

1 WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6
7 VOLUME III

8
9 Fairbanks, Alaska
10 November 8, 2013
11 1:00 p.m.

12
13
14 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

15
16 Jack Reakoff, Chairman
17 Timothy Gervais
18 Donald Honea
19 Pollock Simon

20
21
22
23
24 Regional Council Coordinator, Melinda Burke

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Recorded and transcribed by:
42
43 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
44 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
45 Anchorage, AK 99501
46 907-243-0668/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

(Fairbanks, Alaska - 11/8/2013)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll call the Western Interior Regional Council meeting back to order.

We had an evening hearing on the rural determination process and we're back with still below our quorum.

Did we get James online at all?

MS. BURKE: James Walker, are you on the teleconference?

(No comments)

MS. BURKE: It doesn't sound like it, but he was planning on calling in for a bit this morning.

We do have Tom Doolittle and Dan Sharp on the line.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

MS. BURKE: Item number 9A, old business, customary and traditional use determinations. We've got David Jenkins here from OSM to make the presentation.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

DR. JENKINS: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Council members. David Jenkins with the Office of Subsistence Management. I want to talk a little bit about customary and traditional use and your briefing starts on Page 24 and then there's materials following that.

As you know, in 2009 the Secretary of Interior announced a review of the Federal Subsistence Program and part of that review focused on customary and traditional use determinations. Specifically, in 2010, the Secretary of the Interior asked the Board to review with RAC input the customary and traditional use

1 determination process and to present recommendations
2 for change. Now the Federal Subsistence Board and also
3 the Southeast Regional Advisory Council would like your
4 recommendations on the current customary and
5 traditional use determination process. Of course, you
6 can't make those recommendations without a quorum and
7 I'll make this briefing shorter than I normally would
8 because you're going to hear part of this when you have
9 a full quorum.

10

11 If you recall, the Board last asked all
12 of the Councils about customary and traditional use in
13 2011 and all of the Councils, with the exception of the
14 Southeast Council, indicated that the existing
15 customary and traditional use determination process was
16 working. At the request of the Southeast Council, this
17 additional review is being conducted for your input.

18

19 Now our focus is not on how customary
20 and traditional use determinations are made, but rather
21 on why they are made. The Southeast Council would like
22 you to recommend when you reconvene a quorum to
23 eliminate or amend or to make no changes to the current
24 customary and traditional use determination process.

25

26 ANILCA does not require customary and
27 traditional use determinations. Customary and
28 traditional use regulations were adopted from the State
29 in 1990 when the Federal Subsistence Program was
30 established. The State's eight criteria for
31 determining customary and traditional use were
32 subsequently slightly modified for use in Federal
33 regulations. Since the establishment of the Federal
34 Subsistence Program, the Board has made some 300
35 customary and traditional use determinations.

36

37 The Board initially adopted the State's
38 customary and traditional use criteria, renamed them
39 factors, because it anticipated the resumption of State
40 management of subsistence on Federal public lands. The
41 Board intended to minimize any disruption to
42 traditional State regulation in management of fish and
43 wildlife. The State has not resumed subsistence
44 management on Federal public lands and it appears the
45 Federal Subsistence Program will be permanent.

46

47 So there are two thresholds that have
48 to be met for subsistence users. The first is the
49 threshold in ANILCA, which is the rural threshold. You
50 have to be a rural resident to have the subsistence

1 priority. The second threshold is a regulatory
2 threshold and it is the customary and traditional use
3 determination threshold. It is this latter threshold
4 that the Southeast Council is questioning. They want
5 your input on this regulatory threshold.

6
7 Now remember that the Board does not
8 make customary and traditional use determinations to
9 restrict the amounts of harvest. It makes these
10 determinations relative to particular stocks of fish
11 and wildlife populations in order to recognize a
12 community or an area whose residents generally exhibit
13 these eight factors. The Southeast Council is
14 concerned that the effect is to exclude those
15 Federally-qualified rural residents who do not
16 generally exhibit these eight factors from
17 participating in subsistence harvest in particular
18 areas.

19
20 The Southeast Council, with this
21 concern, has generated two options for you to think
22 about. The first option is on Page 25. It's a
23 regulatory change. It suggested in its annual report
24 to the Federal Subsistence Board the language you can
25 see at the top of Page 25 and it would read like this:
26 The Board shall determine which fish and wildlife have
27 been customarily and traditionally used for
28 subsistence. These determinations shall identify the
29 specific community's or area's use of all species of
30 fish and wildlife that have been traditionally used in
31 their past and present geographic areas.

32
33 In other words, once a customary and
34 traditional use determination is made for an area,
35 residents in that area would have customary and
36 traditional use for all species, so there would be no
37 need for a customary and traditional use determination
38 for specific fish stocks and wildlife or on a species-
39 by-species basis.

40
41 MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don wants to say
44 something.

45
46 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
47 don't want to interrupt here, but could you give us an
48 example of some kind of scenario what that really
49 implies to Southeast Council's statement to exclude
50 those Federally qualified rural residents who do not

1 generally exhibit these factors and participating. For
2 Saxman, could you give an example? What does that
3 mean?

4

5 DR. JENKINS: The Southeast council is
6 arguing that the eight factors, the customary and
7 traditional use determinations have the potential for
8 excluding people who are rural residents and who are
9 under ANILCA qualified for a subsistence priority.
10 There could be a number of examples. One just happened
11 actually in Southcentral in which people in Cooper
12 Landing were asking for a customary and traditional use
13 determination, there seems to be evidence for it and
14 the Southcentral Council did not take up that proposal
15 and excluded folks who have a priority under ANILCA, a
16 rural preference, but the Southcentral Council
17 determined that they did not meet a customary and
18 traditional use determination or at least didn't even
19 debate it. The proposal died for lack of a second.

20

21 So this is a way in which people could
22 be excluded because they don't meet the second
23 threshold, the customary and traditional use
24 determination threshold even though they are rural
25 residents and meet the threshold under the ANILCA
26 standard. So that's the sort of thing they're worried
27 about.

28

29 So they made one proposal on the top of
30 Page 25 to modify regulations. Then after they
31 produced that proposal the Southeast Council formed a
32 workgroup to think more carefully about this customary
33 and traditional use determination process. The
34 workgroup went through all the transcripts. When all
35 of the Councils were briefed on this issue in 2011,
36 according to the working group all of the Councils were
37 inadequately briefed on the process or were briefed in
38 different ways, which made it appear as if all the
39 Councils agreed with this particular process with the
40 exception of the Southeast. So they thought the
41 briefing from OSM was inadequate and one of the reasons
42 we're giving a more thorough briefing now is to address
43 their concerns of that inadequacy.

44

45 The Southeast Council drafted letters
46 to all the Regional Advisory Councils. You have them
47 in your books. After this working group -- or pursuant
48 to the working group findings, the Southeast Council
49 emphasized the following. I'm going to read this.
50 It's on Page 25.

1 The Southeast Council noted that the
2 current customary and traditional use determination
3 process is being used to allocate resources between
4 rural residents often in times of abundance. This is
5 an inappropriate method of deciding which residents can
6 harvest fish or wildlife in an area and may result in
7 unnecessarily restricting subsistence users. The
8 Southeast Council has a history of generally
9 recommending a broad geographic scale when reviewing
10 proposals for customary and traditional use
11 determinations. Subsistence users primarily harvest
12 resources near their community of residence and there
13 is normally no management reason to restrict use by
14 rural residents from distance communities. If there is
15 a shortage of resources, Section .804 of ANILCA
16 provides direction and the correct method of allocating
17 resources.

18
19 So the Southeast Council does not
20 support retaining the current customary and traditional
21 use determination process and instead recommends the
22 use of Section .804 criteria when necessary. There are
23 three of those criteria that has to do with customary
24 and direct dependents upon the populations as a
25 mainstay of livelihood, local residency and the
26 availability of alternative resources.

27
28 The Southeast Council is arguing that
29 in times of resource shortages this should be the
30 mechanism for allocating resources. Customary and
31 traditional use determinations should not be used to
32 exclude otherwise qualified rural residents.

33
34 So the Federal Subsistence Board and
35 also the Southeast Council would like your
36 recommendations on the current C&T process and
37 specifically the Southeast Council would like you to
38 consider whether to eliminate customary and traditional
39 use determinations and instead use a Section .804
40 process or to change the way such determinations are
41 made, as in their regulatory change at the top of Page
42 25, by making area-wide customary and traditional use
43 determinations and not species specific customary and
44 traditional use determinations or to make some other
45 change or to make no change.

46
47 So your input, when you convene a full
48 Council, will then provide the basis for a briefing to
49 the Federal Subsistence Board on this issue. Thank
50 you, Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So no action can be
2 taken, but I have opinions about what the Southeast
3 Council is doing. Southeast doesn't have the kind of
4 overlap of region that the Western Interior has.
5 There's certain customary and traditional use
6 determinations using the eight criteria for caribou
7 from the Western Interior Region onto the North Slope,
8 but you get into if caribou are utilized by certain
9 communities of the northern part of the Unit 24 onto
10 the North Slope, this scenario that the Southeast is
11 proposing would allow people from Galena or someplace
12 in the southern part of the area to overlap for caribou
13 use. If one community has it, then all the communities
14 would have it. Is that true? Is that the way this
15 would work?

16
17 DR. JENKINS: That's how I read their
18 proposal. If there is a shortage, they are arguing
19 that an .804 criteria under ANILCA is the appropriate
20 mechanism.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. The other
23 aspect is I don't like the current allocation process
24 that OSM has developed. As I've sat in other meetings,
25 I feel that there needs to be an option for the
26 Councils and the Federal Subsistence Board to drop into
27 an .804. I like this original states Tier II type
28 permitting used .804. It used direct dependence on the
29 resource, proximity to the resource, et cetera, and
30 they scored those recipients.

31
32 As I've said in 19A, we have a Federal
33 drawing permit for moose. Some person that just moved
34 to Aniak has equitable eligibility to hunt moose as
35 somebody that's been there, lived their whole life
36 there, has a direct dependence on using moose and I
37 don't feel that that's the correct way to allocate that
38 resource.

39
40 The Southeast Council is advocating for
41 the current .804 prioritization, but I don't feel that
42 that works very well and I feel that it's better to
43 define the people who have customary and traditional
44 use of the resource as the users of the resource. So
45 Southeast is quite a bit different because it's kind of
46 an island. It has Canada on one side and the ocean on
47 the other. It's like they're kind of an island. They
48 don't have the regional overlap that Western Interior
49 has on practically every boundary.

50

1 So I don't like this proposal. In our
2 spring meeting I will make my concerns with this
3 proposal. Like our Council said previously, the
4 current customary and traditional use determinations
5 that have been made, the 300 determinations that have
6 already been made would have to be thrown out and it
7 would make quite a bit of -- the original proposal that
8 Southeast had would make eligibility for more users.
9 We have certain populations that can't support a lot
10 more use. We currently have everything working real
11 well. So then we would drop into an .804. Well, then
12 we end up with a drawing permit and people who have
13 truly customary and traditional use are being
14 overwhelmed with drawing permit applications to take
15 the resource away from them.

16
17 I feel the current Federal system works
18 well for the people who have direct dependence on the
19 resource. Southeast can apply this to Southeast.
20 Regionally, I can see how this could be applied, but I
21 don't feel that this could be -- there's the southern
22 part of the Western Interior Region. We get into that
23 Paimiut Slough problem down there with allocating
24 things. I don't want to go there.

25
26 I feel that Southeast thinks inside
27 their box. They think inside their island of use. So
28 that's all fine for them. I don't think this should be
29 applied across the whole state of Alaska for all 10
30 regions, so we need to talk about that at our spring
31 meeting with the full Council.

32
33 So those would be my offhand comments
34 on Southeast's proposal for changing customary and
35 traditional use determinations.

36
37 Any comments from the Council. Tim.

38
39 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Jack. David,
40 what's the timeline here if we don't take any action?
41 Does the issue go away because it needs to be responded
42 to this year?

43
44 DR. JENKINS: No, there is no
45 particular timeline. All of the Councils have been
46 apprised of this request from the Board and from the
47 Southeast Council. It is, however, part of the
48 Secretary's directive to the Federal Subsistence Board
49 to review customary and traditional use determination
50 in that process. So even though there's no particular

1 timeline, it is timely and we do need to respond to the
2 Secretary's directive.

3

4 I could give you some sense of what the
5 other Councils have been thinking about this too if
6 that's helpful.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. Do you have a
9 comment, Tim.

10

11 MR. GERVAIS: I've got one more
12 question before you get into that. What happens in the
13 scenario where we're seeing some different weather
14 patterns here in the state and probably will continue
15 to change over the next few decades. It's going to
16 shift some fish or game populations around and they
17 will be present in areas where they weren't present
18 before. How does the two different scenarios between
19 what we currently have and what Southeast is proposing,
20 how does that affect those situations when new species
21 become available in a specific area?

22

23 DR. JENKINS: My understanding in the
24 first scenario of the regulatory change is that
25 customary and traditional use in a geographic area
26 would be for all species. If you have climate change
27 and you have species composition that's changing or
28 even have new species that are migrating, those would
29 be covered under that first proposal that they
30 presented. All species of fish and wildlife would be -
31 - once that customary and traditional use determination
32 has been made it includes all of them. That's how I've
33 heard the Southeast Council describe their proposal.

34

35 MR. GERVAIS: And then with the status
36 quo C&T determination if a new species came into an
37 area, the subsistence user would be excluded from using
38 that because they can't prove historic use of it?

39

40 DR. JENKINS: No, and we do have
41 instances where that has happened in various parts of
42 Alaska and subsistence users aren't excluded from using
43 a new species that has come back in or reintroduced.
44 Muskox is a good example. They're not excluded from
45 that use. Still, it goes through the process of
46 determining a customary and traditional use pattern and
47 then that can be extended to include new species as
48 they are introduced or come into an area.

49

50 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you want to give
2 the other Council's input to date.

3
4 DR. JENKINS: Generally the Councils
5 have asked the question that I've heard here, what
6 specifically would happen in our region if we adopted
7 an .804 criteria and gave up a customary and
8 traditional use process. They've been asking for
9 specific examples in their regions in order to think
10 about this a little more carefully.

11
12 OSM has not yet developed specific
13 examples for these regions. We've only conducted seven
14 or eight .804 analyses to date. Not all of them are
15 applicable to all regions, so OSM will need to come up
16 with some examples to bring back to the Councils so
17 they can think a little more carefully about this.
18 North Slope would like to see that, for example.

19
20 Southcentral adopted part of the
21 regulatory language at the top of Page 25 in your books
22 in which the regulatory language is -- the Southeast
23 suggested some changes and Southcentral modified that
24 language and thought that would be the way to go,
25 thinking about all species in an area.

26
27 Other Councils have generally had the
28 same response, we need more information and I think
29 this is part of what the Southeast Council was looking
30 for, was to open up the dialogue and to get people to
31 start talking about this issue and to see if it works
32 throughout the state. If it works in Western Interior,
33 that's great. You recommend what you think. If it
34 doesn't work so well in Seward Pen or in Kodiak or in
35 Bristol Bay or wherever, then they can weigh in and
36 have their opinions known.

37
38 So what we're doing is gathering all
39 the opinions from the RACs and to present them at the
40 Board, probably at their April meeting, and have a
41 larger dialogue on this issue. It's part of the
42 Secretarial's directive to look at parts A and B in our
43 regulations that were essentially adopted from the
44 State and to see if what we've adopted from the State
45 continues to meet the intent of ANILCA. That's the
46 overarching Secretarial directive that we're working
47 with. Mr. Chair.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've always wondered
50 why they adopted the State process, but the Tier II

1 type process for .804 was not adopted and I was
2 wondering why that didn't happen. I feel that this
3 opens up this whole .804 question. This puts more
4 pressure on the .804 process. Because I don't agree
5 with the current .804 remedies that the Board has been
6 using, I feel -- I've said it before and you've heard
7 me say it before that I feel there needs to be either
8 the drawing process or an .804 criteria process, a
9 scoring process, so that we truly -- if there's a time
10 of reduction, the moose crash around Ruby and Don and
11 Tim get permits and the new teacher doesn't. I feel
12 that that's the way it should go.

13

14 I feel that this question that
15 Southeast has brought forward is going to put a whole
16 lot more pressure on .804 and I feel that we have a
17 broken system, so I don't want to move to an .804
18 process because we'd have to start fixing the .804
19 process also.

20

21 When we have our full Council this
22 spring, we'll have to spend a little bit of time and
23 start thinking about the broader picture of overlap
24 with other regions and there's a whole bunch of other
25 issues, the numbers of certain kinds of species. Right
26 now I default to our previous statement on the record
27 that the Council felt that the current process was
28 working just fine. If it's not broke, don't fix it.
29 So we'll have to work on that at our spring meeting.

30

31 Pollock.

32

33 MR. SIMON: I agree with you, Jack,
34 what you called it in the beginning. We don't have to
35 make a decision now. Maybe next meeting we'll talk
36 about it again when we have more members.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. This was
39 brought up at this meeting for an overview. I wanted
40 to get that on the record so that we can -- those
41 thoughts, while they're fresh in my mind and so we'll
42 bring those to our spring meeting and we'll rehash this
43 issue again with you, David. Thank you.

44

45 MR. HONEA: Can I.....

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don.

48

49 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
50 kind of missed what the other RACs -- what the general

1 consensus was. I guess everybody is pretty happy with
2 the way the determination is now other than Southeast.
3 So I guess overwhelmingly there's some kind of like a
4 no action or what is the general feeling?

5
6 DR. JENKINS: It's not that the other
7 Councils are happy with the current process. They
8 don't feel like they have enough information to make a
9 reasoned decision and some of them expressed some
10 concern about the eight factors that are being used at
11 the moment and how they were adopted from the State.
12 They would simply like more information and more
13 dialogue and have the opportunity to think a little
14 more deeply about the issue. So it's not that they're
15 happy with the process. They're looking to explore it.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, David.
18 Jennifer Yuhas is here for the State and the State
19 always has a seat here at the table, but come on up.
20 You've got some comments you want to make to the
21 Council, Jennifer?

22
23 MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For
24 the record, my name is Jennifer Yuhas. I am the
25 State's Federal subsistence liaison team leader, so we
26 have a team of folks and sometimes the biologists are
27 here and sometimes some of our directors are here at
28 these meetings. I'll save my comments for the ADF&G
29 report and I also have some Central Caribou information
30 that Beth Lenart has passed along to you today. I
31 brought extra copies. The only color copy is for the
32 Chair though.

33
34 Thanks for having me. I apologize for
35 being late to your meeting with these rebookings after
36 the sequestration I've been triple booked all week and
37 showing up to every meeting apologizing for not being
38 at the full meeting. Thanks for having me, Mr.
39 Chairman.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We've been taking
42 some of these agency reports out of cycle because we
43 don't have a quorum. So, at this point, the only other
44 agency -- since you're at the seat, we could take your
45 State report now and then we'll move to Native
46 organizations. We got National Park Service briefing
47 also. We could take you now if you'd like. Are you
48 prepared? Or we could take Native organizations if you
49 want more further preparation.

50

1 MS. YUHAS: It's your meeting, Mr.
2 Chairman, so I'm happy to present whenever you want me.

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

5
6 MS. YUHAS: I have very little
7 information that falls outside of the proposals and
8 some of the other reports. Someone will be speaking to
9 the MOU and I will add on to that at that agenda item.
10 I have with me for distribution the Central Arctic
11 Caribou field work summary for 2012.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would appreciate
14 that. Thank you.

15
16 MS. YUHAS: As you know, Mr. Chairman,
17 I am not an expert in this matter. I am a generalist
18 with the State who comes to your meetings and keeps
19 track of what you have requested to have reported and
20 then finds the specialist who can answer those
21 questions for you. I may not be able to answer all of
22 the questions that the RAC might have, but I always do
23 my best in the meeting to use my smartphone and find
24 the questions from our biologist if it's something
25 that's above my head here.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Earlier in the
28 meeting -- you know we had a late spring, we had some
29 various things. Winter migrations have been very late
30 this fall. Breeding activity has been limited and some
31 areas it appears that cow caribou may not be breeding
32 very well this fall. I'd asked earlier about if when
33 they did the collaring project at Onion Portage that
34 there was good cow recruitment, calf recruitment this
35 year and this happened to be an off cycle year for
36 that.

37
38 When we have our spring meeting, I
39 think this Council and the agency should be aware that
40 certain -- Western Arctic has been declining and that
41 there could be a significant reduction in calf
42 production this year. I would like the Council at our
43 spring meeting to have any information that the State
44 would have on calf production for 2013 I would like to
45 see presented. That's just strictly for the caribou
46 issues that are on the forefront for this Council, so I
47 would like to know what -- you know, all of the caribou
48 herds. Mulchatna, you know, declined significantly and
49 whether that one has had a significant reduction in
50 calf production. That needs to be known by this

1 Council.

2

3 I do appreciate you bringing the
4 Central Arctic field work for 2012 so the Council
5 members know how the State is actually deriving this
6 information.

7

8 MS. YUHAS: That spring request, Mr.
9 Chairman, makes a lot of sense. There's been a lot of
10 discussion at our AC meetings recently from the
11 biologist that the extremely late spring and the
12 strangely hot and then wet summer may have had some
13 sort of an effect on the fall rut for the ungulates.
14 Velvet was being held later, that animals were
15 responding to calls less frequently early in the season
16 or at the typical time during the season that they
17 would respond to calls and that the rut was probably
18 very late this year.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moose activity
21 seemed to be delayed by a week to 10 day and the leaf
22 deciduation and the leaves stayed green longer than
23 normal and some of these factors seemed to indicate
24 that the late spring had an affect on animals, but I
25 think the caribou may have been more impacted than
26 offhand perceived, so I'm looking for recruitment
27 numbers, calf recruitment numbers. I'm sure the State
28 can provide some. I talked to Jim Dau. He's catching
29 these caribou swimming across the river. He probably
30 took note of how many calves they had and so forth. I
31 think at our spring meeting we can get some of that
32 data.

33

34 MS. YUHAS: We'll also have likely Beth
35 Lenart or Jason present at that meeting. There was a
36 conflict for this meeting and not as specific as a
37 request for such a specific report, but we will meet
38 that request at the spring meeting.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you.
41 Did you have other State comments to the Council.

42

43 MS. YUHAS: You are aware and probably
44 the rest of the RAC is aware of the extended season for
45 moose outside of Galena and we were happy we were able
46 to coordinate so well.

47

48 We are at a public meeting where we're
49 building an official record and I would like to commend
50 Mr. Trevor Fox at OSM for the early coordination on

1 that so that we could act as swiftly as we could.

2

3 We had several people out on medical,
4 acting status, hadn't dealt with how we do special
5 actions before and it was really because of his high
6 level of coordination that we were able to act so soon.
7 We had a biologist in the field who only had a
8 satellite telephone that could text. We didn't know
9 the actual harvest counts yet. A great many people
10 spent a lot of time in between meetings trying to catch
11 up on information so we could act as swiftly as we
12 could.

13

14 The Department is also very pleased
15 with the bear reduction efforts out in that area and
16 the quality of the meat that was supplied after those
17 efforts.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I was very
20 appreciative to Trevor and OSM and the State working
21 fairly rapidly to accommodate that season extension.
22 We were told that two moose were harvested on the
23 Federal side, but we don't know how many were harvested
24 on the State side. Did you have a figure for that on
25 the season extension for Galena and 21D?

26

27 MS. YUHAS: I do not have that number,
28 Mr. Chairman.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Even if it was two
31 more, four moose doesn't sound like that many moose,
32 but that's a lot of meat. So I was very pleased with
33 the State and Federal actions to accommodate the flood
34 victims of the Middle Yukon. Appreciate that.

35

36 MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
37 Without that pre-work that Mr. Fox initiated -- it may
38 look like we acted within a three to four day period,
39 but we were working on this for a week and a half.
40 Without those pre-efforts we wouldn't have been able to
41 act as quickly.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Thanks,
44 Trevor. Any other comments to the Council. Don.

45

46 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
47 have a question, Jennifer. I guess that late State
48 call for that extended, what is the protocol for that?
49 Is that at the call of the wildlife refuge -- I mean is
50 that at the call of the State biologist stationed in

1 Galena there or did they have to -- who ultimately says
2 it's okay for that hunt? Thank you.

3

4 MS. YUHAS: Through the Chairman. The
5 authority resides with the Commissioner's emergency
6 order authority, so often in non-controversial
7 situations that are easily explainable there's a great
8 deal of latitude offered to the local biologist and
9 areas that may be more controversial or the data is
10 concrete, but sometimes it is more difficult to
11 decipher. A small moose population is easy to count.
12 Mixed fish populations are not. So, in this instance,
13 there was collaboration with the higher levels of
14 leadership in Fish and Game, but there was reliance on
15 the local biologist. But that authority resides with
16 the Commissioner under their emergency order authority
17 provided through statute.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other questions.

20 Tim.

21

22 MR. GERVAIS: I just had a comment. I
23 believe that State extension resulted in three moose
24 for Ruby. I don't have any numbers for how it affected
25 the community of Galena.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh. Thank you. Any
28 other comments on the State side.

29

30 MS. YUHAS: I have no further general
31 comments which do not fall inside of one of your other
32 agenda topics, Mr. Chairman.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you.
35 We have acting Refuge Manager Tom Doolittle who wanted
36 to speak to the Council online here.

37

38 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, I am online.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

41

42 MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. Thank you. I
43 hope everybody can hear me well. Sometimes we get some
44 broken communication out of Bethel. I'm the acting
45 Refuge Manager and also the acting and proxy for the
46 Federal In-season Manager for the conservation unit on
47 the Kuskokwim River as Yukon Delta National Wildlife
48 Refuge.

49

50 My concern and seldom would I get

1 involved in issues relative to funding from OSM unless
2 I thought that there were some breach in our ability to
3 manage what I see as one of the more imperiled chinook
4 fisheries in Alaska. As we know, chinook salmon is not
5 just an event that's really confined just to the
6 Kuskokwim River, but it's a more pan event for the
7 species in the Pacific Rim.

8

9 My concern though is that as a manager
10 of a fishery that has the largest subsistence use in
11 the State of Alaska with an average subsistence harvest
12 of chinook salmon that is in the 83,000 average per
13 year and that it has importance especially to the
14 intent of ANILCA and to the Refuge.

15

16 If I look at many of the items and
17 areas that were funded through OSM or I should say
18 potentially to be funded, my concern lies on whether
19 the priorities of ANILCA were truly understood. This
20 is in reference to the tools in the toolbox to help
21 manage this fishery. Two of the smaller weirs, the
22 Takotna Weir and the Tuluksak Weir have been put on the
23 block to no longer fund. My concerns with this was
24 that on the conservation unit the Tuluksak is the only
25 other weir site that we have to monitor not just
26 chinook salmon but other species of salmon along with
27 the Kwethluk River. When you take away 50 percent of a
28 capacity of information, I have concerns about that.

29

30 I also have concerns for the village of
31 Tuluksak. That is the mouth of a river of a declining
32 stock of chinook salmon that now only numbered in 2013
33 of a total of 193 individuals and only around one-third
34 of those were females. I think the math on that is
35 pretty simple. When we look at overall exploitation on
36 the entire Kuskokwim, it can be ranged between 68 and
37 80 percent from years like we've been having and I have
38 a concern about that.

39

40 In simple science and biology, when you
41 look at that sort of exploitation on a fishery and then
42 on a species that again only has four to seven year
43 olds and only again around a third of those are
44 females, again I think simple science and biology
45 starts to tell the wider story and a more serious
46 story.

47

48 The long-term story is really for the
49 subsistence users themselves and not just the village
50 of Tuluksak. When we look at the monitoring

1 information that we get from a river like the Tuluksak,
2 it provides us and shows us that this was a river that
3 could have a few thousand chinook that were spawning on
4 it. I know that some testimony also stated that this
5 particular river has been impacted by mining in its
6 upper regions and that is correct.

7
8 Regardless of that, this river still
9 had runs that were considerably stronger in past years
10 than they have been in recent years. This remains of a
11 concern and the weir data has been appropriate to track
12 this.

13
14 This is also a strong chum fishery and
15 a strong coho fishery where we see an average of about
16 10,000 cohos using this particular system and 15,000
17 chum using the system and it's a system that is active
18 and viable each year when many other weirs blow out.
19 This monitoring of this smaller system has provided
20 consistent annual information on escapement. So it's
21 been a tool that I have used and my predecessor Gene
22 Peltola has used when he was In-season Manager in the
23 management of the fisheries within the conservation
24 unit.

25
26 I guess I really won't elaborate much
27 more other than that I would really like the RAC to
28 look at the funding priorities and sit back and think
29 about whether that particular funding for that
30 particular project was based truly for the subsistence
31 user or whether it had a bias towards commercial
32 fisheries. When you look at the value of subsistence
33 in food pounds, something as -- let's say 83,000
34 chinook coming out of the Kuskokwim River with an
35 average fish being 20 pounds, we have literally over a
36 million pounds of fish that go on the table. Of
37 course, we know that that fishery is worth more than
38 the money. It is the way of life and the quality of
39 life.

40
41 At this juncture, to not fund any weir
42 projects on the Kuskokwim River, considering it was one
43 of the world's best chinook fisheries that still has a
44 chance of recovery, and to take away some of the tools
45 in the toolbox to be able to manage it and to not
46 necessarily follow the appropriate criteria that were
47 used for the selection of funding, prompted my letter
48 to the RAC and then also another letter to OSM in
49 reference to trying to reinstate the funding for the
50 Tuluksak weir.

1 I guess I'll leave it at that. I would
2 truly like to entertain any questions from the board.

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions on
5 Tom's comment. Go ahead, Tim.

6
7 MR. GERVAIS: Yes, good morning. How
8 many weirs.....

9
10 MR. DOOLITTLE: Good morning.

11
12 MR. GERVAIS: How many weirs are set up
13 on the -- traditionally used on the Kuskokwim for
14 fisheries monitoring?

15
16 MR. DOOLITTLE: There are six weirs
17 that are set up on the Kuskokwim River and now there
18 will be four weirs that would be set up to monitor.
19 The issue that we have with those six weirs only two
20 were on Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge. Also
21 these were escapements that started to decline and
22 under the new model that the State has put together
23 essentially they're not providing enough fish and
24 contribution overall to run the model that has been set
25 forth. There's a lot more information that comes out
26 of both weirs that is really important to the
27 management of not just chinook salmon but also for the
28 other species of salmon that we're responsible for
29 within the Kuskokwim River.

30
31 It is also illustrated that we're
32 collecting data on a declining stock and our concern is
33 that this would be a stock of concern in the very near
34 future with only 193 spawners escaping into the system
35 and that we also want to be able to evaluate any
36 restoration projects on that particular river. So it
37 has showed the decline like any of the other weirs in
38 the system.

39
40 So I'm not sure if I clearly answered
41 your question, but what it is is that we need all the
42 pieces of the puzzle to be able to manage it and do we
43 just throw away a weir simply because it's not
44 providing enough information on the species, but we
45 should also track the species in the good times as well
46 as the bad times and not throw out the information when
47 the species is in such decline that it's not providing
48 enough information to support a scientific model.
49 That's just one tool in the toolbox.

50

1 MR. GERVAIS: That was a good answer.
2 I have a question for some letters that we're preparing
3 to send out to various administrators and we don't have
4 any of our Kuskokwim representatives present in our
5 meeting. Can you give us a brief tally on how the
6 Kuskokwim has performed on king salmon escapement in
7 the last 10 years?

8
9 MR. DOOLITTLE: In the last 10 years,
10 it's declined markedly, but especially in the last five
11 years. So now we're approaching actually the entire
12 life cycle of the species at a declining level. This
13 is a river that would average over 200,000 chinook for
14 total run as an average. Under the new escapement
15 goals we're managing for this fishery that between
16 65,000 and 120,000 fish, so quite a bit lower than its
17 historic escapement levels. Right now even it is not
18 even performing at the low end of the escapement goal.

19
20 The severity of regulations and the
21 amount of civil unrest relative to this issue has made
22 the news, as you well know. In 2010, there was a large
23 amount of regulation -- there wasn't a lot of
24 regulation and, again, we would not have met the new
25 escapement goal. In fact, the Kuskokwim only escaped
26 49,000 fish. In 2011, there were severe restrictions
27 and we just made the escapement goal. In 2012, that
28 was when there were severe restrictions put in and just
29 barely made escapement. Again, the total run was one
30 of the lowest total runs on record. Then in 2013,
31 there was not regulation on the subsistence user and
32 this will be one of the worst escapements on record.
33 Some estimates are guessing between 29,000 and 35,000
34 fish may have only escaped in total on the Kuskokwim
35 River.

36
37 So not only are we looking at
38 unprecedented low total runs, but also with the level
39 of subsistence harvest is that our escapements are
40 considerably low and below the statewide sustainable
41 escapement goals. So it's in a pretty serious
42 situation.

43
44 MR. GERVAIS: Do you have any comments
45 on how many years or how much -- when you have this
46 habitual underescapement, how much of that can a king
47 system endure without crashing?

48
49 MR. DOOLITTLE: I think you have a
50 fishery expert in your crowd that has been working with

1 that and it's Ken Harper from Fish and Wildlife Service
2 from Kenai Fishery Office. If he could answer that for
3 me, that would be helpful.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ken.

6

7 MR. HARPER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ken
8 Harper with Kenai Fish and Wildlife Field Office, U.S.
9 Fish and Wildlife Service. I'm not sure that we can
10 really answer that. I know there's been some modeling
11 done. A paper by Jeff Bromaghin looked at the net mesh
12 size and if you continue to fish some of your older
13 aged fish on the Yukon, it looked like you can crash a
14 system and it may take hundreds of years to bring it
15 back. That was in his modeling exercise that he did
16 when you lose some of those older age classes of fish.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim.

19

20 MR. GERVAIS: All right. Thank you
21 very much.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This Council is very
24 displeased with the underachievement of escapement
25 needs on the Kuskokwim River and we're writing a letter
26 that will be -- once we get on conference call and have
27 a quorum, we'll transmit that letter with our delegate
28 Ray Collins to empower him to work with the Kuskokwim
29 Salmon Management Group to -- when we heard that
30 significant subsistence needs were met in the lower
31 river and the Lower Yukon River only the maximum at
32 Alakanuk was -- some of the larger subsistence needs
33 met on the Yukon were 34 percent.

34

35 When large needs were met on the Lower
36 Kuskokwim and the drainage went under escapement, we
37 were very displeased with that, so a letter will be
38 promulgated to that effect to that working group. We
39 can't keep beating this run into the ground. It has to
40 have escapement met. Civil unrest or no, the public
41 has to understand the resource will be irreparably
42 damaged if we continue to overharvest like that. So
43 there needs to be windowed openings and et cetera to
44 assure escapement into the drainage.

45

46 We also took exception to the exclusion
47 of the weirs at Tuluksak and Takotna, so we're going to
48 work towards prioritizing that list with full Council's
49 approval, a reevaluation of that to have those weirs
50 funded to maintain escapement data, especially when we

1 have only less than 20 to 25 percent of the normal
2 escapements that were achieved this year of those
3 historic norms.

4
5 I'm very concerned about the Kuskokwim
6 River chinook salmon and this Council is taking it very
7 seriously and we'll be promulgating two different
8 actions to maintain escapement enumeration and to try
9 to implore escapement needs to be met and 65,000 is a
10 bare bare bones minimum.

11
12 MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you very much,
13 Mr. Chair. With the decrease of those weirs, there'd
14 only be primarily three weirs that would feed into the
15 new model of the State, so it's actually limiting the
16 number of tools that should be feeding into that model.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We appreciate your
19 comments to this Council and be assured we're going to
20 be working on that issue.

21
22 MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23 I appreciate the comments.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Should we go to
26 tribal comments.

27
28 MS. BURKE: I want to see who else is
29 online.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Who else do we have
32 online here? Is anybody else on the conference call?

33
34 MR. OLSON: Yes, this is Travis Olson
35 with Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries, Kuskokwim
36 area.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And Kuskokwim?

39
40 MR. OLSON: Yes.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: As you've heard,
43 we're very displeased with the underachievement of
44 chinook salmon escapement on the Kuskokwim River. So I
45 think we will be transmitting a letter to that effect.
46 This can't keep going on. So you were listening in.
47 You understand our position?

48
49 MR. OLSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. I'd like
50 to say the Department is also very displeased with the

1 results of our escapements from the past season on king
2 salmon. As a result, we've been working up plans for
3 going into next season with a very conservative
4 management strategy. Likely starting the season off
5 closed for salmon fishing through most of June with
6 plans of opening up to six-inch mesh restrictions
7 towards later June to provide some opportunity for chum
8 and sockeye harvest.

9

10 If we do see some in-season assessment
11 that the king salmon run is coming back much stronger
12 than expected, then we have the ability to open it up
13 sooner, but we plan on going in next season very
14 conservatively. We plan to work with a lot of
15 stakeholder groups to try to refine that management
16 strategy and how to implement those actions.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So are you going to
19 work through pulse protection using six-inch gear?

20

21 MR. OLSON: It would be something more
22 along the lines of 2012, although we'd make
23 announcements for closures before the season starts and
24 then we'd be looking at -- during closures it would
25 probably be four-inch or less mesh size for fishing for
26 non-salmon species and then we'd look at, if the runs
27 continued to look forward throughout June, toward the
28 end of June having probably some shorter periods where
29 it's restricted to six-inch or less mesh.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm happy to hear
32 that. Any questions from the Council. Go ahead, Tim.

33

34 MR. GERVAIS: Travis, was there any
35 commercial harvest of kings in this past summer?

36

37 MR. OLSON: Only a little bit. Let's
38 see. I've got the number here somewhere. Bear with
39 me.

40

41 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, I'd also be
42 interested in the subsistence harvest if you have that
43 information.

44

45 MR. OLSON: There was one fish actually
46 sold because the buyers did not purchase chinook.
47 Voluntarily they did that. Let's see, it was -- the
48 total harvest of chinook in the commercial fishery was
49 174 and only one of those was sold. The rest of them
50 were retained for personal use.

1 So we held off the commercial fishing
2 for chum salmon pretty late. We started on July 16th
3 was the first commercial period. That's the lowest
4 chinook harvest we've had since we've been fishing for
5 chum salmon.

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And you have a six-
8 inch gear size on the directed chum fishery?

9
10 MR. OLSON: Yeah, commercial fishing
11 gear was six-inch or less mesh size.

12
13 MR. GERVAIS: And that's been that way
14 for at least a decade, hasn't it?

15
16 MR. OLSON: Well, in practice, it's
17 been that way since about 1986. The regulations on
18 whether or not we could allow for up to eight inches
19 has changed several times in the past 30 years, but the
20 last time we actually had a fishery where it was up to
21 eight inches was, I think, in '85 or '86.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don, go head.

24
25 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
26 Travis, I guess when we're talking about the six-inch
27 mesh restriction, are we talking about both the Kusko
28 and the Yukon?

29
30 MR. OLSON: I'm only speaking for the
31 Kuskokwim area, although I know in the Yukon they've
32 been given similar gear restrictions although they have
33 some different options when it comes to gear
34 restrictions than we do in the Kuskokwim.

35
36 MR. HONEA: Okay. Thank you for that
37 clarification. I mean I just thought we were talking
38 about the Yukon, so thank you.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions
41 for Travis.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. Thanks
46 a lot, Travis. You'll be receiving a -- this Council
47 will be working on some of the issues that you've heard
48 us talking about, so we do have concerns about the
49 Kuskokwim River chinook run. So thank you.

50

1 MR. OLSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Anybody else on the
4 phone there to speak to the Council.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Hearing none, we
9 should move into Native organization, tribal comments.
10 Do we have anybody in the audience that would like to
11 speak to the Council.
12
13 (No comments)
14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments
16 there, Orville?
17
18 MR. HUNTINGTON: Sure.
19
20 (Laughter)
21
22 MR. HUNTINGTON: Orville Huntington,
23 Tanana Chiefs Conference. I guess the only concern I
24 have would be if you prioritize too much on the
25 Kuskokwim. I wouldn't want to see Henshaw Creek or
26 some of the other weirs that we're working on get cut.
27 I mean they're just as critical to us. That would be
28 my only comment on the weirs.
29
30 Another comment I have, I wouldn't want
31 to just blame this bad return on just subsistence
32 fishermen. I think we all know it's much more than
33 that. They're the easiest ones to blame, they're out
34 there, but I don't think we as a body should be blaming
35 them for -- I'm pretty sure their catch is stable. I
36 don't think it's increased. It's just that they're
37 allowed to fish when probably they shouldn't be.
38 That's something the Board can look at.
39
40 The Board can also look at redoing the
41 numbers for escapement on the Kuskokwim. When we went
42 to that plan and when we discussed it, the local people
43 had a lot of say in how that was set up, the local
44 people from the Kuskokwim River. So a lot of their
45 ideas went into that plan. It's just the way the Board
46 of Fish operates, you know. It may be set too low.
47 That certainly doesn't mean it can't be changed.
48
49 I heard your comments loud and clear.
50 Those were good comments. I wanted to especially thank

1 you for your comments you made on the subsistence use
2 areas. I thought those were good comments. The other
3 thing I would add is I was in a joint Board of
4 Fish/Board of Game meeting last month and we discussed
5 with the Chair Spraker of the Board of Game the
6 problems they're having on the Kobuk River. They're
7 having some problems with early harvest of caribou and
8 what happens is it tends to balk the caribou migration.
9 I know you're well aware of that on the Koyukuk River.
10 For years we haven't been able to come up with a way
11 for those caribou to come home.

12
13 One of the ways we discussed was like
14 the Dalton is set up a corridor where there will be no
15 hunting of that initial pulse of caribou that come in,
16 say 400 to 1,000 caribou. Once that amount goes
17 through, then you know they're all going to go through
18 no matter what. No matter how many you shoot. Not
19 only that, the bigger bulls on the tail end will come
20 in with them, the big fat ones, and that's the ones we
21 want.

22
23 So I would hope that you would support
24 their effort, Enoch from the Kobuk River AC. You're
25 going to see a proposal from him. I would hope that we
26 could do something like that for the Central Arctic
27 Herd as well to figure some way to get those caribou
28 back into the Koyukuk River. They're just not coming
29 home. That was their home, the Koyukuk River.

30
31 Other than that I don't have any
32 comments. I was really happy with the questions the
33 Board raised. I'll be around all day if you guys have
34 questions.

35
36 I'm sorry I missed the comment period
37 for last night with Charlie Brower's group. I think
38 it's good that they look at those eight criteria on the
39 Board of Game/Board of Fish we use 12 criteria. The 12
40 criteria we use is probably not enough. I think you
41 explained that pretty well in your comments. We'd be
42 supportive of those comments.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Orville.
45 I'm concerned about migratory caribou, like the Western
46 Arctic Caribou, Teshekpuk, Central Arctic, Porcupine.
47 In 2010, the Board of Game entertained a proposal to
48 change the Central Arctic Caribou harvest from one bull
49 July 1 to October 1 and then cows could only be killed
50 after the first of October.

1 The Department pushed a proposal
2 through to open cows on July 1 and I was cautioning the
3 Board that that would preclude -- if you give people a
4 five caribou limit and they're sitting there in August
5 and here comes a whole bunch of lead cows, they're
6 going to shoot the first caribou that show up because
7 they've got a lot of bag limit. They'll shoot two or
8 three of these lead cows. Well, they started deflecting
9 intensive hunting pressure lines up in the Ivishak
10 drainage in the Ribdon River and they shot up those
11 lead cows and drove them way to the east. It's
12 completely deflected that herd's migration tendency
13 towards the Central Brooks Range. It's pushing it way
14 further to the east over into the Arctic Village
15 country basically. They're basically getting mostly
16 Central Arctic caribou now. It happens on the Western
17 Herd too.

18
19 There's no reason why zones can't be
20 closed and under emergency order authority the
21 Department could open them once the cow caribou come
22 through. Once they could monitor those areas it would
23 be better for everybody. It would be better for the
24 caribou to move into the wintering range and it would
25 allow for the subsistence users and allow -- the sport
26 hunters on the Dalton Highway have had real poor
27 hunting since they had that regulatory change.
28 Thousands of people go over there and nobody hardly
29 comes back with caribou because they've driven all the
30 caribou back over to the east.

31
32 So we do need to work on -- once you
33 train the caribou to do something, it's hard to retrain
34 them to come back because they're basically afraid of
35 those intensive hunting zones. The Board that we have,
36 the Board of Game, is not experienced with migratory
37 caribou. There's no Board member from the northern
38 part of Alaska, so that's kind of a problem. I tried
39 to explain it to the Board. That's all TEK, that's
40 hooley. Go talk to anybody from Anaktuvuk Pass and
41 they'll tell you anybody that goes up there and shoots
42 any lead caribou is basically kicked out of the
43 village. They have to let the lead caribou go through
44 and they always get caribou.

45
46 So we do need to work on these caribou
47 issues. In the next regulatory cycle we could
48 contemplate some proposals to the Board of Game on some
49 closure periods to allow caribou to come through to lay
50 down migration routes. I do take seriously your

1 comments, Orville.

2

3 Anybody else have comments, Native
4 organization comments to the Council.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don't see any.
9 Melinda.

10

11 MS. BURKE: I think just Marcy.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Marcy,
14 National Park Service, will come up.

15

16 MS. OKADA: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
17 Good morning, Council members. I think Melinda might
18 have put a quick update from the National Park Service
19 in your folders.

20

21 MS. BURKE: They're in the packet on
22 the right-hand side.

23

24 MS. OKADA: I'll just quickly run
25 through this document. Marcy Okada, National Park
26 Service, Gates of the Arctic National Park and
27 Preserve. The National Park Service has been tracking
28 the migration of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd as
29 part of its monitoring efforts since 2011. This year's
30 migration was the latest migration documented by the
31 program thus far. Investigations as to what may factor
32 into the timing of caribou migrations are ongoing. As
33 for this year's late fall migration, a very late spring
34 or mild fall may have contributed to this unusual
35 movement pattern. So there's been conversations and
36 discussion already as to the late fall migration.

37

38 The majority of sheep habitat in six
39 National Park Units was surveyed in 2010 to 2011 using
40 a new method and the estimated population for the
41 surveyed Park Units is currently 26,000 to 27,000
42 individuals, similar to the number present in the early
43 1980s when many of the Park Units were originally
44 formed. The approach uses aerial distant sampling
45 techniques to estimate overall population size as well
46 as the composition of each population. It was first
47 implemented in Gates of the Arctic in 2009 where Park-
48 wide surveys were completed for the first time in
49 nearly 30 years.

50

1 Archeological surveys and subsurface
2 testing was conducted on the southern shoreline of
3 Walker Lake during the 2013 field season. A crew of
4 four archeologists aimed to revisit and evaluate the
5 condition of known prehistoric sites, identify new
6 sites and expand survey coverage in the area. Fourteen
7 documented archaeological sites were revisited during
8 the 2013 field season and 16 new sites were discovered.

9
10 Gates of the Arctic National Park
11 Subsistence Resource Commission held a meeting in
12 Ambler on April 9th and 10th of this year. Agenda
13 items included Park project updates, the Foothills West
14 Transportation Access Project, otherwise known as the
15 Road to Umiat, and the Ambler Mining District Access
16 Project.

17
18 We also had an SRC meeting this past
19 week on November 5th and 6th here in Fairbanks.

20
21 Lastly, I traveled to the communities
22 of Kobuk, Shungnak, Bettles, Evansville, Alatna and
23 Allakaket to share information regarding the Park
24 Service's role in the Ambler Mining District Access
25 Project and to hear subsistence related concerns from
26 community members as they relate to the Upper Kobuk
27 River, southern preserve portion of Gates of the
28 Arctic. There should be another handout included in
29 your folders related to the information that was
30 shared.

31
32 Overall, some of the concerns the
33 communities had regarding this road to the Ambler
34 Mining District, they were concerned about obtaining
35 all of the information available, they were concerned
36 about protecting their traditional food, such as fish,
37 bear, moose beaver, muskrats, caribou and protecting
38 the spawning grounds of sheefish.

39
40 They also wanted to share the
41 importance of ensuring protection of areas close to the
42 watershed and to their Native allotments. People don't
43 want trespassers on their allotments and road close to
44 their campsites. They don't want to have to put up
45 signs or fences to restrict access to their allotments,
46 but they do want to protect their hunting grounds.
47 Lastly, there were concerns about sport hunters having
48 access to some of the areas that subsistence users
49 utilize.

50

1 I just quickly went through this
2 report, so if there are any questions.

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions for
5 Marcy. Go ahead, Tim.

6
7 MR. GERVAIS: Yes, Marcy. What's the
8 timeline of when they might want to put a road in aside
9 from whether it's permitted or not? When do the
10 developers want to.....

11
12 MS. OKADA: Once an application is
13 submitted we have nine months to write an economic and
14 environmental analysis and this analysis would go to
15 the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of
16 Transportation. They, in turn, have another year to
17 decide.

18
19 For Gates of the Arctic, there's two
20 routes that are proposed through the Kobuk boot, so
21 they would be deciding on the route that would go
22 through the Kobuk boot. This is approximately a 200-
23 mile road and the portion that would go through Gates
24 of the Arctic is really only about 20 miles. So there
25 are other sections of this road that we have no
26 jurisdiction over.

27
28 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other questions.
31 Don.

32
33 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
34 Marcy, I guess this is a proposed road or is the
35 funding already there? I mean I could really, you
36 know, empathize with these people. The pressure is
37 taking care of their game and stuff. Is this going
38 like from Ambler over to the pipeline corridor? I mean
39 I don't have any kind of a map in front of me to kind
40 of visualize where this is. What exactly is the
41 timeframe? Are we looking at maybe in a couple years?
42 Is the funding already there? Thank you.

43
44 MS. OKADA: Council Member Honea. I
45 think in the spring meeting the project manager for
46 this project, Mary Ellen Tuttle, will be giving a
47 presentation, but right now the proposed route would
48 start from Prospect Creek on the Dalton Highway and
49 move west to the Ambler Mining District. As far as
50 funding being secured for the most part they're

1 anticipating established funding for this project.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other questions.

4 Pollock.

5

6 MR. SIMON: No questions, just some
7 comments. The proposed road to Ambler travels from
8 Haul Road, Prospect to Bettles, which already ice road
9 there and from Bettles and northwest to Ambler Mines
10 the proposed road will traverse Allakaket to our prime
11 hunting and fishing areas. So once the road is created
12 it could open up to public and who knows who will come
13 up the road, I mean just want to look at the country or
14 hunt and fish, to already limited wildlife resource,
15 which would have a great impact on Upper Koyukuk River.

16

17 I sit on the SRC for Gates of the
18 Arctic and the last meeting up there and also sit on
19 the caribou working group and sometimes DOT come to our
20 meetings and talk about the proposed
21 road. I never heard anybody say from the villages that
22 they're for the road. They're pretty opposed to the
23 road because it would forever change our way of life.

24

25 A lot of times they come to the meeting
26 when a village holds a public hearing on the proposed
27 road and most of the time people opposed to the
28 proposed road because they're afraid of it. We never
29 take part in the planning process, so why not just
30 oppose it. The Ambler is a great concern to Upper
31 Koyukuk River and also the villages to the west,
32 they're all opposed to the road.

33

34 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock. I
37 want to know about how many people were attending those
38 meetings you were having when you went to the villages
39 about the roads. A pretty good turnout?

40

41 MS. OKADA: The meetings in Kobuk and
42 Shungnak, there was mainly representatives from the
43 tribal councils. We also met with Evansville Tribe,
44 which was about five people or so. Then met with the
45 city of Bettles, so the city council members. That was
46 a pretty small meeting. In Alatna, we also met with
47 the tribal council. In Allakaket, by far there was the
48 largest turnout with tribal council members and that
49 had about 25 people at that meeting.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. We'll be
2 talking about the Ambler Road more extensively when we
3 have more of a PowerPoint presentation and a little
4 more definition on possible application and so forth.
5 Also the Donlin Creek Project, that's another issue
6 that was going to be on our agenda. We'll see those
7 projects in our spring meeting when we have a little
8 more time.

9

10 Go ahead, Melinda.

11

12 MS. BURKE: Mr. Chair. Yes, both the
13 Donlin and the Ambler updates were moved to the spring
14 meeting. The Donlin Mine rep did send some materials,
15 which I did include in your blue folder. There's also
16 a few posters in the back that they sent along. You'll
17 get briefings from both groups at the spring meeting.
18 We'll reschedule that as soon as possible.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're down on the
21 lower end of this agenda, Melinda.

22

23 MS. BURKE: We are, Mr. Chair. We just
24 have a couple -- without a quorum still today we can't
25 do any voting, but we can set some preliminary dates
26 for the fall 2014 meeting and before we get to those
27 wrap-up items we do have our biologist Trevor Fox here
28 and I think the plan is to go through a quick summary
29 of the proposals. Not to get into too much of an
30 in-depth discussion, but if there are any questions
31 that the Council has while Trevor is here with us in
32 the room, we can quickly cover those Federal proposals
33 just to get that discussion on the record. It will
34 also benefit the Council members who aren't here today
35 as these transcripts will be provided to them as soon
36 as possible.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Come on up, Trevor.

39

40 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
41 Council members. For the record, Trevor Fox with the
42 Office of Subsistence Management. I'm one of the
43 wildlife biologists there. As Melinda said, we can
44 just be pretty brief on these and if anybody wants to
45 go into a little bit more depth, I'm more than happy to
46 answer questions.

47

48 We could start out with the one
49 statewide proposal, which is WP14-01. This a proposal
50 submitted by Kevin Bopp of Nome and it requests the

1 establishment of new statewide provisions for Federal
2 trapping regulations that require trapper
3 identification tags on all traps and snares, establish
4 a maximum allowable time limit for checking traps and
5 snares, and establish a harvest/trapping report form to
6 collect data on non-target species captured in traps
7 and snares.

8

9 Basically OSM preliminary conclusion is
10 to oppose this proposal. We're basically saying that a
11 lot of these extra stipulations can be useful on more
12 unit-specific areas in response to more specific
13 issues, but as a statewide restrictions it's difficult
14 to do.

15

16 The same thing with the report form.
17 These could be useful in more specific situations, but
18 as a statewide provision it's just more of a burden and
19 there's no real need at the time for that information.
20 So the OSM preliminary conclusion is to oppose.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I would like sort
23 of a brief overview position of the OSM. Pollock has
24 to leave here pretty quick. We will deliberate these
25 fully at our spring meeting, so we need to just kind of
26 give people an idea what the proposals are for the
27 record and we'll deliberate these to their full extent
28 at our spring meeting. Go ahead.

29

30 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
31 next proposal is WP14-22. This is a crossover proposal
32 submitted by the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council
33 requesting changes to the Federal caribou hunting
34 regulations in Units 9A, 9B, 9C, 17A, 17B, 17C, 18, 19A
35 and 19B. This is the range of the Mulchatna Caribou
36 Herd. It's to request the establishment of permit
37 requirements for all the units. Also for the to be
38 announced season in Unit 17A remainder, 17C remainder
39 to be shortened from August 1st to March 31st to August
40 1st through March 15th.

41

42 Basically it's to require a State
43 registration permit for all units within the range of
44 the Mulchatna Caribou Herd and then in that small
45 portion of 17A, 17C remainder to basically align that
46 season with the rest of the range and require the State
47 registration permit.

48

49 OSM preliminary conclusion is to
50 support with modification. The modification is to

1 delete regulatory language found in the Units 17A and
2 17C portion and include a delegation of authority
3 letter to the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge Manager
4 for specific in-season management authorities. This
5 has already come up once before. The State
6 registration permit requirements in effect this year
7 based on action taken on wildlife special action WSA13-
8 02, which is a temporary special action that was
9 approved by the Board.

10

11 If there's no specific questions on
12 that, I can move on to the next one.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're not going to
15 question you. We're just going to get all these on the
16 record.

17

18 MR. FOX: Okay. The next one is WP14-
19 23. This one begins on Page 75 of your meeting book.
20 The proposal was submitted by the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta
21 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council to request an
22 extension of the moose season in the Lower Yukon
23 portion of Unit 18. It would be extended from August 1
24 through the last day of February to August 1 to March
25 31st and it also requests the removal of the bull only
26 restriction from August 1 to September 30th. The OSM
27 preliminary conclusion is to support WP14-23.

28

29 The next proposal is a combined
30 analysis for WP14-24 and 25. Both of these are
31 requesting boundary changes for the Lower Yukon portion
32 of Unit 18. Proposal 24 requests that that Lower Yukon
33 area be changed to include the Kashunuk River and the
34 North Fork of the Andreaafsky River. Proposal 25 also
35 requests the change of the Lower Yukon boundary to
36 include the south bank of the Kashunuk River for its
37 entire length. The OSM preliminary conclusion for
38 Proposals 24 and 25 is to support with modification and
39 we've combined the regulatory language to make a single
40 area descriptor and that modified regulation is on Page
41 91 of your meeting book.

42

43 Moving on to Proposal WP14-26, this is
44 also a proposal for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd, but
45 it's only for Unit 18. The proposal was submitted by
46 the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge. It requests
47 that Federal caribou regulations in Unit 18 that
48 portion to the east and south of the Kuskokwim River be
49 changed to require a joint State/Federal registration
50 permit. However, upon further clarification, this was

1 adjusted to be just the State registration permit as in
2 Proposal 22.

3
4 It was also requested to eliminate the
5 one bull harvest restriction so hunters could harvest
6 two caribou without concern of taking two bulls after
7 they have shed their antlers in late winter. This
8 proposal would also eliminate the split season, which
9 there's currently a split season there and return to a
10 continuous season of August 1 through March 15th.

11
12 Then finally it requests that the Yukon
13 Delta National Wildlife Refuge Manager be given
14 delegated authority to close or reopen Federal public
15 lands to all users if needed for conservation concerns
16 after consultation with ADF&G, the Togiak National
17 Wildlife Manager and the Chair of the Yukon-Kuskokwim
18 Delta RAC.

19
20 The OSM preliminary conclusion for this
21 is to support 14-26 with modification to administer the
22 hunt via State registration permit only, retain the
23 harvest limit restrictions and delegate authority to
24 open and close the season via delegation of authority
25 letter to the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge
26 Manager.

27
28 The next proposal is WP14-27. This
29 proposal was submitted by the Yukon Delta National
30 Wildlife Refuge, requests a season for moose in Unit 18
31 in the Kuskokwim area. The season would be established
32 with a season of September 1 through September 30 with
33 a harvest limit of one antlered bull by a joint
34 State/Federal registration permit. Additionally, the
35 hunt will be closed by the Yukon Delta National
36 Wildlife Refuge manager by Special Action when the
37 established quota is met.

38
39 The same with one of the other ones.
40 After further clarification, this would be under a
41 State permit, not the Joint State/Federal. The OSM
42 preliminary conclusion is to support WP14-27 with
43 modification to make this hunt by State registration
44 permit only and delegate authority to close the season
45 and determine annual quotas via delegation of authority
46 letter. All these modifications, the language can be
47 found at the end of the analysis.

48
49 Proposal WP14-28, this is another
50 crossover. It was submitted by the Yukon Delta

1 National Wildlife Refuge and requests extension of the
2 fall season for moose in Unit 18 remainder by 9 days
3 and liberalization of the antlered requirement. The
4 OSM preliminary conclusion is to support WP14-28 with
5 modification to retain the one moose harvest limit, but
6 extend the fall season.

7

8 Now we're getting into the regional
9 proposals here. Proposal WP14-29 was submitted by the
10 Western Interior Regional Advisory Council, requesting
11 that the December 15 through April 15 moose season in a
12 portion of Unit 24B be placed in permanent Federal
13 regulation. The current winter moose season is
14 temporary and set to sunset after June 30, 2014. The
15 Council also mentioned the State proposal that's also
16 out there. The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
17 support WP14-29.

18

19 The next proposal is WP14-30 also
20 submitted by the Western Interior Subsistence Regional
21 Advisory Council, requests the harvest limit for sheep
22 in Unit 24A, except that portion within the Gates of
23 the Arctic National Park, be changed from one ram with
24 seven-eighths curl horn or larger to one ram under
25 Federal regulation. The OSM preliminary conclusion is
26 to support Proposal WP14-30.

27

28 The next one is Proposal WP14-31. This
29 proposal was submitted by the Denali Subsistence
30 Resource Commission, requests that a community winter
31 hunt be established for rural residents of Nikolai for
32 sheep in Unit 19C from October 1 through March 30 with
33 a quota of three sheep; rams or ewes without lambs
34 only. Additionally, the proposal requests the Denali
35 National Park and Preserve Superintendent have the
36 authority to close the season by emergency order when
37 the sheep population is low.

38

39 After further discussion with the
40 proponent, it was clarified that the proposal would
41 only affect those portions of Unit 19C within the
42 Denali National Park and Preserve lands that are open
43 to subsistence harvest.

44

45 OSM preliminary conclusion is to
46 support WP14-31 with modification to add a unit
47 specific stipulation to allow for the accumulation of
48 individual and community harvest limits under Federal
49 regulations so that residents of Nikolai who harvest a
50 sheep during the August 10 through September 20 Federal

1 season could still participate in the winter community
2 harvest. Also to give the Denali National Park and
3 Preserve Superintendent the authority to open and close
4 the community harvest season and set the annual harvest
5 quota for the community hunt. There's a draft of the
6 delegation of authority letter at the end of the
7 analysis.

8
9

10 The next one is Proposal WP14-32. This
11 was submitted by Robert Walker of Anvik as an
12 individual. It requests a modification of the Paradise
13 Controlled Use Area boundary in Unit 21E under Federal
14 regulations by extending the eastern boundary two miles
15 along the east bank of the Innoko River and along the
16 east bank of Paimiut Slough. The OSM preliminary
17 conclusion is to oppose the proposal.

18
19

 Our final proposal is Proposal WP14-40.
20 This is a crossover submitted by the Northwest Arctic
21 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. It requests
22 that the requirement for a State registration permit to
23 harvest brown bears in Unit 23 be eliminated. The OSM
24 preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal WP14-40
25 with modification to insert the word subsistence and to
26 clarify the permit requirements. The modified
27 regulations are at the end of this analysis.

28
29

 This one is a little complicated
30 because we're supporting with modification although
31 we're recommending that the permit stay in place rather
32 than be eliminated. It's just part of how we have to
33 deal with things with support, oppose or support with
34 modification.

35
36

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We'll delve
37 into that when we get to that at our spring meeting.
38 Jennifer, you had a comment.

39
40

 MS. YUHAS: I have confirmed late
41 harvest moose numbers for you that you asked for
42 earlier and I didn't have the answer for.

43
44

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

45
46

 MS. YUHAS: I am pleased to report that
47 although there are still 200 outstanding permits that
48 12 additional moose were harvested from the extension
49 on the State permits. Nine of those were from Galena,
50 two from Huslia and one from Nulato.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Cool. Thank
2 you. So Melinda.

3
4 MS. BURKE: Mr. Chair. Just a couple
5 items to go through. Even though we can't vote on and
6 set positive dates for the fall 2014 meeting, I think
7 it would be beneficial for the Council members who are
8 here to take a look at the calendar of the weeks that
9 are available and at least sort of claim our spot for
10 the dates that work the best or if there's any dates
11 that don't work well for the fall 2014 meeting, we
12 should talk about that with the members that are here
13 present in the room.

14
15 So far it looks like there are no weeks
16 during the fall 2014 meeting dates that have been set
17 so far that are out of the question since there's not
18 been a double up yet. If we want to do a placeholder
19 couple days we can certainly do that and then vote in
20 the follow-up teleconference to set those for sure.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Typically this
23 Council meets the first week in October, so I would
24 like to jump on that 7th and 8th of October if we can.
25 How does the Council feel. Go ahead.

26
27 MS. BURKE: I also coordinate the
28 Northwest Arctic Council, so that wouldn't work for
29 myself.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. 14 and
32 15. Is that okay with the Council, October 14th and
33 15th.

34
35 MR. GERVAIS: Yes.

36
37 MR. HONEA: Yes.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And you're looking
40 for a meeting place for this spring meeting.

41
42 MS. BURKE: We are. Unless we have a
43 community who would like to invite the Council to meet
44 there for February, we can hold off until the
45 teleconference early next month if we'd like to wait to
46 set a location there. I feel comfortable with that
47 amount of time. I'd have to get the logistics in
48 order.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

1 MS. BURKE: So if we'd like to wait
2 unless there's a community who would like to invite the
3 Council for the February meeting here.

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would prefer to
6 have full Council.

7
8 MS. BURKE: Sounds good. The only
9 other -- oh, I'm sorry. Please, Jennifer, go ahead.

10
11 MS. YUHAS: No, this is your item. I
12 just wanted to add some information as you prepare for
13 your spring meeting. Although you can't take action
14 today, I'd like to point out that the statewide Board
15 of Game meeting will occur on March 14th through the
16 18th. So just reinforcing the importance of making
17 your comments official at your spring meeting if you
18 want to convey them to the Board of Game and the
19 timeframe for sending written comments.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh. Why did I
22 think the Board of Game meeting was in late February.
23 Hmm.

24
25 MS. YUHAS: There is a different Board
26 of Game meeting in late February and that is actually
27 occurring in Fairbanks the 14th through the 22nd.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh. What are
30 they covering with that one?

31
32 MS. YUHAS: Interior issues.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay. I'll have
35 to look at that book again.

36
37 MR. GERVAIS: Which meeting is covering
38 what?

39
40 MS. YUHAS: February meeting is
41 Interior specific and March 14th through 18th is
42 statewide and I think you had proposals that pertained
43 to both of those. So if your meeting occurs on
44 February 25th, it will be after the Interior meeting,
45 so your fall comments need to be settled at your
46 teleconference meeting for the Interior meeting and
47 then your spring comments have a very short time window
48 between the statewide meeting.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh. Good point.

1 Thank you. So we should cover State proposals on the
2 conference call.

3

4 MS. BURKE: That's the last item of
5 discussion that we have for the day. Looking at the
6 calendar between now and early December, it looks like
7 the only time that's going to work -- I'm hoping it
8 will work best to get a quorum online will be the week
9 of December 9th. The week of Thanksgiving is out.
10 We're going to need our biologist and he's going to be
11 out hunting and I'm sure a lot of folks will have
12 family events that week as well. We do need two weeks
13 to formally announce the meeting in the Federal
14 Register.

15

16 My suggestion, Mr. Chair, would be to
17 have the Council set just a preliminary date of the
18 week of December 9th. After this meeting is over I can
19 poll the Council members who are not present today and
20 we can set a day and try to get a good one day of work
21 in for timely items. FRMP, State proposals, the letter
22 from Mr. Collins to carry to the subcommittee, future
23 meeting dates, previous meeting minutes or some other
24 housekeeping issues we'll need to take care of on that
25 call.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is that okay with
28 you, Tim?

29

30 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, I believe so. And
31 that's going to be one day?

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It should be,
34 hopefully. Is that okay, the week of the 9th of
35 December for a conference meeting?

36

37 MR. HONEA: Yeah, that's fine with me.
38 Is that pretty much what we're going to discuss in
39 there? I mean if there's other proposals, like ours or
40 whatever.....

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, the Federal
43 proposals we'll all be at our sit-down meeting in
44 February. The State proposals we have to cover during
45 the conference call because the Board will meet
46 basically before our comments can be evaluated. So we
47 need to have all those State recommendations on State
48 proposals during that conference meeting.

49

50 MS. BURKE: Also, Don, with the

1 shifting of the Federal Subsistence Board meeting in
2 April we'll still have plenty of time with our February
3 meeting to get the comments of the Council to the
4 Federal Subsistence Board.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Another statement,
7 Jennifer.

8
9 MS. YUHAS: Just planning information.
10 The week of December 9th the State will do our best to
11 make as many resources available to you as possible for
12 your discussion regarding the State proposals that will
13 be upcoming. For planning purposes any day other than
14 the 10th will free up more of those resources than
15 others.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

18
19 MS. YUHAS: There's another meeting
20 happening on the 10th.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the week of the
23 9th of December would be a good day for you for a
24 conference call, Pollock?

25
26 MR. SIMON: Yes, okay. I like to have
27 meetings regularly in the fall and late spring. You've
28 got to talk with everybody, all the board members.
29 Make sure they come here. If you cancel one meeting,
30 you have to reschedule again. If you reschedule, it
31 might come into conflict with other meetings as
32 happened here.

33
34 Jack, I like this meeting here. You
35 can talk directly with different agencies. On the
36 other hand, like I said before, when you go to a
37 village that we represent, you can hear local comments
38 of how the subsistence life affects them. So I'd like
39 to go out to the rural areas sometimes and listen to
40 them.

41
42 Thank you, Jack.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: On the conference
45 call the Council will select a meeting place for the
46 spring and that will be in rural Alaska someplace. You
47 can be thinking about where we might be going, but
48 theoretically we would be going to Aniak is where we'd
49 possibly be going. We've done Galena. We've been to
50 McGrath previous to that. Aniak would be the next one

1 possibly. But if there's a community that has a
2 burning issue, this Council can advocate for that hot
3 zone.

4
5 So anything.....

6
7 MS. BURKE: Closing comments.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Closing comments
10 from the Council members.

11
12 MR. HONEA: Yeah, I guess I might as
13 well start. I appreciate that we had this even though
14 we don't have a quorum. I feel handicapped because I
15 like our group. It's pretty varied. They could bring
16 interesting hunting and fishing issues in their
17 specific areas I can't speak about. I feel kind of
18 handicapped. Even asking Dr. Doolittle -- or Tom
19 Doolittle this morning on the importance of the
20 Tuluksak Project. They had 11 projects and I guess if
21 you feel compassionate about it, it must be a major
22 spawning ground and things like that. I feel
23 handicapped because I want to know what the two reps
24 from the Kuskokwim River think about that.

25
26 Other than that, I mean just looking at
27 the things that we covered I think we did well. I'm
28 hoping that we can get together for our teleconference
29 and express some of these proposals that are ahead of
30 us. So, anyway, I appreciate the logistics in setting
31 this up and I appreciate Melinda and I appreciate
32 Salena for being here and Jack for doing a good job as
33 usual and for the members that could make it and for
34 the members of the public that had issues. I think it
35 was a worthwhile good meeting.

36
37 Thank you.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don.
40 Pollock, any closing comments.

41
42 MR. SIMON: Okay. Thanks, Jack.
43 You've been chairing meetings for us for a while, so
44 you're doing good. I like it. I want to comment about
45 Upper Koyukuk River and Allakaket. Life is getting
46 tougher there. No more king salmon. There's a lot of
47 chum salmon though. We have a low number of moose. At
48 one time it was one moose per each square mile. That's
49 spread out quite a bit. Nowadays doing wolf control,
50 so people are kind of excited. Wolf control program

1 works sometimes in some areas. We hope to get the
2 moose back. Caribou is kind of questionable. They
3 don't come around every winter.

4
5 We're getting a lot of pressure from
6 the Haul Road, Ambler Road. People come around and ask
7 questions, are you for the road or not. These people
8 from DOT said it could be four or five years project,
9 we'd be making a lot of money working on the road. If
10 the road should open, gas and groceries would come up
11 the road cheaper. That's just telling us one side of
12 the story. You don't hear the other side. If the road
13 is put in, an influx of people would come up and that
14 would really impact our subsistence lifestyle. We get
15 a lot of these. In fact, they're coming to Allakaket
16 today. I hope I can make it before that.

17
18 I've talked to some of the western
19 villages, but so far everybody is opposed to the road.
20 Cost of living is high, gas is high, but a road that
21 comes in maybe would bring some things cheaper, but
22 first you've got to get a truck and go get your stuff.
23 Sometimes it doesn't work. I live in Allakaket. It's
24 kind of off to the side rural areas and a lot of old-
25 timers. We just want to be left alone.

26
27 That road is something like progress.
28 There's a lot of minerals there in the Ambler Hills.
29 They want to get that out. We can't fight progress
30 forever, but we always have our say. If we had our say
31 in the planning process, people would understand.
32 Sometimes that doesn't happen. People come in and say
33 we're building a road through here, sign here. Do you
34 agree. Most time we don't.

35
36 I better go check in at Wright Air.
37 I've been here since Monday, so I'm kind of tired. I
38 want to go home. Thank you, Jack, Don and Tim and all
39 the different agencies for showing up and hearing us.
40 Thank you, Jack.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks a lot,
43 Pollock. Tim.

44
45 MR. GERVAIS: All right. I'd like to
46 express appreciate to the Council members and all the
47 agencies for their cooperation with the change of dates
48 of the meeting and providing us with all the good
49 information. It's really difficult to keep good track
50 and proper information of all the various issues that

1 we cover. So thanks for doing a good job.

2

3 I'd like to extend a special thank you
4 to Jack for working on this Council for 20 years.
5 That's really impressive. I know it takes a lot of
6 extra effort and you always are taking something away
7 from your family or personal life to make these
8 meetings. So thanks for all you do for such a long
9 time. It's real impressive.

10

11 I'd also like to extend appreciation to
12 the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of
13 Fish and Game for working on our hunt extensions. A
14 season like this when the moose season was late -- or
15 the moose season wasn't late, but the behavior of the
16 moose was late. It really helped a lot with enabling
17 our community to meet their subsistence needs.

18

19 I'd also like to take a moment here to
20 remember Elder Katie John passed away this past May. I
21 never met her, but I was impressed with what I read
22 about her and her life and her fight for subsistence.
23 I hope that she sets a good example for younger folks
24 in Alaska to keep working hard for stuff that's
25 important for all Alaskans.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Tim. My
30 closing comments would be that I'm very appreciative to
31 the agency people who sat through this meeting, the
32 State and Federal agencies. I really appreciate all
33 that Melinda has done to reschedule this meeting, the
34 frustration with members becoming sick and not meeting
35 quorum. The Federal shutdown really put this fall
36 meeting in a bind.

37

38 I do think we had a productive meeting
39 here. Salena is always very supportive and does a lot
40 of extra things for this Council that doesn't show, on
41 the set-up and everything.

42

43 And Trevor going full on out to get
44 that special action request, working with the State to
45 get -- apparently considerable subsistence harvest was
46 made, especially in the late fall. That was also
47 another factor and it turned out to be a real positive
48 thing.

49

50 Appreciate that.

1 Having a meeting in Fairbanks, we don't
2 get rural comments, but sometimes we don't get any
3 comments even if we're in a rural place, yet we had
4 many people from -- Native people from Fairbanks at
5 this meeting. So there is another issue there. We had
6 an opportunity to dialogue with Orville quite a bit.
7 Orville can't typically travel all the way out and all
8 the way back, so TCC was able to attend this meeting.

9
10 So there's some positive things to the
11 Fairbanks meeting. We should keep that in the back of
12 our mind also for future dates. That's why I was
13 supportive of having a meeting in Fairbanks because we
14 get more agency participation and the cost of travel is
15 vastly reduced for the agencies in general and we do
16 get quite a bit of comment from people who have
17 concerns.

18
19 I feel that this was a very productive
20 meeting and I'm looking forward to going back to a full
21 quorum. I felt very frustrated. I like to get action
22 items, get motions on the table and move on and get
23 things accomplished. I feel frustrated on kind of
24 getting halfway through something and going to have to
25 go all the way back through this conference call and
26 complete this meeting, but we'll do it.

27
28 That's the hand we were dealt, so we're
29 going to do it.

30
31 With that, I felt we had a good
32 meeting. We can't make a motion to adjourn, but I
33 adjourn the meeting of the Western Interior Regional
34 Council meeting. Thanks for your attendance, Council
35 members.

36
37 (Off record)

38
39 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public, State of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 211 through 256 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME III taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 8th day of November in Anchorage, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed under my direction to the best of our knowledge and ability;

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 22nd day of November 2013.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 9/16/14