

1 WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE  
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3  
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5  
6 VOLUME I

7  
8 Fairbanks, Alaska  
9 February 24, 2010  
10 8:30 o'clock a.m.  
11

12  
13 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

23  
24  
25  
26 Regional Council Coordinator, Ann Wilkinson (Acting)  
27

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Recorded and transcribed by:  
45  
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC  
47 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2  
48 Anchorage, AK 99501  
49 907-243-0668  
50 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 - 2/24/2010)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're going to bring this Western Interior Regional Advisory Council meeting back to order again. So I'd like to welcome various agency people and the Council here. We're having a real nice meeting with Eastern Interior, understanding various aspects of their meeting, our joint meeting, what their thoughts are on various issues and I thought that was a very productive meeting yesterday.

I welcome Robert and James Walker. They finally made it out from bad weather down on the lower Yukon. So I want to introduce our new court recorder. Your name again?

REPORTER: Nickelle.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Nickelle. So she's going to be helping out with Salena on doing our meetings here. We're going to have an invocation from Ray. That's what we usually do at the beginning of our meeting.

(Invocation)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ray. So we're going to call the roll. Ann.

MS. WILKINSON: Robert Walker.

MR. R. WALKER: Yeah.

MS. WILKINSON: Donald Honea isn't here. He's in classes. He did come by last night however to say hello. Also Mickey Stickman is an excused absence. Tim Gervais.

MR. GERVAIS: Here.

MS. WILKINSON: Ray Collins.

MR. COLLINS: Here.

MS. WILKINSON: Jack Reakoff.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Here.  
2  
3 MS. WILKINSON: James Walker.  
4  
5 MR. J. WALKER: Here.  
6  
7 MS. WILKINSON: Jenny Pelkola.  
8  
9 MS. PELKOLA: Here.  
10  
11 MS. WILKINSON: Carl Morgan.  
12  
13 MR. MORGAN: Here.  
14  
15 MS. WILKINSON: Eleanor Yatlin.  
16  
17 MS. YATLIN: Here.  
18  
19 MS. WILKINSON: Thank you. Mr. Chair,  
20 you have a Council quorum.  
21  
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Ann, and  
23 I'm really happy to have a little larger body today.  
24 So we're going to introduce our Agency Staff. We'll go  
25 around the room here and we'll start back there with  
26 Jetta.  
27  
28 MS. MINERVA: Jetta Minerva,  
29 subsistence coordinator, Koyukuk/Nowitna Refuge.  
30  
31 MR. MATHEWS: Vince Mathews, refuge  
32 specialist for Arctic, Kanuti and Yukon Flats.  
33  
34 MR. CAMPBELL: Good morning. My name  
35 is Mitch Campbell from the Alaska Department of Fish  
36 and Game. I'm the liaison coordinator for the staff.  
37 This is my third week.  
38  
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We love your accent.  
40  
41 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.  
42  
43 MR. BERG: Good morning. Jerry Berg.  
44 I'm the staff committee member for Fish and Wildlife  
45 Service out of Anchorage.  
46  
47 MR. KRUPA: Dave Krupa, program manager  
48 for ethnography and subsistence, Gates of the Arctic  
49 and Yukon-Charley.  
50

1 MR. SPINDLER: Mike Spindler, refuge  
2 manager, Pilot and Kanuti Refuge.  
3  
4 MR. MOOS: Ken Moos, refuge manager for  
5 Koyukuk/Nowitna.  
6  
7 MS. SMITH: Melissa Smith, Kuskokwim  
8 Native Association, fisheries biologist.  
9  
10 MR. PEARCE: Josh Pearce, the assistant  
11 area biologist for Fish and Game in McGrath.  
12  
13 MR. BUKLIS: My name is Larry Buklis.  
14 I'm the fisheries division chief for the Office of  
15 Subsistence Management.  
16  
17 DR. WHEELER: I'm Polly Wheeler, the  
18 deputy assistant regional director for Office of  
19 Subsistence Management.  
20  
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I welcome all State  
22 and Federal agency staff. We rely heavily on the staff  
23 for support, information and flow to the Council.  
24 We're going to go through our Regional Council members  
25 concern. The Chair's Report would be I've traveled to  
26 Anchorage in December for the Department of Interior  
27 subsistence review, made comments about various things  
28 that I feel could help the Federal subsistence  
29 management program. I don't think the wheel is broken,  
30 but it needs a little tweaking.  
31  
32 I've been writing proposals for the  
33 Council this winter. I worked with Vince until he  
34 moved to a different position. Those proposals will be  
35 before us, Federal and State proposals. Yesterday we  
36 reviewed Proposal 12 for about half the day. I didn't  
37 have most of my Council for the vote, so I was  
38 wondering, Polly, if we can have a reconsideration vote  
39 on Proposal 12 since I feel that certain members on the  
40 Yukon River weren't present. Can we do that? Is that  
41 a possibility?  
42  
43 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair, my  
44 understanding of Roberts Rules is that a  
45 reconsideration requires somebody on the majority,  
46 which obviously it was a 3-3 tie, but it failed because  
47 there wasn't enough to make it past. So the three that  
48 voted in opposition to the motion, one of the three  
49 would need to request that it be brought up for  
50 reconsideration, Mr. Chair.

1                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see. Okay. We'll  
2 look at that in this meeting. I've been, as Ron said,  
3 the chairmanship and Ray was chair. It's quite a lot  
4 of work you're doing every day. Almost every day of  
5 the week I'm in contact with some agency or some  
6 individual person about RAC business, so it's kind of a  
7 long -- Tim Craig has arrived and I want to recognize  
8 him from BLM. Thanks for coming, Tim. It's kind of a  
9 lot of work, but it's beneficial to the region to stay  
10 on top of all these issues. That would be my report to  
11 this point.

12  
13                   So we're going to go down the table  
14 here talking about the Council's concern for our  
15 region. So I'll start down here with Jenny. Would you  
16 like to start, Jenny.

17  
18                   MS. PELKOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
19 guess my concerns would be from the meeting we had  
20 yesterday with Eastern Interior was fishing. You know,  
21 for years and years our family traded with other  
22 families for fish for this or fish for that. Sometimes  
23 people couldn't pay you in goods, so they would pay you  
24 in cash. You know, we've been doing it for years, but  
25 we're not millionaires. We just barely make it like  
26 everybody else. I could see for the people that go all  
27 out and maybe take tons to town, but for people that  
28 are just trying to make a living.

29  
30                   You try to help elders that can't even  
31 go out. Some are crippled in wheelchairs. They want  
32 fish. They want to live because that's their way of  
33 life. It saddens me that we have people that comment,  
34 are so adamant about -- you know, I figure that they're  
35 going to make criminals out of every one of us and  
36 that's not what we're here on earth for. We're here on  
37 earth, you know, like anybody else, to make a living.  
38 You know, we don't get rich off that.

39  
40                   So I just hope that it would work out  
41 somehow. I guess that's one concern right now.

42  
43                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Jenny.  
44 Appreciate those comments. Carl.

45  
46                   MR. MORGAN: I thought Jenny was a  
47 little -- didn't feel comfortable. The way that it  
48 came out was that our customary trade was going to  
49 jeopardize the industry, the salmon, with that  
50 subsistence trade.

1                   It's just too bad there's a few apples  
2 in the system that's going to try to spoil it for  
3 everybody. Like yesterday, I think it was an  
4 overreaction with frustration that somebody else is  
5 doing this and getting away with something that  
6 shouldn't be.

7  
8                   Anyway, I think my concerns are on  
9 record and I don't think I need to sound repetitive.  
10 I'm on record. It's all about the Mulchatna and the  
11 Tier II hunt in my area, the short season, 20-day hunt  
12 moose season. That's all we got. But until the moose  
13 population increases, that's what we've got to live  
14 with.

15  
16                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Carl.  
17 Concise and very important issues. I recognize those  
18 issues as very important to the lower part of this  
19 region. Eleanor.

20  
21                   MS. YATLIN: I didn't call Allakaket or  
22 Hughes, but I announced on the radio to Huslia that I  
23 was attending this meeting and I got a few phone calls.  
24 One was from Butch and he was happy because he knew  
25 some families did not get moose last fall and he just  
26 wanted to express that we're going to have a winter  
27 moose hunt this year, March 1 through 5.

28  
29                   Also he said that I should bring up the  
30 concerns of the price of fuel. Like everybody else,  
31 when we're living in Bettles, I saw what happened to  
32 the moose there in all those years we lived there. His  
33 concern is down the road what will happen to our moose.  
34 He said that we should think about like other  
35 supplement, that would be caribou.

36  
37                   I'm also still concerned about the  
38 Allakaket people because I know there's no moose up  
39 there. I don't know about the caribou up that way.  
40 Maybe you know more about it.

41  
42                   The other thing is the fish. In the  
43 past, there was no fish up in the Koyukuk River. I  
44 think if they were going to mandate the concerns about  
45 customary trade and how vague it is in the books about  
46 either the Federal or the State, you know, it's not  
47 really written out what customary trade is. That was  
48 how our parents, they had to go down to the Yukon to go  
49 fishing. In the wintertime, people that were not able  
50 to, they traded or they bought fish from the Yukon.

1 Speaking for myself, when we lived over  
2 in Nome, that's how we got our fish, when we lived over  
3 in Nome for two years. When we lived in Bettles for 10  
4 years, there's no fish up there, kings, so that's how  
5 we got -- Evansville got their fish, we bought it. So  
6 that was my other concern there, I don't know, the way  
7 the wording is, I believe, on what customary trade is.

8

9 Thank you.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks very much for  
12 those comments. I do like the RAC members to put on  
13 the record how important customary trade is to our  
14 region and I very much appreciate all of your comments  
15 about how these customary -- all of the people of the  
16 Yukon River are C&T users. That is how the use of the  
17 salmon is disseminated throughout the region and I  
18 appreciate those comments.

19

20 Go ahead, Ray.

21

22 MR. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
23 I guess my concern hasn't changed over the last few  
24 years. My main concern is that we're part of a  
25 management system that is very slow to respond to  
26 change. It takes a long time for decisions to be made.  
27 Now they're reviewing how the Federal Subsistence Board  
28 operates.

29

30 I see two problems there. One of them  
31 is the time frame that it takes to make any changes and  
32 the fact that it's complicated and that we're living in  
33 changing times with global warming and other things.  
34 We don't know what's going to happen. They were  
35 considering going to a two-year cycle, which would  
36 compound that in terms of how soon you could make  
37 decisions and I hope they'll reconsider that and go  
38 back to the one year.

39

40 The other one, in terms of the  
41 composition of the Board, in the current system you  
42 have the potential of having people making decisions  
43 there that are not familiar with subsistence. Of  
44 course, that's true of the management of the refuges  
45 too as there's turnover in personnel and staff. So  
46 it's important that we have a system in place that does  
47 recognize subsistence and can deal with the changes  
48 coming on.

49

50 So I don't know what changes they're

1 going to make there, but I wish that the people sitting  
2 on the Board were in the state for at least a year or  
3 two before they're in the position to make decisions.  
4 If I was new to something like that, I'm going to be  
5 hesitant to make a decision that might have adverse  
6 effects, so that would further delay how decisions are  
7 made.

8  
9                   So we need people that are really  
10 knowledgeable and ready to decide when they're sitting  
11 on that board. How we achieve that, whether it's  
12 through training or through building something in, I  
13 don't know, but I think it's really important in the  
14 future because we don't know what's going to happen in  
15 terms of weather and resources.

16  
17                   From our standpoint, when we put  
18 regulations in there -- we're supposed to provide  
19 opportunity and sometimes the current seasons and bag  
20 limits do not provide opportunity to harvest even  
21 though the resource is there because of too short or  
22 wrong time, winter season and so on, yet we're required  
23 under ANILCA to provide opportunity. So we need to try  
24 to be proactive in the things that we pass that would  
25 make sure that that opportunity is provided for  
26 subsistence users to harvest.

27  
28                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ray. That  
29 was one of the comments I made to the Department of  
30 Interior. The Board makeup used to be they had Staff  
31 Committee members that were dedicated to that seat, so  
32 that's what they focused their attention on. There was  
33 a change and move towards the director sitting at the  
34 seat, but they have a whole region of issues to deal  
35 with. So they don't have the dedication to that seat  
36 that I feel should it should have.

37  
38                   The duration of the meetings are too  
39 short. When we go down there in April, we should do  
40 these fisheries proposals, we should go through all of  
41 our game proposals. The Game Board and the Fish Board,  
42 they sit there for 10 days. This Council is going to  
43 be here for five days going to Board of Game meetings  
44 and so forth. I feel that the Federal Subsistence  
45 Board members should have the dedication to sit and  
46 listen to the RACs and have the durational fortitude to  
47 fully deliberate and fully concentrate on these issues.  
48 I see Board members getting up and leaving, Staff  
49 members coming, and I don't like that. I'm not getting  
50 up and passing the buck here. If a Federal Board

1 member is going to take that seat, they should be there  
2 the whole meeting.

3

4 I feel it should revert back to the  
5 Staff Committee members who are empowered by the  
6 director to sit there and review the issues and to sit  
7 at that table and be there for the whole duration. So  
8 you're exactly right. It brought continuity to that  
9 seat also. We've got directors coming and going every  
10 couple years, we're retraining. So it brought more  
11 continuity to certain Staff Committee members that were  
12 dedicated to that seat.

13

14 So I agree with you on that issue.  
15 That's kind of a big issue on how the program is  
16 changed. It's not as effective as I feel it could be.  
17 Tim.

18

19 MR. GERVAIS: Good morning. I'd like  
20 to welcome James Robert here. I know yesterday there  
21 was several times when I was interested to hear what  
22 the effects of certain proposals and deliberations  
23 would be on your region of the Yukon.

24

25 In January I attended a Board of Fish  
26 meeting. I can give you some information on that if we  
27 have time in our meeting. We were able to get a letter  
28 off to Marine Stewardship Council. I guess you'd call  
29 it protesting their proposal to go ahead and certify  
30 the Bering Sea pollock trawl fleet as sustainable. So  
31 we got the letter off with a really great effort by Ann  
32 without very much time left under the deadline to get  
33 that pushed through. So I hope that letter might have  
34 some bearing on their final publication there.

35

36 I'd also like to encourage Carl, Jenny,  
37 Eleanor to reconsider the opportunity to re-vote that  
38 proposal from yesterday, FP-12, now that we have more  
39 of our Council present. That's it.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Tim. I  
44 heard it through the rumor mill that Tim did a great  
45 job representing the Council at the State Board of Fish  
46 meeting. He was interacting with the subcommittees and  
47 so forth, so I was happy to hear. After the meeting he  
48 gave me a report on what occurred down there, so I  
49 wanted to thank you for representing the Council, with  
50 all the Council's positions and stayed within the

1 parameter what the Council had said and wanted to be  
2 conveyed to the State Board of Fish.

3

4                   There's a letter here in our packet,  
5 the Marine Stewardship. Tim wrote it up, I reviewed it  
6 and OSM cleaned it up, the wording a little bit, and it  
7 was sent off on the certification of the pollock  
8 fishery and some of the problems of what the fishery  
9 has. It has some real problems, so those were addressed  
10 in that letter. I didn't find it in my packet, but we  
11 have it somewhere. We'll find it.

12

13                   Tim, do you have another comment there.

14

15                   MR. GERVAIS: Yes. I'd also like to  
16 mention on procedural issues. At the Board of Fish,  
17 they allowed the subsistence councils to testify for  
18 extended period just as a State sanctioned RAC, but as  
19 far as I think the information going into the record,  
20 the information from Eastern Interior and Western  
21 Interior was treated as a public comment and not as an  
22 advisory council comment. I don't know if that's the  
23 way it needs to be, but I feel that these comments  
24 coming out of the subsistence councils should be  
25 treated as advisory council comments.

26

27                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I didn't realize  
28 they were treated differently, that the Councils  
29 comments were not treated with the same weight as an  
30 Advisory Committee, so I was very unhappy at the last  
31 '08 Board of Game meeting when the Council was only  
32 given five minutes, as any other commentor. I tried  
33 and tried to get the Board support and the Chair of the  
34 Game Board to change that and I still only got five  
35 minutes and I had lots of proposals.

36

37                   So the State is giving us 15 minutes,  
38 but our comments should still be weighted as an  
39 Advisory Committee. That may be some issue that OSM  
40 needs to discuss with the State liaison or  
41 commissioner. We feel that we give lots of footing to  
42 the State, entrance into our meetings, so we should  
43 have equitable access to the State Board system also.  
44 So that is an issue.

45

46                   James.

47

48                   MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
49 I'm glad to be here. It was a little hard getting here  
50 due to weather. I'd just like to make my comments

1 short. I want to say that my comments are comments  
2 that have been relayed to me through people that I deal  
3 with in the local area of Holy Cross. Their issue is  
4 really primarily, like Jenny's comments, on fishing.  
5 Fishing has been an issue that has been close to a lot  
6 of people growing up along the river because that's a  
7 primary use to be a primary source of income. But we  
8 all know that's not the case any more nowadays due to  
9 the economy.

10

11 We have to start working together to  
12 keep the resources that we have. If it takes a  
13 unification of an issue of size of gear, I think that  
14 needs to be addressed because we don't want to get  
15 ourselves locked into a certain gear size that we can't  
16 get back or increased within a number of years or five  
17 years down the road if the fish does come back. At  
18 least those were some of the concerns.

19

20 On the customary trade issue, I could  
21 very well remember Jenny coming down on Dominick  
22 Pinetti's barge and that was a means of trade for the  
23 community along the river to get the goods that they  
24 needed to trade or barter with and that's always been a  
25 very foremost way of the individuals to survive.

26

27 So I'd just like to say I'm totally  
28 supportive of customary and traditional use. However,  
29 determination of customary and traditional use is not  
30 just by definition. I feel it's by individuals who  
31 reside in an area and customarily and traditionally use  
32 it. That's my comment on that.

33

34 On the issue of the gear size, the  
35 majority of the people in Holy Cross is highly in favor  
36 of the 7.5 inch size gear. It would be my directive at  
37 this point to agree with that and that's my comments to  
38 this point.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks,  
41 James. I'm disappointed that you weren't at our  
42 meeting yesterday because your testimony would have  
43 been instrumental in the deliberations of the proposals  
44 that were before us.

45

46 Robert.

47

48 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
49 Welcome, Staff. Dr. Vince, since he's sitting in the  
50 audience he's not over on our right side anymore. We

1 had an audio conference in Holy Cross, Anvik, Grayling  
2 and Shag to discuss what's going to happen at this  
3 meeting and hopefully at the Board of Fish meeting.

4  
5           The consensus was they would rather go,  
6 as Jim says, with a 7.5-inch mesh if it could be  
7 revised. Mike Smith was there also. He was the one  
8 who was coordinating the teleconference. So I'm  
9 bringing it here. Also Rich Cannon was at the YRDFA  
10 meeting down in Nulato and this was very highly  
11 discussed down there. Koyukuk people, Nulato people,  
12 the Kaltag people all were in favor of the 7.5-inch  
13 mesh over the 6-inch mesh. I was kind of -- just sat  
14 back and listened. I'm not on that Board, but kind of  
15 like a spectator. I was offered to go there by YRDFA  
16 just to listen in and report to the Board, which I  
17 thought Rich will also do.

18  
19           Customary and tradition, it's been  
20 there since day one. Government bought fish from the  
21 people on the river to feed the dogs, for the post  
22 office, for the military. So this has been going on  
23 before the turn of the century. It is a thing here  
24 where families use it not for personal large gain but  
25 for personal gain to carry them over to the moose  
26 hunting season and then the winter here.

27  
28           I'm glad to be here. I was kind of  
29 disappointed I didn't get a chance to vote on this  
30 Proposal 90. Just for the record, maybe Carl or the  
31 other three Board members would like to change over and  
32 see what happened on the vote here because our area, we  
33 are in favor of it. We don't want to be locked into a  
34 gear size for the Feds or the State. We want to have  
35 it revised when the fish do come back in the future  
36 whenever our children do grow up and take our place,  
37 this would probably be the fifth or sixth generation of  
38 people that would be subsistence fishing.

39  
40           Thanks again, Mr. Chairman.

41  
42           CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Robert.  
43 Carl, you have a comment.

44  
45           MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I'd like to say that  
46 yesterday's meeting was a completely different meeting.  
47 It was a joint meeting. That action was taken, but if  
48 you look at the agenda you could add it under the next  
49 item, revise and adopt agenda, so that can be added on.  
50

1 To go back and nullify the vote of  
2 yesterday, that had its own agenda, a different date,  
3 two different chairmen, but you still can go back to it  
4 today, adding it onto the agenda.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: As a dissenting  
7 member of the vote, would you make a motion to put that  
8 on the agenda? When we get to the agenda, would you  
9 move to put that back on the agenda?

10  
11 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I would.

12  
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

14  
15 MR. MORGAN: Make everyone's feelings  
16 be better.

17  
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we are at that  
19 point, review and adoption of the agenda. So it's  
20 clear on the record, we're inserting reconsideration --  
21 we'll put this on the top of the day here,  
22 reconsideration of Proposal FP09-12 for a  
23 reconsideration vote. That's inserted into the top of  
24 the agenda.

25  
26 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. Kind of  
27 point of order. We can't presume it's going to be  
28 reconsidered until there's a motion, so I would just  
29 say discussion of whatever it is, the proposal.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I recognized Carl as  
32 a dissenting vote.

33  
34 MR. COLLINS: But he has to make that  
35 motion.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. And so he's  
38 requested it to be on the agenda, so that put it on the  
39 agenda here. I'll make comments on the agenda. We  
40 have many proposals before the -- I want to also  
41 recognize George Oviatt and Tim Hammond joined our  
42 meeting. Glenn Stout is in the back of the room there,  
43 ADF&G area biologist for Galena.

44  
45 Going back to the agenda, we have many  
46 State and Federal proposals. Some of them are on the  
47 same issues, so I would like to combine those reviews  
48 and deal with them as packages. So Proposals 63 and 68  
49 and 91 should be combined. Then Proposal 90, 90A State  
50 proposal, and 67 would be combined. So we'll deal with

1 those at the same time so we don't have to do back and  
2 forth. This seems more expeditious.

3

4 I do feel that we do have presentation  
5 on certain data this morning, so I want to move  
6 Proposal 67, 90 and 90A to the top of the agenda for  
7 this morning because we have certain individuals that  
8 have to do this today. So that would be the change  
9 that I would like to see in the agenda. We'll deal  
10 with 67 first and then we'll move into the State  
11 proposals 90 and 90A at the same time.

12

13 Any other additions to the agenda from  
14 the Council. Yes.

15

16 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I'll move  
17 approval as amended.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Carl has a comment.

20

21 MR. MORGAN: I'd like to add a proposal  
22 WP09-12 on the agenda today.

23

24 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's the  
27 fishery proposal. So then you had a comment, Vince.

28

29 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chair. Vince  
30 Mathews, Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge for the  
31 moment. Yes, we have a special action that's pending  
32 for Unit 24 moose for a later season. So if that could  
33 be put on the agenda.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's a good idea,  
36 Vince. We'll bundle that with the 67, 90 and 90A at  
37 the same time. Just deal with that whole Allakaket and  
38 Alatna moose issue at the same time.

39

40 MR. MATHEWS: I appreciate that. I  
41 apologize to the Staff supporting you. There just  
42 wasn't time to inform them. It's still in the draft  
43 form. Hopefully today it will be in final form so we  
44 can submit it to OSM to get the process moving along to  
45 get consideration of that.

46

47 Thank you.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Vince. That  
50 will be with one of the first items we deal with. Any

1 other comments on the agenda, additions. Polly.

2

3 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. I would just  
4 ask as a matter of process -- bundle away, but as a  
5 matter of process, when this Council votes on the  
6 Federal proposals, if you could have the motion be  
7 discreet so that we don't get confused down the road  
8 with the record.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, my intention is  
11 to deal with each proposal, but taking them in order.  
12 They're bundled, but each one is a separate issue and  
13 dealt with separately.

14

15 Thank you.

16

17 DR. WHEELER: Thank you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for the  
20 clarification. Other Council members, any addition  
21 from the agencies. Ray.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman I'll move to  
24 approve the agenda as amended.

25

26 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny.  
29 Further discussion.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of  
34 the agenda as amended signify by saying aye.

35

36 IN UNISON: Aye.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.

39

40 (No opposing votes)

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we'll move into  
43 the agenda now. We'll take up Proposal 67, which is on  
44 Page 93 in our book. It's revise the moose season and  
45 harvest limits for Unit 24B.

46

47 I might give more of an overview of  
48 this whole issue. The Western Interior Regional  
49 Council has made this proposal. We also made a similar  
50 proposal to the Board of Game and now the State

1 Department of Fish and Game has a counter-proposal 90A,  
2 which will be in our packet here.

3

4 The counter-proposal of the State is  
5 the most advantageous proposal to the subsistence  
6 users. I'm not sure how to address this issue. If the  
7 State Board doesn't take 90 or 90A, we still have to  
8 have a fall-back proposal. I'm not sure how to deal  
9 with -- whether I should prioritize to our most favored  
10 proposal and look at the State proposal first and then  
11 work down into the Federal proposal. Do you think that  
12 would be worthwhile going in that direction, Polly?

13

14 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. It's up to  
15 you and the Council on how the Council wants to  
16 proceed. Again, my recommendation is when dealing with  
17 Proposal 67 that you're dealing with it sort of in a  
18 vacuum and the Federal Board can only take action on  
19 67. Lord only knows what the Board of Game is going to  
20 do beginning on Friday.

21

22 So you can prioritize. You can make  
23 that clear on the record, but I would treat 67 as the  
24 action that this Council can affect in terms of the  
25 Federal Subsistence Board.

26

27 Mr. Chair, I would say too, if we're  
28 going to start right away, I'm just going to put  
29 another chair up here just so that if we have State and  
30 Federal Staff up here presenting, we're not crowded  
31 around here.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I think it's  
34 most expeditious for the time of the Council to review  
35 the preferred proposal, which is the State's alternate  
36 Proposal 90A. So we'll deliberate that proposal first,  
37 we'll move on to 90 and then we'll look at Proposal 67.  
38 That way, the data that's presented for 90A will  
39 compliment all the other proposals, so I think it would  
40 be the most expeditious use of the time of the Counsel.  
41 Since we've bundled these proposals in this manner, I  
42 will review the State Proposal 90A, my mistake, and  
43 we'll look in our packet here. It's green and this is  
44 almost the final draft of this proposal.

45

46 Go ahead, Polly.

47

48 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. Not to be a  
49 stickler for detail, but before you had started with  
50 the proposals I thought you were going to just review

1 and approve your minutes from October 6 and 7 of 2009.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I missed that one.

4 Thank you.

5

6 DR. WHEELER: I know you're excited,  
7 but just in terms of process if you can get there and  
8 then we'll get into the proposal analysis.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Excuse me. I missed  
11 that one. I got in front of myself. We do have the  
12 approval of the minutes agenda item 6. That's on Page  
13 6 in the book. I've reviewed these minutes. I don't  
14 find anything that's -- this is one of the last things  
15 that Vince did for the Council, was write these minutes  
16 up on a weekend or something. I do like this detail in  
17 the minutes for the Council members and the general  
18 public. I know that Pat Pourchot is reading the  
19 minutes from the Western Interior Council meeting. So  
20 I do enjoy about this level of minutes for the Council.  
21 It takes a little concentration to go through those  
22 transcripts.

23

24 Has any of the Council members found  
25 anything that needs to be corrected in the minutes?  
26 These were sent out back in January.

27

28 MS. WILKINSON: January, back in  
29 January.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, James.

32

33 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair. Just one  
34 comment. Vince, you did miss one section there. You  
35 didn't write R. Walker or J. Walker, you just said  
36 Walker and I didn't know which one.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Where is that at?

39

40 MS. WILKINSON: Excuse me, Mr. Chair,  
41 what page was that on?

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Page 6 through 27.

44

45 MS. WILKINSON: I meant the change that  
46 needed to be made. What page the change is on.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I'm not sure.  
49 What page is that, James? You probably saw it when you  
50 were reviewing the minutes.

1 MR. J. WALKER: I was reviewing it.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ann.  
4  
5 MS. WILKINSON: Just for the sake of  
6 time, if that's the only change that needs to be made,  
7 he can find it and tell me later and I'll make the  
8 change.  
9  
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. If you find  
11 it.  
12  
13 MR. J. WALKER: Move to adopt.  
14  
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We've got a motion  
16 to adopt the minutes.  
17  
18 MS. YATLIN: Second.  
19  
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Eleanor.  
21 Any further discussion on the minutes.  
22  
23 MR. MORGAN: Question.  
24  
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is  
26 being called. Those in favor of adoption of the  
27 minutes from our Aniak meeting October 6th and 7th,  
28 2009 signify by saying aye.  
29  
30 IN UNISON: Aye.  
31  
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.  
33  
34 (No opposing votes)  
35  
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Adoption of the  
37 minutes. Thanks for keeping us on track here, Polly.  
38 I have too many things rattling around in my head.  
39 We're going to move into the State Proposal 90A, which  
40 is not in the book. It's going to be this green form  
41 that's in your additional packet. This is almost the  
42 last draft. This proposal was going through a morphing  
43 as the Koyukuk River -- it was presented to the chair.  
44 I brought it as vice chair to the Koyukuk River  
45 Advisory Committee. Glenn Stout presented it to the  
46 committee, so there's one addition to the proposal. So  
47 we'll have Glenn -- do you want to come up and sort of  
48 give us a little overview since this is the  
49 Department's alternate proposal.  
50

1 MR. STOUT: I've got a slide for  
2 presentation of that. Do you want me to do that now or  
3 do you want me to just talk about the language?

4  
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: If you've got a  
6 presentation on the proposal, go ahead with the slide.  
7 We can take a five minute time out.

8  
9 (Off record)

10  
11 (On record)

12  
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to get a  
14 presentation from Glenn Stout on the Proposal 90, which  
15 was a Western Interior Regional Advisory Council, and  
16 then the State has an alternate proposal that was  
17 presented to the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee. The  
18 affected area of this proposal was -- the Advisory  
19 Committee was held in Allakaket in Unit 24B, the area  
20 where people have a real hardship getting enough moose.

21  
22 Go ahead, Glenn.

23  
24 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm  
25 Glenn Stout, the Galena area biologist for the Alaska  
26 Department of Fish and Game. The presentation that  
27 I'll give you is the presentation that I prepared for  
28 the Board of Game meeting that's coming up this coming  
29 week. It's basically an evaluation of Proposal 90 that  
30 was put forward by the Western Interior and then I'll  
31 be presenting the information to them as far as our  
32 preferred alternative amended proposal for Unit 24 and  
33 24C.

34  
35 I looked real quickly at the wording of  
36 the regulation in there and maybe I'll just read to you  
37 what the current wording is that we have that we're  
38 going to be forwarding to the Board of Game. It's  
39 repeated three times, just like what you have in there,  
40 so I'll just read it the once.

41  
42 Basically under remainder of 24B our  
43 wording will now read one bull or for up to four years  
44 beginning July 1, 2010 one antlered bull with five-inch  
45 antlers on one side by registration permit only and  
46 that season would run from December 15 to April 15.  
47 That's a subsistence hunt only. In State regulations,  
48 when we say it's a subsistence hunt only, basically  
49 that means it's open only to State of Alaska residents.  
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's through 2014?

2

3 MR. STOUT: Yes.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So it has a

6 sunset.....

7

8 MR. STOUT: The way it reads is actually

9 for up to four years beginning July 1, 2010, so it

10 would sunset June 30th, 2014.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thank you.

13

14 MR. STOUT: In the presentation that I

15 will be giving to the Board, I'm going to highlight the

16 linkage to Proposal No. 90 and Proposal No. 91. We

17 feel like the two proposals that are both addressing

18 Koyukuk River moose management are closely linked and

19 we feel like we want the Board to consider them and the

20 repercussions of both of those, the implications, I

21 guess, for both of those proposals simultaneously. So

22 that's one thing I want to talk about here as well

23 today.

24

25 The effect of the Proposal 90 would be

26 to add that April season or that floating season in the

27 Federal lands within the Kanuti Controlled Use Area.

28 So it would essentially be the Federal lands covered by

29 this purple section of it. The amended Proposal 90A

30 will actually affect all of 24B downstream of the

31 Henshaw Creek drainage and all of 24C. So it's a

32 substantial increase and it would also include this

33 portion of the Kanuti. A substantial increase in the

34 area and then it's a substantial increase in the number

35 of days of hunting. Instead of a potential 10-day

36 hunt, it would be a four-month hunt. It would be a

37 bulls only hunt.

38

39 Some of the specifics as far as the

40 regulation. As I already mentioned, it would be

41 December 15 to April 15, antlered bulls only. It would

42 be a registration permit, subsistence hunt as I

43 mentioned. There would be a four-year sunset on the

44 regulation to end June 30th, 2014. And it would be a

45 minimum five-inch antler requirement for antlered

46 bulls.

47

48 Some of the hunt conditions that we

49 would ask the Board of Game to add to that would be a

50 permit available at vendors online or at the local

1 vendors and we pretty much anticipate that will be  
2 mostly our licensed vendor there in Allakaket, Steven  
3 Bergman or Janet Bifelt in Hughes.

4  
5           It would also have a requirement not to  
6 allow aircraft for use during this hunt and it would  
7 have a five-day reporting requirement and that would be  
8 to the vendor or to the Department of Fish and Game.  
9 So it would be just basically going back to one of  
10 those vendors where they got the permit and were  
11 reporting within five days. That would just help us  
12 monitor the hunt during the duration because it's a  
13 long season. We want to keep current with what the  
14 harvest is doing and make sure everything is going as  
15 intended.

16  
17           The primary management goal in the  
18 Koyukuk drainage right now is for growth. That's our  
19 management objective that's stated in our Koyukuk Moose  
20 Management Plan, but it was also incorporated to our  
21 moose management reports in 2002 and they've been in  
22 place since then. We've been concerned about winter  
23 hunts and we have opposed those winter hunts in the  
24 past because of our concern for the risk of cow  
25 harvest.

26  
27           We recognized in the past, for  
28 instance, here on Koyukuk Refuge where they had the  
29 winter hunt about 65 percent of the moose harvested  
30 were cows. We've also seen that in previous surveys  
31 when they did the door-to-door surveys. The  
32 Subsistence Division, they documented also that much of  
33 the harvest during the winter hunt, during the winter  
34 seasons was also cows, so we've been concerned about  
35 that. The harvest of cows obviously affects our  
36 management objective for growth, so that's been our  
37 concern.

38  
39           One of the things that I want to  
40 highlight as far as the moose management scenario and  
41 the difference up in 24B and 24C, which is that upper  
42 Koyukuk drainage versus the downriver. First of all,  
43 it's a low density moose population right now. It's .2  
44 to .25 moose per square mile. Generally we think when  
45 we see a density like that it's probably dropped down  
46 into that low density dynamic equilibrium level where  
47 the population probably won't go a lot lower and it  
48 will just kind of continue to kind of bounce around  
49 down there in that basement area, but doesn't have  
50 really the ability to come back out of it because of

1 the effect of predation on that population.

2

3                   Within 24B and C in all our surveys we  
4 continue to have high bull/cow ratios, anywhere from 50  
5 to 70 bulls per 100 cows. 24B and C is a large area.  
6 It's over 16,000 square miles. Within that area  
7 there's just a few small villages totaling 280 people  
8 within that whole large area. So in 2009 our  
9 preliminary harvest is just 24 moose among those  
10 villages that was reported and it's obviously lower  
11 than what we would like it to have and we've heard  
12 plenty of comments. We receive comments all the time  
13 about the concern and we've always recognized that that  
14 has been a concern in that area.

15

16                   I want to contrast the two management  
17 scenarios against each other. I already went through  
18 24B and C. One thing I just want to talk about as far  
19 as what is the effect of having a density that low with  
20 that few people. I want to describe it as encounter  
21 rates, basically a person encountering a moose out  
22 there in a bulls-only hunt. Essentially in that large  
23 of area it would be one bull per 11 square miles that a  
24 person would have to travel to find that one bull. In  
25 addition, the low density of people out there, one  
26 person for 59 square miles, it's not many people out  
27 there traveling, making trails throughout the winter  
28 accessing such a large area. Those two points I think  
29 are important ideas to get across as far as what's the  
30 likelihood of a moose hunter going out and actually  
31 finding a moose when it's that low a density.

32

33                   By contrast, down in 24D and 21D it's a  
34 high density moose population. Between 1.2 and 1.6  
35 moose per square mile. Bull/cow ratios are right at  
36 our management objective right now. They're 30 to 31  
37 bulls per 100 cows, but that's much lower than what we  
38 see up here at 50 to 70 bulls per 100 cows upriver.  
39 It's a much smaller area. Less than half the size of  
40 the area. The people density is much higher too with  
41 1,240 people in the area. Our 2009 moose harvest was  
42 161 moose, so people downriver are doing much better  
43 getting their moose.

44

45                   By contrast, just to go into this  
46 encounter rate to look at the thing, for a hunter down  
47 there to encounter a moose it's one bull per 2.5 square  
48 miles. So the likelihood of a hunter going out and  
49 finding a bull is much higher. This isn't all moose,  
50 it's just bulls remember. So you can see it's much

1 easier for a hunter down here to find a bull than it is  
2 up here. I think that's clearly reflected in the  
3 harvest that's taking place there.

4  
5 By contrast too, many more people in a  
6 smaller area means that fewer miles for one individual  
7 to travel in that area make tracks, you know, make  
8 accessibility throughout the area. So I think those  
9 are really important kind of concepts to understand  
10 about the differences of the two areas.

11  
12 Where we are right now, where our  
13 objectives stand, right now our current status in 21D  
14 we estimate the population somewhere around 8,300 moose  
15 and that's all of 21D. I'm going outside the Koyukuk  
16 drainage a little bit here, but that's within 12,000  
17 square miles. We're sitting about the same number of  
18 moose right now in all of Unit 24, so in an area twice  
19 the size we have about the same number of moose there,  
20 so that's all 24.

21  
22 One thing I want to emphasize on this  
23 that I talked about many times in the past and it was  
24 part of our rationale for why we subdivided Unit 24, is  
25 because 24D holds the bulk of these moose. Upriver in  
26 24B and C, I kind of went past it fast, but it's about  
27 2-4,000 moose in that 16,000 square miles. The bulk of  
28 the moose in 24 is actually 24D, which is down by  
29 Huslia.

30  
31 Once again, where we are at objective-  
32 wise, right on our objectives 30 bulls per 100 cows.  
33 Our management objective in the report is for 45 bulls  
34 per 100 cows upriver and we're doing quite well there.  
35 I think it just speaks to the fact that harvest is not  
36 having an effect on the population. I think that's the  
37 strongest statement. When we see those high bull/cow  
38 ratios there, harvest, non-local, non-resident, local,  
39 all combined. It's not having an effect on that  
40 population.

41  
42 Where we are at as far as objectives,  
43 and these are values that were established by the moose  
44 management plan. We want to return back to where we  
45 were in 1999. This is this year's harvest, so we're  
46 just right where we're wanting to be, about 400  
47 hunters. Success rate is low though. We'd like our  
48 harvest to be higher. We can harvest up to 240 moose,  
49 is where we'd like to, or actually 240-plus. So our  
50 harvest is lower than where we want it to be. That's

1 kind of the emphasis here on 24.

2

3                   Our harvest is lower than where we want  
4 it to be right now in 21D, but things are improving  
5 down there pretty dramatically. Anyway, that's the  
6 story for 24 and I'll keep going on.

7

8                   Just to give you an idea of what we're  
9 looking at in 24 as far as the moose population  
10 surveys, this is the Hog River survey we did two years  
11 ago, 17 bulls per 100 cows essentially, but very low  
12 density. Overall it was 75 bulls per 100 cows. Total  
13 was .36 moose per square mile. It's mostly because  
14 we're starting to get into that higher density area  
15 where we start really picking up a lot of moose over  
16 here in 24D around Huslia.

17

18                   We have several years of data on the  
19 Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. Our 2008 results was  
20 46 bulls per 100 cows. The density within there, and  
21 this is some of the best habitat within 24B is .32 and  
22 that's still quite low and it's about half of what it  
23 was back in 1993. Presented this data last year. The  
24 analysis just in the GSPE surveys that we've done and  
25 we have a significant decline and the population has  
26 been demonstrated from our analysis.

27

28                   So that's the population information,  
29 the harvest information that we have. Some of the  
30 things that I want to talk about as far as what we  
31 talked about at the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee  
32 meeting. It has to do with this drainage-wide hunt  
33 strategy and regulation compromise.

34

35                   Basically the effect of this four-year  
36 sunset clause, one will be to evaluate the  
37 effectiveness of this proposal, this hunt that we  
38 offer, and we want to give it time to evaluate whether  
39 or not people are actually utilizing the hunt, whether  
40 it's effective in meeting their needs, whether it's  
41 working for them. We want to see if people are  
42 reporting and we want to see if it's effective at  
43 setting aside these regulatory process that we go  
44 through every year where we have another proposal  
45 coming in to get this winter hunt opportunity. We want  
46 to make sure that this is working, so we don't keep  
47 having to deal with that regulatory process.

48

49                   One reason that we want that right now  
50 is because the growth of the population has always been

1 what we saw as the real answer to the situation up  
2 there as far as lack of moose. So what we want to do  
3 is we want to improve the number of moose and what we  
4 would like to do is get an intensive management plan in  
5 place for the upriver portion on it. That was part of  
6 the steps of the process when we subdivided 24, is we  
7 wanted to implement an intensive management plan there  
8 to where we could actually have more moose and not be  
9 fighting over the last four or five moose out there  
10 every year on these winter hunts.

11  
12 We want to be able to take a break from  
13 all the regulatory process so I can get to work on that  
14 intensive management plan. I think all the agencies  
15 are pretty occupied with this process, these winter  
16 hunt processes, and we'd like to set that aside for  
17 four years so we can make some progress on getting an  
18 intensive management plan in place.

19  
20 We would like a commitment from the  
21 Western Interior, from the Koyukuk River, and we would  
22 like recognition that the problem right now is up in  
23 the upriver portion of the Koyukuk River drainage, but  
24 we've made strides downriver to improve things and I'll  
25 show you some of the harvest here in a minute on what's  
26 happened down there in the 91 proposal.

27  
28 But that's what we're hoping for, is to  
29 focus on the upriver, acknowledge that we've made the  
30 improvements downriver and we need to set aside that.  
31 We saw the contrast between the two areas right now and  
32 there is a companion proposal that you guys have  
33 submitted as well. So we'd like to set those downriver  
34 proposals aside, focus on the upriver one and accept  
35 this as a compromise and that solution for the  
36 drainage-wide perspective.

37  
38 A few of kind of the rationale, the  
39 psychology, I guess, behind this, kind of just the  
40 common sense aspects of this expanded hunt. First of  
41 all, we believe the largest bulls will essentially have  
42 lost their antlers by December 15th, but there will be  
43 many of the younger bulls that didn't rut as hard that  
44 will still have hard antlers and that really goes on  
45 quite long into the winter. The further you get into  
46 the winter, more of the larger antlered bulls will  
47 start dropping them. But really the biggest breeder  
48 bulls, the 50, 60-inch class bulls, they're going to  
49 drop them antlers pretty early in December. But that  
50 really works pretty well for us as far as the

1 palatability we think of the moose because if it's a  
2 younger bull, it probably didn't rut as hard, still has  
3 good body condition, and so I think that makes sense  
4 for a hunter wanting a good quality moose. Having that  
5 season early protects those larger bulls, but still  
6 makes good quality bulls available to the hunters.

7  
8                   The low encounter rates will be offset  
9 by a longer season. Because we recognize this low  
10 encounter rate, the probability of a hunter out there  
11 finding a moose, that's why we recommended this longer  
12 season. It will also have the effect that it will take  
13 the pressure off that hunter to find that moose during  
14 a short 10 or 5-day season, which we've had in the  
15 past.

16  
17                   They can go out on their normal winter  
18 activities, whether it's cutting wood, trapping,  
19 whatever it is, and they could wait until they find a  
20 bull. They won't be under pressure to shoot that first  
21 moose they see in one of those late winter hunts. I  
22 think that will affect a really big change in how the  
23 hunter is thinking for that hunt and we hope, because  
24 we're still a bit nervous about this long hunt and  
25 that's part of the reason we have a sunset.

26  
27                   But what we hope is that we can protect  
28 the cows by having actually a longer season and I think  
29 in some senses that's counterintuitive to some people;  
30 why open up a big season if we're worried about the  
31 population, we're worried about cows. Well, we're  
32 going to have to watch that, but I think this is the  
33 answer. I think the answer is those hunters won't be  
34 under pressure to pull the trigger too quick and they  
35 will actually take the time to find bulls with antlers.

36  
37                   I think as far as kind of an offshoot  
38 of that, if people are out doing their normal winter  
39 activities, there actually won't be a direct cost to  
40 hunting like they used, you know, in the five, 10-day  
41 hunt. They had to go buy their gas just for moose  
42 hunting and it was kind of a dedicated fiscal kind of  
43 endeavor. In this case it will actually be a normal  
44 winter activity, so I think that will save the hunter  
45 too.

46  
47                   This will solve the land status  
48 problem. Starting dates will not be an issue as far as  
49 bad weather are concerned because it will be four  
50 months long. I think that hunters are really more

1 likely to meet their needs in a situation like this  
2 than what we've had in the past.

3  
4 So, in summary, the management scenario  
5 in 24B, C is very unique. It is a low density moose  
6 population, a low number of people and that translates  
7 to low encounter rates and, therefore, low harvest. So  
8 that's the point I want to emphasize to the Board of  
9 Game, is we have the opportunity to harvest bulls, good  
10 bull/cow ratios. It is a low population, but it is low  
11 harvest. People aren't getting moose up there and we  
12 want to improve that situation.

13  
14 Also, the upper Koyukuk drainage will  
15 benefit from the drainage-wide management strategy.  
16 Therefore, for us opposing the liberal high harvest in  
17 the lower Koyukuk is as important as adopting the  
18 expanded opportunity in the upper Koyukuk. That's what  
19 I talked about before, those proposals for downriver.  
20 We would like the RAC here today to vote against that  
21 proposal you've already submitted. We want you to  
22 support this proposal and I think it will give a very  
23 strong statement to the Board of Game to say that this  
24 is a solution, we've recognized the improvements  
25 downriver and lets get to work on intensive management  
26 upriver.

27  
28 I'll add to that. We really need your  
29 help to raise the priority level of this intensive  
30 management plan. Intensive management plans tend to  
31 become more important when they're raised up in the eye  
32 of the public.

33  
34 So I would really try and encourage you  
35 and try and garner your support for promoting that  
36 intensive management plan because we could write it and  
37 maybe it would sit there too. That's what we don't  
38 want to happen. We want the level of importance for  
39 this to be raised up and I would certainly encourage  
40 your support in that regard. That's all I have.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Glenn. I  
43 appreciate that analysis. I thought those were very  
44 important points. The encounter rates, the density of  
45 moose, and how many moose you're actually going to see.  
46 Those are very important aspects and I appreciate that  
47 to be portrayed to the Board.

48  
49 Does the Council have questions for  
50 Glenn on the slide presentation? Eleanor.

1 MS. YATLIN: You said you presented  
2 this to Koyukuk River AC also?

3  
4 MR. STOUT: Yes, I did. I presented  
5 that a couple weeks ago to the Koyukuk River AC and  
6 they did vote in support of this amended proposal.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim.

9  
10 MR. GERVAIS: Glenn, can you comment on  
11 what some potential effects of distress this might put  
12 on the moose population just from being pursued  
13 throughout the winter.

14  
15 MR. STOUT: Yeah, I don't think it will  
16 be any more than normal and I think it's probably  
17 because of what I described there as far as normal  
18 winter activities that are already taking place and  
19 this would provide that individual -- he would have a  
20 permit in his hand and just normal activities they  
21 would be out there and come across a moose. Really  
22 opportunistically is really how I see it happening more  
23 than anything. Just because of the area, the size of  
24 the area and the effect of that I really don't  
25 anticipate that would be a problem at all.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You've got a  
28 question there, Robert?

29  
30 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr.  
31 Chairman. Glenn, when you said you want us to withdraw  
32 our proposal, I would encourage the Board to have  
33 second thoughts about this because I don't think we  
34 want to withdraw our proposal just yet. I mean your  
35 proposal looks great, but I've still got reservations  
36 about some of the issues on there. I don't think I  
37 would want to support your proposal here. I think I'd  
38 rather stick with our Western Interior proposal. I  
39 mean that's my thoughts on this after listening to your  
40 presentation. Nice presentation. I tell you, you did  
41 some work on this.

42  
43 Mr. Chairman.

44  
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Robert. I'm the co-  
46 chair of the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee and the  
47 Advisory Committee was surprised that the department  
48 had brought forth a four-month proposal and we're very  
49 pleased and welcome this proposal, this alternate  
50 proposal A. The Advisory Committee looked at what

1 Glenn is referring to as opposing Proposal 90, which is  
2 down by Huslia, and the Advisory Committee looked at  
3 what the issues are in the Koyukuk River and the people  
4 in Huslia from the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee  
5 voted to oppose the Western Interior's Proposal 91  
6 because they wanted to propose this proposal for the  
7 upriver because the people up there, direct relatives,  
8 are having a heck of a time trying to get meat up there  
9 in Allakaket.

10

11 So the Advisory Committee voted  
12 actually to oppose Proposal 91, the RAC proposal for a  
13 winter bull hunt, and to try to get this Proposal 90A  
14 in. We'll get to what the Advisory Committee said when  
15 we get to the Advisory Committee comments. The  
16 Advisory Committee was very supportive of this idea of  
17 a four-month season. We can talk about the Advisory  
18 Committee comments later. The people on the Koyukuk  
19 were enthusiastic about this proposal at the Advisory  
20 Committee meeting.

21

22 Go ahead, Robert.

23

24 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. I was  
25 listening to this too and referred to ours as -- you  
26 know, if the Koyukuk people really want it, that's  
27 fine. I mean we can vote in favor of it or whatever  
28 that -- I was just kind of wondering what the Board of  
29 Game is going to say when they see these conflicting  
30 proposals here. Either one has to be dropped or one  
31 has to be supported. I'm just curious about what the  
32 Board of Game is going to say when it comes to this  
33 issue.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we've bundled  
36 90, 90A and 67 together. When we talk about the 91  
37 proposal, we'll go through what the Advisory Committee  
38 felt about that. There is a Federal  
39 winter hunt down there already, so that hunt is being  
40 provided this year and people are taking advantage of  
41 it. They don't have any problem fulfilling that quota  
42 down there because of that encounter rate. I mean if  
43 the quota is 10, they kill the 10 in like three days.  
44 I mean they've got a lot of moose down there. The  
45 people down there just want a winter hunt and they have  
46 a Federal winter hunt. To try to get something for the  
47 upriver people the Koyukuk River Advisory was  
48 supportive of this amended Proposal 90A. So I just  
49 wanted to clarify where people are at there.

50

1 Eleanor, do you have a comment.

2

3 MS. YATLIN: I was just trying to get  
4 clear in my mind what Glenn had said for the Western  
5 Interior to approve of this Proposal 90 and not support  
6 91. I mean I'm just trying to see what you're saying,  
7 is it would be more likely to pass the Board of Game.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good point, Eleanor.  
10 I think the Council is confused which proposal you're  
11 requesting opposition to. You could give a brief  
12 summary of what 91 is. I could give it myself.

13

14 MR. STOUT: That's my next slide.  
15 Proposal 91 was the proposal that the Western Interior  
16 submitted for an April 5 to 15 season and this is a  
17 State proposal. This is the companion proposal for 68.  
18 It would include -- the expectation was that both of  
19 those would similarly be rejected in favor of the 90A  
20 alternative. The 24C and D and 21D portion of the  
21 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area is where that proposal  
22 would effect.

23

24 Basically why it's 24C, D and E is  
25 because Koyukuk Controlled Use Area goes up slightly  
26 into those areas there. This is the area that we talk  
27 about that has that much higher density and a much  
28 higher harvest.

29

30 Just in proportion to where we are and  
31 why we're talking about a drainage-wide perspective is  
32 because they're very close to each other here, but the  
33 situation down in this portion of the river is so much  
34 different than it is up in this portion of the river.  
35 It's really hard to imagine a low density dynamic  
36 equilibrium .25 moose up here and then you come down  
37 here and we have one of the highest densities in the  
38 state. That's how dramatic the change is.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That slide there  
41 kind of portrays what the difference in the population  
42 and why the upper river people at Allakaket have such a  
43 really really hard time trying to get moose. It's a  
44 much different situation down on the lower river. You  
45 go below that little narrows there by Hughes and it  
46 gets into way more moose.

47

48 So 90A, what we're talking about is  
49 that large blue area there and that would be beneficial  
50 for the people that live up in that upper drainage

1 area. Primarily the main beneficiaries of that would be  
2 people in Allakaket and Alatna. People from Bettles  
3 and Hughes also would benefit from that, but those  
4 people up there at Bettles probably wouldn't utilize  
5 this hunt.

6  
7 It would be actually a very low number  
8 of people that would actually participate and the  
9 harvest would actually be fairly low because they're  
10 only catching 25 percent of the moose that they used  
11 to. They used to get 30 to 40 moose. Now they're  
12 getting about between 10 to 20 moose. We're talking  
13 about on 90A, this green proposal here as modified for  
14 that area.

15  
16 Does that clarify that for you,  
17 Eleanor? The 91 proposal is for down there by Huslia.

18  
19 MR. STOUT: Yeah, I'll just show as far  
20 as considerations specifically to the 91 area. The  
21 management strategy is working down in lower Koyukuk.  
22 Our bull/cow ratios are increasing. Our harvest  
23 success by local hunters has been improving. We have  
24 reduced the dependency on these winter hunts and that  
25 was one of our primary strategies.

26  
27 If we can get our bull/cow ratios up on  
28 the lower river, hunters would have more success in the  
29 fall hunt and reduce the dependency on those winter  
30 hunts when so many cows are shot. So although our  
31 bull/cow ratio is definitely an objective, improving  
32 that has the effect of helping our population growth  
33 situation where we can reduce the harvest of those  
34 cows. So it does feed into that.

35  
36 Right now the moose population down  
37 there is stabilizing, so I think that is an improvement  
38 down there. I think it's just really changed much  
39 differently than it has on the upriver.

40  
41 As far as the harvest here, this is  
42 just the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area. There are the  
43 check stations that we operate. One of the key points  
44 to notice is in 2000 we went through the implementation  
45 of the Koyukuk Moose Management Plan, we effected the  
46 drawing permits and that's why this growth that was  
47 just going unchecked as far as the number of hunters  
48 was just skyrocketing. We brought that back down and  
49 we've stabilized that number of hunters since this  
50 time.

1                   Just to kind of show you who has been  
2 affected, the non-local resident is in the gray. We  
3 had a substantial reduction in those drawing permits in  
4 2004 trying to achieve our bull/cow ratios. The first  
5 bump was a reduction in 2000 when the first permits  
6 were implemented, was a reduction in the non-resident  
7 hunters, and that's pretty much gone along. We had to  
8 reduce down here at the same time because of bull/cow  
9 ratios.

10  
11                   It's really easy to control with a  
12 drawing hunt the number of hunters. You have a lot of  
13 control in your management of your hunt there. At the  
14 same time you'll notice that our local resident hunters  
15 has actually been increasing. So that speaks to the  
16 fact that people are recognizing that hunting success  
17 is good on the lower river. They're going up there  
18 now. They're traveling sometimes quite far. Like  
19 Hughes is having to come down into that area and hunt  
20 more.

21  
22                   Last year we had a bump there because  
23 people in Nulato couldn't get out onto the Kaiyuh  
24 Slough and with that low river good bull/cow ratios  
25 gave us flexibility in an area-wide scheme. For those  
26 hunters to come up, get their moose up there, Nulato  
27 had a really good year because they got to go hunt on  
28 the lower Koyukuk and that's one of the benefits of  
29 having a good bull/cow ratio there on the lower  
30 Koyukuk.

31  
32                   As far as our objectives, since we  
33 implemented that in 2000 bull/cow ratios are going up  
34 exactly like we had managed for. When we combine our  
35 core five trend count areas in there, back to 2000 up  
36 to now, we're up to 32 bulls per 100 cows when you  
37 combine them all together. We're going in the right  
38 direction downriver.

39  
40                   Harvest. Harvest is going in the right  
41 direction downriver. This is almost all -- these are  
42 all the local villages. Allakaket is in here, but most  
43 of the increase is this blue line here, which is  
44 Hughes, and Galena has always done real well. But if  
45 you break out just the Huslia harvest you can see and  
46 they would be the ones most affected I think by  
47 Proposal 91. Their harvest has almost tripled and this  
48 includes -- up to this point we don't have the 2009  
49 hunt. That will be on the Koyukuk Refuge. But it does  
50 include these Federal hunt years that they have there.

1 So Huslia has really benefitted from the improvements  
2 of the bull/cow ratios.

3  
4 That's one of the things that I brought  
5 to the Koyukuk River AC and I said we would like you to  
6 acknowledge that things have improved down there and we  
7 would like your support in moving our efforts upriver  
8 and succeed up there like we have down here. That's  
9 what we're trying to get to and that's why we want the  
10 compromise.

11  
12 In the same sense, why we don't like  
13 Proposal 91 is because it's a high-density moose, high  
14 number of hunters, which translates to high encounter  
15 rates and, therefore, high harvest. That's our concern  
16 for Proposal downriver with a winter hunt and that's  
17 why the department is going to ask the Board not to  
18 adopt that proposal.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That clarifies. We  
21 have two different proposals. One is for upriver and  
22 one is downriver. So we have two different problems.  
23 The downriver, Huslia hunt, is winter hunt  
24 opportunities being provided through the Federal hunt.  
25 The 10 moose quota that has theirs easily harvested and  
26 it fulfills people who didn't get a moose in the fall  
27 time. So we're mixing apples and oranges, two  
28 different areas. We want to remain focused on the 90  
29 and 90A proposal and then the Federal Proposal for 67.

30  
31 Further questions about Glenn's  
32 clarification there.

33  
34 (No comments)

35  
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Glenn. My  
37 question is through the deliberation of this proposal  
38 90A, which was the preferred proposal for the Koyukuk  
39 River Advisory Committee and I adhere to the Advisory  
40 Committee's wishes as a RAC member. So if this Council  
41 supports Proposal 90A as drafted with the sunset and  
42 the five-inch beam length, it will be submitted as --  
43 is going to be submitted to the Board? There's no  
44 question about that?

45  
46 MR. STOUT: Well, certainly, Mr. Chair,  
47 if the Council here today doesn't agree with this area-  
48 wide strategy, then we're going to have to go back and  
49 think whether or not the people feel like this is a  
50 good strategy that they want to support. So your vote

1 here today will certainly affect our decision to go  
2 forward with that to the Board.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see. Any further  
5 questions on Glenn's presentation. There's some other  
6 data, some telemetry work that I wanted to show the  
7 Council also on the movements of the moose and why  
8 these subsistence needs aren't being met in the fall  
9 hunt. At this time I would like to see the telemetry  
10 work as part of the deliberation on these proposals.  
11 We'll have a break while that's being set up.

12

13 (Off record)

14

15 (On record)

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Discussing some of  
18 the parameters of this hunt are these telemetry work  
19 that's being done on the Koyukuk Refuge. Kyle is here  
20 to give us a data presentation on the telemetry work  
21 that's been done and you can just describe the project.

22

23 Go ahead.

24

25 MR. JOLY: Thank you for having me, Mr.  
26 Chairman. Council members. I'm Kyle Joly. I'm a  
27 wildlife biologist with Gates of the Arctic National  
28 Park. Back in March of 2008 we began a telemetry  
29 study. We've collared a total of 83 moose in the upper  
30 Koyukuk; 73 are cows, 10 are bulls.

31

32 This is a cooperative project between  
33 Fish and Game, the National Park Service, Fish and  
34 Wildlife Service and the Borough of Land Management.  
35 About half the collars have been put out in the Kanuti  
36 National Wildlife Refuge and the other half in the  
37 Dalton Corridor southeastern portion of Gates of the  
38 Arctic and State lands in between.

39

40 So what I have here is some preliminary  
41 information on our telemetry flights. Once a month  
42 we've been going out and tracking the moose. What I've  
43 done here is put the locations for the Kanuti moose and  
44 the polygons, these rectangles here, are areas where we  
45 found a single moose. The blue dots are where they've  
46 been in January through April, so late winter, and then  
47 the red crosses are where they're found the rest of the  
48 year.

49

50 So I've just got a bunch of slides to

1 show you and I'll just run through them. This is the  
2 first one. You can see that what I've done here is  
3 just thrown up about a half a dozen moose at a  
4 time just to show you where the animals are. I've got  
5 four slides. There's a lot of overlap between the  
6 animals, especially when you get to the Koyukuk proper,  
7 so I just tried to separate them out that way so it's a  
8 little easier to visualize.

9  
10 Here's another half dozen. Can you go  
11 back to the first slide, Tim. One of the most  
12 interesting ones I've found was this one right here.  
13 The animal was captured up in Gates of the Arctic in  
14 March and then it walked all the way down the Koyukuk  
15 past Bettles into Kanuti and then it walked back up the  
16 following winter back up into the Glacier River and  
17 then walked back down to Kanuti. So the home range on  
18 that one is very linear. You find some other ones that  
19 are more stationary.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That was a cow or a  
22 bull?

23  
24 MR. JOLY: That was a cow. So some of  
25 these home ranges are smaller here. As you can see,  
26 they do get around and there's quite a bit of  
27 individual variability.

28  
29 This is the last one. Again, there's  
30 just so many in this middle region of the Koyukuk that  
31 there's just so much overlap. There's actually four  
32 different animals overlapping in that middle one, so I  
33 tried to color the home ranges a little bit different  
34 color.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that's your final  
37 slide?

38  
39 MR. JOLY: That's it.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What I wanted to  
42 point out in this telemetry work is that the majority  
43 of the time the moose during the hunting season, the  
44 fall/summer season, the moose can be back quite a ways  
45 from the river. In the winter, the blue dots, the  
46 moose predominantly come down to the river. Snow  
47 depths and variations and temperature can effect why  
48 they come down to the river. The TEK of the area, you  
49 don't really see a lot of moose near the river corridor  
50 until January. The moose come down from the hills and

1 start getting along the river corridor and then they  
2 move back away once breakup starts coming.

3

4 That's one of the main reasons why  
5 people are having such a hard time catching. We have  
6 moose and we've got a good bull/cow ratio, but the  
7 moose are back in inaccessible areas where people can't  
8 get them. So that's the reason I wanted to have this.  
9 This is in preliminary work. How much longer is the  
10 project going to be running?

11

12 MR. JOLY: The project is scheduled to  
13 run through 2012  
14 right now.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Western  
17 Interior Council was asking for this telemetry project  
18 for many years. This telemetry work can be used in  
19 various ways for twinning surveys and so forth, but it  
20 also shows the kind of movement and understanding of  
21 what the moose are doing in the south slope of the  
22 Brooks Range. We have the Dalton Highway to the east.  
23 We have Bettles and air taxi operators, so we get a  
24 better understanding of what the wax and wane of the  
25 population is as far as annual movements for  
26 management. I feel that this understanding is  
27 beneficial to the Council in that it documents what TEK  
28 is saying.

29

30 Do you have a comment there, Eleanor?

31

32 MS. YATLIN: Just a question. You did  
33 this presentation to the Koyukuk River Advisory  
34 Council?

35

36 MR. JOLY: No, you guys are the first  
37 to see this information. You guys requested this, so I  
38 just put it together. This is the first that anyone has  
39 seen of this, but I would be happy to present it to  
40 whoever is interested.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My comment is that  
43 people from -- Mike Spindler has taken certain  
44 individuals from Allakaket on the flights and shown  
45 people -- they're following the collared moose and so  
46 there's people from there who have gone on rides and  
47 seen where the moose are at. There's certain key  
48 individuals and Mike Spindler can tell us who all he's  
49 taken on these flights. Other questions or comments on  
50 the telemetry work?

1 MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The  
2 question I would have, there seems to be discrete  
3 groups. You're able to shade in where they move  
4 around. Is this tied to where they were born, both  
5 bulls and cows? The area they're born they'll liable  
6 to stay in that area or a tendency to stay in that  
7 area?

8  
9 MR. JOLY: Unfortunately we can't  
10 answer that question. We capture the moose as adults,  
11 so we're not sure where they're born.

12  
13 MR. COLLINS: I think that would be  
14 important if you could add that to the study in some  
15 way to determine that because that may mean -- have  
16 implications on other areas. If there's no cows  
17 bearing calves in certain areas around there, then  
18 maybe they'll remain that way if they're not moving  
19 between areas.

20  
21 MR. JOLY: We are using the collars to  
22 keep track of how many calves they have. Fish and Game  
23 is doing twinning surveys and we also, when we go out  
24 flying telemetry, we keep track of the number of calves  
25 that they have, so that does partially address the  
26 question.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Can there be an  
29 aspect of when you re-collar, can you add collars onto  
30 calves to get some work or would that screw your whole  
31 project up?

32  
33 MR. JOLY: I think it would be an  
34 interesting thing to add on, but it would be an add-on.  
35 We'd have to get together, the interagency group, and  
36 make an addendum to the study plan.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Other  
39 questions about the telemetry?

40  
41 (No comments)

42  
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you very much.  
44 I wanted that to be on the record that this is an  
45 aspect, the moose movements are an aspect of harvest  
46 accessibility or availability. Glenn presented the  
47 general encounter rate, but then you get into when the  
48 moose are actually completely unavailable and then you  
49 get into like these micro encounter rates, and so that  
50 can be an aspect of how people are not -- it gets even

1 harder than even that portrayal and that was an  
2 excellent portrayal of the encounter rate and 24B is  
3 low if you look at per square mile just generated out,  
4 but if moose are way off the river, it gets even worse.

5

6 Thank you, appreciate that.

7

8 MR. JOLY: Thank you for your support.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for coming.  
11 The proposal was introduced. Do you have further  
12 comments, Glenn, on that proposal?

13

14 MR. STOUT: (Shakes head negatively)

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: As the Federal/State  
17 agencies, do you have comments on that proposal, Mike?

18

19 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Chair. For the  
20 record, Mike Spindler, Kanuti Refuge manager. I would  
21 like to applaud Fish and Game for their efforts to work  
22 on counter Proposal 90A. This has been a long, long  
23 effort to try and re-establish winter harvest  
24 opportunity for the people in the upper Koyukuk. I  
25 think by working together we can make this happen.

26

27 Fish and Wildlife Service has sent a  
28 letter to the Board of Game in support of Proposal 90A,  
29 the counter proposal. I want to just go over the  
30 reasons why we're in support of the counter proposal.  
31 It provides a longer time period, four months of  
32 hunting opportunity versus five or 10 days, so the  
33 hunters don't have to sandwich their hunt into a narrow  
34 time field. It provides a much larger area and choice  
35 of places for the hunters to go because they're not  
36 confounded with a checkerboard land status. This would  
37 include all lands; State, Native lands and Federal  
38 lands.

39

40 Hunters, as Glenn mentioned, they can  
41 combine their trips. They can do this hunting along  
42 with their wood gathering and their trapping and their  
43 inter-village travel.

44

45 A huge thing for me is that this  
46 alleviates the administrative burden on the agencies  
47 and that includes the refuge manager who makes the in-  
48 season management decision, but that's not alone to us  
49 because we put a lot -- when we consider these five-day  
50 openings, it puts a lot of work on the OSM staff and on

1 the Fish and Game staff because we have to go through  
2 and analyze the data every year, get the comments every  
3 year and make this hunt happen. Plus there's the  
4 additional law enforcement that we have to do.

5  
6 I think overall this is a much better  
7 deal for the hunters and we would support that Proposal  
8 90A. I do like the idea that it has the sunset period  
9 on it so that we can re-evaluate it.

10  
11 As you may recall, when the Koyukuk  
12 River Moose Management Plan was adopted by the Federal  
13 Subsistence Board as well as by the Board of Game,  
14 there was a time period there for about three or four  
15 years when you have these spurious proposals come in  
16 and we just decided, as the agencies and the advisory  
17 councils and committees, that we're going to wait and  
18 see how this plan worked. So then we're not diverted  
19 onto all these other spurious proposals. As Glenn  
20 mentioned, there's a lot of other things that he would  
21 like to be doing to encourage management efforts to  
22 improve the situation in the upper Koyukuk River.  
23 Likewise, with the refuge staff, it allows us to focus  
24 on studies like the telemetry study and things like  
25 that and doesn't divert us.

26  
27 So, again, I applaud Fish and Game for  
28 working on this with the Council and with the Advisory  
29 Committee and I have great hopes that the Board of Game  
30 will take favorable action.

31  
32 If you have any questions, Mr. Chair.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does the Council  
35 have any questions of Kanuti Refuge. Go ahead, Robert.

36  
37 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
38 Mike, to open this up to all the hunters, this is open  
39 to hunters in the whole state, not only just resident  
40 areas, correct?

41  
42 MR. SPINDLER: Yes, Mr. Walker and Mr.  
43 Chair, this would be eligible -- all hunters in the  
44 state would be eligible; however, there's enough  
45 sideboards of this hunt, such as the registration  
46 permit available in a village by the vendor. The  
47 controlled use area, which is that dark purple area  
48 there, which is no fly, plus you have to be a local  
49 rural resident to hunt on the Federal lands.

50

1                   If you look at the time period when you  
2 have these young bulls that have antlers on them, the  
3 little antlered bulls, that's early in the winter,  
4 early in the hunt period when it's really cold and  
5 dark, so we were having a conversation there during the  
6 break about what is the likelihood that people would  
7 come in from Outside for a small antlered bull. We  
8 think it's very minimal.

9  
10                   The safety valve on this so to speak is  
11 that you have the five-day reporting requirement so  
12 that if something unanticipated happens that we're  
13 getting a lot of that kind of harvest that there are  
14 ways to deal with it, such as an emergency closure.

15  
16                   MR. R. WALKER: Okay. Just a small  
17 little episode happened in our area in 21E back in the  
18 past. We had a State hunt like this and we had to  
19 close it by a board meeting. Ray Collins was there at  
20 the meeting. We had to close it down. But I think you  
21 have a little more restraint here. You have a little  
22 more data. You have a little more enforcement here. I  
23 think maybe it might work, but, again, I'd have to  
24 think about this because I know what nightmares  
25 happened in 21E here in the past. If it comes on that  
26 the Board wants it here, I think I will change my vote  
27 on this.

28  
29                   MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Walker. Mr. Chair.  
30 Just from the perspective of a refuge manager, it is  
31 our job to do the best job we can as land stewardship.  
32 That involves knowing what's going on on the ground, on  
33 the refuge. So if we see a lot of that kind of  
34 activity that's counter to the intent of this proposal,  
35 I think between our patrol work and the registration  
36 hunt aspect of it and the reporting requirements, I  
37 think we're going to know if there's an alarming trend  
38 developing and then we can take action accordingly.

39  
40                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Further  
41 comment, Robert.

42  
43                   MR. R. WALKER: No other comments,  
44 Chairman. Thank you.

45  
46                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Other  
47 Council comments to the refuge staff. Go ahead, Ray.

48  
49                   MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I've got a  
50 question. I'm not sure who to direct it to. I guess

1 maybe it would go back to the State. That is, there is  
2 registration. Are they going to be registering before  
3 the hunt or is it going to remain open all the way  
4 through to get those permits. In the McGrath area it  
5 helps -- we have a requirement that they have to pick  
6 up the registration permit before the hunt begins so we  
7 know how many people are going to go out there and that  
8 may be one way of controlling who is going to apply for  
9 those and whether there's going to be a large  
10 application for outside the area.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ray. Good  
13 point. Glenn.

14  
15 MR. STOUT: Yeah, Mr. Collins. I think  
16 Mike said it best. You know, we have that five-day  
17 reporting period to monitor and watch and see what  
18 happens. Just because of the logistics to get out  
19 there and because most of the moose are in that Kanuti  
20 closed area, I think it's so unlikely that anybody from  
21 outside is going to come out there on a snowmachine  
22 because it's closed to fly in and they're just going to  
23 be little bulls. I think if it's going to be anybody  
24 it would be somebody from Fairbanks, you know, and  
25 they've got winter hunt opportunities here in  
26 Fairbanks. It would be a lot easier to get to.

27  
28 We want to have that permit available  
29 all year long so people aren't lining up having to get  
30 the permit and create all sorts of other problems. I  
31 think just make it readily available to all the local  
32 hunters and I think it will take care of itself.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Kyle,  
35 you've got a comment. Go ahead, Kyle.

36  
37 MR. JOLY: Kyle Joly with the National  
38 Park Service. Just a couple points of clarification.  
39 It sounded like the applications would be done online,  
40 so you wouldn't have to go out to villages. The second  
41 thing is that this map shows a large area of Gates of  
42 the Arctic and that would not be open to this hunt.  
43 This area up here is all Gates of the Arctic.

44  
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, right. In the  
46 upper portion above the Alatna drainage, probably from  
47 about halfway above the dark purple line would be Gates  
48 of the Arctic. Right there.

49  
50 MR. JOLY: So that would all not be

1 part of this hunt.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's Park Service  
4 lands and you have to live in one of the resident zoned  
5 communities, which would be Alatna and Allakaket, to be  
6 able to hunt in that portion of the park.

7

8 MR. J. WALKER: That answered my  
9 question.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further  
12 questions of the Refuge staff.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So we've had  
17 the Federal. What happened to Mike Smith? He took  
18 off. We don't have any tribal people here. Oh, he's  
19 next door. Do you want to run over there and see if he  
20 has a comment.

21

22 I will state that I flew down here with  
23 Stanley Ned and Ron Sam on the plane. Stanley was  
24 supposed to come over here and talk to us, but he had  
25 to get home, so I guess he flew out or whatever. I  
26 will state the Stanley is first chief of Allakaket and  
27 was highly supportive of Proposal 90A. I'll state that  
28 for the record. That's oral communication. Also Ron  
29 Sam from Alatna, our previous chair of this Council,  
30 was also very supportive of this proposal, of 90A.

31

32 He's not around?

33

34 MS. WILKINSON: No.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would have liked  
37 to have Mike Smith comment, but he's not available. I  
38 don't have any tribal comments written that I know of.  
39 Ann, we don't?

40

41 MS. WILKINSON: No.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Gates of the  
44 Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission has not met  
45 since last November, so we didn't have this proposal  
46 available at that time. The Koyukuk River Advisory  
47 Committee, we're in number six here, comments. The  
48 Advisory Committee looked at this issue, looked at  
49 where -- people know where the moose are at, know what  
50 great hardship they're having getting moose. So they

1 were supportive of this and we have our minutes of the  
2 Advisory Committee in our packet here, so there's  
3 actually quite a bit of deliberation on Proposal 90A.  
4 It's starting on Page 3 and goes through Page 4.

5  
6 At that time, the proposal was for an  
7 ear length, so I brought pictures. I didn't know what  
8 a moose ear length was, so that was the original  
9 proposal. In our packet we have some pictures of moose  
10 that I've taken of an ear length in relation to beam  
11 length, so the Advisory Committee felt that half an ear  
12 length would be good, so that's why now the Department  
13 has reduced that to five inches, which is about half of  
14 an ear length.

15  
16 In your packet you see pictures of live  
17 moose, which I presented to the Advisory Committee, and  
18 it shows what we were actually talking about. Like the  
19 second picture back is a bull with approximately four  
20 or five inches of beam length and it shows what that  
21 looks like. It sticks straight out of his head. It's  
22 very apparent. So this hunt extending into April  
23 actually starts to provide some of these moose that are  
24 growing antler.

25  
26 So local comments from the Advisory  
27 Committee, at that time of year it's real dry, people  
28 can get around, the snow is settling and the meat dries  
29 real well for drying meat for summer. So the Advisory  
30 Committee voted unanimously to support 90A, so that  
31 would be the AC's comments to the proposal.

32  
33 We haven't received any written  
34 comments, Ann?

35  
36 MS. WILKINSON: No.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have any  
39 public testimony? I would have really liked to have  
40 had -- Stanley and Ron were supposed to show up this  
41 morning, but they were here for other reasons, medical  
42 reasons and so forth.

43  
44 We're at Regional Council deliberation.  
45 The Chair will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 90A  
46 as amended and presented by the Department of Fish and  
47 Game.

48  
49 MR. GERVAIS: I'll make a motion to  
50 adopt 90A.

1 MS. YATLIN: Second.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Eleanor.  
4 Council deliberation. We've gone over some of the  
5 points of this proposal. Are there other Council  
6 comments and discussion on the proposal. We've talked  
7 over some of the aspects. Do you have other questions?  
8  
9 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I'm going  
10 to support this because I think this is just in line  
11 and what I was asking for in providing opportunity over  
12 a longer period of time. The idea that it's going to  
13 be in place for four years also deals with it. It puts  
14 the burden back on the subsistence hunter to within  
15 that period choose when they want to hunt and where  
16 they're going to hunt and so on. I think we need more  
17 opportunities like this instead of these short five  
18 days when you don't know what the weather is going to  
19 be.  
20  
21 It's right in line with what I would  
22 like to see other proposals look like in the future.  
23  
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Thanks for  
25 those comments, Ray. Other comments.  
26  
27 MS. PELKOLA: Jack.  
28  
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Jenny.  
30  
31 MS. PELKOLA: I guess I have -- I don't  
32 know if this is a question or not, but are the people  
33 that were successful at the fall hunt, are they going  
34 to be able to hunt too or is it just a one-time deal.  
35  
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Glenn.  
37  
38 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Ms. Pelkola.  
39 The way the permit system works is an individual can  
40 shoot one moose in the regulatory year. For instance,  
41 if this hunt were to open this coming December, the  
42 regulatory year starts on July 1st and then goes to  
43 June 30th of 2011. So if they got a moose in the fall  
44 of 2010, they're done for that year, so they wouldn't  
45 be able to use this hunt. But anybody else in their  
46 family could. Proxy hunting would be allowed. There's  
47 a lot of different ways to be able to get another moose  
48 in the family if they needed to.  
49  
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other comments.

1 Eleanor.

2

3 MS. YATLIN: Mr. Chairman. I've been  
4 wanting to hear about this and see this happen for a  
5 long time for Allakaket and Alatna people. We moved  
6 back down to Huslia in '98 and every year it seemed  
7 like we get more and more people down into around  
8 Huslia area that the residents from up there get moose.  
9 I know their hardship. Another thing I really saw a  
10 lot of is -- I mean I could see is they have to go a  
11 really long ways and last year there was a lot of snow.  
12 I don't know what the conditions are this year as far  
13 as snow, but I know they have to go a long ways yet in  
14 that Kanuti area to go hunting. So I really am  
15 supportive of this.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other Council  
20 comments on the proposal. My final comment is the  
21 supplement is the people of Allakaket and Alatna have  
22 combined efforts to cut trail to the north. There was  
23 supposedly caribou to the north. They will cut trail  
24 for 26 miles at great expense to try to get to those  
25 caribou. People are in dire straits there. But the  
26 caribou were gone. They couldn't find these caribou.

27

28 This proposal, the Advisory Committee  
29 members were commenting that this proposal would have a  
30 long enough season that they felt they would be more  
31 relaxed and be able to go about their normal trapping  
32 activities and so forth and catch moose incidental to  
33 their normal travels. Especially we've had these  
34 special action requests for the short five-day hunts  
35 for the Federal lands in Kanuti. We've had cold  
36 weather, deep snow. We've had all kinds of problems  
37 and people are not catching any moose or one moose, so  
38 that's not working out.

39

40 People were very supportive of this  
41 idea and I would like this proposal to move forward  
42 before the Board of Game. I live on the haul road and  
43 I feel that the hunt for caribou, when the antlers fall  
44 off the caribou the first part of November, interest  
45 from the general hunters falls off like a cliff. They  
46 basically won't shoot antlerless bulls. They have  
47 hardly any interest of them. So I don't feel that  
48 small antlered bulls of five-inch soft antler or two-  
49 year-old and yearling bulls, there's going to be  
50 virtually no interest.

1                   We've had problems with people coming  
2 into Bettles and hunting around Bettles previously, but  
3 once the previous winter hunts went to Henshaw, which  
4 is a tough trip, that stopped that. I don't think that  
5 we'll have a lot of abuse, but we do have the emergency  
6 order aspect.

7  
8                   So I feel that the people there are  
9 very encouraged by this proposal and feel this would  
10 fulfill their subsistence needs or help to. Really  
11 have a meaningful address of that issue, so I intend to  
12 vote for the proposal. Any further discussion.

13  
14                   (No comments)

15  
16                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Call for question.

17  
18                   MR. COLLINS: Uh-huh.

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

23  
24                   IN UNISON: Aye.

25  
26                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same  
27 sign.

28  
29                   (No opposing votes)

30  
31                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal is  
32 unanimously adopted. I'd like to thank the Alaska  
33 Department of Fish and Game for reviewing our Proposal  
34 90 and addressing with real thought into presenting  
35 this to the Board and I really appreciate the  
36 Department's presentation that you intend to provide to  
37 the Board.

38  
39                   We're going to move on to Proposal 90,  
40 which we have a supplement, which is our original  
41 proposal. That was the augment of the reaction of the  
42 Department to come up with a meaningful alternate.  
43 It's on Page 140 in our packet here. Our original  
44 proposal that we talked about and I wrote in  
45 conjunction with Glenn off of our transcripts was a  
46 much shorter hunt, April 5 to April 15th. Antlered bull  
47 and had no definition of the length of the antler.  
48 Just the antlered bull was going for a soft antlered  
49 bull. The aspects of that is there's many hunts where  
50 they require one-inch brow tines, so I was going to go

1 for a one-inch antler or whatever it took for the Board  
2 to define that, but I'm not going to go there with that  
3 right now.

4

5                   Having taken action on 90A as the  
6 preferred alternative, if the Board doesn't like a  
7 four-month season, we would like to have something. I,  
8 in the advisor committee, was much more inclined to  
9 support Proposal 90A as the preferred proposal, but the  
10 Advisory Committee unanimously supported 90 as an  
11 alternate.

12

13                   We've gone through all the data  
14 presentation. Basically it's the same thing. It  
15 doesn't have a five-inch beam length restriction. It  
16 just says antlered. There's no sunset on this one and  
17 it's a 10-day hunt. So the Koyukuk River Advisory  
18 supported that also and I would entertain a motion to  
19 adopt this proposal as an alternate to 90A.

20

21                   MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I would  
22 move that if the State Board does not adopt Proposal 91  
23 that.....

24

25                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 90A.

26

27                   MR. COLLINS: 90A, that the Federal  
28 Board would approve of 90. Would that do it?

29

30                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we have a  
31 Proposal 67 that we're going to go to, a Federal  
32 proposal immediately after that, which it's our stop  
33 gap proposal if the State Board doesn't adopt any of  
34 these.

35

36                   MR. COLLINS: So we're not dealing with  
37 67 now.

38

39                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, we're not  
40 dealing with 67. We're dealing with 90, which is the  
41 original proposal. If the Board doesn't like four  
42 months or they have some reason why they don't like the  
43 Department's alternate proposal, then this is a stop  
44 gap on the State side for a 10-day hunt. They can  
45 amend that to a five-inch beam length, sunsets, stuff  
46 like that. We prefer the long and address the real  
47 core of the issue, to give people really meaningful  
48 opportunity in 90A.

49

50                   So the Chair will entertain a motion to

1 adopt this as an alternate to 90A for the State Board's  
2 deliberative process.  
3 chair

4  
5 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

6  
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Have a second? That  
8 was you, Ray?

9  
10 MR. COLLINS: Yes, I'll second it.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's moved and  
13 seconded. Further discussion on that 90A as a stop gap  
14 in case the Board of Game does not like a four-month  
15 season. Tim.

16  
17 MR. GERVAIS: Yes. I'm not promoting  
18 it, but I'm just throwing it out there. Would you want  
19 to -- do you feel we need to align that antler  
20 requirement or just leave it as written.

21  
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, let's bring  
23 Glenn up here. In the deliberation of the Board of  
24 Game, if the Board is obstinate about a four-month  
25 season and they made adopt a 10-day season, do you feel  
26 that you can make the recommendations for the  
27 amendments at that time or would you feel comfortable  
28 doing that or should we make those amendments in this  
29 proposal right now?

30  
31 MR. STOUT: Mr. Chair. Gosh, you kind  
32 of got me. Trying to anticipate, you know, which  
33 directions the Board would go is pretty hard to do. If  
34 you had other things that you wanted to amend to that  
35 now, it would probably be appropriate if it's still  
36 under the umbrella though that it's your alternative  
37 solution to the problem. I can tell you that we've got  
38 support of 90A from you, but if you refer to the rest  
39 of these proposals as just alternates to that and  
40 that's clear, the Department is going to really try  
41 hard to get 90A to go through as it is. We're going to  
42 do everything we can. I have support from my regional  
43 coordinator, from the regional supervisor, it's already  
44 gone to Juneau, they've approved the amended solution.  
45 So we're going to try really hard to get 90A as is.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you.  
48 We don't want to waste a lot of time on 90 then. I  
49 intend to support this proposal just to get it on the  
50 table as additional language. Any further discussion.

1 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is  
4 called on the Proposal 90 State proposal 10-day hunt  
5 antlered bull as described in the proposal. Those in  
6 favor of the proposal signify by saying aye.

7

8 IN UNISON: Aye.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.

11

12 (No opposing votes)

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Support on general  
15 purposes. We're moving to Proposal 67. Should we go  
16 to break, Ann?

17

18 MS. WILKINSON:: I would recommend not.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we'll go to  
21 Federal Proposal 67 which is on Page 93. We're going  
22 to have the introduction of the proposal and analysis.

23

24 Go ahead, Larry.

25

26 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
27 Larry Buklis, Office of Subsistence Management. The  
28 analysis for Proposal WP10-67 begins on Page 93 of your  
29 Council book. We've given the issues thorough  
30 treatment here this morning, so I'll try to be concise  
31 with the points on Federal Proposal 67 and I've amended  
32 the notes at the end to capture approaches you may want  
33 to consider in light of your discussion with the State  
34 process.

35

36 The proposal was submitted as you know  
37 by your Council, the Western Interior Regional Advisory  
38 Council. The primary issues raised by the proposal  
39 dealing with moose management in the Kanuti Controlled  
40 Use Area. The proposal requests a change in dates for  
41 the winter to be announced season from the current to  
42 be announced March 1 to 5 to a window of March 15 to  
43 April 15 with a longer to be announced season within  
44 that window of 10 days instead of the current five  
45 days.

46

47 Other issues is that this proposal  
48 changes description of the areas. It's a consequence  
49 of the way the proposal describes the hunt and I'll  
50 describe the geographic effects of that in a moment.

1 There's a change in harvest limit from the current one  
2 moose to one antlered moose, but with a six-year  
3 moratorium on cow moose harvest in the controlled use  
4 area with an exception for mortuary purposes.

5  
6 Finally, a reminder that this proposal  
7 does not propose any changes for the John River  
8 drainage portion of Unit 24B. That's not germane to  
9 the proposal.

10  
11 In terms of the geography, if you look  
12 at Page 102, I took the map from the regulatory booklet  
13 and drew some lines on the maps to show the geographic  
14 effects of the proposal. Page 102 shows the current  
15 situation. You can see numbered number 1 on that map  
16 is the John River drainage and that's not affected by  
17 this proposal.

18  
19 Label number 2 is the north of the  
20 Koyukuk area, which is defined in the current  
21 regulations. Again, this is the current situation  
22 being described. So this north of the Koyukuk  
23 excluding the John River is a one moose harvest limit.  
24 A limited opportunity for antlerless potentially  
25 allowed the last five days of the fall season and/or a  
26 five-day to be announced season in March. Then there's  
27 the remainder, not in the John River drainage and not  
28 north of the Koyukuk, so the remainder is coded number  
29 3 on the map and there it's a one-antlered bull fall  
30 season, no to be announced season. So that's a  
31 snapshot of the geography of the current regs.

32  
33 If you look at Page 103 in your book it  
34 shows the geography of what you proposed some months  
35 ago. Again, John River drainage is number 1. Then we  
36 have the Kanuti Controlled Use Area, which I've coded  
37 number 2, and there your proposal would have one  
38 antlered bull, the same fall season, and a 10-day to be  
39 announced season during that March 15 to April 15  
40 window, with the six-year cow moose moratorium. Then  
41 there would be a new remainder and you can see it's  
42 labeled 3. It's much of this Unit 24B. This new  
43 remainder retains the regulations of the old remainder.  
44 So whatever wasn't specified for John River or now  
45 specified for Kanuti Controlled Use Area would be new  
46 remainder and it would have the old remainder regs,  
47 which was the antlered bull season in the fall and no  
48 to be announced season.

49  
50 So sometimes this geography gets

1 complicated and you don't realize the consequences of  
2 what you've asked for elsewhere in the unit, so I  
3 thought that would help to lay that out.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good clarification,  
6 Larry. Thanks.

7  
8 MR. BUKLIS: As you know, much of the  
9 former north of the Koyukuk would now be in the new  
10 remainder.

11  
12 Just a word on resource status. I  
13 think we've covered it for the record, but the moose  
14 population in this area is thought to be low in  
15 abundance and density but stable. I think that's  
16 consistent with what we heard this morning.

17  
18 The OSM preliminary conclusion found on  
19 Page 104 is to support your proposal with modification  
20 and the modifications would be to change that floating  
21 date range of the proposed 10-day to be announced  
22 season in the winter to a set date range of March 27 to  
23 April 5th. At one point in the process there was some  
24 consultations where stakeholders and managers thought  
25 that that would be a workable approach that would make  
26 an improvement on your proposal at the time. So it  
27 would be 10 days but set very late March, early April.

28  
29 Secondly, to include all of the refuge  
30 lands in 24B, not only the ones inside the controlled  
31 use area but all the Kanuti Refuge lands in 24B and all  
32 BLM lands in 24B along with the controlled use area  
33 lands in this to be announced season. This is shown on  
34 the map on Page 105, map 4.

35  
36 Now, with the OSM preliminary  
37 conclusion we've got the John River drainage, we've got  
38 labeled number 2 is the controlled use area and these  
39 other Federal lands. That's labelled number 2. Then  
40 remainder is everything else.

41  
42 We further in our conclusion  
43 recommended not including a six-year moratorium on cow  
44 moose harvest. We felt that this is addressed with a  
45 specification on the harvest limit and it was kind of  
46 redundant. We streamlined the regulatory language on  
47 hunt management. That's kind of housekeeping.

48  
49 In terms of justification, including  
50 all the FWS and BLM lands in 24B would provide more

1 opportunity, especially for residents of Allakaket,  
2 Alatna, Evansville and Bettles. There would be more  
3 nearby Federal lands accessible to them for this hunt.  
4 The set 10-day season in late March, early April helps  
5 assure the to be announced hunt, if authorized, will  
6 take place when temperatures are likely to not be as  
7 cold as those often found earlier in that window or in  
8 the current March 1 to 5, and addresses concerns with  
9 deteriorating snow and ice travel conditions later in  
10 April and it would assist users in the field with  
11 identification and avoiding inadvertent harvest of  
12 cows. Setting the dates of the to be announced season  
13 should help alleviate the need for special actions.

14

15                   As I mentioned, the cow moose  
16 moratorium language was thought not to be strictly  
17 needed given the one-antler bull specification.

18

19                   Finally, Mr. Chairman, given the action  
20 earlier this morning, we understand the interest by the  
21 Council in the amended proposal to the State Board of  
22 Game process that establishes a set four-month,  
23 December 15 to April 15, season for bull moose with an  
24 antler specification at least as long as one-half the  
25 ear length on one side. That was amended proposal 90,  
26 90A.

27

28                   Now on the Federal side, Federal  
29 process. Procedurally, the Council could support with  
30 modification WP10-67 to incorporate these  
31 specifications we've talked about on the State side --  
32 so it's quite a package of modifications, but it is  
33 building on your proposal from months ago -- with the  
34 contingency to oppose 67 if there is positive action by  
35 the Board of Game on number 90A. And that would be  
36 known one way or the other by the time the Federal  
37 Board meets in May.

38

39                   So we checked with the Solicitor's  
40 Office, you could have support with modification, a big  
41 modification to move to where you are on 90A, but  
42 oppose if the State process moves on 90A.

43

44                   Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

45

46                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks Larry. I  
47 appreciate the rundown on the analysis and  
48 clarification on the geography of where the hunt occurs  
49 is pretty important for the Council.

50

1 Any comments from the Council on the  
2 presented analysis.

3  
4 (No comments)

5  
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're going to  
7 move to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's  
8 comments.

9  
10 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
11 Members of the Council. Good morning. I'm going to  
12 try to make this as streamlined as possible for the  
13 rest of the day so the State comments can be  
14 streamlined as much as possible.

15  
16 We've made comments on a lot of the  
17 proposals that you've put forward in your RAC book and  
18 I think the coordinator has made them available to you.  
19 If not, they're out in the back. So rather than me  
20 come up each time a proposal is discussed as we  
21 normally do with this procedure, I'm going to try and  
22 deal with it all now if at all possible, Mr. Chairman.

23  
24 We haven't made comments on any of the  
25 statewide proposals. We really want to hear the RACs  
26 comments before we make decisions on those proposals  
27 and the same goes for any customary and traditional  
28 proposals that the RACs or any proponents have put  
29 forward. We aren't going to make comments until we've  
30 heard the RACs comments on those as well.

31  
32 As for 67 and as Larry just touched on,  
33 it's a pretty complex issue with different proposals  
34 going on with different regulatory processes, one with  
35 the Board of Game and one with the Federal Subsistence  
36 Board. I think Glenn did a very good job of  
37 putting the State's proposal forward and it's going to  
38 be up to you guys to amend the 67 proposal to make sure  
39 that if the Board doesn't pass the proposal that you  
40 have a backup option.

41  
42 Unfortunately, we are short on the  
43 ground of wildlife biologists to attend these Federal  
44 Subsistence Board meetings. We don't have a wildlife  
45 liaison representative to discuss these issues in great  
46 detail. It tends to be on an ad hoc and sporadic  
47 basis, so Glenn could fortunately come this morning to  
48 touch on 67 and 90, 90A and 91, which was advantageous.

49  
50 But, yeah, we're just interested in

1 hearing the RAC comments before we make any further  
2 comments, especially on the statewide proposal.

3

4 Thank you very much.

5

6 Just for the record, I'm new to this  
7 position with the Department of Fish and Game. I've  
8 spent the last 10 years in New Zealand managing  
9 commercial stakeholder organizations and subsistence  
10 fishing with Maori and tribal units in New Zealand.  
11 Sort of a similar process to this. I'd just like to  
12 commend you on the professional and comprehensive  
13 manner in which you discuss these important natural  
14 resource issues. It's an eye-opener. I'd like to have  
15 some Maori people from New Zealand come over, I have  
16 good friends in New Zealand, and see how this process  
17 works because I think it's a model that should be  
18 replicated around the world.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We would welcome  
21 them at our meeting. Would you state your name for the  
22 record.

23

24 MR. CAMPBELL: Mitch Campbell.  
25 Subsistence liaison coordinator, Fish and Game.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Thanks  
28 for your comments.

29

30 MR. CAMPBELL: Thanks very much.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The other  
33 Federal/State agencies. Do you have comments, Mike, on  
34 67? No comments from the Kanuti Wildlife Refuge, BLM,  
35 on this proposal? No. So I see no other agencies that  
36 want to speak.

37

38 The other tribal comments, we don't  
39 have any tribes here. Mike Smith is not available.

40

41 The Interagency Staff Committee  
42 Comments.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Subsistence Resource  
47 Commission does not address this issue. Gates of the  
48 Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission. Fish and Game  
49 Advisory Committee did not take up this proposal. Our  
50 time was usurped with the long meeting and weather

1 delays and the committee didn't even start the meeting  
2 until 5:00 and we went until 11:30. With the progress  
3 that was made on Proposal 90A, the Advisory Committee  
4 did not address this particular Federal Proposal 67.

5

6 Do we have any written comments, Ann?

7

8 MS. WILKINSON: No sir, we don't.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have any  
11 public testimony. I see Vince. Do you have one  
12 comment there.

13

14 MR. MATHEWS: Maybe Ann has this. I'm  
15 trying to search. I have to cover three Regional  
16 Councils and now I'm covering several Advisory  
17 Committees. The North Slope Regional Advisory Council  
18 took up 67 and my memory is drawing a blank. I know  
19 they didn't oppose it, but I don't remember their  
20 action. So they did take it up. James Nageak was  
21 there. He's from Anaktuvuk Pass, so it was critical  
22 they take that up. So I'll try to find that or maybe  
23 other Staff has data on what the North Slope Regional  
24 Advisory Council did.

25

26 DR. WHEELER: They differed to the home  
27 region.

28

29 MR. MATHEWS: That's what I thought,  
30 but I wanted to make sure. They deferred to the home  
31 region, but they did talk about it quite a bit, so it  
32 wasn't one of those quick deals. For the members,  
33 Anaktuvuk Pass has a positive C&T for the area in  
34 question.

35

36 Thank you and thank you, Polly.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Vince.  
39 Appreciate that. So we're down to Regional Council  
40 deliberation. The Chair will entertain a motion to  
41 adopt Proposal 67 and it should be modified with the  
42 discussion about the OSM's amendments, incorporation of  
43 the State concerns for the length of antler. I have  
44 concerns with modification of using the OSM -- I  
45 consulted with Mike Spindler about these dates, March  
46 27th to April 5th, and they may be conducive to  
47 people's schedules and so forth. When we got into  
48 measuring ear lengths and what State is shooting for  
49 more definition of antler identification, I'm concerned  
50 that we won't have any moose available in the end of

1 March and the first part of April. Do you want to come  
2 to the mike there, Mike Spindler.

3

4 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Chair. For the  
5 record, Mike Spindler with Kanuti. We had long  
6 discussions with the Allakaket Tribal Council over the  
7 years regarding these dates and in the years we had the  
8 special action to extend the original March 1 to 5 hunt  
9 to subsequent weeks of the month of March, they did not  
10 want to bump it up into April. They were very clear on  
11 not wanting to go into April. The Koyukuk River dog  
12 sled championship race is usually the first weekend in  
13 April and they did not want to have it over that  
14 weekend. They had been very clear on that. There were  
15 other concerns towards the middle of April of  
16 deteriorating snow and travel conditions. So that's  
17 why we ended up settling on that 10-day window that  
18 spans the last few days of March, first few days of  
19 April.

20

21 I prefer as a manager if I have to make  
22 this call every year that it be in regulation in the  
23 book so that I don't have a floating time period that's  
24 not defined well because inevitably you get complaints  
25 by individuals who feel slighted that, well, you know,  
26 I had to go somewhere and I couldn't take advantage of  
27 this hunt, so I'd rather have it in the books so  
28 everybody knows the dates and they can plan around it.

29

30 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The quandary that I  
33 as Chair and co-chair of the Advisory Committee find  
34 myself in is that the proposed hunt now March 27th to  
35 April 5th falls in a time frame when there's not enough  
36 time for antler development for identification of a  
37 five-inch beam. The only time we're really going to  
38 see this start to meet this five-inch beam requirement  
39 is once we start to move in past April 5th into the  
40 last 10 days of that season is when you start to get  
41 real development. I'm concerned that if we have amend  
42 for a five-inch beam requirement like we have in the  
43 other proposal and that season goes to the middle of  
44 April, I feel comfortable that there will be enough  
45 moose around on the State hunt in 90A. I don't feel  
46 that there may be any moose available in the end of  
47 March if we use that modification language.

48

49 Go ahead, Mike.

50

1 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Chair. From the  
2 refuge manager's perspective, I would just prefer it to  
3 be a 10-day period that's at the discretion of your  
4 Council. If you feel that's an important factor, then  
5 by all means feel free to adjust that. For me, a 10-  
6 day period, doesn't matter when it is, early March, mid  
7 March, late March, it's the same amount of effort. I  
8 would just like it defined by regulation so it doesn't  
9 float around.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: At this point,  
12 having adopted 90A, I would prefer to modify this  
13 proposal to have the five-inch beam requirement, which  
14 the Advisory Committee was comfortable with that half  
15 an ear length. What are the options? There's no  
16 option now since we've stated a 10-day hunt. Can we  
17 request a modification of April 1 through April 15th, a  
18 15-day season?

19

20 I would like to modify the proposal by  
21 April 1 to April 15 and also modify it to a five-inch  
22 beam requirement to make the State comfortable with the  
23 hunt and the Federal Board. I'm throwing out some  
24 stuff there and there's a lot of whispering going on.

25

26 Go ahead, Larry.

27

28 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
29 Just for clarification, you have a lot of latitude in  
30 your support with modification motion. I just wanted  
31 clarity. Were you attempting to have a support with  
32 modification position that fully paralleled 90A and its  
33 four-month season? Because now you're talking about a  
34 10-day and when the 10-day would occur. Which means if  
35 90A didn't pass the State process, your modified  
36 package would have a 10-day window, just perhaps a  
37 little different than your initial proposal. Or were  
38 you talking about two support with modification  
39 alternatives? It's really complex.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We've identified an  
42 open time frame between March 15th and April 15th. I  
43 don't know that we can really go to a four-month  
44 season. Can we go that long? Can we make a 90A as a  
45 Federal proposal right this minute?

46

47 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. That's what  
48 I was trying to explain. It's broad in scope, but we  
49 saw it and we consulted and you could have a support  
50 with modification package that paralleled State 90A and

1 an oppose position so that if 90A passes, your oppose  
2 would rise.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I prefer to take 67,  
5 rubberstamp 90A and submit that as the modified  
6 proposal. It's just taking 90A. That's the modified  
7 proposal, now as stated as 67.

8

9 Go ahead, Larry.

10

11 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. We, as  
12 Staff, can work on this language for the process that  
13 follows. What you'd need to do is vote in principal.  
14 It would be support WP10-67 with modification and the  
15 modifications would be to have a four-month season,  
16 December 15 to April 15, with the specification on  
17 antler, as you described, one-half ear length on one  
18 side. It wouldn't need to talk about 90A and the  
19 State.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

22

23 MR. BUKLIS: It's just a set of  
24 modifications.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm just using it as  
27 a template.

28

29 MR. BUKLIS: As shorthand. We  
30 understand that.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So 67 is going to  
33 read identical to 90A, but it's not going to have 90A  
34 in it.

35

36 MR. BUKLIS: And we, as Staff, can  
37 write that up. I understood that it's shorthand, but  
38 it wouldn't talk about 90A in there.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So is the  
41 Council clear on the intention. Go ahead, Robert.

42

43 MR. R. WALKER: Mike, just a question  
44 here too. It says the Federal land manager would set  
45 the quota during the winter season on number of moose  
46 that could be harvested, which would address concerns.  
47 Then you would have a say in this also, would you?

48

49 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Walker, Mr. Chair.  
50 If 90A passes the Board of Game, the refuge would defer

1 to the State on those decisions of sustainability, so  
2 the quota goes away. If 90A  
3 does not pass, the State, then it would be whatever  
4 Federal language you wanted in there. If you wanted to  
5 have quotas in there, sustainability, then that's a  
6 dialogue that I would establish with the State and the  
7 other Federal land managers.

8

9 Again, it's your discretion what you  
10 would like to see in terms of Federal action depending  
11 on what the Board of Game does. Right now, if 90A  
12 passes the Board of Game, then we are going to defer to  
13 those State decisions and sustainability that the State  
14 biologists would set. We would hopefully be consulted,  
15 but by regulation it wouldn't be required.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for that  
18 clarification, Mike. I feel that the State's Proposal  
19 90A gives latitude to the managers to EO. Oh, you have  
20 a comment there, Polly?

21

22 DR. WHEELER: (Nods affirmatively)

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: If we modify FP10-67  
25 to mirror language of 90A, would the Federal managers  
26 be comfortable with the five-day reporting period and  
27 without a quota? The Department doesn't seem to be  
28 worried about this quota. Would you feel comfortable  
29 with just the reporting and monitoring this level of  
30 harvest and forget about developing a quota? You have  
31 sort of an idea of how many moose you can harvest.  
32 Would you feel comfortable with maintaining that same  
33 type of management that the State has portrayed in the  
34 90A proposal?

35

36 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Chair. Yes, that's  
37 affirmative. As I mentioned earlier when we were  
38 talking about 90A, there's enough safeguards and  
39 guidelines on that hunt that I do feel there is a  
40 safety valve that if we see more than anticipated  
41 harvest that we would have a dialogue with the State.  
42 We do on all kinds of other issues like that. If they  
43 felt necessary, they would, I believe, entertain the  
44 idea of an emergency closure. Likewise, if I was the  
45 on-the-ground persons observing things that were  
46 concerning me, I would initiate that dialogue with the  
47 State, so I don't feel like a quota is needed by  
48 regulation.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So what I would like

1 as the Chair to see is that we take the amended  
2 language, a description of the Federal area as  
3 described on Page 105 of our book, all of the Federal  
4 lands described as number 2 within the controlled use  
5 area and the other BLM and Federal lands, as the hunt  
6 area and then the proposal is now modified to mirror  
7 the language that's found in alternate Proposal 90A.  
8 The four-month season, the length of beam, the permit  
9 requirement. What about the sunset? Would you also  
10 mirror the sunset? So a sunset to review this hunt,  
11 whether it's working. Every aspect that the State --  
12 parameters that the State has set up.

13

14 Is that clear to the Council what my  
15 intent is? Take the modified hunt area, which is  
16 described as number 2 on Page 105 and then apply all of  
17 the language that is found in 90A. Is that clear to  
18 the Council?

19

20 Go ahead, Polly.

21

22 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
23 Just one additional point. If the Board of Game passes  
24 Proposal 90A, then the advantage to the person on the  
25 ground would also be that the jurisdictional issues go  
26 away so that people aren't having to worry about if  
27 they're hunting under Federal regulations, a five-day  
28 winter hunt or whatever. But, it's key that the  
29 Federal program will still be providing opportunity.  
30 The argument has been made in the past that we don't  
31 need the Federal program because the State provides  
32 opportunity for subsistence users, so our regulations  
33 are duplicative. So just does need to be clear that  
34 the Council recognizes that this would do away with the  
35 jurisdictional issues, but it's still opportunity being  
36 provided through the Federal program.

37

38 Mr. Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Thanks for  
41 that clarification. That's the intent of the Council.  
42 So is it clear to the Council the most expeditious and  
43 the most best way to address the subsistence lack for  
44 the villages in Alatna and Allakaket is to amend the  
45 Proposal 67 as an absolute stop gap in case the State  
46 Board of Game does not adopt State Proposal 90A? Is it  
47 clear to the Council?

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have further  
2 comment, Polly.

3  
4 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. Just to be  
5 clear, again, recognizing that these processes often go  
6 in ways that we never would have expected, it probably  
7 would be just as clean to again support Proposal 67  
8 with all the modifications detailed in Proposal 90A.  
9 The Board can take parallel action to whatever the  
10 State Board does and then it's very clear for the  
11 record rather than oppose if the Board of Game does  
12 this. Federal Board would be supporting this action,  
13 so both programs are taking parallel action. Both  
14 programs are providing opportunity, Mr. Chair.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's the intent,  
17 to have exact parallel actions and prefer that the  
18 State 90A passes so that people can hunt on the  
19 corporation lands closest to the village. Go ahead,  
20 Robert.

21  
22 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chair. Polly.  
23 This is kind of like really confusing for the person  
24 that's going to be on the ground because it's parallel  
25 to whatever the State had, the Federal government had.  
26 I don't know if we have to have a lawyer go out there  
27 to explain this to them. Maybe you can clarify  
28 something here, Polly.

29  
30 DR. WHEELER: I'm getting some pleas  
31 for a time out, Mr. Chair. If the Federal Board were  
32 to take parallel action, you wouldn't need a lawyer  
33 with you, Member Walker, because the regulations would  
34 be the same on State and Federal lands.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Exactly the same.

37  
38 MR. R. WALKER: Okay. Well that's  
39 makes more sense because  
40 if they're going to parallel for them to be hunting,  
41 that's fine.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is there a real need  
44 to break?

45  
46 DR. WHEELER: I'm hearing, yes, five  
47 minutes.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Five-minute break.

50

1 (Off record)

2

3 (On record)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to bring  
6 the meeting back to order again. Larry, you're going  
7 to describe some of the finer points and give direction  
8 to the Council on the procedures to move on.

9

10 Go ahead.

11

12 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
13 I was incorrect earlier when I described some  
14 procedural options for you. I had said that you could  
15 consider supporting Proposal 67 with modification to  
16 encompass the State 90A specifications and have a  
17 parallel action or oppose Proposal 67 if the Board of  
18 Game does act on 90A. If they act on it, you could  
19 oppose your proposal and then the Federal Board could  
20 pick up that recommendation.

21

22 I was mistaken in counseling you that  
23 way because our regulations closed the Kanuti  
24 Controlled Use Area to all but Federally qualified  
25 hunters hunting under Federal regs. So if you opposed  
26 your proposal on the Federal side should the State act  
27 positively on 90A, we would have a package of State  
28 regulations that capture all of your interest here, but  
29 none of it would apply on the Kanuti Controlled Use  
30 Area because it's closed to people hunting under those  
31 regs. So I didn't connect that feature to my advice to  
32 you.

33

34 So given that consideration your best  
35 options would be still a pair of options, but they're a  
36 pair of different support with modification options.  
37 One would be to support with modification to apply the  
38 State Proposal 90A specifications we've talked about to  
39 the Kanuti Controlled Use Area. That's an option. You  
40 would want to see that through if the Board of Game  
41 acted positively because then they would act on the 90A  
42 specifications that apply to all lands except where  
43 closed by the Federal system and we have done that on  
44 the controlled use area. So you would have the Federal  
45 regs addressing the hunt there and you'd have the  
46 comprehensive approach you wanted.

47

48 Your second alternative under this  
49 advice would be support with modification consistent  
50 with the OSM preliminary conclusion or additional

1 features you might want to further adjust and that  
2 would be a package of modifications you would recommend  
3 to the Federal Board if the Board of Game doesn't act.

4

5 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. Have you  
6 had this written down here as one and two so we could  
7 understand more of what you're just telling us.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: If you look here in  
10 our book on Page 105, it's describing a map there.

11

12 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. During  
13 lunch break I'd like to have Larry and whoever write  
14 this all up and have this presented to us after the  
15 lunch break, okay?

16

17 MR. BUKLIS: Yes, we can do that.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: If you feel  
20 comfortable with that, Robert, and it is around lunch  
21 time, so I feel that we should go to break and you can  
22 define this with a schematic of some type. That might  
23 aid the Council in visualizing this.

24

25 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. I'd like  
26 Larry to finish his presentation now and then after he  
27 is done maybe we can go to lunch break and he can get  
28 this into writing.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. If you want  
31 to continue, Larry, that would be fine.

32

33 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. That's all  
34 I had to say. I wanted to amend my earlier advice to  
35 correct for the Kanuti Controlled Use Area, which does  
36 bring in this other consideration. I appreciate the  
37 Council's patience with us and we will have this typed  
38 up for you to see more clearly.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I do appreciate  
41 you're pow-wow that occurred and we don't want to get  
42 into a bind further on and kill ourselves. I do  
43 appreciate our Staff looking at all the various angles.  
44 I highly appreciate that.

45

46 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. I don't  
47 take credit for that. It was actually Dr. Wheeler that  
48 noticed this nuance.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Dr. Wheeler is quite

1 a cog in the wheel, that's for sure.

2

3 (Laughter)

4

5 DR. WHEELER: For better or for worse.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Would you like to  
8 break for lunch now Robert until that clarification is  
9 finished. We don't want to deliberate this proposal  
10 any further unless you feel comfortable with the.....

11

12 MR. R. WALKER: Let him go back and do  
13 the analysis and everything. That's fine.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So is the  
16 Council clear what the options are? My feeling is that  
17 we should modify Proposal 67 to define the hunt areas,  
18 the Kanuti Controlled Use Area as was the original  
19 proposal, then using the 90A template of hunt  
20 conditions and the length of season and so forth as the  
21 hunt parameters, so that's fairly clean. Does that  
22 sound good to the Council.

23

24 (Council nods affirmatively)

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does the Chair have  
27 a motion to amend Proposal WP10-67 to include the  
28 Kanuti Controlled Use Area with the hunt parameters as  
29 described in State Proposal 90A? Do I have a motion to  
30 adopt with modification?

31

32 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. I move  
33 to adopt WP-67 with 90A.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have a real  
36 pressing issue, Tim?

37

38 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah. In the define the  
39 area, isn't there a  
40 BLM land in there that needs to be included too?

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There was discussion  
43 in the hall about whether that should apply. The real  
44 area that would be used is the Kanuti Controlled Use  
45 Area. It's very very unusual for people to go way on  
46 the other side there. I'm not real concerned about  
47 going that far away. The Kanuti Controlled Use Area is  
48 the area that is primarily the targeted hunt, so I'm  
49 comfortable with using the Kanuti -- another break?  
50 Time out?

1 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman. Before we  
2 continue can we have a second for discussion?

3  
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right, I didn't want  
5 to go into that. I'm asking for a motion to amend the  
6 proposal and then we can go to lunch. Once we get this  
7 thing on the table so we know what  
8 we're talking about. The preferred language is the  
9 Kanuti Controlled Use Area with the 90A language as the  
10 hunt parameters. So we have a motion to adopt. Do we  
11 have a second.

12  
13 MR. COLLINS: I'll second that.

14  
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Then we'll go  
16 to lunch so the OSM Staff can define that for the  
17 Council.

18  
19 (Off record)

20  
21 (On record)

22  
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Open the meeting.  
24 We're working on Proposal 67 modifications. OSM is  
25 going to show us what they've come up with.

26  
27 Go ahead, Larry.

28  
29 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
30 Thank you for your patience with us to organize these  
31 points to help you with more clarity. As we assess the  
32 options we've been discussing with you, we conceptually  
33 saw three that capture your interest with Proposal  
34 WP10-67.

35  
36 The first option shown here on the  
37 screen is contingent on the Alaska Board of Game  
38 supporting the State Proposal 90A and that option is to  
39 support Proposal 67 with modification to apply the  
40 parameters of Proposal 90A to the Kanuti Controlled Use  
41 Area only. That is shown on Page 103. The map on 103  
42 shows the area we're talking about. The map shows that  
43 area labelled 2, the Kanuti Controlled Use Area. This  
44 is sort of captured in principal on the screen. Of  
45 course, we would work through the exact language. But  
46 you'd be applying what is being advanced on the State  
47 side for consideration to the controlled use area.

48  
49 The rationale there is that the  
50 controlled use area is under a Federal closure to all

1 uses and users except for those Federally qualified  
2 hunting under Federal regulations. So if this wasn't  
3 taken but the State acted, ironically the controlled  
4 use area would not have the advantages you're pursuing  
5 here. I missed that point earlier as I said and I  
6 appreciate the counsel I got and this clarifies that  
7 point.

8

9  
10 The second option, if the Board of Game  
11 does not support 90A on their side, one option would be  
12 for you to support Proposal 67 with modification, but  
13 it's a different set of modifications. It's as  
14 described on Page 106 of your book, which is the OSM  
15 Staff work and our recommended preliminary conclusion.  
16 It adjusts the date range to a fixed set of dates later  
17 in March and early April, it expands it to all the BLM  
18 and Refuge lands in 24B, we dropped the cow moose  
19 moratorium and we streamlined the language. We talked  
20 about that earlier this morning.

21

22 So an option if the Board of Game does  
23 not act on 90A would be to have a support with  
24 modification, but in this case the modifications would  
25 be as I've described and as shown on Page 105 would be  
26 the expanded controlled use area and other related  
27 lands. We've typed in the text of what that regulation  
28 would be, so it's not just in principal, that is the  
29 OSM preliminary conclusion. It's the TBA season there.  
30 It's set, those 10 days, but to be announced if  
31 sustainable.

32

33 Finally, thirdly, you could act -- if  
34 the Board of Game does not act, you could act along  
35 these lines, but you may have your own modifications.  
36 We've heard some different things this morning about  
37 dates. Perhaps you don't agree with the OSM dates  
38 here, so you could support with modification as may be  
39 determined by the Council.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So is that clear to  
42 the Council, the  
43 parameters of these hunts? I feel that there's a high  
44 likelihood that 90A should pass the Board of Game, but  
45 I can't say for sure about that. I do like the option  
46 which encapsulates what our objectives are. I would  
47 also like to retain the Kanuti Controlled Use Area as  
48 if unsupported by the Board of Game as the definition  
49 of the hunt area also since those area described are  
50 way on the other side of the refuge, the additional  
51 that the Staff Committee described.

1 I would like the Council to deliberate  
2 the options there. Go ahead, Larry.

3  
4 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. You may  
5 understand this, but just so everyone does, in  
6 conclusion, option 1 is your contingency if the Board  
7 of Game acts positively on 90A. As we counseled you  
8 earlier, you can have multiple options advanced  
9 contingent on what they do. So it would be one plus  
10 two or three.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I see.

13  
14 MR. BUKLIS: So it's number 1 on one  
15 contingency and then 2 or something like it, 3 if they  
16 don't.

17  
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Option 1 is a given  
19 and option 3 would be mirrored language of the hunt  
20 parameters as in 90A, in a longer season, the four-  
21 month season, and the Kanuti Controlled Use Area would  
22 be an option. Go ahead.

23  
24 MR. COLLINS: We would need separate  
25 motions for these, wouldn't we. I would think that we  
26 would do option 1 as a motion and then we could debate.  
27 If not, we need to debate the whole thing about what  
28 we'd want to go in, but if we're all in agreement on 1,  
29 can we just move that and pass it.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'd rather bundle  
32 it.

33  
34 MR. COLLINS: How are you going to  
35 bundle it? In one motion, you mean?

36  
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're laying out the  
38 parameters of what the motion should read. We haven't  
39 made a motion yet, so we're kind of coming around to  
40 how the motion should read. Go ahead, Larry.

41  
42 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. To explain  
43 further the rationale behind these options. Option 1  
44 provides the coverage to the controlled use area for  
45 what the State would be doing around it if they act  
46 favorably on 90A. We're all clear on that. 2 or 3,  
47 there's different variations of 2 or 3. The point  
48 there is of course the Council can move in any  
49 direction they want, but the Federal manager felt that  
50 adopting something like 90A on the Federal side without

1 anything like it on the State side, the four-month  
2 season on all the Federal lands or even Kanuti  
3 Controlled Use Area was not an approach that we  
4 favored.

5  
6 It wasn't described this way as an  
7 oversight. It was more or less the package we came in  
8 with this morning under 2 or 3 and not a 90A applied on  
9 the Federal side alone.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see. The  
12 manager.....

13  
14 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.

17  
18 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, okay, we're going  
19 to debate the whole thing. Why was it felt necessary  
20 to reduce the season length under option 2 then if the  
21 State didn't pass. Why not use the same longer period  
22 as in the language previously since it would be limited  
23 only to subsistence hunters within the area.

24  
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you want to speak  
26 to that, Mike.

27  
28 MR. SPINDLER: Yes, Mr. Collins. Mr.  
29 Chair. After having three years of experience trying  
30 to implement a five-day hunt on checkerboard lands, the  
31 vision of trying to implement a four-month hunt or a  
32 two-week hunt on all the lands that Glenn pointed out  
33 in the much much larger area, those lands are very far  
34 removed, they're not contiguous. It would be a big  
35 responsibility and I think it would be a disservice to  
36 the hunters. It would not be the opportunity that they  
37 need.

38  
39 My feelings are very clear and very  
40 strong on this. We need to make sure that the  
41 checkerboard implications to the hunter go away.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's my objective.  
44 My preferred preference is the Board of Game supports  
45 Proposal 90A. Our modified option 1 passes the Federal  
46 Board. That's the preferred alternative for the  
47 actions that need to be. The wildcard is we don't know  
48 what the Board of Game is going to do. We need to  
49 discuss option 3. Option 2, if we're going for  
50 antlered bull and looking at what the progression of

1 antler growth is, I don't feel that option 2 with those  
2 dates would provide a lot of opportunity.

3

4                   So I would prefer, if we're going to go  
5 to an option 3, as you clarified, Larry, option 3  
6 should be the Kanuti Controlled Use Area, which is a  
7 more defined zone and has certain parameters, and that  
8 the season would be from the 1st of April to the 15th  
9 of April. If people want to go to dog races or  
10 whatever, they can come back and hunt, but we don't  
11 want to make it easy for certain people to -- I would  
12 prefer to have a long enough season to where people --  
13 there's variations in antler growth. There's years  
14 where they grow faster than others. Or we could define  
15 the antler as smaller, one inch antler or smaller, and  
16 use those dates given.

17

18                   You get into providing reasonable  
19 opportunity for people to actually get one of these  
20 moose. So March 27th to April 5th, we could use that.  
21 We'd have to go to a shorter antler beam length, which  
22 is less palatable on the State side and it's less  
23 palatable probably to the Federal Board. I'm just  
24 laying out my thoughts on this issue. I feel that  
25 option 3 should be the Kanuti Controlled Use Area, have  
26 a five-inch beam length and all those requirements as  
27 defined in 90A and then about a two-week season between  
28 April 1 and April 15th.

29

30                   I live in the upper Koyukuk. I can  
31 travel practically every year way past the middle of  
32 April. I mean it would be unusual that you can't  
33 travel in the middle of April. Wouldn't you say so,  
34 Eleanor?

35

36                   MS. YATLIN: Uh-huh.

37

38                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I mean the reality  
39 is in the upper Koyukuk it would be unusual if you  
40 can't travel in the middle of April. So option 3  
41 should have at least a time frame when it would be  
42 possible to see a moose that has that much antler  
43 growth.

44

45                   I would like your feelings on this  
46 also, Glenn.

47

48                   MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
49 really like the way that Mike said it and his concern  
50 and how the weight and the importance of the

1 checkerboard pattern is going to have to be a real  
2 important consideration. From my perspective and from  
3 the State regulation going to the Board of Game, I'll  
4 just offer one more issue.

5  
6 I know it's sometimes contrary to put  
7 all our eggs in one basket, but I think in this case  
8 that's what I would try and talk you into doing. Going  
9 with the option 1 proposal. If we hang onto these  
10 other option proposals and I go to the Board and it  
11 looks like there's this qualified support for that  
12 alternative, I'm concerned it could have the effect of  
13 weakening the message that you're sending that you want  
14 the 90A season as it is.

15  
16 I know how these processes work and  
17 they kind of look at things and messages the way they  
18 are and I want it to be a real clear message that you  
19 guys want the whole option 1 and we aren't holding out  
20 just to get as much as we can if things don't go our  
21 way. I would just really like to see a full strong  
22 support for option 1.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Option 1 is our  
25 priority, but we have no assurance that the Board is  
26 going to pass that option. If we have no option 3, any  
27 backup, which actually provides -- you know, even  
28 though it's a checkerboard we still have more  
29 definition of what the bulls are and we still have --  
30 it actually should be more comfortable for the  
31 Department, more palatability. Light levels are  
32 greater in April and antler definition. We're still  
33 going to stay with the five-inch antler definition.

34  
35 If we don't have an option 3 and the  
36 Board fails the proposal, we're screwed and we're stuck  
37 with nothing, we have zero. We have a two-year Federal  
38 Board cycle and we have nothing for two years other  
39 than a special action request scenario basically asking  
40 for something like an option 3.

41  
42 It's not a mixed signal. It's like we  
43 need to have something. We have a real need and the  
44 Board has to understand this need has to be fulfilled  
45 and if they don't fulfill that, then the Federal side  
46 has to fulfill that need somehow with a Federal  
47 proposal. It should make the Department feel more  
48 comfortable if we have the half-ear length, five-inch  
49 beam length, and the hunt parameters, the permitting,  
50 the sunset, all of those modifications to the proposal.

1 We have to have a fall-back. We're kind of stuck. We  
2 have nothing. So we're going to be in a special action  
3 request for an option 3. I'm kind of stuck between a  
4 rock and a hard place. Go ahead.

5  
6 MR. STOUT: Yeah, and I totally  
7 understand from your perspective why you want that  
8 fall-back. All I'm saying is it's a pretty powerful  
9 statement to the Board if you're willing to forego that  
10 and say we want 90A.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We've said that  
13 clearly in adopting 90A and clearly our first option is  
14 option 1. We also have to say clearly we have a need.  
15 If we say that we don't have an option 3 with no fall  
16 back, then we're saying we can forego the hunt. It's  
17 like, no, we can't forego the hunt. We have to do  
18 something. That's what the problem is. We're getting  
19 25 percent of the harvest that's necessary. The  
20 harvest has to occur in winter and we have to have a  
21 winter hunt. I would feel uncomfortable giving a mixed  
22 signal that we could forego a hunt to the Board of  
23 Game.

24  
25 It's the Council's identified objective  
26 in .805 of ANILCA to identify subsistence needs and try  
27 to work out a harvest that's palatable to meet  
28 scientific basic principals and provide for subsistence  
29 needs. I would feel uncomfortable going the other way,  
30 giving the Board the feeling that we could forego  
31 putting all of our eggs in one basket. If they choose  
32 to fail the proposal, we have nothing. I would feel  
33 almost uncomfortable with that scenario.

34  
35 Would you feel more comfortable with  
36 those 90A hunt parameters, the five-inch beam length,  
37 five-day reporting requirements, two week season.  
38 Kanuti doesn't want to enforce a five-day season on a  
39 checkerboard. So we're making it more palatable than  
40 the March 1 to March 5 bull identification and some of  
41 the problems they've had with that aspect of it. This  
42 should alleviate some of your concerns about  
43 misidentification of cows.

44  
45 I feel that the fall back of option 3  
46 for the Kanuti Controlled Use Area more defined area  
47 and then the hunt parameters as described in 90A should  
48 make you as the area biologist feel more comfortable  
49 with even a disparate Federal hunt. As I told Mike,  
50 that Kanuti hunt is the most strictly-enforced hunt

1 north of the Yukon River. There is zero game wardens  
2 on the Haul Road right now. There's people shooting  
3 caribou in the ditch up there. I know it. I've heard  
4 about it.

5  
6 So the reality is here's a highly  
7 scrutinized hunt that should give managers the comfort  
8 with the beam identification and so forth. Right, I am  
9 repeating myself.

10  
11 Thank you.

12  
13 Point of order. It's like I'm trying  
14 to talk Glenn into this.

15  
16 MR. COLLINS: You don't need to  
17 convince him. We're the ones going to be voting on it.

18  
19 (Laughter)

20  
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Department has  
22 to be on board with the whole big picture. Those are my  
23 feelings and I've stated them on the record about why  
24 we have to have an option 3. Does the Council have any  
25 additional input into the three options or basically  
26 the two options. Option 1 is a given. Option 3 is all  
27 the hunt parameters and the Kanuti Controlled Use Area.

28  
29  
30 Any further discussion on the two  
31 options. Eleanor.

32  
33 MS. YATLIN: I just want some  
34 clarification and that is I know there's a motion on  
35 the table that I seconded before the lunch break. Now  
36 we're in discussion of that motion and I just want it  
37 clear on that motion.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What we're  
40 clarifying is what the motion is. The Staff was going  
41 to draw up these options. At this point, we're at the  
42 point what is the motion. This is what the motion is  
43 going to be. Option 1 is a given. Option 3 is being  
44 typed in there. It's not a to be announced season. It  
45 is a season of April 1 to April 15th and it is all of  
46 the hunt parameters in 90A to be described. Does that  
47 clarify it for you, Eleanor?

48  
49 MS. YATLIN: Yeah. So we're not going  
50 to go with option 2.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't want option  
2 2 at this point.

3  
4 MS. YATLIN: That's what I wanted  
5 cleared. I thought, like Ray, we'd have to vote  
6 separately.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Further discussion  
9 by the Council. Does any Council members want option  
10 2? Ray.

11  
12 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I would  
13 prefer that option 3 remain just antler because again  
14 you're going to have -- are they going to start growing  
15 the first of -- be five inches or you've got to sit  
16 there and wait until they get to be five inches. Why  
17 not just say antlered bulls in option 3?

18  
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Robert.

20  
21 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr.  
22 Chairman. Doesn't 67 talk about a six-year moratorium  
23 on cow moose? That is something that maybe should be  
24 put in there also.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: OSM thought that was  
27 redundant language since it is a bull-only hunt. They  
28 wanted to strike that from the language. That would  
29 not be a part of option 3, the moratorium language.

30  
31 DR. WHEELER: We don't have an option 3  
32 anymore. It's just 1 and 2.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, it's just --  
35 okay. So the new option 2 is what's being typed up  
36 there. Ray's comment -- half an ear length was put out  
37 there by the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee.  
38 Antlered bull gets into -- the Department and managers  
39 have a hard time with identification of the bull, so  
40 this defines what we're really actually talking about.  
41 I feel more comfortable and the Koyukuk River Advisory  
42 Committee members were not uncomfortable with this half  
43 an ear length description.

44  
45 MR. COLLINS: My question is answered.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further  
48 discussion on the two options. Does the Council feel  
49 comfortable with the options as portrayed, the intent  
50 of the options. Do you have a comment, Vince.

1 MR. MATHEWS: I just need clarification  
2 as your past coordinator on the six-year moratorium.  
3 I'm not sure your Council members understand why you  
4 had that six-year moratorium in there. I don't want to  
5 cloud the issue, but is that going to be in these  
6 options? If it is, it needs to be noted on the record.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The reason we had a  
9 six-year moratorium is if in the future the moose  
10 population was high enough to support cow hunts, it  
11 would be easier to return to that. At this point, I  
12 don't feel that it's advantageous to retain that  
13 language in the options. So I will go along with  
14 striking that moratorium language as OSM's conclusion  
15 stated.

16  
17 Is there any further discussion on the  
18 options.

19  
20 (No comments)

21  
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So this clarifies  
23 what the motion is. Proposal 67 is to adopt options 1  
24 and 2, as clarified through our discussions. Any  
25 question on the main motion. Do you have a question.

26  
27 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is  
30 called. Those in favor of Proposal 67 as modified on  
31 the screen and OSM will clarify a few of the languages  
32 and so forth. Those in favor of Proposal 67 with the  
33 two options signify by saying aye.

34  
35 IN UNISON: Aye.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same  
38 sign.

39  
40 (No opposing votes)

41  
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Council  
43 supports the modified Proposal 67. I really appreciate  
44 the departments coming to our meeting, the Staff  
45 working through this proposal and the patience of the  
46 Council. This was a very important proposal for the  
47 people of Allakaket and Alatna, so I really wanted to  
48 make sure we move forward with some kind of a winter  
49 hunt.

50

1                   We're going to move to bundled  
2 Proposals 63 and 68 and then Proposal 91, the State  
3 proposal. I would prefer to take up the State Proposal  
4 91 first and go over what the Advisory Committee did  
5 with that proposal and the reasons why I feel we should  
6 go with the wishes of the Advisory Committee. We'll  
7 have Glenn come up and talk about 91.

8  
9                   MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
10 gave the presentation earlier on that, so I really  
11 don't have anything else to add. The Department  
12 comments stand as far as our recommendation to not  
13 adopt that proposal.

14  
15                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal 91 is in  
16 our other packet. Proposal 91 is on Page 141. As the  
17 Department said, they laid out the parameters of that  
18 hunt. The proposal was our proposal to allow an April  
19 5 to 15th antlered bull hunt in the Koyukuk Controlled  
20 Use Area. The issue was to provide winter hunt  
21 opportunities. So the proposal was put forward. I  
22 wanted to have the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee  
23 meet before the proposal was actually submitted so that  
24 we could refine it, but as vice-chair I couldn't get  
25 the Advisory Committee to have a fall meeting. We kept  
26 having meeting conflicts, so we just submitted this as  
27 a placeholder.

28  
29                   Since this proposal has been partially  
30 presented, the other Federal and State agencies, did  
31 you want to speak to this. Kenton, did you want to  
32 speak to this proposal at all.

33  
34                   MR. MOOS: No.

35  
36                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You have no comment  
37 on that. BLM has no comment. The Interagency Staff  
38 Committee, do they have a comment on Proposal 91.

39  
40                   (No comments)

41  
42                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Subsistence  
43 Resource Commission did not meet on this one, the Gates  
44 of the Arctic. Fish and Game Advisory Committee  
45 comments. The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee met and  
46 reviewed Proposal 91 and they felt that to garner  
47 support for Proposal 90A as Glenn portrayed, that 91 --  
48 and the assessment was with the bull/cow ratio and the  
49 number of people that could participate that the Board  
50 of Game would most likely not support Proposal 91 and

1 that's my assessment after looking at fall moose trend  
2 counts.

3

4                   So the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee  
5 reviewed Proposal 91 and did not support the proposal  
6 and that would be reflected in the minutes of the  
7 Advisory Committee. The line of reasoning was there is  
8 a Federal winter hunt on the Federal refuge lands and  
9 the quota set by the Koyukuk/Nowitna Refuge and that  
10 hunt, when moves forward, is the harvest parameters of  
11 10 moose are fairly easily taken because of the density  
12 of the moose. There is a winter hunt opportunity and  
13 that provides winter hunt abilities.

14

15                   That would be the synopsis of the  
16 Advisory Committee's deliberation on Proposal 91. Did  
17 we have any written comments from anybody, Ann?

18

19                   MS. WILKINSON: No, we did not.

20

21                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No written comments.  
22 Do we have public testimony. I don't see anybody here  
23 that would be making public testimony. So Regional  
24 Council deliberations and recommendations. The Chair  
25 will entertain a motion to support Proposal 91 for  
26 discussion.

27

28                   MR. J. WALKER: So moved.

29

30                   MS. YATLIN: Second.

31

32                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by James and  
33 seconded by Eleanor. So Proposal 91 is up for  
34 deliberation by the Council. Go ahead, Eleanor.

35

36                   MS. YATLIN: The way the motion went,  
37 you said to support?

38

39                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposals are always  
40 put on the table in a positive motion. Through the  
41 deliberation, I intend to oppose the proposal, but it's  
42 always put forward in a positive motion so that it's  
43 always clear which way people are voting. Is there  
44 further Council input on Proposal 91.

45

46                   (No comments)

47

48                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I oppose our own  
49 proposal because I do not feel that the Board of Game  
50 will support the proposal. The biology does not

1 support as Glenn portrayed so much bull harvest by the  
2 various people and there is a Federal hunt provided  
3 already with meaningful harvest. So I personally will  
4 oppose Proposal 91. Further discussion or comments.

5  
6 (No comments)

7  
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question on the  
9 proposal.

10  
11 MS. YATLIN: Question.

12  
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is  
14 called. Those in favor of Proposal 91 signify by  
15 saying aye.

16  
17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Aye.

18  
19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Aye.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same  
22 sign.

23  
24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we have two votes  
27 for the Proposal 91. How many opposing?

28  
29 MS. WILKINSON: Six.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Six opposing. Okay.  
32 Go ahead, Robert.

33  
34 MR. R. WALKER: For the record, I'm  
35 just going to say that we put the proposal in and we  
36 voted down our own proposal. That don't look good for  
37 us in sense of direction for subsistence.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I went along with  
40 the Advisory Committee deliberated. The proposal was  
41 submitted sort of in the blind. Our intention was for  
42 the Western Interior Council to consult and submit the  
43 proposal after the Advisory Committee had worked out  
44 some of the bugs, but we never did get an Advisory  
45 Committee and we couldn't clarify what the Advisory  
46 Committee was going to do.

47  
48 This proposal was basically a  
49 placeholder if the biology came around, if the Advisory  
50 Committee wanted to support the proposal. Well, that's

1 not the way it went, so that's why we have the option  
2 of voting against our own proposals. That's the line  
3 of reasoning behind why the proposal was opposed by the  
4 Advisory Committee.

5  
6 We're going onto the Federal proposals  
7 now, which are bundled as 63 and 68. We'll have the  
8 Staff come forward to present those to us and those  
9 will be found in our booklet on Page 63.

10  
11 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
12 Larry Buklis, Office of Subsistence Management. I'll  
13 highlight the main points in the analysis for Proposals  
14 WP10-63 and 68. The proponent of Proposal 63 is the  
15 Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge. Proponent  
16 for 68 is the Western Interior Regional Advisory  
17 Council.

18  
19 Issues raised by the proposals. Both  
20 proponents are requesting that the existing August 27th  
21 to September 20th moose season be shifted five days  
22 later to a season of September 1 to 25 within the Units  
23 21D, 24C and 24D, portions of the Koyukuk Controlled  
24 Use Area. The season length would remain the same.  
25 Shifting the season dates would align with State action  
26 and alleviate the need to administer a Federal permit  
27 for that early portion of the season.

28  
29 Based on the proposal we have, the  
30 Council believes there is a harvestable surplus of cow  
31 moose, albeit although a very small one, in the Koyukuk  
32 Controlled Use Area and wants to retain the opportunity  
33 to harvest cow moose during the March 1 to 5 to be  
34 announced season, which is the traditional and  
35 preferred time of year when local hunters harvest cow  
36 moose.

37  
38 For conservation purposes, however, the  
39 Council proposal places a six-year moratorium on cow  
40 moose harvest during the September 1 to 5 to be  
41 announced season when antlerless moose may be taken.  
42 Adoption of Proposal 68 would make an April 10 to 15 to  
43 be announced season for bull moose mandatory if there  
44 is no March 1 to 5 season for cow moose. So it's sort  
45 of a follow-up opportunity.

46  
47 Status of the resource. The moose  
48 population is stable, but there's a continued concern  
49 about numbers sufficient to support cow moose harvest.  
50

1                   The OSM preliminary conclusion is to  
2 support with modification, to clarify regulatory  
3 language for the to be announced seasons, retaining  
4 management discretion to authorize such seasons. In  
5 other words, the follow-up season wouldn't be mandatory  
6 for the bull season. And not specifying a cow moose  
7 moratorium given the conservations addressed through  
8 setting of a cow moose quota.

9  
10                   The March 1 to 5 to be announced  
11 antlerless season with a cow quota or an April 10 to 15  
12 to be announced bull season would be the set of seasons  
13 under this conclusion.

14  
15                   The justification points were the  
16 requested five-day shift of the fall season provides a  
17 locally preferred opportunity to harvest moose during a  
18 typically cooler portion of the season. Adoption of  
19 the proposal would align Federal and State fall moose  
20 seasons in this area. It would reduce regulatory  
21 complexities due to mixed land jurisdictions with  
22 different seasons and would avoid the need to  
23 administer a Federal permit for that small portion of  
24 the season that would be Federal only.

25  
26                   Thirdly, retaining manager discretion  
27 for the to be announced seasons is recommended basing  
28 actions on the biological status of the populations.

29  
30                   Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

31  
32                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Larry.  
33 Council questions on the presentation of the proposal  
34 by OSM.

35  
36                   (No comments)

37  
38                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Thanks.

39  
40                   MR. BUKLIS: Thank you.

41  
42                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Alaska Department of  
43 Fish and Game, did you want to speak to this proposal.

44  
45                   MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
46 Members of the Council. As I mentioned before, we're  
47 short on wildlife staff, but in the copy of Department  
48 of Fish and Game comments that I hope you all have a  
49 copy of, we support WP10-63, but we oppose WP10-68 and  
50 the justification for that is in our documents.

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

Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*  
STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS  
\*\*\*\*\*

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

Wildlife Proposal WP10-63:

This proposal by Koyukuk/Nowitna Refuge would change season dates in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area Registration federal subsistence moose hunt in Units 21D, 24C, and 24D from August 27 through September 20 to September 1 through 25.

Wildlife Proposal WP10-68:

Four changes are proposed by the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council: 1) in Koyukuk Controlled Use Area portion of Units 21D, 24C, and 24D, expand late winter season from 5 days (March 1 through 5) to 45 days (March 1 through April 15); 2) establish a federal subsistence quota for moose in the late winter season; 3) establish a moratorium on cow moose harvest; and 4) shorten the fall federal subsistence season by 5 days.

Introduction:

Proposal WP10-63 seeks to align the 24-day federal subsistence moose hunting season with the 24-day state season that was adopted by the Alaska Board of Game in 2008. Special Action Requests that accomplished this change were endorsed by the Federal Subsistence Board and federal subsistence managers in 2008 and 2009. This proposal eliminates the need for annual Special Action Requests. Proposal WP10-68 would establish a 45-day season and retain federal permit requirement for only the May 1 through 5 portion of that season. Proposed changes also include a 5-year moratorium on cows and other changes discussed below.

Impact on Subsistence Users:

An average of 392 hunters harvested an average of 145 moose from RY01 through RY09, as reported on the RM832 subsistence registration permit. Hunters have voiced concerns that warmer fall

1 temperatures reduce hunter success in the late August  
2 portion of the season. Proposal WP10-63 will allow  
3 hunting later into September when temperatures are  
4 cooler and moose are moving to likely improve harvest  
5 success. Proposal WP10-68 would provide an additional  
6 45 days in late winter, assuming the intent was to keep  
7 5 days of opportunity in March 15 through April 15.  
8 There would be flexibility in the ability of federal  
9 managers to open the season depending on favorable  
10 weather. Proposal WP10-68, through the moratorium,  
11 would eliminate antlerless moose harvest in regulation,  
12 which would benefit federal subsistence users, because  
13 the moose population will grow and the harvestable  
14 surplus will increase. Proposal WP10-68 would shorten  
15 the fall hunt by 5 days, which would not affect federal  
16 subsistence hunters, because they could hunt legally  
17 under state regulations.

18

19 Opportunity Provided by State:

20

21 The season dates were September 1  
22 through September 25 until 2000, when a change was  
23 submitted by the department on behalf of the Koyukuk  
24 Moose Hunters Working Group. The Alaska Board of Game  
25 adopted in 2008 a shift of the season from August 27  
26 through September 20 to September 1 through September  
27 25. Adoption of proposal WP10-63 would align the  
28 federal hunt with the state regulations. Alaska  
29 residents are allowed one bull by permit (DM812) from  
30 September 5 through September 25 or one bull with the  
31 trophy value destroyed (RM832) September 1 through  
32 September 25. Nonresidents are allowed one bull with  
33 50-inch antlers or four or more brow tines on at least  
34 one side from September 5 through September 25. In  
35 Units 24C and 24D (KCUA), the state season is currently  
36 one bull from September 1 through 25 and December 1  
37 through 10. In Unit 21D (KCUA), the seasons are  
38 September 1 through September 25 and December 1 through  
39 10. There is no December 1 through 10 federal  
40 subsistence moose hunting season in the 24D portion of  
41 the Koyukuk CUA.

42

43 Conservation Issues:

44

45 From 1997 through 2008, the moose  
46 population in Koyukuk Controlled Area declined by 25%.  
47 The management objective for the area is for growth of  
48 the moose population to levels of the late 1990s. The  
49 Alaska Board of Game endorsed this strategy, closed  
50 antlerless moose harvest in the fall, and closed the

1 spring hunts in order to protect that productive  
2 component (cows) of the population. Improved harvest  
3 success rates for subsistence hunters in fall hunts is  
4 consistent with the management strategy for Koyukuk  
5 Controlled Use Area, because improving fall harvest of  
6 bulls reduces dependency of winter harvest when cows  
7 are harvested.

8

9                   Although fall bull harvest may increase  
10 slightly if Proposal WP10-63 is adopted, the bull:100  
11 cow objectives are being met, therefore this  
12 opportunity can be provided without undermining the  
13 objective for growth. Unreported harvest of cows  
14 occurs annually, which is a conservation concern, and  
15 any additional harvest of cows would further undermine  
16 the objective for growth. Any spring hunt risks the  
17 harvest of cows, impacting the management objective of  
18 growth in the moose population. The Department  
19 requests Proposal WP10-68 be modified to a December 1  
20 through 10 season in the Unit 24D portion of the  
21 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area to take advantage of bull  
22 harvest opportunity, as it exists in state regulations.  
23 The Department requests more specifics regarding the  
24 proposed consultation process and quota establishment  
25 in proposal WP10-68. The proposed regulatory language,  
26 as written, triggers conservation concerns:

27

28                   Unit 21D Koyukuk Controlled Use Area  
29                   1 moose; however, antlerless moose may  
30                   be taken during Aug. 27-31 and Mar. 1-5  
31                   season, if authorized by announcement  
32                   by the Koyukuk/Nowitna National  
33                   Wildlife Refuge Manager and BLM Central  
34                   Yukon Field Office Manager. Harvest of  
35                   cow moose accompanied by calves is  
36                   prohibited. The harvestable surplus of  
37                   cows will be determined for a quota.  
38                   If it is determined there is not a  
39                   harvestable cow surplus, then a  
40                   harvestable bull quota will be set, and  
41                   to be taken from April 10 to April 15.  
42                   During the Sept. 1-20 season, a State  
43                   registration permit is required.  
44                   During the 5 day to-be-announced season  
45                   between Mar. 1-5 season, a Federal  
46                   registration permit is required.  
47                   Announcement for the antlerless moose  
48                   quota and cow quota will be made after  
49                   consultation with the ADF&G Area  
50                   Biologist and Chairs of the Western

1 Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional  
2 Advisory Council, Koyukuk and Middle  
3 Yukon Fish and Game Advisory  
4 Committees.  
5

6 The Alaska Department of Fish and  
7 Game's management responsibilities for sustainable  
8 populations and scientific role in determining the  
9 harvestable surplus of cows will be determined for a  
10 quota needs clarification in the consultation  
11 process for Proposal WP10-68. State population  
12 management objectives for Koyukuk Controlled Use Area  
13 are detailed in the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan  
14 and Unit 21D and 24 Moose Management Reports. It is  
15 important to include Department population and bull:cow  
16 ratio objectives or biologically sustainable values for  
17 use by federal managers if Proposal WP10-68 is adopted.  
18

19 Enforcement Issues:  
20

21 Proposal WP10-68 would take the state  
22 and federal subsistence moose hunting seasons further  
23 out of alignment and cause more enforcement issues,  
24 last minute planning for the subsistence hunter, and  
25 confusion over interpretation of the actual season  
26 dates published in the federal subsistence regulation  
27 summary book versus in-season announcements by the  
28 refuge manager.  
29

30 Recommendations:  
31

32 Support WP10-63. Oppose WP10-68.  
33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would actually  
35 like you to give the justification on the record. I  
36 have not had a chance to look at and I cannot find my  
37 copy of your comments. So if you could come back and  
38 read that into the record, please.  
39

40 MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman. Members  
41 of the Council. The reason I think we opposed WP10-68  
42 it would take the State and Federal subsistence most  
43 hunting seasons out of alignment and cause more  
44 enforcement issues and last minute planning for  
45 subsistence hunter and confusion over interpretation of  
46 the actual season dates published in the Federal  
47 subsistence regulatory summary book versus in-season  
48 announcement by the refuge manager. They were the  
49 comments provided by our wildlife staff. We support  
50 10-63.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for putting  
2 that on the record. Federal comments. Do you have a  
3 comment on that, Kenton?

4  
5 MR. MOOS: Not at this time unless  
6 somebody has questions.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Interagency  
9 Staff Committee comments.

10  
11 (No comments)

12  
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Subsistence  
14 Resource Commission has not reviewed this issue. The  
15 Fish and Game Advisory Committee did not take up these  
16 Federal proposals. As I said, we were quite long on  
17 some other issues and did not get to the Federal  
18 proposals. The reflection on Proposal 91 should enter  
19 into the thought process on this proposal.

20  
21 Summary of written comments. Do we  
22 have any written comments, Ann?

23  
24 MS. WILKINSON:: No, sir.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No public testimony  
27 here. And so Regional Council deliberation. This  
28 proposal has some real validity to it and so the  
29 Council needs to deliberate this proposal thoroughly.  
30 So the Chair will entertain a motion to adopt the  
31 proposal, but combine Proposal 63 and 68 with  
32 modification as defined by the OSM. No motion to  
33 adopt?

34  
35 MR. COLLINS: I'll move to adopt.

36  
37 MR. R. WALKER: Second.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have a motion and  
40 second. We're in Council deliberation on the proposal.  
41 Council member comments about the proposal as we find  
42 on Page 74 and 75 of our booklet here. Do you have a  
43 comment, Eleanor?

44  
45 MS. YATLIN: Just a question, Mr.  
46 Chairman. I see part of this -- I just wondered if  
47 that area is Middle Yukon. I know you said the Koyukuk  
48 River Advisory didn't get a chance to look at it, but I  
49 wanted to know about middle Yukon.

50

1                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's actually a  
2 good question. Has the Middle Yukon Advisory Committee  
3 met? No, the Middle Yukon has not met and not reviewed  
4 the proposal. So further discussion about the  
5 proposal. The housekeeping portion of the Proposal 63  
6 shifting the season September 1 to 25, that's just  
7 aligning with the State season. That's a given.

8  
9                   The problem was last year, it was  
10 determined by the Koyukuk/Nowitna staff that the cow  
11 moose population was not adequate to support a winter  
12 hunt. So there was no winter hunt. So what this  
13 proposal does is if there is not enough cow moose for a  
14 winter quota for any antlerless moose, then it shifts  
15 into a second season, which is April 10th to the 15th.

16  
17  
18                   One of the questions we had after our  
19 fall meeting, is it normally possible to travel at that  
20 time of year, Eleanor, around Huslia, between the 10th  
21 to the 15th of April?

22  
23                   MS. YATLIN: Yeah, we can.

24  
25                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that was one of  
26 the questions that came up, was whether there was  
27 adequate snow cover that far down and so we needed to  
28 clarify that. Basically the people of Huslia have  
29 always -- when we had our meeting there for this RAC,  
30 practically the whole community -- there was many  
31 people that came out and we had people crying that were  
32 wanting to have winter hunts and they were distraught  
33 that they did not have any winter hunts. So people are  
34 in full support for winter hunting opportunity. The  
35 harvest in Huslia has been increasing since the moose  
36 management plan went into effect.

37  
38                   I just went into the Subsistence  
39 Division's databank and I looked at 1980 harvest levels  
40 for Huslia and Hughes and the per capita harvest in the  
41 '80s was .45 moose per capita in Huslia and Hughes was  
42 .5 something. Right now it's currently with 67 moose  
43 .2 moose per person, so we're not even actually close  
44 to the previous harvest levels. So I feel that there's  
45 a need for winter hunting opportunity.

46  
47                   Did you want to speak to that issue,  
48 Eleanor.

49  
50                   MS. YATLIN: Well, they have been

1 asking for winter moose hunt for years. I was looking  
2 at the April 10 to 15. Those dates are okay because  
3 they're still traveling by snowmachine. I  
4 do know that it's the time of the year to get the moose  
5 for dry meat in the springtime and the moose skin,  
6 that's the best time of year to get the moose skin.  
7 That's what a lot of people are doing right now. They  
8 tell us long ago that if we utilize the whole animal,  
9 ducks, geese, birds, whatever, it will always come back  
10 to us, so that's what they believe in. We have to  
11 believe in our traditional knowledge in order to  
12 manage, you know, for the future. I know the people  
13 are for this winter moose hunt.

14  
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: To clarify this for  
16 you, this is a Federal proposal. This would only be on  
17 the Federal lands and one modification that I would  
18 like to see is that visible antlers of five inches be  
19 included as part of the proposal. What does the  
20 Council feel about that? To bring consistency  
21 throughout the whole river. Can I have a motion to  
22 amend to antler of five inches? Who made the motion?  
23 Ray, would you like to modify the main motion?

24  
25 MR. COLLINS: Okay.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: To five inch beam  
28 length.

29  
30 MR. COLLINS: All right.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Concurrence with the  
33 second.

34  
35 MR. R. WALKER: Yes.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So the  
38 proposal is modified to identify in the April 10 to  
39 15th season that the bull would have to have five-inch  
40 antler beam. Further discussion on the proposal.

41  
42 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is  
45 called on the proposal as modified. Those in favor of  
46 the combined Proposal 63 and 68 as modified by the  
47 Western Interior Council signify by saying aye. Go  
48 ahead, Ann.

49  
50 MS. WILKINSON: First you need to vote

1 on the amendment and then you vote on the main motion  
2 as amended.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay. We'll  
5 vote on the amended language of five-inch beam. Those  
6 in favor of the amendment as stated, signify by saying  
7 aye.

8

9 IN UNISON: Aye.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

12

13 (No opposing votes)

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those now voting on  
16 the main motion for Proposals WP10-63 and 68 as  
17 modified also signify by saying aye.

18

19 IN UNISON: Aye.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

22

23 (No opposing comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So Proposal 63 and  
26 68 have been dealt with. So we're going back to our  
27 main agenda. Vince, you've got your hand up back  
28 there.

29

30 MR. MATHEWS: It's your prerogative.  
31 We do have that special action. You've been spending  
32 quite a bit of time on Koyukuk River. It might be good  
33 timing or if you want to schedule it another time.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Thanks for  
36 reminding me about that, Vince. That was one of the  
37 insertions into the agenda, was that we deal with the  
38 Koyukuk special action request. Go ahead with the  
39 special action request, Vince.

40

41 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. I didn't know  
42 there was a hot seat up here, but I'm discovering  
43 there is. You need to turn to Page 105. It would help  
44 me to present this proposal and you need to look at the  
45 map on 105. The special action is in front of you. It  
46 was passed out earlier I believe. It has draft across  
47 it.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We can't find it.

50 Okay. We'll just get new ones. Thanks, Ann.

1 MR. MATHEWS: If you take a look at it,  
2 hopefully I used the right technique of additions being  
3 bold. The main thing to focus on is that the current  
4 season on the books is March 1 through 5. This is a  
5 special action request, a five-day hunt, March 27  
6 through the 31st. I think it's been discussed quite a  
7 bit today about the reason it would be later, so I  
8 won't belabor that.

9  
10 The reason I have you focus on the map  
11 on 105, that polygon there in the middle that you  
12 talked about earlier, mine happens to be colored, that  
13 shows the controlled use area, refuge lands and then  
14 some BLM lands in the lower left-hand corner of that  
15 polygon is the description that's in the special  
16 action. So this would apply to that area. The quota  
17 would be five bulls. The refuge manager is authorized  
18 to close the hunt once the quota is reached. This  
19 quota is based on the sustainability of the population.

20  
21 I don't know if I need to really --  
22 this so closely aligns with your earlier discussions.  
23 I think I'll wait to see if you have questions on the  
24 area because this aligns with Proposal 67.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. The special  
27 action request is coming from Kanuti Wildlife Refuge  
28 staff, which now Vince is part of that staff. We'll go  
29 through the deliberation process. Did the Department  
30 have comments on this special action?

31  
32 MR. CAMPBELL: We have no comments at  
33 this time, Mr. Chairman.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other Federal  
36 agencies. Do you want to speak to this special action  
37 request, Mike Spindler, specifically?

38  
39 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Chair. I'll make it  
40 really brief. You're all pretty aware of the  
41 situation. All I will do is just say that we did not  
42 want to have the season March 1 to 5 based on the  
43 request of the people of Allakaket, so we moved it to  
44 the last five days. This is the paperwork we need to  
45 do with the staff committee and the Federal Subsistence  
46 Board to make that change in date happen and to make  
47 the change in area. If you look on Page 105 in your  
48 book, it's polygon number two that it will apply to and  
49 polygon number three, but not one. So it's just  
50 correcting the area so that the people can hunt close

1 to the village on Federal lands.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for that  
4 clarification. Vince had covered that area too. So  
5 any questions for Kanuti manager on the special action  
6 request from the Council. Go ahead, Robert.

7

8 MR. R. WALKER: Yes, Mike, is this for  
9 this year?

10

11 MR. SPINDLER: Yes, Mr. Walker. Mr.  
12 Chair. You voted on an action earlier that will take  
13 effect next hunting season in 2011. This is to provide  
14 some opportunity in March of 2010.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for that  
17 clarification. Other questions for the Kanuti staff.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Interagency Staff  
22 Committee comments.

23

24 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chair. They've not  
25 even seen it.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. It's not at  
28 that point yet?

29

30 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. If I could,  
31 this is a little awkward because in terms of process  
32 because it hasn't been submitted to the Office of  
33 Subsistence Management. It hasn't been analyzed.  
34 You're being very proactive, but when we do the  
35 analysis and when we go through our process we can say  
36 that the Council talked about this and that will speed  
37 things along.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Eleanor.

40

41 MS. YATLIN: Just a question. Anyway,  
42 I wanted to know if it went through the Koyukuk River.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll get to that.  
45 So basically they consult with the Department of Fish  
46 and Game and the Chair of  
47 the RAC, so normally this type of request is coming  
48 before the Chair. Since the Council is in session,  
49 they're coming before the whole body. The Subsistence  
50 Resource Commission did not meet on this issue.

1                   The Fish and Game Advisory Committee,  
2 the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee met on this. Was  
3 requested whether they supported a March 1 to 5 or the  
4 end of March special action request. The Advisory  
5 Committee unanimously were in support of the late March  
6 hunt, five-day hunt parameter. So the special action  
7 request has moved forward from the Advisory Committee's  
8 request and I guess the tribal council also has signed  
9 on with that. So that answers your question there,  
10 Eleanor.

11  
12                   Do we have any written comments, Vince.

13  
14                   MR. MATHEWS: No, not written comments.  
15 The concept of a later season was agreed to by the  
16 members of Allakaket and the tribal council. This  
17 exact special action they've not seen it. Just so the  
18 record reflects that so there's not any confusion.

19  
20                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, just the  
21 concept.

22  
23                   MR. MATHEWS: Yes, the concept of later  
24 in March season.

25  
26                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Also Alatna Village?

27  
28                   MR. MATHEWS: I wasn't able to get over  
29 to Alatna Village because the snowmachine broke down,  
30 but I think other staff may have gotten over there, but  
31 I did talk to Ron Sam. He came over. He was supportive  
32 of a later March season. I just don't want it that  
33 these exact language was presented to the tribal  
34 council there. It has not.

35  
36                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Larry  
37 Edwards, from Alatna Village, was the co-chair of the  
38 Advisory Committee and he was supportive of this  
39 special action request.

40  
41                   No public testimony. Regional Council.  
42 The Chair will entertain a motion to proceed with the  
43 special action request by the Kanuti National Wildlife  
44 Refuge for the March 27 to 31 hunt as described in Page  
45 105 in hunt area 2, which is the Federal lands  
46 surrounding Allakaket, Alatna Village, and southern  
47 Unit 24B. Motion.

48  
49                   MS. YATLIN: So moved.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Movement of a  
2 motion. I've got a second.  
3  
4 MR. J. WALKER: Second.  
5  
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James seconded,  
7 Eleanor moved. Discussion on the special action  
8 request. It's fairly clear to the Council what the  
9 concept is and that this has been occurring.  
10  
11 MR. J. WALKER: Question.  
12  
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is  
14 called. Those in favor of the special action request  
15 as described signify by saying aye.  
16  
17 IN UNISON: Aye.  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same  
20 sign.  
21  
22 (No opposing votes)  
23  
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Special action  
25 request will be submitted to the OSM and the Federal  
26 Subsistence Board. We'll take about a five-minute  
27 break.  
28  
29 (Off record)  
30  
31 (On record)  
32  
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're coming back.  
34 We need a little direction here. We've moved through  
35 our bundled proposals. Should we stay on the Western  
36 Interior Federal proposals now? The State did not want  
37 us to take up the 21E proposals until tomorrow morning  
38 because they couldn't be present here for the afternoon  
39 session, so the 21E proposals should be looked at  
40 separately. We have a Proposal 70 and 71 bundle we  
41 could look at right now.  
42  
43 Go ahead, Eleanor.  
44  
45 MS. YATLIN: I didn't know where you  
46 put the reconsideration proposal. I thought it was on  
47 top of our list on the agenda, but I didn't write it  
48 down.  
49  
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We do have some

1 clean-up work we can do right now. We have a  
2 reconsideration of fisheries Proposal 09-12 so we could  
3 bring that up at this time. We also have a resolution.  
4 This is also a fisheries resolution that we went over  
5 yesterday in the joint meeting. This is the language  
6 that was drawn up protecting the first pulse. At this  
7 time we'll clean up some of our loose ends here.

8

9 At this time, the Chair will entertain  
10 a motion for reconsideration. It's reconsideration of  
11 fisheries Proposal 09-12, the 7.5 chinook gear  
12 restriction on the Yukon River Drainage. Go ahead,  
13 Eleanor.

14

15 MS. YATLIN: I make a motion to  
16 reconsider FP09-12 proposal.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Do I have a  
19 second.

20

21 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny.  
24 Discussion by the Council. Robert and James were not  
25 present and felt that that proposal should be  
26 revisited. Do you have further discussion on that,  
27 Robert.

28

29 MR. R. WALKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.  
30 Resolution 2/23/10, what is it?

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to deal  
33 with this separate after we get done here. We're on  
34 this reconsideration. Did you have further discussion  
35 on the reconsideration for the proposal.

36

37 Go ahead, Robert.

38

39 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. We had a  
40 teleconference in Anvik, Grayling, Shag, Holy Cross,  
41 the tribal councils. One of the things on the agenda  
42 was the 7.5 inch mesh by 50, 100 or 150 foot by 35 or  
43 45 inch mesh. The tribal councils of the four villages  
44 determined that they would like to go with the 7.5 inch  
45 mesh, 45 mesh deep by 150 feet long or whatever you  
46 want to order. That was their determination.

47

48 Also, when we were in Nulato at the  
49 YRDFA meeting, Rich Cannon was there also, Fred Bue,  
50 and they talked extensively about the mesh size and I

1 believe everything I heard there is what you heard too,  
2 Rich, right? They wanted a 7.5 inch mesh. The Koyukuk  
3 and Nulato tribes were there. Also people from the  
4 Kaltag tribe. People from the Lower Yukon were there,  
5 Y1, Y2 and Y3. They're consensus was the same as  
6 everybody else.

7  
8 So I would recommend that the Western  
9 Interior go ahead and reconsider this vote and push for  
10 a 7.5 inch mesh because it can be revised in later  
11 years when the stocks do come up. It's not going to be  
12 set in stone. Am I correct, Rich? Help me out here a  
13 little bit.  
14 same

15  
16 MR. CANNON: Through the Chair to Mr.  
17 Walker. Robert, YRDFA did discuss this. I wasn't able  
18 to stay for the entire discussion, so I can't really  
19 confirm everything they talked about. What I heard was  
20 about how they would respond to the Board of Fisheries  
21 action. Of course, this is a separate  
22 process, so the action you take has to be based on the  
23 analysis that you've looked at, the Federal analysis.  
24 That's what has to be discussed among your Council  
25 members.

26  
27 Thank you.

28  
29 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you very much.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Polly.

32  
33 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
34 just wanted to make it clear on the record that the  
35 analyses for Fisheries Proposal 09-12 and 09-13 were  
36 sent out separately to the Council several weeks ago.  
37 They were not part of the proposal book because you  
38 were on a short timeline. Rich is correct, it's a  
39 separate process, but obviously it is a little bit  
40 linked too. We had a separate analysis of all the  
41 effects and those have been presented to you. You two  
42 weren't here yesterday, but you had the analysis in  
43 hand, so you understand the issue.

44  
45 I just wanted to put that on the  
46 record.

47  
48 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

49  
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Polly.

1 That clarifies that the Council members were fully  
2 apprised of the staff analysis and I reiterate a very  
3 excellent staff analysis. So clear that the Council  
4 members that received it in the mail were fully aware  
5 of what was being presented.

6

7 Further Council discussion.

8

9 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair. Myself on  
10 record and voting, I would just like to urge the  
11 Council to reconsider the vote of yesterday to amend it  
12 to include the 7.5 inch mesh to be utilized. That's my  
13 comment.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate that.  
16 That's the kind of information the Council is looking  
17 for, Council member input of what's occurred in their  
18 village.

19

20 You've got a comment, Ray.

21

22 MR. COLLINS: Point of order, Mr.  
23 Chair. The motion before us is to reconsider, so we  
24 should vote on that and that brings it officially to  
25 the table. Then we would take a vote on the motion.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So vote on  
28 bringing the reconsideration before the Council. Those  
29 in favor of reconsidering signify by saying aye.

30

31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further  
34 discussion on reconsidering Proposal FP09-12 from the  
35 dissention votes.

36

37 Do you have a comment, Eleanor.

38

39 MS. YATLIN: Today is another day.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's a good point.  
42 I did want to hear from the other guys.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Exactly.  
45 Robert.

46

47 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr.  
48 Chairman. In talking with the people from Y1, Y2, Y3  
49 and Hooper Bay and Scammon Bay, they want to be  
50 conservative. I think we all came into agreement when

1 we talked about this.

2

3 Yes, I think we should take another  
4 vote.

5

6 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for that  
9 comment. Ann.

10

11 MS. WILKINSON: You need a motion.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Chair will  
14 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal FP09-12.

15

16 MR. COLLINS: So moved.

17

18 MS. YATLIN: Second.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Eleanor.  
21 Further discussion. Go ahead, Larry.

22

23 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. Just to  
24 remind you what you voted on yesterday was to support  
25 Proposal FP09-12 with modification as described on Page  
26 24. Given State action, we didn't need to get into  
27 commercial fisheries and some of those other features.  
28 What you voted on was simply the regulatory language on  
29 Page 24 and the analysis.

30

31 As written there towards the top of the  
32 page in bold, in the Yukon River drainage, the maximum  
33 gillnet size is 7.5 inch stretch mesh for subsistence  
34 salmon fishing in Federal public waters. So it's  
35 support with modification as described there.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is that clear to the  
38 Council. Go ahead.

39

40 MR. J. WALKER: I guess my question  
41 would be to the length that you're addressing. No,  
42 it's just to the width?

43

44 MR. BUKLIS: Just the mesh.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So is it clear to  
47 the Council we're supporting the -- Eastern supported  
48 this same proposal as modified, so we would be  
49 supporting -- the main motion would be in support of  
50 this OSM modified language that makes it real clean.

1 Further discussion on the proposal.

2

3 MS. PELKOLA: Was there a motion and  
4 second already?

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

7

8 MS. PELKOLA: I guess since yesterday I  
9 was very against it and I thought about it and I would  
10 like to do what's best for the fisher people along the  
11 Yukon and our grandchildren and their grandchildren. I  
12 know there's a lot of expense, but I guess I just need  
13 to get through that. Somehow, somewhere, the money  
14 will come for nets. That's all I can say right now.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Jenny. The  
17 Yukon River has been declared a disaster, so I think  
18 there's some Federal funds around that possibly will be  
19 used by various entities to supply nets. Further  
20 discussion on the main motion.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do I have a  
25 question.

26

27 MS. PELKOLA: Question.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is  
30 called. Those in favor of the proposal as amended by  
31 OSM found on Page 24 for Proposal FP09-12 signify by  
32 saying aye.

33

34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same  
37 sign.

38

39 (No opposing votes)

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So FP09-12 is  
42 adopted by the Western Interior Council. We'll move on  
43 to this other point of business that we went over  
44 yesterday. Go ahead.

45

46 MR. R. WALKER: I just need  
47 clarification in my mind. Do we have to use the same  
48 number when we do this resolution or do we have to  
49 switch to another number, for the record.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ann.  
2  
3 MS. WILKINSON: It doesn't have a  
4 number yet.  
5  
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This was the date.  
7 The resolution at the top and it's a joint resolution  
8 of the Eastern, Western and Yukon/Kuskokwim Delta. Go  
9 ahead, Robert.  
10  
11 MR. R. WALKER: I was talking about the  
12 resolution that was  
13 done yesterday. Do we have to change the number  
14 because we did another vote on it?  
15  
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, the proposal  
17 number stays the same. We're onto this resolution  
18 that's before the Council. I could read it into the  
19 record. Should I do that, Ann?  
20  
21 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chair. As long as  
22 we have it, it is part of the record.  
23  
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So the  
25 council sees the language that was provided by one of  
26 the Eastern Interior Council members, so the principal  
27 of this resolution is to protect the first pulse.  
28 Eastern and Western members were very supportive of  
29 that. This was to be typed up and presented to each  
30 Council for review.  
31  
32 At this point, the Chair will entertain  
33 a motion to adopt this resolution to be transmitted to  
34 the Federal Subsistence Board and the State managers,  
35 was the primary focus of this. This was to be  
36 transmitted to the Commissioner of Fish and Game and  
37 let it trickle down from there. Go ahead, Ann.  
38  
39 MS. WILKINSON: It was going to be sent  
40 to the Federal Subsistence Board, the Board of  
41 Fisheries, the State and Federal managers and to the  
42 Yukon Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.  
43  
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, the Yukon  
45 Delta, but the RAC chair from Yukon Delta assured us he  
46 would move this forward, so I trust Lester's judgment  
47 on that issue. Do you have a comment, Tim.  
48  
49 MR. GERVAIS: Yes. We just drew this  
50 up last night, Andy Bassich from Eagle and Larry and I.

1 Lester was going to join us, but we couldn't find him.  
2 I would like to add one more statement on the whereas  
3 probably after the whereas of escapement goals in  
4 Canada, I'd like something to the effect of whereas  
5 traditional ecological knowledge consistently indicates  
6 that the average chinook size has been reducing over --  
7 I don't know the exact wording and how to do this, but  
8 in our area I'm hearing elders and other middle-aged  
9 fisherman say that they're seeing definite size  
10 reduction in the average fish of the run over a 20-year  
11 span and also over a 10-year span.

12  
13 Why I feel that's important is because  
14 it could have implications. The trawl fishery for  
15 pollock has been conducted for 20 years and that could  
16 potentially be part of the problem with why the chinook  
17 size is being reduced, so I'd like that both 10 and 20-  
18 year interval addressed in this traditional ecological  
19 knowledge.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So you're stating  
22 whereas TEK indicates, chinook salmon size is declining  
23 in the Yukon River drainage over the past 20 years,  
24 something to that effect?

25  
26 MR. GERVAIS: That's correct.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Is that clear  
29 to the Council? Is that agreeable to the Council?

30  
31 (Council nods affirmatively)

32  
33 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I will  
34 move joint resolution of the Eastern Interior, Western  
35 Interior and Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory  
36 Councils concerning Yukon River chinook salmon  
37 management be adopted as amended with that statement.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks Ray. Do I  
40 have a second.

41  
42 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny.  
45 Further discussion on this resolution.

46  
47 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is  
50 called on the resolution to be transmitted to the

1 various entities described by Ann on the record.  
2 Signify by saying aye.

3

4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same  
7 sign.

8

9 (No opposing votes)

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The resolution is  
12 adopted and to be transmitted. So we've cleaned up  
13 some of our housekeeping issues, loose ends. I was  
14 seeking direction on which proposals we should go with.  
15 The Western Interior proposals that we can visit today  
16 that's still not in 21E is WP10-70 and 71, revised wolf  
17 hunting and trapping seasons in 19B and C on Page 124.

18

19 Go ahead, Polly.

20

21 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. Also just as  
22 a reminder and clearly the Council can go where they  
23 want to go, but there's five statewide proposals that  
24 are pretty much housekeeping proposals and I'm prepared  
25 to present them to you at any time also.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My intention was to  
28 finish this Western proposal and we'll have extra time  
29 today and we'll move into those statewide proposals  
30 after this one. The introduction of the proposal is on  
31 Page 124 in our Council book.

32

33 Larry, go ahead.

34

35 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you. I have a few  
36 brief comments on the analysis for WP10-70 and 71.  
37 These proposals were submitted by the Defenders of  
38 Wildlife in conjunction with the Alaska Wildlife  
39 Alliance.

40

41 Proposal 70 requests that wolf trapping  
42 not be allowed in Units 19B and 19C in the month of  
43 April. Proposal 71 requests that wolf hunting not be  
44 allowed in Units 19B and 19C in the months of August,  
45 September, October and April. The wolf population in  
46 Units 19B and 19C is thought to be healthy and the  
47 current harvest rate thought to be within sustainable  
48 levels.

49

50 Wolves are an important subsistence

1 resource in these units. Over the past decade nearly  
2 half of the reported wolf harvest in 19B and C has  
3 occurred in those months of August, September, October,  
4 and April. The proposed changes would make the Federal  
5 subsistence wolf hunting and trapping seasons shorter  
6 than the State seasons.

7

8 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to  
9 oppose these proposals.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Larry. That  
12 was concise. Questions from the Council on the  
13 presentation of the proposal. Go ahead, Tim.

14

15 MR. GERVAIS: I was just going to ask  
16 Ray if he had some comments since it's in his  
17 neighborhood.

18

19 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I guess  
20 for the record I'd comment that there's no biological  
21 reason for the reduction and that it would deny  
22 opportunity to subsistence hunters and trappers and,  
23 therefore, I'm opposed to it and I believe that would  
24 be true of the residents that I know in the area.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have to stay on  
27 our procedure here. We don't deliberate the proposal  
28 yet. I'm requesting if the Council has any comments or  
29 questions of how it was presented or any of the  
30 information presented by Larry at this time. We're  
31 going to go through the Alaska Department of Fish and  
32 Game's comment next. Come on up to the table. I'm bad  
33 with names. I have to hear it about two or three  
34 times.

35

36 MR. CAMPBELL: Mitch Campbell, Alaska  
37 Department of Fish and Game, Federal subsistence  
38 liaison. In regards to Proposal WP10-70 and 71, much  
39 like OSM, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and  
40 the wildlife staff have moved to oppose both these  
41 proposals. The reasons given are that these proposals  
42 submitted by the Defenders of Wildlife in conjunction  
43 with the Alaska Wildlife Alliance incorrectly assume  
44 that the Federal subsistence wolf trapping and hunting  
45 seasons are solely for predator control.

46

47 In fact, April trapping seasons are  
48 traditional, allowing Federal subsistence trappers the  
49 opportunity to take a wolf and weather conditions allow  
50 travel along traplines. August wolf hunting openings

1 are traditional, allowing Federal subsistence hunters  
2 the opportunity to take a wolf while hunting for other  
3 big game. Spring wolf hunting seasons allow taking of  
4 wolves when mild weather conditions allow travel.

5  
6 Hide value depends on what the wolf  
7 will be used for. Hides of wolves taken in early fall  
8 and late spring are suitable for making warm items for  
9 personal use consistent with subsistence uses.

10  
11 There's also some enforcement issues  
12 that the Department picked up on. Shortening the  
13 Federal season resulting from adoption of these  
14 proposals will create enforcement issues with mixed  
15 land ownership and will cause confusion amongst the  
16 public. So, therefore, both proposals are opposed by  
17 the Department of Fish and Game.

18  
19 \*\*\*\*\*  
20 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS  
21 \*\*\*\*\*

22  
23 Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
24 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

25  
26 Wildlife Proposal WP10-70 and WP10-71:

27  
28 These proposals would shorten federal  
29 subsistence wolf trapping and hunting seasons in Units  
30 19B and 19C. WP10-70 would shorten the federal  
31 subsistence trapping season to November 1 through March  
32 31; the current season is November 1 through April 30.  
33 WP10-71 would shorten the federal subsistence wolf  
34 hunting season in Units 19B and 19C from August 10  
35 through April 30 to November 1 through March 31.

36  
37 Introduction:

38  
39 These proposals incorrectly assume  
40 federal subsistence wolf trapping and hunting seasons  
41 are solely for predator control. In fact April  
42 trapping seasons are traditional, allowing federal  
43 subsistence trappers the opportunity to take a wolf  
44 when weather conditions allow travel along traplines.  
45 August wolf hunting openings are traditional, allowing  
46 federal subsistence hunters the opportunity to take a  
47 wolf while hunting for other big game. Spring wolf  
48 hunting seasons allow taking of wolves when mild  
49 weather conditions allow travel. Hide value depends on  
50 what the wolf will be used for. Hides of wolves taken

1 in early fall and late spring are suitable for making  
2 warm items for personal use, consistent with  
3 subsistence uses.

4

5                   Impact on Subsistence Users:

6

7                   Federal subsistence user opportunity to  
8 trap wolves would be reduced by 31 days. This  
9 reduction would restrict the federal subsistence user  
10 opportunity to take a wolf while trapping other  
11 species. Federal subsistence user opportunity would be  
12 reduced by 113 days. If adopted, federal subsistence  
13 hunters would lose the about 40% of the current hunting  
14 season to take a wolf while hunting and trapping other  
15 species during the fall and spring.

16

17                   Opportunity Provided by State:

18

19                   The state trapping season in Units 19B  
20 and 19C is November 1 through April 30 with no harvest  
21 limit. State hunting seasons in Units 19B and 19C  
22 (August 1 through May 31) are longer than federal  
23 subsistence seasons (August 10 through April 30).

24

25                   Conservation Issues:

26

27                   The current federal subsistence season  
28 and bag limits for wolf trapping and hunting in Units  
29 19B and 19C have virtually no impact on wolf  
30 populations in these units. Furthermore, wolf control  
31 in adjacent Units 19A and eastern 19D have little or no  
32 effect on wolf populations in Units 19B and 19C. The  
33 wolf population in Unit 19B estimated to be 116 154  
34 wolves and the Unit 19C wolf population is estimated to  
35 be 101 135 wolves with a density of 5.8 7.7  
36 wolves/1,000 km<sup>2</sup> in both units.

37

38                   Annual state harvest of wolves in Units  
39 19B and 19C averages 29 wolves per year since 1999  
40 across both units and is less than 13% of the  
41 population. This harvest rate is well within the range  
42 of sustainability regardless of the long hunting and  
43 trapping seasons. April harvest makes up only 9%  
44 (average of less than 3 wolves annually) of this  
45 harvest, although it is unknown what part of this  
46 number is taken under federal instead of state  
47 regulations. Eliminating early fall and late spring  
48 harvest would not benefit the wolf population.

49

50                   The proposer suggests that adjacent

1 Units 19A and 19D have very low wolf densities due to  
2 active predator management. While wolves have been  
3 reduced in these units in recent years, it was not by  
4 80%, or complete removal, as the proposer suggests.  
5 The February 2008 wolf population in Unit 19A was  
6 estimated to be at least 74 wolves (a 51% reduction  
7 across the entire unit) and the eastern Unit 19D  
8 population was estimated to be 85 105 wolves (no more  
9 than a 57% reduction throughout eastern Unit 19D) in  
10 fall 2009. Wolf populations remain at or above the  
11 population objectives stated in 5AAC 92.125 in Units  
12 19A and 19D, as required by state regulations.  
13 Shortening the wolf trapping and hunting seasons in  
14 Units 19B and 19C at this time would have no effect on  
15 the conservation of wolves.

16

17 Enforcement Issues:

18

19 Shorter federal subsistence seasons  
20 resulting from adoption of this proposal will create  
21 enforcement issues in areas with mixed land ownership  
22 and will cause confusion among the public.

23

24 Other Comments:

25

26 Adults have learned to avoid man  
27 through experience and are the most difficult pack  
28 members to harvest, while younger wolves are the most  
29 vulnerable pack members. These populations can sustain  
30 the small reduction in pups born by the taking of a few  
31 pregnant females. Wolves have evolved and thrived  
32 under natural conditions where adult mortality occurs  
33 regularly through intraspecific competition. Also, it  
34 is the mature adults, including pregnant and lactating  
35 females, that do the killing of large prey, thus are  
36 subject to injury and death during attempted predation.  
37 In cases of natural adult mortality, the pack social  
38 structure provides support to pups.

39

40 Recommendation:

41

42 Oppose both proposals.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Do you  
45 have questions of the Department.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other Federal  
50 agencies comments.

1 (No comments)  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tribal comments.  
4  
5 (No comments)  
6  
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Interagency Staff  
8 Committee comments.  
9  
10 (No comments)  
11  
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Subsistence Resource  
13 Commission. Did you hold a meeting lately, Ray?  
14  
15 MR. COLLINS: We did not discuss this.  
16  
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Fish and Game  
18 Advisory Committee. Did you discuss this proposal at  
19 the McGrath Advisory Committee?  
20  
21 MR. COLLINS: No, because this is aimed  
22 at the Federal, isn't it?  
23  
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Well,  
25 Advisory Committees sometimes take up Federal  
26 proposals.  
27  
28 MR. COLLINS: No, we did not.  
29  
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Summary of written  
31 and public comments. Ann.  
32  
33 MS. WILKINSON: There were none.  
34  
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Public testimony. I  
36 see nobody that's here to testify. The Chair will  
37 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal WP10-70 and 71  
38 combined.  
39  
40 MR. R. WALKER: So moved, Mr. Chairman.  
41  
42 MR. GERVAIS: Second.  
43  
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Deliberation of the  
45 Council. I will make a statement.  
46  
47 Go ahead, Ray.  
48  
49 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I'd have  
50 my comments inserted now that there is no biological

1 reason for reduction and we have an obligation to  
2 provide opportunity for subsistence hunters and,  
3 therefore, I oppose this proposal.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ray. My  
6 comments to the proposals are that we deliberated these  
7 season alignments with the State. There's lots of  
8 harvest opportunity for wolves. It's the discretion of  
9 the subsistence user whether they would like to take  
10 wolves at those ends of the season. We feel that the  
11 subsistence users having harvest opportunity have the  
12 discretion to take or not take wolves at that time of  
13 year, so I'd like to put that back into the record  
14 because that has been part of our deliberation. Any  
15 further comments on the proposal.

16  
17 (No comments)

18  
19 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is  
22 called. Those in favor of reducing the seasons in  
23 Units 19B and 19C, Proposals 70 and 71 signify by  
24 saying aye.

25  
26 (No aye votes)

27  
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same  
29 sign.

30  
31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposals fail. So  
34 now we can move to the statewide proposals, Polly, if  
35 you'd like. Those are on Page 2 of our agenda.  
36 Definition of a drawing permit on Page 31 in our  
37 booklet is where Polly is going to start here.

38  
39 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
40 Again, Polly Wheeler with the Office of Subsistence  
41 Management. The statewide proposals that are before  
42 you, four out of five anyway, are really housekeeping  
43 proposals. I know some of the other Councils haven't  
44 quite understood that or it hasn't been entirely clear  
45 to them, but these are all various housekeeping  
46 proposals. I'll be presenting Proposal 10-01, 10-03,  
47 10-4 and 10-5. Larry Buklis will be presenting the  
48 status report on Proposal 10-02, but I'll go through  
49 them one at a time.

50

1                   As the Chair said, the analysis for  
2 Proposal 10-01 begins on Page 31 in your book. It's a  
3 short analysis. I told my staff I'd give them a prize  
4 for the shortest analysis this time around and this one  
5 is a contender. It was submitted by our office, Office  
6 of Subsistence Management, and basically it requests  
7 the addition of a definition for drawing permit to the  
8 Federal subsistence management regulations.

9  
10                   This is a statewide proposal, so it's  
11 being reviewed and voted on by all 10 Regional Advisory  
12 Councils. The existing Federal subsistence management  
13 regulations do not have a definition for drawing  
14 permit, but we refer to drawing permits in several of  
15 our regulations. So this is a housekeeping proposal.  
16 It's coming up with a definition for drawing permit.

17  
18                   The proposed definition that's on Page  
19 33 is four lines long plus. If you look at the  
20 definition that we've come up with after lots of  
21 different people looked at it and made their comments,  
22 you can see that it's gone from four plus lines to one  
23 and a half lines.

24  
25                   So the recommendation of OSM at this  
26 point in time is to support the definition, which you  
27 can find on Page 34 in your books. It would be in the  
28 general regulations. The definition of a drawing  
29 permit that we're recommending to go with is a permit  
30 issued to a limited number of Federally qualified  
31 subsistence users selected by means of a random  
32 drawing. So we don't have the enforcement conditions  
33 that were in the original.

34  
35                   What happens, just to remind you about  
36 our process, our proposal window is open a long time  
37 before the proposal analyses actually go to you, so by  
38 the time we go through these different renditions, the  
39 Solicitor's Office looks at it, Interagency Staff  
40 Committee looks at it, it takes us a while to sometimes  
41 get where we want to be and that's what happened. We  
42 proposed a definition early on, realized that maybe it  
43 had some problems and landed on a more simple  
44 definition that you can find on Page 34.

45  
46                   Mr. Chair, our recommendation is to  
47 support with modification. Strictly speaking, if you  
48 support the original proposal as proposed, it's support  
49 the proposal. If it's modified in any way, shape or  
50 form from the original proposal, then it's support with

1 modification.

2

3 I hope that's clear, Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That is clear,  
6 Polly. I do like the modified language. I think it  
7 goes more to the heart of .804. Thanks for the  
8 representation. Any questions on the presentation.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Alaska Department of  
13 Fish and Game comments.

14

15 MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chair. We have no  
16 comments to make.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other Federal agency  
19 comments.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Interagency Staff  
24 Committee.

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Subsistence Resource  
29 Commission didn't see this. Fish and Game Advisory  
30 Committee comments. Don't know of any. Summary of  
31 written comments, Ann.

32

33 MS. WILKINSON: There are none, but I  
34 would like to point out that both the North Slope  
35 Council and the Northwest Arctic Council are the only  
36 ones that have met prior to your meeting and they both  
37 voted to support.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's good  
40 to know. Public testimony. Don't see any. Regional  
41 Council deliberation. Your Chair will entertain a  
42 motion to support WP10-01 with modification as  
43 presented on Page 34 by OSM.

44

45 MR. R. WALKER: I'll move.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Robert.  
48 Second.

49

50 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by James.  
2 Further discussion on this basic housekeeping proposal.  
3 The question has been called. Those in favor of  
4 adoption of this language for drawing permit as  
5 modified by OSM signify by saying aye.

6  
7 IN UNISON: Aye.

8  
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same  
10 sign.

11  
12 (No opposing votes)

13  
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal is  
15 supported by the Western Interior Regional Council.  
16 Next proposal. Larry.

17  
18 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
19 The briefing for Proposal WP10-02 is found on Page 35  
20 of your books. This is not an action item for the  
21 Councils at this time. Only informational.

22  
23 Proposal WP08-05 was submitted by the  
24 Alaska Department of Fish and Game during the last  
25 wildlife cycle. It's been renumbered WP10-02 for this  
26 wildlife cycle. The request was for clarification of  
27 the regulation governing the use of brown bear claws in  
28 handicrafts for sale. The Federal Subsistence Board  
29 deferred the proposal at its May 2008 meeting, voting  
30 instead to form a workgroup to develop a method of  
31 tracking brown bear claws made into handicrafts for  
32 sale. The Board directed that the working group include  
33 representatives from all interested Subsistence  
34 Regional Advisory Councils and State and Federal staff.  
35 I believe this Council chose to not send a member.

36  
37 An initial scoping meeting between  
38 Federal and State staff was held in January 2009 and a  
39 draft charge was developed. A briefing on the status of  
40 the workgroup was provided to all Councils during the  
41 Winter 2009 meeting. At that time representatives from  
42 the interested Councils were solicited to participate.  
43 As a workgroup, including the Councils, they met only  
44 once in June 2009. Participants from the Councils posed  
45 questions at that time regarding whether or not bear  
46 claw tracking is a problem for subsistence users and if  
47 regulations needed to be changed.

48  
49 These questions prompted Federal and  
50 State staff to conduct further research. The staff met

1 twice during summer 2009 and a third meeting was  
2 attempted but not held. So we have one meeting of the  
3 workgroup, questions arose, staff met afterwards twice  
4 to address questions.

5  
6 A second briefing was provided during  
7 the fall 2009 Regional Council meeting cycle. Looking  
8 ahead, the workgroup intends to meet during this coming  
9 spring or summer to address those questions raised at  
10 the first and only meeting and to begin working towards  
11 resolution of the issues if possible.

12  
13 The workgroup's findings or conclusions  
14 will be presented to each Council for their  
15 recommendations this fall 2010 and then a report will  
16 be provided to the Federal Subsistence Board at its  
17 January 2011 meeting, a year from now, and Proposal  
18 10-02 will be deferred until that time. So we bring to  
19 closure the workgroup process and WP10-02 would be back  
20 on the table for the Board a year from now. A similar  
21 report would be provided to the Alaska Board of Game at  
22 the appropriate time.

23  
24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. This is  
27 strictly informational for the Councils and I  
28 appreciate being apprised of the progress of this even  
29 though this Council does not entertain the use of bear  
30 parts in that manner. Does the Council have any  
31 comments on the process that's going forward with OSM  
32 and the workgroup.

33  
34 (No comments)

35  
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don't see any  
37 comments. Thanks for that rundown.

38  
39 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Polly, go ahead.

42  
43 DR. WHEELER: Okay. Mr. Chair.  
44 Proposal 10-03, moving right along. This proposal can  
45 be found in your books on Pages 36 to 41. It's a  
46 housekeeping proposal. This proposal was also  
47 submitted by the Office of Subsistence Management and  
48 it requests the addition of a general provision in  
49 Federal subsistence management regulations to allow the  
50 harvest of fish and wildlife by participants in a

1 cultural or educational program. This was actually  
2 raised by a special action we had about a year ago  
3 dealing with sheep up in Anaktuvuk.

4  
5 This proposal is a housekeeping measure  
6 to clarify how these permits are currently issued, but  
7 adoption of this proposal will not change how the  
8 Office of Subsistence Management currently issues these  
9 permits.

10  
11 Most requests for these permits come  
12 from culture camps sponsored by Native nonprofit  
13 organizations. The permits are typically requested  
14 both to teach cultural and educational activities  
15 associated with harvest and to provide food for  
16 participants in the program. Once a program has been  
17 approved for a permit, follow-up requests, referred to  
18 as repeat requests in the regulation, may be made  
19 annually for up to five years by the same cultural or  
20 educational program to harvest the same animal species  
21 and amount.

22  
23 The proposal puts into regulation the  
24 guidelines the Federal program currently follows when  
25 issuing these permits. The regulation has four parts.  
26 First it defines a qualifying program. Second, it  
27 alerts the public that the Office of Subsistence  
28 Management needs time to process the application, while  
29 at the same time it allows the OSM to accept a request  
30 for a permit at any time, which is the current policy.  
31 Third, the modified regulation gives direction to the  
32 local field manager in the area where the harvest will  
33 occur. Fourth, it gives direction on how to issue  
34 follow-up permits.

35  
36 Again, Mr. Chair, this is an example of  
37 where we had an original proposal and then after great  
38 minds came together or not so great minds I guess  
39 sometimes came together, we came up with language that  
40 we felt was a little more streamlined, more accurate,  
41 so that's why OSM preliminary recommendation is to  
42 support the proposal with modification. That language  
43 is on Page 41.

44  
45 Just to give you an example, the  
46 proposed language when we originally came up with this  
47 proposal can be found on Page 38 and 39, somewhat  
48 lengthy. What we finally landed on, the language we're  
49 recommending you all support with modification, is  
50 found on Page 41. I'll point out a few key points.

1 In the original language it was the  
2 applications must be submitted to the Federal  
3 Subsistence Board through the OSM and must be submitted  
4 60 days prior. We thought that was a little harsh, so  
5 we said it should be submitted 60 days prior, but if  
6 it's not submitted 60 days prior it's not going to be  
7 the death knell, so we softened the language a little  
8 bit there. With number 2, it's again should be  
9 submitted. That's a big change. We just kind of  
10 streamlined some of this stuff that didn't really need  
11 to be in regulation. We're trying to look at our  
12 regulations with an eye to keeping them as clean as  
13 possible rather than adding in a bunch of extra  
14 language.

15  
16 So that's all I have, Mr. Chair.

17  
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Polly.  
19 That was a good analysis of how this progressed. I was  
20 aware of that sheep take permit in Anaktuvuk. So is  
21 Council clear on the presentation by Dr. Wheeler. The  
22 Chair will entertain a motion to adopt WP10-03 as  
23 modified and found on Page 41.

24  
25 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So moved by Jenny.

28  
29 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by James.  
32 Further discussion on this proposal on clarification of  
33 language.

34  
35 (No comments)

36  
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of  
38 the proposal as modified signify by saying aye.

39  
40 IN UNISON: Aye.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same

43 sign.

44  
45 (No opposing votes)

46  
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal is adopted

48 by the Western Interior Council. Moving on to the

49 WP-04. Go ahead, Polly.  
50

1 DR. WHEELER: Okay. Proposal 10-04  
2 can be found in your books on Pages 42 to 55. This  
3 proposal was also submitted by the Office of  
4 Subsistence Management. See, we do things other than  
5 attend meetings. We also submit proposals to  
6 ourselves. This proposal would remove a number of Game  
7 Management Units from the areas for which the Assistant  
8 Regional Director for Subsistence Management has the  
9 delegated authority to open, close or adjust Federal  
10 subsistence lynx seasons and to set harvest and  
11 possession limits.

12  
13 You might ask why this proposal is  
14 before you and the answer is that it's a statewide  
15 proposal because the current C&T finding is for all  
16 rural residents. Some of the Councils we've presented  
17 this to thus far have been a little confused as to why  
18 it's before them, but that is why.

19  
20 Lynx trapping seasons are adjusted  
21 annually based on recommendations determined using  
22 Alaska Department of Fish and Game Tracking Harvest  
23 Strategy for managing lynx. The Alaska Board of Game  
24 removed Units 6, 12, 20A, 20B, 20C east of the  
25 Teklanika River, 20D and 20E from the list of units  
26 that are managed using the lynx harvest strategy.  
27 Based on this action these units should also be  
28 eliminated from Federal regulation.

29  
30 Just a little bit of background. Over  
31 time the State has removed a number of units from its  
32 lynx tracking strategy. If this proposal is adopted,  
33 it would align Federal and State regulations regarding  
34 lynx management. I would say that as an aside our  
35 program has consistently followed the direction of the  
36 State with regard to lynx management in particular.

37  
38 If this proposal is adopted, it would  
39 align Federal and State regulations. Season and  
40 harvest limits can still be changed through the normal  
41 regulatory cycle or through special action if needed.  
42 We don't believe there will be any adverse impacts to  
43 subsistence users. Really, only the authority  
44 delegated to the Assistant Regional Director for the  
45 Office of Subsistence Management would be affected.

46  
47 So the preliminary conclusion, Mr.  
48 Chair, on Page 45 of your books, is to support with  
49 modification to delete all the regulatory language and  
50 delegate the authority to open, close, or adjust

1 Federal lynx seasons and to set harvest and possession  
2 limits for lynx via a delegation of authority letter  
3 only. So it would take all of this out of regulation.  
4 The authority would be delegated to the Assistant  
5 Regional Director for the Office of Subsistence  
6 Management and a sample letter can be found in your  
7 books on Pages 54 and 55.

8

9 In the past, the delegation of  
10 authority has been a lot of how fisheries are managed  
11 with the thought that it requires more in time  
12 management, but we are -- over time, we do delegate a  
13 fair amount of authority to refuge managers, to other  
14 people for managing hunts. So we've been taking some  
15 things out of regulation and putting them into the  
16 delegated authority letters.

17

18 Mr. Chair and Council members, that's  
19 all I have.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I just got word  
22 Eastern Interior is deliberating a proposal on the  
23 other side and they want to talk to me about that  
24 proposal. We'll finish this before I walk over  
25 there. I had one question on your presentation. If  
26 there is a change decided on, the Councils would be  
27 appraised of any changes that may occur? This  
28 delegation of authority, consultation would be with the  
29 Councils?

30

31 DR. WHEELER: With the affected RACs,  
32 yes.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's the question  
35 I had. Is the Council clear on the presentation. Go  
36 ahead, Robert.

37

38 MR. R. WALKER: Polly, when you get to  
39 OSM primary conclusion, you know, we've got all these  
40 agencies and not one has written oppose or support.  
41 I'm just kind of curious. How long has this proposal  
42 been out there?

43

44 DR. WHEELER: Through the Chair.  
45 Member Walker. Are you talking about the Regional  
46 Advisory Councils, their support? The Council meeting  
47 window started last week, so last week North Slope met  
48 on Tuesday and Northwest Arctic met on Friday and then  
49 this week is Eastern and Western Interior. So the  
50 window just started. These books are published long

1 before the meetings start. My understanding is the  
2 Northwest Arctic Council did not support this proposal,  
3 the North Slope Council did. The Northwest Arctic  
4 Council had concerns about aligning with the State. I  
5 would point out that we have consistently aligned with  
6 the State on lynx management in particular, so this is  
7 carrying that pattern through.

8

9 Mr. Chair, Member Walker.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Eastern Interior is  
12 requesting my presence for a comment on a proposal in  
13 the next room. I'll hand this over to the vice chair  
14 and I'll be back when they get through with me, which  
15 should be shortly. I am in support of this concept  
16 myself, but I have to spread my time out. I'll be back  
17 in a couple minutes.

18

19 MR. COLLINS: Any comments from the  
20 Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

21

22 MR. CAMPBELL: No comments at this  
23 time, Mr. Chair.

24

25 MR. COLLINS: Any other Federal, State,  
26 Tribal agencies wishing to comment.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 MR. COLLINS: Interagency Staff or  
31 committee comments.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 MR. COLLINS: SRC, we have no comments  
36 from SRC that have come in. Fish and Game Advisory  
37 Committees, no comments have come in.

38

39 MS. WILKINSON: None.

40

41 MR. COLLINS: So there is no written  
42 public comments. Public testimony on this.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 MR. COLLINS: Hearing none, we'll move  
47 on. Regional Council deliberation. I need a motion to  
48 approve.

49

50 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.

1 MR. COLLINS: Moved by James. Is there  
2 a second.  
3  
4 MR. GERVAIS: Second.  
5  
6 MR. COLLINS: Seconded by Tim.  
7  
8 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chair. Is that a  
9 motion to support with modification?  
10  
11 MR. COLLINS: Yes. Support with  
12 modification as found on Page....  
13  
14 DR. WHEELER: 45.  
15  
16 MR. COLLINS: .....45. Comments by the  
17 Council members.  
18  
19 (No comments)  
20  
21 MR. COLLINS: Hearing none. All those  
22 in favor signify by saying aye.  
23  
24 IN UNISON: Aye.  
25  
26 MR. COLLINS: Opposed same sign.  
27  
28 (No opposing votes)  
29  
30 MR. COLLINS: Hearing none, vote is  
31 unanimous.  
32  
33 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. That clears  
34 up Proposal 10-04. We still have one more statewide  
35 proposal, which I can go into now.  
36  
37 MR. COLLINS: Go ahead.  
38  
39 DR. WHEELER: Thank you for your  
40 patience. Proposal 10-05 can be found in your books on  
41 Pages 56 to 62. This was also submitted by Office of  
42 Subsistence Management. The proposal seeks to update,  
43 clarify, and simplify the regulations regarding  
44 accumulation of harvest limits for both fish and  
45 wildlife.  
46  
47 This is a statewide proposal, so all 10  
48 Councils will be hearing the presentation and making a  
49 recommendation. The wording in general Federal  
50 subsistence regulations concerning accumulation of

1 harvest limits dates back to 1990 and 1994. While the  
2 Board has addressed a number of area specific proposals  
3 concerning the accumulation of harvest limits over the  
4 years, this part of the general regulations has not  
5 been updated to reflect changes to the unit and area  
6 specific regulations.

7

8 This proposal was submitted because  
9 there's a need to update the wording. So Proposal 10-  
10 05 addresses the inconsistencies in the regulations.  
11 It does not affect fish and wildlife populations,  
12 subsistence uses or other uses. Rather, the proposal  
13 seeks to update, clarify, and simplify the sections of  
14 the general regulations which reference accumulation of  
15 harvest limits.

16

17 The proposed wording changes retain the  
18 general prohibition of accumulation of Federal and  
19 State harvest limits, and points to unit and area  
20 specific regulations for details and exceptions. This  
21 proposal does not change any unit or area specific  
22 Federal subsistence regulations concerning accumulation  
23 of harvest limits or the timeframe, daily, seasonal or  
24 regulatory year, for harvest limits.

25

26 So the OSM preliminary conclusion is  
27 simply to support Proposal 10-05. That, Mr. Chair,  
28 concludes my presentation. I would say there's a typo  
29 on Page 62. That should be support Proposal 10-05, not  
30 09-05.

31

32 Mr. Chair.

33

34 MR. COLLINS: Thank you. Any comments  
35 or questions for Polly.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 MR. COLLINS: Do we have comments from  
40 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

41

42 MR. CAMPBELL: No comments at this  
43 time, Mr. Chair.

44

45 MR. COLLINS: Okay. Any other Federal,  
46 State, Tribal agencies wishing to comment.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 MR. COLLINS: Interagency Staff or

1 committee comments.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 MR. COLLINS: None. Any of the SRCs  
6 present.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 MR. COLLINS: Any Fish and Game  
11 Advisory Committees.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 MR. COLLINS: Do you have any written  
16 comments that have come in?

17

18 MS. WILKINSON: No, sir, there are no  
19 written public comments, but I would like to point out  
20 that the Northwest Arctic and North Slope Regional  
21 Councils both opposed this proposal.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: Did they state reasons  
24 for that?

25

26 MS. WILKINSON: Well, the North Slope  
27 said that they prefer the status quo. Northwest Arctic  
28 didn't offer anything.

29

30 MR. COLLINS: Polly, do you have any  
31 comments on their comments?

32

33 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. I think  
34 that.....

35

36 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chair. I'm sorry,  
37 I just saw that the Northwest Arctic said for number 5  
38 to clarify the regulations -- never mind. I'm sorry.  
39 They just wrote down the proposal again.

40

41 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. You're well  
42 aware, you've been with this program since the  
43 inception of the program. Sometimes there's a  
44 flashpoint between the State and the Federal programs  
45 and I think sometimes when we have proposals,  
46 particularly statewide proposals that talk about any  
47 kind of alignment with State regulations or trying to  
48 work with the State to resolve some of these issues it  
49 becomes a point of contention for some of the Councils  
50 and sometimes they can't really get past that. I think

1 the opposition to some of these statewide proposals is  
2 based on that. It's more taking a position against  
3 State management or something else. As you are all  
4 aware, our goal is to make the regulations as clear as  
5 possible and to clearly address the Federal subsistence  
6 mandates and not get people pinched if our regulations  
7 aren't clear.

8

9 So that's our goal here if that's  
10 helpful, Mr. Chair.

11

12 MR. COLLINS: Thank you. We're down to  
13 public testimony on that then. Is there any public  
14 testimony.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 MR. COLLINS: Hearing none. We're down  
19 to Regional Council deliberation and recommendation. A  
20 motion would be appropriate at this time to adopt.

21

22 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

23

24 MR. COLLINS: Moved by Jenny. Is there  
25 a second.

26

27 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

28

29 MR. COLLINS: Seconded by James.  
30 Discussion.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 MR. J. WALKER: Question.

35

36 MR. COLLINS: The question has been  
37 called. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

38

39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40

41 MR. COLLINS: Opposed same sign.

42

43 (No opposing votes)

44

45 MR. COLLINS: Hearing none, motion  
46 carried unanimous.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm back from the  
49 Eastern Interior Council meeting. They had some  
50 questions on a proposal I had submitted for Unit 25A,

1 so I clarified those issues to the Council. It's not  
2 within our region, but we do have a customary and  
3 traditional use on that side.

4  
5 So we're finished with the statewide  
6 proposals then I see. The crossover proposals, should  
7 we cover that? That's Proposal WP51 and 53, found on  
8 Page 131 of our meeting book. We'll have a  
9 presentation on that.

10  
11 Go ahead, Larry.

12  
13 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
14 Proposals 51 and 53 were submitted by the Bristol Bay  
15 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. Proposal WP10-51  
16 requests that the caribou season in Units 9A, 9B, 17B,  
17 a portion of 17C, 18, 19A, and 19B be established as  
18 August 1st through March 31st within the range of the  
19 Mulchatna Caribou Herd. Proposal WP10-53 requests that  
20 the harvest limit for caribou be set at two within the  
21 herd range.

22  
23 The proponent states that the change in  
24 the season dates and harvest limit will provide  
25 consistency for managing the Mulchatna Caribou Herd on  
26 Federal public lands. Consistency will also be  
27 provided with State regulations relative to the harvest  
28 limits, but the season date request would not match the  
29 State.

30  
31 In 1991, the Mulchatna Caribou Herd  
32 population was estimated at 90,000 and grew to about  
33 200,000 by 1996, but then declined to an estimate of  
34 about 30,000 in 2008. Bull/cow ratios have been  
35 estimated at less than 35 bulls per 100 cows for the  
36 range of 2001 to 2008, with the ratio for 2008 being 19  
37 to 100.

38  
39 Caribou harvest continues to decline.  
40 Harvest within each unit has fluctuated and appears to  
41 have been highest in Units 9B, 9C, 17B, and Unit 18 for  
42 the recent 2005 to 2008 period. The harvest of males  
43 was as high as 86 percent in 1991/92, but decreased to  
44 48 percent male in 2005/06. Most reported harvest  
45 occurs in August and September. The month of March  
46 also accounts for a relatively large amount of the  
47 harvest.

48  
49 Proposal 51, the one that addresses  
50 seasons, would lengthen the seasons in some units and

1 shorten in others. Extending the season to the end of  
2 March as proposed when weather and daylight are more  
3 favorable would likely increase the harvest. Opening  
4 the season earlier is not thought to have much effect  
5 on the harvest as most hunting occurs after July.

6  
7 Proposal 53 would likely decrease  
8 overall harvest and help conserve bull caribou. That  
9 proposal would set the harvest limit to two, which is a  
10 reduction throughout most of the range. It's a small  
11 increase from one to two in two areas. Specifically,  
12 it would increase from one to two in Unit 9C, that  
13 portion within the Alagnak drainage and it would  
14 increase from one to two in Unit 19A north of the  
15 Kuskokwim River, but otherwise it's a decrease.

16  
17 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to  
18 support Proposal 51 with modification, to make the  
19 season ending date March 15 for all units. For  
20 Proposal 53, the OSM preliminary conclusion is to  
21 support the proposal. That's the adjustment to harvest  
22 limit of two.

23  
24 Justification statement. Based on the  
25 declining Mulchatna Caribou Herd population with no  
26 indication of stabilization, conservation concerns  
27 necessitate a reduction in harvest.

28  
29 Adopting Proposal 51 with the  
30 modification to end the season March 15 would reduce  
31 season lengths in most units, thereby reducing harvest  
32 and would align with the State regulations.

33  
34 Adopting 53 would lower the harvest  
35 limit for most units, thereby helping to reduce the  
36 overall harvest and it provides consistency with the  
37 State regulations.

38  
39 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Larry. Any  
42 questions on the presentation of the proposal. I  
43 missed who it was made by.

44  
45 MR. BUKLIS: Bristol Bay Regional  
46 Advisory Council on both counts.

47  
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So any questions in  
49 regards to the proposal or the presentation and the  
50 OSM's recommendation on season modification.

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. That's  
4 good, Larry. Thanks. Does Alaska Department of Fish  
5 and Game have comments on these proposals.

6

7 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
8 Members of the Council. Like OSM, the Department of  
9 Fish and Game supports both of these proposals, however  
10 we would like to modify the Wildlife Proposal 10-51,  
11 which looks to extend the season. Rather than be the  
12 30th of March, we would like it to align with the  
13 current State season, which is the 15th of March, so  
14 exactly the same as OSM.

15

16 We do have some additional comments  
17 we'd like to add as a precursor. As written, the  
18 proposal appears to be a substantial reduction in  
19 hunting opportunity because of the shortened season  
20 linked for most of the herd's range. However, the  
21 realistic effect is that this proposal would likely  
22 result in additional harvest because the season would  
23 be extended in Unit 18, which currently finishes  
24 before the 15th of March. This is where the bulk of  
25 the reported harvest from the herd has occurred for the  
26 past several years under the existing dates.

27

28 While the bulk of the proposal would  
29 shorten the seasons, it would increase it in Unit 18.  
30 Just a comment the staff asked me to pass on.

31

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

35

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

38

39 Wildlife Proposal WP10-51: (GMU 9A,  
40 9B, 9C, 17A, 17B, 18, 19A caribou seasons)

41

42 Wildlife Proposal WP10-53:

43

44 (GMU 9A, 9B, 9C, 17A, 17B, 17C, 18, 19A  
45 caribou bag limit) Proposal WP10-51 would align  
46 federal subsistence opening and closing dates for  
47 caribou hunting on federal public lands throughout most  
48 of the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. Proposal  
49 53 would align federal subsistence bag limits for  
50 caribou hunting on federal public lands throughout most

1 of the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

2

3

Introduction:

4

5

Declines in the Mulchatna Caribou Herd from its peak population in the mid-1990s necessitated reduced season and bag limits throughout the herd s range as the population changed. Earlier changes in federal subsistence hunting regulations kept pace with changes made by the Alaska Board of Game in response to population changes. Present federal subsistence hunting regulations throughout the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd are inconsistent between Game Management Units. Changing the federal subsistence hunting regulations for caribou in the range of the Mulchatna Herd to uniform regulations will reduce confusion for hunters.

18

19

Impact on Subsistence Users:

20

21

Proposal WP10-51 would shorten the caribou hunting season in those areas where the federal subsistence hunting season for caribou presently closes after March 31 (Units 9B, 17B, and that portion of 17C east of the Wood River and Wood River lakes, 19A south of the Kuskokwim River, and 19B). This proposal would lengthen the caribou hunting season in those areas where the federal subsistence hunting season for caribou presently closes before March 31 (Units 18 and 19A north of the Kuskokwim River). By establishing consistent federal subsistence opening and closing hunting season dates, confusion by hunters over what federal areas are open will be reduced. Establishing dates that are not aligned with present state hunting season dates will create confusion because of the mixed land ownership patterns throughout the range of the herd. The shorter state season, ending March 15, occurs during a time when travel conditions are poor so would have little impact on federally-qualified subsistence users and reduce risk of enforcement actions.

42

43

Proposal 53 would reduce the caribou bag limit in those areas where the federal subsistence bag limit is presently greater than two caribou (Units 9A and B, 17A, B and C, 18, 19A south of the Kuskokwim River, and 19B). This proposal would increase the caribou bag limit in those areas where the federal subsistence bag limit is presently less than two caribou (Units 9C that portion in the Alagnak River

1 drainage, and 19A that portion north of the Kuskokwim  
2 River). By establishing consistent federal subsistence  
3 bag limits, confusion by hunters over how many caribou  
4 can be taken on which federal public lands will be  
5 reduced. In addition, because of the mixed land  
6 ownership patterns throughout the range of the herd,  
7 aligning federal subsistence caribou hunting bag limits  
8 with present state caribou hunting bag limits will  
9 further reduce confusion and risk of enforcement  
10 actions.

11

12 Opportunity Provided by State:

13

14 Present state hunting season and bag  
15 limits throughout most of the range of the Mulchatna  
16 Caribou Herd are August 1 through March 15, and 2  
17 caribou (no more than one bull may be taken, of which  
18 no more than one caribou may be taken from August 1  
19 through January 31). The exception to this is the area  
20 of eastern Unit 17A and southwestern Unit 17C (that  
21 area north of the Nushagak Peninsula) which may be  
22 opened by Emergency Order authority with a bag limit of  
23 one caribou. Recent action by the Alaska Board of Game  
24 closed caribou hunting by nonresidents throughout the  
25 range of the herd to assure a subsistence preference  
26 for Alaska residents.

27

28 Conservation Issues:

29

30 Hunting season dates and bag limit were  
31 liberalized as the Mulchatna Caribou Herd grew in size  
32 and expanded in range. Similarly, reductions in season  
33 and bag limits are necessary to manage declines in this  
34 herd. While all the reasons for the herd s growth and  
35 subsequent decline are not well understood, reductions  
36 in take have been recognized as essential to reduce the  
37 rate of decline.

38

39 A regulation change at this time that  
40 would result in additional caribou taken during late  
41 spring (i.e. in Unit 18) would be inconsistent with  
42 other management actions undertaken for this herd.  
43 There is no need to separate the caribou season north  
44 of the Kuskokwim River in Unit 19A since this area is  
45 generally unoccupied by caribou.

46

47 A regulation change at this time to  
48 reduce the number of caribou allowed in those areas  
49 with present larger bag limits, as well as to establish  
50 uniform bag limits throughout the range of this herd,

1 is warranted.

2

3

Enforcement Issues:

4

5

Proposal WP10-51 changes in season dates for federal public lands would open the same but would end two weeks later than the state caribou hunting season. Proposal WP10-53 changes of federal subsistence bag limits for Mulchatna caribou on federal public land would be consistent with present state caribou bag limits. Federal public lands occur throughout a great part of the herd s range and are scattered and not contiguous (especially in Units 9B, 17B and C, and 19A and B). In addition, much of the area around villages in Unit 18 is under state regulations. It may be difficult for federally qualified subsistence users to easily discern land ownership from the ground and be sure they are hunting on federal land.

20

21

Other Comments:

22

23

As written, the proposal appears to be a substantial reduction in hunting opportunity (because of the shortened season length from most of the herd s range). However, the realistic effect is that the proposal will likely result in additional harvest because the season would be extended in Unit 18, where the bulk of the reported harvest from the herd has occurred for the past several years under existing season dates.

32

33

Recommendation:

34

35

Support with modification to amend the closing date to align with state hunting season dates, closing the season on March 15.

38

39

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question, Tim?

40

41

MR. GERVAIS: Why is the harvest coming out of 18?

42

43

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't have that information. Sorry, Tim.

46

47

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other questions. Your staff said the bulk of harvest, winter harvest is coming from Unit 18 or is it bulk of harvest?

50

1 MR. CAMPBELL: Bulk of reported  
2 harvest, so there must be data from the permits on  
3 record somewhere, but I can get them for you.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I was wondering if  
6 that's delineated as Federal reported harvest, local  
7 harvest or if that's harvest by all users, the general  
8 hunt. That's page what, Polly?

9  
10 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. It's on Page  
11 143 in your books. This table should be titled  
12 reported caribou harvest by unit and residency.

13  
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I see a  
15 fairly consistent high harvest in Unit 18 by resident  
16 and that means resident of the unit. I see a steadily  
17 increasing non-resident harvest. Go ahead, Tim.

18  
19 MR. GERVAIS: I would think, since this  
20 is Fish and Game's numbers, they're talking  
21 resident/non-resident regarding the state residency.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, that would be.  
24 And so I am concerned. What is the State season? It's  
25 February 28 on the closure?

26  
27 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. I don't  
28 mean to interrupt the dialogue with State comments, but  
29 a little bit of confusion here. Beyond the harvest  
30 data, if you look at Pages 132, 133 of your book, that  
31 shows the existing regulations and the next two pages  
32 show the proposed regulations. We're talking about --  
33 the question has been raised about Unit 18. Page 133  
34 we show the existing Federal regulations. Unit 18,  
35 August 1st to March 15th.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

38  
39 MR. BUKLIS: I understand the proposal  
40 on those next two pages would extend -- would set the  
41 ending date to March 31st, which in this case in Unit  
42 18 is an extension. But the OSM conclusion was not to  
43 so extend. When the State comments supported the  
44 proposal with modification consistent with OSM, which  
45 would truncate on the 15th, then that preceding comment  
46 about concern with Unit 18 is addressed.

47  
48 MR. CAMPBELL: I was just pointing it  
49 out that it would be an increase in season in Unit 18.  
50

1 MR. BUKLIS: By the proposal.  
2  
3 MR. CAMPBELL: By the proposal, yeah.  
4  
5 MR. BUKLIS: But the modification  
6 package reverses that.  
7  
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That  
9 clarifies the issue. I see where we are at here. I  
10 concur with the OSM closure date. I would comment to  
11 the State that I'm concerned -- and you can bring this  
12 back to headquarters. I'm very concerned with the  
13 increasing number of bull caribou harvest by non-  
14 residents in Unit 18 for Mulchatna caribou. The table  
15 here on the bull/cow ratio in '08-'09 shows that the  
16 bull/cow ratio is declining from '08. From '07 is 14.9  
17 bulls and that's all bulls and mostly small bulls. It  
18 starts to increase to 23 bulls and starts going down  
19 again. That is a very bad sign.  
20  
21 I want to send this back to  
22 headquarters that I think the Department should be  
23 promulgating regulations to control the non-resident  
24 harvest in Unit 18. The Board of Game precluded  
25 harvest in the other Game Management Units associated  
26 with the Mulchatna Herd last spring, so this is  
27 intolerable that we have a declining bull/cow ratio  
28 below management objective of 35 bulls per 100 cows.  
29  
30 My position is the Department is  
31 swatting at gnats here and swallowing camels because we  
32 have the non-residents targeting the largest bulls in  
33 the population, which we have in '07 1.33 large bulls  
34 per 100 cows.  
35  
36 I went through the data and broke it  
37 out. It was all camouflaged in percentage. The  
38 reality is there was only one large bull per 100 cows.  
39 If you're breeding reindeer, you have to have one bull  
40 per 20 cows. You have one-fifth of the breeding  
41 capacity that you should have and you're escalating a  
42 non-resident harvest in Unit 18. I want that to go  
43 back to the Department's headquarters. You've got a  
44 comment there, Tim.  
45  
46 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah. I think you're  
47 reading those years  
48 backwards, Jack. I'm reading the Unit 18 non-  
49 residents.....  
50

1                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I'm reading this  
2 wrong. Excuse me. I read the data presentation wrong  
3 here and I'll retract everything I just said. I'm  
4 still concerned that we have any non-resident harvest  
5 for bull caribou for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. Unit  
6 18 should have zero non-resident. Any take is  
7 intolerable. There's no bulls to give. We're taking  
8 subsistence restrictions. We're taking resident  
9 restrictions. So four bulls is intolerable when we  
10 have not enough bulls for breeding capacity. With this  
11 kind of a herd decline I'm still concerned with any  
12 non-resident harvest.

13

14                   Further comments, Tim.

15

16                   MR. GERVAIS: Yes. If you want to  
17 discuss non-resident harvest, I see guides down in that  
18 area and 17B is a common area for non-resident hunting  
19 to take place. Even though the overall non-resident  
20 harvest has declined, the proportion of that to  
21 resident harvest is actually increasing. The current  
22 state that that scenario where the non-resident hunting  
23 is gaining a higher percentage over the resident  
24 hunting.

25

26                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I seem to be adamant  
27 about this issue because I feel it's the primary cause  
28 of the demise of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. When the  
29 bull component was eliminated from the population, the  
30 breeding capacity of the herd went over a cliff. I've  
31 researched lots of information. I'm building a  
32 bibliography of various studies in various parts of the  
33 world for various ungulates showing that when you  
34 eliminate three year old and older bulls from  
35 populations the estrus cycles are pushed backwards and  
36 here are caribou that have specific calf timings for  
37 dropping calves when the tundra is in blossom.

38

39                   So when you eliminate all the large  
40 bulls from the population you push the estrus cycle  
41 back of the main population and it reduces the stature  
42 of the calves, it subjects them to longer predation  
43 factors and they don't overwinter as well. So you  
44 watch your recruitments go over a cliff as shown in the  
45 biological data here. I'm still concerned with any  
46 additional bull harvest. I just wanted to put that on  
47 the record since the State is making comments to the  
48 proposal.

49

50                   Go ahead, Mitch.

1 MR. CAMPBELL: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.  
2 I'll take those comments back to headquarters and to  
3 the wildlife managers for that region.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. I  
6 appreciate that. Carl.

7  
8 MR. MORGAN: Like you, I am concerned  
9 about the non-residents, but I see 17B is one of the  
10 higher ones. If you come across and go to 19B it's the  
11 next one and those people are strictly all non-  
12 residents. Usually in 19B are pretty close to the  
13 migration where the caribou travel. They're taking as  
14 of '08 they took -- it would be safe to say 16 big  
15 bulls.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's what non-  
18 residents come here for, is for antler. I'm not  
19 opposed to non-residents taking caribou if we have the  
20 extra provision in the population, but I am opposed to  
21 eroding our breeding capacity and causing these kinds  
22 of declines and the hardships and the kinds of  
23 proposals that these Councils have to deal with when  
24 the herds decline and the hardship it puts upon the  
25 people.

26  
27 I'm impassioned with this because right  
28 now in Unit 26B the State has a proposal to increase  
29 bag limit 150 percent and increase cow harvest into  
30 September for non-resident hunters and I'm very  
31 concerned about the Central Arctic Caribou Herd. This  
32 is exactly what happened to Mulchatna. The same kind  
33 of proposals went forward and the herd went over a  
34 cliff. Look at the numbers. They go from 200,000 to  
35 less than 30,000 in a very short timeframe. That's why  
36 my ire is up a little bit. I've got to quit drinking  
37 so much coffee.

38  
39 (Laughter)

40  
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further  
42 discussion. The Council was finished with the State  
43 comments. The Interagency Staff Committees. I don't  
44 know that the Subsistence Resource Commission has met.  
45 We had Park Service around. Did Lake Clark meet on  
46 this? Do you know if we have any Lake Clark comments?

47  
48 MR. KRUPA: I did not get a report.  
49 Somebody next door might know, but I did not hear.  
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'd like to know if  
2 the SRC commented on this proposal. The Fish and Game  
3 Advisory Committees, did we get any comments? Carl, do  
4 you know of any Advisory Committee comments?

5  
6 MR. MORGAN: No, not at this time.

7  
8 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair. We didn't  
9 address it in McGrath because our season isn't proposed  
10 -- there's no proposed change to 19D and C.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Summary of written  
13 comments. Ann, any of those?

14  
15 MS. WILKINSON: There were none.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Public testimony.  
18 Don't see anybody here to comment on that. The Chair  
19 will entertain a motion to adopt OSM's preliminary  
20 conclusion to support with modification Proposal 51 and  
21 to support 53 and OSM has basically dropped back to  
22 March 15th closures with August 1 openings throughout  
23 those affected Game Management Units. These are for  
24 Federally qualified subsistence users. This is for the  
25 constituents of this Council. Do we have a motion to  
26 adopt the modified proposals presented by OSM.

27  
28 MR. J. WALKER: So moved with  
29 modification.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do I have a second.

32  
33 MR. COLLINS: Second.

34  
35 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Discussion of the  
38 Council. Robert.

39  
40 MR. R. WALKER: Yes. Jack, what is the  
41 State doing? What are their proposals to start the  
42 State side of doing things here?

43  
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does anybody have  
45 the State regulations, what the State is actually --  
46 what we're actually comparing is what Robert is asking.

47  
48 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. The  
49 existing State regulations are in the analysis, Pages  
50 136 and 137.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.  
2  
3 MR. BUKLIS: And you can see this would  
4 match those seasons and harvest limits.  
5  
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So this is in  
7 alignment with the State. That clarifies it for the  
8 subsistence users. Any further comment or discussion.  
9  
10 (No comments)  
11  
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have any  
13 feelings on this, Carl? This is kind of down in your  
14 neck of the woods.  
15  
16 MR. MORGAN: I support what OSM has  
17 recommended.  
18  
19 MR. J. WALKER: Question.  
20  
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is  
22 called on the modified Proposals 10-51 and 10-53 as  
23 presented by OSM. Those in favor of the proposal  
24 signify by saying aye.  
25  
26 IN UNISON: Aye.  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same  
29 sign.  
30  
31 (No opposing votes)  
32  
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Western  
34 Interior has adopted the amended language on these  
35 proposals. We're back to -- how are people feeling.  
36 Do you need a break at all?  
37  
38 MR. R. WALKER: Yes.  
39  
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes? Okay, we can  
41 go for a short break.  
42  
43 (Off record)  
44  
45 (On record)  
46  
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Back on the record.  
48 We've got some Council members out in the hall or  
49 someplace. Could you grab them for me, Jetta. At the  
50 break I was informed that the area biologist was

1 unhappy that we did not eliminate the winter Federal  
2 hunt, which I did not know in the presentation that we  
3 had on Proposal 91 that he was requesting us to not  
4 adopt 91. He never said anything about elimination of  
5 the winter Federal hunt. So I'm confused by that, so I  
6 just stated that for the record.

7  
8                   So we're going to continue through our  
9 agenda here. We've gone through crossover proposals.  
10 We've gone through the state proposals. We have 20E  
11 proposals, which we will do tomorrow morning because  
12 the State biologist wanted to be here for those in case  
13 we needed him. So we can move into some of these State  
14 proposals. The State hunting season and bag limits.

15  
16                   I just went through the State proposals  
17 and found various proposals that actually affected our  
18 region, so I just threw these out here. I haven't  
19 triaged them yet. Maybe we could take a couple minutes  
20 and you could look on Page 3 of our book here. It  
21 gives a list of State proposals. If you see any that  
22 are very pressing that you feel should come up high on  
23 your list. If not, we'll work down through this  
24 proposal list. We've covered two of the State  
25 proposals, 90, 90A and 91 so far.

26  
27                   Do Council members have any particular  
28 proposals that you feel are pressing and should come up  
29 first in our deliberations? Tim.

30  
31                   MR. GERVAIS: Yes. I had a couple, but  
32 I wanted to discuss some with the area biologist.

33  
34                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Which ones are  
35 those?

36  
37                   MR. GERVAIS: Stand by. Proposal 92,  
38 taking of game by proxy and then Proposal 88 on  
39 changing a moose hunt area boundary in 21B.

40  
41                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. And those  
42 proposals are within the Galena area biologist region  
43 or area. The Galena area biologist vacated the meeting  
44 before -- I'm on the record here that he vacated the  
45 meeting with standing proposals before the Council. So  
46 we want to deliberate proposals and he's gone.

47  
48                   I would like the State liaison to  
49 understand that it's necessary if these Councils are  
50 going to deliberate proposals that we need to have the

1 area biologist present. That's why I'm holding on 20E  
2 proposals because the State biologist wanted to be  
3 present and I'm holding for him, but we have many  
4 Galena area proposals here. It's becoming more and  
5 more frustrating today with some of these personality  
6 conflicts or whatever they may be.

7

8 Can you find a proposal that does not  
9 entail Galena area, Tim, that you would like to talk  
10 about?

11

12 MR. GERVAIS: I like that list I gave  
13 you earlier. I'd like to add Proposal 88 to that also.  
14 I'm sorry, Proposal 89. It's changing the meat on bone  
15 requirements for subsistence registration permits.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: State Proposal 89?  
18 No, that's not what that says. That's a controlled use  
19 area permit. You must have old.....

20

21 MR. GERVAIS: These were Xeroxes I got  
22 out of.....

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see right here.  
25 You're right.

26

27 MR. GERVAIS: It says Proposal 89, 5  
28 AAC 92.540 controlled use area.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Yeah, you're  
31 right.

32

33 MR. GERVAIS: Then in section four  
34 requiring edible meat on neck and back of any moose  
35 must remain on the bone. Do you want to talk about  
36 this now?

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, this is a  
39 Department proposal and I feel uncomfortable talking  
40 about a proposal without the Department being here.  
41 That's something I don't particularly want to do. I  
42 always encourage the State to be present when we  
43 deliberate State proposals. I'll note that you're  
44 wanting to discuss Proposal 89 and the area biologist  
45 has vacated the room prematurely. This agenda has been  
46 published for many weeks now and it's apparent that the  
47 area biologist is not present, so I can't deliberate  
48 the proposal without the proponent being here.

49

50 MR. CAMPBELL: We can't go into detail

1 because I don't have the information here.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. So I will  
4 have to work around his protest, walk-out or whatever  
5 you want to -- hunger strike or whatever you might want  
6 to call it. So we have to move into proposals that do  
7 not have that biologist.

8

9 You have a comment there, Polly.

10

11 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. I would say I  
12 recognize your problem here or your frustration, but I  
13 would say out of respect for the State they do have a  
14 10-day Board of Game meeting starting the day after  
15 tomorrow. We scheduled this meeting. We have our  
16 process, they have their process. I know they're  
17 feeling the pressure right now too. I'm just putting  
18 that on the record because I don't think it's entirely  
19 fair to the RAC.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate that.  
22 I can see that. I need direction from the Staff here.  
23 I'm in a quandary. I have lots of agenda to go through  
24 and I have mainly State proposals.

25

26 Do you have any ideas, Polly?

27

28 DR. WHEELER: Well, I think that, Mr.  
29 Chair, you're familiar with the State process, as am I,  
30 as are some other people in this room. You've read  
31 through the proposals. You sort of had your initial  
32 hit list. You may want to take a few minutes to kind  
33 of go through the proposals and take a position based  
34 on what's in front of them. Obviously as Federal staff  
35 we can't give you much background aside from what's in  
36 the proposal. But if you're familiar enough with the  
37 proposals that you can take a first stab at supporting  
38 or not supporting.

39

40 Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks for  
43 that, Polly. We can work through some of these on the  
44 periphery. If I could get some kind of idea if the  
45 State biologist is going to come back tomorrow, that  
46 would help me out. Does he have a cell number? Can  
47 you call him up?

48

49 MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, I've never -- this  
50 is the first time I've ever met the guy is today.

1                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. So if you  
2 could find out if he's.....  
3  
4                   MR. CAMPBELL: I can get George to  
5 contact him. Is the normal procedure that the State  
6 comes and presents these proposals at these meetings?  
7  
8                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There's usually a  
9 dialogue with the State with these various proposals.  
10 Do you have comments, Polly.  
11  
12                   DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. I don't know  
13 if the area biologist is going to come back. I suspect  
14 that he may not because, again, the Board of Game is  
15 starting the day after tomorrow and they have to do  
16 reports and everything else.  
17  
18                   We have several options. You can march  
19 through the proposals. You can take up the call for  
20 fisheries proposals, which is an item on your agenda.  
21 Item 8 is the call for 2010-2012 fisheries proposals.  
22 There's potentially agency reports that you could  
23 address. There's other possibilities that you can do.  
24 So don't get stuck on -- but keep in mind that if the  
25 area biologist doesn't show up you still may want to  
26 march through these proposals.  
27  
28                   Mr. Chair.  
29  
30                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. That's  
31 the direction I needed. I'm only human. I will ask  
32 the Council, do we have any fisheries proposals for  
33 2010-2012 Federal Subsistence Board cycle. Do you have  
34 a comment there, Larry.  
35  
36                   MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
37 If you are moving to the call for fisheries proposals,  
38 I have a couple words I could say on that.  
39  
40                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, please do.  
41  
42                   MR. BUKLIS: Thank you. I believe you  
43 were given this outline of how a proposal could be  
44 submitted.  
45  
46                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, I do have that.  
47 It's on the back of this paper that has a news release.  
48  
49                   MR. BUKLIS: Yes, it's a news release  
50 on one side from January 19th announcing the open

1 period for fisheries proposal submissions and the back  
2 side is an outline of the kinds of information that  
3 needs to be on a proposal.

4

5 Mr. Chairman, the proposal period is  
6 open now and it's open through March 24, 2010.  
7 Proposals may be mailed or hand-delivered to OSM or for  
8 the Council you can work through the Council  
9 coordinator and submit them that way. Here we can get  
10 simply proposals in principal and we can work on the  
11 text for you and then run it back by you before it's  
12 officially submitted.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

15

16 MR. BUKLIS: So we don't have to micro-  
17 manage the words here in session. The outline gives  
18 you the information you need on the proponent contact.  
19 I'm saying this for the other members in the audience  
20 as well and then there's six questions to address.

21

22 That's the only points I had on that,  
23 Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks for  
26 that, Larry. Let's call for fisheries proposals. When  
27 does the call end?

28

29 MR. BUKLIS: March 24th.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We won't meet before  
32 the call ends again. Is there any pressing fisheries  
33 issues? Eastern, I'm sure, is writing some customary  
34 trade proposals because that was quite an issue  
35 yesterday when we had our joint meeting. I don't feel  
36 that we -- we will be reactionary to those proposals,  
37 whatever they write. Does anybody have any fisheries  
38 proposals, Kuskokwim or Yukon proposals.

39

40 Does everything seem pretty good on the  
41 Kuskokwim, Ray and Carl?

42

43 MR. COLLINS: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

44

45 MR. MORGAN: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Larry.

48

49 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

50 This is not a proposal, but earlier in your meeting you

1 worked on a resolution regarding Yukon River chinook  
2 salmon management and we've acted on your request for  
3 another whereas point and put in some notes about who  
4 this is intended to be delivered to, so we've got a  
5 revised draft.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

8

9 MR. BUKLIS: Again, this is a  
10 regulatory proposal, but it's a resolution. We can  
11 pass that out if you'd like.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, please.  
14 Council members, if they identify a fisheries proposal,  
15 I would encourage them after this meeting -- if you  
16 come up with a proposal, I would encourage you to  
17 submit it to the Federal subsistence program so that  
18 it's a placeholder for our next meeting and then the  
19 Council can review that as another way of sort of  
20 getting your foot in the door. If after the meeting an  
21 issue comes up or you have a proposal that you would  
22 like to see submitted to the Federal Subsistence Board.

23

24 So we're passing down the draft joint  
25 resolution of the Eastern, Western, and Yukon-Kuskokwim  
26 Delta. The new language is going to come up on the  
27 screen. We'll have it before us also. Are you going  
28 to pop that up there, Jerry?

29

30 MR. BERG: You're looking for.....

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're looking -- do  
33 you have the resolution there?

34

35 MR. BERG: No.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I thought you  
38 were going to put something up there.

39

40 MR. BERG: No, we don't have it.

41

42 DR. WHEELER: Give us five minutes and  
43 we can get it up there thought.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's okay, Polly.  
46 I thought Jerry was going to.

47

48 DR. WHEELER: He was looking pretty  
49 official over there.

50

1 (Laughter)

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: He was fidgeting  
4 there and I thought he was going to put something up on  
5 the screen. Okay. I misread your body language over  
6 there, Jerry. We have it before us. The whereas  
7 traditional ecological knowledge consistently indicates  
8 chinook salmon size has been declining over the past 20  
9 years as a modified language of the Western Interior  
10 Regional Advisory Council. Does that look adequate to  
11 you, Tim?

12

13 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, I thinks that's  
14 fine.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further comments  
17 by the Council on this resolution. Eastern Interior,  
18 when I was over there, was anxious to see this  
19 modification. This also clarifies -- the final  
20 approved resolution will be sent to the Alaska Board of  
21 Fisheries, Federal Subsistence Board and State and  
22 Federal Yukon River fisheries managers. It also is  
23 noting in bold print the modification.

24

25 Any comments.

26

27 Robert.

28

29 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. What is  
30 the resolution number for this?

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It doesn't specify a  
33 resolution number. I'm sure OSM will designate a  
34 resolution number to this, so we're not really worried  
35 about that. It's going to be a tri-Council resolution,  
36 so I'm not sure how to number it. Go ahead, Polly.

37

38 DR. WHEELER: Why don't you just give  
39 it 10-01.

40

41 MR. COLLINS: It's the first one this  
42 year.

43

44 DR. WHEELER: Right. It's the first  
45 one this year.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's a good  
48 idea.

49

50 DR. WHEELER: You're not worried about

1 the number, but Member Walker certainly is, so let's  
2 make sure that we give it a number.

3

4 (Laughter)

5

6 MR. R. WALKER: Okay. Polly, all the  
7 years I've been mayor of Anvik every time we did a  
8 resolution the State or Federal government said we had  
9 to have a number. It had to be for the record.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate that  
12 perspective, Robert. Go ahead, Eleanor.

13

14 MS. YATLIN: Traditional ecological  
15 knowledge is capitalized and in parentheses you put  
16 TEK.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's  
19 clarification of TEK. Good call, Eleanor. Other  
20 comments on the resolution.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So it looks good to  
25 the council and I'd like to have this brought over to  
26 the Eastern Interior Council so they can review it.

27

28 MR. COLLINS: We did pass it.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, it is passed.  
31 Okay. So these are just minor clarifications. The  
32 number 10-01 and TEK is capitalized in parenthesis.  
33 Any other comments to it. There's no significant  
34 change from what we've adopted. I see no  
35 clarifications, so we'll move on from there.

36

37 So I see there are no Council members  
38 that want to submit any fisheries proposals at this  
39 time. I encourage Council members to submit proposals  
40 using this form if you identify an issue and we can  
41 review that at our fall meeting.

42

43 So we have several agency reports and  
44 we can start working through agency reports. Tim Craig  
45 took off for a while?

46

47 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's heading up  
48 the Dalton for a snow survey.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So you'll be

1 doing -- I was just wondering what your status was  
2 there. We have Office of Subsistence Management as A  
3 on this list. Does OSM have any report other than our  
4 dialogue that we've had here.

5

6 Go ahead, Polly.

7

8 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. We don't  
9 have a formal report. I will say that during one of  
10 the breaks several of the members had asked me for some  
11 sort of a chart kind of showing the Secretary, Federal  
12 Board, RACs, where it all fits in. I don't have that  
13 right now, but I'll work on it tonight and I'll have  
14 something for you tomorrow to hopefully put up on the  
15 board so you can see how the various parts fit in.  
16 I'll do that for you tomorrow, but we don't have a  
17 formal report, no.

18

19 Mr. Chair.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Polly.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: I have a question.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead there, Ray.

26

27 MR. COLLINS: Polly, I have a question.  
28 It looks like we're moving towards more permanent  
29 management. Are you going to be staffed up to be doing  
30 research we need or have you got enough staff now in  
31 terms of biological reports, getting information from  
32 elders, et cetera?

33

34 DR. WHEELER: You always ask the tough  
35 questions. We  
36 currently have about 40 or so full-time positions at  
37 the Office of Subsistence Management. One of the  
38 issues that's been raised in the review of the Federal  
39 Subsistence Management Program has been money, not  
40 surprisingly. We are looking to see what  
41 recommendations come out of the Secretary's Office in  
42 terms of funding, where it might go.

43

44 I know there's been a lot of interest  
45 expressed in having a wildlife program similar to the  
46 Fisheries Resources Monitoring Program. The report  
47 that Dave Anderson gave yesterday on the fish for dogs,  
48 that was funded through the monitoring program several  
49 years ago. Those are the types of projects that could  
50 be funded. That program is about a five to six million

1 dollar program, so clearly we would need additional  
2 funding not only to fund the projects but also for the  
3 staff. There's a significant amount of OSM staff time  
4 that goes into evaluating all those research proposals  
5 that come in.

6  
7           So we have asked for additional -- you  
8 know, we've said that if we do -- we would like to do a  
9 wildlife program. We would like to model it after the  
10 fisheries program, but we would need additional funding  
11 to do that. I don't know where it's going. I mean  
12 you're all familiar with what's going on in Congress  
13 right now. Getting additional funding for any program  
14 is a challenge at best. Over the last few years we've  
15 been -- we had one significant cut several years back.  
16 Other than that we've been flat-lined, which means  
17 functionally we're losing money because of cost of  
18 living and everything else.

19  
20           What I can tell you is we know how  
21 important wildlife research is. We know that there's  
22 serious areas out there that need attention. We know  
23 that in order for our program to move forward and be  
24 thought of as rather than a temporary program, in order  
25 to be a serious program we need to be doing our part  
26 for wildlife research as well as fisheries research,  
27 which I think we more than do through the monitoring  
28 program. These are all areas that we know there are  
29 issues out there, but we also have to be realistic and  
30 look at what the funding outlook looks like.

31  
32           So I'd love to be able to tell you that  
33 we're going to have a wildlife program just like the  
34 fisheries program and go great guns. I think if we do  
35 a wildlife program it probably will be a small wildlife  
36 program, but we know the need is there. I will tell  
37 you that the need is clearly.

38  
39           MR. COLLINS: Follow up, Mr. Chairman.  
40 I guess what I was thinking more of like what the State  
41 was doing where they assign some of their staff to do  
42 basic research. For instance, we don't have a history  
43 of the traditional fisheries as a backup, but the only  
44 way for funding that now is to actually put in a  
45 proposal for one of these for a project then. It's not  
46 something you would assign staff to do to be gathering  
47 in the different areas from elders about that kind of  
48 information?

49  
50           DR. WHEELER: I appreciate that and in

1 a perfect world, you bet. The reality is that our  
2 staff -- I know it probably looks like all we do is set  
3 up and then go to meetings, but we have -- the  
4 anthropological staff would be the logical staff to do  
5 that. I have four anthropologists on staff. Two of  
6 them are brand new. Between fisheries proposals,  
7 wildlife proposals, the fisheries monitoring program,  
8 they're pretty maxed out.

9  
10 With each of the staff, if there's down  
11 time, then we have things that we would like them to  
12 work on. I know from previous work I've done that  
13 there is information out there in all these different  
14 places. I was talking to Dave Anderson yesterday and  
15 saying, wow, I know I could pull this stuff together  
16 given the opportunity. Will I do it realistically?  
17 Probably other items will come and get my attention.  
18 But I appreciate your concern and we do -- like I said,  
19 I work with staff to fill up their down time if they  
20 have it, but, to be frank, with the anthropology  
21 division in particular, lately they haven't had any  
22 down time.

23  
24 At this point, if we do projects like  
25 that, if we want it to be done sooner rather than  
26 later, it should probably be done through the  
27 monitoring program.

28  
29 Mr. Chair.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Polly. Go  
32 ahead, Ray.

33  
34 MR. COLLINS: Just one more. I guess  
35 what I'm concerned about is that the elders who have  
36 that knowledge are becoming a scarce resource as we're  
37 losing our elders and it would be good to maybe  
38 identify the kind of information we would want from  
39 them that would give us background information for  
40 helping making decisions in the future and maybe trying  
41 to target that and either write proposals or do  
42 something because we're losing information all the time  
43 now.

44  
45 DR. WHEELER: To go back at least the  
46 Fisheries Resources Monitoring Program, I heard you  
47 yesterday and I wrote down -- as Larry said, we'll be  
48 putting out a call for proposals in November of 2010 to  
49 fund proposals that will be starting in April of 2012,  
50 which I know is kind of a long window, but we have a

1 very public, transparent process.

2

3                   One of the issues that will likely be  
4 identified in the call for proposals is traditional  
5 knowledge of changing fishing patterns along the Yukon  
6 River system to include interviews with key elders on  
7 changing mesh sizes. You don't want to constrain the  
8 call for proposals so that it's so narrow no one will  
9 apply for it, but you want to make sure you include the  
10 critical elements. We will be coming back to this  
11 Council at the fall meeting cycle with maybe some draft  
12 issues and information needs and look to you all to  
13 help us refine it so that it gets more to your liking.

14

15                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's one of our  
16 annual report items, is some baseline data. Other  
17 comments from the Council.

18

19                   (No comments)

20

21                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One moment, Polly.  
22 I want to clarify for the Council members that just  
23 returned, the Council is probably wondering when we're  
24 going to get a permanent coordinator position, so maybe  
25 clarify that for the Council members.

26

27                   DR. WHEELER: That position -- you're  
28 not going to like this, but the position has not been  
29 advertised yet. I'm not going to make excuses. I  
30 could, but I'm not going to. The position hasn't been  
31 advertised yet. Hopefully we will advertise it in the  
32 next two months, which I know seems ridiculous, but the  
33 process is what it is. If we can advertise in the next  
34 several months, then we'll get a list of people that  
35 people tell us are qualified and then we do interviews.  
36 My goal would be to have somebody in this position by  
37 your next meeting. We will keep you informed as we  
38 move through it.

39

40                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You wouldn't want to  
41 do it, would you?

42

43                   (Laughter)

44

45                   DR. WHEELER: Maybe.

46

47                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim.

48

49                   MR. GERVAIS: I was wondering if you  
50 would quantify for us why this position is going to be

1 based out of Anchorage instead of up here.

2

3 DR. WHEELER: For the Members Walker  
4 yesterday this came up and the question came up where  
5 is the position going to be located. As you all know,  
6 when Vince had this position he  
7 was in Fairbanks. My boss and I, Pete Probasco, made  
8 the decision to move the position back to Anchorage.  
9 As I said yesterday on the record, it's a balancing  
10 act. It's managing staff. It's sometimes tough to  
11 have remote staff.

12

13 Somebody had said on the record  
14 yesterday if you have a highly qualified person that  
15 applies for the position out of Fairbanks, could you  
16 consider that. I won't put anything out of  
17 consideration, but from a staff management standpoint  
18 from keeping in tune with what's going on at OSM, all  
19 that other stuff, we decided that -- I mean our initial  
20 decision was to move it to Anchorage. We have a lot of  
21 staff that serve remote Councils and we feel that they  
22 do a good job in doing that.

23

24 What I would ask from this Council is  
25 to bear with us, let us seat this position and then let  
26 us know if it's not working for you because I think  
27 that there's things we can do. That's my response.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. I'll  
30 stand on my statement yesterday that I would not want  
31 to preclude somebody that lives in Fairbanks that would  
32 be a highly-qualified coordinator for these Councils  
33 and their unwillingness to move to Anchorage. With  
34 fiberoptic internet and so forth, my wife works for  
35 U.S. Fish and Wildlife in the Kanuti Field Office in  
36 Coldfoot, so she dialogues with her superior daily with  
37 email and telephone conversations and so forth. It  
38 doesn't really actually matter if they're around the  
39 corner in a cubicle emailing you or in a different  
40 office.

41

42 It was commented to the Department of  
43 Interior, Pat Pourchot, at the review process that the  
44 coordinators are very, very important to the Councils.  
45 They're the working arm of the Councils, writing  
46 letters and so forth. I wanted to clarify that on the  
47 record, the desire of the Council to have the most  
48 highly qualified person be available.

49

50 Go ahead, Ray.

1 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I'd just  
2 like to comment in dealing with Vince over the years,  
3 it wouldn't have mattered whether he was in Anchorage  
4 or Fairbanks because all my correspondence with him was  
5 mostly by phone or email, something like that. And he  
6 was always at our meetings. So really it didn't matter  
7 where he was in terms of my interaction with him and I  
8 think that might be true of other members here.

9  
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Eastern Interior  
11 had more of a vested interest in the face to face  
12 portion of it, but my interest is strictly in getting  
13 the most highly qualified person and not precluding  
14 that person because of where they live.

15  
16 DR. WHEELER: And Mr. Chair, I would  
17 say that's what we're looking for. We are looking for  
18 the best person possible. That's always our goal in  
19 filling any position, is getting the best talent out  
20 there. With that, we will advertise it as widely and  
21 as broadly as we can. We'll let you all know when the  
22 advertisement goes out in the event you know of some  
23 highly talented dynamic charismatic individual that  
24 would want the job of a lifetime.

25  
26 MR. CAMPBELL: I'll do it.

27  
28 (Laughter)

29  
30 MR. R. WALKER: Okay, Superman. Are  
31 you going to look at all the agencies in the government  
32 and the State agencies or are you just going to look at  
33 the Federal government agencies?

34  
35 DR. WHEELER: It will be advertised  
36 within and outside of government so the public could  
37 apply.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comment on  
40 the pending coordinator position for the Western  
41 Interior Council.

42  
43 (No comments)

44  
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for your  
46 clarification on that issue. It's a fairly important  
47 issue to the Council. So OSM has covered some of the  
48 questions that we've had.

49  
50 Native organizations and tribal agency

1 reports. We had a KNA -- Melissa was around. What  
2 happened, did she go off? We'll move her back in case  
3 she wants to come back.

4

5 Alaska Department of Fish and Game,  
6 long-term migration telemetry study. The State is  
7 probably not prepared to make any -- we did see the  
8 presentation about the long-term telemetry project  
9 presented by Kyle Joly.

10

11 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. We'll  
12 go through the -- Mike Spindler.

13

14 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Chair. I have a  
15 handout that I'll pass out. Just in brief, we've got  
16 real low snow conditions up north. We tried to do a  
17 moose survey in 2009. We poised up there in Bettles,  
18 actually got going, but we waited until halfway through  
19 the month to get the snow cover and then it got 40  
20 below and we couldn't fly. So, unfortunately, we  
21 didn't get fresh moose data for 2009.

22

23 The graph there is a 2008 data. You've  
24 seen that before, so I won't spend much time on that.  
25 We've had a few personnel changes as I mentioned at the  
26 Aniak meeting. Our lead biologist has turned over and  
27 we're going to be looking at a list of eligibles  
28 probably this week or next week and hope to have that  
29 filled by the time the field season starts.

30

31 We have a new assistant fire management  
32 officer, Brian Haugen. He transferred up from Montana.  
33 We've got a real good fire crew in both our fire  
34 management officer and our assistant serve Kanuti,  
35 Yukon Flats and Arctic Refuges.

36

37 One of the interesting things that does  
38 affect the villages is the program wildland urban  
39 interface of thinning trees around the villages for  
40 fire hazard reduction. So those guys are working on  
41 some potential projects with Evansville and Bettles and  
42 Allakaket and Alatna. Probably we'll see planning  
43 occurring this year and actual clearing occurring next  
44 year on those.

45

46 Another thing you might be interested  
47 in is the Henshaw Creek Science Camp, which we do  
48 cooperatively with Tanana Chiefs Conference and Fish  
49 and Game and Friends of Alaska Refuges. That's an  
50 educational opportunity for kids from Allakaket,

1 Alatna, Hughes and Evansville to spend some time right  
2 at the fish weir where the fish are counted. They can  
3 learn about spawning salmon, aquatic habitats, careers  
4 in biology. It's a really great opportunity for  
5 educating some of the village kids and get them  
6 interested in doing this kind of work.

7  
8 We have authorization to recruit for an  
9 assistant manager pilot position in Bettles, which will  
10 really make my life a lot easier. We're going to be  
11 looking at possible biologist pilots or ranger pilots  
12 as well. That position hopefully will be filled within  
13 a few months and housing will be completed by the  
14 summer for renovation of an existing house.

15  
16 Our footprint in Bettles is going to be  
17 increasing to try and be more responsive to the local  
18 public that uses the refuge and to make us more  
19 efficient doing our work up there. We do have a  
20 maintenance worker in Bettles, another local hire, and  
21 then, as you mentioned, interpretive park ranger in  
22 Coldfoot. We feel that these remotely supervised  
23 positions are challenging, but very, very rewarding  
24 because it makes us more efficient in the work that we  
25 do.

26  
27 Another major thing that you might want  
28 to be aware of is an initiative with Fish and Wildlife  
29 Service called LCCs, landscape conservation  
30 cooperatives. This involves national and regional  
31 ecological monitoring and partnering with other  
32 agencies and other institutions and organizations to  
33 really increase our efficiency and effectiveness at  
34 monitoring climate change effects.

35  
36 I'll give you a couple examples.  
37 Increased fire frequency on the Kanuti. Another would  
38 be potentially reduced water flow in the streams that  
39 affects spawning success on fisheries. This is  
40 something that no refuge can do by itself, but if you  
41 pool our efforts with other partners, USGS, Fish and  
42 Game, BLM, Park Service, universities, we can put  
43 together a bigger picture and understand what's going  
44 on regionally and nationally.

45  
46 What that means for us is some  
47 additional positions. Not on our refuge but an office  
48 adjacent to our refuges. It will mean a biometrician  
49 and it will mean a data manager. What that means for  
50 me as a refuge manager is that I can have my biologist

1 submit the data to the data manager and the  
2 biometrician and we'll be able to be a lot more  
3 efficient in terms of interpreting some of these data  
4 and pooling data between refuges and other land masses.  
5 I'm really excited about that. It's a big initiative  
6 and well funded, so we're going to try to make maximum  
7 use of that.

8

9 One thing that we kind of need to work  
10 on is better sharing of wildlife harvest data. Our  
11 system is independent from the State of Alaska system,  
12 so we're having some problems. I'll tally something up  
13 and there might be a discrepancy with Glenn's data by a  
14 few moose. What we're working on, and Vince is kind of  
15 spearheading the effort, to improve the dialogue first  
16 and then work towards a more unified method of harvest  
17 data management.

18

19 That's all I have unless the Council  
20 has any questions.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any Council  
23 questions for Mike Spindler, refuge manager Kanuti. Go  
24 ahead.

25

26 MR. J. WALKER: Mike, I just had one  
27 question that I didn't really get your whole comment  
28 on. This portion dealing with fire protection around  
29 villages or areas. Could you say a little more on  
30 that.

31

32 MR. SPINDLER: Yes, Mr. Walker. Mr.  
33 Chair. Most of the Federal agencies that are land  
34 management agencies have a program where they obtain  
35 some national fire funding and it's used to reduce fire  
36 hazards around urban areas or in the case of the  
37 villages around the villages. We had a two-year  
38 project in Evansville that reduced the fire hazard.  
39 Did quite a bit of thinning all around Evansville and  
40 Bettles to reduce the fire hazard there.

41

42 We had a project about three or four  
43 years ago in Allakaket. Took care of new Allakaket and  
44 old Allakaket, but then they added an addition to the  
45 village there of new housing, so that area is not  
46 adequately protected. So we'll have a project there to  
47 do more thinning and hazard field reduction.

48

49 Likewise, Alatna is not covered at all,  
50 so we're working with them to do that. Kenton can fill

1 you in on further down the Koyukuk River what's been  
2 done, but they've had active programs all throughout  
3 those villages downriver. It's a really good program  
4 because it hires local fire crews to do the thinning.

5

6 MR. J. WALKER: Thanks.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Robert.

9

10 MR. R. WALKER: Mike, is this only on  
11 refuge lands or is it on corporation lands or private  
12 lands, what?

13

14 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Walker. It can be  
15 private lands as well. Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other Council  
18 questions. Comments on the presentation.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My questions would  
23 be the pilot position, are you wanting law enforcement  
24 or biologists as a priority in conjunction with pilot?

25

26 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Chair. Because of  
27 the remoteness of the situation I'm looking for a jack-  
28 of-all-trades. Do you want the job? I know you're a  
29 pilot too. No, my vision of the position, it was  
30 probably about 50 percent biology and natural  
31 resources, about 30 percent outreach and information  
32 and education, about 10 percent law enforcement and  
33 about 10 percent maintenance.

34

35 I have a maintenance worker up there.  
36 Sometimes it's really good if he can team up with  
37 someone. We also have a very good working relationship  
38 with the National Park Service in Bettles. We share an  
39 office, visitor center, we share a bunkhouse. When we  
40 need their help, their maintenance worker helps us and  
41 vice versa.

42

43 In answer to your question, I've found  
44 it really challenging over the last four years to be  
45 refuge manager and pilot at the same time and do all  
46 the wildlife surveys. We've been given approval to  
47 recruit for this other pilot position and their role  
48 will be to do most of the survey flying up there based  
49 out of Bettles. It will be a lot more efficient. If  
50 we need another observer, we'll fly one up commercially

1 and meet up with the ranger pilot up there or the  
2 assistant manager pilot.

3  
4 I'll still fly, but it will be mostly  
5 helping people get meetings done and things like that.  
6 Field crews out to field camps.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: How many aircraft do  
9 you have?

10  
11 MR. SPINDLER: We have only one, so we  
12 plan on stationing that plane up in Bettles and then in  
13 Fairbanks here there's about 15 Federal planes, so  
14 based on scheduling any one of us pilots can use any of  
15 those planes, schedule permitting.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I see. My other  
18 question is -- I'm very happy to see the harvest  
19 presentation by Allakaket, Alatna residents, so these  
20 figures of '09 six moose that's to the best household  
21 surveys that your IT person has done, plus what the  
22 State has reported or is that just only your household  
23 surveys?

24  
25 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Chair. That's kind  
26 of based on a hybrid of the two. We have a contract  
27 with the Allakaket Tribal Council for a local liaison  
28 person equivalent to a refuge information technician,  
29 but in this case we've contracted with the tribal  
30 council to do that work. Mr. Kenneth Bergman has been  
31 doing that work for us for about four years. He does  
32 telephone -- not quite door to door, but he calls  
33 everybody in the village to follow up on the success of  
34 their hunt. We try to reconcile that with the State  
35 harvest tickets and the State database.

36  
37 There's some issues and difficulties  
38 there. Glenn's figures say, for example, seven moose  
39 in 2009, so we need to track that down and see where  
40 the error is, but usually the error is only one or two  
41 moose.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So this is the  
44 regulatory year '08-'09, this figure?

45  
46 MR. SPINDLER: That would be regulatory  
47 year '08-'09, yeah.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're in  
50 regulatory year '09-'10 right now, so that doesn't

1 reflect this fall's harvest.

2

3 MR. SPINDLER: I stand corrected. That  
4 does affect this fall's harvest, but it would not --  
5 for example, it would also include the December hunt 1  
6 to 10, but it would not include anything else after  
7 that.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That  
10 clarifies that. That does include that one moose that  
11 was harvested in the March Federal hunt.

12

13 MR. SPINDLER: Yes, Mr. Chair, it  
14 includes that. I think the discrepancy is probably  
15 number of potlatch moose. That might be the source of  
16 it. We need to track it down further. Like I say, our  
17 level of exchange of data needs to improve quite a bit  
18 and we recognize that as a shortcoming and we're  
19 working on it.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I really appreciate  
22 these numbers because the subsistence division had done  
23 quite a bit of work in that area and previously and  
24 shown that harvests were in the 30 to 40 moose for  
25 those villages. This is still showing a very low  
26 harvest rate, giving weight to the subsistence need of  
27 the communities and thus the proposals that we've been  
28 generating.

29

30 That's all the comments I had. Other  
31 Council member comments.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks a lot, Mike.  
36 You're doing a real good job on that telemetry project  
37 and other projects that Kanuti is working with and we  
38 are highly annoyed though that you stole Vince Mathews  
39 from us.

40

41 (Laughter)

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We did Kanuti's  
44 report. Koyukuk/Nowitna, do you care to do yours.

45

46 MS. MINERVA: Mr. Chairman. Members of  
47 the Council. For the record, Jetta Minerva. I don't  
48 have a formal report. There's just a couple things I  
49 wanted to mention. I flew moose surveys with Nate last  
50 November and was pretty excited about the numbers we

1 were seeing around Huslia, so I was pleased to be part  
2 of this March moose hunt this year.

3

4                   The other thing we're doing, we had a  
5 meeting Eleanor and I went to last January with  
6 Lilliana Naves. She's the waterfowl harvest survey  
7 coordinator with Fish and Game, so we're going to be  
8 doing -- she revamped the whole program, so we have new  
9 survey forms. We're doing harvest surveys this year.  
10 On our plate is Huslia and Ruby, so we'll be heading  
11 out in March to do outreach and then doing actual  
12 surveys in July and October.

13

14                   So that's on my agenda. It's great to  
15 be here again and see you guys. That's all I have.

16

17                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Council questions  
18 for Jetta.

19

20                   (No comments)

21

22                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My question is, does  
23 selected communities Huslia and Ruby because of their  
24 proximity to the Nowitna and the Koyukuk?

25

26                   MS. MINERVA: Yeah, well there's a  
27 total of nine villages in our area, so we're on an  
28 every other year cycle, so we'll have seven villages  
29 next year. We don't want to over survey the villages.

30

31                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see. Okay. That  
32 clarifies that. Other questions.

33

34                   (No comments)

35

36                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Kenton.

37

38                   MR. MOOS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
39 Again, Kenton Moos, refuge manager of Koyukuk/Nowitna.  
40 I just wanted to expand a little bit. As far as the  
41 moose hunts here this March 1 through 5, I make the  
42 call on three different hunts. Again, what we've heard  
43 is that we feel that there's sufficient moose in 24D to  
44 hold a March 1 through 5 hunt with a 10-moose quota.  
45 21D and 21B, those areas we did not feel there was  
46 adequate moose to hold a hunt. Again, we're sticking  
47 with the conservative strategy in these areas and any  
48 type of cow harvest we just don't feel is appropriate  
49 at this time. If anybody has any questions on that or  
50 any of the numbers, we can definitely let you know.

1 Overall, as far as the moose surveys  
2 this past November, the numbers were relatively level  
3 on all the trend counters that we did look at. One  
4 concern we have and it's pretty much across the board  
5 is that the calf numbers is down this year. Again,  
6 this is single year production thing. There's a lot of  
7 theories as to why that may have happened. My personal  
8 feeling is last year's deep snow conditions probably  
9 contributed significantly. We're very hopeful with  
10 this year's winter conditions with the light snow and  
11 the easy going that we'll have a good crop of calves  
12 this spring. We're hopeful for that.

13  
14 A few other things that are happening  
15 on the refuge that you might be interested in. Again,  
16 as Mike had mentioned, some field reduction programs.  
17 We are in a second year of a project in Ruby. The  
18 first year we did a fire break. That would have been  
19 to the south and around the cemetery area, or south and  
20 west side of Ruby and this year we're going to continue  
21 with a thinning project on the south side of Ruby and  
22 then next year completing that project.

23  
24 It's bringing, I believe, about 35 or  
25 \$40,000 into the community this coming year. Last year  
26 I can't remember exactly how much money it did bring  
27 into the community, but it is a great project for the  
28 community to both provide economic stimulus but also  
29 the protection needed for fire.

30  
31 We are also doing some community  
32 wildfire protection plans for the communities in  
33 cooperation with the State of Alaska for the community  
34 of Koyukuk and I believe Kaltag as well. We also just  
35 completed one for the community of Galena.

36  
37 As far as field reduction program, we  
38 don't have any projects currently funded in those other  
39 communities. That CWPP, that Community Wildland  
40 Protection Plan, does allow us to apply for those  
41 funding, so that's potentially in the future.

42  
43 As far as new employees, we are  
44 finalizing advertising a fisheries biologist. This is  
45 a new position for the refuge. We hope to have that  
46 advertised within the next couple weeks. As Polly  
47 mentioned, I don't want to make excuses, but human  
48 resources is a little bit slow on some of these  
49 advertisements. We've been working on this since last  
50 August, but we're hopefully going to be getting that

1 fairly quickly here.

2

3                   Those are some of the highlights and if  
4 anybody has any questions as far as anything else going  
5 on the refuge, I'd be happy to try to answer them.

6

7                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions for  
8 Kenton. Go ahead, Robert.

9

10                  MR. R. WALKER: Just a quick question  
11 here. How is the wolf population at your refuge?

12

13                  MR. MOOS: We don't have any directed  
14 studies towards looking at wolf populations. However,  
15 Brad Scott, our supervisor biologist and our other  
16 biologist fly a fair amount and we do sort of an  
17 anecdotal type study where we identify packs and sizes  
18 and so forth both from the public reports as well as  
19 from what we see.

20

21                  In general, Brad's opinion is that it's  
22 been a steady population. It hasn't been increasing,  
23 it hasn't been declining. It's been relatively flat-  
24 lined. With our moose populations, it seems that  
25 they've been pretty much steady for the last four years  
26 since I've been there.

27

28                  MR. R. WALKER: You haven't had an  
29 increase in your calves or your moose population in the  
30 last four years you said?

31

32                  MR. MOOS: I stand corrected because  
33 24D, the Three Day Slough area and that area we have  
34 seen some good increases in moose population. As far  
35 as the Kaiyuh Flats and the Nowitna, again they've been  
36 pretty much flat-lined. We haven't seen any major  
37 increases or decreases other than the Koyukuk Refuge,  
38 which is looking really good.

39

40                  CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other comments,  
41 questions.

42

43                  (No comments)

44

45                  CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My comments would  
46 revolve around the -- I wanted to dialogue on this  
47 Proposal 68 that we reviewed. Was it 68? 67. Federal  
48 Proposal 68. Your impression of this leeway on this  
49 hunt to allow your biologist to have more discretion on  
50 harvesting bulls in April, do you feel more comfortable

1 with that as a manager for your position on providing  
2 winter moose hunt subsistence opportunities?

3

4 MR. MOOS: Mr. Chair. We did provide  
5 comment to OSM on this proposal. The one sticking  
6 point that we had, both myself as well as the biologist  
7 on staff is the mandatory language that was put in  
8 there. We did not feel that if we did forego an  
9 antlerless harvest that it should be mandatory because  
10 a potential for biological concerns that may occur,  
11 such as if our bull/cow ratios take a dive and we're  
12 down at says 20 bulls per 100 cows and the cow  
13 population also goes down, do we want to put that  
14 additional pressure on those bulls. That's where our  
15 concern was.

16

17 As far as an alternative to if  
18 something happens like last year where we did see a  
19 significant dip in our cow numbers, is that something  
20 we would consider? Absolutely. That makes a lot of  
21 sense, especially with the bull numbers that we've been  
22 seeing. We did support that.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Of course, it wasn't  
25 my intention as a Council member and Chair that we  
26 exceed biological parameters with the harvest and you  
27 have the discretion to reduce the quotas, so I felt  
28 that that was your safety valve. Drop the quota five  
29 moose. I just wanted to get your impression because  
30 you didn't comment on the proposal and I wanted your  
31 impression of the proposal and your various concerns.  
32 I feel that it's beneficial to the Council to hear  
33 those.

34

35 I'm very appreciative of the work that  
36 you're doing on both Refuges. Myself, I'm a little  
37 frustrated also with the productivity issues in the  
38 Nowitna and the Kaiyuh. That's frustrating, but can't  
39 do anything about that. I do appreciate all of your  
40 input into our Council's deliberations and the work  
41 that you're doing there.

42

43 Thank you.

44

45 Thanks, Jetta.

46

47 MS. MINERVA: Yes.

48

49 MR. MOOS: Mr. Chair. If anybody would  
50 want moose trend count information data, I'd be glad to

1 provide it. We just didn't want to kill three trees to  
2 get it to you.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I did want to  
5 mention to the Council that the Refuge,  
6 Koyukuk/Nowitna, dialogues with the Chair on these  
7 moose hunt openings and so your biologist has supplied  
8 me with all the biological data that was current for my  
9 review. It was quite some data presentation that I  
10 went through and I do appreciate that. Very nice  
11 graphics and so forth. Your biologist is doing a great  
12 job.

13

14 You've got a comment back there, Vince.

15

16 MR. MATHEWS: I need to make a  
17 presentation after they're done.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Sure. Thanks a lot,  
20 Kenton. How is the Council feeling. One more  
21 presentation. Come on up, Vince. You're always  
22 welcome at our fire.

23

24 (Laughter)

25

26 MR. MATHEWS: Real quickly. I wear a  
27 lot of hats, so I apologize to Mike. Covering three  
28 refuges it gets a little interesting. I'm also the  
29 field coordinator for the waterfowl harvest survey that  
30 Jetta just mentioned, so I'll be involved with the  
31 surveys for Allakaket, Alatna and for Coldfoot.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Coldfoot? Not  
34 Wiseman?

35

36 MR. MATHEWS: Well, that's what I  
37 wanted to bring up to you. I'm going to work with that  
38 program to see if we can combine Wiseman and Coldfoot  
39 together. We'll hopefully get that done. Otherwise it  
40 will be more difficult on staff to go up one year and  
41 do Coldfoot one household and the next year do Wiseman.  
42 So we're going to try and get that straightened out.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My input to that  
45 would be that you should combine both communities.  
46 You'll find virtually no waterfowl harvest from  
47 Coldfoot. I'd be dumbfounded if there was any. You  
48 will find consistent waterfowl harvest in Wiseman, but  
49 you should combine both communities. They're not  
50 particularly homogeneous on use. There's a

1 longstanding waterfowl use.

2

3                   You can look at Arctic Village and  
4 there's pictures of people holding -- referring to  
5 spring waterfowl harvest back in the '30s. So I would  
6 combine both communities if you're going to do those  
7 waterfowl surveys there.

8

9                   That would be my input to that.

10

11                   MR. MATHEWS: We'll try to get that  
12 done. I'm also overseeing the waterfowl surveys for  
13 the Yukon Flats villages and then next year will be the  
14 Arctic Village. Just so you understand that and  
15 hopefully we'll get those two combined.

16

17                   Thank you.

18

19                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I wanted  
20 Council to be able to question you really further on  
21 any issues.

22

23                   MR. R. WALKER: We're going to line up.

24

25                   (Laughter)

26

27                   MR. MATHEWS: I didn't realize you had  
28 buzzers on these seats.

29

30                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any Council members  
31 have questions for Vince.

32

33                   (No comments)

34

35                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I also wanted to  
36 personally say we appreciated your work with our  
37 Western Interior Council, all of those years you put in  
38 with us and now that you're working with us still. I  
39 appreciate all of your past dedication and look forward  
40 to working with you for many years to come.

41

42                   Thank you.

43

44                   We have no more U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
45 presentation. We have a BLM presentation. We should  
46 get that out of the way. Come on up, Tim. Are you  
47 going to be presenting for both?

48

49                   MR. HAMMOND: I am. I'm going to  
50 present for the Fairbanks District and the Anchorage

1 District.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead there, Tim.

4

5 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman. Council  
6 members. Thanks. I'm Tim Hammond. I'm the resources  
7 minerals division chief for BLM Central Yukon Field  
8 Office in Fairbanks. The administrative units that  
9 overlap the Western Interior Region are the Central  
10 Yukon Field Office out of Fairbanks and the Anchorage  
11 Field Office out of Anchorage.

12

13 Tim Craig, the biologist who normally  
14 reports for the Central Yukon, is heading up the Dalton  
15 to your country right now. I think this is the first  
16 time in seven years he won't be giving a report, so  
17 you'll have to settle for me. Geoff Beyersdorf out of  
18 the Anchorage Field Office is doing muskox surveys  
19 right now, so he wasn't able to make it here.

20

21 I'll try and move through fairly  
22 quickly and hit the highlights here. We'll start with  
23 the Central Yukon Field Office administrative stuff.  
24 The Arctic Interagency Visitor's Center in Coldfoot  
25 manager found another job and moved on, so we'll be  
26 looking for a replacement for him soon. We will have  
27 two seasonal employees for the recreation program in  
28 the Dalton Highway this summer.

29

30 Fisheries, this was the last year of  
31 the Tozitna River salmon escapement project. We had a  
32 total of 1,112 chinook salmon pass through the weir,  
33 which was about double the 2008 run, but 15 percent  
34 lower than the seven year average. A total of 9,133  
35 chum passed the weir. It was slightly higher than the  
36 '08 run, but 50 percent lower than the seven year  
37 average. This project started in 2001. This was the  
38 final year of the project. We will be doing some work  
39 pulling all the gear out of there this summer, so folks  
40 in that area may see some helicopter work.

41

42 The Sulukna River sheefish stock  
43 assessment, that was a cooperative project with the  
44 Fish and Wildlife Service. This was the second year  
45 looking at sheefish spawning in the Nowitna River  
46 drainage. That was 3,531 sheefish counted leaving the  
47 spawning area compared to 2,079 in 2008.

48

49 For the Hughes mining district, some  
50 Federal lands surrounding Tigas Mine private and

1 Federal claims in Clear Creek, Bear Creek and Aloha  
2 Creek were transferred to the State of Alaska, but I  
3 think some of those mining claims are going to remain  
4 Federal. Other Federal mining claims in the area are  
5 still under BLM jurisdiction. We anticipate a lot of  
6 these claims will be transferred to Doyon or the State  
7 of Alaska in the next few years.

8  
9 For the Koyukuk mining district we  
10 expect to permit five, possibly six new mining plans of  
11 operation along the Dalton Highway this year. The  
12 drainage affected are Gold Creek, Marion Creek and the  
13 south fork to the Koyukuk. Estimate that about 75  
14 acres of ground will be disturbed this mining season.

15  
16 The American Recovery and Reinvestment  
17 Act, we've become so used to the ARRA acronym that it  
18 just rolls out. Stimulus funds to do a three-year  
19 abandoned mine inventory through the Koyukuk District  
20 identifying both cultural resources, historic mining  
21 history and hazardous conditions that can be corrected.

22  
23 Gravel interest is really increasing  
24 along the Dalton Highway. The State DOT has requested  
25 renewal of 38 existing pits. We've got a couple  
26 proposals for new pits up the Dalton Highway right now  
27 and we're anticipating a lot of additional work if gas  
28 pipelines that keep being discussed go through. So  
29 gravel is becoming a scarce resource up there and  
30 getting pretty competitive.

31  
32 Realty actions. We're involved in  
33 preliminary discussions for various pipeline proposals.  
34 The Trans-Alaska, which is Prudhoe to the Canadian  
35 border. Denali Pipeline, which is Prudhoe to the  
36 Canadian border. The ASAP or Alaska Stand Alone Gas  
37 Pipeline and a possible line to Gubick. I believe  
38 there's another one on the table right now, but they  
39 come and go so fast that I get confused.

40  
41 Conveyances to State and Native  
42 corporations. Lots of conveyances are going on right  
43 now that happened in 2008 and 2009. Significant  
44 acreage will continue to be conveyed through 2010.  
45 There's a website listed here where you can see the  
46 current status of conveyances and easements.

47  
48 Recreation. We've been participating  
49 in a scenic byways corridor partnership plan for the  
50 Dalton Highway. The second draft of that plan has been

1 through a public review process and is expected to be  
2 final next month. We're processing reissues of permits  
3 for guides in the Matthews River drainage. We just  
4 received two new permits for archery sheep and bear  
5 hunting along the Dalton Highway corridor. I believe  
6 there's a scoping letter for one of those on the table  
7 back here that's out for comment right now.

8

9                   Vegetation. We're continuing to  
10 develop a weed management plan for the Dalton Highway.  
11 As you probably know, the white sweet clover is just  
12 running rampant up there, but there's several other  
13 species of invasives that we're hoping to get a handle  
14 on. I'm working on cooperative efforts with Alyeska,  
15 State of Alaska and Native corporations and the Fish  
16 and Wildlife Service is very active in that as well.  
17 Fish and Wildlife and BLM plan to continue manual and  
18 mechanical control efforts doing weed pulls and  
19 potentially mowing up there this summer.

20

21                   Wildlife. We did not complete the GSPE  
22 moose survey that was planned last fall because of the  
23 survey protocol for minimum snow cover was not met and  
24 that's the same survey that Mike Spindler mentioned  
25 that we participate in. Sheep mortality study. Three  
26 ewes have died so far. One early in the study and  
27 another one last week. No new lamb mortalities since  
28 the last fall report.

29

30                   You saw the presentation Kyle did here  
31 on the telemetry study that we're participating in with  
32 Fish and Game, Park Service, BLM and Fish and Wildlife  
33 Service. We will have the University of Idaho project  
34 to analyze some data from that as well as some other  
35 projects for the next three years going on.

36

37                   So that concludes the report for the  
38 Central Yukon Field Office out of Fairbanks. Do you  
39 want to do questions with that and then go on to the  
40 next one.

41

42                   CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll stop at that  
43 point and give the Council a chance to ask questions.  
44 Go ahead, Tim.

45

46                   MR. GERVAIS: Tim, does the BLM have  
47 any plans on what they're going to do with the  
48 information with the Sulukna sheefish stock assessment?

49

50                   MR. HAMMOND: I don't have that

1 information right now. We will produce a report out of  
2 it probably in conjunction with the Fish and Wildlife  
3 Service, but I don't think we have any specific  
4 management targets to come out of that. It was more of  
5 an inventory to find out -- sheefish spawning areas are  
6 few and far between and there's not a lot known about  
7 them and this was kind of trying to pin that down.  
8 Beyond that it would be talking with the Fish and  
9 Wildlife Service out there.

10

11 MR. GERVAIS: And you're not doing any  
12 cooperation with Fish and Game on that with their  
13 sheefish projects?

14

15 MR. HAMMOND: I'm not aware of Fish and  
16 Game being involved in that. It's all BLM and Refuge  
17 lands there in that area, but I wouldn't be willing to  
18 say they haven't been involved. I don't know the  
19 details on that.

20

21 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I suppose you would  
24 have a presentation on that sheefish at our fall  
25 meeting since it's the last year. You'll have some of  
26 those statistics for us at our fall meeting.

27

28 MR. HAMMOND: I'll make sure that  
29 happens.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Other Council  
32 comments on this presentation.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My comments would be  
37 there's two new permits for archery guiding up the  
38 Dalton Highway corridor. Do you have a map of where  
39 those are going to occur? Is that in the back here?

40

41 MR. HAMMOND: I didn't see the map back  
42 there.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I said do you have a  
45 map of where these guides are proposing permits for  
46 archery sheep and bear. We've been apprised that  
47 there's one guide that's been guiding bear hunters.  
48 The sheep proposals are new for inclusion of sheep in  
49 the permits. I was wondering how many permits were  
50 going to be issued. Is this going to be an escalating

1 number of guides going to start taking hunters in the  
2 Dalton Highway corridor? I just want to know what  
3 levels of use. Are they proposing numbers of sheep that  
4 they intend to harvest or numbers of hunters rather?  
5 I'd kind of like to know a little more about that. If  
6 you could transmit that to me by email, I'd appreciate  
7 that.

8

9 MR. HAMMOND: I'll certainly get you  
10 that information.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim could send it to  
13 me when he gets back to his office. I'd like to know  
14 more about that. That would be the majority of my  
15 comments.

16

17 The gravel excavation, I've seen the  
18 DOT by Nugget Creek, which is just above Wiseman a  
19 little ways. There's a Native allotment there and I  
20 was wondering if the BLM is assuring that the DOT is  
21 not -- it appears that the DOT's gravel extraction site  
22 could be in conflict on the Native allotment. I was  
23 wondering if the BLM is tracking that allotment in  
24 regards to the DOT's extraction site that they seem to  
25 be preparing there.

26

27 MR. HAMMOND: We will be visiting all  
28 those pits this summer as part of the reauthorization  
29 process. That's the first I've heard that there may be  
30 encroachment.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's the Arctic  
33 Johnny Native allotment on Nugget Creek. I've seen the  
34 DOT unloading there and with a gravel extraction  
35 backhoe and doing some preliminary work on that  
36 allotment and so they're accessing on the allotment for  
37 one point and I would like to see that the allotment  
38 owners, who is Louisa Riley, she lives in Point Barrow,  
39 I'd like to see that she's notified -- I don't want the  
40 BLM to be inadvertently giving permits to extract  
41 gravel on a Native allotment.

42

43 That would be my comments to that  
44 portion of the report. Go on to the next one there,  
45 Tim. Go ahead.

46

47 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman. Council  
48 members. Geoff Beyersdorf sends his apologies for not  
49 being able to attend, but the muskox surveys didn't  
50 have much flexibility in the timing there, I guess.

1 Administration. BLM proposes to  
2 develop a new resource management plan for the Bering  
3 Sea Western Interior planning area. Funding is  
4 anticipated for fiscal year '10 and I believe they have  
5 started work on that plan already. They're currently  
6 working with UAF to develop a subsistence questionnaire  
7 for distribution throughout the area to villages and  
8 they'll be conducting pre-scoping government to  
9 government consultations with villages and regional  
10 corporations in the spring and summer of 2010.

11  
12 The Iditarod Trail, they're looking at  
13 potentially building three additional shelter cabins in  
14 the summer of 2010. Hazardous materials. The Red  
15 Devil Mine has been identified for placement on the  
16 EPA's national priority list. In 2009, they conducted  
17 ground and surface water sampling, remedial  
18 investigation and feasibility studies will go on in  
19 2010 to characterize the site. Government to  
20 government consultation and discussion with village and  
21 regional corporations are planned after December 2009.  
22 The Kalmikoff Mine cleanup will continue as Federal  
23 lands are made available before conveyance.

24  
25 Fire affects task group protocol was  
26 used to assess the 2009 burn areas near McGrath and the  
27 '77 Fairwell burn, BLM is waiting a position statement  
28 from ADF&G regarding short and long-term goals for the  
29 Fairwell bison herd before moving forward with a  
30 prescribed burn plan there.

31  
32 Wildlife. 21A moose population. BLM  
33 worked with the Department of Fish and Game, Fish and  
34 Wildlife Service, to conduct a GSPE survey in November  
35 of 2009. Weather didn't let those surveys happen and  
36 it will be attempted again in 2010. 21E moose  
37 collaring. BLM funded a challenge cost share proposal  
38 to collar 52 moose in 21E beginning March 15th of 2010.  
39 It will be partnering with Fish and Wildlife Service  
40 and Fish and Game to do the initial capture work and  
41 then will work with Fish and Wildlife Service to  
42 conduct aerial flights. The collars should give some  
43 idea of moose movement and whether there's a resident  
44 or transitory subpopulation, wintering grounds and  
45 calving sites. That's similar to the presentation you  
46 saw here on the Koyukuk.

47  
48 That's the end of Geoff's presentation.  
49 I'll be glad to answer any questions I can, but that's  
50 not my home area.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go right  
2 ahead there, Ray.  
3  
4 MR. COLLINS: Geoff, do you know the  
5 location of the Iditarod cabins, the three proposed  
6 ones? You may not.  
7  
8 MR. HAMMOND: I have been told that one  
9 of them will be south of Ruby, but I don't know  
10 details. I can get the information to you.  
11  
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other comments or  
13 questions from the Council.  
14  
15 Robert, go ahead.  
16  
17 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
18 We asked Geoff a few years back here on cow moose in  
19 21E because one of the things that we would like to see  
20 is how far they're going to migrate, if they're going  
21 to migrate out of 21E or not. This is going to be  
22 interesting to see here by the time 2011 rolls around.  
23  
24 Thank you.  
25  
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have a  
27 comment there, Tim?  
28  
29 MR. GERVAIS: I'm going to retract  
30 because it's not our area.  
31  
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. My comment  
33 would be that I'm very pleased to see that moose are  
34 being collared. This telemetry work gives very  
35 important data. We saw where the moose are wintering  
36 and summering and their availability for harvest for  
37 subsistence and other users. Also what the parameters  
38 of the populations are, where they may bleed into other  
39 areas. So I'm happy to see this work being done.  
40  
41 I have no further comments other than  
42 that on the presentations. Any other Council members  
43 have questions.  
44  
45 (No comments)  
46  
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, don't see any.  
48 Everybody seems tired for some reason.  
49  
50 (Laughter)

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks a lot, Tim.

2

3 If you can give me a little bit of  
4 rundown on those two issues about the allotment and the  
5 number of guides and the number of clients that they  
6 have, I'd appreciate that.

7

8 So we've had a long day. At this time,  
9 the Western Interior will recess until tomorrow morning  
10 at 8:30.

11

12 Have a great night.

13

14 (Off record)

15

16 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

