement rangers will be out there during and after
42 the race.

43

44 Another issue is the Red Devil Mine.
45 That's an abandoned mercury mine as you all well know
46 near Sleetmute. The BLM has been working with EPA in
47 the cleanup of that and looking into mercury
48 contamination in fish and wildlife and people in fact.
49 That's still an ongoing thing that we're working with
50 DNR and Fish and Game to identify those contaminants,

1 mainly mercury, in subsistence resources. There's a
2 lot of fish collection done with contractors this past
3 year, although the results of that aren't back yet.

4
5 This past summer, the remediation of
6 hydrocarbon type stuff, the fuel, has been completed
7 and now this next year, they're going to have what
8 they're remediation work and installing five monitoring
9 wells for metals contamination. That's quite an
10 involved process and I don't have all the information
11 here, but here is a BLM Website. If you go onto BLM
12 Anchorage Field Office website and there's links to the
13 Red Devil Mine and I can give you that exact email
14 address if you want that.

15
16 Also the Donlin Creek Gold Mine near
17 Crooked Creek or just off of Crooked Creek, BLM has
18 authorized them to conduct geotechnical feasibility
19 study. They are proposing making -- building a natural
20 gas pipeline from Cook Inlet to the Kuskokwim River to
21 supply power to their mine. That's 315 miles of eight-
22 inch gas pipeline. About a hundred of those miles are
23 on Federal lands, Federal BLM lands.

24
25 Right now it's in the feasibility study
26 type of mode and whether that happens is yet to be
27 determined, but with the price of gold and that sort of
28 thing, it very well could happen in the coming years.
29 Right now it's only at the stages where their permit is
30 to do this feasibility study and that's all we know
31 right now. That's what they're permitted for, but
32 bringing gas -- natural gas from Cook Inlet seems to be
33 their best option now for bringing the tremendous
34 amount of power they need to make that mine happen.

35
36 And that's all I'll say about that.
37 Right now they're permitted and this next summer,
38 they're going to continue that feasibility study.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead,
41 Ray.

42
43 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, a question on that.
44 Will that pipeline involve a road to build it if it
45 goes in because that's critical for us?

46
47 MR. SEPPE: From what I've heard --
48 yeah. From what I've heard of their study, they do
49 need to build an access road to bring pipe. They
50 actually -- these pipes are too big to airlift, to

1 sling in with helicopters, so it will be some sort of
2 access road. Once it's in, they're telling us that it
3 doesn't need to have maintenance because it's a buried
4 pipeline -- a buried gas pipeline and their maintenance
5 are very minimal and it won't be an access road. Those
6 are the very same questions I asked too is, is there
7 going to be then access to the region then through this
8 road. That remains to be determined, but -- and I
9 didn't get a straight answer on that, but they are
10 building access roads to places to truck this pipe --
11 this eight-inch steel pipe to construct this thing, if
12 it happens. Right now we're not at that point. We're
13 at a feasibility study point.

14

15 Further questions on that?

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
18 questions. Go ahead, Tim.

19

20 MR. GERVAIS: Does -- so is that going
21 to go through the Lake Clark Preserve too?

22

23 MR. SEPPE: I've got -- I don't have a
24 copy of the map with me. It does end up going along
25 the Iditarod Trail over -- their latest proposal is
26 through Rainy Pass and crossing the Kuskokwim, there's
27 many stream crossings and many issues with stream
28 crossings and that sort of thing, so I don't believe it
29 goes to the Lake Clark area. But there are several
30 alternatives and they really haven't picked. They had
31 a proposed -- you know, best alternative that they were
32 contemplating, but often they'd change their proposals
33 as they go out and find the difficulty and expense of
34 making it happen. So I can't say for sure that that
35 route wouldn't include Lake Clark.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay. I hadn't
38 heard about that gas line. That would be of huge
39 impact to subsistence resources and users in the
40 region. I would be inclined to see a winter access
41 route accommodated to install the pipeline as is done
42 on the North Slope and then subsequent burial of the
43 pipeline during wintertime and then go away and not
44 leave a road behind. A second class road brings
45 tremendous amount of impact to a region and that would
46 highly impact our region. And so I would be inclined
47 to encourage the BLM to bring this issue forward before
48 the Council for comments on alternate -- mitigating
49 comments.

50

1 MR. SEPPE: Oh, certainly. They
2 haven't officially brought forward the proposal to
3 build the pipeline. Right now it just is feasibility
4 study and that's what we're permitting. We're by no
5 means permitting a pipeline.

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But if it moves
8 forward, we would like comments on mitigation.

9
10 MR. SEPPE: Yes, of course.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
13 discussion on that aspect. Are you completed with your
14 presentation?

15
16 MR. SEPPE: Yeah. I've got -- just
17 Jerry had mentioned the work on moose in 21A and 21E.
18 Geoff Byersdorf just wanted me to mention that we were
19 out in -- he was out in the Grayling, Anvik and
20 Shageluk areas putting -- bringing out permits --
21 issuing permits for that 21A winter moose hunt which is
22 happening right now. BLM handed out 39 permits and a
23 total of 55 were put out and as Jerry mentioned only
24 one animal has been reported taken at this time.

25
26 BLM's very much involved in that.
27 We'll be cooperating with the Refuge to do twinning
28 surveys in 21E in the spring in May and in that moose
29 collaring project, BLM is also very financially and
30 personnel-wise involved in that and we'll be helping
31 put out those three additional collars in the spring
32 and monitoring of those collared moose in 21E.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Appreciate
35 it.

36
37 MR. SEPPE: That's all I've got. Thank
38 you.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Shelly.

41
42 MS. JACOBSON: Okay. I have a report
43 that I would normally go through with you. However,
44 I'm pretty sure that you would all be interested in it
45 and you can read it at your leisure and I'll just try
46 to highlight a few things out of it to bring to your
47 attention and then I'll also make you aware that I'll
48 be staying at Erica Cleavers' house tonight if anyone
49 wants to stop by and chat it over with me, I'd be happy
50 to do that because I'm really interested in all of it

1 but know there's not time for that, so -- a few of the
2 things. Let me just get right to the point.

3
4 We're a multiple-use agency of course,
5 BLM, and we permit a lot of use authorizations and so
6 that's quite of bit of what's in here.

7
8 We try to bring forward the ones that
9 have a pretty obvious fish or wildlife aspect to them
10 in terms of the likely impact, so there'll be an
11 opportunity to you to comment on those. We put all of
12 our use authorizations, permitting on our website so
13 that people have an opportunity to comment on the
14 proposal. That's part of our scope and we're also
15 trying to make a bigger effort to contact people that
16 we believe might be interested and make them aware of
17 proposals so they can have time to comment as well.

18
19 Some of the things that -- of course
20 there's a lot of gas line activity going on right now
21 in the Central Yukon Field Office focused along the --
22 primarily along the TAPS Route and several of those
23 projects are still active -- quite active particularly
24 the Alaska Pipeline project which was formerly the
25 Trans-Canada project. They had a lot of field work
26 last summer. Jack, you probably saw them all up there
27 surveying and whatnot as well as the Alaska Standalone
28 Pipeline project.

29
30 The Denali Pipeline project hasn't --
31 is still a valid project at this time, although the
32 workload has seemed to have died down quite a bit. So
33 we're not expecting anything too much on that.

34
35 Maybe I should just move right into
36 recreation since we got some -- a letter through Jack
37 on behalf of the RAC here regarding our special
38 recreation permits which are the type of permits BLM
39 issues to hunting guides. And we've had a lot of
40 issues of.....

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One clarification.
43 I sent a letter in response within the timeframe to
44 respond to the -- it was -- I think it was January 24th
45 to get the issue on the table of concern about the
46 permitting process. And so it was my letter, but as
47 Chair, I requested the .810 analysis and so forth.

48
49 MS. JACOBSON: Okay.
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That was the
2 capacity that I requested it as.
3
4 MS. JACOBSON: Oh, I'm sorry.
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Legalities to what
7 my comments, I was not acting under authority.
8
9 MS. JACOBSON: Oh, okay. Okay. But
10 you asked for an update to the RAC.
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I did ask for an
13 update.
14
15 MS. JACOBSON: Okay. Apologize for
16 that. So Jack's own comments and what I've provided --
17 I won't go through the two .810s -- two of the
18 attachments I gave are the .810 analysis that we did
19 for prior permits.
20
21 Just to give you an idea of the idea of
22 analysis that we're trying to use now for our -- more
23 of our complicated permits. And just give you kind of
24 an update of where we've been since I've been with BLM,
25 we used to look at these guide permits strictly as a
26 camp and when you saw the proposed action, it was
27 really focused on the footprint of the camp itself and
28 it didn't really discuss or elaborate on the likely
29 impacts from the activity that the people would be
30 doing. It was really focused on the camp.
31
32 And a lot of the permits throughout the
33 State still with BLM are still focused that way, but
34 several areas in our field office have become real
35 hotbeds of guiding activity and we've been getting some
36 support from our solicitor incrementally to add into
37 our analysis the related actions. Obviously, you know,
38 the guiding -- commercial guiding so there's
39 transporting and the clients themselves and associated
40 impacts from that.
41
42 So some of the -- what I've got here is
43 the .810 analysis. We -- right now, there is no single
44 810 analysis that we do for the entire permitting
45 process. We don't even right now batch them together
46 as a group and do it as a group. We're starting to
47 sort of phase into that. So but right now, they're
48 being done on a permit-by-permit basis and the analysis
49 considers the current knowledge in the case on the
50 sheep populations and the trends and the hunter success

1 rates for the different categories of hunters. So
2 that's the kind of analysis that's in those two 810s
3 that I provided.

4
5 Jack had also asked about a guide area
6 plan that describes the current and future permitting
7 in the Dalton Highway Management Area for Dall sheep.
8 As I said, we don't have a plan at this time. I know
9 Jack well remember Henri Bisson, a former State
10 director of ours, that promised that we would address
11 that issue through our land use planning process. And
12 if we ever get funded, I believe we will honor that
13 promise, but in the meantime, it's clear to us that we
14 need to do something more than just wait. We also
15 spent a little while working with the State, Big Game
16 Commercial Services Board, and we continue to work with
17 them and would like to coordinate with the State and
18 DNR if they implement some kind of a process, but there
19 again it's sort of bogged down.

20
21 It starts and it stops and the
22 complaints just keep rolling in to us. So what we've
23 come up with is -- and really -- I'm sorry to go
24 through this so fast because I really want to take the
25 time to thank Jack in particular and probably some of
26 you others that may have commented because we get -- we
27 make progress incrementally through the constructive
28 feedback that we get from people and so one of the
29 things that has really been helpful to us is the
30 suggestion that we establish a deadline for the receipt
31 of these special recreation permit applications.

32
33 Currently we don't have a deadline, but
34 -- so we're just kind of going on a first come, first
35 serve basis. As each application comes in, we analyze
36 what that particular applicant is requesting and then
37 the next one comes in. And we add what that is with
38 the ones that we already have out there and what we're
39 already permitted and we keep going and of course at
40 some point, you will reach a point -- we will reach a
41 point where it's the last person and that falls to them
42 to -- we'll deny that application.

43
44 And so we've recently -- in my history
45 now started and have denied a few applications. We're
46 getting in to making allocations on the number of
47 clients that they're allowed to take for certain -- by
48 species even, which is a departure from the past.
49 We're trying to get a little bit more involved in the
50 spacing of the -- where they are in relation to each

1 other as well as a little bit on the timing of when --
2 you know, how they cycle through these areas.

3
4 So we don't have everything in place
5 yet, but we've got a guidebook that recommends that the
6 applications be submitted at least 180 days in advance.
7 I think what we'd like to do -- I believe the Park and
8 the Refuge already have that system in place for an
9 advanced due date and hopefully it's the same due date.
10 So we think we'll just need to find out what that is
11 for a spring hunt and a fall hunt and have that be our
12 deadline as well and then what that allows us to do
13 then is do a comprehensive 810 analysis because we'll
14 know everybody that's going to go in there all at once,
15 so we can do a more thoughtful job and make some
16 decisions, allocate the number of guide -- hunters
17 among the applications received after the deadline and
18 following up, what we've normally done is issue our
19 guide permits for about a five-year period, but what
20 we'd like to start doing is limiting the term of the
21 guide permits for about two to three years and this
22 decision is within our discretionary authority and
23 it'll -- some people would like to see it go to year by
24 year, but it's a big workload and we've got about 60
25 permits in our office. So if they all come due every
26 year, we're going to have a hard time keep up and also
27 some of the guides have expressed some concerns because
28 they've booked these hunts a couple years in advance
29 and so try to be a little bit receptive to that idea
30 and stagger the dates hopefully so that they don't all
31 expire, you know, together and give us some -- a little
32 bit more manageable workload there.

33
34 So the data that's on this map shows
35 the permit -- the guides that we have. The other thing
36 about it is as you'll see here, we're able to depict
37 those specific areas that the people that applied for.
38 They aren't really required to do that, but we're
39 encouraging it and if people do, then we can actually
40 limit them to a smaller portion of the guide use area,
41 but as a matter of fact, they can actually use any BLM
42 lands within the area that they're permitted.

43
44 So -- but when they limit themselves,
45 then we depict it and we can even make that a permit
46 stipulation that they stay in the area that they've
47 been approved for. So that's what's shown on this. It
48 shows who applied and who expired and how many clients
49 by the different species and there's also graphs on the
50 back to that show the same information and some tables.

1 So 2010 looks like the -- Jack, you had
2 asked about the current harvest levels for Dall sheep
3 within the area for both the subsistence and all the
4 other users. The information we got said that there
5 were 12 subsistence sheep permits issued out of the
6 Arctic InterAgency Visitors Center in 2010 and we don't
7 have the subsistence harvest data for 2010 at this
8 time.

9
10 The following information was provided
11 by ADF&G. In 2010, 50 hunters reported hunting in GMU
12 24A. 22 hunters reported harvesting rams. None
13 reported harvesting user lambs. Of those 50 hunters,
14 one was from Wiseman, 37 were from other areas of
15 Alaska, and 12 were nonresidents.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don't feel bad about
18 not finding that subsistence information. I've talked
19 to many -- we're under a Federal registration permit
20 for Dall sheep that are issued through the visitors
21 center and those -- that data is really hard to get and
22 so that is an issue of this Council that that harvest
23 data for subsistence harvest on these Federal
24 registration permits needs to more available to the
25 managing agencies.

26
27 It seems to get cornered somewhere and
28 we need to have better access to this harvest data and
29 that data is being collected by the U.S. Fish and
30 Wildlife through a permitting system. And so as you
31 can see, BLM cannot find it and a lot of people can't
32 find it. Dall sheep are not required to be sealed
33 under Federal regulations and so that's -- somebody may
34 have sealed a sheep from Wiseman, but that only entails
35 that one person that, you know, happened to seal it
36 inadvertently or whatever.

37
38 Bottom line is we need better harvest
39 information for the subsistence use because that
40 validates the subsistence use of the local people. We
41 also have a problem with the Park Service -- Park sheep
42 also being unreported. There's no reporting system for
43 the Park. And so I -- continue on, but I just wanted
44 to clarify that why you're not finding that subsistence
45 information.

46
47 Go ahead.

48
49 MS. JACOBSON: Okay. And you had also
50 asked about or expressed some concern about the number

1 of BLM applications and permits within the Guide Use
2 Area 2607 and -- I'm trying to -- we put that on here.
3 We do have one. He's an existing guide, Dan Whetzel --
4 Winzle, and -- but he's indicated that he doesn't plan
5 to guide in 2011, so.....

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

8

9 MS. JACOBSON:that's that. The
10 other relevant information that we put on here is -- of
11 course the State system which I already mentioned, the
12 map of the current guides, and I mentioned the guide
13 use area. So I guess that's it.

14

15 I'm sorry I just really jumped through
16 this, but if I'd had more time, I'd just sit here and
17 read it to you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate your
20 time constraints. We had other fisheries issues pop up.
21 I feel that the Bureau of Land Management -- I address
22 various issues and I'm very encouraged by your
23 addressing those issues through the failed guide
24 selection process. The reality is that you're
25 addressing various issues of my concern and providing
26 an .810 analysis. That's what I hadn't seen before,
27 and so I'm satisfied that you're addressing the issues
28 that I had.

29

30 I wanted the Western Interior Regional
31 Advisory Council to be aware that this is going to
32 continue to be an ongoing problem and so I do feel that
33 the Council needs to be aware that this is going to be
34 expanding into other areas of our region. There's
35 going to be areas and other portions of the mountainous
36 regions for Dall sheep and other species.

37

38 We just went to five caribou limit on
39 the North Slope and it's going to draw a tremendous
40 amount of people into the Brooks Range, and so the
41 North Slope of the Brooks Range, 26B and corridor --
42 Bureau of Land Management lands is also going to be a
43 concern. And so I'm glad you're getting on top of this
44 issue at my urging and I really appreciate that,
45 Shelly, and I express my personal thanks for you doing
46 that.

47

48 And any Council members have comments
49 on the BLM presentation.

50

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you very much.
4
5 MS. JACOBSON: Okay. Thank you, guys.
6 Thanks.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Excuse me. I do
9 have one issue that was -- Randy Rogers called and said
10 there's a wood bison restoration meeting May 11th and
11 12th and they needed a designee to that. Did have
12 comments, George?
13
14 MR. PAPPAS: George Pappas, Department
15 of Fish and Game. 12 seconds or less. We have a new
16 subsistence liaison chair that -- to chair our team.
17 Jennifer Yuhas, she was hired out of the Juneau
18 Commissioner's Office. She was a spokesperson there.
19 And the recruitment process to replace Terry Haynes, a
20 wildlife position, is almost complete, so we should
21 have a very competent wildlife individual onboard
22 fairly soon.
23
24 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate that.
27 The wood bison restoration project for the Alaska
28 Department of Fish and Game is in the process of
29 delineating uses of wood bison and they're going to
30 have a meeting on the 11th and 12th in Anchorage and
31 they wanted a designee from the Western Interior
32 Region. When these bison are introduced near Shageluk,
33 there's going to be a future harvest on those bison and
34 so the Western Interior has a real stake in having
35 input on use of those bison and I would like -- I would
36 prefer to have a designee from that -- in the GASH
37 area. Robert just had to leave -- for some reason, he
38 had to leave, but I would designate -- I would -- as
39 Chair, I would like to see him represent the Regional
40 Advisory Council at that May 11th and 12th.
41
42 Then we'd need an alternate in case
43 Robert has to decline. Jimmy Walker. And so those
44 would be the two designees. Is that agreeable to the
45 Council on the wood bison restoration project and
46 having input into future harvest, use. Does that
47 extend our Alaska Department Fish and Game -- we have
48 National Park Service business.....
49
50 MR. COLLINS: Could I have the name

1 again -- replacing Terry. I missed it.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jennifer Yuhas.

4

5 MR. COLLINS: Huh?

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jennifer Yuhas is
8 her name and she's now the new Board liaison.

9

10 And so go ahead, Nancy.

11

12 MS. SWANTON: Hi, everyone. I'm Nancy
13 Swanton. I'm with the National Park Service. I'm the
14 InterAgency Staff Committee member focusing mostly on
15 fisheries which is why some of you don't see me every
16 time at one of these meetings. Sandy Rabinowitch is my
17 counterpart in the wildlife realm and we both cover
18 policy matters related to subsistence with the
19 InterAgency group and advise our Board member.

20

21 I did pass out a handout, so it covers
22 all the things that I can talk about which I don't
23 intend to do in great detail. Perhaps one of the more
24 useful things to discuss would be the outcomes of the
25 Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission
26 meeting in November. Jack sits on that committee as
27 does Pollock Simon as Chair and Vice Chair. Outcomes
28 of that November meeting included a hunting plan
29 recommendation for science-based management of big game
30 populations based on health and sustainability. The
31 recommendation is 10-01. I believe you put that one
32 together, Jack, didn't you and.....

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I did.

35

36 MS. SWANTON: The SRC is seeking
37 comment on that. A letter went out to the Council
38 coordinators for Western Interior, Northwest Arctic,
39 and North Slope as well as the Fish and Game Advisory
40 Committee coordinators. You should have a copy of that
41 recommendation and again comment is being sought and
42 the plan is to finalize a decision for that proposed
43 recommendation at the next SRC meeting which is
44 scheduled for May -- no date certain quite yet, but it
45 will be in an upper Kobuk River community. That
46 information will get out as soon as they're able to
47 make that plan.

48

49 I didn't know whether you wanted to
50 address that here at the meeting or.....

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Regional Council
2 -- the hunting plan recommendations come before the
3 Regional Councils for review. This is on the table
4 here. Basically this hunting plan recommendation is
5 utilizing the basic premise that science-based
6 management needs to be involved in wildlife management
7 on Park Preserve lands which are open to all
8 nonsubsistence uses and if the trigger points are hit,
9 the -- if the sustainability is exceeded, just like in
10 the MOU recommendation, the Park Service would have to
11 reduce or eliminate nonsubsistence uses.

12
13 I would request that the Western
14 Interior Regional Advisory Council endorse the Gates of
15 the Arctic hunting plan, Subsistence Resource
16 Commission's Hunting Plan 10-02 because it basically
17 reiterates what we've recommended to the Federal
18 Subsistence Board regarding the MOU in general.

19
20 Any comments from the Council on the
21 premise of the hunting plan recommendation. Or
22 questions. It's on -- be on the -- before us here
23 laying on the table. It's titled GAR 10-01. And so
24 the hunting plan recommendation -- the Subsistence
25 Resource Commissions are tasked with coming up with
26 hunting plan recommendations and these are submitted
27 before the public for at least 60-day notice. The
28 public is open for comments, but the Regional Councils
29 -- and there's three Regional Councils that would
30 affect the Subsistence Resource Commission for Gates of
31 the Arctic. That would be the Western Interior,
32 Northwest Arctic, and the North Slope Regional
33 Councils. They will also be encouraged to make comment
34 on this hunting plan recommendation.

35
36 Any questions or comments.

37
38 MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair. So this
39 actually hasn't gone before -- are we the first RAC
40 it's gone to for consideration?

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm not sure about
43 what the Northwest -- whether the Northwest Arctic and
44 the North Slope, have they met yet? Salena?

45
46 REPORTER: (Shakes head negatively)

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: They have not met
49 yet, so this is the first RAC to review it.

50

1 MR. HONEA: Okay. Then is this an
2 action item? Would you like a motion?
3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would like a
5 motion to endorse Hunting Plan Recommendation 10-01.
6
7 MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair, we're missing
8 some copies of that.
9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, it was all -- it
11 was before -- well, you can use mine. The Hunting Plan
12 Recommendation was passed out on the table in all of
13 this pile of papers here. And so I would like a motion
14 to adopt Hunting Plan -- Gates of the Arctic
15 Subsistence Resource Commission's Hunting Plan 10-01.
16
17 MR. HONEA: Move to adopt.
18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Got a motion to
20 adopt.
21
22 MR. GERVAIS: I'll second that.
23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
25 Any further discussion on the Hunting Plan
26 Recommendation.
27
28 (No comments)
29
30 MR. SIMON: Question.
31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's called by
33 Pollock. Those in favor of the premise of the hunting
34 plan and the need for scientific-based management in
35 the Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve
36 lands signify by saying aye.
37
38 IN UNISON: Aye.
39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
41 sign.
42
43 (No opposing votes)
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have further
46 report, Nancy.
47
48 MS. SWANTON: Yes. I'll just run down
49 the list very quickly. I know you're interested in
50 adjourning shortly.

1 Other items of interest that occurred
2 at the Subsistence Resource Commission meeting include
3 a letter of concern regarding an annual Kotzebue
4 sheefish derby. The request was to ask that the
5 sheefish caught in excess be donated to elders. The
6 SRC expressed support for the derby as an important
7 local event, but was interested in ensuring effective
8 management to ensure a healthy fishery for use by
9 subsistence-dependent communities.

10

11 So that was another item that occurred.

12

13 There was a third item dealing with
14 compensation for travel. I think you've all -- or the
15 SRC members have received a letter of response on that
16 one. And then there was a letter of concern to BLM
17 about issuance of guiding permits. You talked a little
18 bit about that earlier. That letter should be going
19 out, however, and I have shared a draft with Shelly so
20 that she was informed about that. So hopefully we have
21 some good coordination with respect to that.

22

23 There are various bullets on the
24 handout regarding studies, surveys, monitoring of
25 moose, Dall sheep, brown bears, air quality at Bettles,
26 slumps and slides caused by permafrost thaw, getting
27 into some global warming issues that I know you have
28 some interest in and perhaps your annual report will
29 address some of those concerns.

30

31 Also an environmental assessment coming
32 up with respect to positioning weather stations in
33 Arctic parks. Something about traditional ecological
34 knowledge that's going on. Dave Krupa in our Fairbanks
35 Office of Gates of the Arctic Yukon Charley is the
36 contact on that one. That will be an interesting
37 study. I -- to let you know that the Gates of the
38 Arctic will be updating its general management plan.
39 This is the all-encompassing plan that addresses Park
40 management. That has not been updated for 23 years and
41 there's reason for that and in part that it hasn't been
42 found to be necessary, but now there are some new
43 things that have occurred and the timing appears to be
44 right for that one to be revisited in some respects.
45 So you'll be hearing about that if you haven't already.
46 I believe there have been some public meetings with to
47 that.

48

49 And then the last item if I -- let's
50 see -- some sculpin meetings -- some public meetings

1 have occurred with respect to this environmental
2 evaluation of traditional and customary uses of shed
3 horns and antlers and collection of plants for
4 handicrafts. I think you've heard about this for about
5 two years now and I believe there is some progress
6 being made on that. Sandy Rabinowitch is the lead on
7 that project along with another individual from our
8 regional office in concert with the Parks.

9
10 I think that's about it. And if you've
11 got any questions or comments, I'd be happy to
12 entertain those.

13
14 Thanks.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Do Council
17 have comments or questions to the presentation from
18 Nancy Swanton.

19
20 Go ahead, Ray.

21
22 MR. COLLINS: This isn't related
23 directly to this Council, but I'd like to mention it
24 now. I'm on Denali Park and one of the problems is we
25 haven't been able to meet because of lack of quorum and
26 part of that's because of appointments haven't been
27 made in a timely manner and is that being addressed by
28 the Park Service to get appointments on these various
29 groups?

30
31 MS. SWANTON: Yes.

32
33 MR. COLLINS: Okay.

34
35 MS. SWANTON: I know that's a
36 frustration. I know it's a frustration for the Park as
37 well, so Amy Craver, our subsistence coordinator at
38 Denali, is working as hard as she can to try to move
39 that forward and I will convey to her your question and
40 your comment and we'll see whether we can get some
41 action on that.

42
43 MR. COLLINS: Actions not on her end
44 though. It's on the other end where the appointments
45 are being made because they have been submitted, you
46 know.

47
48 MS. SWANTON: Yeah. Yeah. Understood.
49 There's only so much one can do other than let our
50 regional director know one more time that these need to

1 be addressed. You know, that's the only thing that I
2 can suggest we might -- make sure that this concern
3 continues to be ongoing.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would like a
6 letter to be transmitted to the regional director of
7 the National Park Service to expedite appointments to
8 Denali National Park Subsistence Resource Commission,
9 working with the Governor's Office on the Governor's of
10 Alaska .3 members also -- or so many members to the
11 commissions and so that letter of encouragement from
12 the Regional Advisory Council which we have one -- the
13 RAC's also appoint one member, and so we as a part of
14 the Subsistence Resource Commission appointing sources
15 need to encourage the other sources to build quorum for
16 the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission.

17

18 Those in favor of that letter -- I need
19 a motion.

20

21 MR. SIMON: So move.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Pollock.

24

25 MR. COLLINS: Second.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Ray.
28 Further discussion on a letter to be transmitted to
29 the.....

30

31 MR. SIMON: Question.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:Sue Masica.
34 Question's called on the motion. Those in favor of the
35 motion signify by saying aye.

36

37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for bringing
40 that forward, Ray. Yukon -- I think we've covered the
41 National Park Service. Thank you, Nancy.

42

43 MS. SWANTON: Thank you and thank you
44 for bringing that forward.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so we have
47 covered Yukon Drainage Fisheries Association issues.
48 They've departed. The Yukon Panel, we've been briefed
49 on the Yukon Panel and is that sufficient for the
50 Council.

1 MS. YATLIN: Yes.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other business,
4 appointment of members to the Tri-Council Customary
5 Trade subcommittee. We've addressed that. Future
6 meeting plans, confirmation of time and location of the
7 fall meeting. The fall meeting is in Aniak. As far --
8 where's our calendar, Donald. Is that in the back.
9
10 MR. GERVAIS: Page 80.
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Page 80.
13
14 MR. SIMON: Page 80.
15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I see it.
17 And so -- so let's see here. WIRAC is October 4 and 5
18 in Aniak. And is that -- is the -- do you have
19 comments, Pollock. Go ahead. Oh, I'm comfortable with
20 those dates. We selected those dates last fall. Is
21 the RAC still comfortable with 4 -- go ahead, Pollock.
22 Do you got a comment, question.
23
24 MR. SIMON: Yeah. I have comments. I
25 just want to say that I've been on a lot of committees,
26 I go to meetings all across the state for the past 30
27 years. And I don't usually worry about the per diem or
28 look for bigger community with a hotel and stuff. I've
29 gone to meetings and slept on people's couch and slept
30 on gym floors. But the main thing is that what I like
31 is that we go to -- sometimes we'll go to smaller
32 communities to meet the peoples that we represent. So
33 not just we go to meet in Galena and Aniak, two bigger
34 communities, but we can go to different places at
35 different times so that we can meet the peoples that we
36 represent. We had good representation here from
37 Galena. Our second chief, Fred Huntington, he got up
38 to the table a lot of times.
39
40 That's all I have.
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate those
43 comments, Pollock. Since you were on the Council the
44 last few years, probably four or five years, we've been
45 under -- the Office of Subsistence Management has had
46 us pigeonholed into two hub communities by request
47 we've gotten -- those would be Aniak and Galena, and by
48 request we've also gotten two hub community McGrath.
49
50 I've commented to the Federal

1 Subsistence Board that, you know, we would like to be
2 able to get to hotspot areas where we have significant
3 concerns and that would be like -- you know, like for
4 this various issues and Yukon River fisheries and
5 various issues, that we'd like to go to hotspots, but
6 so far we've gotten no returns from the Federal
7 Subsistence Board or OSM on being able to meet outside
8 of the hub areas.

9

10 And so did you have further comment on
11 that issue, Polly?

12

13 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. I don't
14 specifically. It is an ongoing issue for our program
15 and we struggle. I mean part of the problem -- and
16 Donald touched on some of it with the briefing on the
17 travel stuff. A lot of our policies are now coming out
18 of D.C. and as you might imagine, some of those
19 policies don't necessarily fit with how things work in
20 Alaska. So, for example, you know, when we make --
21 when we have a contract with somebody for places to
22 stay, they have to be on the Government's central
23 contractor registry. It's just it's all this
24 bureaucracy that I can't -- I'm not going to bore you
25 with, but we always try and kind of -- we're trying to
26 negotiate ways of doing things, but the government
27 doesn't always appreciate the uniqueness of Alaska.

28

29 So we hear you loud and clear and, you
30 know, we will try to work out meeting in other areas.
31 You know, for some of the Councils, it's probably not
32 as pronounced of an issue as it seems to be for other
33 Councils.

34

35 So we hear you and we're doing what we
36 can do.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate what
39 OSM has to deal with with all these regulations. We
40 can't send out questionnaires without Washington
41 approval and stuff. This is getting a little bit -- I
42 feel that a possible letter from this Council to the
43 Federal Subsistence Board requesting them to negotiate
44 with the Special Assistant to the Secretary of
45 Interior, Pat Pourchot, on cutting through some of the
46 red tape -- the DOI wanted this Council to be able to
47 consult with tribes, but we have -- our hands are tied
48 and some of this bureaucratic stuff is tying these
49 Councils down on being able to accomplish our .805 of
50 ANILCA work and so I would like to transmit a letter to

1 the -- through the Federal Subsistence Board requesting
2 that working with Pat Pourchot, Department of
3 Interior's Special Assistant -- Secretary of Interior's
4 Special Assistant to Alaska that we -- they investigate
5 ways of facilitating OSM's economizing and allowing OSM
6 to address the unique character of doing business for
7 these Regional Councils in rural Alaska to meet our
8 .805 ANILCA mandates and do I have a motion to transmit
9 that letter.

10

MS. SIMON: So move.

11

12

MS. PELKOLA: Second.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

(No comments)

MR. SIMON: Question.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's been called. Those in favor of transmitting the letter signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moving back on to our fall calendar, we've selected Aniak. Do the Council members feel that the meeting in Aniak on the 4th and 5th of October is still a valid meeting date? Is that good for you, Pollock?

MR. SIMON: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: New member. And so all members present are affirmative. We have Robert and Eleanor -- Eleanor's not present. Long day. And so that's acceptable to the Council.

(Council nods affirmatively)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so are we requested to set a winter meeting date at this time?

1 MR. MIKE: A tentative winter date.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tentative winter
4 date. We don't like to get in conflict with the
5 Iditarod and so we would bounce back towards Galena or
6 McGrath. And so what would be the Council's wishes?
7
8 MR. MORGAN: McGrath. You mean
9 alternate.
10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: McGrath is -- is it
12 my understanding McGrath should be looked as a total
13 alternate or is it one of our hub areas?
14
15 DR. WHEELER: It's a hub area. I mean
16 we can -- there's planes in there. There's places to
17 eat. I mean it's okay.
18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So McGrath is
20 an acceptable hub area. And so it would be preferable
21 to avoid the Iditarod which is usually the first
22 Saturday in March. If we were meeting in mid-week in
23 the first week in March, we might get in conflict with
24 the Iditarod. We could also do the same thing real
25 close to the end of the week in February, but since
26 it's leap year, we have a couple of -- we have an extra
27 day there to play with. So I would prefer to have the
28 meeting on the 28th and 29th in McGrath would be a good
29 place to have that meeting.
30
31 Does that sound good to the Council.
32
33 (Council nods affirmatively)
34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That sounds
36 agreeable to the Council. And so we're at the
37 conclusion of our agenda and we're only 20 minutes
38 overrun right now and we're not playing bingo.
39
40 (Laughter)
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead there,
43 Polly.
44
45 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. To end on a
46 light note, I notice there's a box in the back of the
47 room and I was looking at it, and it looks like the
48 North Pacific Fisheries Management Council left party
49 favors. They have Chapsticks and pencils. So be sure
50 to pick some up because there's a lifetime supply of

1 Chapstick there.

2

3 (Laughter)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I need a Chapstick
6 right this minute.

7

8 (Laughter)

9

10 DR. WHEELER: We've got lots of party
11 favors back here, so don't go home without them. Thank
12 you.

13

14 (Laughter)

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Appreciate
17 that. Don.

18

19 MR. HONEA: Yeah. Mr. Chair. Action
20 item. I think that today when we -- there was a motion
21 -- I guess it came in the form of a motion. It was
22 kind of confusing. I realized that there was -- one of
23 the members would have liked to attend the meeting in
24 Nome. So I don't know what protocol is in going back
25 to those, but, you know, I mean if we made a motion to
26 do -- to send somebody, I would like the idea if you
27 have an alternate in case Tim cannot make both
28 meetings. So if we have to pull that back up, that
29 would be at the discretion of the person who made the
30 motion.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We've made a
33 selection for the primary. I feel that it's in the --
34 it's a valid point and I would entertain a motion to
35 appoint an alternate to the Nome meeting. Nomination
36 for the alternate and motion.

37

38 MS. YATLIN: This is the second -- I
39 mean the second time we were -- we made a motion,
40 right? I just wanted to get that straight.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, there's -- we
43 have a primary selected. We don't have to revisit the
44 primary. What we.....

45

46 MS. YATLIN: No. What he's talking
47 about is we did one motion and we second it and then
48 there was another, right?

49

50 MR. HONEA: Well, actually I'm kind of

1 confused. I mean did we make a motion to send Tim?
2 Did we did two separate motions?

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We were in
5 discussion on the main motion. The main motion was to
6 send Tim to Nome. Then there was concern we hadn't
7 given the Council enough time. We discussed further
8 should -- does anybody else want to go to Nome and
9 nobody else from the Council commented. The Council
10 was again given another review and Tim was selected by
11 motion and adopted to be primary.

12

13 At this point, we could just make a
14 motion to select a secondary in case Tim can't go and
15 Don has a valid point. And so at this time, we would
16 need a motion -- or a nomination to -- for a secondary
17 to go to Nome.

18

19 MR. HONEA: Okay. Then I would
20 nominate Jenny to be our alternate or secondary.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is that acceptable
23 to Jenny?

24

25 MS. PELKOLA: Yes.

26

27 MR. SIMON: Second.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: A motion to nominate
30 Jenny and it's been seconded by Pollock. Is that
31 acceptable to you or are you clear on the.....

32

33 MS. YATLIN: Say that again.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have a primary.
36 That's, Tim, Tim is going to be our primary. And the
37 motion -- there's been a motion to nominate Jenny as a
38 secondary to go to Nome. Pollock seconded that. And
39 so the motion is clear -- the nomination is clear.

40

41 (Council nods affirmatively)

42

43 MS. YATLIN: (Nods affirmatively)

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And any
46 further discussion.

47

48 MS. YATLIN: Uh-huh.

49

50 MR. MORGAN: Question.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's called.
2 Those in favor of Jenny being the alternate to the Nome
3 North Pacific Fisheries Management Council meeting in
4 June signify by saying aye.

5
6 IN UNISON: Aye.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those oppose, same
9 sign.

10
11 (No opposing votes)

12
13 MS. YATLIN: And should we -- Mr.
14 Chairman, we also didn't make a nomination to send
15 anyone to YRDFA right?

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We didn't.

18
19 MS. YATLIN: Okay. That's all right.
20 I'll.....

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, you were
23 talking about YRDFA. Oh. We made two nominations at
24 that time. We made one nomination to go to Nome and
25 one to go to YRDFA. And Tim was going to be both of
26 those.

27
28 MR. HONEA: Right back again then.....

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so he's going to
31 turn his hat around backwards at both of those
32 meetings, so -- so at the -- now we're at the
33 conclusion. Don.

34
35 MR. HONEA: Okay. Well -- okay. This
36 brings it back -- right back again then. I mean so if
37 Tim can't make it to the YRDFA meeting, I mean -- you
38 know, the thing is I mean, you know, we're -- we should
39 have alternate at every one of these that we designate.
40 So, you know, I would suggest a nominee.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Didn't we -- weren't
43 you going to be our secondary, Jenny?

44
45 MS. PELKOLA: No.

46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I thought you were
48 secondary on that YRDFA meeting. We did so many
49 nomination -- if the Council feels that we should have
50 an alternate to the YRDFA meeting in April, a

1 nomination should be brought forward at this time.
2
3 MR. HONEA: I would nominate Jenny.
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is that agreeable to
6 you Jenny to attend the YRDFA meeting? The preseason
7 planning meeting it's called. And.....
8
9 MR. MORGAN: And I second and I ask for
10 unanimous consent.
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Unanimous consent by
13 the Council.
14
15 (Council nods affirmatively)
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Council affirms
18 Jenny as the secondary. Any further new business.
19 Ray.
20
21 MR. COLLINS: Just a comment in that
22 regard. I think as Chair you probably have the
23 authority if members can't make some meeting to check
24 with others and send someone probably too.
25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah.
27
28 MR. COLLINS: So that we are
29 represented, so.....
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I prefer the Council
32 to take position instead of me.....
33
34 MR. COLLINS: Right. Right.
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:but as Chair,
37 if we have a fail safe, I can work through the Council
38 and get another member to attend. We want
39 representation. You had a comment, Pollock.
40
41 MR. SIMON: You still have closing
42 comments.
43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. I wasn't quite
45 to the end of the -- I was coming to the end of the
46 meeting. Before adjournment, it's traditional -- go
47 ahead, Tim.
48
49 MR. GERVAIS: Back on the new business.
50 Is it possible to put in a motion to become a

1 stakeholder in the Russia Pollock Marine Stewardship
2 Council process, put WIRAC in as a stakeholder?

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We can -- what would
5 be the process for that, Polly. Would we send a letter
6 to the Federal Subsistence Board requesting to be a
7 stakeholder in the Russian Marine Stewardship process?
8 I'm not sure.

9
10 DR. WHEELER: I'm not sure either, but
11 I think that's well advised. If that's what this
12 Council -- Donald has something to say.

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Donald.

15
16 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, the Marine
17 Stewardship Council has a website and I glanced over it
18 real quick, but I think there's a process where we can
19 submit nominations for a Council member to be a
20 stakeholder, but maybe Becca has more information.

21
22 Thank you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Further
25 comment, Becca.

26
27 MS. ROBBINS-GISCLAIR: Yeah. Thank
28 you, Mr. Chair. Basically you are a stakeholder in the
29 NMC process by being someone who's concerned about the
30 bycatch issue. What you could do to be further
31 involved is to comment on -- at the various stages of
32 the NMC process and that's basically how you engage is
33 they come out with a draft report and you submit
34 comments on it and there's a number of.....

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim is referring to
37 the Russian certification of the pollock fishery and
38 the Russian side. Are we still a stakeholder under
39 that?

40
41 MS. ROBBINS-GISCLAIR: I mean I think
42 -- possibly, yeah. Since we don't know what their
43 salmon bycatch is or what stock they're catching, then
44 that could probably be a reason to be a stakeholder and
45 it.....

46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: By default?

48
49 MS. ROBBINS-GISCLAIR: Yeah, but
50 basically it's a process where you had to engage in it

1 from the beginning of when they start issuing draft
2 reports. and then you can continue to engage although
3 it may not be the best.....

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would be more
6 comfortable with the Western Interior Regional Council
7 sending a letter to the Federal Subsistence Board
8 requesting formal request to the marine stewardship to
9 be a stakeholder so that the Federal Subsistence Board
10 -- because we have to have a communication vector
11 through the Federal Subsistence Board and OSM as that
12 would be a proper -- or is that unnecessary. Can we
13 talk -- send a letter of request to be a stakeholder
14 directly to the marine -- they're not going to know we
15 want to be stakeholder unless we tell them we want to
16 be a stakeholder.

17
18 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair, I don't know
19 enough about the process to comment at this time, but
20 what I would say if this, that if the Council -- if
21 that's the direction that they want to take, we'll take
22 it under advisement and we'll find out more and get
23 back to you on that. Because I can't speak
24 intelligently to something that I don't know anything
25 about.

26
27 (Laughter)

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. But we want
30 the Federal Subsistence Board to be aware that we want
31 to be a stakeholder at the marine stewardship's
32 deliberations of the Western Bering Sea Russian Pollock
33 Fishery certification. That would be the gist of the
34 request.

35
36 Tim.

37
38 MR. GERVAIS: That's correct.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Those in --
41 motion to send that letter to the Federal Subsistence
42 Board requesting to be a stakeholder in the
43 certification process of the Russian pollock fishery.

44
45 Do we have a motion to that effect.

46
47 MS. PELKOLA: I'm make a motion.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion by Jenny.

50

1 MR. GERVAIS: I'll second it.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Second by Tim.
4 Those in favor of the motion -- any further comment.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, those
9 in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.
10
11 IN UNISON: Aye.
12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
14 sign.
15
16 (No opposing votes)
17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further business
19 of the Council?
20
21 (No comments)
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: New business?
24
25 (No comments)
26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Closing comments.
28 We usually go around the table and have a quick -- and
29 we should be abbreviated. Eleanor, would you like to
30 have a closing comment? Oh, I got you with your mouth
31 full. Sorry.
32
33 MS. YATLIN: Well, first of all, I'd
34 like to say thanks to Galena for their -- putting on
35 this meeting and then the other thing is we have so
36 much on our agenda, we didn't quite go through
37 everything that we wanted to and say what we wanted to
38 and we said too much at the beginning and we -- some
39 things got redundant and we got to start saying now,
40 you're keep to -- stick to the agenda and do a timeline
41 where we could focus on a lot of these issues that we
42 wanted to discuss. We discussed them at the beginning,
43 but we never go back to it next day where we're -- we
44 just got on a time crunch and it's got to be more
45 manageable than what we did the past two days.
46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate your
48 concern. That's my fault. I'll take responsible for
49 that. I try to give the public and commenters as much
50 time as I possibly can, but, they did become redundant,

1 but I feel uncomfortable about cutting tribal chiefs
2 off and -- on various issues and so I will take
3 responsibility for the meeting becoming compressed.
4 There was some significant amount of compassion in the
5 Yukon River fisheries that more or less extended the
6 meeting.

7
8 And so I appreciate your comments,
9 Eleanor.

10
11 Go ahead, Carl.

12
13 MR. MORGAN: Just like to say thank you
14 to the community of Galena and also I was glad that
15 North Pacific Fisheries Management Council came and
16 gave a real good overview and it kind of opened my eyes
17 in that they are concerned and they are -- you know,
18 all this time, I was thinking they were just completely
19 ignoring the river system, but that we still keep
20 pushing them forward to decrease the cap.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate those
23 comments.

24
25 Pollock.

26
27 MR. SIMON: I want to thank the peoples
28 of Galena for the great hospitality and I also want to
29 stress that we need more leadership coming to our
30 meetings from the villages like Second Chief of Huslia
31 and he gave us some good comments and also Second Chief
32 of Galena, he gave us good comments. So the -- those
33 are -- should be in the plan for next meeting if the
34 residents can afford to send their leaders or something
35 that would be fine.

36
37 I also want to comment on the covering
38 of our agenda. You know, most agendas you see the time
39 that first Chairman made a roll call, it's 8:30, and
40 then the approval of the agenda, maybe 10, 15 minutes
41 later, each item of business has a time limit that you
42 can comment on so that we will know if we're falling
43 behind or we're ahead.

44
45 That's good.

46
47 That's a lot of discussion, you know,
48 and it always happens. It's nobody's fault. We just
49 get carried away discussing.

50

1 But I enjoyed the visit down here. I
2 have a granddaughter that live down here. My youngest
3 son's daughter and I visit with her. Good
4 accommodations. We had good rooms and we had good
5 rest. I've been on this Board the first three years
6 that it was formed and now I'm glad that I'm back again
7 and thank everyone for doing your part and good Board
8 members.

9
10 Thank you.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock.

13
14 Don.

15
16 MR. HONEA: Yeah. I'd like to thank
17 Galena for hosting this and, you know, I really like
18 the public comment section of it and I thank you. I
19 thank Darrell for coming up from Huslia and for Fred
20 for testifying and -- you know, because that means a
21 lot. I mean if they have certain issues that we don't
22 know about and, you know, that when -- that we can
23 reinforce it.

24
25 And I also like to thank the -- you
26 know, we might have a -- we might say, you know, that
27 we'd like to hold it in smaller villages and stuff like
28 -- but sometimes we -- you know, so I'd like to that
29 Koyukuk/Nowitna Staff because of the vehicles, because
30 of the housing that we had and everything turned out
31 great and, you know, we have a place up there that's
32 even though we're all spread out, we have more
33 resources. We have a good place to meet here and, you
34 know.

35
36 I just want to remind people too that
37 the North Pacific Management Council is going to be --
38 I mean if you're going to be at the TCC convention in a
39 couple weeks, you know, we have something to look at.
40 We have -- if we have any questions, that's a good time
41 to bring that up.

42
43 I'll just -- see you guys in Aniak.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. My comments
46 are I appreciate the community of Galena hosting our
47 meeting here. We come back every couple years and I
48 appreciate people coming to the meeting. I would like
49 to see more outreach to the associated communities,
50 better coverage on the radio and various ways of

1 getting more people to comment and so I'm always
2 encouraged by Galena's participation in our meetings.

3
4 I appreciate our Staff support to our
5 Council year-round from OSM and I really appreciate
6 that. And the huge involvement that the Councils with
7 Office of Subsistence Management and the coordinator's
8 support to the Councils is very, very important. And I
9 appreciate the Council members themselves. I know it's
10 a burden to sit through some of these -- all these
11 facts and figures and things and I really appreciate
12 your spending the time to review all of these and look
13 to bettering the resources and the subsistence uses in
14 this region.

15
16 And so with that, I -- we had a great
17 meeting. It was a little bit long, but good.

18
19 Thanks. Ray, go ahead.

20
21 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I want to extend
22 my thanks to Galena too for hosting and I think a
23 special thanks to Jenny for all the snacks she provided
24 and she provided us with supper over at the lodging we
25 were staying in and meat and I really appreciate that,
26 Jenny. Thank you very much.

27
28 And I'd like to see when we go to
29 Aniak, if possible, that as many Board members as
30 possible could stay at the same location because we
31 have got to know one another better through that and we
32 usually cook a meal like in Galena where we had the
33 lodge or something. So I hope they can keep that in
34 mind when they try to find housing over there again to
35 keep the members together because sometimes the only
36 time we see one another is at these meetings, so it
37 allows us to exchange information.

38
39 Thank you.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ray. Good
42 point. Go ahead, Tim.

43
44 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
45 I'd like to thank the community of Galena for hosting
46 us. I was appreciative of the public and tribal
47 comments. Really helpful as I don't get to most of the
48 region on my own travels, so it helps me to learn
49 what's the pertinent issues and the local perspective
50 on certain issues. I'd also like to thank the agencies

1 for their participation and assistance with getting us
2 the information and helping us work through the
3 process.

4
5 I'd like to thank my fellow Council
6 members for doing a good job and I wish everybody safe
7 travel home.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Tim.
10 Appreciate that.

11
12 Go ahead, Jenny.

13
14 MS. PELKOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
15 just want to -- well, I heard about, what, 10 billion
16 words today and I know when I go home I'm going to try
17 to process all these different things I heard. But I
18 just want to thank my Council members for coming here.
19 I know this is a hard thing to sit on. We hear
20 different things and we have to try to work through
21 this and it's a tough job, but it's -- you know, we all
22 work together and I don't think -- you don't see any
23 arguments or disagreements up here. We all -- we're
24 working for our people, so we all have to work together
25 otherwise nothing will get done.

26
27 I'd just like to apologize for not
28 getting more people from Galena involved, otherwise
29 they probably would have had a nice potluck for you
30 guys. It was on the radio, but there's so many things
31 going on right now in Galena and this wasn't a very
32 good time for a meeting here I thought right now
33 because we have our basketball tournament at regionals
34 and a lot of people, you know, go for that. I mean
35 Galena just follows their basketball teams around and I
36 had a chance to go, but I chose to stay for this
37 meeting.

38
39 So anyway I just thank you for all
40 coming I guess and I see you in Aniak.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks,
43 Jenny. Did you want to have a final comment, Robert.

44
45 MR. WALKER: Thank you and I'll see you
46 in Aniak.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Robert's --
49 Donald, you got final comment.

50

1 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd
2 like to thank Jenny and the community of Galena for
3 hosting the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council
4 meeting.

5
6 To bring up concerns of Ms. Eleanor
7 Yatlin and Mr. Simon Pollock about the agenda items,
8 but I just want to offer a suggestion to the Council
9 and see what they think. At our next meeting in Aniak
10 if you want to do a work session prior to the start of
11 the meeting, like the evening before the meeting
12 starts, you know, just have a work session just to go
13 over the agenda items and just sort of build a road map
14 of where you want to go and where you want to be at.

15
16 Just as a suggestion, Mr. Chair.

17
18 Thank you.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have that -- the
21 day before the meeting, we have our working group and
22 so maybe at the -- right after that meeting we could go
23 over the agenda real quick, spend a little time on it,
24 if you'd like. That'd be something we could look the
25 agenda over and it'd expedite the main meeting.
26 Appreciate that comment.

27
28 Go ahead, Polly.

29
30 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair, just a point
31 for that too for thinking in terms of the agenda is,
32 you know, we always get these special requests, we get
33 add-ons, we get, you know, these people that
34 desperately want to speak to the Council and we always
35 appreciate. We try to do the agendas about a month in
36 -- you know, at least a month in advance and I guess it
37 would be helpful if we have -- you know, if members or
38 the Chair gets a request to speak at the meeting if
39 they could forward that request to OSM, then we can
40 figure out a way to put it in on the agenda because I
41 sort of feel bad. I mean Mr. Sandone, just as an
42 example and I'm not picking on him by any stretch, but
43 it was an hour or so yesterday on the agenda that
44 wasn't actually an agenda item and then people that
45 were agenda items got short shrift.

46
47 So maybe if there are requests that
48 come in, forward them to OSM. We can figure out the
49 agenda and then -- and, you know, special
50 accommodations always need to be made, but, you know,

1 we'll try to work with you, but I think it's good if
2 people get the message that they need to kind of go
3 through OSM so that they actually get on the agenda so
4 that we can help facilitate things that would be
5 helpful too. Just as a thought.

6

7

Mr. Chair.

8

9

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Polly.
10 Yeah, I think it probably has to be more clarified to
11 the public that agenda items need to be submitted much
12 earlier in the process and that the Western Interior
13 Council is going to meet at these certain dates and if
14 they want to have agenda items inserted into the
15 agenda, they got to work a little -- we got a whole
16 bunch of stuff coming up right at the last minute right
17 before the meeting and makes it kind of hard for me
18 because, you know, some of those -- it is a public
19 process and -- but then you got to try and jam it all
20 in there and it kind of muddles it up.

21

22

Any further discussions or comments.

23

24

(No comments)

25

26

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I do appreciate
27 Alaska Department of Fish and Game's presence here. I
28 felt Glenn did an excellent job presenting things for
29 the Department and so I'm -- was very -- oh, you got --
30 no.

31

32

We got one guy over here. Come on up,
33 Darrell.

34

35

MR. VENT: There was some comments I
36 wanted to make, but we ran out of time, so I'd like for
37 future consideration, you know, you have public
38 opinions there at the beginning. Maybe you could make
39 some time at maybe the next day or something to maybe
40 put a little bit of time in for more public comments.

41

42

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The floor is always
43 open to the public during each agenda item and so
44 there's no preclusion of your commenting throughout the
45 whole meeting. You're -- I mean if you've got something
46 to say, just get my attention, give me a green card,
47 come up to me at a break or whatever it takes. There
48 is no preclusion. The public is not -- it's not the
49 Board of Game. You're not stuck in three to five
50 minutes at the beginning of the meeting and that's it.

1 You can come at any time and I want the public to be
2 aware that that is -- this floor -- this mic is always
3 open to the public.

4
5 MR. VENT: Yeah, because I wanted to
6 make some comments, but we're running short of time, so
7 it's just -- you know, didn't want to get everything
8 slowed down, so I didn't want to get up here and drag
9 it on.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any further
12 public comment. Ken. You had a final comment.

13
14 MR. CHASE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If I
15 remember correctly -- maybe I misunderstood, but I
16 thought in our McGrath meeting we had discussed trying
17 to hold some sort of a meeting or hearing in Holy
18 Cross, you know, prior to this meeting that's going to
19 happen in Aniak and dealing with the 21E customary use.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to have
22 a work session with the affected communities and the
23 customary and traditional use determinations are for
24 communities in 19A. We're going to have the four GASH
25 communities. We're going to have the advisory
26 committees and we're going to have a representative
27 from the YK-Delta RAC attend that meeting. I don't
28 recall -- personally recall having a meeting in Huslia
29 -- correction -- Holy Cross. Does any Council members
30 recall that? I don't recall that.

31
32 And so we did -- I did at the Federal
33 Board talk about having a neutral location, but that
34 didn't come together. I was intending that to happen
35 in McGrath, but I get out in front of myself. So the
36 meeting is slated for Aniak. It is a hub community.
37 We typically don't have a lot of public participation
38 there. I do feel that it's more of a neutral location
39 for the 19A people. So I don't personally feel that
40 it's a bad place to have the working group the day
41 before the RAC meeting.

42
43 MR. CHASE: That's okay. I just wanted
44 to make sure when I go back to my committee and I
45 appreciate this -- being here for this Board and I try
46 to make all these meetings so I can bring information
47 back to the GASH advisory committee, you know, and
48 what's going on so they can make decisions too on the
49 stuff that you guys work on and I appreciate that.
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, OSM is going
2 to facilitate bringing these communities together and
3 the Advisory Committees and so again they will send out
4 the request to participate, select a nominee to attend
5 the meeting, what the meeting is about, the customary
6 and traditional use determination and what the RAC has
7 done so far and what the Federal Subsistence Board
8 wants the working group to come together on.

9
10 And so the communities are not going to
11 be left out of this process. It my intention that the
12 communities' participation is fully recognized.

13
14 MR. HONEA: Okay. Thank you.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don.

17
18 MR. HONEA: Well, just -- thank you,
19 Mr. Chair. Just in response to that, I think that the
20 -- that, you know, maybe we can consider Holy Cross. I
21 know it's a big fishing village and GASH is -- it's
22 right -- located right there, so, you know, maybe we
23 can just at least consider it for future meetings.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And for future
26 meetings, we will consider Holy Cross as -- if it
27 becomes what I consider hot, if it becomes a hotspot
28 area, we will possibly petition the Office of
29 Subsistence Management to have a meeting in Holy Cross
30 if there's hot issues there for comment.

31
32 MR. CHASE: Okay. Thank you. If not,
33 you know, not the whole Board, just maybe a couple
34 representatives of -- you know, not going to come,
35 subcommittee, you know, that could talk to people if
36 they have questions and then kind of make clear to them
37 so that it's coming from this Board, you know.....

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, this RAC has
40 two members, one in Holy Cross and one in Anvik and so
41 I -- these Council members are -- they're -- part of
42 our job is to speak to our communities and so if the
43 RAC members want to go to a tribal council meeting or
44 the Advisory Committee meetings and discuss these --
45 this customary and traditional use determination, I
46 would encourage those RAC members to do that.

47
48 I would encourage the tribal councils
49 to nominate a representative for the working group.
50 And so that's -- we're under funding restraints at this

1 time, and so I can't promise going to -- a subcommittee
2 of a subcommittee going to Holy Cross. I can't promise
3 that. So -- does that answer your main concerns?

4

5 MR. CHASE: Yes.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

8

9 MR. CHASE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank
10 you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ken.

13 Appreciate that. Okay. Carl.

14

15 MR. MORGAN: Make a motion to adjourn.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion to adjourn.

18 We have a.....

19

20 MS. PELKOLA: Second. Third.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Third. Those in
23 favor of adjournment signify by saying aye.

24

25 IN UNISON: Aye.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Western Interior
28 Council is adjourned until our next meeting in Aniak.

29

30 (Off record)

31

32 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 147 through 348 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II, taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC on the 2nd day of March 2011, beginning at the hour of 8:40 o'clock a.m. in Galena, Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 18th day of March 2011.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 9/16/14