

1 WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME I

7
8 Aniak, Alaska
9 October 4, 2011
10 9:00 a.m.

11
12
13 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

14
15 Jack Reakoff, Chairman
16 Ray Collins
17 Timothy Gervais (Telephonic)
18 Carl Morgan
19 Jenny Pelkola
20 Pollock Simon
21 James Walker
22 Robert Walker
23 Eleanor Yatlin

24
25
26
27 Regional Council Coordinator, Melinda Hernandez
28

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Recorded and transcribed by:

45
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
47 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
48 Anchorage, AK 99501
49 907-243-0668/sahile@gci.net

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Aniak, Alaska - 10/4/2011)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm Jack Reakoff,
Chair of the Western Interior Advisory Council bringing
the Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional
Advisory Council meeting to order. We'll have a roll
call and there's a roster on Page 5.

Do you want to call the roll, Jenny.

MS. PELKOLA: Robert Walker.

MR. R. WALKER: Yes.

MS. PELKOLA: Don Honea.

(No response)

MS. PELKOLA: Pollock Simon.

(No response)

MS. PELKOLA: Timothy Gervais.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim is online here,
on the teleconference.

MS. PELKOLA: Raymond Collins.

MR. COLLINS: Here.

MS. PELKOLA: Jack Reakoff.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Here.

MS. PELKOLA: James Walker.

MR. J. WALKER: Here.

MS. PELKOLA: Jenny Pelkola, here.
Carl Morgan.

MR. MORGAN: Here.

MS. PELKOLA: Eleanor Yatlin.

1 (No response)

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So Eleanor and
4 Pollock are supposed to be flying in. Weather
5 precluded Tim and Don from attending from Ruby. So
6 welcome and introductions. Welcome to all those in
7 attendance.

8

9 I wanted to make it clear that last
10 night we had a workshop with the proposal for customary
11 and traditional use in Unit 21E, the lower portion, and
12 if anybody throughout the meeting from the public
13 attends we want to get as much public input on that
14 proposal as we can. We're also encouraging letters to
15 be written for the Federal Subsistence Board analysis
16 of that proposal. The proposal is WP10-69.

17

18 We typically have an invocation. Would
19 you care to do that, Ray, or is there an elder here.
20 Ray will do the invocation.

21

22 (Invocation)

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're at review and
25 adoption of the agenda. Has the Council reviewed the
26 agenda that's in the book on Page 1.

27

28 MS. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Melinda.

31

32 MS. HERNANDEZ: For the record, this is
33 Melinda Hernandez. I'll be coordinating this meeting
34 for this fall. I do have a couple things that I was
35 asked to add in. Under Item Number 15, if you'll add
36 under Tanana Chiefs, number 3, Kuskokwim Native
37 Association. They will be having a report from their
38 partners fisheries biologist.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That will be 15A?

41

42 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes, under 15A we'll
43 add number 3 for Kuskokwim Native Association.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

46

47 MS. HERNANDEZ: And then if you'll go
48 down to Item E, David Runfola will be doing an update
49 for the Division of Subsistence as well.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any Council
2 insertions into the agenda.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would like to
7 insert under other business towards the end of the
8 meeting, Melinda is working temporarily for us. We've
9 had a Western Interior Council coordinator change. I'm
10 very satisfied with Melinda Hernandez's work and I
11 would like the Council to send a letter to the Office
12 of Subsistence Management, Pete Probasco, on her
13 continuance and so I would like to insert that under
14 other business 16. Is that okay with Council? That
15 would just be promulgating a letter. I see an
16 affirmative from the Council.
17
18 Any further insertions from the Council
19 to the agenda.
20
21 (No comments)
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are you hearing us
24 okay, Tim?
25
26 MR. GERVAIS: Yes.
27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have any
29 insertions?
30
31 MR. GERVAIS: No.
32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So seeing no
34 additional -- Ray.
35
36 MR. COLLINS: I was just going to move
37 approval of the agenda as amended.
38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do I have a second.
40
41 MS. PELKOLA: Second.
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny.
44 Those in favor of the agenda as amended signify by
45 saying aye.
46
47 IN UNISON: Aye.
48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed.
50

1 (No opposing votes)
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Agenda is approved.
4 Review and adoption of the minutes from the March 1
5 through 2 meeting in Galena on Page 6.
6
7 I want the Council to be aware I
8 received a letter from Virgil Umphenour on April 2nd.
9 He had read the transcripts and he took exception to
10 Eleanor Yatlin's statement on the record that his
11 guiding operation had left some barrels and stoves and
12 so forth in Three Day Slough. He said that was not
13 him, he didn't even hunt down there and he wanted the
14 record to reflect a correction to that speculation, so
15 I'll recognize this letter of April 2nd, Virgil
16 Umphenour, Hunt Alaska, to be included in the record as
17 an invalid assumption. Is that okay with Council?
18 This letter was received by OSM and myself.
19
20 (Council nods affirmatively)
21
22 MS. HERNANDEZ: It's in your red
23 folder.
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You have a red
26 folder before you. Going back to the main minutes.
27
28 MR. GERVAIS: Jack, can I interrupt.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim. Any
31 time.
32
33 MR. GERVAIS: Did Eleanor have any
34 response to what Virgil is saying in his letter?
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Eleanor didn't make
37 the plane yesterday and she's still traveling at this
38 time. I also talked to the Koyukuk-Nowitna Refuge
39 manager. He said that was not Virgil's camp either.
40 That was just speculation on her part.
41
42 Any further comment, Tim?
43
44 MR. GERVAIS: No.
45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any
47 corrections to the minutes from Council members?
48
49 (Pause)
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have not found any
2 corrections myself. Have you reviewed the minutes,
3 Tim?

4
5 MR. GERVAIS: Yes, they're fine.

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Welcome, Don.

8
9 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Jack.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're on the
12 adoption of the minutes. Eleanor Yatlin and Pollock
13 Simon are still traveling. They missed flights for
14 mechanical and various reasons. We're sorry we didn't
15 have you and Tim due to weather also. We're viewing
16 the minutes. Have you found any issues with the
17 minutes that you would like to have corrected?

18
19 MR. HONEA: Jack, I don't have anything
20 in front of me. We haven't gotten our agenda through
21 the mail or anything. Actually I was just going to
22 give a little short report on the meeting I attended.
23 If you want me to call back. I'm going to go to
24 Fairbanks this afternoon on my own here. I've got to
25 take care of personal things. My vehicle is up there.
26 So I just wanted to kind of give a brief little report.
27 If you guys are still on the minutes, maybe I could
28 call back in.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll we're going to
31 be on Council member reports probably within a few
32 minutes here, probably within 15 or 20 minutes. Can
33 you stay online for that?

34
35 MR. HONEA: I'll do that.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'll put you on
38 first for your Council member reports and then you can
39 do whatever.

40
41 MR. HONEA: Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments
44 from the Council on the minutes.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Chair will
49 entertain a motion to adopt the minutes.

50

1 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Jenny.
4
5 MR. J. WALKER: Second.
6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by James.
8 Those in favor of the minutes as stated signify by
9 stating aye.
10
11 IN UNISON: Aye.
12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
14 sign.
15
16 (No opposing votes)
17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did people vote on
19 that?
20
21 (Council nods affirmatively)
22
23 (Laughter)
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We need some high
26 octane coffee this morning.
27
28 (Laughter)
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moving down the
31 agenda. The Chair's report. We have the response from
32 the Federal Subsistence Board to our annual report.
33 Item one was outside moose hunters in the Koyukuk River
34 leaving refuse. That was addressed by the Virgil
35 Umphenour letter that was in our red packet. There's
36 various responses to our annual report.
37
38 Our concerns about the chinook salmon.
39 The response is fairly new, as of September 20th. The
40 chinook escapement into Canada was met but barely. Has
41 the Council read the annual report responses?
42
43 I was not fully satisfied with Issue
44 11. The Western Interior Council, under Issue 11 was
45 -- the .804 currently for Unit 19A is using a drawing
46 permit for the Federal hunt under .804. This response
47 did not address promulgation. The request was for
48 promulgation of a Tier II type administration of .804,
49 using .804 of ANILCA as the criteria. The direct
50 dependence on the resource, long standing use of the

1 resource and proximity to the resource. That was the
2 request and the response by the Federal Subsistence
3 Board has not addressed developing those criteria and I
4 wanted to have that on the record.

5
6 The response is saying that they're
7 going to use .804, but I'd like it to be resubmitted as
8 one of our annual report topics. That we would like
9 the Federal Subsistence Board to promulgate an .804
10 using ANILCA .804 criteria to develop a process as
11 another tool that the Board has to prioritize
12 subsistence users if there's a problem with the
13 resource.

14
15 Is there any other discussion on the
16 annual report responses from the Council.

17
18 (No comments)

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, we'll
21 move on. I'll give my Chair report.

22
23 After our meeting in Galena I wrote a
24 letter to the Bureau of Land Management about guided
25 hunters in the Dalton Highway Corridor for dall sheep.
26 I've written another letter this summer also in regards
27 to that and that will be in our packet. Where would
28 that be again, Melinda?

29
30 MS. HERNANDEZ: It's right here. I
31 wasn't sure when you wanted it.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I don't want
34 those passed out, but I have those letters when we --
35 this is an agenda item, this guided hunter issue in the
36 Dalton Highway Corridor and I've written two letters
37 and the Council will be able to review those letters
38 and the issue that's developing fairly rapidly.

39
40 I attended the Federal Subsistence
41 Board meeting in Anchorage in May. I felt that there
42 were various issues that the Board was going to review.
43 I was on teleconference for their April meeting, but I
44 did attend the Federal Subsistence Board meeting in
45 May. There was lots of testimony on tribal
46 consultation. The Federal Subsistence Board also was
47 setting chum salmon bycatch or reviewing chum salmon
48 bycatch in the Bering Sea and also chinook salmon
49 bycatch in the Gulf of Alaska.
50 I made comments and encouraged the Board.....

1 Don Honea left.

2

3 So I encouraged the Federal Subsistence
4 Board to go to the minimum and most conservative
5 bycatch numbers and they did adopt a position with the
6 North Pacific Fisheries Management Council for the
7 conservation of chum and chinook in bycatch.

8

9 I wanted the Council to be aware that
10 after our meeting -- I have to work with the Council
11 coordinator and Donald Mike was very lax. I want the
12 Council to be aware he was very lax on timely business
13 that the Councils needed to have done. I wrote a
14 letter to OSM, encouraging -- Donald Mike expressed
15 concern that he did not agree with some of our
16 positions on Yukon River fisheries, he had a cultural
17 barrier with the Western Interior Council, he did not
18 seem to want to work for this Council, and as the
19 Council Chair I felt that it was this Council and the
20 Department of Interior review -- the coordinators for
21 the Regional Advisory Councils is a very important
22 aspect of the Council's working arm.

23

24 I wrote a letter to the Office of
25 Subsistence Management encouraging them to either
26 transfer Donald Mike to an area that he felt more
27 comfortable with or encourage him to at least do the
28 business of the Western Interior Regional Advisory
29 Council.

30

31 Donald Mike is now coordinating
32 Northwest Arctic and the North Slope Regional Councils.
33 I wish him well. I hope he is happy up there. Melinda
34 Hernandez has been provided as our acting coordinator
35 and I'm very -- she hit the ground running for this
36 Council and is providing this Council with the kind of
37 support that we need. So we need to maintain a good
38 Council coordinator.

39

40 So those would be the things as Chair
41 I've been working on in between our two meetings here.
42 Any questions from the Council on any of those issues.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. We
47 have annual report topics. Are there any annual report
48 topics at this time that the Council would like to see
49 on our next annual report topics.

50

1 I feel this BLM Dalton Highway.....

2

3 MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

6

7 MR. GERVAIS: I would like to see the
8 continuation of the -- okay, I'm not seeing the exact
9 issue, but an item I would like to see more information
10 on for 2011 is see declining size or historic time on
11 the salmon size for the Yukon. I just found an article
12 last week where the University of Washington did a
13 study on Bristol Bay salmon for over seven years worth
14 of study and they're suggesting that continual
15 harvesting is leading to shorter fish over time.

16

17 My issue is we hear from all our elders
18 and pre-elders how the fish have declined quite a bit
19 for the last 40 years or the last 20 years. As of this
20 time, I know what I've seen of the State of Alaska's
21 position is that reducing gillnet mesh size in the
22 Yukon is going to fix the problem on the size on the
23 size distribution. My own personal perspective, I
24 believe that a windowed fishing schedule where it's
25 letting a small portion of fish go out through time
26 such as we practiced this summer would be more
27 beneficial to the stocks.

28

29 I'd like to see an annual topic
30 addressing whether the mesh size restriction is going
31 to be enough of a measure to help the stocks out of
32 salmon.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We'll put
35 that down as a topic for our annual report requesting
36 the importance of the mesh size reduction coupled with
37 reduced impact to unfished components of passage in the
38 Yukon River and maintaining the windowed structure to
39 allow unfished portions to get through to spawning
40 destination. That would be a synopsis of what you just
41 said?

42

43 MR. GERVAIS: Yes.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any other
46 annual report topics at this time from the Council.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. We'll

1 move on in the agenda. If throughout the meeting at
2 some point if Council members feel that there are
3 annual report topics that occur and should be
4 incorporated, we can insert those at any time during
5 this meeting.

6

7 I had someone return on line here. Who
8 recently joined the Western Interior teleconference
9 about five minutes ago while Tim was talking? That
10 person may or may not still be there. Are you still
11 online, Don Honea?

12

13 MR. RIVARD: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is
14 Don Rivard. I'm still online and I heard that it was
15 Chris McKee that joined. He's a wildlife biologist in
16 our office.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Chris McKee
19 is online. Is Don Honea still online.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I heard his name
24 depart. He was supposed to hold for 15 minutes, so
25 Don's offline. I'll start with Ray Collins here on my
26 left. Did you have any Council member reports.

27

28 MR. COLLINS: Just that the subsistence
29 hunting in the McGrath area, most of it is State land
30 around there, but I wanted to report that the hunt did
31 go well this fall. It was a good harvest of moose and
32 that's the benefit of the State program for subsistence
33 management in the area. They have built up the herd.
34 We've got a good number of breeding cows now that are
35 producing young animals and a lot of the harvest was
36 those young animals. But I don't have any other issues
37 that aren't on the agenda.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ray.

42 Robert.

43

44 MR. R. WALKER: We had a very good year
45 for fishing even though we had a 7.5-inch mesh net. We
46 did get more fish than we did with our 8.5. A lot of
47 people didn't catch a lot of fish, but we had our
48 setnet. I think we did about average this year. We
49 only fished two days and we got what we needed in two
50 days. That's my report.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One question for
2 you, Robert. Were the fish large or were you just
3 catching smaller fish or did you catch any of your
4 customary larger fish with 7.5-inch gear?

5
6 MR. R. WALKER: We averaged from like a
7 five pound all the way up to like a 40 pound, so it
8 varied between the 210 fish we got.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. This is the
11 first year of the 7.5-inch net and I'm real interested
12 to see what the catch sizes were and demographics of
13 the fish.

14
15 Thank you.

16
17 Jenny.

18
19 MS. PELKOLA: In May, I went to the
20 customary trade meeting in Anchorage. At that meeting
21 it was still up in the air about the amount that could
22 be sold. At that meeting we came to the amount of 750
23 because there were some people wanted 500, some wanted
24 1,500 and so we just sort of went in the middle and
25 said 750. I did not attend the August meeting on that
26 customary trade due to a death in my family.

27
28 But I got to go on a Canada trip with
29 Jason Hale and we spent nine days in Canada and it was
30 a very interesting trip. We let fish go. We met our
31 goal to let all this fish go, but yet in Canada they
32 refused to fish even though they had it. They had all
33 the fish there. They wanted the fish to reach the
34 spawning grounds and it really shocked me that some of
35 us sort of sacrificed our fishing and then they let all
36 the fish go.

37
38 I just got a complaint from some
39 residents of Koyukuk, the river. The people that do
40 hunt up there, there were some airboats up there and
41 they thought that was outlawed a couple years back and
42 they were disappointed in having those boats up there.
43 And there was still wanton waste up there. A lot of
44 people got their moose, but yet some people didn't. I
45 know in Galena people were sharing their meat.

46
47 I just want to know if that airboats is
48 legal. I don't know. You'll probably hear from other
49 people later on on that.

50

1 In our area I did not really -- we
2 didn't get our moose this year because we didn't really
3 hunt. I had to take care of a sister who was sick, so
4 I had to cut my moose hunting short.

5
6 Back to the fishing, we didn't do very
7 well in our fishing area because of -- we had to quit
8 fishing about a week and a half before the season was
9 over due to just all kinds of different things going
10 on. Sickness in our family and nets breaking and this
11 happening, so we just quit fishing, but I did get
12 enough for my family, which I'm glad.

13
14 I guess that's my report.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My question for you,
17 Jenny, how did the 7.5-inch mesh work for chinook for
18 you this year?

19
20 MS. PELKOLA: It was pretty good, but
21 we did get -- just like Robert we got from five up to
22 40, 45 pounds fish. It seems like we got more, but
23 like I say we had to quit early. And then we lost the
24 fishing spot, so that put a hindrance on our fishing
25 too. But that worked, I guess.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you. I
28 want to ask our teleconference people, how are you
29 hearing our discussions? Are you hearing us okay?

30
31 MR. RIVARD: Yeah, it sounds fine. Mr.
32 Chair, this is Don Rivard. I have a suggestion for
33 you. I'm not hearing people like well other than
34 yourself. Is the microphone itself near one of the --
35 or the speakerphone, is it near one of the microphones
36 other than yours?

37
38 REPORTER: We're doing the best we can.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don, we can turn on
41 one of these mikes. Would that be all right, Salena?
42 We can leave one of the mikes on so that the
43 speakerphone will be next to an on mike. Okay, that's
44 what I wanted to know.

45
46 Thank you.

47
48 MR. RIVARD: You don't need the mike
49 on, but there's a speaker next to the microphone. If
50 the phone is next to one of the speakers, it helps.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we moved the
2 speakerphone towards -- James Walker is going to talk
3 next, so hopefully this will work a little better.
4 Okay, go ahead, James.

5
6 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7 I just have a few comments in general. Nothing
8 specific. The fishing season that I observed in Holy
9 Cross is different compared to setnetting, which is
10 what Robert does. So the average size of fish the
11 fishermen were catching in the driftnets were smaller
12 kings than the setnetters. The overall was that they
13 had adequate fishing time. Not to say that the weather
14 cooperated in July, so they had problems there.
15 Overall fishing was good.

16
17 As far as through the hunting season,
18 it appears that most of the locals were able to harvest
19 their moose without any problem, without any impact
20 like previous years from Lower Yukon. I think a lot of
21 that has to do with the price of gas restricting them
22 from coming upriver.

23
24 Other than that I don't have much else
25 to report on anything yet.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thank you. So
28 you would say generally 7.5 inch caught smaller fish
29 than you normally would take with larger mesh gear?

30
31 MR. J. WALKER: I think with the 7.5
32 size mesh they were able to catch just about any size
33 king that you wanted as long as you were careful
34 pulling it in. I think with the 7.5 itself you're able
35 to catch more fish than with 8.5.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Statistically,
38 that's what was supposed to happen. You would catch
39 more fish -- you would catch what's present and you
40 wouldn't be targeting the larger fish. So you'd catch
41 just sort of what's averaged out, what's actually
42 there. That's why I'm asking these questions, is what
43 that's -- that was a model and is that actually
44 occurring and so that seems to be what is actually
45 happening, so thank you.

46
47 Go ahead, Carl.

48
49 MR. MORGAN: My report is going to be
50 kind of brief, but I hope it has some impact. As far

1 as the moose season, residents around here caught a
2 little bit more than last year and we don't know --
3 maybe the Tier II system is working or maybe different
4 regions -- the moose migration has changed or we might
5 be getting other moose from different regions. People
6 around here do hunt very aggressively because their
7 hunt is only limited to 20 days and once that amount is
8 caught moose season is over. So people aggressively
9 try to catch moose. They're not wasting any time.
10 Leaving right after work. Leaving and staying until
11 the morning and come back to work in the morning from
12 hunting. So they aggressively went out. But more
13 moose was caught this year, like I said.

14
15 We're still concerned about the
16 Mulchatna Herd. We haven't seen it in this part of the
17 country in a while. If we do see, we see three, four,
18 five, you know, but not that many. Not like it used
19 to. That's part of the hunting.

20
21 About the fishing this year, for some
22 reason the fish was late. The first pulses that came
23 in were small. They were small. Later on, towards
24 about July, then they started getting big and people
25 generally got their fish.

26
27 The other concern is about the Aniak
28 River. It's a major tributary for all salmon species,
29 plus it's the major -- the last northernmost river that
30 rainbow do go up that are native to the river. That's
31 the last northernmost point. People are concerned
32 about that and they're very concerned about the amount
33 of traffic and the amount of guided traffic that's
34 going up the river. It's getting bigger boats, bigger
35 loads.

36
37 Every two or three days there's two
38 boats going up and they've got 225 jugs and that thing
39 is just packed with 15 and 30-gallon plastic jugs with
40 gasoline and they can bring it up to the lodge and
41 those people can go from the lodge. They just come
42 through here. Hardly any money is spent here. The
43 economy -- this community don't get no plus from that.
44 It leaves the state, it opens up in the spring, start
45 gearing up in the spring and it leaves the state.
46 We're very, very concerned about the erosion. Once we
47 see the native species like rainbow, once it's gone
48 from here it's gone.

49
50 Like I was saying, another thing about

1 during World War II Adak -- I didn't know that they
2 used to be able to have salmon year round almost, but
3 the GIs dammed a little stream there and it's gone,
4 it's wiped out, decimated, and we don't want to see
5 that.

6

7

Thank you.

8

9

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Would you like that
10 to be one of the action items, is the high traffic of
11 jet boats on the Aniak River as one of our annual
12 report topics?

13

14

MR. MORGAN: That's being discussed
15 with the fishing working group here. I think the more
16 publicity it gets, I think it will get -- some of the
17 thought is a 40-horse aggregate limitation, just like
18 the Kenai and one time they did that. Holitna they did
19 that.

20

21

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those 40-horse
22 limitations, wasn't that for hunting though?

23

24

MR. MORGAN: Yes, that was on the
25 Holitna, but the Kenai wasn't for hunting.

26

27

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I'm looking
28 at a map here. So the Aniak doesn't have a lot of
29 Federal lands, so that probably wouldn't be an issue
30 that the Federal Subsistence Board could deal with, a
31 proposal like that. Maybe on the very lower portion.

32

33

A question for Staff, is the lower
34 Aniak River associated to the Yukon Delta Wildlife
35 Refuge are those Federal waters on the lower Aniak
36 River? Can you hear me, Don Rivard?

37

38

MR. RIVARD: Yes, Mr. Chair. There's a
39 real small portion there on the Aniak River that's part
40 of the refuge.

41

42

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Federal Board
43 could entertain -- the solicitor for the Board has said
44 that the Board can restrict non-subsistence users. I
45 would like staff to get back to us at some point in
46 this meeting whether the Federal Board can entertain a
47 restriction in motor size for sportfishing on the Aniak
48 River. Would that be a good question, Carl? So at
49 some point the Staff can return to us on whether the
50 Federal Subsistence Board could restrict motor size for

1 sportfishing on the Aniak River.

2

3 That's in response to Carl Morgan's
4 concerns for the Aniak. He's brought this issue up
5 several different times. That's why I'm pursuing this
6 issue.

7

8 Do you have a comment there, Ray. Go
9 ahead.

10

11 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chair. There's
12 one item I wanted to comment on that I missed in my
13 report. It relates to what Carl was saying. The fish
14 did come in late, the kings, and as a result of that to
15 increase escapement I know they had to make a decision
16 in the management group and they closed the fishery
17 down on the lower river down there, but as a result of
18 that bigger fish made it upriver, so it was a hard
19 decision to make, but it did result in a slug of bigger
20 fish making it up the river and people reported that
21 they were getting big ones they hadn't gotten in
22 previous years. So closures at the right time do make
23 a difference. That's what I wanted to get on the
24 record.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. That
27 kind of dovetails on the Yukon River with Tim's
28 comments that windows are integral to allowing larger
29 fish, a good healthy stock fish to actually reach
30 spawning destination. Thanks, Ray, appreciate that.

31

32 So we'll let Tim Gervais -- do you have
33 comments, Tim.

34

35 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. On
36 June 8 I traveled up to Nome for the North Pacific
37 Management Council meeting and on the 9th I testified
38 in front of the advisory panel requesting a low amount
39 on the allowable amount of chum that could be caught as
40 bycatch. The testimony went pretty well. The majority
41 of the testimony was for restricting the amount of
42 bycatch by Tim Andrew of AVCP and a lot of people from
43 the Norton Sound communities were all testifying for
44 low bycatch levels.

45

46 The advisory panel was fairly receptive
47 to that. I spoke with a couple council members, Duncan
48 Fields of Kodiak and he was on track with serious
49 bycatch allowance and then after the meeting I heard a
50 radio story and Commissioner Laura Campbell, she

1 sounded like she was pretty in favor of recognizing use
2 of the resource and keeping subsistence users in mind
3 when going over the bycatch analysis. The Councils are
4 going to take action on that this year.

5
6 In the pre-meeting this morning I was
7 talking to Don Rivard about what their scheduling would
8 be and it looks like it will not address issues in a
9 meaningful way until 2012. We can probably wait until
10 our spring meeting of 2012 before put together kind of
11 a resolution or think about sending somebody down to
12 the next meeting. Apparently they're just going to be
13 talking about their total allowable catch amounts. So
14 that issue is moving forward, but there's nothing this
15 fall that's going to be an issue as far as the
16 Council's concerned.

17
18 I'd like to thank the members of the
19 WIRAC going to meetings on customary trade.
20 Appreciate, you know, part of your summer to go ahead
21 and represent the Western Interior with that.

22
23 Our local moose season in 21B went
24 pretty well for the local harvest. A lot of people
25 they harvested their moose. I don't have exact numbers
26 on it, but like our harvest is probably above average.
27 There's a lot of traffic on the river, like traveling
28 hunters coming down from the bridge or Nenana. All the
29 dynamics of that might be everybody is used to paying
30 \$4-plus for gas now. It's, to me, a surprising amount
31 of numbers of hunters traveling down. I don't know
32 exactly what their final destination would be. If it
33 was the Yuki or Koyukuk or further down.

34
35 Anyway, our local harvest was good.
36 Appreciate the work on keeping our moose populations in
37 the target zone.

38
39 Fishing for kings was not -- I talked
40 to about 14 people. I had one individual say it was
41 really good. A lot of people, especially people who
42 are fishing with gillnet, they felt like they missed
43 out on fish by just having to wait on the first pulse,
44 but they also had an issue where they started to get
45 into a lot of high water and a lot of driftwood was
46 coming down and made fishing hard.

47
48 But people were able to get some king
49 salmon in and overall, our long-term view, I was really
50 pleased that we were able to meet our boundary

1 escapement and biological escapement goals. I would
2 like to have people here be able to harvest what they
3 felt they needed for their household. I think the more
4 important issue at this stage is the biological
5 escapement was met and it's going to be beneficial for
6 the run in the long-term.

7

8 It was pretty interesting, Jenny's
9 comment about the Canadians letting all their fish
10 pass. I would like to learn some more about that and
11 see how the Canadian's feel about Alaska's efforts at
12 conservation.

13

14 Thank you for putting up with our phone
15 connection here. That's all I have for now.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Tim, thanks a
18 lot. Appreciate your comments. Let me ask if Don
19 Honea came back on line. Have you come back on, Don.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I didn't hear
24 anybody come back. Don is not present. He said he had
25 other things to do. So we're down on reports, ANCSA
26 corporation and tribal consultation teleconferences.

27

28 MR. CHASE: Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Come to the mike
31 here. I'd rather have you on the record. State your
32 name for the record. Turn the mike on.

33

34 MR. CHASE: Ken Chase, Anvik GASH
35 committee. My question is directed to one of the Yukon
36 members, preferably James Walker. My question concerns
37 the mesh size and the type of net that was used on the
38 Yukon this year. Nobody mentioned that the replacement
39 nets that we got this year, the 7.5-inch versus the 8
40 were monofilament nets. Mine at least was monofilament
41 replacement net from my 8-inch down to the 7.5 and I
42 believe that was the reason why the catch was a lot
43 higher. There was some concerns before we changed it
44 that the mesh size would cause a lot of drop off and
45 mortalities, but that didn't seem to be the case. I
46 didn't fish setnet, I fished driftnet.

47

48 And I think another thing this year's
49 catch was good. I noticed there were -- I caught
50 larger fish this year, but I think that was due to the

1 fact that we had more than three pulses. We actually
2 had about four pulses of fish. My fishery was four
3 miles above Anvik. Robert like fished 12 miles below.
4 I think the water was just perfect water this year for
5 fishing for drifting, so I did a lot better myself on
6 those fish.

7
8 So I wanted to ask James does he think
9 -- did you have the monofilament net?

10
11 MR. J. WALKER: Yes, Ken.

12
13 MR. CHASE: The new 7.5, 7.25?

14
15 MR. J. WALKER: Yes.

16
17 MR. CHASE: Okay. I wanted to make
18 that point.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I appreciate
21 that comment.

22
23 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James.

26
27 MR. J. WALKER: Ken, in regards to your
28 type of fishing, was that setnet or drift?

29
30 MR. CHASE: Drift.

31
32 MR. J. WALKER: Okay. What location?

33
34 MR. CHASE: Four miles upriver from
35 Anvik on the west bank.

36
37 MR. J. WALKER: Okay. So that area --
38 was it June, July?

39
40 MR. CHASE: Yeah, it was just the
41 regular season. We had to hunt, you know, different
42 areas for depth of water, but once we found it, you
43 know, the fish was there.

44
45 MR. J. WALKER: I guess the reason I
46 ask is because normally in June is when the bigger fish
47 come up, the first ones, the first run, they're bigger
48 chinook kings that go up. Generally that's what I've
49 been seeing over the years around Holy Cross. The
50 majority of the bigger fish are caught in June with the

1 exception of the blue backs in July, around the 4th of
2 July.

3

4 MR. CHASE: Yeah, that's correct. I
5 think we caught -- I don't know if you call them blue
6 back, we don't call them blue backs, but we did catch a
7 good amount of large fish in that lake last run. That
8 was just interesting to me.

9

10 Thank you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's good
13 supplementary information for the Council to hear on
14 the size of the fish. The Mono Twist gear that was
15 used is a superior net and I used to fish a Mono Twist
16 gear down in Bristol Bay. It actually springs and
17 snaps on -- when the fish quit kicking on it's first
18 run, it actually cinches back down, so it's like a
19 snare that tightens up and so it actually does hold
20 better. It actually should have been an aspect of the
21 net size analysis. I'm glad to hear that they are
22 using Mono Twist gear because it does have a lower drop
23 out rate. So that's good supplementary information for
24 the Council to hear on this net size thing, which has
25 been a big issue over the last several years.

26

27 So we're to the reports on the ANCSA
28 corporation and tribal consultation teleconference.
29 Who is going to give that report. Okay, Pat.

30

31 MS. PETRIVELLI: Good morning. I'm Pat
32 Petrivelli with the Bureau of Indian Affairs,
33 subsistence anthropologist. What Tina is passing
34 around is the draft summary of the tribal consultation
35 teleconference that was held with the Western Interior
36 regional tribes. Basically the two tribes that
37 participated in the teleconference were from Allakaket
38 and Organized Village of Grayling.

39

40 It says draft on it because it was just
41 held last week and then I went to the Y-K meeting and
42 the whole goal of the tribal consultation was that once
43 it occurs we will make a report out and share it with
44 the RAC members. I did try to contact the tribal
45 members to get their approval of this draft. So I
46 emailed them this summary and I haven't heard back yet.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Let me stop you real
49 quick. Can the teleconference hear Pat speaking
50 clearly? Tim?

1 MR. GERVAIS: No, cannot.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Cannot. Let's move
4 this to the table. Thank you, Tina.

5

6 MS. PETRIVELLI: So this draft summary
7 report just has who participated in the teleconference,
8 the individuals from the two villages, and then it had
9 the Federal Board members present and then it has the
10 Federal Staff. Jack participated just to listen in to
11 hear and provide input.

12

13 What we learned was they didn't have a
14 copy of the materials. Allakaket did not have a copy
15 of the wildlife proposal book. Grayling did. You'll
16 see the input they had was mainly no comment. We did
17 encourage them -- we did try to figure out why they
18 didn't have the materials and Jack encouraged them to
19 participate in the teleconference that we had yesterday
20 evening and I'm not sure if Grayling called in or not.
21 But I did mail them the RAC book. Of course mailing,
22 as some of you know, relying upon the mail system is
23 iffy, but then even access to the web, which we've
24 learned is troublesome also. I know trying to download
25 a 12 mg book would be tedious, but that's how big the
26 RAC book is. I think it's 12 megabites and it would
27 just take forever. I don't blame people for not
28 getting it downloaded.

29

30 It's a learning process. Later one of
31 your agenda items has the overview of the tribal
32 consultation and there's opportunities to improve it at
33 a later date. Page 290 outlines the places for input
34 at a later date for the tribes to tell us how to
35 improve it and the corporations also.

36

37 I guess that's the other thing I want
38 to report on this. The ANCSA corporations, the Board
39 held consultations. They had two -- besides the
40 consultation with each of the 10 regions with the
41 tribes, they held two consultations with ANCSA
42 corporations and they were held September 7th and
43 September 15th.

44

45 In the September 7th consultation,
46 Cully Corporation from Point Lay, Hoonah Corporation
47 from Hoonah, Ahtna Corporation and Kwethluk
48 participated and provided input. Then on the 15th
49 Cully Corporation called back, Kwethluk and Ahtna.
50 NANA just listened. That was also just a discussion

1 about did they have the proposal book, where could they
2 get it. Luckily they were in urban areas so we could
3 just give them the web address and they downloaded it
4 and read the books on the web.

5
6 The specific input they had was mainly
7 about the statewide proposal and I could read it now or
8 read it when you discuss the actual proposal.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That will be during
11 the deliberation process of the proposals.

12
13 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah. So, if you'd
14 like, I could just read those two comments.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: When we have that
17 point on our procedure on the proposals, we'll have you
18 bring forward any comments from the tribal councils.

19
20 MS. PETRIVELLI: Okay. That's all I
21 have.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pat. Does
24 the Council have questions for Pat on the tribal
25 council process.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My comment to the
30 Council is I listened to the teleconference. I did see
31 that there's a real need for the tribal government,
32 tribal councils, to be informed with the proper
33 proposals and so forth. I do see a need, as I spoke to
34 the Federal Board back in January, that the subsistence
35 coordinators for the Federal agencies, Park Service,
36 BLM, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, those have subsistence
37 coordinators. Those coordinators need to be involved
38 in contacting the communities when these
39 teleconferences are going to occur and they need to
40 provide the materials or at least request -- make
41 contact with the tribes of each community and sort out
42 the proposals that would actually effect them.

43
44 You can't just send a huge 12 megabyte
45 book to the tribal councils with proposals for the
46 whole state of Alaska. This has to be honed down to
47 the proposals that would affect specific communities.
48 So this is going to be more of a work load, but the
49 Secretary of Department of Interior wants this tribal
50 consultation and this is -- we only had two communities

1 online for the Western Interior proposal book and I
2 forget how many communities we have, 26, or we have a
3 whole bunch more communities. We have 24 communities
4 that did not participate.

5
6 The Secretary of Interior, Department
7 of Interior, wants these communities to at least have
8 the opportunity to address these proposals. So I do
9 feel that the comment that I would like this Council to
10 make to OSM is that the Federal Subsistence Board has
11 to direct the coordinators for the Federal agencies to
12 contact each community with the time and also the
13 proposals that will affect their Game Management Units
14 and their customary and traditional uses for those
15 communities. That's the only way we're going to get
16 good participation from the communities. Is the
17 Council clear on that issue?

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pat.
22 Appreciate that. Is everybody good, do we need a
23 break. We'll take about a 10-minute break and we'll be
24 back here in a second, Tim.

25
26 (Off record)

27
28 (On record)

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're still taking
31 comments throughout the Western Interior meeting on
32 Proposal WP10-69, the customary and traditional use
33 area of lower Unit 21E from Paimiut Slough to the upper
34 bluffs of Molybdenum Mountain. I have at least one
35 person that would like to testify on that. Come up to
36 this mike right here, push the button and state your
37 name for the record and we'll gladly take your
38 testimony.

39
40 MR. ADKINS: Good morning. My name is
41 Morgan Adkins.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Can you spell your
44 last name for the record, please.

45
46 MR. ADKINS: A-D-K-I-N-S. I moved in
47 this country about 22 years ago. Lived in Grayling for
48 a little while and then married a little girl from here
49 and I've lived here for about 20 years now. I've
50 hunted 19A ever since I came out here. My

1 father-in-law took me back into the area of 21E and
2 that's been his traditional area to hunt along with 19A
3 and that's become my traditional area to hunt. We've
4 hunted that for years and he's hunted that for over 60
5 years basically. 21E for me is just part of my natural
6 territory. It's just there. There's not a boundary
7 sign out there that says this is the drainage. It's
8 just you learn where it's at and you know where it's
9 at. It's just a good hunt.

10

11 I normally hunt it during the winter
12 time -- during the fall time, excuse me. If there was
13 a winter hunt, I would probably go back in there during
14 the wintertime hunt. Not just myself, but other people
15 I know have hunted that territory too. I ran into
16 Henry Kelila back in there. He'd be back there hunting
17 moose or bear. And I've ran into Calvin Simeon, who
18 unfortunately is no longer with us, back in there
19 hunting. So there's quite a few of us that utilize
20 that territory.

21

22 If it's kept 21E and we're allowed to
23 hunt it on the Federal level or whatever, it's just a
24 plus for the communities. It's not a difficult area to
25 access. It takes a little thought to get in there, but
26 the trails are well marked. Everybody knows it during
27 the wintertime and it's not that hard to get to during
28 the fall time.

29

30 There's a lot of game in there. I run
31 across cows and calves and bulls all the time, bears.
32 There's just a good lot -- it's just a good area.
33 There's not a lot of people going back in there because
34 of the accessibility. Those that want to haul an ATV
35 over there or whatever, they get in there in about an
36 hour. It's just quality country and I think it should
37 be open to all of us.

38

39 I can't really say much more than that.
40 It's just something excellent for us.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We appreciate
43 your testimony that you utilize the area. Excuse me,
44 Ray. I was wondering on the teleconference -- I've got
45 the monitor next to my mike. Are you hearing that
46 okay, Tim?

47

48 MR. GERVAIS: I'm hearing you fine. I
49 wasn't able to hear the testimony.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay. We've got
2 real challenges with this speaker phone here. Go
3 ahead, Ray.

4
5 MR. COLLINS: Would you clarify again
6 what community do you reside in.

7
8 MR. ADKINS: I live right here in
9 Aniak.

10
11 MR. COLLINS: Aniak. And the area
12 you're talking about hunting in 21E is the area where
13 it's proposed to give you customary and traditional
14 use?

15
16 MR. ADKINS: Yes.

17
18 MR. COLLINS: So that line works for
19 you?

20
21 MR. ADKINS: Yes.

22
23 MR. COLLINS: Okay. Thank you.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm not sure how to
26 accommodate the conference call. Salena is going to
27 try something else here. Thank you for your testimony.
28 Appreciate that. Do we have anyone else here.

29
30 Elsie. Elsie is going to make
31 testimony or comment. Go ahead, Elsie. Turn your mike
32 on there, Elsie.

33
34 MS. SIMEON: Hi. I'm here on behalf of
35 Golga Kelila, Jr. He is a resident from Aniak, 66
36 years old. Regarding 21E, he is against the winter
37 season for cow moose. They're too skinny. Regarding
38 the bull moose, they're also skinny and they're hard as
39 rubber. Leave the young moose alone. They have no
40 meat, they're too young. It's good hunting in the
41 fall. He's always hunted over there on 21E as well
42 with his brother Henry. So this is his comments for
43 today.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I really appreciate
46 those comments. He has hunted there and his brother,
47 that will be entered into the record on the
48 deliberation for the Federal Board. We'll take his
49 comments under consideration for the winter hunt, which
50 is another proposal.

1 Thank you.

2

3 MS. SIMEON: Thanks.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other local
6 comments. We're taking all testimony for lower 21E
7 people from here utilization of that area. Come up to
8 the mike, state your name.

9

10 MR. THALHAUSER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
11 Mike Thalhauser with the Kuskokwim Native Association.
12 I guess I've kind of been silent at this meeting since
13 I actually submitted the proposal on behalf of the
14 Kuskokwim Native Association. When I did submit it, if
15 you read through it, it's clearly stated the proposal
16 actually was put in for the entire Unit 21E with the
17 suggestion to the Councils that they use their
18 expertise and knowledge on the area and the use
19 traditionally to draw those lines where they represent
20 that use and I think that's worked out perfect.

21

22 At this point I guess I'd like to say
23 if there are any questions about the specific proposal
24 I'd definitely answer them, but I think what we're
25 going for is -- Ray and Mr. Chair, you mentioned is
26 whether or not that use is represented by these
27 proposed lines and so far I think we haven't had any
28 comments against that and the only thing that's come up
29 is allocation of that resource.

30

31 I was just curious -- really, I guess,
32 if the proposal was put in, you can really narrow it
33 down to three different groups of users. The current
34 subsistence users, Federally qualified users in the
35 GASH area, the newly proposed users of these four
36 communities, which is an extra probably 800 people, a
37 significant amount of people, and the State non-
38 resident hunters that are also in the area.

39

40 I guess what I'm just trying to clarify
41 as far as this goes is the proposal is just for the
42 lines and then after that is where we trust the State
43 and Federal managers to work together and allocate
44 those resources. I was just kind of curious as to what
45 the State and Federal and I guess we'll probably maybe
46 hear this when we talk about the management plans
47 later, but what their plans would be if something like
48 this were passed. Another thing is maybe someone from
49 OSM or someone could let the Board know what options
50 they have as far as what say they might have in the

1 allocation of that resource. I know that's not part of
2 this proposal, but something you could put along with
3 that.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Mike. The
6 testimony is just strictly about the use of moose in
7 this area. If the Federal Subsistence Board passes
8 this proposal, then the managers and the WIRAC will
9 have to work on how the harvest will stay within
10 sustainability and that will be future proposals and so
11 forth, management plans and so forth. I think these
12 are primarily BLM lands down here, so the BLM managers
13 would have the primary role in staying within
14 sustainability for that moose population.

15

16 There may be far too many hunters. It
17 may have to go to an .804 criteria for winter hunts.
18 There might be a whole bunch of regulations, but first
19 the Federal Subsistence Board has to review and pass
20 the proposal before those future management actions
21 will be necessary to be taken and the Western Interior
22 Council will be very involved in working on those
23 proposals.

24

25 Thank you for your testimony and
26 appreciate your input.

27

28 MR. THALHAUSER: Thank you.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No other local
31 comments, so we'll go back onto the agenda. We are
32 taking testimony out of cycle. There's no way to
33 enhance our teleconference, Salena? No? I guess we'll
34 just keep the conference call next to me here. Can you
35 hear me, Tim, on the teleconference?

36

37 MR. GERVAIS: I can hear you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So we'll just
40 move back and forth if we have testimony. We're back
41 on the agenda, 9, review of the 2012 Fisheries Resource
42 Monitoring Program. So you'll be speaking to this, Don
43 Rivard, and I'll put the mike here, so go right ahead
44 then.

45

46 MR. RIVARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Stand by for just a
49 second, Don. Is the public hearing this teleconference
50 clearly in the room? Okay, the public is hearing

1 clearly in the room, so go right ahead, Don.

2

3 MR. RIVARD: Good morning, everyone.
4 This is Don Rivard with the Office of Subsistence
5 Management in Anchorage. I'm a fish biologist. We're
6 going to be starting on Page 21 in your book. The
7 first couple of pages basically is an introduction and
8 the background on the process of the Fisheries Resource
9 Monitoring Plan. We'll be going through region by
10 region and I'll pause after each region to see if
11 there's any questions and to allow Council to write a
12 recommendation if they so choose at that time.

13

14 If you go to Page 24, you'll see the
15 2012 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan. A total of 32
16 investigation plans are under consideration for
17 funding. That's Table 1 there on Page 24. Of these, 22
18 are stock status and trend studies and 10 are harvest
19 monitoring and traditional ecological knowledge
20 projects. The Technical Review Committee recommends
21 funding 29 of these investigation plans. Again, that's
22 statewide.

23

24 For the Yukon and Kuskokwim Region,
25 we're going to do the Yukon first, that's on Page 25.
26 The 2012 request for proposals for the Yukon Region,
27 there were eight priority information needs that were
28 identified and those are listed on the top of Page 25.

29

30 Since the inception of the Monitoring
31 Program in 2000, 93 projects have been funded by OSM in
32 the Yukon Region, and seven of these will still be
33 operating in 2012. Those can be seen on Tables 1 and 2
34 on Pages 28 and 31.

35

36

37 Fifteen Yukon Region proposals were
38 initially submitted to the Office of Subsistence
39 Management in response to the 2012 Request for
40 Proposals. In March 2011, the Technical Review
41 Committee reviewed these proposals and recommended nine
42 for investigation plan development, including seven
43 stock status and trends projects and two harvest
44 monitoring and traditional ecological knowledge
45 projects.

46

47 One stock status and trends and one
48 harvest monitoring/traditional ecological knowledge
49 proposal were withdrawn by the investigators prior to
50 submittal of an investigation plan. Investigators for

1 the remaining seven projects responded to Technical
2 Review Committee proposal review comments in developing
3 their investigation plans. If you go to Page 26,
4 you'll see the ones.

5
6 After reviewing the seven investigation
7 plans, the Technical Review Committee recommended
8 funding six projects there on Page 26. That's the
9 Alatna River Inconnu Population Structure. The second
10 one is the Abundance and Run Timing of Salmon in
11 Henshaw Creek. Third is the Anvik River Sonar Project.
12 Fourth is the Kaltag Chinook Salmon Sampling Project.
13 Fifth is the Yukon River Bering Cisco Spawning Origins
14 Telemetry. And the sixth project is In-season
15 Management Teleconferences and Harvest Interviews.

16
17 The six projects recommended for
18 funding by the Technical Review Committee comprise a
19 strong Monitoring Plan for the region by addressing
20 strategically important information needs based on
21 sound science and by promoting cooperative
22 partnerships.

23
24 For your information, the Yukon-
25 Kuskokwim Delta Council met last week and they
26 concurred with the Technical Review Committee's
27 recommendations there on Page 26. That's the end of my
28 presentation for the Yukon, Mr. Chair.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. Does
31 the Council have questions for Don on the six projects
32 that the Technical Review Committee proposed.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is the Council in
37 agreement with the Technical Review Committee.

38
39 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. This is an
40 action item, so we're hoping to get a recommendation
41 from your Council.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I'm moving
44 in that direction, Don. Thank you. The list of the
45 projects are on 26 and 27. These are all, I feel, very
46 important projects. I live in the upper Koyukuk. The
47 sheefish inconnu population structure is a very
48 important project. Those fish are caught in the
49 subsistence fishery and the gillnet fishery throughout
50 the Yukon River Drainage.

1 The abundance and run timing of the
2 Henshaw Creek salmon is also a very important project.
3 The Henshaw Creek Drainage is a major contributor of
4 summer chum and also chinook salmon in the Yukon River
5 system, so this is a very important project. I'm in
6 full agreement with those.

7
8 I'm very concerned about sheefish.
9 They're a very sensitive fish to handling and so forth
10 and they're highly sought fish for sport fishers and
11 catch and release. We've had concerns in the Kobuk
12 River drainage with the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence
13 Resource Commission on sheefish handling and harvest.

14
15 Moving down this list, Anvik Sonar
16 Project, is this a good project for you, Robert?

17
18 MR. R. WALKER: Yes, it is.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't see any
21 disagreement with the Council on the six projects. Any
22 disagreement with the Technical Committee from the
23 Council.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Chair will
28 entertain a motion to endorse the six projects
29 presented for funding by the Technical Review
30 Committee. Do I have a motion.

31
32 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.

33
34 MR. R. WALKER: Second.

35
36 MR. GERVAIS: So moved.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There was a motion
39 to move. Did you second, Tim.

40
41 MR. GERVAIS: I was trying to move, but
42 I'll second Robert's.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Those in
45 favor of the six items presented by the Technical
46 Review Committee for the Yukon River Drainage signify
47 by saying aye.

48
49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you vote, Tim.
2
3 MR. GERVAIS: Aye.
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
6 sign.
7
8 (No opposing votes)
9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Western Interior
11 adopts the six projects. On to the next item, Don, go
12 right ahead.
13
14 MR. RIVARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Now
15 I'll ask you to turn to Page 50 in your Council book.
16 For the Kuskokwim Region, the 2012 Request for
17 Proposals focused on 10 priority information needs.
18 You can see they're on the top of Page 50, outlined
19 there.
20
21 Since the inception of the Monitoring
22 Program in 2000, 75 projects have been funded in the
23 Kuskokwim Region, and eight of these will still be
24 operating during 2012. Again, you can see those on
25 Tables 1 and 2 starting on Page 54 through Page 56.
26
27 A quick note. Presently, the
28 Monitoring Program supports over 50 percent of all
29 fisheries monitoring and research being conducted in
30 the Kuskokwim Region. Sixteen Kuskokwim Region
31 proposals were submitted to the Office of Subsistence
32 Management. The Technical Review Committee reviewed the
33 proposals and recommended nine for investigation plan
34 development. Investigators for one of these proposals
35 withdrew it from further consideration prior to
36 submitting an investigation plan. Investigators for the
37 remaining eight responded to Technical Review
38 Committee proposal review comments in developing their
39 investigation plans.
40
41 After reviewing the eight investigation
42 plans, the Technical Review Committee recommended
43 funding seven of the proposed projects. Those are
44 found on Page 51. The first is the Lower Kuskokwim
45 River Chinook Salmon Harvest for Age, Sex and Length.
46 The second is the George River Salmon Weir (Option B).
47 The third is the Takotna River Salmon Escapement
48 Monitoring. Fourth is the Kwethluk River Weir Video
49 Salmon Escapement Enumeration. Fifth is the Highpower
50 Creek Sheefish Status and Upper Kuskokwim River. The

1 sixth is the Kuskokwim River Bering Cisco Spawning
2 Origins. And the seventh is the Upper Kuskokwim River
3 Whitefish Climate Change Trends.

4
5 The seven projects recommended for
6 funding by the Technical Review Committee comprise a
7 strong Monitoring Plan for the region by addressing
8 strategically important information needs based on
9 sound science and by promoting cooperative
10 partnerships.

11
12 Again, the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta
13 Council last week also recommended and they concurred
14 with the TRC recommendations. In the other section
15 there's some brief descriptions of each project on Page
16 51 and then further on in your book starting on Page
17 58.

18
19 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Don.
22 Does the Council have any questions for Don Rivard on
23 the seven projects that the TRC is recommending for
24 funding.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any comments on the
29 seven projects from the Council. Do you have any
30 comments, Carl?

31
32 MR. MORGAN: No. Just pleased that the
33 Option B is put in and adopted for funding to have a
34 high school intern. I think it's very important to get
35 our younger people into the system. I think it's
36 wonderful.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Appreciate that
39 comment, Carl. Ray.

40
41 MR. COLLINS: The ongoing Takotna
42 River, that's the only stream up there that has a weir
43 on it in headwaters right now, so it's important, I
44 think, for history to be able to monitor over time, so
45 I'm glad it's continuing. The Highpower is new
46 information. That's another headwater stream where
47 they've identified as a spawning area, so I'm glad to
48 see that.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Where is Highpower

1 Creek, Ray?
2
3 MR. COLLINS: It's clear up above
4 Telida.
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Way up there.
7
8 MR. COLLINS: Way up there. And now
9 it's an undeveloped area. I mean there's no impact on
10 it, but it would be good to get the documentation that
11 it is an important stream. And the same with whitefish
12 use up there in Lime Village and Nikolai. As
13 mentioned, it has been declining and this is looking at
14 the harvest patterns and see what's going on. So it's
15 a documentation of historical use and current use.
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate those
18 comments, Ray. Any further discussion on the seven
19 projects on the Kuskokwim River.
20
21 (No comments)
22
23 MR. R. WALKER: I'll make a motion to
24 approve.
25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Robert makes a
27 motion to adopt the seven projects.....
28
29 MR. COLLINS: I'll second.....
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:that the
32 Technical Review Committee has recommended.
33
34 MR. COLLINS: I'll second that.
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Ray.
37 Further discussion.
38
39 (No comments)
40
41 MR. COLLINS: Question.
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
44 called. Those in favor of the seven projects for the
45 Kuskokwim River Drainage slated by the Technical Review
46 Committee for funding signify by saying aye.
47
48 IN UNISON: Aye.
49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same

1 sign.

2

3

(No opposing votes)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the seven projects are adopted by the Western Interior Council. Thanks, Don. Appreciate your participation.

MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. I still have the multi-region.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay. Excuse me. Go ahead.

MR. RIVARD: If you go to Page 81 in your books. For the Multi-regional review, this could simply be all statewide. In this particular case, we're going to see it's just for Yukon and the Kuskokwim, so it's two regions for your Council.

For the multi-regional category, the 2012 Request for Proposals was focused on four priority information needs, which you can see on the top of Page 81.

Since the inception of the Monitoring Program in 2000, 14 projects have been funded in the multi-regional category, and one of these projects will be ongoing during 2012. Three proposals for research in the Multi-Regional category were submitted to the Office of Subsistence Management for funding consideration in 2012. In March 2011, the Technical Review Committee reviewed these proposals and recommended two for development of investigation plans. One of these was subsequently withdrawn by the investigator, while investigators for the other one used comments from the Technical Review Committee review of their proposal to develop an investigation plan.

Go to Page 82. After reviewing the investigation plan, the Technical Review Committee recommended funding the Yukon and Kuskokwim Inconnu or Sheefish Genetic Baseline. For your information again, the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Council concurred with this recommendation.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 That concludes my presentation.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. This
4 genetic baseline is \$16,788?
5
6 MR. RIVARD: Yes, that's for the first
7 year.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is there a total on
10 that?
11
12 MR. RIVARD: Yes, Mr. Chair. If you
13 look at Page 85, you'll see the full thing and it shows
14 a three-year project and the cost for each.
15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I see it here.
17 That's what I was looking for. Okay. Any questions
18 from the Council on this project.
19
20 (No comments)
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Technical Review
23 Committee has endorsed this project. I feel that the
24 project is worthwhile myself. Go ahead, Ray.
25
26 MR. COLLINS: Move approval.
27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: A motion to approve
29 the project by Ray.
30
31 MS. PELKOLA: Second.
32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny.
34 Further discussion.
35
36 MR. COLLINS: Question.
37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
39 called on the motion. Those in favor of endorsing this
40 project for multi-regional slated by the Technical
41 Review Committee signify by saying aye.
42
43 IN UNISON: Aye.
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
46 sign.
47
48 (No opposing votes)
49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Western Interior

1 Council approves this project. Any further -- Don, any
2 further projects.

3

4 MR. RIVARD: That's it, Mr. Chair. I'm
5 going to sign off now to research your question about
6 restricting more size of sportfishers on the Aniak
7 River and the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge and
8 I'll get back to you as soon as I can.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I did want to
11 make one comment.

12

13 MR. GERVAIS: I have a question for
14 Don, Mr. Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead.
17 Timothy Gervais wants to ask you a question, Don.

18

19 MR. GERVAIS: Don, is there any issues
20 come your way regarding the Donlin Creek Mine as far as
21 permitting and other issues that may be associated with
22 that?

23

24 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. Right now
25 there's nothing that's come in front of the Office of
26 Subsistence Management or the Federal Subsistence
27 Board. If they start to do some permitting, it's going
28 to probably be the Army Corps of Engineers and the
29 Environmental Protection Agency that will be the lead
30 Federal agency on any Donlin Creek Project. I will
31 probably review anything that has to do with affecting
32 subsistence, but as of now there's nothing on our
33 plates here.

34

35 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you very much.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I did want to
38 -- on these Fisheries Monitoring, I do feel that
39 it's very important to at some point develop an indices
40 for dropout of chinook salmon from 6-inch chum gear in
41 directed chum fisheries. There is a significant
42 dropout rate of chinook salmon and in our annual report
43 there was no investigators came forward, but I do want
44 to keep this issue on the table. There is a
45 significant dropout of chinook salmon on a 6-inch mesh
46 size gear and managers need -- they have an unknown
47 number. There is no scientific-based number to
48 evaluate if the chum salmon runs increase in the Yukon
49 River, there will be an increasing impact to chinook
50 bycatch and dropout rates.

1 So my concern is that if there is a
2 directed chum fishery in the Lower Yukon River, it will
3 still have an exponentially increasing impact to the
4 chinook salmon run on the Yukon River and to the
5 fishers who rely on the chinook salmon. I do feel that
6 this is a fisheries monitoring issue that needs to be
7 looked at because no scientific based information can
8 be provided for me or the managers and this is an
9 unknown number.

10
11 So I feel that this project needs to be
12 looked at and I would like the Technical Review
13 Committee to look at developing a project to
14 scientifically evaluate how to come up with an indices
15 for dropout rates from 6-inch directed chum fishing
16 gear in the Yukon River. So I would like to get that
17 on the record.

18
19 Did you copy that, Don?

20
21 MR. RIVARD: Yes, Mr. Chair, I've
22 written that down and noted it and it would be
23 something that would go into probably our 2014 call for
24 proposals under information needs and issues. So I've
25 got that noted and I will pass that on to my supervisor
26 and let him know.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate that.
29 Thank you. So that would be all my comments on the
30 Technical Review Committee. We'll let you go to
31 research the Federal Subsistence Board's ability to
32 restrict motors on the Aniak River.

33
34 Thanks for your participation, Don.

35
36 MR. RIVARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Back on our agenda.
39 We did agenda Item 9. 10, Fisheries issues. Yukon
40 River Subsistence Fisheries Post Season Report and this
41 is a joint Federal/State presentation. Who is going to
42 make the presentation.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We don't seem to
47 have any fisheries people present. George is going to
48 come to bat.

49
50 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 George Pappas, Department of Fish and Game, Subsistence
2 Liaison Team. I was told that a Federal representative
3 would be here to cover this as our fisheries folks were
4 not available. I do have the Yukon River salmon
5 fisheries preliminary season summary from the
6 Department dated September 28th. I believe there's
7 seven copies. I handed it to Melinda a little bit
8 earlier. I'm surprised I don't have a counterpart
9 here, so I can do one of two things. I can read this
10 to you or we can have this issued to you and we can
11 answer questions later on.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Just stand by,
14 George. Would Don Rivard be a presenter for this? I'm
15 asking make a statement there.

16
17 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. Let me make
18 a phone call and see if I can find somebody.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We can delay this
21 agenda item if -- the State feels uncomfortable
22 stepping up to bat here on this issue, so we can table
23 this until we do have a Federal fisheries biologist,
24 whoever that might be.

25
26 MR. ARDIZZONE: I don't know who is
27 supposed to present this, but I will make a phone call
28 and check.

29
30 MR. PAPPAS: Conversely, Mr. Chair, I
31 will attempt to get one of our State Staff. Possibly
32 we can have them teleconference to save time.

33
34 Thank you, sir.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, I don't want
37 to put you on the spot here, so I would prefer -- if
38 the Council wants to see these fisheries review that
39 for questions and so forth I feel that it's appropriate
40 to have a fisheries biologist. So the Federal
41 fisheries Staff in Fairbanks can call in.

42
43 We'll move down to wildlife proposals
44 for the Council review and recommendation. That's
45 agenda Item 11. So we're moving right into statewide
46 proposals. The first proposal is WP12-01 brown bear
47 requirements when selling handicrafts incorporated
48 laws.

49
50 David Jenkins is going to present the

1 proposal.

2

3 DR. JENKINS: Good morning, Mr. Chair
4 and Council members. David Jenkins with OSM. WP12-01
5 was submitted by the Brown Bear Claw Handicraft Working
6 Group. You can find it on Page 92 of your book. It
7 requests that prior to selling a handicraft
8 incorporating a brown bear claw the hide must be sealed
9 by an authorized Alaska Department of Fish and Game
10 representative or if a claw is detached that too must
11 be sealed and a copy of the ADF&G sealing certificate
12 would then accompany the handicraft when sold.

13

14 This proposal is a compromise reached
15 by the members of the Brown Bear Claw Handicraft
16 Working Group. The proposal addresses concerns
17 originally raised by the State of Alaska with Federal
18 regulations that allow the sale of handicrafts that
19 include brown bear claws from bears that are taken
20 under Federal subsistence regulations. The Working
21 Group suggested that deferred Proposals WP08-05 and
22 WP10-02 be opposed and that Proposal WP12-01 be
23 submitted.

24

25 The intent of the proposal is to
26 protect subsistence users who incorporate brown bear
27 claws into handicrafts for sale by providing proof that
28 the claws are from brown bears that were harvested by
29 Federally qualified subsistence users. Having proof
30 that the claws are from subsistence-harvested brown
31 bears could provide added value to a handicraft as it
32 would clearly identify that the claws are from a
33 legally harvested brown bear. Requiring that a copy of
34 the sealing certificate accompany the handicraft would
35 provide a method of tracking legally harvested brown
36 bears, but also would require modification to the
37 sealing certificate, which is managed by the State of
38 Alaska, to include a place on the certificate
39 indicating that the bear was harvested by a Federally
40 qualified subsistence user.

41

42 I should point out that the Brown Bear
43 Claw Handicraft Working Group was composed of
44 representatives from nine of the
45 ten Councils, Staff from ADF&G, and Staff of Federal
46 agencies.

47

48 If you look on Page 93 you can see the
49 language of the proposed regulation. It reads like
50 this: Prior to selling a handicraft incorporating a

1 brown bear claw or claws, the hide or
2 claws not attached to a hide, must be sealed by an
3 authorized ADF&G representative and a copy must
4 accompany the handicraft when sold.

5
6 Adopting the proposal would provide
7 some protection to subsistence users who incorporate
8 brown bear claws into handicrafts and it's possible, as
9 I mentioned, that it could add value. There is no
10 evidence to indicate that current Federal subsistence
11 regulations adversely affect brown bear populations nor
12 that Federal subsistence regulations have led to an
13 increased legal or illegal harvest of brown bears.

14
15 OSM's preliminary conclusion is to
16 support this particular proposal.

17
18 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, David. Does
21 the Council have any questions on the proposal as
22 presented.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. The
27 Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments.

28
29 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
30 believe our comments were distributed in your packet
31 and I brought a second set yesterday. First I'd like
32 to ask respectfully permission to discuss this subject
33 matter.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Say again.

36
37 MR. PAPPAS: I respectfully request the
38 permission to discuss this subject matter. This was an
39 issue a couple years ago. I do have permission to
40 discuss this subject matter?

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

43
44 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
45 Summarizing from our comments, which we will request to
46 be incorporated into the record as appears here.
47 Changing the Federal regulations to provide documents
48 which support the legal sales of Federal subsistence
49 harvested brown bear claws handicrafts should help
50 eliminate illegal commercial markets and the illegal

1 sales in Alaska and elsewhere.

2

3

4 Adoption of this proposal will not
5 interfere with continuing to allow Federally qualified
6 subsistence users to obtain such handicrafts for
7 ceremonial, religious and cultural purposes. If
8 adopted, Federally qualified subsistence users who plan
9 on selling handicrafts made from legally harvested
10 brown bear claws will be required to have the hide
11 sealed by the Department and retain copies of the
12 sealing certificate and provide copies of the
13 certificate to customers.

13

14

15 Under State regulations, handicrafts
16 made from bear fur may be sold to anyone, but sales of
17 handicrafts with claws, skulls, teeth and bones are
18 prohibited.

18

19

20 This proposal will reduce enforcement
21 issues created by the existing Federal regulations by
22 creating a tracking system which provides documentation
23 to accompany brown bear claws used for making
24 handicrafts legally taken, utilized and sold under
25 Federal subsistence regulations. Further adoption of
26 this proposal will significantly reduce the likelihood
27 that Federally qualified subsistence users will face
28 State prosecution for engaging in sales that are
29 prohibited under State law when they occur on State or
30 Federal lands.

30

31

32 The Department appreciates the
33 cooperative work the Brown Bear Claw Working Group
34 completed over the last two years, providing a tracking
35 system would be an important first step to addressing
36 some of the Department's concerns regarding
37 conservation and enforcement. If brown bear harvests
38 can be tracked over time and bear parts or handicrafts
39 can be traced to reported legal harvest, conservation
40 concerns will less likely arise and managers will be
41 better able to determine if or when legal sales are
42 contributing to illegal sales or otherwise creating
43 conservation concerns.

43

44

45 The Department does support this
46 proposal.

46

47

48

49

50

STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

1 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
2 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council
3

4 Wildlife Proposal WP12-01: Develop a
5 tracking program for federal subsistence harvested bear
6 claws that are made into in to handicrafts for sale by
7 federally qualified users.
8

9 Introduction:
10

11 This proposal was a consensus outcome
12 of the Brown Bear claw handicraft working group. The
13 proposal requests all federal subsistence harvested
14 brown bear claws, which are incorporated into
15 handicrafts for sale, be tracked through use of the
16 current department brown bear sealing program. If
17 adopted, federal subsistence users who intend on
18 selling brown bear claws incorporated into handicrafts
19 will be required to have the bear hide sealed by the
20 department. If adopted, a copy of the bear sealing
21 document will be required to accompany the bear claw
22 handicrafts when sold.
23

24 Sales of handicrafts made from brown
25 bear claws, teeth, skulls, and bones present a
26 particular problem, because these are potentially high
27 value items, and allowing sales creates market
28 incentives for illegal harvest in Alaska and other
29 states. Adoption of this proposal will protect federal
30 subsistence craftsmen and their clients by providing
31 proof and a means of documenting their handicrafts were
32 legally taken, legal to sale by federally qualified
33 users only, and are legal to own by any customer.
34 Additionally, if this proposal is adopted, the
35 customers who purchase brown bear claw handicrafts from
36 federally qualified users will have the security of
37 written proof certifying the handicraft came from a
38 legally harvested Alaskan brown bear, legally
39 authorized harvester, and legally authorized artisan.
40

41 Changing federal regulation to provide
42 documents which support the legal sales of federal
43 subsistence harvested brown bear claw handicrafts
44 should help eliminate illegal commercial markets and
45 the masking of illegal sales in Alaska and elsewhere.
46

47 Impact on Subsistence Users:
48

49 The Federal Subsistence Board's current
50 allowance of brown bear handicraft sales was not based

1 upon a determination that such sales are customary and
2 traditional but instead upon the Board's unsupported
3 argument that the Board can authorize any use if the
4 take is customary and traditional (see e.g., January 2,
5 2006, letter from Chairman Demientieff to Commissioner
6 Campbell). Therefore, adoption of this proposal will
7 not impact customary and traditional subsistence
8 activities.

9
10 Adoption of this proposal will not
11 interfere with continuing to allow federally qualified
12 subsistence users to obtain such handicrafts for
13 ceremonial, religious, and cultural purposes.

14
15 If adopted, federally qualified
16 subsistence users who plan on selling handicrafts made
17 from legally harvested brown bear claws will be
18 required to have the hide sealed by the department,
19 retain copies of the sealing certificate, and provide
20 copies of the certificate to customers.

21
22 Opportunity Provided by State:

23
24 Under 5 AAC 92.200, handicrafts made
25 with bear fur may be sold to anyone, but sales of
26 handicrafts made with claws, skulls, teeth, and bones
27 are prohibited. Whole bear skins, with claws attached,
28 taken in certain predator control areas may be sold
29 under 5 AAC 92.031, but only after sealing and under
30 terms of a permit issued for that bear skin.

31
32 Conservation Issues:

33
34 The Federal Subsistence Board created a
35 new market for bear claws and other high value bear
36 parts which could readily mask illegal sales, thereby
37 compounding problems with the international trade of
38 Endangered Species and contributing to the illegal
39 harvest, overharvest, and waste of bears in other
40 states and countries, as well as Alaska. Markets for
41 high value bear handicrafts create a conservation
42 concern because brown bears are protected under the
43 Endangered Species Act in other states and Mexico, and
44 the origin of brown bear products cannot be determined
45 by visual inspection. Brown bears are also listed on
46 Appendix II of the Convention International Trade of
47 Endangered Species (CITES).

48
49 In Alaska, economic incentives
50 associated with harvesting brown bears to make

1 handicrafts create conservation concerns because brown
2 bears develop slowly and have a low reproductive rate,
3 making small populations extremely susceptible to
4 overharvest. Allowing widespread sale of high value
5 bear parts without any kind of tracking mechanism is an
6 invitation to illegal harvests. Further, the existing
7 regulations are unenforceable and inconsistent with
8 sound wildlife management principles.

9

10 Enforcement Issues:

11

12 This proposal will reduce enforcement
13 issues created by the existing federal regulation by
14 creating a tracking system which provides documents to
15 accompany brown bear claws used for making handicrafts
16 legally taken, utilized, and sold under federal
17 subsistence regulations. Further, adoption of this
18 proposal will significantly reduce the likelihood that
19 federally-qualified subsistence users will face state
20 prosecution for engaging in sales that are prohibited
21 under state law when they occur on state or private
22 lands.

23

24 Jurisdiction Issues:

25

26 The Federal Subsistence Board lacks
27 jurisdiction to allow sales of any wildlife handicrafts
28 when and where such sales are not customary and
29 traditional. In the past, the Federal Board has
30 rejected this argument, asserting that if any use is
31 customary and traditional then the Board can authorize
32 any other use. The Board's argument is inconsistent
33 with its litigation stance in the Chistochina Unit 12
34 moose case where it argued that customary and
35 traditional use is related to how resources are used
36 after they are taken, and not to or a prerequisite
37 condition for the taking itself. State v. Fleagle,
38 (Case 3:06-cv-00107-HRH) Doc. 32 at 22.

39

40 Other Comments:

41

42 The department appreciates the
43 cooperative work the brown bear claw work group
44 completed over the last two years. Providing for
45 tracking would be an important first step to addressing
46 some of the Department's concerns regarding
47 conservation and enforcement. If brown bear harvests
48 can be tracked over time, and bear parts or handicrafts
49 can be traced to reported legal harvests, conservation
50 concerns will be less likely to arise and managers will

1 be better able to determine if or when legal sales are
2 contributing to illegal sales or otherwise creating
3 conservation concerns.

4

5 Recommendation: Support.

6

7 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, George.
10 Appreciate the State's comments. Any questions from
11 the Council on the State's position.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. Do we
16 have any Federal agencies that want to speak to the
17 proposal.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. Are
22 there Native, tribal, village or other council entities
23 that would like to speak to the proposal. Tribal
24 comments.

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none.
29 InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There are none.
34 Advisory group comments. Is there GASH or any other
35 advisory committee commented on this proposal.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none.
40 Neighboring Regional Advisory Council comments.

41 Melinda.

42

43 MS. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chair. I do have a
44 comment that was provided by the Lake Clark National
45 Park SRC. They did not take a position on this
46 proposal. Also, for your information, the Seward
47 Peninsula Regional Advisory Council did support this
48 proposal. It was opposed by the Kodiak and Southeast
49 Regional Advisory Councils.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Was there
2 justification on opposition by Southeast and Kodiak
3 Regional Councils?

4
5 MS. HERNANDEZ: Not that was provided
6 to me. Chuck, would you like to talk about the
7 deliberations at those meetings.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm asking that
10 because I would like to know what other Regional
11 Council's concerns were with the proposal.

12 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. Chuck
13 Ardizzone for the record. I attended the Southeast
14 meeting and they opposed Proposal 01 based on a burden
15 to subsistence users and law enforcement issues. They
16 thought it would be difficult for law enforcement to be
17 able to track everything and know which claws came from
18 where and they felt it would be a burden for
19 subsistence users to have to go and get the
20 documentation and gets things sealed.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see. Any Council
23 comments on the positions of the other Regional
24 Advisory Councils.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My comment would be
29 that Western Interior has been neutral and not
30 supportive of sale of brown bear parts within the
31 Western Interior Region and at this point the driving
32 force of this proposal would be Southeast and Kodiak,
33 so if they're nonsupportive, I would prefer to defer
34 the proposal from this Council.

35
36 Is there any other Subsistence Resource
37 Commission comments.

38
39 MS. HERNANDEZ: Not that I was
40 provided, Mr. Chair.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any summary of
43 written comments provided.

44
45 MS. HERNANDEZ: There were no written
46 public comments.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. There's no
49 public testimony.

50

1 At this time the Regional Advisory Council
2 recommendation needs a motion. As the Chair, I feel
3 that this proposal was failed by the driving Regional
4 Advisory Councils and so I would like to take a
5 deferral position. The Chair would entertain a motion
6 to defer this proposal.

7

8 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So moved by James.
11 Do I have a second.

12

13 MR. R. WALKER: (waves hand)

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: A second by Robert.
16 Any further discussion on this proposal.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This only would
21 affect the Western Interior Region in 24B within the
22 Gates of the Arctic National Park and so I don't feel
23 that this Council needs to take a stand on this. Let
24 this be sorted by the Federal Subsistence Board. Any
25 further discussion.

26

27 MS. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chair.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Melinda.

30

31 MS. HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry. I
32 apologize. I did miss the Gates of the Arctic National
33 Park's comments on this. On Proposal 12-01 the SRC
34 vote was to support. There was no justification
35 provided, but they do support this proposal.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm on the Gates of
38 the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission. We
39 reviewed the proposal. We supported just because North
40 Slope was endorsing the proposal. This was in the
41 northern portion of Unit 24B, but this has been a
42 deferred proposal. This was before the working group
43 actually was formed. Basically those comments were on
44 the previous proposal and basically supportive of users
45 from Anaktuvuk Pass that may want to participate in
46 this.

47

48 Chuck, you have a comment.

49

50 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. I've been

1 informed that the Y-K also took action on this and they
2 opposed it. Their justification was it's another way
3 to hinder artists and bury them in more paperwork and
4 needs more vetting before the public.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So the motion
7 before the Council right now is to defer the proposal
8 to the Federal Subsistence Board. Any further
9 discussion.

10
11 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I have a
12 question for clarification. We're saying this only
13 applies to Gates of the Arctic. My understanding is
14 this proposal was statewide, that it was any legally
15 taken bear by a rural subsistence user.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: On Page 90 it shows
18 the Game Management Units 1 through 5, 9A and C, 9E,
19 12, 17, 20, 22, 23 and 24B.

20
21 MR. COLLINS: Okay.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Or 26. If you're a
24 subsistence user in those units and have C&T within
25 those units, this would apply to those users. The
26 Councils this is primarily applying to are opposing the
27 proposal. I would like to defer the proposal. So any
28 further discussion on this proposal by the Council.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Hearing none. Those
33 in favor of the proposal signify by saying aye.

34
35 IN UNISON: Aye

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
38 sign.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Aye.

41
42 MR. MORGAN: Aye.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Clarification for
45 the Council. An affirmative -- oh, I'm completely
46 incorrect. Excuse me. I vote for the main motion.
47 I'll redo the vote. The motion is to defer the
48 proposal. Those in favor of deferral of the proposal
49 to the Federal Subsistence Board signify by saying aye.
50

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Excuse me, my brain
4 failed there for a second. Those opposed same sign.
5
6 (No opposing votes)
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal is
9 deferred to the Federal Subsistence Board for their
10 analysis. The next proposal WP10-02 on 100. Brown
11 bear claw incorporation and handicrafts in our book.
12
13 Who just joined the teleconference?
14
15 MR. BUE: I apologize. This is Fred
16 Bue.
17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we were working
19 interim on some proposals, Fred. Can you hear me?
20 Fred, this is Jack Reakoff. We were on a fisheries
21 update on the Yukon River and we didn't have any Staff
22 to present the post-season analysis report and so we
23 started working on some proposals. So, at this time,
24 we'll move back to our agenda item. If you have a
25 post-season report you would like to provide the
26 Council, go right ahead.
27
28 MR. BUE: Good morning. I apologize.
29 This is Fred Bue with Fish and Wildlife Service here in
30 Fairbanks. Gerald Maschmann was supposed to be en
31 route there. I don't know what time the flight is
32 scheduled to be there, but he has a packet. I don't
33 know if you received it.
34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay.
36
37 MR. BUE: But I can give you an
38 overview if it works best for you.
39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, if he's here
41 to provide information and has a packet, then we'll
42 still await his arrival. He may be arriving
43 imminently, so that's good to know. We'll let him
44 arrive and we'll let him give his presentation when he
45 gets here. I didn't know who was going to do what.
46
47 MR. BUE: Right. I apologize again.
48 We have kind of a meeting schedule conflict here, so I
49 wasn't able to make it. What I'll do is leave my phone
50 on here and when he arrives if there's any additional

1 information or questions.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I do want to see his
4 packet and presentation on post-season from your Staff.
5 Okay, we'll await his arrival. Thanks, Fred, for
6 calling in.

7

8 MR. BUE: All right. I'll be on hands-
9 free here. Thanks.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, that clarifies
12 that issue. We're moving back to statewide proposals.
13 It would be WP10-02, deferred Proposal WP08-05, brown
14 bear bear claw incorporated into handicrafts on Page
15 100 of our book. Who is going to present on this?
16 David, go right ahead.

17

18 DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. David Jenkins
19 again. WP08-05 and WP10-02, which was subsequent to
20 the first one, was deferred by the Board pending the
21 recommendation of the Brown Bear Claw Handicraft
22 Working Group. The working group proposed regulation
23 was WP12-01, which you just addressed. The
24 recommendation of the working group is to oppose the
25 proposals WP08-05 and WP10-02 and for the Board to
26 consider the Proposal WP12-01 and the OSM preliminary
27 conclusion is to take no action on WP10-02.

28

29 Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. State
32 comments.

33

34 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
35 Department recommends take no action on this proposal
36 and we're actually going to try to see if we can get
37 granted permission to withdraw this proposal in light
38 of Proposal 12-01. I believe the work group wanted to
39 defer this. I believe action on 01 will eliminate the
40 need to even review this deferred proposal 10-02.

41

42 *****

43 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

44 *****

45

46 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
47 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

48

49 Wildlife Proposal WP10-02 (Deferred
50 WP08-05): Change the regulations regarding sale of

1 brown bear handicrafts to allow sales of handicrafts
2 made from brown bear fur in all units and to restrict
3 sales of handicrafts made from claws, bones, teeth, or
4 skulls to transactions between federally-qualified
5 subsistence users.

6

7

Introduction:

8

9

Existing federal regulations allow
10 essentially unconstrained commercial sale of
11 handicrafts made from bear parts taken in some units as
12 a customary and traditional activity, despite a lack of
13 substantial evidence demonstrating that such sales are
14 a customary and traditional practice. The sale of such
15 handicrafts is limited only by virtually unenforceable
16 provision that prohibits sales constituting a
17 significant commercial enterprise. These regulations
18 also allow the purchase of brown bear handicrafts by
19 persons who are not federally-qualified subsistence
20 users, despite such purchases being prohibited under
21 state law and, as was pointed out at the Spring 2006
22 Federal Subsistence Board meeting, that sales can even
23 occur over the Internet.

24

25

Sales of handicrafts made from brown
26 bear claws, teeth, skulls, and bones present a
27 particular problem, because these are potentially high
28 value items, and allowing sales creates market
29 incentives for illegal harvest in Alaska and other
30 states.

31

32

Black bear handicraft sales, although
33 not customary and traditional, do not create the high
34 level of conservation concern raised by sales of brown
35 bear handicrafts. Similarly, sales of brown bear
36 handicrafts do not raise the same level of concern if
37 limited to the skin or fur as defined in state
38 regulations; and even sales of handicrafts made with
39 claws and teeth do not currently raise extremely high
40 levels of concern if limited to sales among
41 federally-qualified users.

42

43

Changing the regulation to continue
44 allowing the sale of brown bear fur products to anyone
45 (state regulations allow sale of untanned brown bear
46 hides), while limiting sales of handicrafts made with
47 brown bear claws, teeth, bones, and skulls to sales to
48 other federally-qualified subsistence users, should
49 help eliminate commercial markets and the masking of
50 illegal sales in Alaska and elsewhere.

1 Unit specific restrictions on sales are almost
2 impossible to enforce without tracking and
3 documentation requirements and are not needed for lower
4 value fur handicrafts. This proposal will eliminate
5 the unit-specific sale allowances and render the
6 regulations more user-friendly and more enforceable.

7

8 Impact on Subsistence Users:

9

10 The Federal Subsistence Board's current
11 allowance of brown bear handicraft sales was not based
12 upon a determination that such sales are customary and
13 traditional but instead upon the Board's unsupported
14 argument that the Board can authorize any use if the
15 take is customary and traditional (see e.g., January 2,
16 2006, letter from Chairman Demientieff to Commissioner
17 Campbell). Therefore, adoption of this proposal will
18 not impact customary and traditional subsistence
19 activities.

20

21 This proposal will continue to allow
22 rural residents to: sell brown bear fur handicrafts to
23 anyone (as allowed under State law); barter brown bear
24 handicrafts with anyone under federal regulations; and
25 sell brown bear handicrafts to other rural residents
26 under federal regulations. Therefore, this proposed
27 regulation change will not impair the ability of rural
28 residents or urban Alaska Natives to obtain such
29 handicrafts for ceremonial, religious, and cultural
30 purposes.

31

32 Further, adoption of this proposal will
33 significantly reduce the likelihood that
34 federally-qualified subsistence users will face state
35 prosecution for engaging in sales that are prohibited
36 under state law when they occur on state or private
37 lands.

38

39 Opportunity Provided by State:

40

41 Under 5 AAC 92.200, handicrafts made
42 with bear fur may be sold to anyone, but sales of
43 handicrafts made with claws, skulls, teeth, and bones
44 are prohibited. Whole bear skins, with claws attached,
45 taken in certain predator control areas may be sold
46 under 5 AAC 92.031, but only after sealing and under
47 terms of a permit issued for that bear skin.

48

49 Conservation Issues:

50

1 The Federal Subsistence Board created a
2 new market for bear claws and other high value bear
3 parts which could readily masks illegal sales, thereby
4 compounding problems with the international trade of
5 Endangered Species and contributing to the illegal
6 harvest, overharvest, and waste of bears in other
7 states and countries, as well as Alaska. Markets for
8 high value bear handicrafts create a conservation
9 concern because brown bears are protected under the
10 Endangered Species Act in other states and Mexico, and
11 the origin of brown bear products cannot be determined
12 by visual inspection. Brown bears are also listed on
13 Appendix II of the Convention International Trade of
14 Endangered Species (CITES).

15
16 In Alaska, economic incentives
17 associated with harvesting brown bears to make
18 handicrafts create conservation concerns because brown
19 bears develop slowly and have a low reproductive rate,
20 making small populations extremely susceptible to
21 overharvest. Allowing widespread sale of high value
22 bear parts without any kind of tracking mechanism is an
23 invitation to illegal harvests. Further, the existing
24 regulations are unenforceable and inconsistent with
25 sound wildlife management principles.

26
27 Enforcement Issues:

28
29 This proposal will reduce enforcement
30 issues created by the existing federal regulation in
31 several ways: (1) by limiting the pool of eligible
32 purchasers for high value bear parts, it will
33 significantly reduce economic incentives for poaching
34 in other states and countries as well as in Alaska; (2)
35 by allowing the sales of brown bear fur handicrafts
36 from any Game Management Unit, as presently allowed
37 under state law, this proposal will eliminate
38 unenforceable Unit-specific sales authorizations in
39 existing regulation; and (3) the proposed regulation
40 will reduce the likelihood that federally-qualified
41 subsistence users will face prosecution for attempting
42 to engage in sales on state or private lands that are
43 prohibited under state law.

44
45 Jurisdiction Issues:

46
47 The Federal Subsistence Board lacks
48 jurisdiction to allow sales of any wildlife handicrafts
49 when and where such sales are not customary and
50 traditional. In the past, the Federal Board has

1 rejected this argument, asserting that if any use is
2 customary and traditional then the Board can authorize
3 any other use. The Board's argument is inconsistent
4 with its litigation stance in the Chistochina Unit 12
5 moose case where it argued that customary and
6 traditional use is related to how resources are used
7 after they are taken, and not to or a prerequisite
8 condition for the taking itself. State v. Fleagle,
9 (Case 3:06-cv-00107-HRH) Doc. 32 at 22.

10

11 Recommendation: TAKE NO ACTION / GRANT
12 PERMISSION TO WITHDRAW / DEFER TO PROPOSAL 12-01 AS
13 RECOMMENDED BY WORKING GROUP

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, George.
16 At this time the Chair will entertain a motion to take
17 no action on this Proposal WP10-02. Do I have a
18 motion. Somebody has to make the motion.

19

20 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Speak to the mike,
23 please.

24

25 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Jenny.

28

29 MR. MORGAN: Second.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Carl.
32 Any further discussion on this Proposal WP10-02.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
37 the motion signify by saying aye.

38

39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40

41 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. We should
42 put in the justification. It's based on the State
43 comment about not needed.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, we'll take that
46 after the vote. Did you vote?

47

48 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you vote, Tim,

1 online there? Can you hear me, Tim? Ask him if he
2 voted. Did he vote?

3

4 REPORTER: Tim, they're voting to take
5 no action.

6

7 MR. GERVAIS: That's fine.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. The
10 justification for taking no action on Proposal WP10-02
11 was the State's comment to withdraw and the working
12 group's opposition to the proposal. That's pretty much
13 the synopsis of take no action on this proposal.

14

15 So moving on in the agenda, WP12-02.
16 Are you going to make a presentation, David?

17

18 DR. JENKINS: WP12-03 is the next one
19 in line. Oh, my mistake.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, this was 10-02
22 and this is 12-02. This is WP12-02 and the previous
23 one was WP10-02. That clarifies that. Go ahead,
24 David. Designated hunter.

25

26 (Pause)

27

28 DR. JENKINS: Tim, if you can't hear me
29 when I'm speaking, speak up and I'll put the telephone
30 closer to me. Proposal WP12-02, submitted by Michael
31 Cronk of Tok, Alaska, requests that only people 60
32 years of age or older, or disabled, be allowed to
33 designate their harvest limit to another person. This
34 regulation change would apply to the entire state.

35

36 The Federal Subsistence Board
37 established the statewide designated hunter system in
38 2003 and that regulation includes the following: The
39 designator must be a Federally qualified subsistence
40 user and the designator may designate another Federally
41 qualified subsistence user to take deer, moose and
42 caribou on his or her behalf. The designated hunter
43 must obtain a designated hunter permit and must return
44 a completed harvest report. The designated hunter may
45 hunt for any number of recipients but may have no more
46 than two harvest limits in his/her possession at any
47 one time. These provisions apply unless they're
48 modified in unit-specific regulations.

49

50 The purpose of the designated hunter

1 rules is to recognize the customary practices of
2 sharing and redistribution of harvest in rural Alaska.
3 For example the designated hunter system legalizes a
4 traditional practice that is ongoing in much of rural
5 Alaska. Within individual harvest limits some hunters
6 cannot harvest enough meat to meet the needs of their
7 own households as well as the needs of the people with
8 whom they share and the designated hunter system allows
9 hunters to harvest moose, caribou and deer expressly
10 for sharing.

11
12 As we know, households may contain
13 members who are unable to or do not choose to harvest
14 for themselves. All hunters don't possess equal skills
15 and abilities. Each community tends to have a minority
16 of good hunters, trappers and fishers who then share
17 with the community more generally.

18
19 If this proposal were adopted, the
20 impacts on subsistence users cannot be measured exactly
21 because statistics we've gathered were only partially
22 gathered to describe the age of those designating a
23 hunter and not whether the user was disabled. Based on
24 the partial information on Table 3 on Page 121 in your
25 books, for 2009 and 2010 you can see that only 77
26 percent of the users designating a hunter were under 60
27 years old. If the proposal were adopted, that 77
28 percent would be prohibited from designating a hunter
29 if this proposal were adopted.

30
31 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
32 oppose this particular proposal.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, David.
37 George, State comments.

38
39 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
40 I'll be summarizing from our comments. If adopted,
41 Federally qualified subsistence designated hunters
42 could harvest animals for Federally qualified users 60
43 years of age or older or disabled. If adopted, some
44 Federally qualified subsistence super-harvesters may
45 spend additional time locating and obtaining game tags
46 from qualified designated hunter beneficiaries. If
47 adopted, designated hunters who cannot locate Federally
48 qualified users 60 or over or disabled may harvest
49 fewer animals per year.

50

1 For opportunity on the State side, the
2 State proxy hunting beneficiary requirements include
3 being a resident of Alaska who is blind, 70 percent
4 physically disabled or 65 years of age or older. Proxy
5 hunters on the State side may not proxy hunt for more
6 than one beneficiary at a time and may not have more
7 than one proxy authorization with them at a time in the
8 field.

9
10 For enforcement, if adopted, this
11 proposal would bring Federal and State regulations
12 closer into alignment.

13
14 The Department recommends supporting
15 this proposal with modification to establish a
16 designated hunter beneficiary qualification equal to
17 those approved by the Federal Subsistence Board for
18 Unit 6. The State recommends modifying this proposal
19 to require beneficiaries of the Federal subsistence
20 designated hunters be blind, 65 years or older or at
21 least 70 percent disabled or temporary disabled.

22
23 The State also recommends modifying
24 this proposal to reflect the Unit 6 designated hunter
25 possession limit adopted by the Federal Subsistence
26 Board which limits the designated hunters to only one
27 bag limit at a time. Adoption of these recommended
28 proposal modifications will bring regulatory
29 consistency to Units 1 through 6 and make Federal and
30 State regulations more parallel.

31
32 *****
33 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
34 *****

35
36 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
37 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

38
39 Wildlife Proposal WP12-02:

40
41 Change federal subsistence designated
42 hunter regulations.

43
44 Introduction:

45
46 This proposal seeks to change the
47 statewide federal subsistence designated hunter
48 regulation by specifying the qualifications for the
49 recipient of harvest. The proposal requests federal
50 regulations be changed to require that federal

1 subsistence designated hunters only harvest for
2 federally qualified recipients 60 years of age or older
3 or for a person who is disabled.

4
5 The proponent indicates the federal
6 subsistence designated hunter program has diverged from
7 the original intent of the Federal Subsistence Board by
8 allowing designated hunting to provide for elders and
9 others that were unable to hunt for themselves. The
10 proponent indicates the designated hunter program is
11 currently an uncontrolled system. The proponent
12 indicates some federal subsistence users are abusing
13 this regulation and are harvesting as many animals as
14 numbers of permits they can obtain which may lead to
15 detrimental impacts to game populations and subsistence
16 hunting in general.

17
18 Impact on Subsistence Users:

19
20 If adopted, federally qualified
21 subsistence designated hunters could harvest animal for
22 federally qualified users 60 years of age or older or
23 are disabled. If adopted, some federally qualified
24 subsistence super harvesters may expend additional time
25 locating and obtaining game tags from qualified
26 designated hunter beneficiaries. If adopted,
27 designated hunters who cannot locate federally
28 qualified users 60 or over or are disabled may harvest
29 fewer animals per year.

30
31 Opportunity Provided by State:

32
33 Proxy hunting for big game is
34 authorized in state hunting regulation. State proxy
35 hunting is allowed for moose, caribou, and deer. The
36 state proxy hunting beneficiary requirements include
37 being a resident of Alaska who is blind, 70% physically
38 disabled, or 65 years of age or older. Proxy hunters
39 may not proxy hunt for more than one beneficiary at a
40 time and may have only one Proxy Authorization with
41 them in the field at a time.

42
43 Conservation Issues:

44
45 Undetermined at this time. If this
46 proposal is adopted without modifications many more
47 animals may be harvested than anticipated.

48
49 Enforcement Issues:

50

1 If adopted, this proposal would bring
2 federal and state regulations closer to alignment.

3

4 Recommendation:

5

6 Support with modification.

7 Adopt the proposal with modification to establish
8 designated hunter beneficiary qualifications equal to
9 those approved by the Federal Subsistence Board for
10 Unit 6. The State recommends modifying this proposal
11 to require beneficiaries of the federal subsistence
12 designated hunters be blind, 65 years old or older, at
13 least 70% disabled, or temporarily disabled. The State
14 also recommends modifying this proposal to reflect the
15 Unit 6 designated hunter possession limit adopted by
16 the Federal Subsistence Board which to limits
17 designated hunters to possession of only one bag limit
18 at a time. Adoption of these recommended proposal
19 modification will bring regulatory consistency to Units
20 1 through 6 and make federal and state regulations more
21 parallel.

22

23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, George. Any
26 questions on the presentation by the State and OSM from
27 the Council.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. Ray,
32 do you have a comment.

33

34 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I think the Federal
35 proposal was designed to meet more of the customary and
36 traditional hunting patterns in the village where the
37 younger people fed the whole community and it wasn't
38 just the elders that they fed. Because they had the
39 time or the skill they hunted for other members of the
40 community and this would move it just to elder support,
41 so it would kind of restrict traditional patterns --
42 practices, I think.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll go down
45 through the list here. Are there any Federal agencies
46 who want to comment on the proposal. So we're going
47 down through the comments. Are there any Native tribal
48 organizations that would like to comment on this
49 proposal. Pat.

50

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: I just had the two
2 comments from the corporations that participated and
3 they both opposed it and it was Kwethluk Corporation.
4 They commented that proposed restrictions limited
5 designated hunting permits to people over 60 could
6 cause problems for the subsistence households where the
7 household head is a widow or single mother under 60
8 years of age and this proposal should not pass.

9
10 And from Cully Corporation. We are
11 concerned about this proposal. Hunters need to be able
12 to utilize the designated hunter provisions when needed
13 to support subsistence uses of the resources available.
14 Hunters need to be able to teach other younger hunters
15 where and how to hunt according to traditional and
16 cultural values.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. I
19 appreciate those comments from those tribal entities.
20 So we're moving down the list here. InterAgency Staff
21 Committee comments.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Neighboring Regional
26 Advisory Councils.

27
28 MS. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chair.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Melinda.

31
32 MS. HERNANDEZ: For WP12-02, the Seward
33 Peninsula Regional Advisory Council opposed the
34 proposal, as well as the Kodiak-Aleutians and
35 Southeast. Chuck did provide me a little bit of
36 rationale for the Southeast. They prefer to keep it
37 the same. It's a little more restrictive the way that
38 it's proposed. That's it for the Regional Advisory
39 Councils.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any comments from
42 the local advisory committees. David.

43
44 DR. JENKINS: I could add the Y-K
45 response too. They opposed this proposal as well.

46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any local Fish and
48 Game Advisory Committee comments.

49
50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: National Park
2 Service, Subsistence Resource Commissions.

3
4 MS. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chair. For WP12-
5 02, the Lake Clark National Park Subsistence Resource
6 Commission decided to support with modification to more
7 closely mirror the State eligibility requirements for
8 proxy hunting. The SRC recommends that qualified
9 hunters be allowed to hunt for individuals who are
10 blind, 70 percent physically disabled as determined by
11 a government agency or over 60 years of age. This
12 measure would reduce the possibility of abuse of
13 designated hunter provisions by clearly defining who is
14 eligible to use a designated hunter.

15
16 In the book on Page 127 there's also a
17 printed comment from the Gates of the Arctic National
18 Park Subsistence Resource Commission. They have
19 decided to support with modification to include
20 windows. The designated hunter option is important to
21 traditional subsistence practices and ensuring the
22 animals are harvested correctly.

23
24 That's all, Mr. Chair.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'll comment on the
27 Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission
28 comment.

29
30 Who just joined the teleconference?
31 Don Rivard?

32
33 MR. RIVARD: Yes.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. We're in
36 a proposal right now. The Gates of the Arctic
37 Subsistence Resource Commission was under time
38 constraints when we reviewed this proposal. There's a
39 Department of Transportation meeting going to occur.
40 We were trying to vacate the building. There was some
41 local people started enumerating widows that needed to
42 be harvested. Not windows, widows. The Gates of the
43 Arctic Subsistence Resource commission did not properly
44 vet this proposal and endorse the proposal, but when I
45 returned home and actually sat and thought about this
46 proposal, Anaktuvuk Pass has 100 percent of the
47 households eat caribou, yet only less than 35 percent
48 of the household actually harvest, so there's a
49 phenomenal amount of people being provided for. I know
50 people who hunt for their sister, their sister works in

1 Huslia, their brother needs to go out and get them a
2 moose, they're not disabled, so I deeply regret
3 endorsing this proposal with the Subsistence Resource
4 Commission.

5
6 So that would be my comments from the
7 Subsistence Resource Commission, that they did endorse
8 it, but we were on a very strong time restraint and did
9 not properly vet this proposal. I wanted to get that
10 on the record.

11
12 Summary of written comments, Melinda.

13
14 MS. HERNANDEZ: (Shakes head
15 negatively)

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There seems to be no
18 public testimony.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Regional Council
23 recommendation. The Chair will entertain a motion to
24 adopt the proposal, but my intention is to oppose the
25 proposal and I want to get full justification during
26 discussion. So the Chair is entertaining a motion to
27 adopt the proposal.

28
29 MR. COLLINS: I so move.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Ray.

32
33 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny.
36 Discussion from other Council members and then I'll
37 give my justification.

38
39 MR. COLLINS: My earlier comments were
40 a little out of time, but, yes, I oppose it because it
41 does not meet the traditional practices of skilled
42 younger hunters hunting for the whole community or
43 whoever needs the meat and there's various reasons why
44 they can't hunt themselves.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other Council
47 comments on the proposal.

48
49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I will give my
2 comments. My comments are the proposal does not
3 reflect within the Western Interior Region the
4 customary and traditional practices of designated
5 hunters or how the demographics of harvest occurs
6 within rural communities. This may be a regional
7 problem in the Eastern Interior where the proposal was
8 promulgated from, but as far as the Western Interior I
9 feel this would be a detriment to subsistence uses
10 within the Western Interior Region and I oppose the
11 proposal.

12
13 Any further discussion.

14
15 (No comments)

16
17 MR. J. WALKER: Question.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question has
20 been called. Those in favor of the proposal signify by
21 saying aye.

22
23 (No aye votes)

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
26 sign.

27
28 IN UNISON: Aye.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you vote, Tim?

31
32 MR. GERVAIS: I voted in opposition of
33 the proposal.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So unanimous
36 rejection of the proposal. Moving on in the agenda,
37 we're at Proposal WP12-03, trapping. David.

38
39 DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. Proposal
40 WP12-03, submitted by the Orutsararmiut Native Council,
41 would require trappers to move a trap that incidentally
42 harvests a moose, caribou, or deer at least 300 feet
43 for the remainder of the regulatory year.

44
45 State of Alaska wildlife regulations
46 already have that provision. In those regulations a
47 trapper is prohibited from placing a trap or snare set
48 within 300 feet of the site at
49 which a moose, caribou, or deer was taken using a trap
50 or snare. This prohibition applies for the duration of

1 the regulatory year.

2

3 The proponent wants a similar provision
4 in Federal wildlife regulations, specifically to better
5 inform State and Federal enforcement officers that the
6 prohibition applies during the same regulatory year of
7 the same calendar year because it was reported that an
8 enforcement officer was confused on this particular
9 issue.

10

11 Currently Federal regulations require
12 that wildlife caught incidental to trapping furbearers
13 be salvaged. The hide, skin, viscera, head or bones
14 may be used for bait.

15

16 We have no good estimates of how often
17 moose or caribou or deer are caught in traps set for
18 furbearers statewide or by region. State and Federal
19 Staff assume generally that low levels of incidental
20 harvests may occur and may be ongoing. Occasionally
21 non-targeted animals are caught, but trappers tend to
22 use techniques to avoid them. This is one reason there
23 are low levels of incidental harvests.

24

25 If this proposal is adopted, Federal
26 subsistence users would be required to move a trap for
27 the remainder of the regulatory year when it has taken
28 a moose, caribou, or deer incidental to trapping
29 furbearers on Federal public lands using Federal
30 trapping regulations. Requiring a trapper to move a
31 trap would be a hardship that would not conserve
32 caribou, moose or deer.

33

34 OSM's preliminary conclusion of this
35 proposal is to oppose it.

36

37 Thank you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, David.

40 Questions from the Council. I have one question
41 myself.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My question is since
46 State trapping regulations require removal -- it was my
47 impression that it was one-quarter mile from the
48 incidental harvest mortality, not 300 feet. If
49 somebody has the State trapping regulations.

50

1 My question is don't state regulations
2 apply to Federal lands or is there really actually a
3 need for -- is there a real enforcement problem? If
4 that animal is incidentally killed, a moose, caribou or
5 deer, on Park lands, Federal lands, don't State
6 regulations apply or is there a specific need for a
7 Federal regulation. David.

8
9 DR. JENKINS: My understanding, Mr.
10 Chair, is that we have no data about incidental take of
11 these animals in furbearing traps or traps for
12 furbearers, so it's a hard question to answer. That's
13 part of your question.

14
15 The other question is do State
16 regulations already apply and force people to move.
17 Apparently the Federal regulations don't force you to
18 move that trap if you've incidentally caught.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see. So we'll go
21 to the State comments. George.

22
23 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
24 I'll summarize. Adoption of this proposal likely won't
25 solve any conservation issues as the Department has not
26 identified any conservation issues associated with this
27 proposal.

28
29 This proposal has purportedly been
30 submitted in response to previous confusion by
31 enforcement personnel. The State understands the local
32 enforcement personnel have received updated training as
33 a result of reported events surrounding this issue.
34 Failure to adopt this proposal is not expected to
35 contribute to continued enforcement issues. It should
36 have been self-corrected here. This proposal is likely
37 unnecessary given that if this proposal is not adopted,
38 Federally qualified subsistence users would continue to
39 be required to comply with State regulations requiring
40 that when caribou, moose or deer are harvested
41 incidentally, the trap must be moved at least 300 feet
42 for the remainder of the regulatory year or risk
43 receiving a citation.

44
45 The Department does oppose this.

46
47 *****
48 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
49 *****

50

1 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
2 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

3

4 Wildlife Proposal WP12-03:

5

6 Incidental harvest requires moving
7 traps for regulatory year. This proposal was submitted
8 by the Orutsararmiut Native Council.

9

10 Introduction:

11

12 The proposer seeks to require trappers
13 to move a trap that incidentally harvests a moose,
14 caribou, or deer at least 300 feet for the remainder of
15 the regulatory year. Trappers would also be required to
16 salvage the edible meat and turn it over to the Federal
17 inseason wildlife manager.

18

19 Impact on Subsistence Users:

20

21 Federal subsistence users would be
22 required to move a trap when it has taken a moose,
23 caribou, or deer incidental to trapping furbearers for
24 the remainder of the regulatory year, and surrender
25 their meat specifically to the Federal inseason
26 wildlife manager.

27

28 Opportunity Provided by State:

29

30 5 AAC 92.085. Unlawful methods of
31 taking big game; exceptions The following methods and
32 means of taking big game are prohibited in addition to
33 the prohibitions in 5 AAC 92.080: (6) with the use of a
34 trap or snare5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of
35 taking furbearers; exceptions a) The following methods
36 and means of taking furbearers under a trapping license
37 are prohibited, in addition to the prohibitions in 5
38 AAC 92.080: (12) by placing or leaving an active trap
39 or snare set on land that is within 300 feet of the
40 site at which a moose, caribou, or deer was taken using
41 a trap or snare; this prohibition applies for the
42 duration of the regulatory year in which the moose,
43 caribou, or deer was taken using the trap or snare.

44

45 Conservation Issues:

46

47 None identified nor solved by adoption
48 of this proposal.

49

50 Enforcement Issues:

1 This proposal is purported to have been
2 submitted in response to previous confusion by
3 enforcement personnel. The state understands local
4 enforcement personnel have received updated training as
5 a result of reported events surrounding this issue.
6 Failure to adopt this proposal is not expected to
7 contribute to continued enforcement issues.

8

9 Other Comments:

10

11 This proposal is likely unnecessary
12 given that if this proposal is not adopted, Federally
13 qualified subsistence users would continue to be
14 required to comply with the State regulations requiring
15 that when a caribou, moose, or deer are harvested
16 incidentally, the trap must be moved at least 300 feet
17 for the remainder of the regulatory year, or risk
18 receiving a State citation.

19

20 Recommendation: Oppose

21

22 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There must have been
25 a regulatory change because it used to be one-quarter
26 mile from the mortality site. Are you quoting from
27 State regulations, the 300 feet?

28

29 MR. PAPPAS: Yes. 5 AAC 92.095 by
30 placing or leaving an active trap or snare set on land
31 that is within 300 feet of the site at which a moose,
32 caribou, or deer was taken using a trap or snare; this
33 prohibition applies for the duration of the regulatory
34 year. That was part of the issue, the definition of
35 regulatory year. That came up in our YKD RAC meeting
36 and the regulatory year is July 1 through June 30th.

37

38 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That
41 clarifies it for me also. Any comments or discussions
42 on the presentation from the Council.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. Is
47 there any Federal agency comments.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tribal or village
2 comments.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: InterAgency Staff
7 Committee comments.
8
9 (No comments)
10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Local advisory
12 committee comments.
13
14 (No comments)
15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none.
17 National Park Service Subsistence Resource Commission
18 comments. Melinda.
19
20 MS. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chair. I see that
21 the Lake Clark National Park SRC did not take a
22 position on this proposal and that's the only one I've
23 got.
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Any
26 written comments, Melinda.
27
28 (No comments)
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No public testimony.
31
32 (No comments)
33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Regional
35 Advisory Council recommendation and motion. The Chair
36 will entertain a motion to adopt the proposal.
37
38 MR. COLLINS: I so move.
39
40 MR. MORGAN: Second.
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
43 Discussion on the proposal. Carl.
44
45 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chair. I intend to
46 oppose the motion, vote against it. I think it's --
47 the ungulate is purely an accident, unlucky trapper.
48 Move it 300 feet. Who knows, he might be unlucky again
49 and catch another moose or whatever and then he's got
50 to move again. It would further confuse the issue and

1 it's not a targeted trapping animal. I intend to vote
2 in the negative to this proposal.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Carl. I
5 appreciate those comments. My comments are similar.
6 There was a problem in certain other areas of trappers
7 actually using heavy snares to catch moose and then use
8 them for bait. That's where this regulation actually
9 came from in the State process. I don't know anybody,
10 subsistence users -- moose and these animals are so
11 precious.

12

13 I trap and I highly try to avoid any
14 incidental bycatch of moose and caribou in my area. If
15 the caribou come in the area, I have to pull all my
16 traps. Those caribou just go everywhere. So I don't
17 know any trappers, subsistence users in the Western
18 Interior Region that are specifically targeting.

19

20 I don't think this is a problem in the
21 Western Interior Region, so I oppose the proposal
22 because I don't feel this is an issue for subsistence
23 users under Federal regulations.

24

25 Any other comments from the Council.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 MR. MORGAN: Question.

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
31 being called. Those in favor of the proposal signify
32 by saying aye.

33

34 (No aye votes)

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
37 sign.

38

39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal fails.
42 When procedural is the lunch? Do we have a time on
43 that?

44

45 REPORTER: Probably about noon.

46

47 MS. HERNANDEZ: Probably right about
48 noon, yeah.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, we're about

1 11:30. Okay. We'll move on in the agenda here. We're
2 on Western Interior Regional proposals. That would be
3 WP12-56, 135 in our book. Trevor Fox is going to make
4 the presentation. State your name.

5

6 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Trevor
7 Fox with OSM. I'm a wildlife biologist.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Introduce yourself
10 to the Council as our new wildlife.....

11

12 MR. FOX: I'm one of the two new
13 wildlife biologists with OSM. I started in May.
14 Before that I was working with the Forest Service down
15 in Sitka and I was able to participate in some
16 subsistence sockeye projects down there. So I'm happy
17 to be here.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Welcome, Trevor. Go
20 ahead.

21

22 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23 Members of the Council. The analysis for WP12-56
24 begins on Page 136 of your book. Proposal 12-56
25 submitted by Kathleen ZuRay of the Tanana Tribal
26 Council requests an extension of the fall moose season
27 by seven days in Unit 21B. The current season is from
28 September 5th to October 1st with a portion after
29 September 25th being only open under Federal
30 regulations.

31

32 The proponent is requesting that the
33 Federal moose season in Unit 21B be extended from
34 September 26th through October 1st to September 26th
35 through October 8th to provide additional harvest
36 opportunities for Federally qualified subsistence
37 users. The proponent states that due to warm weather
38 conditions fall moose movements have been delayed and
39 the season extension is needed to harvest moose.

40

41 This proposal affects rural residents
42 of Units 21B, 21C, Tanana, Galena, and Ruby and would
43 extend the season on Federal public lands in Unit 21B,
44 which are primarily within the Nowitna National
45 Wildlife Refuge.

46

47 Previous regulatory changes have been
48 adopted to address the reduced harvest opportunities in
49 Unit 21B including the adoption of an August 22nd
50 through 31st extension in 2006 and then in 2007 that

1 season extension was replaced with the current
2 September 26th through October 1st extension and there
3 was also the addition of a five-day to be announced
4 season to take place between December 1st and March
5 31st.

6
7 As far as the biological background,
8 the moose population in Unit 21B or the last survey for
9 most of Unit 21B was last estimated at 2,317 moose in
10 2008, which is below the State management objective.
11 Aerial moose trend surveys in 2010 showed stable adult
12 bull and cow numbers, improved fall calf abundance and
13 low yearling recruitment. There's a figure on Page
14 141. Just a note on that figure, the two columns --
15 excuse me. The results in Figure 1, these are only for
16 the Nowitna Wildlife Refuge and not for all of Unit
17 21B.

18
19 The population composition data in the
20 area affected by this proposal, which is within the
21 Nowitna River area, they're different from the rest of
22 Unit 21B, suggesting that hunting pressure along the
23 Nowitna River has lowered the bull/cow ratio. The
24 survey results are found on Table 1 on Page 142. Note
25 on this one that the surveys along the Nowitna area and
26 all of Unit 21B are from different years. There's a
27 survey in 2008 and 2010. So they're not directly
28 comparable, but just to give you an idea that it does
29 appear that there has been some effective harvest along
30 the Nowitna.

31
32 Moose continue to be the most important
33 and widely used large animal for the subsistence users
34 of the Interior Region. Ruby residents reported
35 harvested that were above average in Unit 21B from 2007
36 to 2009. This was after a period of below average
37 harvests from 1994 to 2006. Tanana residents harvested
38 an average of five moose per year. This was reported
39 harvest in Unit 21B between 1983 and 2009. Reported
40 harvests were low in 2006 and 2008-2009.

41
42 As far as the current September 26th
43 through October 1st Federal season, this was the
44 Federal-only extension that was initiated in 2007, most
45 of the harvest and effort has been associated with
46 residents of Ruby. Tanana residents have been issued
47 11 permits between 2007 and 2008, but only three
48 residents reportedly used their permit and only one
49 moose was harvested in 2007. No permits were requested
50 or issued to Tanana residents for this hunt in 2009 or

1 2010.

2

3

4 The effects of this proposal. By
5 adopting the proposal the season would be extended for
6 the fall moose hunt on a portion of Federal public
7 lands in Unit 21B from October 1st to October 8th. The
8 one-week season extension would provide additional
9 opportunity for Federally qualified subsistence users
10 to harvest a bull moose.

11

12 The adoption of the extended season
13 would not likely lead to a large increase in bull moose
14 harvest in Unit 21B, especially with recent low
15 participation rates. Just a note, only Federal public
16 lands on the part of the Nowitna River drainage,
17 downstream from and including the Little Mud River
18 drainage would be included in this extension. Residents
19 of Tanana would be required to travel a minimum of 30
20 river miles to reach the eastern boundary.

21

22 As far as effects to the moose, the
23 proposed season extension would overlap with the peak
24 of rut, which may affect the population. However, the
25 extent of such impacts from harvesting during the rut
26 is not known, as much of effects are speculative and
27 direct evidence of such impacts are lacking. There are
28 some evidence with other ungulates that when you
29 harvest during the peak of the rut that there can be
30 effects and some of those are listed within the
31 analysis. So there's potential, although the harvest
32 here is pretty limited.

33

34 Due to the overall low performance of
35 this population, including fluctuating cow numbers in
36 the trend count areas and the recently recovered
37 bull:cow ratio, a conservative harvest strategy is
38 warranted. Therefore, the OSM preliminary conclusion
39 is to oppose Proposal 12-56.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you. Any
42 comments on Trevor's presentation from the Council.
43 Any questions.

44

(No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: State comments. Go
47 ahead, George.

48

49 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
50 These comments are somewhat difficult to summarize.

1 I'll do my best. Adoption of this proposal provide
2 Federal subsistence moose hunters an identified area a
3 portion of 25B one extra week to harvest moose. The
4 Department does have -- for conservation issues, our
5 comments are fairly extensive and data contained.
6 Would you like me to basically read through those or
7 try to highlight?

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Just the highlight.

10

11 MR. PAPPAS: Do the highlight. The
12 moose population in 21B is estimated about 2,300 moose
13 and appears to be stable, but the population is below
14 the management objective of 4-5,000 moose. The
15 bull:cow ratio in 21B is 40 to 50 bulls per 100 cows,
16 but lowest in the Nowitna Corridor at 25 to 30 bulls
17 per 100 cows. It's likely lower due to easier access,
18 therefore higher hunting pressure.

19

20 Recent regulations that have been
21 adopted in 2004 were successful in increasing the
22 bull:cow ratio that had dropped very low. Research
23 suggests that populations with low bull:cow ratios
24 skewed heavily to yearling bulls may be impacted by
25 disrupting normal rutting activities.

26

27 In our notes that we distributed
28 earlier, there's a list of impacts, cascading results
29 of reduction of mature bull component of this
30 population. In a population skewed with male to female
31 sex ratios heavily favoring females and immature males
32 age ratios heavily favoring immature males the effect
33 is expected to have a potentially greater impact. Cows
34 receptive to breeding only for brief period of time and
35 the median dates for breeding are reported in the range
36 of September 29th through October 4th in a Denali
37 National Park study.

38

39 Calving dates of radio-collared moose
40 have not changed in the Interior from 1996 to 2005,
41 which demonstrates that fall weather patterns have not
42 shifted the breeding dates, which is one of the
43 proponents claims concerned about the changing
44 environment in recent times. Analysis of weather
45 patterns for the Galena area indicate there have been
46 no significant increases in temperatures during
47 September.

48

49 Adoption of this proposal will further
50 misalign Federal and State moose hunting season dates,

1 which may increase enforcement issues in areas with
2 mixed land ownership and the Department does oppose
3 this proposal. We have or talented biologist behind us
4 here to answer some questions if you have further
5 questions about the science part.

6

7 Thank you, sir.

8

9 **No official written comments
10 inserted/provided by State at this
11 time**

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, George.
14 Appreciate those comments. Any questions from the
15 Council on the State's position.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. We
20 have Federal agency comments. Keith.

21

22 MR. RAMOS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm
23 Keith Ramos. I'm the Deputy Refuge Manager for the
24 Koyukuk-Nowitna Refuge out of Galena. Just a quick
25 note on this year's permits. As of Friday, we have
26 only issued -- the Ruby Tribal Council office had only
27 issued one permit and our Fish and Wildlife Service
28 office in Galena only issued one permit for this hunt.
29 I have been unable to get a hold of a Tanana person in
30 charge of the permits to see if Tanana residents have
31 obtained any permits. We closed down that Nowitna
32 check station on Thursday and we had not seen any
33 hunters come in for this subsistence hunt up the
34 Nowitna River as of Thursday.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Appreciate
37 that supplementary information, Keith. Is there any
38 tribal comments.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any InterAgency
43 Staff Committee comments.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Advisory Committee
48 comments.

49

50 MR. CHASE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ken

1 Chase, GASH, 21E. Our committee would oppose this as
2 we have tried hard to enhance the moose population in
3 21A, which borders 21B. I think taking these bulls
4 that late in the year is not justified because of the
5 conditions of the moose and then also the accessibility
6 to get them real easy. I haven't seen any support from
7 Galena or Ruby, you know, other than the one from
8 Tanana, just putting it in. I don't know how much
9 support they got from the other villages there. So
10 we'd oppose this, I think, because of those reasons.
11 And then another point is that we hope to try to keep
12 the State and Federal seasons in line with each other
13 rather than go helter skelter in all the different
14 units so that people understand what's happening with
15 the seasons. It simplifies it.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for your
20 comments, Ken. This is not Park Service land, so there
21 would be no Resource Commission comments. Is there a
22 summary of written comments.

23

24 MS. HERNANDEZ: (Shakes head
25 negatively)

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other public
28 testimony.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Regional Advisory
33 recommendation and motion. The Chair will entertain a
34 motion to adopt the Proposal WP12-56. We're in
35 deliberation of a proposal right now for whoever just
36 joined the teleconference.

37

38 I did want to have before we move into
39 adoption of a motion -- did the Advisory Committee in
40 Ruby review this proposal, Tim?

41

42 MR. GERVAIS: No, they haven't reviewed
43 it. I'd like to make a comment as a RAC member.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We'll do that
46 during discussion of the proposal. So the Chair will
47 entertain a motion to adopt the proposal.

48

49 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Jenny.

2

3 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
6 Discussion. You want to make a comment, go ahead, Tim.

7

8 MR. GERVAIS: My comment would be that
9 residents of Unit 21B or qualified users of 21B we
10 already enjoy a fairly good season with a lot of
11 opportunity to harvest moose. I feel that it's hard to
12 hunt past October 1st anyway. There's a lot of colder
13 weather, it's tougher getting out of the skiff and then
14 moose are entering into rut. It's better for our moose
15 population to give them a rest from hunting pressure
16 even though it's not very much pressure that late in
17 the year. So between the combination of there's
18 already a lot of hunting opportunity available in the
19 duration of the existing season and taking the hunting
20 pressure off after October or 30th of September, I
21 don't think there's much advantage with adopting this
22 proposal and I'm going to vote against it.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for your
25 comments, Tim. Any other Council comments. I will
26 comment on the proposal also. Any other comments from
27 the Council. Ray.

28

29 MR. COLLINS: I think that breeding
30 opportunity should be provided for those larger bulls.
31 A lot of it takes place in that late season. I think
32 in order to maintain the health because there is heavy
33 pressure already on bulls that I would oppose the
34 extension.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ray. Other
37 comments.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My comment would be
42 the West Interior Advisory Council proposed the
43 extension for hunting opportunity in 21B to October 1.
44 The permit usage for that hunt is low right now,
45 participation is low, but it has fluctuated with
46 people's success rate. I think the Western Interior
47 Regional Council has provided additional hunting
48 opportunity for local residents of 21B if that have bad
49 hunting conditions. There's yearly occurrences that
50 affect people's success rate.

1 We have taken testimony from
2 individuals that have utilized the hunt in previous
3 years, but personally I feel that any further hunting
4 into October, past October 1, the moose are degrading
5 fairly rapidly. There would be opportunity to harvest
6 younger bulls, but the moose they pretty much stop
7 eating and they're getting in poor condition. With
8 this kind of a bull:cow ratio as the State has
9 presented and the Federal biologist shows that they're
10 below management objective for bull:cow ratio, I see
11 some real downturns from weather events and so forth,
12 so I feel that there's plenty of opportunity provided
13 with the extension to October 1 and this proposal is
14 unwarranted. That would be my justification for
15 opposing the proposal.

16
17 Any further discussion. Jenny.

18
19 MS. PELKOLA: I don't think they got
20 any input from Galena. I think they just threw
21 Galena's name in there and I am opposed to the hunt
22 because of the same reasons of the moose condition and
23 just other things involved.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So basically the
26 health condition of the moose starts degrading fairly
27 rapidly after the 1st of October. Any further
28 discussion from the Council.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 MR. J. WALKER: Question.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question has
35 been called. Those in favor of the proposal WP12-56
36 signify by saying aye.

37
38 (No aye votes)

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
41 sign.

42
43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the proposal
46 fails. Back to our -- we're right at about 12:00
47 o'clock.

48
49 REPORTER: You should probably break so
50 the rest of these people can go get lunch.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So it is
2 12:00 o'clock. We'll break for about an hour and 15
3 minutes, so that would be about 1:15. Hopefully we'll
4 have other Council members arrive for lunch. You can
5 come back on conference call around 1:15, Tim.

6
7 MR. GERVAIS: Okay.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And other people
10 online there. We're going to lunch. We'll be back at
11 1:15.

12
13 (Off record)

14
15 (On record)

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to bring
18 the meeting back to order. Tim Gervais is supposed to
19 be online here. He should be coming back on at any
20 time. We moved forward in the agenda, but we wanted to
21 have the review of the 2012 fisheries issues for the
22 Yukon River subsistence fishery post-season report and
23 Gerald Maschmann was going to come up and give us that
24 report.

25
26 I'm also going to need somebody to do a
27 post-season report for the Kuskokwim. You don't have
28 any Staff here right now and I was wondering if George
29 would pinch-hit for that. Do you have any post-season
30 stuff on the Kuskokwim, George?

31
32 MR. PAPPAS: No.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, you don't. So,
35 no problem. I also want to recognize that we have two
36 Council members that have arrived. We have Eleanor
37 Yatlin. Welcome, Eleanor. Is that you, Tim?

38
39 MR. GERVAIS: I've been online for
40 about five minutes.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I was trying
43 to find out if you were there. And then we have
44 Pollock Simon has arrived. We'll have the post-season
45 report from Gerald Maschmann. Go ahead, Gerald.

46
47 MR. MASCHMANN: Thank you. I'm Gerald
48 Maschmann with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service out
49 of Fairbanks. I work for Fred Bue, who is the Federal
50 Yukon River Federal salmon manager. He provided -- you

1 should have this.

2

3

MS. HERNANDEZ: Red folders.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

For the chinook salmon summer season

1 that's pretty much what we did, was our main management
2 actions. We closed subsistence fishing periods around
3 that first pulse all the way from the coastal district
4 all the way up to 5D and then as the season progressed
5 it looked like the chinook run was even going to be
6 below our poor expectations and we pulled the second
7 period around the second pulse.

8

9 I think the take-home message is that
10 subsistence fishers I think sacrificed a lot, but we
11 were able to meet our chinook salmon escapement goals
12 and our border obligations into Canada. If there's any
13 good news to take out of that is we were able to meet
14 our goals due to subsistence fishers making that
15 sacrifice.

16

17 Along with that there was some
18 commercial opportunity on summer chum. It happened a
19 little bit later in the season. We took some unique
20 actions. We noticed that chinook salmon were coming in
21 pretty strong in the north mouth, but were not coming
22 in very strong in the south mouth, so we opened up
23 commercial fishing in the south mouth only for chum.
24 That seemed to work pretty well. It allowed fishermen
25 to get some of that summer chum opportunity without
26 hitting the chinook salmon.

27

28 We also did not allow the sale of
29 chinook salmon during the summer season. Folks just
30 took those home or they passed them around for
31 subsistence and that seemed to work well too.

32

33 As the summer season ended and the
34 chinook moved up river, it looked like the fall chum
35 were going to do well as the summer chum and fall chum
36 have a good relationship. If we know that the summer
37 chum do well, then we suspect that the fall chum are
38 also going to do well, then we suspect that the fall
39 chum are also going to do well. It turns out that as
40 the fall season progressed, we opened up subsistence
41 fishing to seven days a week in the lower river for the
42 fall chum and to five days a week in the middle river
43 and even as the season got about midway through we
44 opened up the mid river districts to seven days a week
45 also. Then 5D was open seven days a week for
46 subsistence on fall chum.

47

48 We were able to meet and exceed our
49 border obligations for fall chum. We met or exceeded
50 most of our escapements. There's a little bit of

1 concern right now for the Porcupine River stocks in the
2 Fishing Branch weir. At last count, there was about
3 30,000 went by the Fishing Branch weir, but they were
4 flooded out for a good portion of the first half of the
5 run, so we don't know how many they might have missed.
6 But we've always kind of had a little bit of concern
7 for that Fishing Branch. They seem to be up and down.

8

9 But overall fall chum looked good and
10 coho were pretty much an average year and they've been
11 holding steady and they'll probably have a good return
12 on those too.

13

14 The 2011 run of chinook salmon was
15 disappointing and it performed below expectations,
16 which resulted in a well below average run. In
17 contrast, the fall chum, but to their recent low
18 production trend, with the run size above expectations.
19 The summer chum run came in strong with above average
20 run while coho have remained more stable in recent
21 years with the run assessed to be near average.

22

23 Are there any questions?

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Council questions.

26 Jenny.

27

28 MS. PELKOLA: I have one question. You
29 said you opened up commercial in the south side or
30 south river.

31

32 MR. MASCHMANN: Yes.

33

34 MS. PELKOLA: Did you take count of all
35 the chinook that went through there?

36

37 MR. MASCHMANN: Yes. At the mouth of
38 the Yukon it's one river and then at the delta it
39 spreads out and there's three kind of mouths to the
40 Yukon. The south mouth, middle mouth and north mouth.
41 Any chinook salmon that were harvested in the
42 commercial fishery had to be recorded on fish tickets,
43 but they had to be taken home or given away for
44 subsistence uses.

45

46 MS. PELKOLA: And are we going to see
47 numbers?

48

49 MR. MASCHMANN: I think I can provide
50 those for you. There was not really that many. A

1 total of 4,083 chinook salmon were incidentally
2 harvested in Districts 1 and 2 during the summer season
3 and all those were given away to the communities.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray, do you have a
6 question.

7

8 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. The total run on
9 chinook was it 107,000 or that was just the weir? Do
10 we have a count on the river and I was wondering how it
11 compared to the year before because it's interesting
12 that our actions did result in the escapement into
13 Canada in spite of the low run, which is good in terms
14 of management.

15

16 MR. MASCHMANN: Yes. The preliminary
17 end of the season Pilot Station sonar estimate was
18 107,000 chinook salmon and that's what went by Pilot.
19 So you figure there was a little bit of harvest
20 downriver below pilot.

21

22 MR. COLLINS: And the year before?

23

24 MR. MASCHMANN: I could probably look
25 that up. Not immediately, but I could get that. The
26 '95 to 2010 average passage has been 160,000. So we're
27 well below average.

28

29 MR. COLLINS: And in those years even
30 in higher years even didn't meet subsistence, that's
31 right, because of overfishing then basically?

32

33 MR. MASCHMANN: Well, the managers
34 think if we get about 150 to 160 past the Pilot Station
35 sonar that's a run where we think we're going to meet
36 escapement goals and a normal subsistence harvest.
37 It's not a solid magic number that we're hitting, but
38 we think as managers if we're projecting 150 to 160
39 past the sonar, then we're going to be okay on
40 escapement objectives and a normal subsistence harvest.
41 Clearly this year we weren't even close to that, so we
42 had to restrict subsistence.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. James.
45 Your mike.

46

47 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. Jim
48 Walker. In regard to the count this year, was it
49 because of the improved sonar abilities in Pilot
50 Station?

1 MR. MASCHMANN: I wouldn't say there's
2 improved abilities. They are definitely working on
3 some what they call side scan sonar and putting the
4 sonar in the barge out in the middle to see if they're
5 missing fish and we're still -- I should say the
6 Department is still working and looking at what
7 information we can get from that.

8
9 MR. J. WALKER: That would be
10 considered improved.

11
12 MR. MASCHMANN: It was not utilized --
13 those counts were not utilized in this year's count.
14 The Pilot Station is operating as normal or operated as
15 normal this year and we're looking at possibly the new
16 technology to add later, but we're still analyzing
17 that.

18
19 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other questions from
22 the Council on the presentation.

23
24 MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chairman, I have a
25 question.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

28
29 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
30 I'll start off with I would like to congratulate you
31 and other managers for meeting the escapement goal
32 transboundary and biological escapement goal even when
33 there was no abundance of fish. Subsistence users in
34 our area definitely wish there was more fish, but the
35 long term, meeting the treaty escapement and the
36 biological escapement is the key to long-term goals
37 with the management.

38
39 Seeing as how this run was weak and a
40 lot of systems in western Alaska were weak, is the
41 Department going to take any kind of policy action to
42 try and enhance that beyond what happens with in-river
43 management?

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you want to
46 restate that question. Gerald didn't quite understand
47 that one.

48
49 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. Going forward in
50 future years, is there -- well, do you see that there's

1 anything else that needs to be done other than the
2 restriction on commercial and subsistence harvest and
3 getting these stocks back in historical levels?

4

5 MR. MASCHMANN: I think I understand
6 what you're saying. I guess as the manager or
7 assistant manager, we're pretty much tied to that
8 salmon management plan and the regulations. Any
9 additional things that we could or could not do really
10 has to come through the public process. We, I guess,
11 as the managers we try and stick to what we can do,
12 what's in the regs and anything else that you as the
13 public think needs to be done, I would encourage you to
14 go through the public process and make those changes to
15 the regulations.

16

17 MR. BUE: Mr. Chairman. This is Fred
18 Bue.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Fred.

21

22 MR. BUE: I just wanted to apologize
23 I'm not there again. One of the things that is in the
24 process was the mesh size regulation change actually
25 went into effect limiting the mesh size to 7.5 inches
26 this year. We think the effects of that is going to be
27 a long-term thing, but the idea there is to try to
28 improve or get more spawning fish or more eggs in the
29 gravel in the spawning grounds. The idea being that it
30 will harvest a few more smaller males, maybe help fill
31 their fish racks with smaller males and so they pass a
32 few more females up the river. Also some of the
33 females tend to be larger and older fish and maybe it
34 will help avoid some of that and over time it may
35 actually improve the quality of escapement.

36

37 Another place where we're looking at is
38 some research trying to understand what mechanism is
39 withholding our production rates. We don't know what's
40 driving the low production at this time. We're barely
41 getting replacement, one return per spawner. We don't
42 know what's going on there, but we know that we have to
43 keep fish in the spawning gravel or get it to the
44 spawning grounds so when production does improve we'll
45 have something to work off of.

46

47 But we're also trying to understand and
48 get measurements and our data collection on the
49 spawning grounds to improve our data in Canada to
50 understand sex ratios, percent of females and it may be

1 that we start looking at escapement goals based on
2 other things rather than just numbers. But those are a
3 lot of things that are in the future and we're trying
4 to -- you're right on, Tim. We're just trying to
5 figure out what's limiting production, what will help
6 us improve production in the future.

7
8 I guess I'll also add -- Gerald kind of
9 pointed out the commercial fishery and what we did and
10 from our standpoint as Federal managers we work very
11 closely with the State and I didn't want to give you
12 the impression that we were actually managing
13 commercial fishery, but we're involved -- the State
14 involved us in a lot of the discussions and thought
15 process and stuff and so I have to thank the State for
16 allowing us to be there and be part of some of those
17 discussions, what happens when commercial fishery also
18 affects our subsistence fishing. I didn't want to
19 leave the impression that we were actually managing
20 commercial.

21
22 So I'll leave it at that.

23
24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Fred.

27
28 MR. GERVAIS: I have one more question,
29 Jack.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, Tim, go ahead.

32
33 MR. GERVAIS: This is to Gerald or to
34 Fred. What I said about Yukon River Panel meeting this
35 past winter and Jenny's comment of the Canadian
36 fishermen standing down and letting their fish get to
37 spawning grounds, have you fellows seen that the
38 Canadian subsistence users are carrying a lot more of
39 the sacrifice in helping these fish get to the spawning
40 grounds or do you have any comments or information
41 about if we, as Alaskans, need to do more?

42
43 MR. BUE: I'll speak to that again. I
44 don't have a good answer for that, but we do know that
45 this year we did pass sufficient numbers of kinds
46 across the border so they could utilize them in their
47 aboriginal fishery. Whether or not they took advantage
48 of that fish, I don't know. I think some of them just
49 have it in their mind that they do want to put extra
50 fish up there or safeguard and take extra protection or

1 precaution to protect their fish. I can't speak for
2 the Canadians or judge that, but I think part of our
3 agreement is to provide them with a harvest and that's
4 what we're trying to do.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Fred. I had
7 a couple questions I would like to ask. The first
8 thing I would like to bring out is I listen to the
9 teleconferences and fairly early in the run Y1 and 2
10 were meeting their subsistence needs before the
11 directed chum fishery and my concern was that too much
12 subsistence harvest time was provided in Y1 and 2 when
13 the Department and Federal subsistence managers knew
14 that there was going to be a directed chum fishery with
15 the bycatch that was going to be absorbed into the
16 subsistence use.

17

18 My concern is that fishers within this
19 region we're reducing harvest, but there was more than
20 enough chinook in Y1 and Y2 in the subsistence use. My
21 question is, was the bycatch beyond what the people
22 there could use and was it fully utilized?

23

24 And through the managers, would they
25 consider that there's going to be, with these run
26 strengths, about 4,000 to 10,000 chinook salmon bycatch
27 in the directed chum fishery. I keep reiterating there
28 is a dead loss rate with 6-inch gear. And would the
29 managers, Fred, consider that bycatch not to be sold,
30 but also to be calculated that it is going to occur and
31 it is going to be part of the subsistence use and
32 reducing the subsistence time in Y1 and Y2? So that's
33 my question for you, Fred.

34

35 MR. BUE: Yeah, I think that's a good
36 point and I don't have anything real perfect for you,
37 but I think that you made the point that those fish are
38 going to the lower river fishermen and they are being
39 used for subsistence. There are concerns with fishing
40 late in the season. What do they do. It's difficult
41 for any of the subsistence fishermen to use them when
42 the weather is really -- or for processing. Just
43 fishing late for them is a difficult thing with the
44 kings especially. You know, the fatter fish summer
45 chum some of them they can -- are a little bit thinner
46 and they can dry and they can put up easier, but kings
47 are a problem late in the season.

48

49 I think the question that we can work
50 with the people down there on is how -- we definitely

1 need to do more. How do we use those fish. The
2 challenge down there is their commercial summer chum
3 fishery. It's a tradeoff. I guess part of working
4 with those people down there will be to figure out how
5 to deal with that. As you know, summer chum there is
6 some lost opportunity for commercial harvest, but
7 they're also getting a few extra kings in the
8 subsistence fishery. I don't have a perfect answer for
9 you, but I recognize and appreciate your question and I
10 think that's something we need to work with the RACs
11 and the ACs on.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: As the Chair of this
14 RAC, it's my concern that fishers in the Western
15 Interior Region bore more of a conservation burden and
16 reduced chinook harvest, yet those fish -- you know,
17 those fish are going to be caught in the directed chum
18 fishery. Those fish can be frozen. Those fish are
19 utilized. They are part of their subsistence harvest
20 as bycatch. So I would encourage your office to
21 consider an additional half period reduction for
22 subsistence use because they are going to have
23 additional chinook salmon caught in the bycatch.

24

25 You had a comment there, Ray.

26

27 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, it was along the
28 same line, Jack. I know in the upper Kuskokwim there's
29 been a shift from the traditional drying of fish to
30 putting more of them in the freezer now. I'm wondering
31 don't they have the freezer capacity down there to save
32 all those bycatch by freezing them? They would be
33 eaten, but they wouldn't be able to dry them
34 traditionally.

35

36 MR. BUE: I don't know to answer that,
37 but people up and down the river are always changing as
38 lifestyles change and stuff and we do see more people
39 freezing fish all the time, but it's not their entire
40 catch and I think they can take advantage of different
41 opportunities, but it's not perfect. Freezers cost
42 money and all that stuff too. Appreciate it.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Gerald, do you have
45 a comment.

46

47 MR. MASCHMANN: I just wanted to add to
48 what Fred said. You know, in the lower river we kind
49 of notice there's a core group of fishermen who tend to
50 fish early and fish heavy and get done early, but not

1 everyone is finished and early. there's plenty of
2 subsistence fishermen like anywhere else where they
3 don't have the gas money to start early or their boat
4 motor is broke down. There's a lot of subsistence
5 fishermen in the lower river who aren't finishing
6 early. Sometimes you hear the guys on the
7 teleconference they're done already, but there's still
8 a lot of folks who haven't finished and they're
9 definitely taking those incidentally caught fish home.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would like your
12 office to analyze the needs met throughout the whole
13 drainage and assess -- you know, people say in
14 percentage what their subsistence needs were net or for
15 chinook. I would assess the lower river chinook needs
16 being met versus the middle yukon, Western Interior
17 Region needs versus Eastern Interior needs. And then
18 analyze as to how that bycatch can be absorbed. I
19 think this thing needs to be more finely tuned in
20 allocation and I want this issue to be brought up
21 before the pre-season working groups also.

22
23 Any other comments from the Council. I
24 have one more comment, but I'll give the Council
25 comments.

26
27 MR. GERVAIS: I do, Jack.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

30
31 MR. GERVAIS: In 2009 when we did the
32 pulse protection type management it had improved
33 itself, like at Eagle check station or research station
34 and they seem to get better fish up on the Koyukuk. Do
35 you guys have any information on similar positive
36 results for the upriver users either due to the pulse
37 protection or do to mesh size?

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim, I'll answer
40 that. I'm doing a genetic sampling survey for ADF&G
41 for upriver stocks on chinook and summer chum in the
42 Jim River and middle fork of the Koyukuk. Last year it
43 was pathetic. There were no kings hardly present on
44 the spawning grounds and the size was extremely small.
45 This year, with the protection measures in combination
46 with the gear size, I found chinook up to 840
47 millimeter and there were a larger component of fish,
48 chinook, there's not that many chinook that get up
49 there, but there was more utilization of the spawning
50 grounds, so I considered it a success story on getting

1 higher quality fish onto the spawning grounds, at least
2 in the Koyukuk with the conservation measures that were
3 taken this year, so that answers a portion of your
4 question. I'll let Gerald answer the other portion.

5

6 MR. MASCHMANN: That was kind of a
7 question I had. I was hoping maybe Pollock and Eleanor
8 might enlighten me on what they saw up in the Koyukuk
9 this year for chinook salmon.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you want to
12 comment on the size of the kings caught on the Koyukuk,
13 Pollock or Eleanor.

14

15 MR. SIMON: Water has been high during
16 the fishing season at that time. Usually there's a lot
17 of rain. Seems like they're smaller. I haven't seen a
18 big king salmon for about 20 years, so some of the king
19 salmon is getting smaller over time. That's my
20 comments.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Eleanor.

23

24 MS. YATLIN: Let's see. We, like
25 anybody else, you need luck to catch the kings. We
26 don't have that luck, but the camp below us the one day
27 I knew they were getting kings and average pretty much.
28 One day they got nine, so they gave us four. I think
29 Hudson did pretty good. They were not the large kings.
30 I would probably say medium. Up around Huslia, those
31 guys that go fishing up there, young people, I think
32 they did pretty good. Same size, not large.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks. Eleanor and
35 Pollock. I didn't want to give the misimpression that
36 they were big kings on the upper Koyukuk. Last year I
37 saw kings that averaged in size between five to nine
38 pounds. This year I saw kings that were between five
39 and about 26 or 28 pounds. Not huge kings, not like
40 pictures of the old timers in Wiseman that used to
41 catch 35, 40 pound kings up there, but the kings
42 compared to last year were much larger. So I
43 considered that successful in that we saw at least some
44 at least what you're calling medium sized kings. No
45 really huge ones. Pollock.

46

47 MR. SIMON: Yeah, the cost of gasoline
48 is affecting us too. If there's a place across the
49 river we sit there. Sometimes a good spot is 20
50 minutes away, but the cost of gasoline is preventing us

1 from going there. So that has a lot of effect on us.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And one final
4 question I have is, Fred, you were talking about
5 looking at the spawning grounds in Canada and getting
6 better sex on the escapement of chinook. I was
7 wondering -- at the Eagle sonar they take some samples
8 there. I was wondering with the windowed protections
9 was there larger fish taken in the samples that were
10 crossing into Canada.

11

12 MR. BUE: Yeah, I don't have the data
13 in front of me again, but my sense was that they were a
14 little bit larger and also the percent females is a
15 little bit more. Certainly more than last year. We
16 are tracking that pretty good right now.

17

18 We're working with Canada, the JTC and
19 the Panel, to get projects in Canada to get more
20 sampling on the spawning grounds. They are stepping
21 back up their program, their escapement monitoring, so
22 we're getting more information, but where the problem
23 is is that there's a little bit of a data gap between
24 the tracking. Historical is kind of a problem.

25

26 I think that the pulse protection seems
27 to be getting a reflection of what's coming into the
28 river, the spawning grounds. Every year there's a
29 different composition of different age classes, strong
30 ones and weak ones, four, five and six-year-old fish in
31 combination. It depends on the year. So it gets a
32 little bit complicated on which size fish you see on
33 the spawning grounds.

34

35 But I think the pulse protection moving
36 a group of fish through the river helps reflect what's
37 naturally out there rather than putting selective
38 fishing pressure on the stock. So I think that way of
39 thinking, logic-wise in my mind it seems to be
40 effective. We can't really -- you know, there's a lot
41 of natural pressures on the stocks and all those
42 natural selections is kind of beyond us, but I think
43 pulse protection does put back up -- pushes through the
44 river what's naturally coming in the mouth, so I think
45 that helps.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thanks, Fred.
48 I, like, Tim, want to congratulate the Department of
49 Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Fisheries on
50 getting an escapement into Canada and the increased

1 size on the spawning grounds with the windowed
2 protections on pulse protection, so I wanted to
3 congratulate. It's a movement in the right direction
4 and I want to see a continuance of that.

5
6 I think we've covered this Yukon
7 fishery issue fully. On our agenda we have the
8 Kuskokwim post-season report. I don't know that we
9 have anybody that can give that. Are you still online,
10 Don Rivard?

11
12 MR. RIVARD: Yes, Mr. Chair, I'm
13 online.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Can you give a
16 Kuskokwim River post-season report for OSM.

17
18 MR. RIVARD: If you'll give me a
19 minute, I'll get what was presented last week at the
20 Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Region.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

23
24 MR. BUE: Mr. Chair. This is Fred.
25 While you're standing by, I just had another item. I
26 just wanted to get the RAC's opinion on when we did the
27 pulse protection it would help to reduce the confusion
28 if we split up 4A into upper and lower and for us it
29 made sense to pass that pulse through the river more
30 precisely and targeted. Is that the RAC's feeling or
31 is there anything different the RAC might think we
32 should be considering?

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does any RAC members
35 want to comment on the division of 4A. Did that seem
36 to work for fishers.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have no feeling on
41 that. I do feel if that protects the primary pulse,
42 then I personally feel that those measures that you
43 feel necessary should be implemented. That's my
44 personal opinion.

45
46 MR. BUE: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you return, Don?

49
50 MR. RIVARD: Yes, Mr. Chair. I'm

1 prepared to give you somewhat of a summary here on what
2 happened on the Kuskokwim.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go right ahead.

5

6 MR. RIVARD: This was a report that was
7 delivered last week by Dan Gillikin, the fisheries
8 biologist with the Yukon Delta National Wildlife
9 Refuge. The title of the briefing is Chinook Salmon
10 Conservation Actions Resulting in Restrictions on
11 Chinook Salmon Fishing in the Kuskokwim River and Its
12 Tributaries in 2011.

13

14 A little bit of a background. Need to
15 talk a little bit about what happened in 2010. There's
16 a couple lower tributaries, the Kwethluk and Tuluksak
17 Rivers that did not achieve established chinook salmon
18 escapement objectives for the third and fourth
19 consecutive years in 2010. The Kisaralik River also
20 had the lowest aerial index count ever recorded in
21 2010, so it did not meet the lower end of its
22 established escapement goal.

23

24 Projected outlook for Kuskokwim River
25 chinook salmon for 2011 at the beginning of the season
26 was similar to the 2010 return. Again, the 2010 was
27 the lowest on record. Return of chinook salmon to the
28 Kuskokwim drainage has been declining since about 2004.
29 Since 1976 chinook salmon abundance has varied widely.
30 Total runs returned ranging from 140,000 to 470,000 and
31 escapements ranging from 56,000 to 358,000.

32

33 Again, the preliminary results here.
34 The directed commercial chinook salmon fishery was
35 discontinued in 1987 on the Kuskokwim. Since the year
36 2000 commercial harvest of chinook salmon has ranged
37 from 72 to 8,865 fish with exploitation rates ranging
38 from less than 1 percent to 3.7 percent of the total
39 return to the Kuskokwim River.

40

41 As many probably know, the Kuskokwim
42 River supports the largest subsistence chinook salmon
43 fishery in the state. Since 2000 the subsistence
44 harvest in the Kuskokwim Management Area has averaged
45 an estimated 73,584 chinook salmon with an estimated in
46 river harvest of over 98,000 in 2008 and over 78,000 in
47 2009. The majority of recent, from 2000 to 2010,
48 chinook salmon harvest has been by subsistence fishers.

49

50 In March of this year local area

1 fisheries managers met with the Kuskokwim River Salmon
2 Management Working Group, the Office of Subsistence
3 Management Staff, Regional Advisory Council members,
4 AVCP staff, village representatives and other
5 stakeholders to discuss and develop management
6 recommendations for the 2011 season.

7
8 One of the in-season management
9 strategies agreed on at the March meeting was to use
10 the corrected Bethel Test Fishery in-season data as an
11 indices of abundance and establish trigger points for
12 taking management actions based on that data,
13 specifically implementation of windows, which means
14 periods of closure, in the main stem of the Kuskokwim
15 River were discussed. They based it on some
16 statistical models from the test fishery data for years
17 when greater than 50 percent of the established
18 escapement objectives were met and for years when 50
19 percent were not met.

20
21 Additionally, it was agreed on that
22 more specific tributary and local area closures would
23 be necessary pre-season around
24 tributaries of particular concern to reduce stock
25 specific harvest resulting from river bank orientation
26 by returning chinook salmon.

27
28 So there were a number of actions taken
29 this year to conserve chinook salmon. The ADF&G did
30 some area closures for sportfishing. They also did
31 some area closures for subsistence salmon fishing.
32 They had a four-day subsistence salmon fishing closure
33 at one point and then another five-day subsistence
34 salmon fishing closure. The Federal Subsistence Board
35 authorized an additional three-day subsistence salmon
36 fishing closure at the request of the in-season
37 manager, Gene Peltola, of the Yukon Delta National
38 Wildlife Refuge with a fishing closure to Federally
39 qualified users. ADF&G at one point restricted
40 gillnets to 6 inch or less to avoid capturing chinook.
41 And then they also had an emergency order that closed
42 subsistence fishing as are usual six hours prior to
43 during the three hours after commercial opens.

44
45 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service staff
46 and management did not oppose the commercial fishery
47 opening after the Federal closure providing that no
48 incidentally caught chinook salmon are sold in the
49 fishery and that they may be retained for subsistence
50 purposes.

1 Again, there was quite a bit of action
2 that took place. Although chinook salmon escapement
3 objectives were not met for the majority of the
4 tributaries of the Kuskokwim in 2011, it is uncertain
5 that without imposing severe hardships on subsistence
6 users any action would have been possible.

7
8 There is still some concern about some
9 of the -- I know the Kwethluk and the Tuluksak at the
10 end did not meet escapement goals. So if we have
11 another run in 2012 similar to what we've seen the last
12 couple years, there's probably going to be similar
13 restrictions next fishing season.

14
15 Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll try to
16 answer any questions if anybody has any.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. That
19 was good to understand how the season went on the
20 Kuskokwim. Any questions from the Council on the
21 Kuskokwim River post-season report.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. I
26 appreciate that, Don. We did have that question
27 regarding the ability of the Federal Subsistence Board
28 to restrict motor sizes on the Aniak River. Just sort
29 of an informational. If you could just give us a quick
30 answer on that, I'd appreciate it.

31
32 MR. RIVARD: Yes, I did talk with one
33 of our solicitors and he referred me to ANILCA section
34 .815, subparagraph 3. Basically there's a couple of
35 things you can do. Restrict non-subsistence uses if
36 it's determined that it's needed to serve healthy
37 populations and/or to continue subsistence uses of a
38 resource. I did not hear all of what Carl Morgan said
39 about what was going on, but if, for example, these big
40 motor outboard motors were disturbing spawning grounds
41 on a regular basis, that could be construed as a
42 conservation concern. If that's the case or if there's
43 something else that Carl said I didn't catch, then your
44 Council could take the action of submitting a fisheries
45 proposal for the next cycle and that would be for
46 fisheries regulations that go into effect 1 April 2013
47 and also you could submit a special action request to
48 the Board if you thought you needed to take some kind
49 of action or they needed to take some kind of action
50 for the upcoming 2012 fishing season. That's it,

1 Mr. Chair.

2

3

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. I think we would need data to press a proposal like that. I think that would be a fisheries monitoring proposal. I would like to know if the Council would like the impacts of jet boats on salmon spawning on the Aniak River, if that would be a fisheries monitoring project. We would need a database to actually press a proposal like this. How would you feel about one of those being a project, Carl?

12

13

14 MR. MORGAN: I think we would need the data. They used to have a counting place up there at the Aniak River. But that's been discontinued, huh?

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Mike.

19

20 MR. THALHAUSER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mike Thalhauser with the Kuskokwim Native Association. Yeah, Carl, we did have a weir escapement project on the Salmon River, which is one of three tributaries emptying into the Aniak River and that has been discontinued as of 2009, which is the last year of the coho run reconstruction project that we were on. There is talk of it going back in, so that's something that KNA and Fish and Game has been working on.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we have time to consider a proposal like this and the fisheries monitoring proposal. I would like OSM to consider the impacts of jetboats on spawning stocks in shallow tribs as there's more interest in sportfishing. So I do think we would need a database.

36

37 So this is about as much time as we can spend on the fisheries issues. We have to return to the game proposals, so we'll be moving on here.

40

41 MR. RIVARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have noted your concern and the possibility of having this as a fisheries monitoring proposal.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. Appreciate that. So we were on Western Interior regional proposal. The proposals that we have now are WP12-57 and 58, Unit 24 moose, and so we'll have a presentation on the proposals.

50

1 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Trevor
2 Fox with OSM. Before I begin with WP12-57/58, I just
3 want to make sure everybody has a copy of the handout
4 of the regulations with the maps on the back. It
5 should be in your red folder. This will be important
6 when we get into the effects.

7
8 The combined analysis for WP12-57 and
9 58 begin on Page 150 of your meeting book. One of the
10 reasons I have this handout is there was an error in
11 printing out the meeting book, the maps didn't show up
12 very well, so this should be helpful.

13
14 Proposal WP12-57 was submitted by the
15 Alaska Department of Fish and Game and it requests an
16 alignment of Federal and State boundaries for the
17 winter moose season in Unit 24B. Proposal WP12-58,
18 submitted by the Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge, and
19 they're requesting additional language in the
20 regulations to clarify that a State registration permit
21 is allowed to harvest moose in the Kanuti Controlled
22 Use Area of Unit 24B during the fall and winter
23 seasons. The proposal also requests that additional
24 language be included in the regulations to describe
25 Federal public lands where a State registration permit
26 is not required during the winter moose season.

27
28 The proponent of Proposal WP12-57
29 states that this proposal would align State and Federal
30 hunt boundaries for the winter moose season in Unit
31 24B. The proponent believes the alignment of State and
32 Federal hunt boundaries would eliminate the need for
33 subsistence users to differentiate between State and
34 Federal public land within the drainages of the Koyukuk
35 River, downstream from and including the Henshaw Creek
36 drainage. This may reduce the possibility that a
37 Federally qualified subsistence user would
38 unintentionally violate hunting regulations while
39 hunting moose in the portion of Unit 24B near Bettles
40 and Evansville, which has a checkerboard pattern of
41 State and Federal land jurisdiction.

42
43 The proponent for Proposal WP12-58
44 requests clarification in the regulations for the fall
45 and winter moose seasons. The proponent believes a
46 State registration permit would be required to harvest
47 moose on closed Federal public lands within the Kanuti
48 Controlled Use Area during the September 1st through
49 25th season and December 15th through April 15th
50 season. The proponent believes this is an

1 administrative action request that parallels several
2 other hunts that have closed Federal public land and
3 use one permit for reporting. The proponent states
4 that the use of a single registration permit for the
5 winter moose season in Unit 24B would lessen the burden
6 on subsistence users and avoids duplicate harvest
7 reporting.

8
9 Also in 12-58 the proponent is
10 requesting the description of the section of Unit 24B
11 that is not covered by a State registration permit be
12 clarified for the December 15th through April 15th
13 moose season. Basically the language is correct in the
14 CFR and it states the area upstream of and including
15 the Bonanza Creek drainage. So that would be included
16 in the handy dandy book. They request also to add the
17 Fish Creek drainage be added to the area description.
18 These language descriptions are actually administrative
19 changes and they require no action by the Federal
20 Subsistence Board.

21
22 In 2010 the Alaska Board of Game
23 adopted State Proposal 94, which reduced the size of
24 the Kanuti Controlled Use Area under State regulations.
25 So now the boundaries of the Federal and State Kanuti
26 Controlled Use Areas are out of alignment. Also the
27 Alaska Board of Game adopted State Proposal 90A also in
28 2010, which established a December 15th through April
29 15th moose season in Unit 24B, except for the drainages
30 of the Koyukuk River upstream from the Henshaw Creek
31 drainage, excluding the North Fork of the Koyukuk River
32 drainage.

33
34 The Federal Subsistence Board adopted
35 WP10-67 with modification to expand the December 15th
36 through April 15th season to all Kanuti National
37 Wildlife Refuge and BLM lands of Unit 24B. So there's
38 some differences between the State and Federal hunts
39 here.

40
41 As far as the moose population goes,
42 the moose population on the Kanuti National Wildlife
43 Refuge has been relatively stable but at low levels
44 since 1999. Bull:cow and calf:cow ratios were above
45 the management plan objectives of 30 40 bulls per 100
46 cows and 30-40 calves per 100 cows in all survey years
47 since
48 1999. There's a table including that on Page 157.
49 These higher bull:cow ratio numbers suggest the
50 population can support current harvest levels.

1 Moose are an important subsistence
2 resource to residents of communities in Unit 24B.
3 Participation in the moose hunt is variable with
4 residents of Allakaket and Alatna harvesting more moose
5 and having higher participation rates than those from
6 Bettles and Evansville.

7
8 Approximately 95 percent of the moose
9 harvested throughout Unit 24, including Unit 24B, were
10 harvested during the September 1st through 25th season,
11 but the winter seasons provide opportunities for those
12 subsistence users that were unable to harvest a moose
13 in the fall.

14
15 Current and previous Federal moose
16 seasons that are beyond the September 1st through 25th
17 season, including seasons that have been in March, late
18 September and the recent December to April seasons have
19 been primarily used by residents of Allakaket, while
20 use among residents of Alatna and Bettles and
21 Evansville have been low. Overall harvest has been low
22 for all Federally qualified subsistence users and only
23 one moose was reportedly harvested out of 40 attempts
24 in these extended seasons beyond the September season.

25
26 So, as I get into the effects here is
27 when you'll want to have this handout ready to compare
28 some maps. Just a note. Proposals WP12-57 and WP12-58
29 would not affect the portion of Unit 24B within the
30 John River drainage, which has a separate August 1st
31 through December 31st Federal moose season. On your
32 map this is labeled as number 1.

33
34 Proposal WP12-57 is where we'll want to
35 compare Map 1 and Map 2. The proposal would align
36 Federal and State boundaries for this December 15th
37 through April 15th moose season by removing sections of
38 land around Bettles and Evansville. The best way to
39 see this is to look at Map 1, which is the current
40 regulations. If you look around Bettles and
41 Evansville, that portion north of there labeled 3 is
42 separate while currently Bettles and Evansville are in
43 that section marked 2, so that includes the winter
44 season we're talking about.

45
46 If this proposal was adopted, if you
47 look at Map 2, you'll see that the area is eliminated
48 and now it's part of that hunt section 3, which removes
49 it from the winter season, that December 15th through
50 April 15th season. So by removing this section of

1 Federal lands, current or future harvest opportunity
2 would reduced even though few residents currently
3 participate in these hunts, and that's the residents of
4 Bettles and Evansville, which have low participation
5 rates.

6
7 Going on to Proposal WP12-58, this
8 proposal proposes that a State registration permit be
9 required to harvest bull moose on Kanuti National
10 Wildlife Refuge and BLM lands during the September and
11 December 15th through April 15th seasons. However,
12 currently the State permit would not be valid because
13 much of the Federal public land in the affected area is
14 within the Federal Kanuti Controlled Use Area, which is
15 closed to the taking of moose except by Federally
16 qualified users, thus a Federal registration permit
17 would still be required unless there was some agreement
18 made between State and Federal land managers to allow a
19 State registration permit or potentially to institute a
20 joint State and Federal registration permit.

21
22 Both of these proposals would not have
23 a significant impact on the moose population in Unit
24 24B.

25
26 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
27 oppose WP12-57 because it would unnecessarily exclude
28 Federal public lands near Bettles and Evansville and to
29 support WP12-58 with the modification to create one
30 Federal registration permit for the fall and winter
31 moose seasons on Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge and
32 BLM lands in Unit 24B.

33
34 Federally qualified subsistence users
35 would be able to use this one permit as long as they're
36 on Federal lands within that area for the August 25th
37 through October 1st and the December 15th through April
38 15th season. So we're basically just trying to
39 simplify everything in this region, which I'm sure you
40 guys have been dealing with for a while.

41
42 That's all, Mr. Chair.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Trevor. Any
45 questions about the presentation from the Council.
46 Vince.

47
48 MR. MATHEWS: On Proposal 57, we've had
49 several meetings, not about Proposal 57 but about moose
50 hunting in the Allakaket and Alatna area. Pollock

1 could probably comment better on this, but we got some
2 information that people from Allakaket and Alatna do go
3 over to the Fish Lake area, which would be in the area
4 that 57 would eliminate. One person mentioned about
5 building a cabin there and I didn't have time to look
6 into land ownership. So, for 57, if that was to pass,
7 it also would impact residents of Allakaket and Alatna
8 if they go over there to hunt in addition. Pollock was
9 at that meeting when some of that information came
10 forward for it. Again, it was just at a meeting that
11 was discussed.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Vince. Did
14 you want to comment, Pollock.

15

16 MR. SIMON: What they were saying is
17 moose down in Allakaket area is pretty scarce in Unit
18 24B, like one moose every five square miles. They
19 changed the regulations and the boundaries to have a
20 moose season four months in the winter and only one
21 person got one moose. It's not easy to hunt moose in
22 the winter time. People are not hungry for bull moose
23 in winter time. They have no fat, they have tough
24 meat. It's easier to get bull moose in the fall
25 season. But, yeah, you've got to change the
26 regulations, change the boundaries. People just don't
27 care that much because there's no moose. That's my
28 comments.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Vince.

31

32 MR. MATHEWS: Being the subsistence
33 coordinator for Kanuti Refuge, I've been working with
34 the area biologist quite a bit on moose issues in that
35 area and I think you'll be discussing some of those
36 issues later in the agenda.

37

38 It's clear to me that the Refuge, the
39 OSM and Fish and Game all want to put the least burden
40 on the hunters in this situation, so that needs to be
41 clear on the record. It's how do we get there is where
42 there's some differences. The Refuge does not support
43 Proposal 57 and 58 we submitted it. Again, our goal
44 was to have the least burden so we can get the best
45 data so all the managers can manage that moose
46 population to get back to higher levels. As Pollock
47 has pointed out, there's low moose population, people
48 have to travel great distances. So anyway just to make
49 that clear. I don't know if wildlife conservation is
50 online.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Vince.
2 State comments, George, and then I had Glenn Stout on
3 there a while ago. Are you still on here, Glen.

4
5 MR. STOUT: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I'm still
6 on.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: How would you like
9 to proceed with this, George.

10
11 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
12 would defer to our area manager Glenn to discuss these
13 issues. I do have the Department comments here. For
14 this particular proposal they're in the packet that's
15 on the table. The expert on this issue is our
16 biologist area manager Mr. Stout.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead.
19 Your comments on both Proposals WP57 and 58.

20
21 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
22 know George has official State comments and so I guess
23 I will leave those up to him to read.

24
25 One of the key points to really
26 highlight in this discussion is, for instance, the very
27 issue that Vince just brought up about the possibility
28 of hunters from Allakaket going over into the Fish
29 Creek Lake area. That will still not be resolved with
30 Proposal 58 because it would still need in that State
31 closed area the Federal permit, so two permits would
32 still have to be employed. So the simplification that
33 we hope to achieve with Proposal 58 would simply not be
34 realized.

35
36 When we started on this process a
37 couple years ago to add in the additional four months,
38 we started off with a season that was just five days
39 and in an effort to come to a compromise we offered
40 four months of additional hunting opportunity and we
41 went from an area of approximately 2,000 square miles
42 to nearly 10,000 square miles. That was a pretty big
43 jump and opportunity offered by the Department to
44 address this problem, the winter hunt situation and
45 trying to align the seasons.

46
47 When we offered that, we knew we
48 couldn't offer the area over by Bettles because under
49 State regulation that would open up for all State
50 resident hunters. We've seen that situation before and

1 we knew that it was a problem if we opened up that area
2 where hunters could access on that Bettles ice road
3 into that hunt area, so we are in a situation where we
4 feel like in the State side we don't dare open up that
5 portion of the area, so we set those hunt boundaries
6 accordingly.

7
8 What we would like to see is just
9 simply an alignment of the boundaries on that greatly
10 increased area as we originally agreed upon and leave
11 it at that and then we could have a one permit system,
12 there would be no confusion over land status and no
13 potential for hunters hunting on State lands during a
14 Federal hunt.

15
16 *****
17 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
18 *****

19
20 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
21 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

22
23 Wildlife Proposal WP12-57/58:

24
25 GMU 24B Moose

26
27 WP12-57 proposed by the Alaska
28 Department of Fish & Game proposes a straight-forward
29 joint state/federal permit

30
31 WP12-58 proposed by the Kaunti Wildlife
32 Refuge proposes a hunt area boundary under federal
33 regulation that would be different from the state hunt
34 area and therefore escalate enforcement problems.

35
36 Introduction:

37
38 The abovementioned proposals have been
39 drafted in an effort to resolve ongoing confusion in
40 the area as discussions with state and federal managers
41 have not reached a mutually acceptable solution to
42 ongoing issues related to a patchwork of land ownership
43 in portions of the drainages of the Koyukuk River.

44
45 Impact on Subsistence Users:

46
47 WP12-57 would alleviate confusion for
48 subsistence users where WP12-58 would create further
49 confusion and enforcement issues.

50

1 Opportunity Provided by State:

2

3 ??

4

5 Conservation Issues:

6

7 ADF&G is unable to change the state
8 hunt area due to previous overharvest issues and the
9 close proximity to haul road accessibility of other
10 State resident hunters.

11

12 Enforcement Issues:

13

14 Although a dual permit would seemingly
15 work, Enforcement personnel report not favoring a dual
16 permit due to differing hunt regulations/qualifications
17 that apply to state and federal hunters and their
18 ability to enforce hunt conditions under two sets of
19 regulations.

20

21 Other Comments:

22

23 The federal government cannot pass a
24 regulation to make the State provide a permit on State
25 Managed Lands, for an area that is not open under State
26 regulations (the area upstream of Henshaw Creek).

27

28 Additionally, it is important to review
29 the hunting report card to see the problem with
30 non-alignment of the hunt area boundary. Only the
31 Kanuti Refuge federal lands were open during the 2006
32 and 2009 hunts.

33

34 Passage of WP12-58 would not address
35 simplification of permitting as USFWS would still issue
36 permits. ADF&G believes that maintaining two permits
37 for a portion of the unit is inconsistent and serves
38 only to continue confusion issues for users.

39

40 Should hunt areas become aligned, a
41 single state permit is logical and ADF&G would be fully
42 supportive. ADF&G is unable to change the state hunt
43 area due to previous overharvest issues and the close
44 proximity to haul road accessibility of other State
45 resident hunters.

46

47 While it is argued by the proposers of
48 WP12-58 that the hunt area above Henshaw Creek should
49 be retained on the basis of one hunter, ADF&G maintains
50 that in both years in which that hunter reported, he

1 was in fact confused, and hunted on State managed lands
2 under a Federal season (see map attached). This
3 demonstrates the need to eliminate confusion, and
4 demonstrates that no real loss of opportunity will be
5 jeopardized by alignment of the hunt areas. Federal
6 staff analysis reports that only one individual from
7 Bettles/Evansville has reported hunting hunted twice
8 and was not successful. Additionally, the Dec. 15-Apr.
9 15 season is in no way a longstanding opportunity as it
10 was first introduced just last year.

11
12 It should be noted that moose
13 concentrations are higher in the Henshaw Creek drainage
14 than the area hunted by the one individual reporting.
15 Henshaw Creek drainage is also closer to Bettles than
16 the area hunted; therefore the Spindler (pers. comm.)
17 is not accurate. Grayling creek is in fact 44 miles
18 from Bettles, whereas Henshaw creek drainage is just 23
19 miles.

20
21 Last year, ADF&G offered a compromise
22 concerning the winter hunt opportunity issue, by
23 expanding the winter season dates from 5 days to 120
24 days. The department also offered an additional
25 compromise expanding the winter hunt area from less
26 than 2,000 mi² to over 10,000 mi². Both of those
27 compromises benefited more than 95% of the hunters. It
28 is in the best interest of the subsistence hunters, for
29 the Fish & Wildlife Service to compromise on this small
30 area (<550 mi²). Such a small compromise would achieve
31 so much in eliminating confusion for local hunters.

32
33 Recommendation:

34
35 Support WP12-57 / Oppose WP12-58

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thank you.
38 Does the Council have questions of Glenn Stout on the
39 State's position.

40
41 MR. GERVAIS: I have a question, Mr.
42 Chair.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

45
46 MR. GERVAIS: So, Glenn, you're saying
47 that 57 is your preferred alternative between these
48 two?

49
50 MR. STOUT: Yes, through the Chair, Mr.

1 Gervais, that's correct.

2

3 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions from
6 Council on State's positions on the proposals.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. We'll
11 move down the list here. The Federal agencies, you
12 commented fully on Kanuti's -- I do have a couple
13 questions, Vince, on the permits for Bettles. My
14 question, Vince, is how many permits were issued to
15 Bettles people? I would like the Council to be aware
16 of how many permits were issued for the other Federal
17 lands that are currently opened for the winter hunt.

18

19 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I didn't bring that
20 material with me, but I think Trevor has it here in the
21 analysis how many permits were issued, so I'm not going
22 to attempt to answer that. It has been a low number,
23 there's no doubt, in that area around Bettles,
24 Evansville.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Which page is that
27 on, Trevor?

28

29 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If you
30 go to Page 159, you'll see Figure 2, the bottom figure
31 there, includes Evansville and Bettles and those are --
32 the dark black line is harvest, which is low there, and
33 then the lighter gray is the number of permits issued
34 for those years and you can see it's less than five.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The numbers I'm
37 asking for, there was a regulatory change for 2010,
38 which -- go ahead.

39

40 MR. FOX: I'm sorry. I gave you the
41 wrong number. It's Table 2 on 161 and these are the
42 different seasons, so this is outside of the September
43 5th through September 25th, so these are the seasons
44 after there. These are the Federal seasons. So in
45 2010 for the December 15th through April 15th there
46 was one issued and but it was not reported being used
47 and no harvest then.

48

49 MR. STOUT: Mr. Chair. This is Glenn
50 Stout.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Glenn.

2

3 MR. STOUT: Mr. Chair. We did provide
4 information and I think George may have that regarding
5 the use by Bettles and Evansville. The one in the
6 Table 2 that's reported in the book that the RAC has,
7 that one individual was two hunt areas that were used
8 during that one winter season. It was interesting to
9 note that the report card information that that
10 individual provided the two times he hunted in fact
11 demonstrated that he was on State managed lands during
12 his hunting activity. I think once again that just
13 highlights the problem that we're concerned with that a
14 Federal user, it's not clear to them where their
15 hunting area is and we'd be pretty concerned about
16 having that additional area continue to be open.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. So did you
19 have any comments on this presentation, Eleanor, since
20 you used to live down there in Bettles.

21

22 MS. YATLIN: When we did live there you
23 could see where they gave out the permits and the
24 number of moose that was taken was because, you know,
25 Al always hunted for everybody in Evansville and my
26 boys did too and Brett, but we're no longer there.
27 Brett is no longer there, so there's really -- there's
28 mostly elders and women, widows, no young men live
29 there.

30

31 I was just looking at this data and
32 that is pretty accurate and we know the moose was
33 depleted there pretty much. We saw that as I testified
34 numerous times. I'm really not catching all this. I
35 could see that they're trying to align the State and
36 the Federal to make it easier on everybody else.

37

38 One comment I would like to make on
39 taking the bull and doing the winter hunt, they do
40 pretty good -- like in Huslia area they do pretty good
41 on -- like when we have our winter hunt in March, the
42 Federal Controlled Use Area and where we are able to
43 hunt and where they can't go, they do pretty good on
44 presenting their maps and the area you are able to
45 hunt. I think it's pretty clear to people in Huslia
46 anyway, so I was thinking it was pretty clear to the
47 people of Allakaket and Alatna and Evansville. That's
48 all I have.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have a question

1 for you, Eleanor. Have you talked to people who have
2 harvested those winter bulls in Huslia and how do they
3 feel about the quality of those moose?

4
5 MS. YATLIN: The people that did go out
6 needed the meat, the families, and they're the ones
7 that get the permits. If they're lucky, they do get
8 them. They need the meat, the people that do go out,
9 and they're good. They're not as fat as the fall time.
10 It's late enough, March 1 through 5 is late enough in
11 the year. You know, they're good because it's needed.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Well, that's
14 -- you know, I've harvested bulls late in the winter
15 when we have the winter hunt like that, around March 1
16 to 10. They're in recovery at that time. They're not
17 like in December. It's like more like they're
18 recovered. So do you have a comment, Pollock.

19
20 MR. SIMON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.
21 A few years ago moose used to be fat when they eat the
22 river willows. They'd come down in early fall and eat
23 river willows. Now moose are staying in this area now
24 and they're not as fat as when they used to come down
25 the river. We used to catch them with almost two inch
26 fat on the rump. Now you can barely get a moose that's
27 has an inch of fat on their rump because the fire
28 burned all the dry stuff up. The moose that we eat,
29 they're not as fat as they used to. You know, they
30 always say that forest fires does good for moose, moose
31 health. I don't buy that. If they come down the river
32 and eat river willow, they'd be more healthier.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock. Go
37 ahead, George.

38
39 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm
40 checking off what hasn't been discussed in the State
41 comments that should be read into the record. Although
42 a dual permit would seemingly work, enforcement
43 personnel report not favoring a dual permit due to
44 different hunting regulations and qualifications that
45 apply to State and Federal hunters and their ability to
46 enforce hunt conditions under two sets of regulations.

47
48 Additionally, the Federal government
49 cannot pass a regulation that makes the State provide a
50 permit on State managed lands for an area that is not

1 open under State regulations, which is upstream of
2 Henshaw Creek. Additionally, passage of WP12-58 would
3 not address simplification of permitting as U.S. Fish
4 and Wildlife would still issue permits. ADF&G believe
5 that maintaining two permits for a portion of a unit is
6 inconsistent and serves only to continue confusion
7 issues for users.

8

9 Last comment. Should hunt areas become
10 aligned, a single State permit is logical and ADF&G
11 would be fully supportive. ADF&G is unable to change
12 the State hunt area due to previous overharvest issues
13 as Glenn mentioned earlier.

14

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, George,
18 for the clarification on the State's position. The
19 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee is not -- is there any
20 further Federal comments, Vince. Go ahead.

21

22 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I'm kind of going
23 out on thin ice here, so I'll be honest right from the
24 get go. There was a season earlier, winter season,
25 five days in that area. My understanding is the
26 parameters to eliminate a season is biologically
27 driven. So my understanding from the analysis and et
28 cetera there is not a biological question.

29

30 My understanding also winter hunts is
31 the way we talk about them is more of an insurance
32 policy if someone does not get a fall moose, moose in
33 fall, because that's a more desirable time. So those
34 were the reasons behind my understanding that it
35 resulted in the area up around Bettles, Evansville to
36 have this long December hunt.

37

38 So that's basically all I want to share
39 on that. I suppose we could do research and find a lot
40 of hunts where there's low participation, but I don't
41 know if that's the only reason it should be looked at
42 as possible removal. The same would apply for the
43 matrix of the land makeup. Since day one of this
44 program that has been a challenge, but my
45 understanding hunters are supposed to know where
46 they're at and what regulations they're hunting under.
47 So, with that, I'll just leave it at that and I know
48 that was covered in the analysis.

49

50 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Vince.
2 Tribal and Native village comments. Did the Allakaket
3 Tribal Council discuss these proposals at all, Pollock.

4
5

6 MR. SIMON: Yes, they did, but there
7 were not too many comments. There was a meeting in
8 Bettles and Evansville and Port Alatna and Allakaket
9 were there, so they also had discussion on it. I don't
10 know what became of it. I don't know what the outcome
11 is.

12
13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock. So
15 they made really no recommendation one way or another.

16
17

18 MR. SIMON: No.

19
20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Neighboring Regional
22 Councils, no comment.

23
24

25 (No comments)

26
27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Koyukuk River
29 Advisory Committee has not met and has no comment. The
30 Subsistence Resource Commissions.

31
32

33 MS. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chair. I do have
34 something from the Gates of the Arctic. For WP12-57
35 they oppose this proposal. Justification, the local
36 harvest in Bettles and Evansville would be negligible.
37 And on WP12-58 the SRC voted to support the proposal
38 because it simplifies the permit process. That's all.

39
40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any written
42 comments.

43
44

45 (No comments)

46
47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any public
49 testimony.

50
51

52 (No comments)

53
54

55 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We should address
56 each proposal separately for a vote, so the Chair will
57 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal WP12-57.

58
59

60 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.

61
62

63 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by James,
2 seconded by Jenny. Discussion on the proposal.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No Council
7 discussion. I'm going to discuss the proposal. The
8 Western Interior Regional Advisory Council recognized
9 the need for winter moose hunting opportunity for
10 Allakaket and Alatna. Their harvest had been reduced
11 by 75 percent through various years. We had tried
12 different winter hunts. The State came to the table
13 with a four month season and the Board of Game provided
14 this winter hunting opportunity for four months. This
15 winter hunt does have a sunset of 2014.

16
17 I'm concerned that Bettles is not
18 participating in this hunt and as stated by the harvest
19 report that the one participant was hunting on State
20 land. I'm concerned about that. I'm concerned that
21 Bettles is not utilizing the hunt. We're getting a lot
22 of heartburn about duplicity of permitting and the
23 State is a proponent that we should just drop back to
24 our agreed upon area starting at Henshaw Creek and stay
25 within the State hunt area, utilize one permit.

26
27 I'll point out a couple other things
28 about Bettles' use. They have trail access into the
29 Brooks Range that they can access caribou and they also
30 are tied to the Dalton Highway and they have customary
31 and traditional use in the Dalton Highway corridor area
32 and can harvest caribou from the road. I do want the
33 Council to be aware of their uses.

34
35 I'm concerned that Bettles is not
36 utilizing this winter hunt. The State has a real
37 concern about enforcement. I personally will vote for
38 Proposal WP12-57 because I feel that the State has made
39 a compelling argument and that we have tried this hunt
40 for one year, actually two years of administration, and
41 Bettles has shown a lack of interest. Allakaket and
42 Alatna, if you look at the numbers there, they are
43 participating in the hunt.

44
45 So I'm concerned that there will be
46 people that have already demonstrated on their harvest
47 report that they're hunting in a State land area and
48 it's not worth it. I don't want to lose the hunt in
49 the sunset. I don't want the Board of Game to have an
50 animosity because of lack of participation on the

1 sunset when this comes up for review in 2014 by the
2 Board of Game that we would lose the whole State
3 combined winter Federal hunt. So I intend to vote for
4 WP12-57.

5

6 Any further discussion.

7

8 Trevor.

9

10 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just
11 wanted to make a quick clarification. There is still a
12 little bit of seasons being out of align just with that
13 September 26th through October 1st. So just to clarify
14 that under both of these that that's out of alignment
15 with the State, so that would require an additional
16 Federal permit.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're not to
19 Proposal 58 yet.

20

21 MR. FOX: Right.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
24 discussion on Proposal WP12-57.

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 MR. J. WALKER: Question.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question has
31 been called. Do you have any comments, Tim. I
32 overlook you because you're online. Do you have any
33 comments.

34

35 MR. GERVAIS: No comment.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
38 being called on the proposal. Those in favor of the
39 proposal signify by saying aye.

40

41 IN UNISON: Aye.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to the
44 proposal signify by same sign.

45

46 (No opposing votes)

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Was there
49 abstentions? Did everybody vote for the proposal?

50

1 (Council nods affirmatively)
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Proposal 57 has
4 passed, the State's proposal. We move on to Proposal
5 WP12-58.
6
7 The Chair will entertain a motion to
8 adopt the Proposal 12-58.
9
10 MR. R. WALKER: I'll move.
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Robert.
13
14 MS. PELKOLA: Second.
15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny.
17 Discussion on the proposal.
18
19 MR. R. WALKER: Question.
20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I want to discuss
22 the proposal. I am in favor of this proposal. It does
23 have aspects that the Board can sort out to provide for
24 one permit for the fall and spring or the winter hunt
25 and so I would like the Federal Subsistence Board to
26 adopt Proposal 12-58 for administrative purposes for
27 administering the disparate Federal hunts from the
28 State. Any further discussion.
29
30 (No comments)
31
32 MR. R. WALKER: No.
33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No further
35 discussion. Those in favor of Proposal WP12-58 signify
36 by saying aye.
37
38 IN UNISON: Aye.
39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you vote, Tim.
41
42 MR. GERVAIS: I'm going to abstain
43 because I'm not understanding all the issues for 12-58.
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, the issue is
46 it's basically a housekeeping proposal, an
47 administrative proposal, to make one permit instead of
48 a fall permit and then a winter permit, so it's
49 basically a housekeeping proposal.
50

1 MR. GERVAIS: I'm still going to
2 abstain because I couldn't hear all the testimony and
3 stuff and I can't vote for something I don't know all
4 of it.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So we have
7 one abstention and eight Council members voting for the
8 Proposal 12-58. Go ahead, Chuck.

9
10 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. Chuck
11 Ardizzone. I just want to make sure I have this clear
12 on the record. So support 57 that would align the
13 boundaries. Support 58 to use some sort of one permit
14 system.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One permit for the
17 fall and winter hunt.

18
19 MR. ARDIZZONE: I just wanted to make
20 sure I had it right.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Basically it makes
23 it the easiest for the subsistence users that want to
24 participate in the hunt. You had a comment, Vince.

25
26 MR. MATHEWS: I understand. I'm not
27 asking you to revisit your vote. You're asking for one
28 single permit, correct? Is that Federal or State? Our
29 understanding from the State is that a Federal permit
30 will not apply to those closed lands. So has that been
31 cleared up that it be one permit period or do we still
32 have two permits that would have to be issued.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The State is not
35 recognizing the fall hunt extension. Do we actually
36 need to have Proposal 58 if it only applies to the
37 State for the winter hunt?

38
39 The intention is for administrative
40 purposes if there's a need for one permit for September
41 26 to October 1 and if there's a need for a winter hunt
42 on any other Federal lands that it's all under one
43 permit. We've eliminated basically all of those
44 contentious areas up around Bettles, so it may be the
45 winter hunt falls under the State regulations and maybe
46 Proposal 58 is not necessary anymore. What would be
47 your position? Is that your understanding?

48
49 MR. MATHEWS: Well, based on the State
50 comments -- let's go back. An Allakaket hunter hunting

1 the winter hunt, if they hunt on the State land, would
2 have to have a State permit. If they hunt also on
3 Federal land, they would have to have a Federal permit.
4 So that's not a single permit. That's why I'm confused
5 with the -- well, I'm not asking you to revisit the
6 motion. I'm just saying if the motion is for a single
7 permit, was that meaning a single Federal permit plus
8 the State permit or was it a single permit. It would
9 have to be State then.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, it's my
12 understanding there would have to be a Federal permit
13 to hunt on the Federal lands for the Federal -- it's a
14 dual season. So let's just clean this all up and have
15 one permit that applies to the fall extension only on
16 Federal lands and then include that on the Federal
17 lands in the winter hunt and that's Proposal 58.

18
19 MR. MATHEWS: I'm not communicating
20 clearly and maybe Glenn can do a better job, but the
21 understanding from the State is those closed lands
22 within the controlled use area, a Federal permit cannot
23 apply there. A State permit, excuse me. So Allakaket
24 hunters, for an example, will have to get a State
25 permit for that winter hunt and a Federal permit if
26 they decide to harvest a moose that presents itself
27 when they're out.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's my
30 understanding that when we originally did this proposal
31 in Fairbanks that there has to be a Federal permit on
32 the -- because of the closure aspect on the controlled
33 use area and so there has to be a Federal permit. That
34 was what Polly Wheeler drove home is that there has to
35 be a Federal permit for the winter hunt.

36
37 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chair. We're
38 actually beyond the motion. I mean we're debating an
39 issue.....

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

42
43 MR. MATHEWS:and I don't really
44 want to confuse you on it, but in answer to that there
45 are other hunts where there's a joint permit.

46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

48
49 MR. MATHEWS: In 58 and et cetera. I
50 don't have all those numbers on top of my head. All

1 I'm trying to say so that all the Council members
2 understand that it's going to be two permits for that
3 winter hunt.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Hmm.

6

7 MR. MATHEWS: There will be one Federal
8 permit for the fall seasons combined with the winter
9 seasons and then they're going to have to have a State
10 permit.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

13

14 MR. MATHEWS: Just so it's clear to
15 everybody. That's all.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I did understand
18 that part of it. But I do think this is the cleanest
19 thing for the subsistence users who are going to
20 participate in the hunt, so I do feel that the actions
21 of the Council have addressed that.

22

23 So I'm seeing a time out. We'll move
24 down the agenda in about 10 minutes.

25

26 (Off record)

27

28 (On record)

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're back on our
31 agenda. Carl Morgan said he had to leave the meeting.
32 He had to go visit a relative or something. He needed
33 to go by boat before it got dark. So he wants the
34 Proposal WP10-69 -- he wants to be here for the
35 deliberation of the proposal. That's fair. This is
36 his hometown. We will defer the proposal in our agenda
37 until he returns tomorrow morning.

38

39 We'll move on to our agenda. We're at
40 Proposal WP12-59 and 60. Go ahead, Trevor.

41

42 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
43 combined analysis for Proposals WP12-59 and 60 begin in
44 Page 166 of your meeting book. Both proposals were
45 submitted by the Defenders of Wildlife.

46

47 WP12-59 requests that wolf hunting not
48 be allowed in Units 19B and 19C in the months of
49 August, September, October, and April. WP12-60
50 requests that wolf trapping not be allowed in Units 19B

1 and 19C in the month of April.

2

3 In 2009, Defenders of Wildlife and the
4 Alaska Wildlife Alliance requested the same regulatory
5 changes. The Western Interior Regional Advisory
6 Council opposed those proposals as well as the Federal
7 Subsistence Board rejected them.

8

9 The wolf populations in Unit 19B and
10 19C are thought to be healthy and it appears that the
11 population of wolves is regulated more by natural
12 factors than by harvest of hunters and trappers.

13

14 If these proposals were adopted by the
15 Federal Subsistence Board, hunters and trappers will
16 still be able to take wolves on FWS, BLM, Denali
17 National Preserve, and Lake Clark National Preserve
18 public lands during August, September, October, and
19 April under State regulations. Therefore, the OSM
20 preliminary conclusion is to oppose Proposals WP12-59
21 and 60.

22

23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Trevor.
26 State comments, George.

27

28 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
29 I'll be summarizing. These proposals incorrectly
30 assume Federal subsistence wolf hunting and trapping
31 bag limits and season lengths are a part of a predator
32 control program. Predator management is the
33 responsibility of the State of Alaska. For impacts on
34 subsistence users, Proposal 59 would reduce Federal
35 subsistence user opportunity to hunt wolves in 19B and
36 C by 112 days, about a 40 percent reduction of the
37 season. Proposal 60 would reduce the Federal
38 subsistence users' opportunity in Unit 19B and C to
39 take wolf while trapping other species in the spring.

40

41 The current Federal subsistence season
42 bag limit for wolf trapping and hunting in 19B and C
43 have very little impact on wolf populations in these
44 units. Furthermore wolf control in adjacent 19A and
45 19D have little effect on wolf populations in 19B and
46 19C. Shorter Federal subsistence seasons resulting
47 from adoption of these proposals will create
48 enforcement issues in areas of mixed land ownership and
49 will cause confusion amongst users.

50

1 The Department opposes both of these
2 proposals.

3
4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5
6 **No official written comments
7 inserted/provided by State at this
8 time**

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, George. So
11 we have Federal agencies. Is there any Federal agency
12 want to comment on the proposals.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And tribal
17 organizations want to comment on the proposals, TCC or
18 KNA.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. InterAgency
23 Staff Committee comments.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Advisory Committee
28 comments.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: National Park
33 Service Subsistence Resource Commission comments.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Summary of written
38 comments.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any public testimony
43 on these two proposals.

44
45 (No comments)

46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Regional Advisory
48 Council recommendations. The Chair will entertain a
49 motion to combine these two proposals WP59 and 60 in
50 one motion to adopt. Do I have a motion to adopt the

1 proposals.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: I'll move to adopt.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do I have a second.

6

7 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by James.

10 Discussion on the proposals. Any Council discussion.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I will comment on
15 the proposals. The Defenders of Wildlife seems to be
16 of the impression that subsistence users will not
17 utilize wolves for personal and family consumption in a
18 non-wasteful manner. The hunting opportunity provided
19 by the Federal Subsistence Board and State of Alaska
20 provides subsistence users the opportunity to take
21 wolves throughout timeframes when they may be in the
22 field and when wolves could be utilized.

23

24 If the conditions are poor, if the fur
25 quality declines, subsistence users -- if I see a
26 rubbed wolf in April, I'm not going to shoot the wolf.
27 I'm not going to waste the wolf. I think that these
28 proposals actually are not recognizing that subsistence
29 users have discretion when taking resources. I don't
30 shoot a skinny moose. I don't shoot a skinny caribou.
31 I will let the caribou recover and heal up and maybe
32 next year I'll catch that caribou. So I don't feel
33 that the Defenders of Wildlife fully understand
34 subsistence uses in rural Alaska.

35

36 The disparate seasons between the State
37 and Federal would
38 be cumbersome for the public and there's really no need
39 biologically for these proposals to be adopted by the
40 Federal Subsistence Board, so I oppose both proposals
41 and intend to vote against them.

42

43 Any further discussion by the Council.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 MR. COLLINS: I concur with those
48 comments, no biological reason.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing no further

1 discussion, those in favor of Proposals WP12-59 and 60
2 signify by saying aye.

3

4 (No aye votes)

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
7 sign.

8

9 IN UNISON: Aye.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposals failed
12 unanimously. Moving on in our agenda. The next
13 proposals are block proposals for Unit 18. In
14 discussion with the Council, all of these Proposals
15 WP12-42, 44/48, 45/49, 47, 50, 52, 53, all of these
16 proposals are in Unit 18. Several of the Council
17 members wanted to block them together and defer the
18 proposals. Discussion by the Council on deferral, does
19 the Council want to go through each proposal or what's
20 the feeling of the Council members especially from Unit
21 21E on these varied proposals. Do you want to continue
22 through the analysis.

23

24 Go ahead, Robert.

25

26 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. I'd like
27 to defer them back to the home base.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Would that be the
30 wishes of the Council, to defer these proposals back to
31 the Federal Subsistence Board and the Y-K Delta Region.

32

33 (Council nods affirmatively)

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see affirmative.
36 Is that okay, Eleanor.

37

38 MS. YATLIN: (Nods affirmatively)

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Pollock. Tim, do
41 you see these block of proposals.

42

43 MR. GERVAIS: Yes. Just block them
44 together and defer them.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. It's the
47 consensus of the Western Interior Regional Advisory
48 Council to defer these proposals. Do we need to take a
49 vote on this.

50

1 MR. R. WALKER: Yes.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Chair will
4 entertain a motion for deferral of WP12-42, 44/48,
5 45/49, 47, 50, 52 and 53 to be deferred to the Federal
6 Subsistence Board and to the home region of Y-K Delta
7 Regional Advisory Council. Do I have a motion to that
8 effect.
9
10 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Jenny.
13
14 MR. COLLINS: I'll second. I do have a
15 question. By deferring does that mean that we will
16 agree with whatever that region agrees with?
17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. We're deferring
19 the proposal to the Federal Subsistence Board. It's to
20 their discretion.
21
22 MR. COLLINS: So none of them require
23 concurrence from us then.
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Any further
26 discussion on the proposals, deferral of the proposals.
27
28 (No comments)
29
30 MR. R. WALKER: Question.
31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question has
33 been called. Those in favor of deferral of the
34 proposals signify by saying aye.
35
36 IN UNISON: Aye.
37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Unanimous deferral.
39 We're moving on to WP12-69, Unit 25D caribou. This
40 proposal affects me personally, so we will hear the
41 analysis for WP12-69. Carl requested WP10-69 to be
42 deferred until tomorrow morning when he comes back from
43 a trip he had to go on today.
44
45 Are you going to make a presentation
46 for this, David.
47
48 DR. JENKINS: Proposal WP12-69 was
49 submitted by the Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence
50 Regional Advisory Council, requests a change in the

1 customary and traditional use determination in Unit 25
2 remainder from all rural residents to residents of Unit
3 25.

4
5 The proponent expresses concern that as
6 the Fortymile Caribou herd expands it may draw
7 Federally qualified subsistence users from outside Unit
8 25.

9
10 In 1998, the Federal Subsistence Board
11 adopted a customary and traditional use determination
12 for caribou in Unit 25D for rural residents of Units
13 20F, 25D, and Manley. For the remainder of Unit 25, the
14 Board made no specific customary and traditional use
15 determination, which meant that all Federally qualified
16
17 users were eligible to harvest caribou in Unit 25,
18 remainder.

19
20 The communities in Unit 25D include
21 Stevens Village, Beaver, Birch Creek, Fort Yukon,
22 Chalkyitsik, Venetie, and Circle; Arctic Village is in
23 Unit 25A; and Central is in Unit 25C. There are no
24 communities in Unit 25B.

25
26 The analysis you have in front of you
27 went through an analysis of the eight factors by which
28 we analyze customary and traditional use
29 determinations. Briefly, for units of 25D and
30 communities in 20F and Manley, that analysis was found
31 in a proposal from 1998, which concluded that
32 historical and contemporary Gwich in Athabascan
33 territories encompassed Unit 25D, portions of which
34 were also used by Koyukon Athabascan. Members of these
35 Athabascan communities recognized and continue to
36 recognize caribou as an important subsistence resource.

37
38 Evidence of patterns of use includes
39 caribou fences, traditions associated with hunting,
40 seasonal hunts, traditional means of storage, meat
41 distribution through networks of kin, and the
42 incorporation of caribou into a larger pattern of
43 resource use, which included sheep, moose, bear,
44 waterfowl, small game, fish and other resources. These
45 patterns broadly persist to the present day.

46
47 I should point out that residents from
48 a number of Federally qualified rural communities
49 statewide have hunted caribou with
50 a joint State/Federal permit in Unit 25. You can see

1 that listing. I think it's in Table 2 and you can see
2 where rural residents have come from to hunt as
3 Federally qualified users in Unit 25. That's on Page
4 277.

5
6 Factor 4 of the eight factors by which
7 we analyze customary and traditional use refers to
8 being near or reasonably accessible from the community
9 or area. If we take that factor into consideration,
10 rural residents from outside of Unit 25 who hunt
11 caribou in Unit 25 may be reasonably excluded from a
12 customary and traditional use determination with a few
13 exceptions.

14
15 There is no available information
16 indicating that the harvests by residents of
17 communities outside of Unit 25 should be included in
18 the customary and traditional use determination
19 for Unit 25. For these residents, Unit 25 is not
20 reasonably accessible. The exception may be residents
21 in Unit 24A, which is why you're listening to this
22 proposal.

23
24 Residents of Coldfoot harvest caribou
25 in Unit 25, as shown in Appendix A of this analysis.
26 Between 2000 and 2009, Coldfoot residents were issued 3
27 permits for Unit 25 and harvested 2 caribou. Residents
28 of Wiseman and other Unit 24A residents also hunt
29 caribou in Unit 25. So for these residents, Unit 25 is
30 reasonably accessible and should be considered for a
31 positive customary and traditional use determination.

32
33 The effect of the proposal would be to
34 exclude Federally qualified users from outside of Unit
35 25, with the possible exceptions of those residents in
36 Unit 24A, from harvesting caribou under Federal
37 regulations in the remainder of Unit 25, that is Units
38 25A, 25B, and 25C.

39
40 If the proposal is adopted as written,
41 then recognition of customary and traditional use of
42 caribou for residents of Unit 25 would not be provided
43 to those who have a pattern of use, you can see that in
44 Table 2, who come from elsewhere.

45
46 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
47 support with modification this proposal. The
48 modification would be to include residents of both Unit
49 25 and Unit 24A. The argument is that residents of
50 these communities exhibit the eight factors required to

1 provide a customary and traditional use determination
2 for them.

3

4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, David. Does
7 the Council have any questions for David's
8 presentation.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have one question
13 myself. This proposal broadly uses 25 C&T when
14 specifically Unit 25 has five different caribou herds.
15 The Eastern Interior is addressing one caribou herd
16 within Unit 25. In reality, Eastern Interior
17 overlooked the fact that they have multiple caribou
18 herds in Unit 25 and they have multiple user groups.
19 They use specific herds and didn't use other specific
20 herds. I'm positive people north of the Yukon River in
21 Unit 25A did not use caribou in the White Mountains and
22 down in Unit 25D to the south.

23

24 So the reality is this proposal has
25 many flaws. I was concerned that the broad based
26 application of this proposal did not specifically
27 address the issues the Eastern Interior was trying to
28 get at, and that was to define who utilized Fortymile
29 Caribou Herd.

30

31 The preliminary conclusion, I agree
32 with, to modify the proposal for Unit 24A residents to
33 be included in C&T use, but not for the broad 25, only
34 for 25A. That would be the use area that we
35 specifically use is Unit 25A, which is a very vast area
36 to the northeast of where I currently reside and the
37 people that utilize that portion of 25A consistently.

38

39 I wanted to point out that some of the
40 analysis did not take into account the five different
41 caribou herd within Unit 25A. I think the Federal
42 Board should recognize there are different herds and
43 different user groups for each one of those herds. I
44 do think that the Federal Board should be aware that
45 Unit 25 has multiple sub-units and that should be
46 analyzed in their deliberation.

47

48 So that would be my comments on the
49 analysis and I see why you're working on 25 because
50 that's what Eastern Interior threw on the table, but

1 Eastern Interior painted a wide brush and it needs to
2 be a little finer point.

3

4 Okay. George, go ahead.

5

6 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Our
7 comments appear on Page 282 and I'll do a little
8 summarizing there. If adopted, Federal subsistence
9 users who are residents of Unit 25 will be granted
10 proprietarial opportunity to harvest caribou in Unit 25
11 Remainder under Federal regulations. If adopted,
12 Federally qualified subsistence users residing outside
13 Unit 25 will be prohibited from participation in this
14 Federal caribou hunt.

15

16 On the State side, hunting is by joint
17 State/Federal registration permit with a fall and
18 winter season. The State resident fall season is
19 August 10th through September 30th in the roadless
20 portion of the herd s range and August 29th through
21 September 30th in the road accessible areas. The State
22 non-resident fall season in the roadless area is August
23 10th through September 20th. The bag limit is one bull
24 for all fall seasons. The State winter season in
25 restricted to residents only and is December 1 through
26 February 28th with a bag limit of one caribou. All
27 hunts are subject to openings and closings on
28 short notice to prevent overharvest.

29

30 This proposal resulted from Eastern
31 Interior Regional Advisory Council participation in the
32 Fortymile Caribou Herd Harvest Coalition which includes
33 the Council, six State Fish and Game Advisory
34 Committees, Yukon First Nations, and Yukon Government.
35 The intent of the proposal may have been to change the
36 C&T use determination for only Unit 25C. This needs to
37 be clarified.

38

39 The Department supports Unit 25C, but
40 makes no recommendation for other areas within Unit 25.

41

42 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, George. I
45 was wondering why the Department's comments also didn't
46 differentiate between the five different herds in the
47 various sub-units and user bases. Is it strictly
48 because of the way the proposal is written?

49

50 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 That potentially may lead to it, but in our
2 introduction these comments specifically address the
3 Fortymile Caribou Herd. As I understand, that is part
4 of the intent of the Department is to address
5 specifically the Fortymile Caribou Herd.

6

7 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Well, I know
10 where the Eastern Interior was going with this, but it
11 opens a bigger can of worms. I mean there's some
12 various aspects to be considered. There may be some of
13 these other groups may be actually harvesting from the
14 Dalton Highway in Unit 25A from these other areas.
15 Those other areas cannot utilize firearms but they may
16 utilize other means of bow and arrow access.

17

18 I wanted to point these issues out.
19 This whole list of Skagway, Haines and other places may
20 be actually utilizing the Dalton Highway 25A, so rural
21 residents may be excluded that may be utilizing 25A
22 also, which has harvestable caribou at this time. I
23 personally don't feel that 25A needs a customary and
24 traditional use determination at this time. I'm more
25 lenient for other users, so I do want to point out the
26 flaws in this proposal.

27

28 This proposal has some other aspects
29 that wasn't turned. It was looked at as a ball, but it
30 has different facets to it. I want the State and OSM
31 to be aware that this proposal has multiple aspects of
32 five different herds, multiple sub-units and the Board
33 and the State should consider the various impacts to
34 what's going to happen if this proposal passes. So I
35 would like the State to reconsider some of these
36 things.

37

38 Go ahead, David.

39

40 DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. I just wanted
41 to point out one aspect. Your point is well taken
42 about the multiple herds. The Federal program doesn't
43 make C&T determinations by herd, so we need to put that
44 into the mix as well.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal is
47 regarding the Fortymile Caribou Herd though. That's
48 where Eastern Interior started talking about herds. I
49 feel that Eastern Interior should have deliberated the
50 sub-units that the Fortymile Herd resides in and

1 addressed those sub-units, not the broad-based 25
2 approach. This is the flaw of their whole proposal.
3 It's got everybody making these assumptions. The
4 Federal Board C&T doesn't use herds, but the Eastern
5 Interior is designating herds and concerns about a
6 specific herd and the premise of the proposal and they
7 should have addressed that in specific sub-units where
8 the Fortymile Herd resides.

9

10 George.

11

12 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you very much. I
13 definitely agree with what you're saying. The State --
14 the least firm of our comments are the C&Ts. We're
15 here to hear information. I assume the record you're
16 building now will be translated to the Eastern Interior
17 next week so they can clearly state on the record the
18 intent of this proposal.

19

20 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. That's why
23 I'm speaking this all onto the record because I want
24 that to be conveyed to the Eastern Interior Regional
25 Council as part of our comments. So we've done the
26 State comments. Do we have any Federal agency
27 comments.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any tribal comments.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any InterAgency
36 Staff Committee comments.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Advisory groups. Is
41 there Advisory Committee comments from Fortymile.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: National Park
46 Service Resource Commission.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Written comments to

1 this Council.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any public

6 testimony.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're at Regional

11 Council recommendation. I would like a motion to

12 support aspects of the OSM preliminary conclusion to

13 support Proposal WP12-69 with modification, but

14 modification that would include residents of Unit 24A

15 and customary and traditional use determination for

16 caribou in Game Management Unit 25A, not all of 25

17 remainder.

18

19 So that would clarify to the Eastern

20 Interior Council that it's specific C&T. If they want

21 to go for a C&T request for 25A, that it should include

22 25A residents within Unit 24A as customary and

23 traditional use recognition. Do you have a comment

24 there.

25

26 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair. Point of

27 order. I think if we move to support it, bring it on

28 the table, then we would amend it to do what you just

29 accomplished. I don't think in a motion we can amend

30 the main proposal. See what I mean?

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

33

34 MR. COLLINS: So why don't we bring

35 that motion to the table and then amend it.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We can do it

38 that way. My mistake. So I'd like to see support of

39 the OSM preliminary conclusion for WP12-69 with

40 modification to get it on the table. Do we have a

41 motion to that effect.

42

43 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Jenny.

46

47 MS. YATLIN: Second.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Eleanor.

50 Under discussion. I would like the motion to be

1 amended to reflect the customary and traditional use
2 for residents of Unit 24A be for Game Management Unit
3 25A, not all of Unit 25. Can I get an amendment to
4 that motion.

5

6 MR. COLLINS: I'll move to amend to
7 restrict the motion to Unit 25A only for residents of
8 24A. So moved.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do I have a second
11 to that amendment to the main motion.

12

13 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny.
16 Any further discussion on that amendment.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
21 the amendment signify by saying aye.

22

23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Now to the main
26 motion to support WP12-69 with modification with
27 further modification by the Western Interior Regional
28 Advisory Council. Any further discussion on the main
29 motion.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 MR. COLLINS: I move to support as
34 amended.

35

36 MR. GERVAIS: I have a question, Jack.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Moved as
39 amended. Go ahead, Tim.

40

41 MR. GERVAIS: I thought the issue that
42 Eastern Interior is trying to draft is the caribou in
43 25C, so why don't we have a modification to why don't
44 we have a modification to address that rather than get
45 into the 25A part?

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, it's my
48 impression that the Eastern Interior is going to try
49 and drive a customary and traditional use determination
50 for all of Unit 25A and I want to be on the record as

1 defining 24A residents as using Unit 25A. That
2 accomplishes -- that quells my fear that at the Federal
3 Board process there will be a broad brush applied to
4 this proposal. Does that make any sense?

5
6 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. So do you want a
7 modification that C&T for 25C is only for residents of
8 Unit 25 also in addition to what you've already
9 modified?

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, they have it
12 divided into 25D and then 25 remainder. This remainder
13 issue is what we're addressing in the modified proposal
14 with amendment. Does that make sense to you? I don't
15 want to do the Eastern Interior's business of defining
16 who's going to hunt in 25D. I don't want to get into
17 their realm. I just want them to be aware that we need
18 to have a C&T for 24A residents in Unit 25A. I don't
19 want to get into their workload. Does that make sense,
20 Tim? Go ahead.

21
22 MR. GERVAIS: All right. But in doing
23 that are you going to exclude every resident of the
24 state other than 24A and 25?

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, it at least
27 puts the known people who hunt in Unit 25A on record.
28 If the Federal Subsistence Board wants to delve into
29 who else hunts in Unit 25A from rural Alaska, they can
30 do that on their own. We're just getting on record
31 from the Western Interior aspect that these are the
32 known users in 24A that utilize Game Management Unit
33 25A for caribou and the Federal Subsistence Board can
34 sort out at the meeting whether there's other rural
35 residents that hunt in Unit 25A. But this puts us
36 where we need to be for our region.

37
38 Any further discussion on the modified
39 proposal with amendment for Proposal 12-69.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. We're
44 on the main motion. Those in favor of Proposal 12-69
45 as modified by OSM with amendment by the Western
46 Interior Regional Advisory Council to include residents
47 of Unit 24A for Game Management Unit 25A for positive
48 customary and traditional use determination for caribou
49 in Unit 25A signify by saying aye.

50

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you vote, Tim.

4

5 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, I voted for that.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There's somewhat of
8 a delay or something with your phone and it kind of
9 skips a little bit. So the modified proposal 12-69 as
10 amended by the Western Interior Council is adopted
11 unanimously.

12

13 Moving further into our agenda. We
14 have now completed everything but WP10-69, the C&T for
15 Unit 21E and Carl will return tomorrow morning and
16 we'll look at that. We still have about an hour and a
17 half. Can we move into this Tri-RAC Customary Trade
18 Subcommittee status report. That would be next on our
19 agenda here.

20

21 DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. That's me as
22 well. I'll give you some background on that. The
23 Tri-RAC Customary Trade Subcommittee is made up of
24 members of the Y-K RAC and the Eastern Interior and
25 Western Interior RACs. You have sitting here three
26 members of that subcommittee, Jenny Pelkola and Robert
27 Walker and Ray Collins.

28

29 They attended the first meeting. There
30 was a second meeting. Don Honea and Ray Collins
31 attended the second meeting. I'll give you some
32 background on this. The subcommittee had a
33 teleconference in April to set their agenda and they as
34 members of the subcommittee decided what issues they
35 wished to address. It wasn't an OSM driven or Federal
36 Subsistence Board driven process. It was subsistence
37 users along the length of the Yukon River who were
38 getting together to try to figure out what to do about
39 customary trade.

40

41 So they made their agenda and they
42 first met in May for two days and they came up with
43 three proposals to limit customary trade and they did
44 that in the context of declining chinook runs. The
45 whole issue was generated by declining chinook runs.
46 Discussions kept coming back to that central fact.

47

48 So the first three broad regulatory
49 changes that the subcommittee suggested were these.
50 Preclude customary trade of Yukon River chinook salmon

1 between rural residents and others. Second, allow
2 customary trade of Yukon River chinook salmon between
3 rural residents within the Yukon River drainage with a
4 \$750 limit per household. Third, require a subsistence
5 Yukon River chinook salmon permit in recordkeeping form
6 with three components. Those components would be a
7 harvest permit calendar for Yukon River chinook salmon,
8 a customary trade recordkeeping form and a transfer of
9 possession form.

10
11 Those three proposals were sent out for
12 public comment and we, by email and by mail, sent these
13 proposals to as many users on the Yukon River that we
14 could get to. Tribal groups, tribal corporations,
15 YRDFA helped us distribute this information. So we
16 broadcast it as broadly as we could. We followed that
17 up with a postcard reminding people that they could
18 comment on these three broad changes to customary trade
19 regulations.

20
21 The subcommittee met again in August
22 and considered in detail the responses from the public.
23 We got about 20 written responses ranging from a two or
24 three line email to a seven or eight page very
25 carefully crafted response. The subcommittee went
26 through all of these responses and modified their three
27 proposals and came up with one preferred solution to
28 customary trade of Yukon River chinook salmon.

29
30 This is what they came up with and I'll
31 read it. Because of declining chinook salmon runs, the
32 Tri-RAC subcommittee recommends the following
33 regulation to govern customary trade of Yukon River
34 chinook salmon: Customary trade of Yukon River chinook
35 salmon may only occur between Federally qualified rural
36 residents with a current customary and traditional use
37 determination.

38
39 The subcommittee justified that as
40 their main alternative in this way. They thought that
41 by allowing customary trade only between federally
42 qualified rural residents with a customary and
43 traditional use determination for Yukon River chinook
44 salmon, the hope was to curtail large customary trade
45 exchanges involving chinook, which are reported to
46 occur in urban areas of Alaska and may rise to the
47 level of a significant commercial enterprise.

48
49 The idea was that in times of low
50 abundance chinook should remain within the Yukon River

1 drainage system for subsistence uses. The subcommittee
2 thought that it would reduce overall chinook salmon
3 harvest, which may allow fisheries managers to minimize
4 subsistence fishing restrictions and provide managers
5 additional fish to meet drainage-wide escapement goals,
6 which also has the potential of improving future
7 returns.

8

9 In addition, the subcommittee thought
10 that by allowing customary trade in this way fishers
11 could recover reasonable expenses for traditional
12 subsistence activities. So this was the main proposal
13 that the subcommittee came up with.

14

15 They also came up with an alternative
16 proposal for RAC review. The alternative was to
17 preclude customary trade of Yukon River chinook salmon
18 between rural residents and others to establish a \$750
19 limit per calendar year per qualified household and
20 require customary trade recordkeeping and receipt
21 forms. That was an alternative proposal. It wasn't
22 the preferred one.

23

24 Mr. Chair. Perhaps it would be useful
25 or perhaps not to remind everybody what customary trade
26 refers to. Would that be useful?

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

29

30 DR. JENKINS: Customary trade is a
31 recognized and protected subsistence use under ANILCA.
32 It refers to the exchange of fish in this instance for
33 cash as long as those exchanges don't reach the level
34 of a significant commercial enterprise. There have
35 been two regions that have adopted cash limits, Bristol
36 Bay and the Upper Copper River and those cash limits
37 are about \$500. So that's what they thought was the
38 significant commercial enterprise cap.

39

40 Federal regulations specifically refer
41 to the customary trade of fish, their parts and their
42 eggs. Customary trade is getting more complicated
43 because the State of Alaska argues that if you sell for
44 commerce processed fish, then State health regulations
45 apply. The Federal Subsistence Board has adopted that
46 argument and has made the same point.

47

48 So what we're really talking about here
49 when we talk about customary trade is whole unprocessed
50 fish and not processed fish like strips or canned fish.

1 So with that clarification we can move -- and Ray and
2 Jenny and Robert can provide other details.

3

4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, David. Any
7 questions from the Council on the customary trade
8 subcommittee meetings. Ray.

9

10 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I should point out
11 that there is concern about members of the Yukon even.
12 They have family members in town and so on that they
13 want to continue to share that with. But it was
14 pointed out that you can still share through barter.
15 Barter has no cash limits. So you can give fish to
16 relatives in town or you could exchange it for food or
17 gas or something else under the barter provision. But
18 it stops a sale to anyone outside the area. If cash is
19 involved, it would be another village member that's
20 working maybe that wants to pay you to do their
21 subsistence fishing and so on. So there's still way
22 under barter to share it with a larger customary
23 community

24

25 For myself, there's real disappointment
26 that there isn't a recognized way to sell strips.
27 Strips don't even come under customary trade because of
28 the money involved and the State and there should be
29 efforts made to get around that somehow. I mean it was
30 pointed out that a farmer can put up jams and jellies
31 and so on and sell them at a stand without meeting
32 health regulations.

33

34 The biggest use of salmon strips has
35 been a long-standing practice to sell salmon strips.
36 For our area that's probably the biggest customary
37 trade item that's gone on and now we're saying that
38 both on the Federal and State side it's not allowed
39 because you don't process them properly. So at some
40 point we ought to push that point and get the State to
41 modify. The people that buy them know what they're
42 getting. That's what they want. They want
43 traditionally processed fish. So that was my comments.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I really appreciate
46 those comments. I feel that a part of the Western
47 Interior's comments to the Federal Subsistence Board on
48 the Customary Trade Subcommittee should include the
49 recognition by the Federal Subsistence Board of
50 customary and traditional preservation practices as

1 part of customary trade for salmon on the Yukon River
2 or within the Western Interior Region.

3

4 Do you feel that would be a good thing
5 to do, Ray?

6

7 MR. COLLINS: Yes, I concur with that
8 point. The reason the preferred alternative is the one
9 that was stated in there is we didn't want to get into
10 the recordkeeping and the amounts and so on except the
11 dollar amount. So if you don't want to go in that
12 direction, then you could accept our first one that
13 would keep it within the drainage for the sales. That
14 way we didn't have to -- there wasn't concurrence
15 between the three committees on the dollar amount.
16 That \$750 was one proposed before, but some questioned
17 what that was. To avoid that, if it stayed within the
18 drainage, then it doesn't say how much you can sell
19 within the drainage.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: But, yeah, I think an
24 important point is to make the point that that has been
25 the customary trade practice within the area, the sale
26 of those strips.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Making an amendment
29 to this whole thing may be inappropriate, but it could
30 be put on our annual report that the Federal
31 Subsistence Board should recognize customary
32 preservation practices as part of customary trade
33 drying, jarring and conveyance. That should be part of
34 our annual report. This is an issue that this Council
35 has recognized since day one when we talked about
36 customary trade and that the Federal Subsistence Board
37 -- because State health regulations allow farmers to
38 jar jam and stuff like that, there is absolutely no
39 reason that the Federal Subsistence Board can't
40 recognize customary trade preservation practices as
41 part of customary trade and I would like to see that on
42 the annual report.

43

44 Is that agreeable to the Council for
45 the annual report.

46

47 (Council nods affirmatively)

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, I see
50 affirmative. Thanks for bringing that point up, Ray.

1 MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

4

5 MR. GERVAIS: That preservation, I mean
6 it's not just strips, it's eating fish and fish caught
7 for dogs also. I mean all that, as far as the State of
8 Alaska is concerned, is profit you make on a knife cut
9 on a fish so it constitutes processed fish. As far as
10 I know, there's hardly any traditional or customary
11 trade practices dealing with unprocessed fish on the
12 Yukon. They have non-processed fish as the crux of the
13 whole deal has been inaccurate historically.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. It's one of
16 the primary flaws in the customary trade regulation is
17 raw, unprocessed fish trying to align with State health
18 regulations when the State of Alaska ignores customary
19 and traditional preservation practices in rural Alaska.
20 I do feel that customary trade should be recognized.
21 The Federal Subsistence Board should recognize
22 customary preservation, you know drying salmon or
23 processing in any various ways the Federal Board would
24 so direct.

25

26 This Council could enumerate the
27 various methods of preservation. But we do just want
28 to be on the record as customary preservation practices
29 in rural Alaska that are employed in customary trade
30 and that will be an annual report topic. Is that
31 understood, Tim.

32

33 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, that's good.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: David.

36

37 DR. JENKINS: Can I make a clarifying
38 point. Actually this is part of what's confusing.
39 Federal regulations do not speak to whole unprocessed
40 fish. Federal regulations are clear. They say you can
41 sell under customary trade fish parts and their eggs.
42 That's the phrase. What gets confusing is that the
43 State then says if you process a fish and that fish
44 enters commerce, you are a business and you then are
45 under health State regulations.

46

47 So the Federal regulations do not speak
48 to whole unprocessed fish. They say fish parts, eggs,
49 can be sold under customary trade. It just gets more
50 complicated when the State comes in and then the

1 Federal Subsistence Board agrees with that State
2 position.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate that
5 clarification. I still want that to be as part of our
6 annual report that the Federal Board will recognize
7 that there is customary preservation practices for
8 those parts or eggs of fish.

9

10 Any further discussion on -- what point
11 are we at here, David. Oh, go ahead, Pollock.

12

13 MR. SIMON: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I just
14 wanted to comment on customary trade that has been
15 going on with the river people for centuries, but now
16 there's going to be restrictions, cut back on their
17 fishing. I just wanted to say that if the people are
18 cut back, it should be across the board. Fishermen in
19 high seas take a lot of fish too, so they should also
20 take a cut.

21

22 Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock. I
25 appreciate those comments also. David.

26

27 DR. JENKINS: I can tell you what the
28 next steps will be in this process.....

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

31

32 DR. JENKINS:if that would be
33 helpful. After the Councils have all deliberated on
34 customary trade, the RACs that are involved on the
35 Yukon River customary trade, and the public comments
36 have been gathered, then these Council deliberations
37 and public comments will be taken back to the
38 subcommittee, which will be reconvened to consider
39 those comments. Then the subcommittee decides on a
40 proposal to submit. The proposal would then go through
41 the Federal regulatory process for fish beginning with
42 the publication of the proposed rule and a call to
43 change regulations. So the Councils then would provide
44 recommendations on that proposal during the 2012 fall
45 meetings and the Federal Subsistence Board would then
46 take action in January 2013.

47

48 So that would be the series of steps
49 that would happen after this point.

50

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, David. At

4 this point, it's my impression that we need to adopt

5 the work of the Tri-Council Customary Trade

6 Subcommittee, their options 1 and 2.

7

8 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.

11

12 MR. COLLINS: I would move that we

13 support the proposition one of the committee.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Only one.

16

17 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That shows which

18 direction we're leaning. Because there's two put

19 before us.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I see.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: So if we agree with the

24 primary one, then we should tell the committee then.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's right.

27

28 MR. COLLINS: So I would move to

29 support the preferred alternative.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you want to read

32 it into the record. I can read it into the record.

33

34 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, you read it.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Customary trade of

37 Yukon River chinook salmon may only occur between

38 Federally qualified rural residents with a current

39 customary and traditional use determination. So the

40 main motion is to adopt this language by the Western

41 Interior Regional Advisory Council.

42

43 MR. COLLINS: Well, to support.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: To support his

46 language. That's the motion. Do we have a second.

47

48 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by James.

1 Any further discussion on this specific language for
2 customary trade.

3

4 MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

7

8 MR. GERVAIS: Why do we keep referring
9 to it as chinook salmon? In the Western Interior it's
10 referred as king salmon.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Would you like to
13 reply to that, David. It's my perception that most
14 fisheries managers use chinook. The Federal
15 Subsistence Board uses chinook and bycatch. We could
16 use king salmon, but that's basically the most
17 accepted. The scientific community uses chinook, just
18 like they're using inconnu for sheefish. Would that be
19 your perception, David?

20

21 DR. JENKINS: Yes, Mr. Chair.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.

24

25 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I think it
26 would be very easy to just put brackets king afterwards
27 so that when it goes out to the communities they know
28 what we're talking about. That would be an editorial
29 change, I think, if that's more acceptable.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The OSM can clarify
32 that by putting brackets for chinook with king salmon
33 inside bracket. We won't change that at this time.
34 Any further discussion, Tim.

35

36 MR. GERVAIS: No, thank you.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
39 discussion by the Council on adoption of this customary
40 trade language.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Hearing none.
45 Adoption of the main motion, all those in favor of the
46 main motion signify by saying aye.

47

48 IN UNISON: Aye.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same

1 sign.

2

3

(No opposing votes)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

We adopted this last March and what did not happen was there were three additional Regional Advisory Councils, Northwest, Arctic and North Slope, that did not review the hunting plan recommendation. Because they are appointing sources for the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission, for them to move this recommendation forward needs their at least review during their meeting of this hunting plan recommendation so that it can be forwarded to the Secretary of Interior.

So we've reviewed the plan. The

1 Western Interior has adopted the plan. The subsistence
2 coordinator for the SRC sent it to all three RACs to
3 make sure it got on the agenda and she's actually
4 attending their meetings because of this. So that's
5 why this is on the agenda. It's sort of a status
6 update for the Council.

7

8 Moving down to agenda item 14, review
9 and comments on the Board of Game statewide and
10 Arctic/Interior proposals. I don't know if other
11 Council members have received the Alaska Board of Game
12 regulatory proposal book for 2011-2012 proposed changes
13 to regulations for Arctic/Western Region, the statewide
14 regulations in Interior Region. It's a fairly thick
15 book of about three-quarter inches thick.

16

17 I just received this book about 10 days
18 ago. I was hunting until the end of September, but on
19 the plan down here I reviewed various proposals and
20 there's several proposals in this book that would
21 affect the Western Interior Region. So there are some
22 what I would consider high priority proposals that the
23 Council should actually review. Are there other State
24 proposal books present in this meeting? Where's
25 George. We're down on the agenda to review and comment
26 on the Board of Game's statewide proposals. Do you
27 have any additional proposal books?

28

29 MR. PAPPAS: (Shakes head negatively)

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Vince, come to the
32 mike.

33

34 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Jack, already knows
35 I've been reviewing those proposals, so if I could get
36 a few moments to get a hold of Staff we could, with
37 assistance from the State, get copies of those
38 proposals here. The reason I bring that up is the
39 Board of Game meeting for any Interior -- I don't want
40 to confuse you because there's State proposals -- is
41 March 2nd to 11th. You tend to meet in March, so you
42 would lose your opportunity to comment. But I would
43 just need time to get a hold of Staff to get on my
44 computer and get that information to you. Jack knows
45 what I did. I reviewed all the proposals and separated
46 them by refuges, which would be for Kanuti, but I'm
47 sure I could sit down with others and show you Koyukuk
48 and then Innoko if that's what you desire. I think we
49 can get you the proposals.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Let's go through
2 some procedures here. When is our next meeting,
3 Melinda. I think it's the very end of February, right
4 previous to the Board of Game meeting. I think the
5 Board of Game meeting starts on the 2nd of March.

6
7 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, it starts on the 2nd
8 of March for Interior. I'm drawing a blank. The
9 statewide, which I think you have interest on, I think
10 that's in November, but maybe the State can clarify
11 that.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Josh, do you want to
14 come to the mike. We may have time to address some of
15 these proposals in our spring meeting, but we should
16 make comment on the statewide proposals at this meeting
17 because we'll lose our opportunity for the January
18 meeting.

19
20 MR. MATHEWS: He can find that out. I
21 know it's either November or January. And then you
22 would have to schedule your spring meeting, if that's
23 the right term, before March 2nd.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Our meeting does
26 fall before March 2nd, so statewide proposals will be
27 reviewed by the Board of Game on January 13th to the
28 17th, a five-day meeting. The Arctic Region proposals
29 will be a Barrow meeting in November. There are a
30 couple Arctic proposals that I would like this Council
31 to review for 26B caribou bag limits. That's an
32 important issue for the Arctic and the statewide -- I
33 think we can deal with the Interior Region proposals at
34 our spring RAC meeting. 19 is still within Region 3.

35
36 MR. PEARCE: Yes, Unit 19 is. There
37 were a couple other proposals affecting the McGrath
38 area office that I had identified that I was going to
39 talk to you about tomorrow, I guess. At any rate,
40 there is, just so you know, at the November meeting in
41 Barrow there's a proposal that would affect the
42 boundary between Unit 18, 19A and 21E. You might want
43 to comment on that. And then at the statewide meeting
44 there's a proposal related to -- the first one is
45 Proposal 21. The next one is Proposal 131, which would
46 add a bear control component to the 19A intensive
47 management plan. Might be another one you're
48 interested in commenting on. Then, of course, the
49 Region 3 meeting I'm sure there's multiple proposals at
50 that.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I will state
2 that this book is very cumbersome and the State Board
3 of Game process made this very cumbersome for the
4 public. I'm on the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee
5 and I want the State to be aware that this publishing
6 one book with multiple meetings and multiple proposals,
7 this has become much harder for the general public.
8 I'm positive the general public is going to have a hard
9 time with this new Board process.

10
11 We do have some interest. State
12 regulatory process highly affects the Western Interior
13 Region. I would like Vince to get some of the
14 highlighted proposals that you've identified and we
15 need to deal with these statewide proposals, the Arctic
16 proposals and the two proposals here that Josh has
17 enumerated, 21 and Proposal 31.

18
19 MR. PEARCE: I think it was 131.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we'll take a
22 little bit of a break so we can configure on how we're
23 going to approach some of these State proposals.

24
25 We'll take about a 10-minute break here
26 to figure this thing out a little bit.

27
28 (Off record)

29
30 (On record)

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The meeting's coming
33 back to order. Review and comments on Alaska State
34 Board of Game and Arctic Interior proposals. The
35 Interior Region 3 meeting is just after our RAC meeting
36 in February. We don't have to deal with those. This
37 Council does have to comment on some statewide
38 regulatory proposals because that meeting will be held
39 in January. So we do have to address them. So I would
40 like to have State and Federal Staff provide the
41 proposals for Proposal 50, 92, 93, 102, 104 and
42 124. We'll review those proposals.

43
44 Melinda.

45
46 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, Jack, what we'll
47 do is -- tonight, when we get back to the lodge, I'm
48 going to download these on a jump drive and Mike has
49 graciously agreed to get these printed for us first
50 thing in the AM so you'll have them in your hands

1 tomorrow.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So the
4 Council can review these statewide proposals. There's
5 some black bear baiting proposals here. There's some
6 other proposals that may have merit, but those would be
7 the most concerning at this time that the Council
8 should deal with. And the advisory committees can also
9 review these. We'll have those printed up for
10 tomorrow. I'm sorry that I didn't have enough time to
11 review and break these out as to which meeting was
12 going to occur where.

13

14 We still about 45 minutes. So we have
15 agency reports, so we should knock off a few of these
16 agency reports. We have tribal and non-governmental
17 organizations. We have TCC and KNA. If TCC has any
18 comments that would like to be presented to the
19 Regional Council, go ahead. Reports rather.

20

21 MR. DUPUIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
22 Sir, you'll have to excuse me, this is my first RAC
23 meeting. Don't be shy of reprimanding me for breaking
24 the Robert's Rules or anything like that.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: State your name for
27 the record.

28

29 MR. DUPUIS: My name is Aaron Dupuis.
30 I'm the Partners biologist with Tanana Chiefs
31 Conference. I'll just give you guys a brief overview
32 of what we've been doing this past year. Kind of the
33 first thing that happened was we were involved with the
34 Subsistence Net Exchange and those in response to the
35 recent regulation changes on mesh size in the Yukon
36 River. We used the monies that came from the disaster
37 declaration to purchase subsistence nets that would be
38 considered legal, so 7.5-inch and 6-inch nets. Then we
39 distributed those to the subsistence fishers within our
40 region. That was a very big success. I think we had
41 about 617 nets go out to people within our area. I
42 think that was very well received. We were very happy
43 to be able to help folks out like that.

44

45 The next thing that went on was we were
46 involved in the.....

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: If I could ask one
49 question on that. Did you inadvertently or advertently
50 select these nets for Mono Twist gear or was that the

1 cheapest price or it just happened to happen that way?

2

3 MR. DUPUIS: I can't speak to that with
4 any authority, but my impression with it -- I wasn't
5 there when they ordered all the nets.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you.
8 Continue.

9

10 MR. DUPUIS: So we were also involved
11 with the subsistence catch monitoring for the king
12 portion of the salmon and that involved several
13 different communities from Holy Cross all the way up to
14 Eagle. I think we had maybe 20 subsistence fishers
15 involved with that throughout the various communities
16 and we were able to get approximately 1,700 samples
17 back and those samples included age, sex and length and
18 then genetic information. Those pieces of data have
19 been shipped off to the ADF&G lab in Anchorage and
20 we're still awaiting results of those data. It will be
21 exciting to get some of that back to see what was
22 happening with the subsistence catch given the changes
23 in regulations. So we're interested in taking a look
24 at that.

25

26 The final project that we were involved
27 with this summer and that was the Henshaw Creek Weir.
28 There were some comments earlier about chinook and chum
29 numbers on the Koyukuk River. The numbers that we got
30 on Henshaw Creek, which is in the upper Koyukuk River,
31 it's about 30 miles upstream of the village of
32 Allakaket, so it's pretty high up there in the system.
33 We were able to count 248,247 chum salmon, which is the
34 highest number ever counted at that weir in the 10
35 years of operation. We also counted 1,767 king salmon,
36 which was also the highest number ever recorded through
37 the weir. As with the subsistence catch data, we're
38 still waiting on the age data to come back from that.
39 So I'm also interested in seeing if there were any
40 differences given the changes in regulations on the
41 Yukon River this year.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you genetically
44 sample randomly throughout that run?

45

46 MR. DUPUIS: At Henshaw Creek?

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: At Henshaw.

49

50 MR. DUPUIS: Not this year, we did not.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Have you done that
2 previously there?

3
4 MR. DUPUIS: I believe it's been done
5 in the past. I believe it was to help create the
6 baseline, the genetic baseline for sampling.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see. Okay,
9 thanks.

10
11 MR. DUPUIS: And we do not have plans
12 in the future to do that. However, I have submitted a
13 proposal to actually use an ultrasound machine on the
14 weir to help validate our sex assignments to determine
15 male and female fish because there was some dispute
16 within the Department of Fish and Game about how well
17 we have been assigning sex up there because in the past
18 something the male/female ratios that have been
19 recorded coming over the weir have been a stark
20 contrast to weir river projects, so we're looking
21 forward to doing this validation to kind of end the
22 discussion on that. I'm really excited and I hope that
23 works out.

24
25 Are there any other questions from the
26 rest of the panel for TCC.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does the Council
29 have questions on TCC's projects.

30
31 MR. J. WALKER: One question, Jack.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James.

34
35 MR. J. WALKER: Did you note the size
36 of the kings, say Y3, going upriver?

37
38 MR. DUPUIS: In respect to the
39 subsistence sampling?

40
41 MR. J. WALKER: Yes.

42
43 MR. DUPUIS: Yes, that information was
44 recorded. The biologist in charge of that is Lisa
45 Kangas and she is still analyzing those data. If any
46 of the board members are interested, I can get you guys
47 those data when they become available and you can just
48 get a hold of me afterwards and I can get your
49 information so we can disseminate that for you.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions
2 of TCC projects.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don't see any.
7 Thank you very much. I think they were all very
8 worthwhile and congratulate TCC on these. These are
9 very important issues that TCC has been working on.

10
11 Thank you.

12
13 MR. DUPUIS: Thank you very much, Mr.
14 Chair. Thank you to the rest of the board.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So TCC. Now we have
17 KNA. Come up to the mike, Mike.

18
19 MR. THALHAUSER: Thank you, Mr. Chair
20 and Council. Mike Thalhauser with Kuskokwim Native
21 Association. Melinda is passing around kind of a quick
22 information packet on the different projects that we
23 ran over the last -- these are all from 2011 and I just
24 want to touch briefly on one project from 2010 that we
25 haven't talked to this Council about. So I'll just go
26 through these projects one by one and if anyone has any
27 questions on each one, feel free to stop me as we go
28 through.

29
30 The first, in 2011 KNA cooperated on
31 the George and Tatlawiksuk River weirs with the
32 Department of Fish and Game. This was generally a
33 really successful year for both of those projects. We
34 had some inoperable periods, but both of those weirs
35 were -- just during the coho run I'd say we probably
36 missed about 20 percent of the silvers for the George
37 River and probably around 30 percent of the
38 Tatlawiksuk. I actually have the last two pages here
39 on both sides of those the escapement for the four
40 species of salmon that we monitor at these weirs. The
41 George and the Tatlawiksuk are the third and fifth. I
42 actually included the weirs from the Kwethluk and the
43 Takotna just for your information. All the weirs
44 basically if you're looking through those go from lower
45 river tributaries to upper river tributaries.

46
47 Generally most of the trends were
48 similar for the drainage for each species for chinook
49 salmon. We had a generally low escapement year. A
50 little bit higher than last year, but it was generally

1 low. We had an excellent chum and a pretty good silver
2 run this year on the Kuskokwim and both of those
3 projects we cooperated on and sockeye was average to a
4 little below average.

5
6 I'll let you go through those and if
7 anyone has any questions as we go on, please let me
8 know. As always, the two weirs that we cooperate with
9 Fish and Game on we also operated at those projects our
10 high school internship. I'll talk about that next.

11
12 Basically the high school internship
13 was our first education program that we started at KNA
14 and it sort of evolved over the years. This year we
15 actually operated our two cooperative weirs, the George
16 and the Tatlawiksuk, as well as the Kalskag fishwheels
17 that we used as part of the sockeye tagging project
18 this year. Basically what the high school internship
19 is, it's a way for us to get youth in our communities
20 out to the projects to see what's going on, to go
21 through a week-long salmon curriculum and to see what
22 it's like to be able to work at one of the weirs and
23 just to see what we're doing up at these tributaries.

24
25 It's really been one of our better
26 outreach avenues. The kids that go through this
27 program, A, do it usually one year after another and
28 some of them will actually end up being fourth year
29 interns by the time they're out of high school, so they
30 can kind of see some trends just while they're up at
31 the weirs in escapement and bring that back to their
32 community.

33
34 And something that we've sort of
35 developed over the years is we've had kids, like I
36 said, coming to the weirs for one, two, three,
37 sometimes four years in a row and by the time you're in
38 the third year you've dissected salmon with the same
39 person a couple times, so it gets a little monotonous.
40 Last year and a little bit the year before that we
41 started doing second and third year curriculums where
42 we do more advanced lessons with the kids, having them
43 pick their own projects, calculating stream discharge
44 and actually doing projects. All in all, it's a really
45 good program, especially the work we've done with Fish
46 and Game. They've been really helpful in mentoring the
47 high school interns. We were lucky enough to have one
48 of our previous interns from Stony River this year hire
49 on as a full-time technician. So I think we're really
50 starting to see the fruits of the high school

1 internship program.

2

3 This year we had high school interns
4 from I guess Kongiginak all the way up to Stony River,
5 so it's not quite just in the KNA region. I think word
6 is starting to spread and we worked with ONC. They
7 sent us a few kids that were interested in that. So we
8 had a few from Bethel. It's just kind of a drainage-
9 wide thing.

10

11 So the Kalskag fishwheels and the
12 sockeye run reconstruction project is not an OSM-funded
13 project. This one is actually through the Alaska
14 Sustainable Salmon Fund. This project is similar to
15 the run reconstructions we did with king salmon and
16 coho salmon. Basically we're tagging sockeye at
17 Kalskag and looking at passage past our weirs and
18 trying to develop or try to find out the in-river
19 abundance of sockeye salmon above Kalskag.

20

21 With this project we've added a new
22 weir, the Telaquana Lake, which is at the head of the
23 Stony River in the Lake Clark National Preserve. That
24 specific weir is looking at lake-type sockeye. In the
25 Kuskokwim we're kind of unique in that we don't have
26 more of a strictly lake type or strictly river type.
27 We have a pretty good mix of both. So we have one weir
28 that's on the Kogrukluuk in the Holitna drainage that is
29 a really good sort of identifier of river type sockeye
30 and the Telaquana has proven to be a pretty good one or
31 a very good one for the lake type.

32

33 So we've got one more year of that
34 project 2012 and what we're hoping to do with that is
35 once we get the abundances for 2010 through 2012 is to
36 pair that with data that we have. It's kind of
37 sporadic from about 1975 to now and with less
38 confidence as you go back, but still some good
39 confidence to be able to estimate what the abundance
40 was from the mid '70s through now and that will give us
41 a good way of -- kind of as a report card for
42 management decisions and harvests over those years and
43 environmental factors as well.

44

45 Our post-season surveys. I don't have
46 a whole lot to say on this one. We run the surveys in
47 Aniak and the Department of Fish and Game runs that
48 throughout the rest of the drainage with the exception
49 of Bethel, which ONC conducts there. We're just getting
50 started on those in about a week here in Aniak.

1 Everybody is done fishing, so we'll be hitting the
2 streets pretty soon for that one.

3

4 I already hit on our high school
5 internship. I guess one thing I didn't say is we had I
6 think 10 high school -- no, 11 high school interns this
7 year, a mix of first year, second year and third year
8 and actually one fourth year intern. I think we're up
9 to about 150 as far as since the program has been
10 around.

11

12 Our college internship is another
13 education program that we have and that's basically
14 hiring local students interested in fisheries careers.
15 With the wide array of projects that we have going on
16 throughout the drainage we try to get those college
17 interns through as many projects and as many diverse
18 projects that we can. Some of them are fishing with
19 environmental companies doing baseline work actually at
20 the mine site for their environmental company they have
21 doing their baseline data and they worked at our weirs
22 tagging program and sheefish tagging. We were doing
23 some pike radio-tagging. So really a whole lot of
24 experience and that worked out really well this year.
25 We had some excellent college interns.

26

27 Another education program that we have
28 going on and it's actually going on right now and this
29 is our most recent education program that since we have
30 the high school internship and the college internship,
31 the only thing we really were missing to get that flow
32 from young kids that are interested in just fish say to
33 someone being in a career in fisheries or really the
34 main goals as far as I see it is having them be active
35 and educated so they can participate in Councils like
36 this and participate in the management of the
37 fisheries.

38

39 So what we were missing in that sort of
40 line was the K through 12 aspect of it, so we have a
41 fisheries educator I think some of you guys met last
42 night. His name is Scott Fritz. He takes a two-year
43 curriculum and sort of goes back and forth between
44 salmon biology and watershed ecology. We're trying to
45 use the projects that we work on to teach math and
46 science in the schools. So we've cooperated with
47 Kuspuk School District here, from Lower Kalskag up to
48 Stony River, and that's been working out really well.
49 He's in the schools from, I guess, a couple weeks ago
50 till the end of December.

1 I guess one other project that isn't on
2 here that I wanted to hit on was a Bering cisco
3 genetics project that we worked on
4 with U.S. Fish and Wildlife last year. Pretty much a
5 year ago today that we were out sampling. Basically
6 the background on that is Bering cisco actually spawn
7 in just three places in the world that we know of. One
8 being on the Yukon, one population on the south fork of
9 the Kuskokwim or so we thought, and one in the Susitna.

10
11
12 There's a commercial fishery at the
13 mouth of the Yukon that right now is an experimental
14 commercial fishery where they harvest about 10,000
15 pounds of Bering cisco or about 10,000 fish.
16 What this study was looking at is trying to find the
17 stock composition of that commercial harvest and really
18 just to get some beginning information on Bering cisco
19 because it's one of the whitefish that we really don't
20 know that much about yet. So finding out where they
21 spawn and getting some genetics is a good place to
22 start.

23
24 KNA did the genetic sampling on the
25 south fork, so last year I traveled up and worked with
26 one technician from Aniak and some folks from Nikolai
27 and Kevin Whitworth that used to work with the Refuge
28 in McGrath. We traveled up to Nikolai and past there
29 about 40 or so miles and ended up, with help from
30 people of Nikolai for sure. That was a really good
31 outreach effort with Nikolai and they were super
32 helpful. So that was part of that project and we did
33 get the samples and they got the samples from the other
34 two drainages, so that work is still being done. Then
35 they also collected genetics from the actual harvest,
36 so we'll be able to see if those are Kuskokwim fish,
37 Yukon fish, Susitna or a mix.

38
39 I guess with that just future projects,
40 Bering cisco project sort of was a spur for a project
41 that you guys adopted in the FRMP program proposals
42 earlier, which is actually a KNA-led project, which is
43 pretty significant for us because it's our first
44 project as the primary investigator and so that's
45 basically building on the work we've done with Bering
46 cisco. Starting next year we'll be tagging 25 Bering
47 cisco down in Kalskag and 25 in Nikolai and looking at
48 where those go and how long it takes them to get there.
49 The ones we tag by Kalskag we'll be able to see if any
50 Bering cisco are going in any other drainages. And

1 then the ones on Nikolai we'll be sure that those will
2 make it to the spawning grounds because they're so
3 close.

4

5 So I've been working with the folks in
6 Nikolai and we'll be hiring a technician up there and
7 I'm going to hold a community meeting up there this
8 winter to try to get in before we actually start doing
9 work. We'll actually put out 50 tags like that in 2012
10 and 2013 just as kind of a redundancy in case we have
11 bad weather for telemetry flights or something like
12 that.

13

14 We also with ADF&G put in for a
15 cooperative project. 2013 will be the last year for
16 sockeye, so if that's funded through AKSSF we'll be
17 working with them to do a chum reconstruction project,
18 which is really similar to the coho and the other
19 species that we've already done.

20

21 I think that's about it. Does anyone
22 have any questions.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Council questions.
25 Ray.

26

27 MR. COLLINS: One. When you go to
28 Nikolai, are you going to try to get that information
29 in the school? It would be interesting to get that
30 information that one of the only areas located is up
31 the south fork above Nikolai. To get that to the
32 younger people in school as well as working with some
33 of the adults.

34

35 MR. THALHAUSER: Yes. I usually end up
36 sleeping at the schools when we do a community meeting,
37 so it's kind of a good in with the teachers. Yeah, I
38 think we'll definitely try to work something out where
39 we get to spend some time there. I've also been
40 working with Lisa Stubie, who's done Kuskokwim work on
41 sheefish, and Ken Harper, who's done work on broad
42 whitefish and humpback whitefish, and I think we're
43 going to try to do a joint whitefish sort of meeting up
44 there. Since we'll all be coming through McGrath it
45 would be nice to hit that too. So, yeah, that's
46 something that we're looking forward to this year.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions.
49 James and then we'll take you, Tim. Go ahead, James.

50

1 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you. In regards
2 to -- did you mention you had a test fishery on the
3 mouth of the Yukon?

4
5 MR. THALHAUSER: The test fishery --
6 it's not a test fishery like the test fishery on the
7 Kuskokwim where they're going out drifting every day.
8 This is a commercial fishery and they call it an
9 experimental commercial fishery, so they're not --
10 since we don't have any real abundance estimates,
11 they're keeping it really -- their harvest numbers
12 really low at this point since there really isn't too
13 much to add on which fish they're catching and how many
14 fish there are to catch. So right now it's stalled at
15 10,000 pounds.

16
17 These fish go to a kosher market in --
18 I want to say it's in New York. Really, there's as
19 much demand as possible for these whitefish with some
20 of the declines in the Great Lake whitefish. I guess
21 these Bering cisco, from what I've seen in a newspaper
22 article, actually the New York Times, where these are
23 some of the best smoked whitefish that they've seen in
24 that market.

25
26 MR. J. WALKER: My question would be
27 more to is it primarily in Y1 or Y2?

28
29 MR. THALHAUSER: I'm not sure which
30 district it is. I can look into that and find out for
31 you.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you.
34 You've got a question, Tim.

35
36 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
37 Mike, is there any demand for commercial fishermen on
38 the Kuskokwim to start doing the commercial harvest of
39 the Bering cisco on the Kuskokwim River?

40
41 MR. THALHAUSER: Not that I know of.
42 Like I said, maybe it's just because they're easier to
43 catch in the mouth of the Yukon. That's really the
44 only place we know where they're congregated, which is
45 why we think it might be a mixed stock fishery. But I
46 haven't heard any pressure of that yet.

47
48 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you for your
49 report. It's very interesting.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Tim. Any
2 other comments on the KNA report.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My comment would be
7 I'm real happy to see your appropriation of so many
8 students in your programs. I also congratulate you on
9 many successful projects. You've been doing a great
10 job for KNA there, Mike. Thanks.

11
12 MR. THALHAUSER: Thanks.

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we have OSM
15 management status reports on Secretarial Review
16 recommendations. That would be on Page 286 of our book
17 here. Go ahead, Chuck.

18
19 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. Chuck
20 Ardizzone for the record. Since you look all so wide
21 awake I thought I'd just read them.

22
23 (Laughter)

24
25 MR. ARDIZZONE: No, all these briefings
26 are written there in your books, Page 286. I'm just
27 going to try and touch some of the high points.

28
29 The status report of the Secretarial
30 Review items, as we all know, our program went under
31 review by the Secretary and the Secretary made a number
32 of recommendations to the Board and the Board has been
33 addressing those recommendations and working through a
34 number of issues. The only issue that we have results
35 from is adding two new members to the Board. The final
36 rule was published and the Secretaries are seeking
37 applicants and nominations for individuals for those
38 two positions on the Board.

39
40 I believe Melinda handed out a letter
41 to everybody. It should be in your folder. It shows
42 how to apply or how to have someone nominated. Just to
43 be clear, this is not run through our office. It's run
44 through the Office of the Secretary, so OSM has nothing
45 to do with this. This is very similar to the Board
46 Chairman process.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My question to that,
49 Chuck, is this has been widely dispersed to all the
50 village councils and I would really like to see a large

1 pool of applicants. If Council members know anybody
2 that would like to sit on the Federal Subsistence Board
3 and advocate and vote on subsistence proposals, I would
4 really appreciate getting the word out in the various
5 communities.

6

7 You have a comment there, Melinda.

8

9 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I included one
10 copy in each of your folders so you're welcome to take
11 that and make copies and I made a big stack as well, so
12 if you'd like to take them to your home communities,
13 you're more than welcome to do so.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Melinda. I
16 appreciate that. Chuck.

17

18 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. On this
19 same issue I just wanted to point out that the closing
20 date is the end of this month, October 31st. If you
21 know anybody, try and get their name in as best you
22 can.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions on the
25 Secretarial Review process and the two new Federal
26 Subsistence Board appointments from the Council.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none.
31 Thanks, Chuck.

32

33 MR. ARDIZZONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
34 If you look on Page 287 and 289 there a number of other
35 issues that the Board has addressed or will address.
36 Number 7 is a number of issues that the Board has not
37 addressed due to funding. Just to be clear, if you
38 look on Page 289 there is -- as everybody is aware, the
39 Federal government is on a tight budget right now, so a
40 lot of issue may be held in a holding pattern until we
41 have additional funding because the budget looks very
42 flat. We don't expect any increases in the near
43 future.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: On that issue is OSM
46 -- I was talking to various Refuge managers and they're
47 looking at a 5 to 10 percent reduction in funding. Is
48 OSM looking at those same type figures?

49

50 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. I'm not

1 aware of the exact percentage, but everyone in the Fish
2 and Wildlife Service is facing a reduction. I know
3 travel budgets have been reduced and I'm aware of right
4 now we're in a quasi-hiring freeze. If we can justify
5 it to the regional director, we can hire people, but
6 we're short-staffed as it is.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm very aware of
9 OSM short-staffing. I'm concerned about that as a RAC
10 member that OSM's staff is approaching inadequate to
11 address all 10 regions for Alaska. So I'd like to
12 express that on the record. Anything further, Chuck.

13
14 MR. ARDIZZONE: Nothing further on this
15 issue unless anybody has some questions.

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions
17 from the Council.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks. That covers
22 the Secretarial Review. Briefing on tribal
23 consultation, you're going to give that one also.

24
25 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. That one
26 also is in the book on Page 290. As I think everyone
27 is aware, the Board is trying to incorporate
28 consultation into the review of wildlife proposals. To
29 that end the Board established a work group to come up
30 with these draft protocols, which we're currently
31 using. The draft protocols can be found on Pages 291
32 and 293. That's kind of guiding the consultation
33 process through this cycle. The work group continues
34 to work on these protocols and hopes to have some final
35 protocols for the Board to approve in May of 2012. If
36 you look on Page 290, there's three upcoming meetings.
37 On October 20th there's a consultation meeting with
38 ANCSA corporations at AFN. December 1st there's a
39 consultation with Federally recognized Tribes at the
40 BIA Tribal Service Providers Conference. And January
41 17th through 19th during the Board meeting the Board
42 will also be holding a discussion of draft protocols at
43 that meeting in January.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Chuck. You
46 had a comment, Ray.

47
48 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I was just thinking
49 about this two new seats on the Federal Board there. I
50 don't know if we have a role in that or not, but I hope

1 that they find people who have some experience on RAC
2 or they look closely at the candidates who come from
3 RACs so that the ones sitting on the Board understand
4 what we've been going through and have some history of
5 what's been going on the last few years. If they end
6 up bringing in people new to this process, then you're
7 kind of educating them in the process too in a sense.
8 I know we can't influence the Secretary of the
9 Interior, but I hope that they'll look closely at
10 candidates that come from RAC experience.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm sure the
13 Secretary of Interior's office will be looking at
14 experience in Federal subsistence management. They'll
15 select from the highest quality candidate, I'm sure.
16 So I have confidence in the Secretary's office on their
17 selection of the two Federal Subsistence Board.

18
19 You've got a comment there, Chuck.

20
21 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. On that
22 issue, in the letter that Melinda provided everyone
23 with there's a whole list of qualifications. Personal
24 knowledge and experience with subsistence use in rural
25 Alaska, experience and knowledge of the Federal
26 subsistence management programs and so on. So they did
27 lay out some criteria.

28
29 MR. COLLINS: Okay, good.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Chuck, for
32 the clarification. Any other comments on the tribal
33 consultation briefing from the Council.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've encouraged the
38 Federal Board to have as much outreach to the tribal
39 councils and would highly encourage tribal
40 participation in the Federal Subsistence process. I
41 want to have that on the record and Council to be aware
42 of that.

43
44 So moving on in the agenda. Update on
45 Bering Sea/Aleutian Island chum salmon bycatch. Go
46 ahead.

47
48 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. That is
49 also a written briefing found on Page 294. To be
50 brief, I guess the North Pacific Fishery Management

1 Council held its initial review of the analysis of
2 proposed management measures to protect chum salmon
3 bycatch in the Bering Sea pollock fishery. During that
4 meeting in June 2011 the Council revised and
5 restructured the suite of alternatives and options and
6 requested new information. Some of the changes include
7 the following, which are listed on Page 294.

8
9 An additional option for a separate
10 hard cap for June and July when western Alaskan chum
11 stocks are more prevalent in the bycatch.

12
13 Removal from consideration complicated
14 monthly area management options.

15
16 Additional provisions on the Rolling
17 Hotspot Program.

18
19 Analysis of additional parameters of
20 the Rolling Hotspot Program that could be adjusted.

21
22 All these were things we'd like to see
23 changed. The full Council motion is posted on the
24 website on Pages 294 of your book. A revised set of
25 alternatives based upon the Council's motion will be
26 posted in the near future. The Council requested that
27 the analysis be revised per its requests listed above
28 in your written briefing and it will be back for review
29 before the Council in early 2012.

30
31 Is there any questions I can answer on
32 that.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions or
35 comments from the Council on the update on Bering Sea
36 and Aleutian Islands chum salmon bycatch.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have any
41 comment, Tim?

42
43 MR. GERVAIS: No.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, okay. Any
46 comments from the Council. Ray.

47
48 MR. COLLINS: This should be on our
49 February meeting if they're going to make a decision in
50 April. Hopefully we'll be able to review this

1 information in February so that we can comment directly
2 to the Board before they act.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have that on the
5 agenda for the February meeting. Melinda is taking
6 note of that. This is a very important issue. The
7 Federal Subsistence Board has taken a very strong
8 stance for the lowest hardcap and so the Federal
9 Subsistence Board was fully engaged on this issue at
10 the May meeting.

11

12 MR. J. WALKER: Jack.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, James.

15

16 MR. J. WALKER: One question in regards
17 to the -- I don't know if it's in regards to you're
18 addressing the subject here, but it's in regards to the
19 monitoring procedure of the bycatch. I know there was
20 an issue a couple years back that was done by eye
21 contact. When it went to sleep, there was no
22 monitoring. So is there any video monitoring now in
23 place.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Chuck.

26

27 MR. ARDIZZONE: Through the Chair, Mr.
28 Walker. I do not know, but I can check. Make a few
29 phone calls and try to find out for you for tomorrow
30 morning.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Further
33 comments from the Council on the chum salmon bycatch
34 briefing.

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none.
39 Thanks, Chuck. We've got about five minutes. It's
40 time to pull the plug for tonight. They're going to
41 have bingo here, so we're going to pack up all our
42 materials. We'll adjourn until 9:00 o'clock. Starting
43 at 9:00 o'clock sharp.

44

45 (Off record)

46

47 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

