

1 WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE  
2  
3 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING  
4  
5 PUBLIC TELEPHONIC MEETING  
6

7  
8 Alaska  
9 May 14, 2010  
10 10:12 o'clock a.m.  
11

12  
13 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 14  
15 Jack Reakoff, Chairman  
16 Ray Collins  
17 Timothy Gervais  
18 Donald Honea  
19 Jenny Pelkola  
20 Eleanor Yatlin  
21  
22  
23  
24 Regional Council Coordinator, Ann Wilkinson  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Recorded and transcribed by:

40  
41 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC  
42 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2  
43 Anchorage, AK 99501  
44 907-243-0668  
45 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

(Alaska - 05/14/2010)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have a quorum. We have myself, Eleanor, Tim, Jenny, Don and Ray on line. And then we have, let's see, we got Vince, Bo Sloan, Kenton Moos, Fred Bue, Glenn Stout, Beth Leonard and who else is on here?

MS. BROWN: Caroline Brown.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Caroline. Caroline Brown.

MR. MATHEWS: Bo is on, I believe, Bo Sloan.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

So we should probably get started and if we get additional members coming on line -- did everybody get the agenda that was sent out by Ann.

MS. YATLIN: This is Eleanor, I didn't receive it.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh.

MS. YATLIN: I'll just listen.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Basically the four agenda items are we need to go over the Unit 24B Proposal 10-67 for around Allakaket/Alatna; a few points on that one. We need to go over the Unit 24D proposal, WP10-68. And then we -- I wanted to go over the Board of Game changes to caribou regulations for Unit 26B, which were vastly expanded at the Board of Game meeting. I wanted to go over the Yukon River chinook fisheries management with the Council to find out if Council members are comfortable with the way the season's going to be managed.

Beth Leonard emailed me and says that she has a conflict after 12:00 o'clock so I would like to move the caribou issue to the front and just covering these issues fairly briefly because we're on teleconference here.

1                   So is that fine with the Council,  
2 basically, and then Council comments and concerns would  
3 be another portion -- does that sound good to the  
4 Council?

5  
6                   MS. PELKOLA: Yes.

7  
8                   MS. YATLIN: Yes.

9  
10                  MR. COLLINS: It's good with me.

11  
12                  MR. GERVAIS: Yes.

13  
14                  MR. HONEA: Okay.

15  
16                  CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll go into this  
17 Unit 26B, this basically affects the Central Arctic  
18 Caribou Herd fairly dramatically.

19  
20                  The Council looked at Proposal 104 --  
21 State Proposal 104, which was to expand the caribou  
22 season or bag limit from July 1, five bulls was the  
23 original proposal; and on September 1 was to go to five  
24 caribou; and so that's an expansion of going from two  
25 caribou July 1 for bulls and then October 1 is when cow  
26 season started. The Council opposed the proposal, but  
27 during the deliberation, the Department of Fish and  
28 Game submitted a Record Copy 126, which increased the  
29 cow season to two and a half months; it moved the cow  
30 season to the 1st of July instead of the 1st of  
31 September, and it lengthened it an additional half a  
32 month into the middle of May. This is for residents  
33 and non-resident hunters. It was stated during  
34 deliberation that there was little access to the area,  
35 well, there's the Dalton Highway, a major highway that  
36 goes all the way to Prudhoe Bay, and then there's 737  
37 jet aircraft service, Alaska Airlines, into Deadhorse,  
38 that little industrial town up there. And so I  
39 expressed at the Board of Game meeting and the Advisory  
40 -- Koyukuk River Advisory Committee was concerned that  
41 there wasn't adequate harvest inventory done for the  
42 current structure of what's actually been harvested.

43  
44                  Right now Venetie and Arctic Village  
45 have had access to only Central Arctic Caribou and they  
46 typically take 500 caribou, each village. I talked to  
47 somebody in Venetie and they told me they had taken  
48 over 500 caribou as of February.

49  
50                  And so I'm very concerned that the

1 Department didn't account for the current harvest on  
2 the road or from the villages within the Central Arctic  
3 Herd, and that this vastly expanded access will attract  
4 innumerable amounts of additional non-resident hunters  
5 and for non-residents will be able to harvest five cow  
6 caribou, I feel it absolutely not the direction, that  
7 it will reallocate this resource away from the local  
8 villages that rely on these caribou and move it towards  
9 basically a sport-interest base. And so I'm very  
10 concerned about this.

11  
12                   And so I've written a petition to the  
13 Board of Game, and so I was up at Barrow at the  
14 beginning of this month here and so the North Slope  
15 Borough is looking at the petition with their  
16 attorneys. The Gates of the Arctic Subsistence  
17 Resource Commission has adopted the principle of  
18 petitioning the Board to rescind the regulations that  
19 were not addressed by the public, the public did not  
20 even see RC 126 parameters. We did not see cow seasons  
21 up through July. And so I was wanting to know if the  
22 Western Interior Council would like to be a co-signor  
23 to this petition to the Board of Game to rescind  
24 regulatory language that was not addressed under the  
25 Procedural Act. The Board of Game is constrained by  
26 the Procedural Act and so there has to be a 30 day  
27 notice of all regulations, just like we have to have  
28 FACA announcements for this meeting. And so I would  
29 like to poll the Council, whether they would like to be  
30 co-signors in petitioning the Board of Game to rescind  
31 this vastly expanded seasons for cow caribou that's  
32 been adopted by the Board, and this would have to go to  
33 the Board, the Board would look at it and then would  
34 take it up at their next meeting, most likely.

35  
36                   So Council member discussion.

37  
38                   MR. COLLINS: Jack, this is Ray. What  
39 kind of reasoning did they give for this expansion? Do  
40 they think the herd is growing and they need to slow  
41 down the growth or why the -- I can't see why non-  
42 residents would want even five bulls; that seems like  
43 something.....

44  
45                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, I'll give Beth  
46 Leonard, she's the area biologist, I'll give her a  
47 chance to discuss that issue. Go ahead, Beth.

48  
49                   MS. LEONARD: Thanks Jack. Hi Ray,  
50 this is Beth Leonard. That's a good question. And I

1 can tell you what's been going on.

2

3 In the last 10 years pregnancy rates of  
4 that caribou herd have been over 90 percent, over 95  
5 percent in some years, so we know the herd was growing  
6 in 10 years. And we did a photo count -- photo census  
7 in 2008 and counted 67,000 caribou in there, and at  
8 that time, and still, now, less than 3 percent of the  
9 herd had been harvested. And we think a lot of that  
10 has to do with access along the Dalton Highway with the  
11 restrictions along the corridor there where you can't  
12 use a firearm within five miles of the road and you  
13 can't use a fourwheeler or a snowmachine to go hunting.

14

15 So we think that's part of the reason  
16 that that herd hasn't been heavily hunted by non-local  
17 hunters.

18

19 And we've had a limited cow season in  
20 that herd for many years, and by that I mean we did not  
21 allow a cow season during July, August and September;  
22 Jack had noted that, and that's when most of the  
23 hunting occurs, is in August. And we had that limited  
24 season because at that time we were trying not to mask  
25 the effects of harvest on what might be happening to  
26 caribou in the oilfield. So when the herd grew to that  
27 degree and still weren't getting -- we're getting an  
28 increase of hunters, a little bit every year but  
29 there's still not, you know, a huge harvest on that  
30 herd, we felt that liberalizing the cow season would be  
31 okay and that most hunters during that time would still  
32 be targeting bulls anyways.

33

34 But that's what we were thinking.

35

36 And in all the other North Slope  
37 Caribou Herds where there's bag limits of five caribou  
38 per day, you know, and it also has a cow season year-  
39 round, except for that six week period during the  
40 calving. And so we thought that that would -- that the  
41 herd could withstand that. That's partly because of  
42 the access issue along the Dalton Highway.

43

44 We've got some airplane hunters.  
45 There's some transporters set up there, and that may  
46 change. I know that's one of Jack's concern that we'll  
47 see an increase in the number of transporters using  
48 that area and that could happen.

49

50 And I also wanted to make a comment

1 about the non-resident and the five caribou bag limit.

2

3 I think you're right that even though  
4 we had proposed a bag limit of five for non-residents,  
5 because we weren't concerned about the biological part  
6 of it, we didn't think very many non-residents would  
7 take five caribou. For one thing those caribou are not  
8 known for Boone and Crockett animals. And so we didn't  
9 really think they would -- there'd be very few people  
10 who would even fill that bag limit. And I think very  
11 few non-local hunters that would take five, there'll be  
12 some, but we can kind of track that in the harvest and  
13 see if that changes through time. Currently when there  
14 was the two caribou bag limit, about 100 hunters in the  
15 reported harvest, you know, took two caribou.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Well, the 3  
18 percent harvest, was that calculating the village  
19 harvest? When we got into what actually was being  
20 calculated, you were only calculating Nuiqsut and  
21 Kaktovik; we're talking about Arctic Village and  
22 Venetie killing 1,000, just those two villages,  
23 probably this year.

24

25 MS. LEONARD: Jack. Right, when I was  
26 talking to you originally I had a percent of 2 percent  
27 because I did -- I did a couple of things after I  
28 talked to you this fall and you were concerned about,  
29 one was unreported harvest and you were concerned about  
30 us not including those other villages. So I worked  
31 with Caroline some on trying to get an idea of numbers  
32 from the other villages and then also using some data  
33 we had from harvest surveys and just some modeling; and  
34 in a lot of those areas, you know, it's mixed with the  
35 Porcupine or the Western Arctic and the Teshekpuk so I  
36 took that into consideration. In some years it might  
37 be higher. For example, like you're talking about this  
38 year where very few Porcupine animals were over there  
39 by Arctic Village and Venetie and it was mostly Central  
40 Arctic. But I did include numbers there.

41

42 And I also looked to the literature  
43 some on unreported harvest. And there was a study done  
44 in 20A by Mark McNae on that, and he had calculated  
45 that about 32 percent of the caribou harvest tickets,  
46 by successful hunters, were not returned. So I applied  
47 a 32 percent correction factor on the reported harvest.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, the bottom  
50 line is I still feel that there's an expanding, even

1 with the two caribou limit, I saw more early spring,  
2 late winter hunters than I've ever seen since and so we  
3 had an expanding harvest that's not being reflected by  
4 your sporharvest. And there's really a poor harvest  
5 of information on the village harvest here and so I'm  
6 very concerned that we may be already approaching the  
7 sustainability of 3,350 caribou. And with this high  
8 attraction rate, and that's what five caribou limit  
9 does, is it's a high attraction rate, and so we just  
10 watched Mulchatna get shot out. They were pounding  
11 away with air taxis way far away from Anchorage. Here  
12 we have the road and we have jet air service right into  
13 the middle of the caribou which is a short hop with  
14 aircraft, 30 percent of the hunters were already using  
15 aircraft and there's already boat access. So it's not  
16 just walking out hunters. The misperception is that  
17 it's just walk -- that over 50 percent of the harvest  
18 is with boat and aircraft already. And so I'm very,  
19 very concerned.

20

21 The people of the North Slope, Nuiqsut  
22 is very concerned, and there's been lots of comments  
23 taken already on the North Slope by people who are  
24 really concerned that this expansion is going to really  
25 damage this population.

26

27 We've already seen the bull/cow ratio  
28 starting to fall just from what we've had already. You  
29 had 50 bulls per 100 cows in your last composition last  
30 fall and it used to be 100 to 70 to 100 bulls per 100  
31 cows and so we're already seeing it affecting the cows  
32 -- or the bull component.

33

34 And so I don't feel that it was  
35 appropriate for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
36 to slip in another two months of cow season during  
37 deliberations when the public, the Western Interior  
38 Council, Advisory Committees did not get a chance to  
39 comment on that. I feel that was illegal,  
40 inappropriate, and so I feel that we need to petition  
41 the Board to rescind those regulatory extensions and go  
42 back over this proposal again.

43

44 And my question to the Council is do  
45 you want to be a co-signor to the petition to the Board  
46 of Game because I'm very concerned that we're going to  
47 see exactly what happened to Mulchatna happen here.

48

49 I'll poll the Council. Ray, how do you  
50 feel about petitioning the Board?

1 MR. COLLINS: Yes. Yes.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Don.  
4  
5 MR. COLLINS: There should have been  
6 more public debate.  
7  
8 MR. HONEA: Yeah, Jack, I think this is  
9 a no-brainer. I certainly agree with that.  
10  
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jenny.  
12  
13 MS. PELKOLA: Yeah. It sound like that  
14 -- well, anyway, I agree.  
15  
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Tim.  
17  
18 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, I would support it.  
19 I'm curious to know if you had any conversation with  
20 the North Slope RAC?  
21  
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The North Slope RAC,  
23 they opposed the proposal and they wanted to reduce --  
24 the original proposal, they wanted to reduce the bag  
25 limit down to three. And so I was in Barrow and I  
26 talked to the North Slope Borough, I didn't get a hold  
27 of Harry Brower on this, but they're working with the  
28 Advisory Committee -- the North Slope Borough is  
29 working on this petition. They're very concerned about  
30 this.  
31  
32 So, Eleanor, how do you feel about  
33 petitioning the Board to repeal certain regulations.  
34  
35 MS. YATLIN: I would support their  
36 letter to petition the Board.  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.  
39  
40 MS. YATLIN: I know what happened to  
41 the moose population up that way with the transporters  
42 coming in.  
43  
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. And so we'll  
45 -- this takes awhile to get all the right language  
46 together. It has to be legally -- it's being legally  
47 looked at, the legalities of how this was pushed  
48 through with this additional two and a half months of  
49 cow season.  
50

1                   The problem is when people buy a  
2 handful of tags, these non-residents and caribou  
3 segregate in the fall, in August, and so there would be  
4 -- if there's only cows they're going to shoot  
5 something and so I'm concerned they're going to start  
6 snapping tags, and over in the Porcupine 10 percent of  
7 the caribou way out in the middle of nowhere killed by  
8 non-residents were cows, and so this is going to be a  
9 short hop with air taxis right off the road.

10

11                   So we've covered that. When this  
12 petition is finalized the Western Interior will be a  
13 co-signor to that petition.

14

15                   And so we're going to go to the  
16 proposals that we need to address. And.....

17

18                   MS. WILKINSON: Excuse.....

19

20                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: .....for the  
21 Proposal WP.....

22

23                   MS. WILKINSON: .....excuse -- Mr. --  
24 excuse -- Mr.....

25

26                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: .....10-67, which  
27 was for.....

28

29                   MS. WILKINSON: Excuse me, Mr.  
30 Chairman, I'm sorry to interrupt, this is Ann.

31

32                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right, go ahead.

33

34                   MS. WILKINSON: I thought I heard  
35 someone else come on line.

36

37                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay.

38

39                   MS. WILKINSON: And then I have a  
40 question.

41

42                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead.

43

44                   MS. WILKINSON: Did someone else come  
45 on line recently?

46

47                   (No comments)

48

49                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did we have any more  
50 Council members come on line?

1 MR. BEYERSDORF: This is Geoff  
2 Beyersdorf.  
3  
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, Geoff, thanks.  
5  
6 MS. WILKINSON: Okay, thank you.  
7  
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right.  
9  
10 MS. WILKINSON: And so I have a  
11 question. After this petition that the North Slope  
12 Borough is putting together is done then will you send  
13 a copy to me to distribute to the Council members?  
14  
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, I will.  
16  
17 MS. WILKINSON: Okay.  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And this may  
20 take.....  
21 MS. WILKINSON: Thank you.  
22  
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: .....some more time,  
24 maybe -- I'm not sure, we're working on it. I've read  
25 the basics of it and so we're working over some of the  
26 fine language and then we're going to get all the other  
27 villages to sign onto it also. Anaktuvuk Pass is very,  
28 very concerned. They're willingly wanting to sign this  
29 thing.  
30  
31 MS. WILKINSON: Okay.  
32  
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so okay we're  
34 going to Proposal WP10-67. And that was, during our  
35 deliberations, for Don's information, Honea, who wasn't  
36 at the meeting; the State of Alaska, Glenn Stout,  
37 worked out a proposal, a State proposal, that allowed a  
38 bull season from December 15th to April 15th. It had  
39 parameters for -- did you get the map there, Don, on  
40 line; did people find the map for Unit 24B?  
41  
42 MR. HONEA: No, I don't have it.  
43  
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay. Did you  
45 send that Vince?  
46  
47 MR. MATHEWS: I can send it, or if  
48 you're on line you'd look at Page 687 of the analysis,  
49 if you're looking on line. I didn't send it because  
50 you guys are looking on line.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

2

3 But anyways the upshot of what happened  
4 is that the State Board of Game passed Glenn Stout's  
5 proposal except they -- the proposal stated a five inch  
6 antler was the restriction, the moose -- the bull had  
7 to have a five inch antler and so the season was from  
8 December 15th to April 15th, one antlered bull, by  
9 registration. Were there some other hot parameters  
10 also Glenn, do you want to add anything in?

11

12 MR. STOUT: Yeah, the other parameters  
13 that the Board of Game adopted would be that it would  
14 have a four year sunset, and antlered bull for that  
15 period of December 15th to April 15. And so they  
16 dropped that five inch restriction and just called it  
17 an antlered bull.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. And so when  
20 we deliberated the Federal proposal, which we have to  
21 have a Federal proposal for the Kanuti Controlled Use  
22 Area, which is dead center within -- basically within  
23 this hunt, we had two different options.

24

25 One is if the State proposal passed  
26 then we would adopt a proposal that mirrored the  
27 State's proposal December 15th to April 15th. During  
28 deliberations we had stipulated the five inch antler  
29 restriction, well, the State Board of Game eliminated  
30 that. And so what we need to do here; the first thing  
31 we need to do is align with the State current  
32 regulation which will be one antlered bull. And so  
33 just on that one issue I'd like to -- to the Council,  
34 is that clear, what we need to, we need to align to the  
35 State language, which is one antlered bull instead of a  
36 five inch antlered beam.

37

38 MS. YATLIN: Yes.

39

40 MS. PELKOLA: Yes.

41

42 (Council affirms)

43

44 MR. GERVAIS: Clear.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So clear to the  
47 Council. And so we'll vote on that particular aspect  
48 separately and so the Council -- call the roll for  
49 affirmative of aligning with the State regulation as  
50 far as the antler configuration, one antlered bull; go

1 ahead Ann.  
2  
3 MS. WILKINSON: Okay. Of those members  
4 present, Don Honea.  
5  
6 MR. HONEA: Yeah.  
7  
8 MS. WILKINSON: Eleanor Yatlin.  
9  
10 MS. YATLIN: Yes.  
11  
12 MS. WILKINSON: Ray Collins.  
13  
14 MR. COLLINS: Yes.  
15  
16 MS. WILKINSON: Jack Reakoff.  
17  
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.  
19  
20 MS. WILKINSON: Tim Gervais.  
21  
22 MR. GERVAIS: Yes.  
23  
24 MS. WILKINSON: Jenny Pelkola.  
25  
26 MS. PELKOLA: Yes.  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.  
29  
30 MS. WILKINSON: So the measure passes.  
31  
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so then the  
33 second aspect of what we have to deal with is when we  
34 discussed this proposal with Glenn, that we stipulated  
35 that the Federal proposal would be the Kanuti  
36 Controlled Use Area.  
37  
38 Subsequently there's been lots of  
39 discussion from the Refuge manager; did you want to  
40 comment on that aspect, Vince, for the Kanuti Refuge?  
41  
42 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. Basically what the  
43 Refuge was trying to do was to make the regulations as  
44 simple as possible for in the field, which we succeeded  
45 with the special action this past season. And for  
46 those that have the map, we're basically trying to have  
47 it be all the Refuge lands and BLM lands in Unit 24B,  
48 as in Boy. So it was to make it easier and to capture  
49 some lands that hunters -- qualified hunters might use,  
50 which are closer to Bettles, Evansville.

1                   And, that, in a nutshell, is what is  
2 going on with this. And a better description, for  
3 those that can see it on line is the preliminary  
4 conclusion, OSM conclusion on Page 686. That's where  
5 we're at from the Refuge perspective.

6  
7                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. And so I'm  
8 in a quandary, as we had an agreement with Glenn, and  
9 so I want your position, Glenn, on the Federal  
10 proposal, as OSM is recommending. Are you comfortable  
11 with including the other Federal lands outside the  
12 Kanuti Controlled Use Area or are you strictly hard and  
13 fast on the old -- and it has to be the old Kanuti  
14 Controlled Use Area, because the Board of Game trimmed  
15 off a significant northern portion.

16  
17                   Go ahead, Glenn.

18  
19                   MR. STOUT: Yeah, thanks, Jack.

20  
21                   MS. WILKINSON: Who is that?

22  
23                   REPORTER: Glenn.

24  
25                   MS. WILKINSON: Who?

26  
27                   REPORTER: Glenn Stout.

28  
29                   MR. STOUT: Yeah, the Department's  
30 recommendation is the same that we've submitted to have  
31 just the Kanuti Controlled Use Area portion of the  
32 Refuge that includes the Henshaw Creek drainage down  
33 stream; and so that's still where we're at on our  
34 recommendation.

35  
36                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And so the --  
37 our -- what we've agreed to was the old Kanuti  
38 Controlled Use Area, which goes from the VOR at Bettles  
39 to -- in that Kanuti Controlled Use Area configuration.

40  
41                   And so how does the Council feel  
42 regarding the State's position and/or taking OSM and  
43 the Refuge's position of including all the Federal  
44 land, the BLM and Refuge lands outside of the Kanuti  
45 Controlled Use Area. This would be for Federally-  
46 qualified rural residents that have C&T for moose  
47 within that Game Management Unit 24B.

48  
49                   MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair, this is Don  
50 Rivard.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.  
2  
3 MR. RIVARD: If you would like I could  
4 read the OSM conclusion, just so everybody knows what  
5 we recommended here now.  
6  
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, go ahead, Don.  
8  
9 MR. RIVARD: Okay. It says support  
10 Proposal WP10-67 with modification to provide a four  
11 month winter/spring hunt on all Kanuti National  
12 Wildlife Refuge and BLM lands in Unit 24B, as in Boy;  
13 to specify the Kanuti Controlled Use Area as described  
14 in Federal regulation and to specify that the  
15 regulation will sunset on 30 June 2014.  
16  
17 Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. That  
20 clarifies the language.  
21  
22 And so things are pretty much aligned.  
23 I do want the Council to deliberate the area of about  
24 the BLM and Refuge lands outside of the Kanuti  
25 Controlled Use Area and so I'll go through and hear  
26 everyone. Ray, do you have comments on that?  
27  
28 MR. COLLINS: Well, I'm not clear on  
29 the area but actually if it's increased opportunity for  
30 subsistence hunters I would say yes.  
31  
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It would be  
33 basically the areas -- if you have a map that shows the  
34 Kanuti Controlled Use Area, there's significant BLM  
35 land and Refuge land, basically southwest and south and  
36 north of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area, just slightly  
37 to the northeast of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area.  
38  
39 Do you have that map, Ray?  
40  
41 MR. COLLINS: No, but I -- the issue I  
42 have is what do the villages up in that area that use  
43 that area want; do they want to see this expansion or  
44 are they afraid that outside people will come in? They  
45 have to be Federally-qualified, I guess, to do it,  
46 don't they?  
47  
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: They'd have to be  
49 Federally-qualified for this Proposal WP10-67.  
50

1 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so basically  
4 it'd be Bettles, Allakaket, and Alatna that would be  
5 the beneficiaries of this.  
6  
7 MR. COLLINS: Well, if it's an expanded  
8 opportunity for subsistence hunters I would say yes,  
9 the more land open the better, personally.  
10  
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Don, you have  
12 comments on that?  
13  
14 MR. HONEA: Yeah, comments on this,  
15 Federal public lands in the Kanuti, and I'm just  
16 reading the last sentence on this paragraph here; are  
17 closed to the taking moose except by Federally-  
18 qualified subsistence users of Unit 24, Koyukuk,  
19 Galena, hunting under these regulations, not having a  
20 map in front of me I -- you know, I really can't say,  
21 you know, what the take was in the past, how much  
22 people are using it and where it actually is. But I  
23 just know that, you know, that anything that within our  
24 wildlife refuge that we sit here adjacent to, the Novi,  
25 that we leave it at the discretion of our manager,  
26 Kenton, so, you know, maybe we should just -- you know,  
27 that's kind of my take it on it that we just leave it  
28 at the discretion of the manager.  
29  
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.  
31  
32 MR. HONEA: But I'd like to hear other  
33 views.  
34  
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Refuge manager  
36 is a large proponent of all the Federal BLM and Refuge  
37 lands being included in the proposal.  
38  
39 So, okay. Jenny.  
40  
41 MS. PELKOLA: Yes, I would agree, same  
42 thing, as Ray, if it allows more hunters, more chances  
43 for the local people -- the Federally-qualified users  
44 then yes.  
45  
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Tim.  
47  
48 MR. GERVAIS: I'll go along with it.  
49  
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Eleanor.

1 MS. YATLIN: I am looking at the map  
2 and I could see where you mean where Bettles VOR and  
3 how much expansion it is because I know to -- like you  
4 said to the east of there is -- around South Fork and  
5 that area and going to the Haul Road is -- part of it's  
6 BLM land.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

9  
10 MS. YATLIN: And north of there is the  
11 Gates of the Arctic so, yeah.

12  
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So it would be all  
14 -- it would be basically all of the Refuge lands to the  
15 south of Bettles and then the BLM lands primarily are  
16 down towards the -- towards Hughes, basically going  
17 down towards the Unit 24B boundary towards Hughes. Do  
18 you see those colored areas?

19  
20 MS. YATLIN: Yeah, I see that. Like it  
21 says National Preserves and other Federal lands, yes.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those lands to the  
24 north would not be the -- the Park Service lands would  
25 not be in this OSM recommendation.

26  
27 MS. YATLIN: No, it's not.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, just the lands  
30 down there.....

31  
32 MS. YATLIN: Yeah, I would agree with  
33 them opening it up -- to combine it with this other  
34 National Preserves and other Federal lands.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So most of  
37 the Council is in favor of recognizing that it is  
38 Federally-qualified users. They are in favor of the  
39 OSM recommendation. So the majority of the Council is  
40 in favor of it. I.....

41  
42 MS. WILKINSON: Ex -- Mr. Chairman.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead.

45  
46 MS. WILKINSON: Sorry, this is Ann. I  
47 did not hear a motion. If you're going to amend these  
48 recommend -- your previous recommendations.....

49  
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

1 MS. WILKINSON: .....you need to make a  
2 motion.  
3  
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And so we'll  
5 vote on the -- we'll need a motion to adopt the OSM  
6 conclusion.  
7  
8 MR. HONEA: Jack, I so move.  
9  
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, Don. Do I  
11 have a second.  
12  
13 MS. PELKOLA: Second.  
14  
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded.  
16  
17 Those in favor.....  
18  
19 MS. WILKINSON: Who.....  
20  
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: .....in favor of the  
22 OSM.....  
23  
24 MS. WILKINSON: Who -- who was.....  
25  
26 REPORTER: Jenny. Jenny.  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: .....conclusion  
29 signify by saying aye.  
30  
31 IN UNISON: Aye.  
32  
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So there'll be  
34 little significant use of that area. Bettles would be  
35 possibly -- there was one permit issued for the winter  
36 bull moose hunt from Bettles. There -- it's really a  
37 nominal thing but it would give people an opportunity  
38 at least.  
39  
40 MR. COLLINS: Jack.  
41  
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.  
43  
44 MR. COLLINS: Point of order.  
45  
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead, Ray.  
47  
48 MR. COLLINS: You didn't ask for  
49 opposed, I think just for the record you should ask  
50 that.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thanks, Ray.  
2 Those opposed same sign.  
3  
4 (No opposing votes)  
5  
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the motion  
7 carries.  
8  
9 MR. STOUT: Mr. Chairman.  
10  
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead,  
12 Glenn.  
13  
14 MR. STOUT: Just so people are aware  
15 for the area that does not overlap with the State  
16 regulation now.....  
17  
18 MS. WILKINSON: Who is this -- who  
19 is.....  
20  
21 MR. STOUT: .....that will require a  
22 second permit so people will have to.....  
23  
24 REPORTER: It's Glenn Stout.  
25  
26 MR. STOUT: .....have two permits now.  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, right.  
29  
30 So this area -- right. And what's  
31 Kanuti's position on that, that would be primarily  
32 Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge lands.  
33  
34 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I didn't talk to  
35 Mike about that at all. We would probably have to see,  
36 it's difficult doing it on the teleconference, to see  
37 if the State permit could still be used for that.  
38  
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.  
40  
41 MR. MATHEWS: And it's difficult to do  
42 over the teleconference, so that would be an option  
43 that would have to be.....  
44  
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. That could  
46 be a problem. That could actually cost the Refuge --  
47 and so there is an area that's outside of the State  
48 hunt area and can you see that on your map, Eleanor?  
49  
50 MS. YATLIN: Unit 24B.

1                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: In 24B, it'd be the  
2 area -- the State hunt is that area going way up into  
3 the Park and way down in 24B, and then there's this  
4 chunk basically around the South Fork that's going to  
5 be -- going to have to have a separate Federal hunt. I  
6 hadn't quite thought about that one.

7  
8                   MS. YATLIN: Yeah, the Haul Road going  
9 from Bettles to.....

10  
11                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

12  
13                   MS. YATLIN: The Dalton Highway is the  
14 -- is other Federal lands, I know it's BLM because we  
15 got a letter from them around there, from them before,  
16 when we were living in Bettles and they were talking  
17 about that area.

18  
19                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

20  
21                   MS. YATLIN: Around South Fork, you  
22 know, going towards -- right over there.

23  
24                   MR. MATHEWS: Jack.

25  
26                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, go ahead  
27 Vince.

28  
29                   MR. MATHEWS: Well, Mike and I have  
30 talked a bit about that and I know Glenn -- we'll  
31 incorporate Glenn on this, that with these season  
32 changes and control use area boundary changes there's  
33 going to be a need for a very extensive outreach  
34 effort. So with that we're going to be out there  
35 anyways so the permit thing I'll have to discuss with  
36 Mike and that, but based on the fact that it's going to  
37 take a while for people to understand these seasons  
38 we're going to be out there so it may not be as  
39 difficult. And then we'll talk with Glenn and others  
40 on the permit question.

41  
42                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

43  
44                   MR. MATHEWS: But I did want to ask  
45 Glenn a question, I already know the answer, but I kind  
46 of want to get it affirmed then. There was discussion  
47 of a month or so ago that if the Council action aligned  
48 with OSM, that this possibly could be a consent agenda  
49 for the Board. Glenn, it appears by your statement  
50 that this will not -- there's no movement by the State

1 to align with this action?

2

3 MR. STOUT: Yeah, my understanding of  
4 it, as it went through headquarters, was that we would  
5 have a support for the overlap of the Federal lands  
6 within the Kanuti Controlled Use Area that the State  
7 went with, but the additional Federal lands off to the  
8 east of that hadn't been part of that consideration.

9

10 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, I appreciate that  
11 because I'll have to see about travel plans for Refuge  
12 Staff to attend the meeting.

13

14 That's all I had, Jack, thanks.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. But if we --  
17 even we adopted the original proposal, there would  
18 still be an area within the Controlled -- old  
19 Controlled Use Area that would still need a separate  
20 permit it would seem.

21

22 MR. STOUT: No. The way it would work  
23 is -- the way that boundary line changed, if all of a  
24 sudden it went north of the Kanuti boundary, because  
25 the boundary went south, that would just fall under the  
26 State permit so it would still be authorized for  
27 anybody who wanted to hunt that so that wouldn't be  
28 affected at all.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah.

31

32 MR. MATHEWS: Jack, I need to let you  
33 know that Jim Neely just walked in, he's the zone law  
34 enforcement officer so you know he's in on the  
35 discussion.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

38

39 And so we may have to have a separate  
40 Federal permit that will run basically the same hunt  
41 parameters as the State hunt and this could cause some  
42 problems. Is the Council aware of what that may  
43 actually entail, a separate permitting system; is the  
44 Council aware of that -- so without everybody having  
45 maps, there's an area just to the east of the Kanuti  
46 Controlled Use Area that's going to be a point of  
47 contention. So is the Council aware of that, that  
48 there's going to be an area that's going to have to  
49 have a special Federal permit.

50

1 (Council affirms sporadically)  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I think everybody  
4 is.  
5  
6 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.  
7  
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So any  
9 further discussion.  
10  
11 (No comments)  
12  
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, hearing none.  
14 The OSM and the Federal Subsistence Board will have to  
15 wrestle with, as well as the Kanuti Refuge Staff, with  
16 this at the Federal Board meeting next week and I will  
17 be attending that meeting, on this issue.  
18  
19 And so we're going to Proposal WP10-68,  
20 which was the proposal for -- you want to lay that out  
21 Don, are you still there, Rivard?  
22  
23 MR. RIVARD: Yes, Mr. Chair, I'll be  
24 glad to do that.  
25  
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, go ahead.  
27  
28 MR. RIVARD: Proposal WP10-68 was  
29 submitted by your Council, request a change in dates  
30 for the fall season and changes in dates and harvest  
31 limits for the winter/spring season for moose in the  
32 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area portions of Units 21D as in  
33 David, 24C as in Charlie and 24D.  
34  
35 Would you like me to just kind of give  
36 a synopsis of what you guys did?  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead.  
39  
40 MR. RIVARD: Okay. During your most  
41 recent meeting in February 2010, your Council discussed  
42 this proposal and the ADF&G area biologist in Galena  
43 offered and spoke to State Proposal 98, which you just  
44 talked about for 67, as an alternative for  
45 consideration, however you went with something  
46 different than that. You agreed with the OSM  
47 preliminary conclusion, which I'll read in a little  
48 bit. But you made an additional modification to the  
49 April 10 to 15th season to include the minimum five  
50 inch antler restriction, as requested in State Proposal

1 98. The week following the Council's meeting, the  
2 State Board of Game adopted Proposal 98 with a limit of  
3 one antlered bull but did not adopt the minimum five  
4 inch antler restriction due to the reported difficulty  
5 with accurately determining the size of an antler in  
6 the field.

7

8 And so you're going to discuss, again,  
9 this five inch antler restriction.

10

11 The OSM conclusion is to support  
12 Proposal 68 with modification to clarify the regulatory  
13 language for the winter/spring to be announced seasons.

14

15 And.....

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So.....

18

19 MR. RIVARD: Go ahead, thank you, Mr.

20 Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And so is the  
23 Council clear that the basic difference is that the  
24 five inch antler restriction was not adopted by the  
25 State Board of Game, as in Proposal 67, they went with  
26 just one antlered bull. Deliberations on that, there  
27 was Board of Game members that were concerned that  
28 there would be difficulty trying to watch a moose grow  
29 at half an inch a day, or whatever it is, or a week, or  
30 whatever, and then the Fish and Wildlife Protection  
31 also stated that because this is a subsistence  
32 regulation it would be really hard for them to enforce  
33 if the moose was only four and a half inches instead of  
34 five and so there was some real pertinent information  
35 at the Board of Game on that antler beam.

36

37 And so what we need to have is a motion  
38 to align with the State language that's been adopted  
39 for Unit 24 in general for this winter hunt, now, of  
40 one antlered bull, and so we need a motion to change  
41 the language to one antlered bull and the April 1 to 10  
42 season in Proposal 68.

43

44 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. This is Don,  
45 again.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.

48

49 MR. RIVARD: What you're just deciding  
50 on is the, as you stated, the antler size.....

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.  
2  
3 MR. RIVARD: .....and whether to keep  
4 that or not.  
5  
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.  
7  
8 MR. RIVARD: The winter dates don't  
9 line up at all with the State on this one. They wanted  
10 another four month season in this portion as well and  
11 you just went with a March 1 through 5 to be announced  
12 season.....  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.  
15  
16 MR. RIVARD: .....and an April 10 to 15  
17 to be announced season if the March season doesn't  
18 occur.  
19  
20 Thank you.  
21  
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I want to get  
23 this antler thing out of the way. So do we have a  
24 motion to align to one antlered bull?  
25  
26 MR. COLLINS: This is Ray, I so move.  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Do.....  
29  
30 MS. WILKINSON: Exc.....  
31  
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: .....we have a.....  
33  
34 MS. WILKINSON: .....exc -- excuse  
35 me.....  
36  
37 MS. YATLIN: Second.  
38  
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: .....second.  
40  
41 MS. WILKINSON: .....Mr. Chairman,  
42 just.....  
43  
44 REPORTER: Who made the second,  
45 Eleanor, did you?  
46  
47 MS. WILKINSON: .....just -- just.....  
48  
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have a second?  
50

1 MS. YATLIN: Eleanor.  
2  
3 REPORTER: Thank you, Eleanor.  
4  
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Eleanor.  
6  
7 MS. WILKINSON: Just to be cleaner it  
8 would be better to just say you wanted to support with  
9 modification as described in the OSM conclusion.  
10  
11 Thank you.  
12  
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And so  
14 support with OSM modifications, is that clear to the  
15 Council?  
16  
17 MS. YATLIN: Yes.  
18  
19 MR. GERVAIS: Jack, this is Tim. So  
20 are we changing the -- is this vote changing the length  
21 of the season too then?  
22  
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, I was just  
24 getting after the antler portion because I didn't see  
25 that in the OSM conclusion. Is that in the OSM  
26 conclusion?  
27  
28 MS. WILKINSON: No.  
29  
30 MR. RIVARD: No, the five inch  
31 restriction was never in there.  
32  
33 MS. WILKINSON: No.  
34  
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right, so we want to  
36 get rid of the five inch restriction on this motion and  
37 then we'll go after the season on the next one.  
38  
39 And so is.....  
40  
41 MS. WILKINSON: But -- but -- excu --  
42 exc.....  
43  
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: .....it clear we're  
45 going to one antlered bull, the motion, is that clear  
46 to the Council.  
47  
48 MS. YATLIN: Yes.  
49  
50 MR. GERVAIS: Yes.

1 MS. WILKINSON: Yeah, I'm -- I'm -- I'm  
2 sorry, I.....  
3  
4 MR. COLLINS: Yes.  
5  
6 MS. PELKOLA: Yes.  
7  
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So.....  
9  
10 MS. WILKINSON: I'm -- I'm sorry, Mr.  
11 Chairman, I didn't realize you were going to address  
12 the seasons also so if you were going to change the  
13 season then you wouldn't be supporting the OSM  
14 conclusion, sorry.  
15  
16 MR. BUKLIS: So the motion is the  
17 antler restriction.  
18  
19 REPORTER: Yes, it was.  
20  
21 MS. WILKINSON: Right. So the motion  
22 is for the antler restriction to be removed.  
23  
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right, it was.  
25  
26 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you.  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. And so we're  
29 getting rid of this antler -- this has to be addressed  
30 as part of this proposal. And so.....  
31  
32 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair, this is Don.  
33  
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.  
35  
36 MR. RIVARD: I just want to clarify  
37 that in our proposal it's one bull is what we have, if  
38 you go with one antlered bull that's your choice, or  
39 one antlered moose, but we had one bull in our  
40 recommendation.  
41  
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Well, that  
43 stays with the State language. And so the motion's on  
44 the floor, poll the Council Ann.  
45  
46 MS. WILKINSON: Okay.  
47  
48 So for the motion to withdraw support  
49 for the antler restriction on Proposal 68, Don Honea.  
50

1 MR. HONEA: Well, actually I'm a little  
2 confused now. If I voted yes that would be taking away  
3 the antler restriction?  
4  
5 MS. WILKINSON: Yes.  
6  
7 MR. HONEA: Okay. Okay, that's yes  
8 then.  
9  
10 MS. WILKINSON: Eleanor Yatlin.  
11  
12 MS. YATLIN: Yes.  
13  
14 MS. WILKINSON: Ray Collins.  
15  
16 MR. COLLINS: Yes.  
17  
18 MS. WILKINSON: Jack Reakoff.  
19  
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.  
21  
22 MS. WILKINSON: Tim Gervais.  
23  
24 MR. GERVAIS: Yes.  
25  
26 MS. WILKINSON: Jenny Pelkola.  
27  
28 MS. PELKOLA: Yes.  
29  
30 MS. WILKINSON: Thank you. Mr.  
31 Chairman, the motion passes.  
32  
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And then  
34 going back to the -- you want to read that over again  
35 Don, the OSM preliminary conclusion and make it clear  
36 to the Council.  
37  
38 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. Just to kind  
39 of summarize it real quick, you weren't really dealing  
40 with any of the dates, your Council decided back in  
41 your last meeting to go with an April 10 to 15 -- well,  
42 I don't have it in front of me.  
43  
44 MS. WILKINSON: It's the conclusion.  
45  
46 MR. RIVARD: It's the conclusion,  
47 is.....  
48  
49 MS. WILKINSON: Yes, it is, I'm right,  
50 yes.

1 MR. RIVARD: .....basically to have an  
2 April 10 to 15 to be announced season and also a --  
3 March 1 to 5th for cows, one year, if that doesn't  
4 occur in March then you would have an April 10 to 15th  
5 season for bulls, so that's part of the OSM conclusion.

6  
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

8  
9 MR. RIVARD: And I believe your Council  
10 went along with that part of it already.

11  
12 MS. WILKINSON: No, they.....

13  
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. We were in  
15 support of that portion so we don't really need to  
16 change anything that I see there.

17  
18 So the proposal as written meets the  
19 objective of providing a winter hunting opportunity for  
20 Huslia and clearing up this antler restriction was my  
21 primary objective. And so I don't think we really need  
22 to do anything else there.

23  
24 Any Council members have comments on  
25 that proposal.

26  
27 MS. WILKINSON: So I was right.

28  
29 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

32  
33 MR. BUKLIS: Larry Buklis, OSM. There  
34 is one question here, I don't mean to confuse anything,  
35 but if I understand it correctly, the Council position  
36 had been antlered bull and then a stipulation about  
37 what antlered meant with this five inch feature.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

40  
41 MR. BUKLIS: OSM, I believe had been  
42 bull moose, so now the.....

43  
44 MS. WILKINSON: But -- but -- but  
45 the.....

46  
47 MR. BUKLIS: .....only question we have  
48 -- thank you Ann.

49  
50 MS. WILKINSON: Their recommendation

1 doesn't include that.

2

3 MR. BUKLIS: Thanks very much. The  
4 only question, there's a little uncertainty here with  
5 multiple people speaking up here, the only question I  
6 have is, is your position now, bull moose or antlered  
7 bull, just not specifying the five inch feature of the  
8 antler, I just wanted to clarify that.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My objective is to  
11 -- as was done in the State hunt in 24B is an antler,  
12 just if it's starting to show antler it's an antlered  
13 bull and where we got cross-threaded with the Refuge  
14 Staff and the State is that, you know, the antlerless  
15 bull could be confused with a cow and so if the  
16 antler's beginning to grow and it's an antlered bull  
17 then that's what was used by the Board of Game, that's  
18 what we should stay with. And so it'd be staying with  
19 an antlered bull. And usually by the 1st of April  
20 they're showing significant antler growth on several of  
21 the bulls.

22

23 And so does that clarify that for you  
24 Larry?

25

26 MR. COLLINS: Well, I made the  
27 motion.....

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.

30

31 MR. COLLINS: .....Jack.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

34

35 MR. COLLINS: I'll speak to that. And  
36 it was to align with the State wording.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

39

40 MR. COLLINS: So whatever the State  
41 had, that's what I meant, was that we would drop our  
42 position and align ours with the State wording.....

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

45

46 MR. COLLINS: .....whatever that is.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's exactly  
49 right, Ray.

50

1 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further  
4 discussion on that proposal by the Council.  
5  
6 (No comments)  
7  
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So hearing none,  
9 then the -- we couldn't refer to the in-season  
10 management of the chinook run and so there's been the  
11 managers -- are you on here Fred Bue?  
12  
13 MR. BUE: Yeah, I'm still here, Jack.  
14  
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So do you want to  
16 give an overview of what the State management outlook  
17 will be and the -- going to the normal schedule, go  
18 ahead.  
19  
20 MR. BUE: Sure, I'll just try to keep  
21 it brief.  
22  
23 REPORTER: Fred. Fred, this is Tina,  
24 can you get closer to the phone.  
25  
26 MR. BUE: Really, how's this.  
27  
28 REPORTER: Really. Thank you.  
29  
30 MR. BUE: Okay, so the -- again this is  
31 Fred Bue with the Fish and Wildlife Service.  
32  
33 The 2010 chinook outlook, typically we  
34 base it on a spawner recruit and sibling models,  
35 relationship models and that typical outlook would say  
36 that we'd expect a near average run size. However, in  
37 recent years we've had a poor performance where we've  
38 gotten back less fish than we anticipated. So this  
39 year what -- the U.S./Canada Joint Technical Committee  
40 adjusted that outlook and they used the recent trends  
41 to reflect the reduced production performance that we  
42 seen in the last two years. And so with that they  
43 reduced the outlook to a range with a lower end of the  
44 range being below average. And so what they're looking  
45 at for a total chinook run size is as a range of  
46 155,000 to 226,000. And, again, that low end is a  
47 below average range.  
48  
49 A run of that size with a conservative  
50 low end should be sufficient for escapement,

1 subsistence and our Canadian obligations, both in  
2 escapement and harvest shares in that Canadian  
3 component.

4  
5                   So with that we're anticipating no  
6 directed chinook salmon commercial fishing.

7  
8                   Subsistence restrictions to conserve  
9 chinook salmon, should not be enacted this year, the  
10 windows -- beyond the windows schedule is --  
11 restrictions beyond the windows schedule is unlikely.  
12 However, if the chinook run does come in below  
13 expectations, well below that low end of that range,  
14 restrictions may become necessary.

15  
16                   We had a preparedness meeting, YRDFA  
17 sponsored it, it was funded by the U.S./Canada Fund and  
18 that was last month, I guess, in Anchorage. Many of  
19 the fishermen were asked the question, if it was  
20 necessary to reduce subsistence fishing to get a few  
21 more fish up river, what they'd prefer, and what the  
22 preferred option there was, to pull a single period or  
23 periods, if necessary, but not to reduce the actual  
24 fishing time in that window. So if District 4 was  
25 normally two 48 hour periods a week, fishermen told us  
26 that they'd prefer to just pull one period rather than  
27 reducing it into two 24 hour periods in that timeframe.

28  
29                   So at this point we think restrictions  
30 beyond the windows are unlikely but if it was necessary  
31 in-season we'd be looking at that as an option as to  
32 pulling a period and that would likely occur between  
33 the first quarter point and the mid-point in the run  
34 and essentially that would allow some fishing on the  
35 front end of the run, by pulling a period would  
36 probably protect a big portion of the run when fish are  
37 abundant but it would kind of narrow the timeframe, so  
38 you'd get a lot of fish through for a narrow timeframe  
39 with the idea of minimal interruption to subsistence  
40 fishing.

41  
42                   So I think that's pretty much what I  
43 had to say if you have any other questions.

44  
45                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thanks, Fred.  
46 Do Council members have any questions?

47  
48                   MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, I have a question,  
49 Jack.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.  
2  
3 MR. GERVAIS: Fred, this is Tim Gervais  
4 from Ruby. So you're going to base the run strength on  
5 the sonar data or can you explain how you're going to  
6 make the assessment that the run strength is sufficient  
7 or insufficient?  
8  
9 MR. BUE: Yeah, Tim, we -- you know  
10 the sonar is a big part of our management tools, you  
11 know, everybody knows that we use that to try to  
12 quantify what the run is doing, but it's not our only  
13 method. We do communicate with subsistence fishermen  
14 on a daily basis. We have test nets at Emmonak. The  
15 Department. We have set net sites and we also have a  
16 drift program there. We've got money to increase --  
17 Mountain Village is going to have a test fishery during  
18 the summer season, during the chinook run. That's an  
19 additional project. It's run by the Mountain Village  
20 Council there, they're local fishermen who are out  
21 there fishing on a regular schedule consistently so  
22 even during -- the problem with subsistence fishing is  
23 their reports only come in during the windowed periods,  
24 down there they only have -- fish two 36 hour periods a  
25 week, and so sometimes their information may be hit and  
26 miss or it's conceivable some fish may get through, and  
27 so by adding the Mountain Village test fishery,  
28 something else -- that's a little bit a ways from the  
29 Coast, we're not so dependent on the tides there, so  
30 they'll be fishing on a regular schedule, consistently,  
31 and it's less likely that something will get by or we  
32 may miss something with that added project.  
33  
34 Also the Pilot Station sonar got  
35 additional funding and they're going to be running  
36 their normal operation but in addition to that they're  
37 going to be trying out longer nets to make sure that  
38 it's not a sampling problem, that the fish aren't  
39 getting around their nets or doing something different.  
40 So that's been added.  
41  
42 And so those are the things that we're  
43 using, the subsistence fishing, our test net sites, and  
44 the sonar.  
45  
46 MR. GERVAIS: All right.  
47  
48 MR. BUE: Okay.  
49  
50 MR. GERVAIS: Well, throughout --

1 through the Board of Fish deliberations and with our  
2 Regional Advisory Council deliberations this winter,  
3 pretty much the entire drainage-wide, was in favor of  
4 some form of pulse protection and I realize the State  
5 managers are not very in favor of that, can you briefly  
6 give us your opinion on why we're not seeing this --  
7 any kind of pulse protection action even though it's  
8 fairly unanimous along the river that we need to get  
9 these larger fish across the border?

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, go ahead,  
12 Fred.

13

14 MR. BUE: Well, yeah, I guess that's --  
15 I don't think it's -- I mean I don't want to argue with  
16 you but apparently it wasn't necessarily unanimous  
17 because there was a group at the Board of Fish that did  
18 -- the Board of Fish put them into a work group to come  
19 back with some agreed upon position and I don't think  
20 that -- some things did not come forward at that time,  
21 it wasn't agreed upon. All three RACs did agree on a  
22 pulse protection. And certainly there's a lot of  
23 people that aren't always represented there.

24

25 But the other thing that the Board of  
26 Fish struggled with is that with a pulse protection  
27 just all the time, if there is subsistence fishing  
28 opportunity available, they did not want to have  
29 subsistence unnecessarily forego a harvest, and that  
30 was their concerns.

31

32 They did enact the mesh size  
33 restriction for next year. I know that was something  
34 else that people were concerned with. So they did --  
35 they were trying to address the quality of the  
36 escapement without people having to forego a fishing  
37 opportunity unnecessarily. They did know that -- last  
38 year there was a disaster declaration that it was a  
39 hardship for people to forego those fish, and to do  
40 that unnecessarily is a big concern to them.

41

42 And so that's why we're not just  
43 protecting the pulse. If it is necessary that's  
44 essentially what we would be doing this year by pulling  
45 a period, but we want to wait until in-season to make  
46 that judgment to make sure that it really is warranted  
47 because it is -- it puts a big hardship on a lot of  
48 people.

49

50 Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right.  
2  
3 MR. GERVAIS: All right, well, may I  
4 make one last comment to that?  
5  
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead there, Tim.  
7  
8 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. We'll see what  
9 happens but I feel that the conversations we had with  
10 Galena folks and Ruby folks is -- they're willing to  
11 forego periods to get this run built back up  
12 genetically where it needs to be and we're -- the  
13 middle river is trying to look at this as a long-term  
14 solution and not just to be focused on missing a  
15 period; that's not the main focus; it's to getting  
16 genetics back in the run that are healthy and full  
17 spectrum.  
18  
19 That's all I had.  
20  
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Other Council  
22 members on this outlook for the season and the  
23 management.  
24  
25 MR. HONEA: Yes.  
26  
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.  
28  
29 MR. HONEA: This is Don. Yeah, Fred,  
30 this is Don Honea in Ruby. I'm just wondering why, you  
31 know, having missed the Western Interior meeting in  
32 Fairbanks, I realized there was a proposal come out of  
33 there to forego the first pulse for the next 12 years  
34 or something, and I don't know what YRDFA, what their  
35 recommendations for the spring season is either, but  
36 I'm just wondering what kind of tools that you have  
37 like to take the first pulse and then just go ahead and  
38 let it by; is that the general consensus on the Yukon  
39 and when will we know for certain when you guys make  
40 that determination? Is it when the numbers come by the  
41 sonar at Pilot Station?  
42  
43 MR. BUE: Yeah, well, essentially as  
44 the fish are moving into the river. We watch both is  
45 it a late run, how compressed the run is, the timing of  
46 it, if -- and just, you know, how the enter the river.  
47 Part of it's early timing, late timing, how compressed  
48 the run may be. There's a lot of issues. By the time  
49 they get up to you we kind of have a pretty good idea  
50 of what's in the river and what's moving, but out on

1 the Coast we really don't know and so it's -- we're  
2 starting with the windowed schedule and.....

3  
4 MR. HONEA: Okay, I guess -- I'm sorry  
5 to butt in here, but I'm just wondering, I mean if you  
6 had that option to you open last year and we already  
7 knew that we were going to let the first pulse go by, I  
8 mean is that a given this year or is that already -- I  
9 mean how do we know, you know, for certain whether  
10 we're going to be able to fish or not?

11  
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, Don, they're  
13 not protecting the first pulse, they're going to the  
14 normal fishing schedule and that's one of the reasons I  
15 wanted to have this on our teleconference is I'm  
16 concerned, myself, that as Tim said, that we're not  
17 actually protecting the first pulse, we're just going  
18 to the normal fishing schedule, and we are using, this  
19 year, large mesh gear, and so the lower river could  
20 conceivably meet their subsistence needs and then we  
21 have a problem and so we've taken out a bunch of the  
22 first Canadian stocks off the first pulse, we haven't  
23 protected them and then, uh-oh, we got a problem, and  
24 then everybody else up river's got to go into  
25 restrictions.

26  
27 And so I'm concerned that there was too  
28 much fishing time, 36 hour periods twice a week, in Y1,  
29 2 and 3 and they get to basically meet their  
30 subsistence needs and we're still straining off all the  
31 big fish, we're still not going to meet -- send, what I  
32 consider, our Council's doing, as a -- all three  
33 Councils wanted a resolution to protect the first  
34 pulse, at least, the escapement portion should have  
35 been protected, the 42,000 to 55,000 escapement. And I  
36 wrote a letter to the Yukon Panel on that issue. That  
37 all got thrown aside. And so they're not protecting  
38 the first pulse and we're going to fish with heavy  
39 gear, large mesh gear and so we're going to end up with  
40 a strained off escapement meeting the Canadian  
41 component which is a lot of smaller jacks and a lot of  
42 smaller fish.

43  
44 And so I'm concerned about this issue  
45 and I wanted the Council to discuss this in-season so  
46 that the in-season manager can hear our concerns. I  
47 have huge concerns with what we're going to do to this  
48 year's run and we're trying to be rebuilding of the run  
49 and we're basically going to have another year of  
50 straining.

1                   So other Council member's opinions.  
2  
3                   (No comments)  
4  
5                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments.  
6  
7                   (No comments)  
8  
9                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, hearing none,  
10 I hope the run comes in big and that we meet people's  
11 needs without doing a lot of damage to this Canadian  
12 component. So we will be on the teleconference and  
13 tracking this run as it progresses, YRDFA  
14 teleconferences.  
15  
16                   So any closing comments from the  
17 Council members. We've come to sort of the end of our  
18 agenda here, any other issues that you would like to  
19 bring up or any closing comments.  
20  
21                   Ray.  
22  
23                   MR. COLLINS: No, I'm good.  
24  
25                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh. Don.  
26  
27                   MR. HONEA: Yeah, I guess I'm good on  
28 this. And I just, you know, I guess, I mean, you know,  
29 what you're actually saying is that it's just thrown  
30 out there this year and that we're not -- there's  
31 really not too much protection for our first pulse --  
32 for chinooks as a whole, so we're just going to take it  
33 as -- and whatever happens on the first pulse or  
34 something we're going to maybe try on the second or  
35 third pulse or something to try to rectify it or  
36 something.  
37  
38                   But, anyway, that's just my take on it.  
39  
40                   Thanks.  
41  
42                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, thanks for  
43 those comments, Don.  
44  
45                   Eleanor.  
46  
47                   MS. YATLIN: I will be on the  
48 teleconferences.  
49  
50                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Jenny.

1 MS. PELKOLA: No comments.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Tim, you got  
4 final comments.  
5  
6 MR. GERVAIS: Just one final comment.  
7 On that Board of Fish meeting was, discussions we had  
8 in committee were not very well summarized in the  
9 committee report and I think a lot of -- a lot of is  
10 not -- all the participating groups were kind of  
11 surprised that -- how the committee report summarized  
12 the discussions. And I guess in the future we'll just  
13 have to be more aggressive in communicating our point.  
14 I was not impressed with what regulations manifested  
15 out of what the discussions, concerns and reality are;  
16 this decade of stock of yield concern and not real  
17 significant corrective action to get it to end is --  
18 it's frustrating.  
19  
20 That's all I have.  
21  
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate your  
23 concern. I have the same concerns, Tim, that we surely  
24 should have thought about doing what all three Councils  
25 -- all three RACs wanted protection of at least the  
26 spawning goal of an unharvested component, and, you  
27 know, managers should be able to calculate  
28 approximately how much -- how many fish are passing  
29 through and protecting the 42,000 to 55,000 primary as  
30 an unharvested, not letting it go through net, fishing  
31 large mesh gear, but that's not what's going to happen.  
32  
33 Well, I think that we're just going to  
34 be -- keep beating this dead horse until we get a  
35 handle on the length of fishing in the lower river, you  
36 know, because those guys will tell you they can set  
37 their gear and meet their subsistence needs in an hour  
38 of fishing and so we're -- I'm concerned that we're  
39 going to have a lot of good fishing in the lower river  
40 and then we're going to have some bad fishing up river,  
41 again, that's what's been happening.  
42  
43 So any final comments from any of the  
44 Council members on any issues.  
45  
46 MS. PELKOLA: Jack, this Jenny.  
47  
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Jenny.  
49  
50 MS. PELKOLA: I guess I didn't make any

1 comment before because I am very frustrated and being a  
2 fishermen in the middle Yukon, really not getting any  
3 fish, we have to go further away from -- I fish at  
4 Bishop Rock, so we have to go further away from our  
5 camp to get our fish and it's just getting hard, it's  
6 getting tougher and I'm getting older and harder to  
7 fish, you know, and we live on fish. I grew up on fish  
8 and I will die eating fish. But, whatever, you know.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

11

12 MS. PELKOLA: And it's really  
13 frustrating. I get frustrated so I don't like to  
14 really -- you know everybody's frustrated and we just  
15 have to live, you know, make do with what we have, I  
16 guess, start eating little fish that spawn right away,  
17 get them out of the river and eat them up, I guess, I  
18 don't know.

19

20 (Laughter)

21

22 MS. PELKOLA: That's it.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I appreciate  
25 those comments, Jenny, we really need those.

26

27 So any final comments from any of the  
28 Council members.

29

30 MR. HONEA: No, Jack, I was just  
31 wondering if we're going to have -- is this it until we  
32 meet again in our October or whatever meeting?

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, this will be  
35 our final teleconference until we meet in October.

36

37 One of my final comments is I was -- am  
38 a little bit concerned on the Proposal 67, that  
39 overlapping Federal hunt. I am a little concerned with  
40 that. And I did not hear a lot of discussion from  
41 Kanuti on how that would really work and we will hear  
42 about it at the Federal Board meeting next week. And I  
43 would like to get a report back to the Council on how  
44 that Federal Board meeting goes on that particular  
45 issue.

46

47 And also on this caribou petition to  
48 the Board of Game, I want to get that back to you right  
49 away.

50

1                   But as far as any more meetings this is  
2 our final meeting until our October meeting.

3  
4                   MR. HONEA: Okay. Just one final  
5 thought Jack and to the Board, I mean I think that any  
6 time that we have discussions about any particular game  
7 management, I think it'd be really good if the manager  
8 was present so that we can ask them directly or their  
9 take on this.

10  
11                   That's all.

12  
13                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Okay,  
14 thanks, Don.

15  
16                   MR. HONEA: All right.

17  
18                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other -- and if  
19 issues come up, you know, like in the season here, like  
20 if the fishing is going really bad and the Council  
21 feels that there's a real need to have a teleconference  
22 you can just give me a call and we'll talk about  
23 whether we really need to have another conference call,  
24 but I don't think that we really will. I think that we  
25 can deal with our normal route, or, you know,  
26 conferencing with the in-season manager and so forth.

27  
28                   MR. BUE: Jack.....

29  
30                   MS. WILKINSON: So.....

31  
32                   MR. BUE: .....this is Fred.

33  
34                   MS. WILKINSON: .....so -- so.....

35  
36                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead Fred.

37  
38                   MR. BUE: Yeah, and so everybody --  
39 just to make sure everybody's aware, we still have the  
40 YRDFA teleconferences will be every week on Tuesdays at  
41 1:00 p.m., most of you should be aware of that.

42  
43                   But to add to that there is the  
44 U.S./Canada has an educational exchange where they're  
45 bringing some people from Canada into Alaska to give  
46 them some experience to see what our fisheries are  
47 like. They're going to first, I think it's four or  
48 five people, but they're going to first go to Emmonak,  
49 but on their way -- and they're going to come up river,  
50 and in Galena, I believe it's June 28th and 29th, and

1 they're going to be in Galena visiting the community.  
2 And one of their goals is to visit some fish camps but  
3 to also sit in on the YRDFA teleconference on the 29th.

4  
5                   And so if people are interested in  
6 being there and meeting some of those people, it's an  
7 opportunity to talk to them, explain to them how you  
8 fish, what sorts of things are important to you, your  
9 experience with the river and give them your  
10 perspective.

11  
12                   The whole idea is so that they take  
13 what they learn back to their communities in Canada and  
14 it's an opportunity to understand each other; how they  
15 harvest fish, and just a better understanding of the  
16 other users on the river that may be long-distance, and  
17 you really may have some questions; it's an opportunity  
18 to talk to them.

19  
20                   Just throw that out there.

21  
22                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Sounds like a great  
23 program.

24  
25                   MS. PELKOLA: Who did you say they were  
26 representing, from Canada?

27  
28                   MR. COLLINS: How's the break up going,  
29 Jack, over there, still got high water, our river went  
30 out here and it's probably the lowest I've ever seen in  
31 the spring and it looks like we're going to -- there's  
32 no snow in the mountains so we're going to have a real  
33 low water year it looks like.

34  
35                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

36  
37                   MR. COLLINS: And I don't know how  
38 that's going to affect the fish because usually they  
39 wait for some of that water to be moving.

40  
41                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, that's an  
42 issue that I have, is last year was real, real high  
43 water with lots of debris and fishing was really hard  
44 on the lower river. With low water, when the fish  
45 start coming, with low water and low debris, there's  
46 going to be -- the fishery is going to be very  
47 effective.

48  
49                   MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Here, the river's  
2 been out about 10 days, two weeks early and there's  
3 very little snow pack in the mountains, the river's  
4 running real low for this time of year, and I don't  
5 think there's -- unless we get a lot of rain, the lower  
6 river fishery is going to be very effective.

7  
8 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. It's too bad we  
9 didn't go with that window like we had last year  
10 because it worked.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That worked real  
13 well.

14  
15 MR. COLLINS: I mean it did cause some  
16 problems up -- up here, yeah.

17  
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we requested  
19 that, that's what the Councils did, but that wasn't  
20 adhered to. The Councils all wanted a protection of  
21 the first pulse and as we see there is no real  
22 protection.

23  
24 MR. GERVAIS: The comments to the  
25 committee wanted that too but it didn't show up in the  
26 committee report.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh.

29  
30 MR. GERVAIS: I don't know, I want to  
31 talk to Dani about it, I think, yeah, I'll just talk to  
32 her about it, we got to get -- we all to get on the  
33 same page here.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Okay, well,  
36 it's about 12:30 so I don't -- any pressing issues.

37  
38 (No comments)

39  
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: If not I'll call for  
41 a motion to adjourn.

42  
43 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

44  
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved to adjourn.  
46 Do I have a second.

47  
48 MS. YATLIN: Second.

49  
50 MR. GERVAIS: Second.

1                           CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. It's been  
2 great having you all on conference; thanks for calling  
3 in and we'll see you this fall and if you have any  
4 problems give me a call.

5  
6                           All right.

7  
8                           MR. HONEA: Okay, you guys have a great  
9 summer.

10  
11                          MS. PELKOLA: Okay.

12  
13                          CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

14  
15                          MR. GERVAIS: Good luck fishing  
16 everyone.

17  
18                          CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, good-bye.

19  
20                          (Off record)

21  
22                          (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in, State of Alaska and reporter of Computer Matrix, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 42 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL TELEPHONIC MEETING, taken electronically by our firm on the 14th day of May 2010, beginning at the hour of 11:12 o'clock a.m. at Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 15th day of May 2010.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Salena A. Hile  
Notary Public, State of Alaska  
My Commission Expires:9/16/2010