

1 WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME II

7
8 Fairbanks, Alaska
9 February 25, 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 Jenny Pelkola
19 James Walker
20 Robert Walker
21 Eleanor Yatlin

22
23
24
25 Regional Council Coordinator, Ann Wilkinson (Acting)

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 Recorded and transcribed by:

44
45 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
46 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
47 Anchorage, AK 99501
48 907-243-0668
49 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, since we have the biologist for 21E here this morning, we're go into these 21E proposals that we have to go through and so we'll try and do the -- follow the 21E proposals and the 19 State proposals since we have this opportunity, so which -- well let's see here, we have Proposal WP10-66, that's on Page 89 of our book here and let's see --so we'll have the Staff present this.

Jerry go ahead.

MR. BERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jerry Berg with Fish and Wildlife Service, so you wanted to start with 66 before 65.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Excuse me, maybe I may have missed one there, go ahead, we'll do 65. Next one next one forward.

MR. BERG: Most of the biological and harvest history information is in 65 and then I just referenced that one from 66.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's fine, thanks.

MR. BERG: So Proposal 65 starts on Page 77 in your book, looks like you're probably all are there already.

Proposal 65 was submitted by your Council and requests that the winter season dates for moose in Unit 21E be changed from February 1 to 10 to February 15 to March 15, so that would make it a month long season, it also requests that the harvest parameters for the winter hunt be announced by the Federal managers after a consultation with ADF&G, BLM and the chairs of the GASH AC and your Council. The proposal also request a Federal permit be required for the winter season, that these permits be issued by the Innoko Refuge manager and that only one permit be allowed per household. You probably remember discussion in Aniak last fall.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Unh-huh.

2

3 MR. BERG: The proposal suggests that
4 these changes for a longer winter season would allow
5 for local users to hunt moose when travel conditions
6 are more optimum and may also help spread hunting
7 pressure across a wider area. The proposal also
8 suggest -- suggests that by requiring the Federal
9 permit, that this would most likely provide more
10 accurate harvest data, which could result in more
11 informed management decisions in the future. It also
12 -- the request also states that the harvest parameters
13 identified by the Federal managers would need to align
14 with the harvest guidelines of Yukon Innoko moose
15 management plane, which would provide flexibility to
16 limit the number of the moose harvested or the sex of
17 the moose to be harvested when needed for conservation
18 purposes, and there were two other provisions discussed
19 at your Council meeting in Aniak that were not included
20 in the proposal as it was submitted and that would --
21 those -- those provisions are to provide the Innoko
22 Refuge manager, the emergency closer authority for the
23 winter hunt and a 24 hour reporting requirements for
24 the winter season, but I think that was just an
25 oversight that those weren't included, but I'll address
26 those a little bit later in the presentation. I think
27 most of you are aware of the regulatory history for
28 moose in 21E, so I won't go into those details. There
29 is an appendix with kind of the regulatory history
30 outlined in it, however I will point out that the
31 February winter hunt in the Federal subsistence
32 regulations was aligned with State regulations when the
33 Federal program was first established in 1990 and has
34 been in place since, so it's basically been in the
35 Federal regulations ever since the start of the
36 program. And then more recently I know some of you
37 were involved with the Yukon Innoko Moose Management
38 working group that began in January of '05 and that
39 resulted in the planning effort -- or the result of the
40 planning efforts by the working group was the Yukon
41 Innoko Moose Management plan, which was completed in
42 March of '06, so I included a few of the key management
43 goals, objectives and recommendations outlined in that
44 plan in the analysis on Page 82, just for your
45 reference. And there was one recommendation made by
46 the working group that I wanted to point out since it
47 does pertain to this winter season hunt and the working
48 group recommended that if -- and this is in quotes:

49

50 If the Federal customary and

1 traditional use determination for Unit
2 21E is revised to make a large number
3 of additional communities eligible the
4 Federal winter season should be
5 eliminated.
6

7 And you know Proposal 69 being taken up
8 a little bit later today, requested change in an
9 existing C&T use determination for moose in Unit 21E.
10 So I just wanted to make sure that's brought out and so
11 that, you know, we just go into this with our eyes wide
12 open of -- about the past history there. The
13 biological information, I worked closely with the
14 wildlife biologist with BLM and the Refuge, who also
15 have worked closely with ADF&G for all the biological
16 information presented in the analysis and I want to
17 thank them for helping me get this biological section
18 formulated. You can see that the population estimates
19 in figure 1 appear to show a higher moose population in
20 2009 compared to the previous surveys, however you can
21 also see that the 90 percent confidence intervals,
22 which are the lines above and below the point estimates
23 in the graph all overlap each other, which prevents any
24 conclusive trends for the Unit 21E moose population at
25 this time, however the biologist involved with the
26 surveys, have told me that they do believe the
27 population is stable. The 2008 and '09 composition
28 survey data in table one suggest that the bull/cow and
29 calf/cow ratio have declined since the '07 survey. The
30 most recent calf/cow ratio was 18 in 2009, which is
31 below the management objective in the Moose Management
32 Plan of 30 to 40 calves per 100 cows, however the
33 biologist who flew the surveys felt that the extensive
34 flooding that occurred last spring may help explain
35 this lower calf/cow ratio for that one year. They also
36 said that they were not able to fly the survey or they
37 were not able to survey a portion of the area that
38 typically has more bulls in it which could possibly
39 explain for the lower bull to cow ratio that showed up
40 in 2009.

41
42 There is a moose collaring study
43 planned to begin this spring, as many of you are aware
44 of, which should help address some of the moose survey
45 data limitations for Unit 21E. Where the harvest
46 history information the reported moose harvest and
47 household survey data for Unit 21E by residents of
48 Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk and Holy Cross are shown in
49 Table 3. If you look at the harvest from the household
50 surveys conducted in '02/03 and then in '03/04, the

1 estimated average annual total harvest by the GASH area
2 residents between both years was about 126 moose per
3 year in Unit 21E with an annual average of 17 of those
4 moose having been taken during the winter season.
5 Information reported on the harvest ticket database
6 does not -- does suggest that the GASH area hunters
7 have had a nine year average success rate of 68 percent
8 regardless of this high -- relatively high success
9 rate, there does seem to be a downward trend in harvest
10 success over the past 10 years, so adoption of this
11 proposal would provide the residents of 21E and Russian
12 Mission with additional opportunity and more
13 flexibility to harvest moose during the winter season,
14 population data from surveys indicate that affected
15 moose population is stable and can continue to support
16 a limited moose harvest during the winter season,
17 however hunters should be encouraged to harvest bulls
18 as much as possible to favor productivity and yearling
19 bull recruitment. A more streamlined approach to
20 administer the hunt while also following the same
21 provisions as outlined in your proposal would be to
22 delegate the authority to the Innoko Refuge manager to
23 announce permit conditions and any needed closures for
24 the hunt after consulting with State and Federal
25 agencies and the chairs of the local Fish and Game
26 advisory committees in your Council.

27

28 The details of which specific AC's and
29 Councils are to be consulted it could be spelled out in
30 a letter of delegation to the Refuge manager from the
31 Federal Subsistence Board. This would basically
32 specify with agencies and Councils the need to be
33 consulted without listing them in regulation. The term
34 harvest parameters could be changed to permit
35 conditions to provide more flexibility to the Federal
36 managers to adjust permit conditions that may be
37 different than those parameters related only to
38 harvest. A Federal registration permit would be
39 established and only one permit would be issued per
40 household, and again these details would be stipulated
41 in a delegation of authority letter rather than putting
42 those into regulation. The 24 hour reporting
43 requirement is a provision that can be added to the
44 permit without stipulating that in regulation, and
45 providing the emergency closing authority to the Refuge
46 manager would allow the manager to react more quickly
47 in season to adjustments when needed, so all these
48 changes would be an extensive outreach effort to
49 educate and implement these changes because it would be
50 some pretty big changes for folks in those communities

1 and the Innoko Refuge Staff have committed to working
2 with the GASH area communities to inform them of the
3 Federal registration permit conditions of this hunt.
4 So they're committed to going out and doing the work on
5 the ground that's going to be needed to implement this
6 hunt.

7
8 It should be noted and I'm sure you're
9 aware that the accumulative effects of adopting the
10 three proposals affecting this area, which is this one
11 and then 66 to be taken up right after and then the C&T
12 proposal, 69, could result in an increase in harvest to
13 a degree that restrictions may need to be considered in
14 the future, so I just just wanted to point that out.

15
16 So the preliminary conclusion is to
17 support Proposal 65 with modifications to change
18 harvest parameters to permit conditions to provide the
19 emergency closure authority to the Innoko Refuge
20 manager and have the Innoko Refuge manager announce the
21 permit conditions after consulting with local area
22 Federal and State agencies and local Fish and Game
23 Advisory Committees and your Council, as stipulated in
24 a letter of delegation to the Refuge manager.

25
26 So Mr. Chair, that completes my
27 presentation, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Jerry. That
30 was a real concise presentation. Council members
31 questions on the OSM's presentation.

32
33 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, James.

36
37 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
38 I'm glad to see some of these survey data that's been
39 on the moose count in 21E, it's been kind of consistent
40 and stable, however it's been a none I guess known
41 knowledge that moose migration out at 21E to Unit 18
42 has been going on for some time and I'm glad to see
43 that finally this collaring is going to take place this
44 year that maybe show some of the pattern of moose
45 migration. So I'm just glad to say that at least it's
46 stable but there's still predatory issues to the moose
47 population at 21E.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, James. I'm
50 glad to see composition of that data myself and the

1 collaring program. I would like to go over that
2 collaring program a little more at some point in this
3 discussion here, at what age moose are being collared
4 and stuff like that.

5

6 Other questions on the presentation.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Yeah, my
11 comments would these -- the trend counts here or
12 population estimate bars -- did you fly the survey then
13 or I'd like to know more about why the confidence level
14 is spread so wide. Go ahead.

15

16 MR. PEARCE: Yeah, the yeah, thanks
17 Mr. Chair. Josh Pearce with Alaska Department of Fish
18 and Game and I did fly that 2009 survey, I was not a
19 part of either of the other two surveys, And those
20 confidence intervals are actually about as good as
21 these surveys produce. They were, I believe, about 18
22 percent, you know, the point estimate plus or minus 18
23 percent.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Unh-huh.

26

27 MR. PEARCE: Which for our ability to
28 count moose is actually a fairly precise survey. One
29 of the real issues and one of the big benefits that
30 will come out of this collaring effort is we don't have
31 any sightability correction factors, so we know when we
32 go out there and we count moose, we can't count them
33 all, we miss moose. And in a lot of areas, most areas
34 we try to count moose in the fall, in November -- well
35 fall, November where sightability tends to be not only
36 better but less variable. These late February, early
37 March surveys which is when we have to do 21E, tend to
38 have really wide fluctuations and how visible moose are
39 for a variety of reasons, but at any rate 21E, the snow
40 conditions aren't consistently good enough that we can
41 do surveys in November which is a preferred time.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Huh.

44

45 MR. PEARCE: So we have to do them kind
46 of late February, early March like I said. So one
47 thing that could easily change this and this will be,
48 like I said a big benefit from the collaring project is
49 once we are able to put a sightability correction
50 factor on these, then we're going to have a lot better

1 ability to detect trends. So right now you can see
2 2009, the lower end of that survey was actually not
3 very much below the upper end of 2005 survey, they did
4 almost clear each other, but they did overlap so
5 statistically speaking we can't say -- we can't detect
6 any change.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

9

10 MR. PEARCE: So that does that answer
11 your question about that?

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That does answer my
14 question. Yes, I wanted to know what why that spread
15 and I I am happy to hear about the collaring project
16 for various reasons, you know, this correction factor,
17 twin rates and some other factors of movements, home
18 ranges and so forth.

19

20 Do you have a question there, Ray.

21

22 MR. COLLINS: Yes. Josh, did the
23 spring counts have any affect on the ability to
24 determine the calf/cow ratios, in other wards those
25 calves are a little bit bigger during the spring I
26 think, and is there -- still pretty easy to distinguish
27 between cow and calf in the surveys that you're doing,
28 so that those you can depend on those or are they
29 better in the fall, November?

30

31 MR. PEARCE: Yeah, we're still able to
32 determine calf/cow ratios even in those winter surveys.
33 November surveys are better for a variety of reasons
34 and one of the pieces of information -- or some of the
35 information that we can't get in February or March are
36 things like bull/cow ratios, yearling bulls, so we're
37 able to get a lot better composition data as part of a
38 November survey than we are in the late winter, but we
39 can still get calf/cow ratios, and this year it was --
40 I don't have the number here but I believe it was close
41 to 20 calves per 100 cows, which is right at the
42 management objective identified in the Yukon Innoko
43 Moose Management Plan.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions
46 on the biology of the 21E moose population and the
47 presentation by OSM.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So, no. Okay, so
2 we're at Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments on
3 the proposal, do you have comments?

4
5 MR. PEARCE: Yeah. The Department
6 supports this proposal and there were a few
7 modifications identified, and Jerry actually touched on
8 a couple of those that weren't in here, such as the
9 Innoko manager having basically emergency closure
10 authority, to insure that there is a tight reporting
11 requirement. There's a potential, especially if this
12 C&T determination for Unit 19 villages goes into
13 effect, that -- that definitely could have an impact on
14 the number of moose that are harvested and one of the
15 things that the Department feels really strongly about
16 is we need to cap this at around 40 moose at the most.
17 And so there's a couple of other points as well that
18 the Department recommended if -- if the Yukon Innoko
19 Moose Management Plan could specifically be mentioned
20 in this proposal somehow. I'm not sure if that could
21 be in the -- the Refuge manager's permit authority, but
22 basically that is the guiding document that we all will
23 be working within, that will be the framework that sort
24 of determines our management actions and decisions and
25 Jerry pointed out, that C&T determination definitely
26 could have an impact on this.

27
28 When this proposal was developed that
29 kind of was not in the picture and that does definitely
30 change things a little bit, especially from the Refuge
31 and BLM's perspective. They're going to be the ones
32 coming out to the villages and issuing permits and
33 adding all those other villages definitely increases
34 their workload. That doesn't mean that we can't still
35 manage, as long as we have that tight reporting
36 requirement, that will be really essential and then the
37 Refuge manager having emergency closure authority.

38
39 *****
40 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
41 *****

42
43 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
44 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

45
46 Wildlife Proposal WP10-65:

47
48 This proposal would change the federal
49 subsistence winter moose hunt in Unit 21E from a
50 February 1 through 10 season with an any moose bag

1 limit to a February 15 through March 15 season by
2 federal registration permit with a quota and a bag
3 limit of one moose per household.

4

5 Introduction:

6

7 This proposal was submitted to lengthen
8 and delay the federal subsistence moose hunting winter
9 season in Unit 21. Federal subsistence delegated
10 official would establish a quota in consultation with
11 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and require one
12 federal subsistence registration hunt permit per
13 household.

14

15 Impact on Subsistence Users:

16

17 If adopted federal subsistence moose
18 hunting opportunity will be expanded by 15 days and be
19 moved later in the winter when more sunlight and
20 traveling conditions should improve opportunity for
21 success.

22

23 Opportunity Provided by State:

24

25 There is no state winter moose season
26 in Unit 21E due to conservation concerns.

27

28 Conservation Issues:

29

30 The Yukon Innoko Moose Management Plan
31 (YIMMP) was endorsed by the Federal Subsistence Board,
32 the Alaska Board of Game, and supported by the Western
33 Interior Regional Advisory Council and the Grayling-
34 Anvik-Shageluk-Holy Cross (GASH) Fish and Game Advisory
35 Committee. The YIMMP included a provision for a
36 harvest of up to 40 cow moose during a winter season,
37 and this proposal is consistent with the YIMMP. If
38 adopted, the requirement of a federal registration
39 permit could improve the quality of federal subsistence
40 harvest data by providing a mechanism for better
41 harvest reporting during the winter moose season. The
42 Alaska Board of Game closed the state winter general
43 season moose hunt in 21E because the moose population
44 could not withstand the substantial interest from Unit
45 18 hunters.

46

47 Enforcement Issues:

48

49 Adoption of this proposal results in
50 only federally qualified users hunting during the

1 winter season and only on federal public lands.
2 Adoption of this proposal could reduce harvest
3 reporting violation citations.

4

5 Recommendation:

6

7 Support with modifications to: (1)
8 assure that the harvest quota remains consistent with
9 the YIMMP, (2) due to conservation issues, require
10 reasonable permit reporting in regulation for the
11 winter hunt rather than leaving that as an optional
12 permit condition, and (3) provide emergency closure
13 authority to delegated federal official. The YIMMP
14 needs to be referenced in federal regulation; if not in
15 regulation, the Department requests the Federal
16 Subsistence Board specifically reference the harvest
17 quota and management objectives of the YIMMP in the
18 letter of delegation to the designated official.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Go ahead,
21 Robert.

22

23 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
24 Just a question on discussion here or even on the issue
25 since it's only a draft analysis, this could be added
26 into the Yukon Innoko Working Management -- could be
27 drawn right into this, correct me?

28

29 MR. BERG: Yeah. Mr. Chair. Mr.
30 Walker. That certainly can be put into the letter of
31 delegation to the Refuge manager specifically
32 referencing the Moose Management Plan and adhering to
33 the guidelines of the Moose Management Plan. And I
34 think we we had intended to put that in that letter
35 of delegation because I know the Refuge manager is also
36 interested in having that in there so that it's clear
37 that we're going, you know, the Federal Board also
38 adopted that moose management plan, so we certainly
39 plan to follow those guidelines.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does that address
42 the State's concern, having that inserted into the
43 letter of delegation?

44

45 MR. PEARCE: Yeah. It does, I think
46 that would be a good point to put in there and like I
47 said the State definitely overall supports this
48 proposal. This is a good step in the right direction.
49 Right now we've got extremely poor reporting from this
50 winter hunt as its currently run and this -- this is a

1 good step in the right direction.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other comments from
4 the Council to the Department comments.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Thank you.
9 We're going to go to Federal and tribal, State -- other
10 State comments, are there any of those?

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: InterAgency Staff
15 Committee comments, probably not.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Subsistence Resource
20 Commission comments, probably no Parks near this area.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Fish and Game
25 Advisory Committee comments and so do you have comments
26 Ken?

27

28 MR. CHASE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
29 Members of the committee. The Grayling, Anvik,
30 Shageluk, Holy Cross Advisory Committee met several
31 days ago on a teleconference and we had -- Josh was one
32 of the participants on the Council call and some of the
33 concerns still exists between the locals and the
34 management of the resource, especially on moose, exists
35 and it was pretty strongly brought out from Grayling
36 and Shageluk areas. And one of the concerns was the
37 Federal allowance of antlerless moose or cow moose
38 taken during the late season hunt that's going to be
39 allowed, and some of the Council members voiced that
40 since the State -- since we stopped our cow season hunt
41 and we still have the half mile limit off the river
42 during the winter hunt, that we're doing our part and
43 our effort to bring the population back up, which they
44 -- some of the locals think are still below the count
45 that the Department brings to the table, so one of the
46 members from Holy Cross stated that we -- tell the this
47 advisory, this Staff, Federal Advisory Board, that in
48 the future if our population gets to the point where we
49 need management predator control that we would ask this
50 committee too immediately stop the cow harvest and if

1 that did not happen we'd have to look at closing
2 certain areas within that unit, that moose cannot be
3 taken during that season.

4
5 That's some of the concerns that we
6 have.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. Does Council
9 have comments on the Advisory Committee's comments.

10
11 MS. PELKOLA: I have just a question.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead Jenny.

14
15 MS. PELKOLA: You're saying you don't
16 have predator control down there now, and what kind of
17 predators are you talking about, basically wolves or?

18
19 MR. CHASE: We have a large number of
20 wolves and -- but the moose population still shows
21 that, you know, we're okay, but bear -- we're concerned
22 with bear also in the spring. And we do have a
23 management -- predator control and management going to
24 be before the State Board, it won't be put into effect
25 but it will be -- we want it to be lying dormant so
26 when and if we do need it that we can call on it and
27 use it.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have a
30 comment there, Ray.

31
32 MR. COLLINS: Yes. Ken, do you feel
33 comfortable with the restraints that were put in there
34 giving the manager authority to make decision -- in-
35 season decisions and so one, after a consultation with
36 advisory committees and others, that was kind of a
37 check in there, do you think that will meet your
38 concerns?

39
40 MR. CHASE: I believe it will.....

41
42 REPORTER: Wait, you need to turn your
43 mic on.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Restate that.

46
47 MR. CHASE: I said we have a -- we are
48 pretty -- I think I could say the people have, you
49 know, a pretty good understanding of it and they -- we
50 work pretty close with Innoko at this time, however I

1 think I'd like to stress that dialogue between the
2 Innoko managers and the Federal, when they do talk to
3 them on -- it's not only on one group, like come in and
4 say we met with Council, the Native Council, we met
5 with a certain person and we brought this up, you know,
6 we want to be sure that all entities are advised, you
7 know, of any kind of changes or anything that's going
8 on because it's new and it's changing and, yeah, that's
9 about it.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Other
12 comments.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. So did the
17 McGrath Advisory Committee meet then, Ray, on this on
18 any of this?

19
20 MR. COLLINS: We didn't take action on
21 this I don't believe because it's outside our area of
22 funding there.

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

25
26 MR. COLLINS: So we usually defer to
27 the locals, the GASH.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thanks.

30
31 MR. CHASE: I'd like -- I keep going
32 off. I'd like to point out too that, you know, we have
33 a big interest in 21A, you know, it's an Upper Innoko
34 area, and McGrath area comes out to that area and it
35 borders down along around *Hoguchuck there, so this is
36 some of the concerns because Grayling people use that
37 area too or used to, but they haven't because of the
38 low population right now.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you have a
41 comment there, Josh.

42
43 MR. PEARCE: Yeah. Josh Pearce with
44 Fish and Game, again. And I just wanted to add that
45 the GASH AC did vote to support this proposal, so they
46 are in support of that just so that's clear to you guys
47 and the concern that Ken mentioned with the cow portion
48 of that winter harvest, if I get to it in the State
49 proposal to implement an intensive management program
50 in 21E, we specifically address the GASH's concern in

1 that and one aspect of that would be potentially
2 closing the cow portion of that hunt, not the whole
3 hunt, but eliminating the cow portion of that hunt,
4 which address Ken's concern, so I just wanted to bring
5 up if I do get to that presentation I will address that
6 at that time.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I understand.
9 Robert.

10

11 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
12 Ken. Did you have a chance to look at the Innoko
13 wildlife Refuge moose trend there in 21A, the portion
14 that the GASH works with?

15

16 MR. CHASE: Robert, personally yes, I
17 have. I've been flying that myself pretty much in the
18 last year and I just flew that about two weeks ago, and
19 I was kind of encouraged by the upper part of that
20 area, between there and Eagle Island on the Yukon,
21 which there was hardly anything, any activity until
22 this past fall and I've noticed some moose back in
23 there and I don't know where they came from but there's
24 more than ever have been in there, but the calf ratios
25 is almost -- so they probably migrated from somewhere.

26

27 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Will that be within
30 that collaring area, this 21 that won't be in the --
31 any of the collared moose won't be up there, no. That
32 would be interesting to throw a few collars on those
33 moose too.

34

35 James.

36

37 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
38 Ken, on the predator issue in the 21A area, have you
39 seen any increase in the wolf population or the pack
40 population in that area?

41

42 MR. CHASE: Very much so. I don't know
43 the number of packs but I know in the area that I trap
44 and hunt in on the Anvik River within a 20 mile --
45 between my place and Anvik there's a 20 mile stretch
46 and I have two packs operating right now, so it's
47 definitely high and I know in the Bonzilla Allure
48 between Holy Cross and Anvik there's a big number
49 that's always been there, and then up the Innoko is
50 another one. I know those, so -- but they are higher.

1 MR. J. WALKER: Ken, would you say
2 that, that has some impact on driving the moose out of
3 that area?

4
5 MR. CHASE: I couldn't say that, I
6 don't know. But they've been taking, I've been
7 watching them all winter.

8
9 The other concern, if I may is, you
10 know, the bear population in the spring since no one
11 uses, especially black bear anymore for subsistence
12 meat and stuff, very few people do, that one of the
13 things our committee has talked about is how do we, you
14 know, get people's interest in harvesting them or
15 taking them back or putting them on -- so people from
16 out of State can take and harvest them, you know,
17 during the regular hunt -- regular moose hunt when
18 they're hunting.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've been told that
21 the Board of Game has know classified black bears as a
22 furbearer and so there may be actual demand for their
23 skins somehow, so that's kind of a different curve that
24 just has occurred last month.

25
26 So further comments to the GASH
27 advisory.

28
29 Ray.

30
31 MR. COLLINS: Ken, I'd just like to
32 point out that in the McGrath area when they do the
33 studies on mortality of calves that bears were a
34 significant factor in the mortality of bears -- I mean
35 mortality of calves and that could be true in yours
36 especially if there's a growing population. Wolves
37 prey all year long and there's some factor, but bears
38 were taking the majority of the calves in the McGrath
39 studies.

40
41 MR. CHASE: I haven't talked to Josh,
42 you know, but I heard earlier about the count being
43 done in the spring versus fall and it would be
44 interesting to see, you know, what the calf count was
45 in early spring versus what it is in the fall, seeing
46 how much were really happening -- what was really
47 happening, you know, I think that's -- that would be a
48 good idea.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other comments,

1 questions.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ken.

6

7

MR. CHASE: Thank you.

8

9

10

11

12

13

MS. WILKINSON: No, Sir. We don't.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

(No opposing votes)

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Western Interior
2 supports the Proposal 65. Jerry, we're going to go on
3 to 66.

4
5 MR. BERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
6 Proposal 66 starts on Page 89 in your book, of course
7 right after this one. Again this proposal was
8 submitted by your Council in request that the fall
9 moose season dates for Unit 21E be shifted by five days
10 from August 20 to September 25 to August 25 to
11 September 30. The proposal suggests that the moose are
12 moving around later in the season and a five day shift
13 would provide greater opportunity to harvest moose and
14 that this could even help prevent cow moose from being
15 harvested during the winter season since a successful
16 hunter who takes a bull during the fall season would
17 not be eligible to harvest a cow during the winter
18 season. Our proposal also states that the fall
19 temperatures have been warmer and so a change could
20 help reduce a spoilage of meat.

21
22 Now, most of the background information
23 for this proposal is the same as what we just presented
24 in the previous proposal so I'm not going to go over
25 all that again unless there's questions. Adoption of
26 the proposal would shift the fall moose hunting dates
27 in Unit 21E five days later into the fall. Moose will
28 likely be moving along the river corridors and thus
29 easier to locate in September than they are in late
30 August. The foliage along the river and corridors is
31 usually dropped by late September making the moose
32 easier to see, and this proposed change would likely
33 result in an increase hunting success for bull moose
34 during the fall, during the later fall season. Since
35 the fall season only allows for the harvest of bulls,
36 any increased harvest during the fall season may help
37 reduce the potential harvest of cows during the winter
38 season. This could be a benefit to the moose
39 population in the long-term depending on how harvest
40 patterns change over time and of course temperatures in
41 late September are usually cooler than they are in late
42 August so this could help reduce spoilage of meat and
43 again it should be noted that the accumulative effects
44 of adopting all three proposals affecting this area
45 could result in an increase in moose harvest to the
46 degree that restrictions may be need to be considered
47 in the future.

48
49 So with that, Mr. Chair, the
50 preliminary conclusion is to support the proposal. I'd

1 be happy to answer any questions.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Jerry. Does
4 anybody have questions on the OSM's presentation.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, okay. Thanks,
9 Jerry.

10

11 Josh, ADF&G's comments.

12

13 MR. PEARCE: So the -- Josh Pearce,
14 again with Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The
15 Department at this time doesn't have an official
16 recommendation on this proposal. From the McGrath area
17 office's perspective this proposal is not of concern to
18 us, and like I said, the Department doesn't have an
19 official position on this yet. But really shifting the
20 season by five days may allow some more opportunity
21 where, I think it was Robert who pointed out, you know,
22 if someone takes a moose in the fall won't be taking
23 potentially a cow in the winter. The weather can start
24 to get a little harder at that -- at the end of the
25 season, so really even the amount of people who might
26 get out and participate in that, it's kind of, I guess,
27 up in the air from our perspective, if that'll really
28 increase harvest all that much or not, so we don't have
29 great concern with this proposal.

30

31 *****

32 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

33 *****

34

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

37

38 Wildlife Proposal WP10-66:

39

40 This proposal would delay the federal
41 subsistence fall moose season five days in Unit 21E
42 from August 20 through September 25 to August 25
43 through September 30.

44

45 Introduction:

46

47 The Western Interior Regional Advisory
48 Council submitted this proposal and indicated delaying
49 the federal subsistence moose hunt five days would
50 increase opportunity to harvest bull moose as they

1 become more active as the breeding season approached.
2 The proponent also indicated delaying the season will
3 also reduce spoilage of meat due to cooler weather and
4 possibly will reduce the number of cow moose harvested
5 in the winter because hunters will have increased
6 success rates of fall bull harvests.

7

8 Impact on Subsistence Users:

9

10 This regulation would have minimal
11 change on subsistence opportunity.

12

13 Opportunity Provided by State:

14

15 The state resident moose hunting season
16 in Unit 21E is September 5 through September 25 with a
17 limit of one antlered bull. The state nonresident
18 moose hunting season in Unit 21E is September 5 through
19 September 25 with a limit of one bull with 50-inch
20 antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on at
21 least one side.

22

23 Conservation Issues:

24

25 If adopted, the number of bull moose
26 harvested by federal subsistence hunters is unlikely to
27 change during most years. Typically, late seasons
28 result in greater success, but late September is also a
29 time when weather can effectively prevent hunting and
30 lower water levels can limit access.

31

32 Recommendation:

33

34 No recommendation until the Department
35 evaluates additional information acquired at the
36 Regional Advisory Council meeting.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any comments
39 from the Council to ADF&G's position.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My question would be
44 on the bull/cow ratio. When you flew those trends the
45 bull/cow ratio dropped in half and there was -- did you
46 recognize that there were several bulls outside of your
47 trend count areas or I see 62 bulls in '08 in 21E and
48 then dropping to 32 bulls, but Jerry told us that some
49 of the bulls might have been outside of your trend
50 areas.

1 Go ahead.

2

3 MR. PEARCE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. That
4 data point really needs to be taken with a pretty big
5 grain of salt. This -- that was an incomplete survey
6 and really those two numbers aren't even comparable. I
7 feel that we still have high bull/cow ratios is my
8 guess. That survey we were not able to do the Yukon at
9 all, it was completely socked in with freezing fog, so
10 we surveyed the Innoko. We basically did half of our
11 trend area, so that data point is highly suspect and I
12 don't put much weight in it.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That
15 clarifies that. Go ahead, Tim.

16

17 MR. GERVAIS: So, continuing with that,
18 Josh, you're saying that you're bull ratio's much
19 higher on the Yukon than in the Innoko sections of your
20 survey?

21

22 MR. PEARCE: Where we tended to see
23 more bulls was on the Yukon, up around the Grayling
24 area. There tended to be a higher percentage of bulls
25 in the number of moose that we saw, so yeah that's
26 correct. And that's in November, any time from early
27 to early November to Thanksgiving tends to be when we
28 do these composition counts.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so another --
31 oh, go ahead James.

32

33 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair, thank you.
34 Have you -- did you say you didn't fly the lower
35 portion of 21E?

36

37 MR. PEARCE: By the lower portion you
38 mean south of the Yukon and Paimiut Slough, no. We
39 tend to end right around Holy Cross, actually we go
40 just south as far as Paimiut Slough, but that's as far
41 south as we go, so we don't go any further towards the
42 19A boundary.

43

44 MR. J. WALKER: You mean Paimiut
45 Slough, you mean the village of Paimiut?

46

47 MR. PEARCE: The old village site of
48 Paimiut and then east of there across what would be
49 south of the confluence of the Innoko and Yukon river.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so another
2 question on the Innoko portion, now this 32 bulls per
3 -- you have quite a bit of bull harvest from non-local
4 people up there, local people -- that seems to be
5 cropping right about 32 bulls per 100 cows, which
6 indicate you're getting a fairly consistent harvest of
7 bulls in the Innoko drainage?

8
9 MR. PEARCE: I guess I'm not sure
10 exactly what your question is.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, the question
13 is if you've only surveyed the Innoko, and you're
14 showing 32 bulls per 100 cows, it indicates that you're
15 harvesting quite a few or you're getting a pretty
16 good harvest there. Is that local harvest or is that
17 -- are there non-resident hunters hunting in there or
18 what's the hunting demographics of the Innoko?

19
20 MR. PEARCE: The hunting demographics,
21 I guess you could say, it's mostly local hunters, but
22 there is a fair amount of non-local, but Alaskan
23 residents, hunting and non-resident hunting is pretty
24 minimal. There's only -- well we issue potentially 60
25 permits per year. Last year -- I actually have those
26 numbers in one of these presentations, but last year
27 there were maybe 30 hunters, non-resident hunters that
28 went out, and non-resident harvest is only around 10 to
29 12 moose per year, so the majority of the harvest that
30 occurs in 21E is by Alaska residents.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that's a fairly
33 stable number of non-local hunters that have continued
34 to go there?

35
36 MR. PEARCE: One of the things that has
37 changed quite a bit in recent years. And James and
38 Robert could speak to this probably better than I can,
39 but there's been a decrease in the number of Unit 18
40 hunters, from our harvest reports anyways, that use
41 that area. There's a lot more opportunity in 18 now
42 than there ever has been before, and so a lot of those
43 hunters are staying home basically.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see. Well, I'm
46 not -- it's a good number. I'm not complaining about
47 32, that's a decent number. And you got good big bulls
48 up there in your composition, in the 32 you're seeing
49 some nice adults, over three year old bulls?

50

1 MR. PEARCE: Yeah. We definitely see a
2 good number of large bulls as well, and one of the
3 things, too, that this collaring project, and I haven't
4 gotten to the details of this, but this will split in
5 here as well. One of the things that's really
6 important to keep in minds is we do our counts in
7 November and late February/March, people are out there
8 hunting for the most part in September and so there's
9 definitely some differences there and some of the local
10 perceptions that maybe don't line up with our data. I
11 don't disagree at all with what the locals are seeing
12 there on the ground. We're looking at moose at a
13 different time of year than they are, and so this
14 collaring data, again, is going to help us kind of mess
15 some of that.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. All right,
18 thank you. I'd like to know what's going on with the
19 harvest trends and so forth in that area. So I -- my
20 analysis is that there's good numbers of bulls and we
21 can support this, easily support this harvest into the
22 end of September. My position on these, we've been
23 moving seasons back in September and most of the bulls
24 that would be harvested at that time are satellite
25 bulls that are kicked away from those breeding
26 aggregates, and, so those would be the highest
27 encounter rate by people who were looking for moose,
28 and if I don't have a moose I'm going to hunt until the
29 last daylight, and I'm fading away and I've done that,
30 and so mainly it'd kill younger bulls on that kind of a
31 -- at that time of year, so they're good moose to get.

32
33 Any other comments about the State's
34 discussion.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll move to the
39 tribal comments.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We don't have any of
44 those.

45
46 InterAgency Staff.

47
48 (No comments)

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Subsistence Resource

1 Commission.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5

6

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Fish and Game
Advisory Committee, you've got comments, Ken, on
Proposal 66?

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

MR. CHASE: I have one short comment.
In our meeting the other day, our committee supported
and, you know, they want this but then we they voted
8 to -- 6 to 8 to not extend our non-resident hunting
that we tried to get for the State to the 25th of
September, they didn't want that. That's -- I don't
know where the -- where, you know, the concerns are
coming from, but they did support the later season, but
not saying really why.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This was a Federal
proposal. This would only be for basically rural
residents that have customary and traditional use in
that area. Is there a State proposal for non-resident
extension of seasons?

MR. CHASE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's what you're
talking about, okay. Yeah, we'll probably get to that.

MR. CHASE: But we, you know, they
support the extension because of some of the concerns
that the weather and, et cetera, however in talking to
some of the people off the record, you know, they say
well maybe we should put a restriction on the larger
bulls, and not take those, the breeding bulls.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

MR. CHASE: So that -- that's kind of
in the back thinking.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, you're
floating around a lot, most of the moose you see moving
around and away from the breeding aggregates are those
either beat up bulls that get kicked away or younger
bulls, and so they're usually traveling more and those
are the ones that are going to be susceptible. Is that
your perception also?

I'm of the opinion that very few

1 breeding bulls, the bulls with the cows, he's got so
2 many cows around him, they know it, they hear you
3 coming. They're high alert, those breeding aggregates
4 and so I don't -- I'm not so concerned about the large
5 bulls, the satellite bulls is the ones I feel would be
6 the most likely to get harvested.

7

8 You got a comment, Josh.

9

10 MR. PEARCE: Yeah. This is actually a
11 -- this is Josh Pearce again, Fish and Game. A
12 question for Ken and James and Robert as much as
13 anything, with this C&T determination, how do you guys
14 feel that -- if those 19A villages were included, you
15 know, they would be able to participate in this later
16 fall hunt as well, do you think you get a lot of 19A
17 -- yeah, 19A, do you guys think you would see a large
18 influx of hunters from 19A in September or are they
19 only able to travel there in the wintertime?

20

21 MR. J. WALKER: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I
22 believe that a majority of those hunters would be
23 during the winter hunt.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Comment, Robert.

26

27 MR. R. WALKER: Yes, Mr. Chair, thank
28 you. Yes, it would traditionally be a winter hunt, it
29 wouldn't be a fall hunt, that's all it would be.

30

31 MR. PEARCE: Okay. I just thought that
32 would be an important point to get out for your
33 deliberations.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, it would be.

36

37 MR. R. WALKER: And, also Mr. Chairman,
38 that is a different proposal too, so Josh I think we
39 were getting to.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Other
42 comments.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Written comments at
47 all, Ann?

48

49 MS. WILKINSON: No.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And no public
2 testimony.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So Regional Council
7 deliberation. Motion to adopt the Proposal WP10-66 as
8 written.
9
10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What number?
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 66.
13
14 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.
15
16 MS. YATLIN: You already did 67.
17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, we're on
19 Proposal WP10-66.
20
21 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, it was 65 we.....
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, we just passed
24 65. Proposal 10-66 extending the season to -- from
25 August 25th to September 30th and so moved by who?
26
27 MR. J. WALKER: I did.
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James.
30
31 MS. YATLIN: Second.
32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Second by Eleanor.
34 Discussion on the proposal.
35
36 (No comments)
37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'll make a comment
39 or statement, justification. Bull/cow ratio is
40 completely adequate for additional harvest and will be
41 a non-conflict with the population and will meet
42 subsistence needs.
43
44 Those in favor of the proposal.....
45
46 MR. R. WALKER: I got one more comment.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, you got one
49 more comment.
50

1 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. I'd like
2 to thank the AC -- the GASH AC for working in line with
3 the Board here in getting these two proposals for the
4 record.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Robert.
7 Further discussion. Jenny.

8
9 MS. PELKOLA: I didn't hear Robert.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Restate that Robert,
12 she didn't hear you.

13
14 MR. R. WALKER: I think -- do you need
15 a miracle ear.

16
17 (Laughter)

18
19 MR. R. WALKER: My statement was I'd
20 like to thank the GASH AC, Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk,
21 Holy Cross for working in line with the Western
22 Interior RAC Board, that was my comment.

23
24 Thank you.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I appreciate
27 that. Those in favor of Proposal WP10-66, signify by
28 saying I.

29
30 IN UNISON: Aye.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
33 sign.

34
35 (No opposing votes)

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Western Interior
38 adopt Proposal 10-66. Jerry are we or Polly.

39
40 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
41 Proposal -- I'm going to talk about Proposal 10-69 and
42 the analysis for this proposal can be found in your
43 books on page -- beginning on Page 108 and going to
44 123. I'll give you a minute to find that in your
45 books. This is the customary and traditional use
46 determination for moose in 21E. This proposal was
47 submitted by the Kuskokwim Native Association or KNA,
48 as it's frequently called.

49
50 Proposal 10-69 requests the recognition

1 of customary and traditional uses of moose in 21E, Unit
2 21E for residents of Lower Kalskag, Upper Kalskag,
3 Aniak, Chuathbaluk. The current C&T determination can
4 be found on Page 109 in your book and the current C&T
5 determination for moose in Unit 21E is rural residents
6 of 21E and Russian Mission, which basically is the
7 communities of Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk, Holy Cross
8 and Russian Mission. This request or a similar request
9 was submitted by KNA to the Board, the Federal
10 Subsistence Board in 2008, you might remember this, in
11 the form of a special action request. The Board
12 rejected the request in part because it believed
13 additional public participation and discussion was
14 necessary. The Board encouraged KNA to submit a
15 regular cycle proposal and that regular cycle proposal
16 is the topic of this analysis.

17
18 While caribou can be harvested in Unit
19 21E under Federal subsistence regulations by residents
20 of some communities in Unit 19A, Aniak, Chuathbaluk and
21 Crooked Creek, currently no community in 19A is
22 included in the customary and traditional use
23 determination for moose in 21E, as I just said. The
24 full analysis is in your books, but I'm just going to
25 touch on a few key points today.

26
27 A discussion of the eight factors that
28 we use to elucidate a customary and traditional pattern
29 of use, a discussion of the eight factors for each of
30 the four communities included in the request can be
31 found on Pages 113 to 120 in your books, it begins on
32 Page 113 and it goes through the eight factors and goes
33 through each of the four communities.

34
35 Just a few key points I wanted to
36 mention here, Lower Kalskag, Upper Kalskag and Aniak
37 use only a part of Unit 21E, primarily the area that
38 was by residents of Paimiut, the Paimiut Slough area.
39 This hunting pattern differs from that of the four,
40 Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk and Holy Cross communities in
41 Unit 21E that are known to hunt moose in the entire
42 area of 21E. Access to Unit 21E, something that Josh
43 just addressed earlier, access to Unit 21E by Lower
44 Kalskag, Upper Kalskag and Aniak is over land in
45 winter.

46
47 Several factors have been identified
48 that influence the decision to travel to Paimiut Slough
49 to hunt moose.

50

1 One is the low success rate in the fall
2 season and,

3
4 Second is if favorable travel
5 conditions occur in February. If
6 favorable travel conditions do not
7 exist hunters are unlikely to travel to
8 this area.

9
10 So Mr. Chair, I would ask that you turn
11 to -- and Council members turn to Page 121 in your
12 books and that has the modified language that the
13 Office of Subsistence Management is looking at
14 supporting, and that would be sort of a two part C&T
15 analysis.

16
17 The first part would be south of the
18 line beginning at the western boundary of Unit 21E near
19 Tabernacle Mountain extending eastly to the junction of
20 Paimiut Slough and Innoko Slough and southeasterly in
21 the direction of the Millivdian Mountain to the
22 juncture of Units 19A, 21A and 21E. That little area
23 would be residents of Unit 21E, Aniak, Kalskag, Lower
24 Kalskag and Russian Mission and then the remainder of
25 21E would be residents of Unit 21E and Russian Mission.

26
27 And Mr. Chair, if you look at the map
28 on Page....

29
30 MR. COLLINS: 110.

31
32 DR. WHEELER: 110. Thank you, Ray.
33 It's there -- I colored in just that little pocket
34 because the hatching is kind of tough, this is a fairly
35 busy map, but I colored in the little pocket that we're
36 talking about there. It's the lower part, it's right
37 near 19A, so if you look at that, that's the area that
38 we're suggesting. The 19 -- those three communities
39 would be included and I would also add that we are
40 recommending to exclude Chuathbaluk from this. It was
41 included in the original request, but we're not
42 recommending to support Chuathbaluk just because the
43 information to support a recommendation for them is
44 really sparse. It doesn't look like there's much going
45 on up there, so, again, the final -- or the preliminary
46 recommendation is on Page 121 and it includes this
47 little pocket, so it's kind of a two part C&T
48 determination.

49
50 Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Polly.
2 Council comments on the OSM's presentation.

3
4 Robert.

5
6 MR. R. WALKER: Thanks, Mr. Chair.
7 Polly, didn't residents of Russian Mission have
8 knowledge of this C&T that KNA is putting in?

9
10 DR. WHEELER: This analysis will be
11 presented to the YK RAC because I believe that they're
12 included in the YK RAC area, so they'll be included,
13 and also these communities are included in the YK RAC
14 area, so they'll be -- it will be presented to that
15 Council. Do members of -- were -- did we specifically
16 get in touch with Russian Mission, no.

17
18 MR. R. WALKER: I'm just kind of
19 curious too, because the tribal council, I talked to
20 some of the tribal council, I went to school with them
21 in the '60s here and they were asking that, you know,
22 we're part of your region six, but we're not in your
23 unit, which is kind of weird, you know, how'd this
24 happen. I said, boy, you know, this has happened
25 before I got on board here, but they would like to be
26 in, just as much as they would from their lower Yukon
27 advisor or from their RAC too, so it's kind of like
28 they're in a Catch-22 where they -- where they're at
29 our mercy, then they're also at the mercy of the Yukon
30 RAC.

31
32 DR. WHEELER: Duly noted.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So other comments on
35 the OSM's presentation.

36
37 Ray.

38
39 MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I
40 know this issue came up a number of years ago and I was
41 -- sat in with some of those members and trying to
42 discuss this and reach a resolution in the past, and
43 all of the testimony was about that small area there.
44 They were asking for the whole thing, but the use was
45 actually limited mostly to that small area there, so
46 this seems to be a move in the right direction of
47 delineating a smaller area than 21, the whole thing.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. When we had
50 that meeting about this special action request I had

1 made that point. I said, you know, you're asking for
2 the moon and so I -- the delineation is what I would
3 preferred to have seen and so I'm encouraged by that
4 part. I am concerned that looking at the population
5 status of these communities, that they're very large
6 villages and they would basically usurp all of the
7 quota of the winter hunt, is what I'm concerned about.
8 And so is there a possibility of putting a limitation
9 on the percentage of that winter hunt quota. Once you
10 have a C&T they have full blown -- they can just take
11 the whole quota, all -- and that's not advantageous to
12 take the whole quota in one place either, well
13 basically kill all the moose in one very localized
14 area. Can we limit quota hunts, their ability to share
15 the quotas with the other communities of that -- of
16 that -- that have C&T of that Unit? That's probably a
17 tough one for you.

18
19 DR. WHEELER: Oh, it's not that tough.
20 Well, a couple things that I need to point out.

21
22 Number 1, if this preliminary
23 recommendation of OSM were to pass it's not just for
24 the winter season, it's the whole unit, you know, we
25 don't do C&Ts by season, so it would be for the whole
26 unit. So that -- in the interest of full disclosure,
27 that needs to be put on the record.

28
29 What you're asking about, Mr. Chair,
30 you know, typically our pat response is that customary
31 and traditional use determinations are separate from
32 conservation concerns. If there's conservation
33 concerns we deal with those through seasons, bag
34 limits, if need be through .804. So if this Council
35 were to make the recommendation to include these
36 communities in the C&T for a portion of 21E, they're in
37 and if we -- if there were conservation concerns then
38 we would need to go down the road of an .804.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Excuse me.
41 I m going to dialogue about this issue.

42
43 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

46
47 DR. WHEELER: Jerry just reminded me,
48 and we would also have to close Federal lands to all
49 but Federally-qualified users.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.
2
3 DR. WHEELER: So it's kind of a package
4 deal. We close Federal lands to all but Federally-
5 qualified users and then do an .804.
6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: On the winter hunt
8 Proposal 65, the Refuge manager has discretion on
9 issuing the permits, would the Refuge managers have the
10 discretion to allocate permits for that area, no
11 discretion area, where all the harvest can occur even
12 for biological reasons?
13
14 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair, no. I mean
15 ANILCA .804 is very clear on that. That if there is a
16 conservation concern then you need to do an .804
17 analysis, which we did, for example, for moose in Unit
18 19A. Where you go and you look at proximity to the
19 resource, dependance on the resource and availability
20 of alternative resources. But that's, again, .804 is
21 clear, if there's conservation concerns we go down that
22 road.
23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Okay, well
25 we're sort of exploring avenues here.
26
27 DR. WHEELER: That's good.
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
30 questions on the OSM's presentation.
31
32 (No comments)
33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so Alaska
35 Department of Fish and Game comments.
36
37 MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman. I'm new
38 to the Council. We don't have any comments to make.
39
40 DR. WHEELER: For the record, I believe
41 the Department doesn't have any comments to make on
42 customary and traditional use determinations at all.
43
44 MR. CAMPBELL: Until we've heard the
45 RAC's discussions.
46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I see.
48
49 DR. WHEELER: Then I suspect there will
50 be comments.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, down in
2 Anchorage. Okay. And other Federal -- we don't -- I'm
3 wondering why Innoko is not here at this meeting?
4
5 DR. WHEELER: I asked Kenton that
6 earlier, but he doesn't supervise Kevin anymore.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. Well, I mean
9 Bo or Kevin usually are at our meeting.
10
11 DR. WHEELER: Yeah. He is usually at
12 these meetings.
13
14 MR. BERG: Yeah. Mr. Chair. Jerry
15 Berg, Fish and Wildlife Service. I did talk to Kevin
16 just before coming to this meeting and he had intended
17 to be here, but something came up that he and Bo both
18 had to attend.
19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I see.
21
22 MR. BERG: And so he's not able to be
23 here.
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: They don't have any
26 written comments on any of these issues from the Refuge
27 position?
28
29 MR. BERG: No. Well, they were neutral
30 on 66, but they don't have a position on this proposal.
31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay. I was
33 just wondering what their Staff was thinking.
34
35 MR. BERG: Well, yeah, I guess I can
36 add that, you know, they certainly committed to working
37 with the communities to implement the winter season and
38 they realize that if this C&T were to pass it would
39 significantly increase their administrative efforts to
40 go to, you know, these extra villages to issue permits
41 and, you know, I mean it's certainly -- they're aware
42 of that extra workload and they just, you know, Bo said
43 that he would, you know, work with the situation and do
44 what he could, so I mean it just would be a little bit
45 of an extra workload for him.
46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Okay.
48
49 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair.
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. Go ahead,
2 James.

3
4 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. Along
5 that line if this were to go how would there be any
6 monitoring of actual residents of these particular
7 villages that are coming over, I mean it's a broad area
8 down there?

9
10 DR. WHEELER: It would be through the
11 reporting requirements, so whatever the reporting
12 requirements are with the hunt, people would have to
13 report, that's it.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jerry.

16
17 MR. BERG: Yeah. Can I add to that.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: (Nods affirmatively)

20
21 MR. BERG: I, you know, I almost wanted
22 to bring this up when you guys voted on the 24 -- that
23 was part of when you guys voted on 65, was the 24 hour
24 reporting and I don't know, you know, that's going to
25 be a big change for folks in those communities and I
26 don't know how well that 24 hour reporting would work.
27 It might be good to get -- to have some discussion on
28 that, if that's what you guys want to stick with. I
29 mean the reporting requirement is a stipulation that
30 can be put on the permit and we have, you know, a
31 little bit of latitude on what that reporting
32 requirement would be and, you know, certainly that
33 would be a way to track who's harvesting what from what
34 village, you know, as the season progresses. But, you
35 know, whether that 24 hour reporting will work or not,
36 you know, you guys probably have a much better feel for
37 that than we do. We're just going with what you guys
38 think will work, and I know the Refuge wants to work
39 with the communities in what they think works best.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I know we talked
42 about the reporting requirement down in Aniak last
43 fall, but Robert you had a comment.

44
45 MR. R. WALKER: Yes. I'd like to hear
46 from the other communities that -- in this GASH area
47 also.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. And so we're
50 off those State comments and I was asking about the

1 Innoko where -- you got a comment there, Ray.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman.
4 Point of order kind of, this is a proposal asking
5 whether they had C&T in that area and we're talking
6 about how they might hunt and permit and other things.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

9

10 MR. COLLINS: And that's completely
11 separate.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well it all -- it's
14 not actually that separate. It actually enters into
15 the -- basically we're -- we mail out hundreds of
16 additional harvesters access to a resource that -- and
17 so.....

18

19 MR. COLLINS: But the question is
20 whether or not they actually use that area historically
21 according to the criteria that was laid out, and if you
22 look at the area it comes clear down to the river right
23 behind Aniak there, so obviously that -- at least a
24 portion of that area -- we might argue about how big
25 that area is, but it's right in their backyard and it's
26 obvious that they have used at least a part of it.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm not disputing
29 their use. I'm not disputing that aspect. I'm
30 disputing the allocation of the winter hunt. The
31 primary time that they're going to come to 21E is in
32 the winter, and my concern is that we're going to allow
33 a C&T on a Federal hunt and this large population base
34 is going to take the whole quota. That's my concern.
35 And so it is tied one to the next. And so this whole
36 definition of this smaller area of Unit 21, this is
37 addressing part of my concern and so I'm inclined to
38 back up and go to 65 and give the -- and revisit that
39 and give the Refuge manager allocation authority along
40 for -- for the various villages, that's one of the --
41 you don't want to go there?

42

43 DR. WHEELER: Well, Mr. Chair, I feel
44 compelled to at least put this on record sort of what
45 member Collins was saying is that -- is, again, the
46 customary and traditional use finding is a -- I mean
47 it's hard to separate them because we don't live in a
48 vacuum, but the customary and traditional use
49 determination is about who customary and traditionally
50 uses that resource and then if there are conservation

1 concerns or anything else we go down that road. But I
2 would really caution you to think long and hard -- I
3 mean I don't believe that the Council, I mean the
4 Council can make whatever recommendation it makes, but
5 under ANILCA Section .804 you -- if there is a
6 conservation concern you go down the road of doing an
7 .804 analysis.

8
9 So there's a C&T determination, whoever
10 is in the pool of users is in the pool of users; if
11 there's a conservation concern who select from amongst
12 those users as to who's most dependent on the resource.

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'll keep dialouging
15 with the Staff here. My concern is that a concurrent
16 implementation of .804 has gone to a drawing system and
17 so you just ballot box stuff that the -- or with
18 hundreds of additional applicants, which takes resource
19 away from people who live right next to the resource,
20 and so I'm concerned about -- I'm becoming more
21 concerned about the drawing allocation. I feel that
22 there should be more at a Tier II, the old Tier II,
23 style of an analysis for .804 applications. That's one
24 of my concerns that I'll state on the record here
25 because of this issue because we get large committees
26 that then ballot box stuff, the applications and take
27 all of the quota away -- or the resource away from the
28 rest of the people that live in the area and that's
29 just -- I don't feel that is correct application of
30 .804 or the ANILCA priority for the whole -- all of the
31 customary users.

32
33 Polly.

34
35 DR. WHEELER: I don't know how far down
36 the road you want to go with this, Mr. Chair, and feel
37 free to cut me off using your mic or any other device,
38 but with the Unit....

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Speak your mind,
41 Polly.

42
43 DR. WHEELER: Yep, see he did it. He
44 has the power.

45
46 (Laughter)

47
48 DR. WHEELER: With the Unit 19A, .804
49 what we did, you know, with the .804 for moose, we did
50 an .804 analysis back in May of 2006 and there were a

1 huge number of communities that had the C&T
2 determination to hunt moose in 19A, and we did the
3 analysis. We came up with, I believe five communities.
4 Then we divided up the drawing permits based on the
5 population of those five communities, so, you know,
6 they allocated whatever the number of permits that was
7 available, it was divided amongst the five communities
8 that were identified as to be the most dependent on the
9 .804.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

12

13 DR. WHEELER: So it's not strictly
14 about box stuffing. But I appreciate your concern if
15 there's a huge community and if you divided it up like
16 on a per capita basis or something, a large community
17 would get a large number of permits.

18

19 Mr. Chair.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Thank you.
22 I just wanted to express my concerns about -- they are
23 interrelated, customary and traditional use is
24 interrelated to the allocation of the actual hunts
25 themselves.

26

27 And so further discussion with Polly on
28 this issue.

29

30 Go ahead there, Robert.

31

32 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr.
33 Chairman. Polly, you know back in the 70's, 80's where
34 you had State hunt in the winter, I and Carl Morgan
35 were talking about this here before he left yesterday,
36 was that what if Bethel, all the Kuskokwim River, all
37 the way down that did come up and use it in the winter
38 time, how would they have -- would they be legal to say
39 we hunted there in the past. Part of our C&T here, we
40 -- is that possible?

41

42 DR. WHEELER: Through the Chair, member
43 Walker. As you know we have had a number of requests,
44 or proposals submitted from Unit 18 communities to have
45 their customary -- to be added to the customary and
46 traditional use determination for moose in Unit 21E.
47 The Board had not acted on any of those proposals. You
48 remember we had a working group, we had any number of
49 things. This request is the first we've received from
50 19A, so I can't speak to what the Board would do. If

1 we had yet another request from Unit 18 communities, as
2 Josh said earlier their participation in the State hunt
3 in 21E has dropped off because there's more opportunity
4 down in Unit 18 than there has been historically, but
5 it would require a proposal and then we'd look at the
6 available information. But that's not what is before
7 you today, it's just the Unit 19A communities.

8

9 Mr. Chair.

10

11 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Polly. And
14 so I think we'll move to the Advisory Committee
15 comments. You have Advisory Committee comments, Ken.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, didn't look at
20 this, okay. Comment there, James.

21

22 MR. J. WALKER: Thanks, Mr. Chair.
23 Ken, I believe that some of the tribal councils had
24 comments, and they were going to address GASH on this
25 issue. Were you aware of it?

26

27 MR. CHASE: Mr. Chair and Jimmy. No,
28 I'm not. We haven't been addressed by any of the
29 councils. I heard the Holy Cross, no Shageluk, I think
30 had something but we never did see it.

31

32 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
33 Ken. I know I'm aware of an issue here that was
34 addressed in Holy Cross Tribal Council and they were
35 going to contact the other villages on this issue here
36 and I'm just wondering if there was any interaction
37 between the tribal councils and the GASH membership?

38

39 MR. CHASE: Not to me. No, not
40 formally to our committee, no.

41

42 MR. J. WALKER: This is -- to me it's
43 an important issue here that, you know, might have a
44 really detrimental impact on the ability of the village
45 people to hunt during the winter hunt because you are
46 aware of the easy access that the Toza (ph) would have
47 during the winter hunt to get to this area and they've
48 done it through other resource depletion, namely pike
49 and that's been a big issue down below Holy Cross and
50 there's people from Bethel, Toksook Bay loading up

1 they're sleds, bringing that back. And I see this just
2 as a door that's going to open up this area and this
3 resource is going to be depleted.

4

5 MR. CHASE: Yeah. I think, you know,
6 our committee didn't -- haven't really addressed this
7 lately, but myself hearing Jack's -- Mr. Chairman's
8 comments on the allocation around on -- maybe the
9 manager of the wildlife Refuge, say allocating so many
10 moose for each village, you know, that's kind of
11 interesting because if the area that's in question
12 right now were to be included into the Chuathbaluk,
13 Aniak area then I think that would have to happen, you
14 know, in their area there's so much population there,
15 they'd have to just give them a certain allocation.

16

17 I'm kind of looking ahead I guess to
18 the what if, you know if that happens, if it's
19 permitted. I'm not too up on what all the problem
20 areas are, and if it's implemented, but I know for
21 years we've talked about maybe just letting that area
22 being used by areas, but it would concern the whole 21,
23 we can't -- we can't isolate it.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James.

26

27 MR. J. WALKER: Thanks, Mr. Chair. And
28 Polly, I know the documentation as far as historical
29 and cultural use of this area is somewhat in the
30 record, but primarily the customary and traditional use
31 that's stated here is by residents, former residents of
32 the Paimiut Village that moved away to these villages
33 in question now, so it's mainly a family issue here
34 that's been assumed and assimilated in these villages.
35 Now, you had one individual that moved away that has
36 family; now it's Chuathbaluk or Aniak that's all coming
37 over. You see what my question is as far as
38 determination?

39

40 DR. WHEELER: Through the Chair, member
41 Walker -- member J Walker. I can't disagree with you,
42 you know, the way that we do customary and traditional
43 use determinations, we typically look at the pattern of
44 use by community and as you well know communities are
45 made up of individuals who -- some of whom have lived
46 elsewhere. But that being said it's still a pattern of
47 use by this particular community. So -- but you raise
48 -- I agree with your -- I mean I see your perspective,
49 Member Walker.

50

1 That's probably not a very satisfying
2 response.

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You got a comment
5 there, Eleanor.

6
7 MS. YATLIN: Just one question.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

10
11 MS. YATLIN: I just had a question.
12 How did they determine those eight factors, I mean, you
13 know, it was a question on the joint, and you know they
14 didn't have a complete, you know, traditional use for
15 customary trade?

16
17 DR. WHEELER: There's customary and
18 traditional use determinations and then there's
19 customary trade. I'll just speak today to customary --
20 or right now to customary and traditional use
21 determinations just to give you a little bit of
22 background.

23
24 When the State had management authority
25 before the Federal program began, the State joint
26 boards met. They actually had a fisheries -- it was a
27 fisheries issue originally that prompted it, but the
28 Board of Fisheries, Board of Game, joint boards met.
29 They came up with these eight criteria, actually
30 originally it was 10, but it went down to eight, that
31 were to elucidate a customary and traditional pattern
32 of use that would be sort of consistent with
33 subsistence uses. When the Federal program started in
34 1990 with wildlife, we adopted that model. We tweaked
35 it a little bit, we called them factors rather than
36 criteria, but functionally they're the same and they're
37 talking about -- and, in fact, in your analysis on Page
38 -- let me see, on Page 113 it lists the eight factors.

39
40 It's a long-term consistent pattern of
41 use excluding interruptions beyond the
42 control of the community or area.

43
44 A pattern of use reoccurring in
45 specific seasons for many years.

46
47 A pattern of use consisting of methods
48 and means of harvest which are
49 characterized by efficiency and economy
50 of effort and cost, conditioned by

1 local characteristics.

2

3 The consistent harvest and use of fish
4 or wildlife is related to past methods
5 and means of taking: near or
6 reasonably accessible from the
7 community or area.

8

9 A means of handling, preparing,
10 preserving and storing fish or wildlife
11 which has been traditionally used by
12 past generations, including
13 consideration of alteration of past
14 practices due to recent technological
15 advances where appropriate.

16

17 A pattern of use which includes the
18 handing down of knowledge of fishing
19 and hunting skills, values, and lore
20 from generation to generation.

21

22 A pattern of use in which the harvest
23 is shared or distributed within a
24 definable community of persons.

25

26 A pattern of use which relates to
27 reliance upon a wide diversity of fish
28 and wildlife resources of the area and
29 which provides substantial cultural,
30 economic, social and nutritional
31 elements to the community or area.

32

33 So those are the eight factors.

34

35 Together they're supposed to kind of
36 speak to a customary and traditional pattern of use.
37 Now, our program -- like I said when we started in 1990
38 we adopted that model for looking at a customary and
39 traditional pattern of use, is that model, the best
40 model. Well that's certainly been a topic of
41 discussion in the 20 years that our program has been
42 around because there are some that say under ANILCA
43 it's rural users, so why do we even need to then
44 further define the pool or users. But that's still --
45 that being -- I mean what we have in our implementing
46 regulations is this eight factor approach.

47

48 The other piece of customary and
49 traditional use determination, which I need to add is
50 that when the Federal program started we adopted this

1 model with the idea that this was a temp -- we were not
2 going to be around forever, well now it looks like we
3 may be around forever, so this whole issue of C&T
4 determinations and how we do them probably will likely
5 be a topic of conversation. I know it's been an issue
6 that's been raised in the subsistence review, but with
7 the thought that we were going to be a temporary
8 program, we adopted the model, we also adopted a lot of
9 the States C&T determinations. And this 21E moose
10 determination was adopted from the State back when the
11 State did C&T determinations, I mean they still do them
12 but they mean something different now. So we adopted
13 the C&T finding from the State back in 1990. Like I
14 said there's been a number of proposals that have been
15 submitted to the Federal program, which haven't been
16 acted on by the Federal Board or they've been deferred,
17 on that I have spoken to this 21E moose C&T, but I
18 would be lying to you if I would say to you that this
19 hasn't been before the Board on a number of occasions,
20 before this Council. And it was an issue that was
21 hotly debated in the Yukon/Innoko Moose Management
22 Planning effort as well.

23

24 So anyway that's your short little
25 tutorial on C&Ts, but thank you for the question.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

28

29 MS. YATLIN: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.
30 And so you're saying TEK is factored into this?

31

32 DR. WHEELER: Yes. Traditional
33 knowledge is factored into it, ethnographic interviews
34 kind of talking, I mean that's how we get that
35 information. And in the best case scenario --
36 unfortunately we haven't interviewed every elder in the
37 state, so we don't -- some of our information is dated.
38 It's spotty in places. But we do the best we can with
39 the information that we have. But I will say that the
40 Regional Advisory Council, one of the key roles of this
41 Council, all the Councils, the 10 Councils, is to
42 provide that local perspective, provide that
43 traditional knowledge on C&T determinations, all the
44 other proposals as well, so we really rely on you all
45 to provide the information that we can't get out of
46 books or, you know, studies or whatever else.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You got a comment
49 there, Mitch.

50

1 MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You got to come to
4 the mic.
5
6 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman
7 and members of the Council. Just for the record, I'm
8 Mitch Campbell from the Alaska Department of Fish and
9 Game. And Polly was right in her analysis of the C&T
10 determinations, but when they adopted the Federal
11 Subsistence Program from the State in 1990 they did
12 adopt relatively the same criteria that the State had
13 been using prior to that; however it did go through a
14 substantial and NEPA, an Environmental Impact
15 Assessment where they reviewed different alternatives
16 to see which ones would be most beneficial and those
17 can be found in the record of decision in 1992.
18
19 So I just thought I'd clarify that.
20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you.
22
23 MR. CAMPBELL: But Polly was dead
24 right.
25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. So
27 further discussions with Polly here.
28
29 James.
30
31 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair and Polly.
32 This is on kind of a little lighter note, is that it
33 only takes five bulls for a village to get a
34 determination here, I mean any village out there can
35 say I went over there and shot five times and got a
36 moose, and this was done years ago so is that
37 traditional and customary?
38
39 DR. WHEELER: And that's -- I'm not --
40 I'm going to throw it back at you, again through the
41 Chair and Member J Walker, that would -- that is where
42 the wisdom of the Council comes in.
43
44 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you. And no
45 longer is that village there.
46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So further comments.
48
49 (No comments)
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Going back to this
2 whole issue, I would feel more comfortable if there was
3 a winter hunt allocation process that would address the
4 concerns that this large population base will take away
5 the resource from -- and so I would feel more
6 comfortable if 21E was zoned from Holy Cross south,
7 then a middle part and an upper part, and have
8 allocations within those -- and using a customary --
9 correction, a Tier II type allocation system instead of
10 a drawing would address James and Robert's questions
11 about who will use this resource, I mean that have now
12 moved into these communities or dispersed into those
13 large community bases. A Tier II type system would
14 address those user -- or they would be assessed -- you
15 remember the old scoring Tier II system, they would
16 score out and then they would be -- they would have the
17 use of the resource. Has the OSM considered the old
18 Tier II scoring system in the .804 process, I've given
19 you some hard questions today, Polly.

20
21 DR. WHEELER: In short, no. We
22 haven't. You know, again we have -- the structure of
23 our program or the, you know, sort of the idea for our
24 program is provided by ANILCA and then the structure is
25 provided through the implementing regulations, that's
26 kind of how I think about it. And the implementing reg
27 -- ANILCA doesn't talk about customary and traditional
28 use determinations, ANILCA talks about protecting and
29 continuing subsistence uses, and subsistence uses are
30 defined and you all are familiar with the definition.
31 And then .804 says if there's a conservation concern we
32 go down this road, now, you know, thinking kind of
33 theoretically here could we come up with some sort of a
34 point system to address the .804 criteria, possibly.
35 Have we thought about it, no.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, having lived
38 here my whole life, it was my impression that .804
39 drove Tier II, that's what -- that's why the Boards
40 developed Tier II, was a scoring system to address the
41 four points of .804, and that's what Tier II was about,
42 so I feel that Tier II....

43
44 DR. WHEELER: Theoretically.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Theoretically. So
47 the old Tier II's, not the morphs Tier II's that they
48 use now. The old Tier II system actually hit at who
49 used the resource and so forth, so that would address
50 their concerns about the users basis, the family users

1 basis and so forth and so, how would we would this
2 Council address this issue with the Federal Board about
3 these allocations under .804, can we make
4 recommendations regarding drawing permits versus a Tier
5 II scoring system?
6

7 DR. WHEELER: Well, lest I get in
8 anymore hot water, I would ask that you take a break
9 and that I can call Sloan's office because I don't want
10 to give you bad information.
11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.
13

14 DR. WHEELER: I mean I could tell you
15 what I think, but that isn't necessarily what's.....
16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This is a fairly
18 complex issue and as you know it would be a complex
19 issue here, so I think it would be good to take a --
20 you have one last comment there.
21

22 Go ahead Robert.
23

24 MR. R. WALKER: Polly. Thank you, Mr.
25 Chairman. Talking to Tier II and over the last 10
26 years we have denied the lower Yukon C&T and the lower
27 portion of 21A. I mean, you know, we had meetings and
28 meetings and hours spent in discussions and brought in
29 people and fly out people and now we're talking to the
30 Kuskokwim, give them a C&T and what are the lower Yukon
31 going to do, are they going to scream foul. Say that
32 you guys are -- because they're closer, we use it more
33 than they did because they've been using it since as
34 far as I remember when we were kids. Me and James and
35 Holy Cross, they were using it before when the Paimiut
36 people were living there, so it was something that I
37 want to be careful on how we do this because this is
38 not going to be easy.
39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we're going to
41 take a break and regroup.
42

43 (Off record)
44

45 (On record)
46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Let's continue the
48 meeting here. Hey, Sandy. So we're going to come back
49 on the record here. We've had a little discussion
50 thinking about strategizing on how to address the C&T

1 issue, which I just told James is, is that we don't
2 know what the Federal Board is going to do about the
3 C&T, so I feel more comfortable about going back to
4 Proposals 65 and in the discussion or in the regulatory
5 language on 65, it gives the Refuge manager and
6 consultation with the other Federal agencies and land
7 managers, in his -- where is it, the letter of
8 delegation, in the letter of delegation the Refuge
9 manager has the authority to zone the -- the Unit 21E
10 winter moose hunt so that overharvest does not occur at
11 any one portion of the Unit. Like in 20A across the
12 river they have zones that they actually take moose --
13 they went over harvest all the cows right by the river,
14 they have it zoned out to where they spread -- and this
15 is proper harvest strategies.

16

17 And so I would like to have a motion
18 because the way it could go is if these communities get
19 a C&T they will eat the quota.

20

21 They'll kill 40 moose in the lower
22 portion of 21E and it will all be over in two days, and
23 so if we give the Refuge manager the authority to have
24 -- have allocation zones or zones where harvest shall
25 occur then it's the discretion of the Refuge manager in
26 concert with the department on how many moose is
27 correctly to be harvested in any one area in 21E and so
28 I would like to entertain a motion to go back to
29 Proposal 10-65 and insert that language into the letter
30 of delegation for the Refuge manager and he will
31 consult with all of the State and Federal managers
32 also, and so can I have a motion to revisit.....

33

34 MR. COLLINS: Point of order, though,
35 can we do that now since we've got something else on
36 table? Don't we need to deal with this issue first and
37 then move to reconsider the other?

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's -- well, we can
40 vote on the C&T but I feel, myself, would feel more
41 comfortable -- I would be inclined to vote for the C&T
42 area if I knew that the quota was not going to be
43 eaten, that the Refuge manager had the authority to
44 manage the unit correctly for 40 more moose quota in
45 21E.

46

47 So we can continue on with deliberation
48 of this proposal.

49

50 Ann, Go ahead.

1 MR. COLLINS: I m just asking a
2 procedural question, I'm not sure.....
3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Go ahead,
5 Ann.
6
7 MS. WILKINSON: What you could just do,
8 is have the maker of the motion withdraw it with
9 concurrence of the second and then you can move on to
10 the reconsideration.
11
12 MR. COLLINS: And I guess we haven't
13 made a motion on this, maybe we were just getting.....
14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well we weren't -- I
16 haven't actually gotten to that part.
17
18 MS. WILKINSON: That's true, you
19 haven't.
20
21 MR. COLLINS: Okay.
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would like to
24 revisit -- I would like to entertain a motion to
25 revisit 10-65 on Page 87 and discuss this letter of
26 delegation to the Refuge manager. Do I have motion to
27 that effect.
28
29 MS. YATLIN: So moved.
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Eleanor.
32 Do I have a second.
33
34 MR. COLLINS: Second.
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded.
37
38 And so inserting language that the
39 Refuge manager after consultation with local area
40 Federal and State managers and local Fish and Game
41 Advisory Committees, Councils committees, as stipulated
42 in the letter of delegation.
43
44 In the letter of delegation there's a
45 whole bunch of things that the Refuge manager has
46 authority to do in their set hunt conditions and so
47 forth. The Refuge manager has authorization as to set
48 hunt conditions as zones within Unit 21E, to divide the
49 harvest within harvestable surplus zones. And so that
50 plugs that issue.

1 And so I want that Refuge manager to
2 have that authority -- and so that would be the
3 language inserted.
4
5 Do I have concurrence of the Council on
6 that language?
7
8 Go ahead, Tim.
9
10 MR. GERVAIS: I'd like to ask a
11 question first. Does the Innoko Refuge manager -- does
12 his permitting -- does that have jurisdiction over the
13 BLM lands and the Federal lands outside the Refuge?
14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: He's given the
16 authority to speak with the other Federal managers and
17 come up with -- he's in conference with all of the
18 stakeholders, but he's the lead agency that's issuing
19 the permits and speaking to the other agencies
20 including the State.
21
22 Do you have an additional comment to
23 that, Polly.
24
25 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, before we
26 get to Polly.....
27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, go ahead
29 Robert.
30
31 MR. R. WALKER: Polly, shouldn't we
32 call Mr. Sloan here and ask, you know, so we can run
33 this by him so he doesn't find out, like say whoa,
34 what'd you guys do here?
35
36 DR. WHEELER: Well, one thing, first of
37 all Mr. Sloan is the person that currently resides in
38 position of Innoko Refuge manager, but our delegated
39 authority goes to the position not the person, so it
40 would be the Innoko Refuge manager that has the
41 authority -- that would have the delegated authority,
42 and yes that delegated in-season manager will confer
43 with all the land owners, you know, the other Federal
44 land owners and the State land owners and the State
45 managers, et cetera. So Mr. Sloan has -- the Innoko
46 Refuge manager supports proposal 65 in -- and so he's
47 aware of his authority that will include the parameters
48 of the hunt, and this would be a parameter of -- it
49 would be one of many parameters of the hunt.
50

1 Now, Jerry just raised a good question
2 and that is does the Council, in discussing this motion
3 it would probably be helpful for the record, for the
4 Council to address the number of zones. Are you
5 talking 10 zones, four zones, six zones, do you want to
6 leave that up to the Refuge manager?

7
8 My recommendation is to be as clear as
9 possible on the record because that is key in terms of
10 giving him the delegated authority or giving that
11 position the delegated authority.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That would be my
14 position, that there should be two or three zones
15 within Unit 21E for the winter moose quota and I would
16 like conference with the Council on that.

17
18 The one would include the possible C&T
19 and included area, and the other zones would be --
20 there could only be two, one would be the lower portion
21 and the upper one is just the other zone because then
22 there's no allocation problems up there.

23
24 The allocation problems are going to
25 occur where this C&T area is and so there could be two
26 or three zones drawn by the Refuge manager, would you
27 feel comfortable with that?

28
29 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair, I'm not
30 entirely comfortable with that. But, you know, if
31 that's the best we can do I guess that's the best we
32 can do. But I feel really uncomfortable with the fact
33 that the local GASH community out there hadn't had a
34 really serious comment on this issue. To have an
35 opinion that could be brought to this Board to show
36 that they have either a yea or nay on it. That's why I
37 feel uncomfortable.

38
39 But getting back to, you know, what you
40 just said I'm somewhat comfortable but not entirely.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. The GASH
43 didn't take this C&T proposal up and so this authority
44 for the Refuge manager to draw zones for harvest
45 dissemination throughout the unit would be -- has just
46 been morphed into this meeting.

47
48 Go ahead, Robert.

49
50 MR. R. WALKER: Polly or Josh. Would

1 this affect our customary and traditional -- or not our
2 customary and traditional, but our ceremonial moose
3 harvest or anything here?

4

5 DR. WHEELER: Through the Chair, Member
6 R. Walker. No.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thank you.

9

10 MR. R. WALKER: My other question would
11 be will the allocated 40 moose by Yukon Innoko River
12 management by the State and this is kind of like I'm
13 having second thoughts here. You're saying 10 moose
14 here to -- down the lower portion to be C&T over to the
15 Kuskokwim, that gives us 30 moose between three
16 villages. If there's a hard year, you know, somebody
17 is going to have to go to the State and say, hey, we
18 need more moose but again you're coming with
19 management, our agreement was no more than 40, so we
20 would have to go back to the drawing board here and
21 talk another look at this Yukon Moose Management here.

22

23 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Josh do you have a
24 comment there.

25

26 MR. PEARCE: Yeah. Josh Pearce with
27 Alaska Department of Fish and Game. And, yeah, I've
28 got a lot of thoughts going through my mind with all of
29 this. You're absolutely right that the -- when the
30 Yukon Innoko Management Plan was developed it was --
31 that 40 didn't come from what the need was in the area,
32 that 40 came from what could be biologically
33 sustainable and -- or that up to 40 language, and so it
34 didn't necessarily address allocation except as Jerry
35 pointed out. Actually it did pretty specifically say
36 if C&T determinations were to expand to other
37 communities than that Federal season, the whole Federal
38 season would need to be reassessed and because there
39 was a potential at that time the way the system worked
40 and still did as of this winter, was basically all it
41 required was a harvest ticket and our reporting was so
42 poor we really didn't know what the level of harvest
43 was, so that's one of the big improvements that this
44 proposal would make is it's got a mandatory reporting
45 requirement in there.

46

47 In terms of zoning these areas, you
48 know, it's really an allocation issue is what we're
49 talking about here and I know that the State won't
50 speak to that part of it because if 40 moose can be

1 taken from 21E and it's an allocative issue, who are
2 you going to give those 40 moose too, Holy Cross,
3 Shageluk, you know, split between everybody. And one
4 of the real problems with zoning, and we'll be able to
5 -- I'm kind of thinking from Bo's perspective here a
6 little bit as well because I have talked to Bo a lot
7 about this issue.

8
9 First of all just the -- if this gets
10 too complicated it has a potential to fall apart I
11 guess. From the Refuge's perspective, they're going to
12 have to be able to issue permits in Kalskag, Lower
13 Kalskag, Aniak, whatever communities may be added. But
14 then additionally from just the biology perspective of
15 it, I've got a map here that I can show you at some
16 point, but basically our moose survey areas, it's
17 roughly two-thirds of Unit 21E and then from that we
18 extrapolate out to the entire sub-units. So we don't
19 actually survey all of 21E and then also as I pointed
20 out earlier, you know, we've got these 17, 18 percent
21 confidence intervals, so our ability to count is
22 somewhat, you know, it's the best we can do, but it is
23 a bit crude. And so to come up with a number of moose
24 from what's shown in that proposal book, kind of that
25 little southwest corner, I guess where these
26 communities would be added, we could come up with a
27 reasonable estimate of what the number of moose is in
28 there, but really we're not able to count that all that
29 well. And then we'll just -- I know what we'll use
30 right now, it's 4 a percent harvest rate, which is what
31 the Yukon Innoko Moose Management Plan specifies, so
32 the best we're going to be able to do and I can't do
33 this right now -- this is, you know, short notice but
34 is come up with our best estimate of what the moose
35 population is in that area and multiply that by 4
36 percent and that's going to be the quota and if the
37 reality is most of the moose in 21E are sort of I guess
38 halfway between Holy Cross and Aniak south and that
39 Paimiut Slough area does have a pretty significant
40 portion of the moose, so biologically speaking, you
41 know, you guys are throwing out the number 10 and then
42 30 for the rest of 21E, that may not be what it comes
43 out to be when we apply that 4 percent. If half the
44 moose in 21E are in that lower section it could be
45 potentially a number like 20. So I don't know what
46 that number is going to be yet, but it may not be 10 so
47 just be aware of that.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, what -- you
50 got to look at the big picture, is -- but these

1 additional communities will only be, if we go with the
2 OSM's map, will only be able to go not even a third of
3 the way into that heavy moose population, and so what
4 I'm trying to do is give the Refuge's manager and
5 yourself the authority to decide at your -- when you
6 have your current data and so forth how many moose can
7 be harvested in that lower -- the addition and then you
8 set the quota there. That's easy to do, you can do
9 that next fall when you're going to initiate the hunt,
10 you can figure that out next winter. Then you allocate
11 so many moose in that zone when you know you're going
12 to have heavy harvest there.

13

14 If you look at the harvest data from --
15 that we've reviewed in 65, it shows fairly sporadic
16 harvest up and down through the rest of the area and so
17 we're not so worried about all of the moose being
18 harvested in the, you know, in the lighter density
19 areas to the north. There's only a few killed up there
20 and it's sort of spotty, but we do know that there are
21 going to be a lot of people coming into that other area
22 and so you can set a specific quota that you feel
23 comfortable with, to stay within the 4 percent harvest
24 range, and so that's why I'm requesting this zone
25 theory.

26

27 Go ahead.

28

29 MR. PEARCE: Yeah. And I guess the
30 point that I was trying to make Mr. Chairman, was that
31 the zones are going to be -- we're going to be able to
32 come up with our best estimate in those zones, but
33 really our ability to say what the moose population is
34 in all these little small areas is not as strong as our
35 ability to say what the moose population is in a larger
36 area. We tend to, in general, manage populations at a
37 more landscape level than these little kind of
38 micromanaged areas, so with that if -- if you are
39 discussing how many zones, from what I've seen, the
40 best option from our perspective would be just two.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

43

44 MR. PEARCE: The zone that would
45 include the -- this new C&T determination and then the
46 rest of 21E.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

49

50 MR. PEARCE: And that would keep things

1 the most straight forward.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

4

5 MR. PEARCE: If you start trying to
6 micromanage this too much.....

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I do agree with you
9 there. And so go ahead, Tim.

10

11 MR. GERVAIS: Josh, does it really need
12 to be a quota per zone or could you just say that the
13 amount of moose taken out of a lower zone, the southern
14 zone, just be a not to exceed level? Not specifically
15 have it be that eight or 10 moose have to come out of
16 that, just say that no more than eight moose can come
17 out of that, so.....

18

19 MR. PEARCE: Polly could probably
20 answer that question better than I could. But yes,
21 certainly from the State's perspective we use "up to"
22 language all the time and if it were up to 10, as an
23 example but the GASH communities got the harvest before
24 that because, you know, then -- but like I said, Polly
25 would be able to answer that better than me. I don't
26 know if the Federal system has the ability to do that,
27 but that certainly -- that would be an option that
28 would be okay for my perspective.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Further discussion
31 by the Council.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What I want -- what
36 I'm trying to do is cover our backs with -- in case
37 this C&T goes through Federal Board and so I feel
38 comfortable with taking Josh's comment of two zones.
39 One is just right there where the -- where the shaded
40 area of the C&T proposal as one zone and the rest of
41 Unit 21E is the other zone. The Refuge manager under
42 the discretion -- letter of delegation sets these up to
43 so many moose can be harvested in the lower zone as one
44 of the hunt provisions and then we move on.

45

46 And so is that clear to the Council.

47

48 James.

49

50 MR. J. WALKER: Yeah, Mr. Chairman.

1 Just a question on the wording, during the winter hunt
2 is one half mile from the Yukon or the Innoko River.
3 At this point it doesn't state the Paimiut Slough area,
4 so would that be -- an issue on that?

5
6 MR. PEARCE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Mr.
7 Walker. Yeah, the half -- the half mile corridor
8 closure wouldn't change under -- under these
9 provisions, it would still be in place. A half-mile
10 closure around the river corridor.

11
12 MR. J. WALKER: That would be just
13 addressing the Innoko and the Yukon River, right?

14
15 MR. PEARCE: Correct.

16
17 MR. J. WALKER: So this Paimiut Slough
18 discussion -- what I'm getting at is Paimiut Slough
19 being inserted too -- covered.

20
21 MR. PEARCE: Well, maybe I'm -- maybe I
22 need to look. I mean it's already in place for that
23 Paimiut Slough area, so it wouldn't change, it would
24 still be in place.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That clarify it for
27 you, James?

28
29 MR. PEARCE: No, I think -- this is
30 Josh Pearce again. The half-mile corridor, I believe
31 is just along the Yukon and Innoko Rivers and I think
32 -- I think what James is asking for is could Paimiut
33 Slough be added, correct?

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

36
37 MR. J. WALKER: That's correct.

38
39 MR. PEARCE: And that -- I don't know,
40 that's up to these guys to tell you that.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The -- those are in
43 the -- that would be under the authority of the letter
44 of delegation, to set Paimiut Slough as also -- have
45 the half-mile offset.

46
47 Jerry.

48
49 MR. BERG: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Polly and
50 I were just talking about that. I mean that would be a

1 pretty significant change that I think would probably
2 require another proposal to go through the public
3 process to establish a half-mile corridor beyond what's
4 already in regulation. I think that would, you know,
5 recommending that through this proposal would go -- be
6 going beyond the intent of the proposal. I think it
7 would really require another proposal. Now, you could
8 submit a special action request for that action to be
9 taken prior to the next winter's hunt and that could be
10 analyzed and taken up at your next fall meeting and be
11 put in place through a special action and then you
12 could follow that up with a proposal to put it into
13 regulation permanently. That would be an alternative.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Robert.

16

17 MR. R. WALKER: Jerry. Thank you, Mr.
18 Chairman. I think we'll follow our procedure here,
19 this would have to put a proposal, have to -- from the
20 Federal Board here to do that rather than do an action
21 here. I think it would be more formal because then it
22 would give us a little more time to do the -- all due
23 diligence that we have to do.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I think a special
28 action request could come from the Council at this time
29 for the prosecution of next year's 21E winter moose
30 hunt, and so we'll make that request.

31

32 Is that agreeable to the Council, and
33 then we'll have a formal proposal go through -- it's a
34 two year cycle, and so we have -- we'll have to do that
35 for two years before we can -- we can make a proposal
36 for next year, unless the DOI changes the system, but
37 it will be two years, so we'll have to make a special
38 action request now.

39

40 Do you feel comfortable with that,
41 Robert?

42

43 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. Polly,
44 could you give us an analysis on this here, so we can
45 understand a little more better what Mr. Chairman is
46 saying?

47

48 DR. WHEELER: Through the chair, Member
49 Walker. What Jerry said is absolutely true. We can --
50 the half-mile corridor on the Paimiut Slough is beyond

1 the scope of Proposal 65 in my opinion.

2

3 So your options are, you can submit a
4 special action request and that would -- we would have
5 plenty of time because the hunt wouldn't be occurring
6 for basically another year, so we -- we could do it --
7 if this Council were to put a special action request
8 in, it could be analyzed, brought before the Council,
9 that would constitute the public hearing at next fall's
10 meeting. And then it could be put into regulation to
11 the end of the season and then we could do another one
12 for the following year. You couldn't submit a proposal
13 during our next wildlife cycle and then -- we could
14 cover it through the temporary action -- temporary
15 special action process for two years until a proposal
16 would work through the cycle, assuming it would, you
17 know, we never want to assume that -- what the Federal
18 Board is going to do with it, but, you know, that --
19 that could be -- it could be dealt with through the
20 special action process.

21

22 Mr. Chair.

23

24 Member Walker, does that answer your
25 answer?

26

27 MR. R. WALKER: Yes, it did. It would
28 take two years, you said, to do this with a special
29 action?

30

31 DR. WHEELER: I'm sorry. I misspoke.
32 We could do a special action, it could be put into
33 place assuming the Board supported it, this Council
34 supported it, the Board supported it, it could be put
35 into place by the time this hunt were to occur, which
36 wouldn't be until February of 2011, so a year --
37 roughly a year from now. We're not talking about this
38 year, we're talking about a year from now because these
39 regulations that we're talking about at this meeting go
40 into effect.....

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 2011.

43

44 DR. WHEELER: Thank you. 2011.....

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Regulatory year
47 2010.....

48

49 DR. WHEELER: Actually it goes July 1,
50 2010.....

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 2010, 2011.
2
3 DR. WHEELER: So next summer. So we
4 could put a special action into place for the hunt next
5 winter and -- and we'd have plenty of time. All I'm
6 saying is if you wanted it to be a permanent part of
7 the regulations then it would have to be put -- a
8 proposal would need to be put in through the regulatory
9 process, but we can address this issue through the
10 special action process in time for next winter's hunt.
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So -- did you have a
13 comment, Eleanor.
14
15 MS. YATLIN: Yeah.
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I was -- I thought
18 -- I seen you fidgeting there.
19
20 MS. YATLIN: Well, I just thought we
21 were off track somewhere, but.....
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. We're trying
24 to get into this -- just go back, revisit this issue so
25 that it's clear that the Refuge manager has the letter
26 of delegation that stipulates the hunt parameters that
27 we were concerned about overharvest in one specific
28 portion of Unit 21E and that would alleviate a lot of
29 people's fear, and so that's where I was going with
30 this and so the special action request can be part of
31 it for the -- for the Paimiut Slough area. That's a
32 different issue, we don't -- we care -- if at this time
33 the Council would like to have the Paimiut Slough
34 special action request as -- you would feel comfortable
35 with that. I'd make -- I'd take a motion right now to
36 -- well we better finish this first, we got to finish
37 this first and then we'll go for the special action
38 request and then we'll go back for the original
39 Proposal 66.
40
41 Is it clear to the Council that this --
42 that the letter of delegation to the -- that the Refuge
43 manager, in concert with all of the other Federal and
44 State managers and stakeholders, will have the
45 authority to set two zones. One right above the
46 requested customary and traditional use determination
47 in Proposal 66 and the rest of the zone; two would be
48 the upper portion of Unit 21, is that clear to the
49 Council and to -- on the record, is that clear, Ann?
50

1 MS. WILKINSON: Did you.....
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
4
5 MS. WILKINSON: You said 66, I think
6 you meant 69.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, is it 69.
9 Excuse me.
10
11 MS. YATLIN: The one we have on --
12 we're on 65.
13
14 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, we're on 65.
15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. I was referring
17 to the special -- the customary and traditional use
18 determination proposal. Is that 69, yeah, it's 69. My
19 mistake. Thanks for the correction.
20
21 And so Proposal 65, the Refuge manager
22 has discretionary authority to zone the lower portion
23 of Unit 21 right above the customary and traditional
24 use determination request if that is provided and
25 necessary.
26
27 Is that clear to the Council?
28
29 (Council nods affirmatively)
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Further discussion.
32 Tim.
33
34 MR. GERVAIS: Do you need to.....
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to vote
37 on this.
38
39 MR. GERVAIS: Do you need to say what
40 the purpose of the zones are?
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The purpose of the
43 zones is that the overharvest during the -- during the
44 21E Federal winter moose hunt that has a specific quota
45 of 40 moose is not -- the harvest parameters are not
46 exceeded in one particular portion of the Game
47 Management Unit, and the harvest is allocated
48 throughout the -- harvest is allocated throughout the
49 whole Unit within more -- more sustainable guidelines.
50 That's the -- that's the reason. Go ahead.

1 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. Has this
2 done -- has this been done at any other C&T here, any
3 place else?

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well this -- this --
6 we're talking about the hunt provisions right now.
7 We're talking about the hunt itself, we're not on the
8 C&T proposal. This is Proposal 65, and as far as
9 zones, the State uses zones all the time in their cow
10 moose hunts. They got zones all across the river over
11 here. Zones, various zones, and they don't want to
12 shoot all the cows in one place and so these zones are
13 commonly used for management in -- by the State of
14 Alaska, and so this is not unusual as a management
15 tool.

16 Further discussion by the Council.

17
18 (No response)

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those is favor of
21 the motion to clarify the language of the letter of
22 delegation to the Refuge manager, signify by saying
23 aye.

24
25 IN UNISON: Aye.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
28 sign.

29
30 (No opposing votes)

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Moving on
33 back to Proposal 69 and the customary and traditional
34 use determination request as provided by the OSM.
35 We're back to that proposal.

36
37 Is there any further discussion by the
38 Council on the deliberation of Proposal 69. We have to
39 have a motion to adopt Proposal 69. Do I have a motion
40 to adopt.

41
42 MR. GERVAIS: Chair.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

45
46 MR. GERVAIS: There -- there is some
47 discussion regarding the modification of the.....

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we have to
50 have a motion to adopt the proposal and then we can

1 deliberate the proposal.

2

3 MR. GERVAIS: I'll put forward a motion
4 to adopt the proposal.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do I have a second.

7

8 MS. YATLIN: Second.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Eleanor seconded.
11 So now we can discuss.

12

13 Go ahead, Tim.

14

15 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. There's been some
16 discussion regarding the modification of the Paimiut
17 Slough area and I would like to hear if the Council
18 would be interested in further restricting the size of
19 that area down to an area south of the Paimiut Slough,
20 but approximately taking 10 or 15 percent off of the
21 map area that we see on Page 110.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that would be
24 discussion by the affected Council members. You want
25 to see a line drawn below what -- what is this, this is
26 a river drainage coming out just below Paimiut Slough?

27

28 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

31

32 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair. It comes
33 out right above the old village of Paimiut. The
34 Paimiut Slough area drainage.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. So you would
37 be requesting that the Paimiut drainage be the northern
38 boundary of the customary and traditional use area?

39

40 MR. J. WALKER: Yes, Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's a
43 defined -- can we do that Polly, set a specific river
44 drainage as the boundary?

45

46 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. Yes. My
47 recommendation would be when you discuss this, you talk
48 about the use patterns because this proposal is about
49 customary and traditional use patterns.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

2

3 DR. WHEELER: So you want to talk about
4 where people are using this particular resource and
5 that, you know, in this particular area, so it would be
6 best for the record if your discussion were based on
7 the substance of the issue. And the other thing that I
8 would point out is that, you know, in other -- and this
9 is sort of a side on -- with regard to customary and
10 traditional use determinations, but we've, you know,
11 we've done customary and traditional use determinations
12 differently across the state and a one size fits all
13 doesn't always -- fits all approach doesn't always work
14 because these C&T determinations do take into account
15 the spacial, temporal, cultural and social
16 patterns.....

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

19

20 DR. WHEELER:that are -- that are
21 evidenced in these different areas.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

24

25 DR. WHEELER: So I think you're, you
26 know, if you want to take about that, that those kinds
27 of issues in your discussion, that would probably be
28 helpful too. Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I -- I appreciate
31 that and I'm really, you know, because Carl had to
32 leave and this would have been -- he would have been an
33 important part of this discussion. Looking at the map
34 the Paimiut Drainage basically configures the Federal
35 lands. It actually stays just inside the Federal
36 boundaries and so if you go to the north of there you
37 get into Corps lands, and so the Paimiut Drainage just
38 trims off just a tiny bit of Federal land, but in
39 reality it -- it addresses some of the concerns of the
40 Paimiut Slough as being an area of concern. And so do
41 you have discussion on peoples' use in that area.

42

43 Go ahead, James.

44

45 MR. J. WALKER: Yes, Mr. Chair. I --
46 I'm aware of some of the use at least in my lifetime.
47 The Paimiut area that we're talking about is the mouth
48 of the Paimiut primarily to the last or second high
49 bank on the Paimiut River and that's not on the map.
50 And those are the primary areas that the people use.

1 They use that area for hunting and berry picking,
2 primarily those things. And the way I see it, the use
3 area would end at the upper high bank area.

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I appreciate
6 those comments.

7
8 MR. COLLINS: Question, Mr. Chair.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.

11
12 MR. COLLINS: Use by who now, that
13 area?

14
15 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair. Ray
16 Collins. Those are used by -- used by the villages in
17 question or the families in question of those villages.

18
19 MR. COLLINS: Okay.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Appreciate
22 that clarification, that's very important.

23
24 You got a comment there, Eleanor.

25
26 MS. YATLIN: I just wanted some
27 clarification because, you know, we don't have the
28 AC's, their statements or hearing this, and then also
29 this is mostly BLM land and I could see where the
30 Federal lands are below the -- the slough there and I
31 guess there was a question earlier on, you know,
32 representation by -- you're doing this for, you know,
33 the other entities like BLM and, you know, that's just
34 the question. I didn't hear the answer.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, the GASH
37 Advisory Committee did not meet on this, didn't pick up
38 this proposal and we don't -- do not have -- what do
39 they call that, Middle Kuskokwim or what's that
40 Advisory Committee there at Aniak, Central Kuskokwim
41 Advisory Committee, I've seen no comment from them and
42 so we're reviewing this proposal with what presentation
43 we have from our OSM anthropological analysis and so
44 forth.

45
46 Go ahead, Polly.

47
48 DR. WHEELER: I can speak to the part
49 about the Federal, you know, the landowners or land --
50 the managers, and that is that the manager for the

1 earlier proposal that you were talking about, the
2 person that has the delegated authority to manage the
3 hunt is the Innoko Wildlife Refuge Manager, that person
4 works with BLM and all these other entities.

5
6 With regard to this specific proposal,
7 all of the five Federal agencies that deal with Fish
8 and Wildlife -- that deal with Federal Subsistence
9 Management have reviewed this proposal and have -- are
10 in agreement with the OSM preliminary conclusion, which
11 is to support this.

12
13 MS. YATLIN: Okay.

14
15 DR. WHEELER: So they have been
16 consulted and they -- they're -- the -- through the
17 InterAgency Staff Committee as well as the team field
18 review.

19
20 MS. YATLIN: Yeah.

21
22 DR. WHEELER: That answers your
23 question?

24
25 MS. YATLIN: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

26
27 DR. WHEELER: Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks for
30 that clarification, Polly. Discussion about the
31 Paimiut Slough has the boundary of the northern portion
32 of the C&T request. It appears that Council members
33 feel that, that would be within the use of the
34 requested communities and to the best of our knowledge
35 that would also fall within -- on Federal lands that
36 would be -- they would be eligible to hunt on under
37 this Federal C&T request, and so I feel comfortable
38 with that as the boundary for the northern portion of
39 the C&T request.

40
41 Further discussion by the Council about
42 this proposal.

43
44 MR. CHASE: Mr. Chair.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ken.

47
48 MR. CHASE: I have one nagging thought
49 that's been ringing in my mind and it concerns Russian
50 Mission and I have never talked to anybody down there

1 and that's cutting into their traditional use, that
2 area; if the area from 19 comes over and hunts, and if
3 the allocation is going to be set like 10 moose then
4 they're going to be competing with that or they're
5 going to have to come up into the other zone to hunt.
6 So I think Russian Mission's concern should be
7 somehow.....

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ken. YK-Delta is
10 going to meet and can address Russian Mission's -- do
11 they have a Council member from Russian Mission on the
12 YK-Delta?

13
14 MS. WILKINSON: Yes.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But the YK-Delta
17 represents Russian Mission's -- and so they're Council
18 is going to meet.....

19
20 DR. WHEELER: Next week.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:next week, in a
23 few days and they can -- I would like -- I would like
24 OSM to convey the GASH Chair's concerns that Russian
25 Mission is aware of what's transpiring with the C&T
26 request. And that would get them -- be able to --
27 maybe a transmittal to their traditional council for
28 comment on that if they're unaware of this special
29 action request.

30
31 MR. CHASE: Okay. Thank you. But on
32 the other side, if I may voice my, I guess thinking on
33 it kind of on the behalf of the villages up river,
34 Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk, that I know what they --
35 what their stand is going to be.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

38
39 MR. CHASE: From past actions, you
40 know, they're going to want to see more documentation.
41 I think a lot of them aren't even -- they're not aware
42 of this proposal, it seems.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, James.

45
46 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair. Ken.
47 That's what I was addressing in asking you that issue
48 because it was addressed through the traditional
49 councils to bring it up to the communities, Anvik,
50 Grayling and Shageluk and my assumption that it was

1 going to go to the GASH Board and that's why I was
2 questioning to that.

3

4 MR. CHASE: Yeah. Usually normally our
5 committee takes a stand, and we have years ago, not to
6 push the fact or push the areas that -- that's out of
7 the State, you know, out of our kind of jurisdiction
8 unless we're requested and we didn't formally get any
9 questions or requests from any of those villages.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So, yeah. I -- well
12 the Federal Subsistence Board will have to wrestle with
13 these various aspects of the information flow to the
14 affected communities within the GMU and so this Council
15 can't really get into -- at this point we have a motion
16 on the table and we have to deal with it.

17

18 Go ahead, Robert.

19

20 MR. R. WALKER: Well one -- Mr.
21 Chairman. Thanks, Ken. When Vince was our coordinator
22 he did a lot more communication with you than anybody
23 else or a lot of AC Boards, so you were up to par here,
24 so I think we have a transition between coordinators
25 now, so a lot of this information is not falling into
26 your hands now, so I could see where the point is to
27 where the WIRAC Board is kind of at fault here too.

28

29 MR. CHASE: Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So further
32 discussion by the Council on the Proposal 69 special
33 action -- or the customary and traditional use
34 requests.

35

36 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.

39

40 MR. COLLINS: Where are we at right
41 now, we're -- we're talking about modifying that. Is
42 that a -- is there a move to modify the proposal or add
43 to it?

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we're
46 discussing it. We could make a motion to modify the
47 boundary as further definition of the boundary as
48 described on Page 110 of our book and the shaded area
49 that OSM has drawn out. Define the boundary on the
50 northeast corner would come down to the Paimiut

1 Drainage and then follow the Paimiut Drainage down to
2 the Yukon River would be the definition, that would be
3 correct.

4

5 So we're still in discussion.

6

7 But you could make a motion to adopt
8 that amendment to this proposal, we're modifying the
9 proposal further from the OSM's shaded diagram on Page
10 110. I described that and so would you make that
11 motion or -- go ahead.

12

13 MR. R. WALKER: I just have a question.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, just questions,
16 okay, go ahead.

17

18 MR. R. WALKER: Jack. I'm kind of
19 thinking here too for protection for State Fish and
20 Wildlife and Federal Fish and Wildlife, you'd almost
21 have to have coordinated corners for -- because if you,
22 you know, 10, 20, 50 feet, how are you going to
23 determine the boundary when the protection officer come
24 in here and takes a look at where somebody takes a
25 moose here because I'm kind of curious, you know, I'm
26 -- we're going to have to be a little more definite --
27 define it with corners, with whatever otherwise, you
28 know, you could get away with in court if you're 10
29 feet off it.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, that's -- on
32 all Federal hunts there's delineations of boundaries
33 and that's just -- that's just par for the course with
34 this -- with the Federal hunt parameters. These State
35 controlled lands, they mean a specific point on the
36 Paimiut drainage and a boundary, a range marker could
37 be set by the Bureau of Land Management and they're
38 gone, but Bureau of Land Management could set a
39 boundary at the upper drainage boundary on the Paimiut.

40

41 Go ahead.

42

43 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
44 I hope you don't say upper boundaries of the drainage
45 because that goes all the way into Innoko River.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. No. Within the
48 definition that we're laying out.

49

50 MR. J. WALKER: But I guess my question

1 would be folded into this, if this went through then
2 the Paimiut Slough wording needs to be inserted in the
3 winter hunt half a mile of the Paimiut Slough drainage.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And that would be a
6 special action request that I intend to deal with right
7 after we've completed this proposal.

8

9 MR. J. WALKER: One more comment, Mr.
10 Chair. There's two defined points on the Paimiut
11 Slough area as noted as high banks on the Paimiut
12 Slough, they're the big sand cliffs and you can't miss
13 them. And the upper one could be used as an upper
14 boundary, that's, you know, something out there.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate that
17 local knowledge and land topology. So is it clear that
18 the upper banks or the upper portion of the Paimiut
19 Slough is the northern boundary and then the shaded
20 area to the south, to the Unit 19A boundary of Unit
21 21E, is it clear that's the definition that the Western
22 Council has defined as the customary and traditional
23 use zone by the Council.

24

25 Clarified now for the Council.

26

27 MR. GERVAIS: And then keeping this
28 corner.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. That whole
31 shaded corner, the whole lower corner as defined -- and
32 with the northern boundary is what we're describing, so
33 it's clear to the Staff, it's clear to the Council that
34 I can tell as far as boundary.

35

36 You got a comment, Eleanor.

37

38 MS. YATLIN: Mr. Chairman. I just have
39 a question. I'm kind of confused here because we're
40 going -- we're in that C&T that.....

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

43

44 MS. YATLIN:the KNA proposed.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

47

48 MS. YATLIN: And now we're putting --
49 are we going to insert this boundary, you know, the --
50 the end to this proposal.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. This is the
2 proposal. This is the requested area. The OSM has
3 defined it from our fall meeting we thought that the
4 whole unit should not be included in the C&T request.

5
6 MS. YATLIN: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We requested that
9 they define it in the lower portion, that is actually
10 in the record, and where they actually use that area,
11 and then we're refining it further as from this Paimiut
12 Drainage here, it looks like this, which is also right
13 inside the Federal land and so it all dovetails pretty
14 nicely. And so is it clear now, Eleanor?

15
16 MS. YATLIN: Yeah. Well, the upper
17 portion is in the Controlled Use Area and the lower
18 portion of the slough is -- some of it is Federal and
19 BLM, so.....

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That'd be.....

22
23 MS. YATLIN: Right here, see.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. This is --
26 well this is Refuge lands and then this is BLM
27 lands.....

28
29 MS. YATLIN: Right.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:but it's all
32 Federal lands. It doesn't matter what kind of Federal
33 lands it is.

34
35 MS. YATLIN: Okay. Uh-huh.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: As long as its
38 Federal land they're -- it applies to those Federal
39 lands.

40
41 You got a comment there, Ray.

42
43 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Mr. Chairman. I
44 move that we amend the proposed Controlled Use Area so
45 that the boundary follows the south bank of the Paimiut
46 Slough from the mouth to the upper high bank and then
47 proceeds easterly to the boundary -- to the point where
48 19A hits -- I don't know what you call that, it's where
49 it ends right now. You see, it's right at the point
50 where this boundary strikes 19A.

1
2 MR. GERVAIS: And 21E.
3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's a specific
5 mountain -- (Indiscernible) Mountain.
6
7 MR. COLLINS: Okay.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And then everything
10 to the south within GMU 21E.
11
12 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so that's the
15 definition of the C&T area.
16
17 Further discussion by the Council.
18
19 MS. YATLIN: Mr. Chairman. So I'm
20 clear on this that we already got a motion on, it was
21 seconded for this Proposal 90 -- no, 69 and now he's
22 made a motion to amend, right, that's correct?
23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Amend the language.
25
26 MS. YATLIN: Okay.
27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And I need a second
29 on that amendment.
30
31 MS. YATLIN: Well, I'll second it.
32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And so now
34 we'll vote on the amended description of the customary
35 and traditional use determination for the villages for
36 19A that are requesting use of 21E.
37
38 It's clear to the Council of the
39 description of the boundary.
40
41 (Council nods affirmatively)
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those is favor of
44 that description signify by saying aye.
45
46 IN UNISON: Aye.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And moving on to the
49 main motion.....
50

1 MR. COLLINS: Oppose.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, opposed -- I
4 heard -- all those opposed to that boundary
5 description.
6
7 (No opposing votes)
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None. Unanimous for
10 the description of the customary and traditional use
11 determination area within 21E.
12
13 On the main motion further discussion
14 about whether people from 19A, the requesting
15 communities one way or another on their C&T use within
16 that 21E area described. No further -- you got
17 questions or comment, Eleanor -- you got your hand
18 there.
19
20 MS. YATLIN: Mr. Chairman. I just -- I
21 guess I was just thinking about these eight factors in
22 determining customary and traditional uses so, I know
23 Polly kind of described it and it is a big issue, so I
24 feel -- I mean I don't feel like I should object to
25 anything, but it's just -- to me it's kind of vague,
26 you know, some of it -- some of it is, you know, they
27 determine -- well the State determined that, you know,
28 this C&T and then the Federal followed the law with --
29 made modification or -- but, you know, and this one
30 justifications, one of the members pointed out to me
31 that, you know, they said, they use snowmachines in
32 there and I thought, you know, that that was not really
33 traditional use, so I just -- that's just a question.
34
35 Thank you.
36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, snowmachines
38 are defined in ANILCA as a customary and traditional
39 access for use.
40
41 MS. YATLIN: Yeah, I see it.
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And then previous to
44 that dog teams would have been the main land
45 conveyance.
46
47 Further discussion on the main
48 proposal.
49
50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have a
2 question. Tim, you got one more, you seem to be
3 fidgeting.
4
5 MR. GERVAIS: Well, yeah, I don't.....
6
7 (Laughter)
8
9 MR. GERVAIS:I don't know when to
10 bring it in, but I was wondering if we could have some
11 comment from KNA about their thoughts about it.
12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I see. KNA is a
14 good, good point. Does KNA have any position on this
15 proposal.
16
17 MS. SMITH: Thanks, Tim. Melissa
18 Smith, Kuskokwim Native Association. We are fully in
19 support of OSM's proposed area. However, I'm kind of
20 hesitant because we're missing out on Carl Morgan's
21 personal testimony, which would be really beneficial
22 right now in this discussion so I just hope that we'll
23 keep that in mind, also Calvin Simeon, resident of
24 Aniak, originally gave KNA the idea to propose this
25 back in 2008 and he wanted to give a public testimony
26 over a teleconference today and wasn't able to because
27 we don't have teleconference capabilities
28 unfortunately, so we're missing out on a lot of Aniak
29 testimony that I think would be beneficial to this
30 discussion, so that's all we had.
31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's very
33 important comments there. I appreciate that, Melissa.
34
35 MS. SMITH: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)
36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And good catch
38 there, Tim. You got a further question.
39
40 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah. Melissa, did --
41 from your -- can you communicate some of -- did you
42 talk with Carl or Simeon about some of these things,
43 can you communicate some of their views on this topic?
44
45 MS. SMITH: Yeah. I wish I had more
46 time to discuss it with Carl, I actually didn't know he
47 was leaving. I know that back when this came before
48 the committee the previous time, he was the only one
49 that voted for it and so that's kind of why I was
50 really hoping he'd be here for the voting process. And

1 then from talking to Calvin, he just -- he's very
2 focused on the traditional use aspect only, not so much
3 on the -- the looking into the moose population
4 dynamics. He thinks it's more of a right that, you
5 know, the communities traditionally use this area so
6 let's focus on that. Let's just get the recognition
7 for what we have always done here, so that's kind of
8 the gist of what I can get from talking to him.

9

10 Is that helpful.

11

12 MR. GERVAIS: Yes. And then also how
13 much effort, hunting effort is going to utilize this --
14 this new area if it is approved by the other -- by the
15 Federal Board.

16

17 MS. SMITH: That's really hard for me
18 to answer. The only thing I can direct you to is the
19 tables that OSM have provided for historic use, which I
20 mean the figures are per community, you know, for --
21 Aniak, for example, can be like eight or nine percent
22 of their harvest, annual harvest came from that Paimiut
23 Slough area, so if that gives you a little idea. I
24 mean close to 10 percent is a pretty significant food
25 source I would say.

26

27 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate those
30 further comments there.

31

32 Go ahead there, Robert.

33

34 MR. R. WALKER: Michelle, welcome to
35 our meeting here.

36

37 MR. GERVAIS: Melissa.

38

39 MR. R. WALKER: Melissa, sorry. 1972,
40 '73 and '74 I trapped down in that area. I had a guy
41 named Billy Turner, the late Bill Turner from Holy
42 Cross and we never ever seen anybody from Aniak. All
43 we seen is people from Kalskag would come over and trap
44 beaver in that area. One of the guys poached a moose
45 down there and we didn't turn him in, but apparently a
46 Wildlife Protection Officer by the name of -- I forgot
47 his name, Hensley, came along and kind of picked the
48 guy up and asked what are you going to do with the
49 moose, so he gave it to us to give to the elders in
50 Holy Cross, so maybe there is a legal description here

1 for Kalskag but we never seen any Aniak people down
2 hunting moose. I don't know, but you know you guys
3 call it tradition, I'm -- I would be careful on how you
4 use that word because in those years we didn't --
5 anybody and later on years there was nobody from Aniak
6 down there hunting or Chuathbaluk. Mainly, I would say
7 Kalskag, that they did use this portion, some of them,
8 not all of them but some of them, so, you know, just to
9 have a vote and say this is a customary and tradition,
10 it would be a given it wouldn't be tradition, that's
11 all it would be.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for that
16 comment, Robert. I would state that there are many
17 people within our region that have hunted moose
18 illegally and so I would -- it would be defensible of
19 that -- I mean the State at times did not, and the
20 managers did not have regulations in place to provide
21 subsistence needs.

22

23 MR. R. WALKER: Could you state those
24 years, Jack.

25

26 (Laughter)

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have personal
29 knowledge of various people that have done bad things.
30 That's as far as I'll go with that one and illegal
31 things.

32

33 Further discussion on the proposal as
34 defined and clarified by our amendment definition of
35 the boundaries, clarification of -- Carl Morgan was at
36 our meeting when the special action request was before
37 us last fall, commented to his uses within the area,
38 that's all in our transcripts from our last meeting and
39 was supportive of at that time and so I'll let the
40 record reflect his willingness for this to proceed.

41

42 Further discussion.

43

44 Robert.

45

46 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chair. Thank you.
47 Who's going to determine the days, the months, the
48 schedule for this.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Polly.

1 DR. WHEELER: Through the Chair.
2 Member Walker. I'm not sure I understand your
3 question. The schedule for what?
4
5 MR. R. WALKER: Is it going to be a
6 February hunt, March hunt, is it going to be 30 days,
7 10 days.
8
9 DR. WHEELER: That's Proposal 65. This
10 is -- this Proposal 69 is strictly just the C&T
11 determination.
12
13 MR. R. WALKER: Yes. But there has to
14 be a schedule there, aren't there.
15
16 DR. WHEELER: Right. And that's in
17 Proposal 65.
18
19 MR. R. WALKER: Following Proposal 65.
20
21 DR. WHEELER: 65 and 66.
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So it is clear on
24 the -- on the customary and traditional use motion
25 before us for Unit 19A communities that request -- and
26 the boundary description.
27
28 Further discussion by the Council.
29
30 (No comments)
31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Council expended
33 their comments.
34
35 (No comments)
36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see no further
38 comments.
39
40 Those in favor of the proposal, 69, as
41 defined by the Western Interior Council for the
42 boundary description for customary and traditional use
43 determination within the lower portion of Unit 21E,
44 those in favor of the Proposal signify by saying aye.
45
46 IN UNISON: Aye.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.
49
50 MR. R. WALKER: I oppose, Mr. Chairman,

1 for the record.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. One
4 opposition. And so the proposal is adopted as amended
5 by the Western Interior Council. It's time for a
6 break. It's lunch time and oh, Salena was just here
7 and she was going to have -- put in some -- because
8 we're in deliberation here she was going to put in for
9 some sandwiches; that's what she just told me. Oh, go
10 ahead Ann.
11
12 MS. WILKINSON: I had something else.
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead.
15 What.....
16
17 MS. WILKINSON: This is a reminder that
18 today we need to break down and be out of here by 4:30,
19 no later than.
20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
22
23 MS. WILKINSON: And the other thing is
24 that if you would please sign in on the sheet, that's
25 how we know who attended for the record and get your
26 name spelled right when you speak to the Council in the
27 transcripts and also helps us plan for meeting spaces
28 in the future.
29
30 Thank you.
31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Polly.
33
34 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. I would note
35 that while we need to be out of here by 4:30 today, we
36 still have meeting space available for tomorrow, so
37 that wasn't made clear.
38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
40
41 DR. WHEELER: So if need be we will be
42 able to meet tomorrow.
43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And where will that
45 be.
46
47 DR. WHEELER: Ann?
48
49 MS. WILKINSON: There's a space here
50 and then also one at the hotel just.....

1 DR. WHEELER: Alpine Lodge.
2
3 MS. WILKINSON: Yeah, Alpine Lodge.
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
6
7 MS. WILKINSON: Just right over there.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. All right.
10 Well, we'll jump in front of Eastern if we need that.
11 We're staying here.
12
13 (Laughter)
14
15 (Off record)
16
17 (On record)
18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to go
20 back on the record. We were waiting for Eleanor but
21 we've got a lot of agenda to get through and so we can
22 work through some things that she doesn't necessarily
23 have to be here.
24
25 The Council wanted to revisit the vote
26 on Proposal 69 and state on the record why -- there
27 were two members that actually abstained during the
28 vote and that would have been Eleanor and James and
29 then a vote of opposition by Robert and they wanted to
30 state why they voted that way on the record. Since
31 Eleanor's not here we're going to go back to -- we have
32 this special action request for a one-half mile offset
33 for the Paimuit Slough portion for the winter hunt and
34 so that -- did you want to describe that further than
35 James.
36
37 MR. J. WALKER: I think it's important
38 that this be inserted in here to define, because all we
39 have this for the Yukon and the Upper Innoko, so if
40 this hunt is going to take place at all, it should have
41 a similar definition of a winter hunt within a half a
42 mile of Paimiut Slough.
43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, do you make a
45 motion to that effect.
46
47 MR. J. WALKER: I do.
48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Got a second.
50

1 MR. R. WALKER: Second.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Robert.
4 Further discussion.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is it clear to the
9 Council for the hunt parameter for Unit 21E, Federal
10 hunt, that that special action request will go forward.
11
12 (No comments)
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No further
15 discussion. Those in favor of those special action
16 request moving forward to the Federal Subsistence Board
17 signify by saying aye.
18
19 IN UNISON: Aye.
20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign.
22
23 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. Do we need
24 to have why we're doing that, it's to protect those
25 wintering moose that are very vulnerable along the
26 river.
27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right, that's good
29 justification.
30
31 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Polly.
34
35 DR. WHEELER: And just to provide
36 clarity for the record, Mr. Chair, is this just for the
37 winter hunt?
38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. It's always
40 just the winter.
41
42 DR. WHEELER: Right. But it's always
43 good for the record to be crystal clear.
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, that's clear.
46
47 And so the justification would be
48 during the winter Sidney Huntington has told me the
49 cows with calves live closet to the river and need
50 additional protection from hunting and so forth. That

1 would be my understanding why that's in place.

2

3 (Council nods affirmatively)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so that would be
6 the justification for the special action request for
7 the Paimiut Slough. And so I would like to revisit the
8 vote on Proposal 69 for justification. Eleanor's still
9 not here so we can move forward with our Board of Game
10 proposals, I think, yeah, we're done with all the
11 Federal proposals to this point, it looks like, except
12 revisiting that one.

13

14 And so we're going to move to Proposal
15 78, it's 19A, to eliminate the non-resident closed area
16 for caribou in 19A, wording for non-resident, closed
17 area in 19A issue, non-resident closed area -- if you
18 want to lay out these proposals for us, Josh, have you
19 visited these with Advisory Committees and so forth,
20 these proposals?

21

22 MR. PEARCE: Yeah, Josh Pearce, Alaska
23 Department of Fish and Game. I'm familiar with all of
24 these proposals, Roger Seavoy, the area biologist will
25 actually do the presentations for some of them at the
26 Board meeting, I'll do some of the others. So I don't
27 have -- the one presentation I could share with you
28 that may be of interest is for Proposal 84, which is
29 the IM plan for predation control in 21E, but then as
30 far as the other ones, if you want to start with 78 and
31 go down through them I can do that and then answer
32 questions as best I can.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

35

36 MR. PEARCE: Proposal 78 then basically
37 is related to the non-resident closed area for caribou
38 in Unit 19A and that non-resident closed area is
39 defined under the State regulation book. And basically
40 what this proposal is doing is we have a closed area in
41 a closed area. As you may be aware non-resident for
42 the Mulchatna Herd has been closed entirely so this is
43 really a double closure in essence and it's an
44 unnecessary regulation in the book.

45

46 This was submitted by a member of the
47 public and the Department doesn't have an official
48 position on it, it's an allocation issue. But Roger,
49 in his presentation, will basically present what I just
50 said, it's a closure within a closure.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does the Council
2 want to take this proposal up?

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: At this time it
7 would seem to be muted subject so we'll pass on that
8 proposal.

9
10 Since Eleanor has returned, I want to
11 clean up our past business and I want to go back and
12 revisit the vote on Proposal 69 and so when we voted
13 there were two people after the breaks, Eleanor and
14 James, that wanted to state on the record why they
15 abstained and then Robert wanted to give why he voted
16 against the proposal.

17
18 Go ahead Eleanor.

19
20 MS. YATLIN: Do we need to bring the
21 motion back?

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, it's just
24 revisiting the vote, it's justification for the vote.

25
26 MS. YATLIN: Well, I stated that when
27 we -- well, I was kind of -- well, normally, you know,
28 you go down to Council deliberation and each member
29 would say either I support it or don't support it and I
30 didn't hear that and also I was -- I kept questioning
31 on that C&T because I figured if we put it on this one
32 proposal then what would it make -- what statement
33 would it make on other proposals now and in the future,
34 and no input from the villages or -- it was just kind
35 of -- I wanted more to see what the rest of the Council
36 was going to do. But I just didn't get a chance to
37 either let you know that, you know, I wanted to hear
38 what everybody had to say.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm sorry I didn't
41 make it clear that when I asked for Council discussion
42 during deliberation, I'm asking for you to speak to
43 whatever the proposal is, and that's part of the
44 Council discussion and so I failed to make that clear.

45
46 And so be it duly noted that Eleanor
47 was unsure what the communities position within Unit
48 21E's feelings were and was unclear about the eight
49 factors for customary and traditional use
50 determination. And so those eight factors have been

1 used since the program began. And so that's just part
2 of the process, to this date, how C&Ts are determined.
3 So that was her reason.

4
5 James, now what's your reasoning for
6 abstaining.

7
8 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
9 My reasons would be straightforward, is that, the
10 traditional council, like I stated, I believe it was
11 the first day I got here, not the first Monday, but
12 Tuesday, their opinion on this issue was they oppose it
13 entirely. But Holy Cross is directly impacted with
14 this issue. And I recognize the need for this Board to
15 have some opinion or position on this issue but I would
16 have to say I abstain for the fact that the traditional
17 council does not support it.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And, Robert,
20 your reason for voting against the proposal.

21
22 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, thank
23 you. Talking with our tribe in Anvik here before we
24 came over here to discuss this, I showed them this
25 proposal here, Proposal No. 69 and I let them read it,
26 too, and they opposed this, that was the reason why I
27 voted no because Anvik Tribe didn't support it in any
28 direction for purpose of being in 21E for the other
29 three villages.

30
31 Also I talked to William Paintner (ph)
32 when I was in Grayling, he is the tribal chief and I
33 can't hardly -- they don't think it was a good idea to
34 have this in our unit to start with but he is the
35 tribal chief in Grayling.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

38
39 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thank you. So
42 the record shall reflect those justifications for those
43 votes.

44
45 And so now we're going back to the
46 State proposals and so I haven't -- didn't get a chance
47 to triage these and the Council, since we have Josh
48 Pearce here from the McGrath office, we're going to try
49 and do these proposals that affect 19 and 21E. Let's
50 see Proposal 79, hunting season and bag limits for

1 moose, change the registration permit and general hunt
2 areas, and close season dates in 19D. Have you
3 reviewed this proposal at your -- you haven't had a
4 McGrath meeting yet or you must have had a McGrath
5 meeting?

6
7 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, let me get the --
8 what are we looking at, is it in the booklet?

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It'd be 79, it'd be
11 this proposal right here.

12
13 MR. COLLINS: So on Page 112.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 112, the first page.

16
17 MR. COLLINS: Okay.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so this is the
20 Department's proposal. Do you want to present the
21 proposal since it is a Department proposal?

22
23 MR. PEARCE: Yeah, I think that'd be a
24 good idea. This is a fairly complex proposal actually
25 and I'll try to walk you through it the best I can
26 without slides to kind of guide where it's going.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

29
30 MR. PEARCE: But this is a Department
31 proposal and a little bit of background for those of
32 you that are unaware of it. The McGrath area has had
33 predator control ongoing now for a number of years.
34 And since that started the moose population has
35 approximately doubled in the McGrath area.

36
37 And what this proposal then is an
38 attempt to do is start to take advantage of some of
39 those moose that we have in the area. The regulations
40 are actually kind of scattered right now and rather
41 complicated. It's residents only. And basically we've
42 got these various seasons. There's one area where it's
43 the 1st through the 15th; another where it's the 1st
44 through the 20th; and, yet, a third where it's the 1st
45 to the 25th. So one of the main things this proposal
46 would do is simplify those seasons quite a bit for
47 resident users and this hunt is available to all
48 residents of Alaska.

49
50 The permit then would be -- the major

1 changes, right now there's a permit registration RM650
2 and that hunt is allowed basically, I'm not sure if you
3 have unit maps or not in front of you, but from the
4 Slatna Black River drainages up river on the mainstem
5 of the Kuskokwim and all the drainages that come in
6 additionally so in 19D east is basically how that's
7 been defined. That may be a term some of you have
8 heard before. What this proposal would do then is make
9 it so the registration permit was valid in all of 19D
10 and the season would be September 1 to September 25, so
11 it's real easy for local residents and then, like I
12 said, other folks can come in as well. But basically
13 somebody from McGrath, for instance, could have one
14 piece of paper in their pocket and hunt moose anywhere
15 in 19D, that's not the case now.

16
17 Then additionally two years ago the
18 Controlled Use Area, the Kuskokwim Controlled Use Area
19 changed and that's actually something where the Federal
20 regs are different from the State regs. It was at our
21 last Board meeting in 2008, it's now a two mile
22 corridor from the Black River, as far as the Swiftfork,
23 which is the drainage that Telida is on and up to
24 Takotna and Nikolai are the other villages, it's a two
25 mile wide corridor, which is considerably different
26 than what you see in the Federal regulations. To hunt
27 in that corridor you would have to have RM650.

28
29 Then the other big change is we're also
30 opening up additional opportunity for non-residents,
31 where you could use a green harvest ticket then to hunt
32 moose outside of that Controlled Use Area, and why
33 that's important is the registration permit that we
34 give out right now is only available in the villages of
35 McGrath, Takotna and Nikolai and so it's actually
36 fairly difficult for somebody non-local to get a hold
37 of one of those permits. So the additional opportunity
38 that would be presented here is by allowing folks to
39 use a green harvest ticket to hunt outside of that
40 Controlled Use Area.

41
42 I see Tim has the State regs book in
43 front of him and that clearly shows that new corridor
44 on Page 87 in that book if any of you happen to have
45 it.

46
47 The other thing that this proposal
48 would do is have a -- get a winter hunt on the books,
49 it would be February 1 to 28, it'd be for any moose and
50 it'd be a to be announced season. We're not to the

1 point yet with the moose population where we want to
2 start slowing growth at this point, but what we're
3 going to use is a gage to when we're getting there, or
4 twinning data, and as twinning numbers start to fall,
5 we would then come in with this winter hunt and allow
6 us to start to slow the growth of that population or if
7 needed, even decrease the population, you know, if we
8 got to a point where there were more moose than the
9 landscape could support.

10

11 So those are -- there's sort of three
12 major components to this proposal then.

13

14 Make RM650 available in all of 19D,
15 which it is not currently.

16

17 Allow a green harvest ticket to be used
18 outside of the State defined Controlled
19 Use Area.

20

21 Have a winter hunt on the books with a
22 to be announced season.

23

24 We're not there yet, like I said, but
25 it's something that we want to have available to us.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Comments on the
28 proposal.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My question is, do
33 you have a bull/cow ratio threshold for this
34 population?

35

36 MR. PEARCE: With this hunt there --
37 one of the things that we have -- I don't have the
38 actual data, Roger's going to give this presentation,
39 and the twinning data is really going to be one of our
40 most important factors that we look at because with the
41 way the hunt's structured right now you need an RM650
42 permit to hunt within that river corridor. That, in
43 and of itself, limits hunting pressure pretty
44 significantly.

45

46 We also have a harvestable surplus,
47 it's much higher than the number of moose that we're
48 taking right now. The Board of Game identified 130 to
49 150 moose needed locally, meaning the villages of
50 Takotna, McGrath, Nikolai and Talida. We are currently

1 harvesting about 100 moose right now from 19D East and
2 our harvestable surplus is -- this number is exact, but
3 it's somewhere around 250, so there's quite a few moose
4 out there on the landscape right now that we could be
5 harvesting that we're not, and that's at a four percent
6 harvest rate. So I guess to get at your bull/cow ratio
7 question, that's definitely something that we keep an
8 eye on; that was one issue in the past in 19D, that
9 bull/cow ratio got depressed pretty significantly where
10 the harvest was really focused on the river corridor.
11 So our hope with this green harvest ticket and allowing
12 access outside of that corridor that would distribute
13 some of the pressure on the bulls, we'd start to take
14 bulls, because we can't take that many bulls from the
15 river, we would depress our bull/cow ratios, but what
16 we're going to try to do is disburse that pressure to
17 the larger area and hopefully avoid that problem.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But do you have a
20 management objective of like 30 bulls per 100 cows or
21 what?

22

23 MR. PEARCE: You know, I'm not sure
24 what the answer to that is. I would imagine there is
25 somewhere, and there is management planning that has
26 occurred in that area, and I wouldn't be surprised but
27 I don't know the answer.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I would like
30 to see that.

31

32 Other questions from the Council on the
33 proposal.

34

35 Eleanor.

36

37 MS. YATLIN: This was presented to the
38 local ACs?

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, we'll move
41 into the Advisory Committee position. McGrath Advisory
42 Committee, do you want to speak to that Ray.

43

44 MR. COLLINS: Yes. At our recent
45 meeting we went through these proposals, it was at the
46 end of January, and we support this. And as was
47 mentioned we had a closed area around McGrath and we
48 opened it for the first time last fall and we had a 1-
49 20, we were more conservative in the length of period
50 and now this movement to 1-25 throughout the whole area

1 kind of equalizes the hunting in that former management
2 area and the other one so it -- and then there's good
3 reason for -- well, yeah, for the 25, it gives a little
4 more opportunity. At some point we may want to go
5 beyond that because of the late movement of animals and
6 so on. But for now the Committee supported the 1-25
7 through the whole area, and we supported the winter
8 hunt as well, or at least to have it on the books.
9 We're not sure whether it'll be implemented and whether
10 it's justified right now, but we did support having the
11 ability there since the Board only comes up with
12 proposals every two years, they wanted to get it on the
13 books.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Well, the
16 Chair will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 79 --
17 State Proposal 79.

18

19 MR. COLLINS: I so move.

20

21 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny.
24 Further discussion, it's fairly straightforward. It's
25 the harvest objections are not being met and so the
26 Department and the AC has worked together to provide
27 additional harvest opportunity within our region so I'm
28 supportive of the proposal.

29

30 Further discussion by the Council.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing no further
35 discussion, those in favor of State Proposal 79 signify
36 by saying aye.

37

38 IN UNISON: Aye.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
41 sign.

42

43 And so we're moving to Proposal 80. So
44 this would be 21A. You want to describe the proposal
45 Josh.

46

47 MR. PEARCE: Yep. So this proposal was
48 submitted by a member of the public and what it intends
49 to do would be to lengthen the season for non-residents
50 in Unit 21A. Currently the season is the 5th to the

1 20th for non-residents, and this would extend it to the
2 25th. The Department is opposed to this proposal. And
3 I know the GASH AC, I know their positions, I don't
4 know if you just want me to state those, I guess I
5 could and if they want to say more they can but the
6 McGrath AC and the GASH AC both also opposed this
7 proposal.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

10

11 MR. PEARCE: And the rationale behind
12 it was in 2006 the Innoko Moose Management Plan was
13 endorsed by both Board of Game and the Federal
14 Subsistence Board and so both Boards are on record
15 supporting this plan. And as part of that one of the
16 main tenants of that plan was conservative management
17 of the moose population. So in 21A we don't have a lot
18 of good population data. The last survey was done in
19 2002 by the Refuge and we had plans to do one this
20 November but the snow conditions, it's low snow
21 everywhere so unfortunately we weren't able to pull
22 that off.

23

24 So at this point we still don't have
25 very good information on the moose population.

26

27 What we do have though is some harvest
28 data and composition data. And looking at the harvest
29 data we've seen a pretty large decline, both in the
30 number of hunters and number of moose taken which means
31 success rates have gone down. Local perception is that
32 the moose population has declined there and this
33 harvest data fits in there with that, if you have fewer
34 people hunting and there were the same number of moose,
35 if anything, you would think success rates would go up,
36 but we've seen fewer hunters, fewer moose taken and
37 lower success rates, and so that fits in with local
38 perception.

39

40 The one thing we do have pretty high
41 bull/cow ratios. This last year we had 64 bulls per
42 100 cows, which I think Glenn showed some data similar
43 to that. This is a real low density -- most likely
44 it's a very low density moose population, you kind of
45 have these low encounter rates. So there's moose out
46 there on the landscape that basically aren't being
47 encountered by people, and I think that somewhat
48 explains the high bull/cow ratio.

49

50 So the Department opposes this.

1 Basically we don't have any data to suggest that the
2 moose population could support that additional level of
3 harvest and maybe as of next year, once we get a --
4 we're going to try to do that survey again next year,
5 we may be in a better position to reassess this but no
6 recommendation from the Department's perspective it's
7 consistent with the Moose Management Plan, and like I
8 said the GASH and the McGrath AC also opposed this.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Do you have
11 further comments on the proposal, any Council members,
12 on the clarity of the proposal.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so did you have
17 further comments from the McGrath AC or just stand on
18 the opposition.

19

20 MR. COLLINS: They had opposed it,
21 yeah, for the reasons stated.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Do you have
24 any further comments from the GASH AC Ken.

25

26 MR. CHASE: No.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so this is --
29 yeah, I don't feel comfortable with additional hunt
30 harvest opportunity. The Chair will entertain a motion
31 to adopt Proposal 80, I intend to vote against this
32 proposal.

33

34 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

35

36 MS. YATLIN: Second.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Jenny,
39 seconded by Eleanor. Further discussion on the
40 proposal.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's been
47 called on Proposal 80, those in favor of the proposal
48 signify by saying aye.

49

50 (No aye votes)

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to
2 State Proposal 80 same sign.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so Proposal 80
7 is not supported by the Regional Council.

8
9 Proposal 81, do you want to present the
10 proposal Josh.

11
12 MR. PEARCE: Okay, Proposal 81 is very
13 similar in nature. It is actually misprinted, not
14 because the Office of Subsistence Management made a
15 mistake here, but it was misprinted in the book.

16
17 This proposal affects 21E, not 21A.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

20
21 MR. PEARCE: And what the proposal is
22 is an extension of the non-resident season by five days
23 again in 21E. Currently the season there is also the
24 5th-20th in September for non-residents. This would
25 change it from the 20th to the 25th for non-residents.

26
27 The Department has a different position
28 on this, we actually support this proposal, and, again,
29 we use the Innoko Moose Management Plan as our guiding
30 document in this case.

31
32 We have data that has been presented,
33 Jerry presented it already and the next proposal will
34 show it once again. But basically we have no
35 information to show that this moose population has
36 declined, it appears to be at least stable at this
37 time. And as we get some sightability correction
38 information, it may actually -- you know, there's a
39 chance that it has increased as well.

40
41 But in 2006, when the Board adopted
42 that -- or supported that plan, they made some changes
43 to the seasons and one of the components of that plan
44 was to cap non-resident harvest at 30 moose per year.
45 The intent was not to reduce non-resident harvest, it
46 was just to keep it where it was, the working group
47 felt at that time that that was a reasonable amount of
48 harvest. So two measures that the Board adopted were
49 to implement a permit system for non-residents and then
50 they also shortened the season at the same time. So

1 the season was the 25th prior to 2006.

2

3 Currently the way it works is there's
4 60 permits available, and there was about a 50 percent
5 success rate for non-residents at that time which gets
6 you to about 30 moose. The Board also allocated those
7 permits with 80 percent going to non-guided hunters and
8 20 percent going to guided hunters. And what we've
9 seen since that permit was put in place in 2007 is an
10 undersubscribed hunt every year, meaning we have
11 additional permits leftover at the end of the year that
12 people weren't even interested in. That may be the
13 person who submitted this proposal, says, it's because
14 they have to finish hunting on the 20th and they want
15 to be able to hunt later so there's -- the interest
16 wouldn't be there.

17

18 With that then we have also seen a
19 pretty significant decline in non-resident harvest.
20 There were 12 moose taken in 2007, 10 in 2008 and only
21 7 taken last fall in 2009. So we're certainly well
22 below that 30 moose cap that was intended with the
23 management plan.

24

25 So basically we have a couple of
26 options. Fish and Game has been authorized with our
27 permit discretion to issue up to 100 permits. We can't
28 do that, we can't give away the 60 permits that we're
29 currently offering. So then the next alternative would
30 potentially be to return the season back to the 25th,
31 which is why we're in support of this proposal.

32

33 Our bull/cow ratios, I took a two year
34 average, I've already discussed that, last year's
35 bull/cow ratio, which as Jack pointed out, even as is
36 is still a fine bull/cow ratio, there's nothing wrong
37 with that number, but it has been quite a bit higher
38 the last two year, so the two year average at any rate
39 is 47 bull per 100 cows, and we probably most likely
40 somewhere in that ball park. We've got an estimate of
41 1.2 moose per square mile, that's a midpoint of the
42 estimate, and we're also -- with that, we're also below
43 the harvestable surplus based on our estimates of what
44 current harvest is. And, again, a sightability
45 correction factor could change that. If anything it
46 would make the harvestable surplus even somewhat
47 higher. So we have a real conservative number right
48 now for what the harvestable surplus is.

49

50 So biologically speaking there's no

1 reason to oppose this additional five days of hunting
2 opportunity for non-residents, and the Department also
3 feels that it's consistent with the Yukon Innoko Moose
4 Management Plan.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thank you.
7 Did the Advisory Committees take this proposal up, Ken,
8 do you want to speak to the proposal.

9
10 MR. COLLINS: I think McGrath deferred
11 because it's outside our area.

12
13 MR. CHASE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We
14 had quite a discussion on this proposal three or four
15 days on a teleconference call and the proposal failed.
16 On our Committee we had two that voted for it and the
17 rest were against it. And it was interesting to see, I
18 think there may have been some maybe doubt or some not
19 clearance on some of the parts, because some of the
20 ones that voted on the Committee were actually part of
21 the plan, the Moose Management Plan, when we drew it up
22 so I'm not sure whether they were mistaken or they were
23 not -- something went on and they voted different and
24 they were on the plan.

25
26 So I think part of the problem comes
27 from the fact that when they hear commercial or hear
28 non-residents they just tie it in with somebody that's
29 guiding and transporting and therefore not wanting to
30 support it. And I believe the low rate of success is
31 -- or interest in taking the permits, getting the
32 permits is the lack of information in that area for --
33 there's no PR, you know, to tell people, well, this
34 area is all swamp, this area is fairly good, and et
35 cetera, et cetera, you know, there's nothing there for
36 them to see and they're kind of a little bit reluctant
37 to apply for those permits.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It is a remote area
40 and hard to access and very expensive to get in and out
41 of.

42
43 Further Council discussion with the AC
44 Chair.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Thanks, Ken.

49
50 MR. CHASE: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does the Council
2 want to take this proposal up, motion to adopt.
3
4 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair. Question,
5 though, first, isn't this mostly non-Federal land,
6 State land in there, I'm wondering how much interest we
7 have in terms of Federal land within the area.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's 21E, they've
10 changed this, it was a misprint.
11
12 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So it's got quite a
15 bit of Federal land in there.
16
17 MR. COLLINS: Oh, I see, okay.
18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so there's, you
20 know, an extensive Federal lands.
21
22 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, okay.
23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So James.
25
26 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
27 I'd just like to say that, again, our direction from
28 the tribal council, they were in direct opposition to
29 this proposal so I would be not in favor of it.
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Well, you can
32 vote your conscious on it. And so is there a motion to
33 adopt the proposal to move the proposal forward.
34
35 MR. R. WALKER: So moved.
36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved. Do we have a
38 second.
39
40 MR. GERVAIS: I'll second it.
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's seconded by
43 Tim. And Council discussion on Proposal -- James has
44 registered his opposition to the proposal, other
45 Council members have feelings on the proposal.
46
47 MR. R. WALKER: Jack.
48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Robert.
50

1 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr.
2 Chairman. The tribes had an audio conference here over
3 10 days ago and in order for the State to go ahead and
4 start -- for the Board to approve this, one of the
5 things that was brought forth was predation, the State
6 hasn't done nothing about this yet. If we're going to
7 go out and start issuing permits maybe they ought to
8 start doing something about the wolves, the bears, et
9 cetera.

10
11 The other question was, are we getting
12 a little hasty here to approve something of this here
13 in 21E, the tribe wasn't too sure yet about this. With
14 the Byersdorf collaring the moose, that would be
15 interesting to see how many moose are migrating out
16 because there's no more moose up in 21A to migrate in,
17 21D. Tanana Chiefs has taken a stand on this, they're
18 the ones that directing more or less that the tribes
19 are to format this into a plan.

20
21 So that is their opposition for this
22 proposal.

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Further discussion
25 by the Council. Ray.

26
27 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I
28 guess the plan might support this thing but it kind of
29 disturbs me that they're not even using the permits
30 that are available now and until that starts happening
31 I don't know if we need to provide other activity.
32 Maybe it's because they can hunt longer, but there's
33 still permits there that does allow hunts that aren't
34 even being used.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

37
38 MR. COLLINS: So I guess with that in
39 mind and the objection of the communities I'd vote
40 against it.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim, you got
43 comment.

44
45 MR. GERVAIS: I'm going to support it.
46 I hear what the tribes and villages are saying and
47 stuff. My seat on this Council is to represent
48 commercial users and based on Josh's presentation that
49 biologically the amount of moose being harvested is
50 well below what was set aside in the Moose Management

1 Plan, that I'm going to have to go ahead and support
2 the proposal.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'll speak to the
5 proposal. I tend to support the proposal because under
6 .815 -- I have to caution the Council that I've read
7 ANILCA and .815 of ANILCA does not provide exclusive
8 use of a resource and the management plan allocating 30
9 permits and so harvest of one-third of the allocation
10 there is -- I personally can't oppose the proposal
11 because it's part of the ANILCA law that you cannot
12 have exclusive use, you have to provide other users if
13 there's excess resource and so if the plan developed
14 provided 30 moose to be harvested, the tribes signed on
15 to the plan and I'm confused by that, and so in
16 reality, you know, if this was before the Federal Board
17 they could not support this because they can't usurp
18 resource away from the other users, other users.

19

20 And so I'm sort of on the fence with
21 this one, I want to side with the tribes but in reality
22 we have .815 and it is a lot of Federal land there and
23 so .815 says we can't -- we have to provide for other
24 users also and so I wanted to throw that out for the
25 Council. I'd like the Council to be aware of the
26 entirety of what the law we're dealing with entails.

27

28 Go ahead, James.

29

30 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

31

32 Like Ray stated there, there is permits
33 available for this additional usage. In the previous
34 years, has the number of permits stayed the same or
35 increased?

36

37 MR. PEARCE: No, the number of permits
38 distributed has actually changed quite a bit.

39

40 And just for a little bit of
41 background, the Department is authorized to issue up to
42 100 permits, we have that within our permit discretion
43 authority. So one thing that we do have available to
44 us, if we did see harvest start to get up to, you know,
45 where it was close to 30, we could simply back off on
46 the number of permits that we issue so that's a tool
47 that we already have in place right now, so we're not
48 worried about this leading to over harvest. You know
49 if we had 100 percent success rate we'd issue 30
50 permits, for instance, but, of course, we wouldn't get

1 there.

2

3 So just to let you know, the number of
4 permits available, like I said there were 60 total, in
5 2007 we issued 53; in 2008 we issued 40; and then last
6 year we only issued 31. So not only are we not issuing
7 the 60 but interest in this hunt is also going down. I
8 think there's just too many unknowns. People aren't
9 interested in a hunt that they're not very familiar
10 with and then in addition to that there's other places
11 they can go and hunt until the 25th and these non-
12 residents really are interested in being out there when
13 the rut is really starting to kick in.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have a
16 comment there, Ken.

17

18 MR. CHASE: Yes, Mr. Chair, thank you.
19 Just to follow up what you said on your committee, in
20 the meeting the other day I told our committee the very
21 same thing, that I was representing, and we were to
22 represent all user groups, you know, within the state,
23 and the success rate, I think, is determining the --
24 like Josh says, determines the amount people that's
25 been applying for these permits. If you had a five day
26 season extra and people got 10 moose or the non-hunters
27 got 10 moose, then next year you'd see a little more
28 interest in it, you know, and it brings a little
29 resource and a little work to local people, too.

30

31 So that's my point, thank you.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Well, you
34 know, I've worked on various -- the Koyukuk Management
35 Plan, and also in the Dalton Highway Corridor we have a
36 drawing permit system and, you know, those are the
37 allocations and so as the Western Interior Chair, I've
38 read the ANILCA law, we can't -- we have to stay within
39 our boundaries and so I'm under the ANILCA .815
40 position that there's additional resource that's
41 allocated toward sport use and I can't oppose the plan
42 that's endorsed by the Federal Subsistence Board under
43 the auspices that I don't like sport use, I can't do
44 that. We have to stay -- work within the legal
45 parameters of the system and so I have to vote along
46 with what the law provides and so that's -- I will vote
47 for the proposal and I will probably be voted down but
48 I have to vote my conscious on this proposal.

49

50 You got a comment Ray.

1 MR. COLLINS: Well, you convinced me
2 I'll probably vote for it too, because of the low
3 number that are actually being harvested now. But I'll
4 be watching it to see what happens with that and there
5 is a limited number of permits available.

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's a fairly
8 regulated system and I feel comfortable with this type
9 of system on the Koyukuk Plan, we can -- Glenn will
10 adjust the numbers up and down and stay with what the
11 plan is stating. And so I had put quite a bit of
12 confidence in the planning process and I don't want to
13 see it derailed -- I don't want to see the State
14 thinking that, you know, we're trying to derail our
15 management plans that we agree to and so I can't vote
16 for the plan and then vote to take all the resources
17 away from the other users, I can't really do that, and
18 that's not actually legal for me to do if I'm thinking
19 about the ANILCA law. And so I have to vote along
20 those legal boundaries.

21
22 Other discussion by the Council.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, those
27 in favor of Proposal 81 signify by saying aye.

28
29 MR. COLLINS: Aye.

30
31 MR. GERVAIS: Aye.

32
33 MS. PELKOLA: Aye.

34
35 MS. YATLIN: Aye.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Aye. How many votes
38 was that -- we got five votes and so there's five votes
39 -- those opposed same sign.

40
41 MR. R. WALKER: Aye.

42
43 MR. J. WALKER: Aye.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so those --
46 state for the record why you're opposing -- I'd
47 appreciate your opposition justification, please.

48
49 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
50 Like I stated my opposition for this, I don't have

1 anything personal with this issue here, I could see
2 where it would be an advantageous thing to be enforced
3 but I do have to, again, bring up the concern directed
4 to me from the tribal of Holy Cross in opposition of
5 this.

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate that,
8 thank you. Robert.

9
10 MR. R. WALKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman,
11 thank you. I'm on the same line here. I'm not against
12 this here but I just don't like to see subsistence
13 people compete with other user groups that can't -- or
14 will not utilize whatever -- I know that anything over
15 40 inches after the 25th is not barely edible so that
16 would be my thing here.

17
18 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Robert,
21 appreciate that.

22
23 So we're going to continue on to
24 Proposal 82. Do we really want to deal with this one.
25 Ray. It's a sheep proposal for 19C. Go ahead, Josh.

26
27 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

28
29 MR. PEARCE: Proposal 82 was submitted
30 by a member of the public from Nikolai who is on the
31 McGrath Advisory Committee and what this proposal
32 intends to do is -- I don't have the exact wording in
33 front of me, but open subsistence sheep hunt for --
34 what they wanted was residents of Nikolai, McGrath and
35 Talida. Under the State system, of course, we don't
36 have the ability to restrict a hunt based on residency.
37 So there's been -- the Department supports this
38 proposal, not as written, with some amendments.

39
40 But basically this is for a very
41 limited number of sheep, it's up to five sheep and it
42 would be any sheep under three-quarter curl, so this is
43 a meat hunt, not a trophy hunt. Some of the concerns
44 are, how are we going to be able to limit the number of
45 permits issued, and working within the constraints of
46 the State system, so the Board's definitely going to
47 have to grapple with this one, I'm not sure where it
48 will go. Like I said we don't have the ability to
49 restrict a hunt based on where somebody lives. And,
50 Ray, I think can speak as well from the McGrath's AC's

1 perspective. They had quite a bit of discussion about
2 this as well, how they could support this and what
3 would be potentially some ways to implement it.

4
5 So this proposal is for a small number
6 of sheep and it would be by Alaska residents but the
7 person who submitted the proposal, their intent was to
8 have it be McGrath, Telida and Nikolai residents only.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Do you want
11 to speak to the proposal Ray.

12
13 MR. COLLINS: Yes. And I have personal
14 knowledge of this hunt because when we moved to Nikolai
15 in 1963 many traplines ran out to the mountains and in
16 connection with the trapping, people would hunt out
17 there and they'd bring back one, two, three sheep and
18 they'd be shared with the community at the winter
19 potlatches and things like that and it's a tradition
20 that's gone on for a long time. If there was Federal
21 land involved they would be pushing for a C&T finding
22 and pushing for the hunt, but they can't do it, it's
23 State land. And so if -- I'm hoping they'll be able to
24 get this moved forward because it is something that's
25 been done traditionally for a long period of time and
26 we're just trying to figure out how to do it under the
27 State and the McGrath committee voted in favor of this,
28 too, and I'll be speaking to this at the State Game
29 Board.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

32
33 MR. COLLINS: So what you're doing
34 would be supporting subsistence hunters, basically, or
35 residents there, of trying to get through and find out
36 -- carry on a practice that they have traditionally
37 carried on under the State regs.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Chair will
40 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 83 as -- you had
41 modification that you wanted to state.

42
43 MS. YATLIN: 82.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 82, excuse me.
46 Yeah, 82. Was there specific language modification?

47
48 MR. PEARCE: Yeah, actually I misspoke,
49 the Department made no recommendation on this proposal
50 because of it's allocative issue.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
2
3 MR. PEARCE: We weren't opposed to it
4 biologically at all though.
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
7
8 MR. PEARCE: So if the Board can figure
9 out a way to do this that's up to them.
10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And so the
12 proposal as written, the Chair will entertain a motion
13 to adopt.
14
15 MR. COLLINS: I so move.
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Second.
18
19 MR. GERVAIS: I'll second it.
20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so discussion on
22 the proposal.
23
24 (No comments)
25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I will speak to the
27 proposal. We have similar proposals with non-aircraft
28 in the Brooks Range, various restraints, the
29 disincentive of the proposal is the half-curl or three-
30 quarter curl or less -- is it three-quarter curl?
31
32 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
33
34 MR. R. WALKER: Three-quarter.
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Three-quarter curl
37 or less. It's a winter hunt, really hard to get to in
38 mountainous country and so this is kind of a tough hunt
39 and fairly low number of animals to be taken, I'm in
40 support of the proposal.
41
42 Tim.
43
44 MR. GERVAIS: That was going to be my
45 comment, I'd like to -- I'm not fulling understanding
46 the mechanisms that's going to make -- that's going to
47 fill the intent that local hunters are going to get
48 these permits, or utilize these permits, I don't know
49 Josh or Ray, if you'd comment on that.
50

1 MR. COLLINS: Well, what we're
2 proposing is that they be issued in the area and since
3 it is a winter hunt and you can't use aircraft, we were
4 hoping that the number who would actually apply would
5 be rather limited, even in McGrath I don't think
6 there'd be a lot of interest in applying for that other
7 than someone who really wants to make out the effort to
8 get one for community use. So that's the only
9 mechanism we got now and we're hoping that that will
10 work if they just issue them in the area. Because it
11 has to be monitored too because you need to know when
12 you reach the number. So there may be -- if it's
13 approved there may be reporting requirements within a
14 certain reasonable period of time.

15
16 But the thing that tailored it was the
17 no aircraft use so it has to be on the ground and
18 that's -- which means you have to reach it by
19 snowmachine probably and there's going to be only a
20 limited number of trails that will access the area and
21 so on and so we're hoping that there'll be little
22 interest outside of the area in the permits but we
23 don't know.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Further discussion
26 on the proposal.

27
28 (No comments)

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, those
31 in favor of Proposal 82 as written signify by saying
32 aye.

33
34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35
36 MR. COLLINS: Aye.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Aye.

39
40 MR. GERVAIS: Aye.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to the
43 proposal, same sign.

44
45 I got three votes for and I have.....

46
47 MR. J. WALKER: I said aye.

48
49 MS. YATLIN: I said aye.

50

1 MS. PELKOLA: I said aye.

2

3 MR. J. WALKER: I said aye.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, you did, okay,
6 Proposal -- do we have any opposition votes.

7

8 (No opposing votes)

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I'm not
11 hearing very loud ayes lately. We're getting tired.
12 We need a case of Coke here to pep this Council up.

13

14 (Laughter)

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so the proposal
17 is supported. If the proposal passes, the Chair would
18 like a notation made to the OSM Staff that a similar
19 Federal proposal would need to be promulgated,
20 submitted because there's Park lands within 19C that
21 would need a Federal regulation. Right now the current
22 regulation does not have this small of curl size and so
23 there'd be a need for a similar proposal at our next
24 round.

25

26 And so Proposal 83, discuss that
27 proposal, Josh, go ahead.

28

29 MR. PEARCE: Yeah, the Department -- or
30 Proposal 83 is a Department proposal, and what it would
31 do, currently in the McGrath area in 19D east there is
32 an early reporting requirement for hunters and trappers
33 who take wolves, they have to report that wolf within
34 10 days of take. And where that came from is, of
35 course, we have a wolf control program going on there
36 right now and there's a minimum number of wolves which
37 we cannot fall below and if we start to approach that,
38 the Department closes aerial wolf control and hunting
39 and trapping by emergency order.

40

41 This early reporting requirement has
42 proven to be unnecessary. They've not had to ever
43 issue an emergency order and the size of the wolf
44 control area has been reduced as well and as part of
45 that reduction we're fairly well assured that we would
46 not even be able to go below that minimum number of
47 wolves. So this proposal then would change it to the
48 same as other areas where a trapper or hunter has until
49 30 days after the close of the season to report their
50 take of a wolf. So this eliminates an unnecessary

1 burden, I guess you could say, on hunters and trappers.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And the Advisory
4 Committee position, Ray.

5

6 MR. COLLINS: We support.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. The Advisory
9 Committee supports the proposal.

10

11 I see this strictly as a housekeeping
12 proposal and as a trapper I feel that 10 days would be
13 burdensome to come out of camp to go report wolves.

14

15 Further discussion on -- motion to
16 adopt the Proposal 83.

17

18 MS. YATLIN: So moved.

19

20 MR. R. WALKER: Second.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded. Those in
23 favor -- any discussion.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
28 the proposal signify by saying aye.

29

30 IN UNISON: Aye.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to
33 Proposal 83, same sign.

34

35 (No opposing votes)

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal 84,
38 predator control area implementation plan, you want to
39 discuss that one, Josh.

40

41 MR. PEARCE: Yeah, so this one I
42 actually have a presentation for and this is my
43 presentation I'll be giving to the Board in the next
44 couple of days. But I thought this would be of
45 interest to you folks.

46

47 This is Proposal 84, which is also a
48 Department proposal, and it is to -- would establish a
49 predation control implementation plan in Unit 21E.

50

1 (Pause)

2

3 MR. PEARCE: I'll keep going here,
4 Polly can just skip a couple of slides.

5

6 So the Department's recommendation is
7 to adopt and the GASH AC has supported this proposal,
8 if Ken wants to say more about it, he certainly can.
9 Actually I'll -- no, I'll do this in a minute, I was
10 going to -- I need to get this collaring project out
11 there for you guys as well.

12

13 So as I mentioned the Board -- the
14 State Board and the Federal Subsistence Board have both
15 endorsed the Yukon Innoko Moose Management Plan and
16 they did that in 2006 and some of the main tenants of
17 that plan were to establish a proactive management
18 program, conservatively manage harvest of moose and
19 also to create an IM plan. The GASH submitted a
20 proposal in 2008 to the State Board, they deferred it
21 at that time. In 2009 the State submitted a proposal
22 as well, the Board deferred it again. And, now, here
23 we are in 2010, so we're finally getting -- hopefully
24 we're going to get this before the Board.

25

26 Unit 21E, this map here shows all of
27 Unit 21E, it's approximately 7,795 square miles and the
28 predation control area created by this proposal would
29 encompass all of 21E. The predation control program,
30 however, would not apply on National Wildlife Refuge
31 lands.

32

33 Next slide.

34

35 Within the Unit 21E predation control
36 area, and so these next few maps are really meant to
37 orient everyone, we would establish a 2,600 square mile
38 GASH Moose Management Area, or MMA we would call it.
39 The purpose of the MMA would be to focus intensive
40 management activities in a relatively small area near
41 the GASH villages rather than spread the effort over
42 the entire Game Management Unit, and wolf control would
43 only be conducted within the MMA. So that figure there
44 -- oh, that's okay, you can go to the next slide.

45

46 This map here shows where we actually
47 conduct moose surveys. This is the checkerboard area,
48 that's a 5,070 square mile area where we conduct our
49 GSPE surveys which are done in late February, early
50 March, as I mentioned earlier. The thresholds used to

1 implement wolf control would be based on the moose
2 population that we determine from this area.

3

4 Okay, next slide.

5

6 This map I've overlaid the two, the
7 moose management area would be the blue dashed line,
8 and then the moose survey area is, again, that
9 checkered area, so here you can see the two in relation
10 to each other. And it's mostly the two overlapped.
11 There is that one small corner up in the northwest
12 corner there where we don't survey moose but wolf
13 control would be permitted.

14

15 Next slide.

16

17 There are currently 1.2, and I'm going
18 to use this term a lot throughout -- observable moose
19 per square mile, and that's an important distinction to
20 be made here. We don't have sightability correction
21 information, as I mentioned to you, and so right now
22 observable moose is the best that we can do. So there
23 are currently 1.2 observable moose per square mile in
24 the moose survey area which was that checkerboard area,
25 and implementation of wolf control would only occur if
26 the midpoint of the future estimate falls between one
27 observable moose per square mile and where we came up
28 with that one observable moose per square mile is
29 that's what the estimate was in 2000, so we're kind of
30 using that as a baseline for future management
31 activities.

32

33 This proposal then, therefore, is meant
34 to be proactive and does not recommend wolf control at
35 this time, so we want to get this on the books, if the
36 moose population, if we're able to detect a decline, we
37 would then have the tool in place to address that.

38

39 Next slide please.

40

41 Local hunters -- local residents and
42 other hunters have reported a decline in the 21E moose
43 population since the mid-90s and are concerned that
44 additional declines may occur. However, there are few
45 data available on the number of moose prior to 2000 for
46 comparison and as I mentioned earlier, population
47 surveys were conducted in March 2000, 2005 and 2009.

48

49 Next slide.

50

1 Estimates at the 90 percent confidence
2 interval and Jerry showed you this in a nice figure
3 overlap and without sightability -- and -- oh, let's
4 see, estimates at the 90 percent confidence intervals
5 without sightability factors during these surveys were
6 approximately 5,000, 4,600 and 6,200 in those years.
7 The ranges of these estimates overlap and we can't
8 detect a change in the population at this time.
9 Extrapolating our most recent survey to all of 21E, our
10 most recent estimate of the moose population is 6,200
11 to 8,700 moose, and, again, that's observable moose.
12 If anything, with a sightability correction factor
13 those numbers would only go up.

14
15 Estimated annual -- average annual
16 moose harvest by all Alaska residents in Unit 21E was
17 311 between '96 and 2005. This estimate was based on
18 all available harvest data, including harvest ticket
19 reports, Division of Subsistence household surveys and
20 other subsistence research. The average non-resident
21 harvest between 2000 and 2004 was 30, but as I showed
22 you just a little while ago is lower now.

23
24 According to harvest ticket reports the
25 number of moose harvested in 21E declined from an
26 average of 182 annually during the '98 to 2002 seasons
27 to 124 during the '03 to '08 seasons. A large part of
28 this decline can be attributed to a reduction in the
29 number of hunters from Unit 18 who no longer travel up
30 river to hunt because of increased opportunities in 18.

31
32 The intensive management moose
33 population objective for Unit 21E, and this is set by
34 the Board of Game, is 9,000 to 11,000 moose and as I
35 showed just a couple of slides ago we're below that
36 number right now with observable moose, but if you
37 apply even a somewhat modest sightability correction
38 factor of 1.25, we're definitely -- we would most
39 likely be in that range, I'll say it that way, not
40 definitely. The intensive management moose harvest
41 objective established by the Board is 550 to 1,100
42 moose. You can see over on the right-hand side our
43 current estimate, as I said, without sightability, is
44 6,200 to approximately 8,700 and the estimated annual
45 harvest over the last five years is 240 moose, and
46 that's by all residents and non-residents.

47
48 The objective for moose in this
49 proposal is a minimum of 5,070 within the moose survey
50 area, that was that checkerboard area, and 5,070,

1 that's how many square miles, so that's one moose per
2 square mile, that would be as estimated from aerial
3 surveys and not corrected for sightability. The moose
4 harvest objective in this proposal is a minimum of 203
5 also taken from that moose survey area. And that's
6 simply 203 is four percent of 5,070. that's our harvest
7 rate that we're using.

8
9 Composition surveys conducted during
10 November, '87 through '98 and '07 through 2009 indicate
11 that bull/cow ratios and calf/cow ratios were at or
12 above the 25 to 30 bulls per 100 cows and 30 to 40
13 calves per 100 cows in most years. In November 2009,
14 and we've already been over this as well, the calf/cow
15 ratio was lower at only 18 per 100 which was likely due
16 to the flooding and these are some pictures I took out
17 there in May when you guys were under water in the GASH
18 area. And it's a little hard to see with the light
19 right now but basically the moose were finding these
20 little islands of habitat and if the light was better,
21 there's a cow with a calf right there on that island so
22 they were finding these spots. And as Jack pointed
23 out, you know, any bear that swam out there, that calf
24 would either drown or be pretty easy pickings for a
25 bear, so we think that this flooding is really most
26 likely what explains that low calf/cow ratio.

27
28 MR. GERVAIS: How many days was the
29 flooding.....

30
31 MR. PEARCE: It was a long time. That
32 water took a long time to go away.

33
34 This is some twinning data, we collect
35 this information in late May and sometimes it's as late
36 as early June, but we try to do it by late May. We've
37 had seven aerial surveys since spring 2000 and our
38 twinning rates have all -- or the average twinning rate
39 for those years has been above 35 percent and for the
40 last two years the average twinning rate was 48.5
41 percent.

42
43 Next slide.

44
45 A browse survey conducted during spring
46 2006 indicated that moose were more than 21 percent of
47 the current annual biomass; this is considered a
48 moderate level along the gradient of removal observed
49 in other interior moose populations and this
50 information taken with the twinning information from

1 the previous slide suggests that habitat is not
2 currently limiting moose productivity in 21E.

3

4 The pre-control wolf population in 21E
5 was estimated for fall 2008 using a survey that was
6 conducted in 2009 and we go backwards because we have
7 to use information from sealing records, so how many
8 wolves were taken by hunters and trappers over the
9 course of that winter. And the data that we collected
10 resulted in an estimate of 146 to 156 wolves or
11 approximately 18 to 20 wolves per 1,000 square miles.

12

13 Somebody asked about packs one time.
14 And this survey we were able to conduct the survey in
15 about a 3,600 square mile, basically the area from
16 Grayling over to the Innoko River and then south as far
17 as Paimiut Slough, so about half of the Unit 21E area,
18 and with that then the average pack size was seven
19 wolves, and using that with our extrapolated number
20 that gets you to 20 to 22 packs for an estimate in 21E.

21

22 I guess just for something to compare
23 that to as well, those are actually fairly high wolf
24 densities as you guys are aware of. The unit just to
25 the south of us, Unit 20A has some fairly high wolf
26 densities as well, some of the highest in the state
27 actually, and these aren't too far below that so
28 there's -- well, as we were doing that moose survey we
29 definitely saw lots of signs of wolf predation out
30 there.

31

32 So studies have concluded that
33 reductions of 60 to 80 percent are required to wolf
34 population levels and to reduce predation by wolves on
35 their prey. Once a wolf population has been reduced
36 annual reductions of less than 60 percent will likely
37 regulate the wolf population at the control objective.

38

39 Next slide.

40

41 If wolf control was implemented, the
42 objective would be to reduce wolf numbers and wolf
43 predation on moose within the moose management area,
44 which was that smaller blue dashed line, approximately
45 2,600 square miles to the lowest level possible. With
46 that, however, we would also have a minimum number of
47 wolves remaining in 21E, which would be 29 to 31
48 wolves, so that would represent no more than an 80
49 percent reduction from what our pre-control estimate is
50 and it's highly unlikely that we would even get to that

1 because most of the area would not be within the wolf
2 control zone.

3

4 Let's see, okay, next slide please.

5

6 Average harvest of wolves by hunters
7 and trappers from 2003 to 2008 was only 17 per year and
8 some thoughts are the low price of wolf pelts versus
9 the high cost of fuel may be some factors that
10 contribute to low harvest.

11

12 The Yukon Innoko working group really
13 was pressing for this and one of the -- as I said one
14 of the main tenants of the plan was a proactive
15 approach so reducing wolf numbers -- let's see,
16 reducing wolf numbers through a wolf predation control
17 program combined with a reduction in moose harvest is
18 the approach most likely to succeed in a recovery of
19 the moose population if any additional declines were to
20 occur. So, again, we're not there yet, this is being
21 addressed as a proactive approach.

22

23 Moose hunting seasons and bag limits
24 have been reduced in 21E, first the Federal resident
25 season for any moose was closed in 2003 and next the
26 non-resident season, as we just discussed, was capped
27 at 30 moose per year and that was done in 2006/2007.
28 If additional declines in the moose population were to
29 occur these measures by themselves would be unlikely to
30 allow the moose population to increase.

31

32 The Yukon Innoko Moose Management Plan
33 supported the existing Federal winter hunt with a
34 harvest of up to 40 antlerless moose. This hunt is
35 currently open to residents of 21E and Russian Mission.
36 If wolf control were to be implemented, the Department
37 would submit a proposal to the Federal Subsistence
38 Board to close the cow portion of that hunt. So not
39 eliminate the winter hunt but the cow portion of it.
40 We feel that if we're doing wolf control we can't be
41 shooting cows at the same time, that seems
42 inconsistent.

43

44 Permissible methods and means used to
45 take wolves during this program would be under the
46 regular hunting and trapping regulations and then the
47 Commissioner would also be able to issue public aerial
48 shooting permits or public land and shoot permits as a
49 method of wolf removal when the midpoint of any
50 population estimate obtained in the moose survey area,

1 that checkerboard area, declines below one moose per
2 square mile. So we're sitting at 1.2 moose per square
3 mile right now.

4

5 The anticipated timeframe and schedule
6 for updates and reevaluation are as follows. For up to
7 six years, beginning July 1, 2010 the Commissioner may
8 reduce the wolf population in 21E. Then once
9 implemented the Department will provide annual reports
10 to the Board including recommendations for change, if
11 necessary.

12

13 This -- I'll go on to the moose
14 collaring project at the end of this, I guess, I'll
15 keep them separate.

16

17 So the next slide, please.

18

19 The Commissioner will suspend wolf
20 predation control activities when information indicates
21 the need to avoid reducing wolf numbers below the
22 minimum population objective of 29 to 31, no later than
23 April 30th of any regulatory year or when the prey
24 population objectives are attained. And that's our
25 objective for moose within the moose survey area, which
26 was that one moose per square mile. So that's kind of
27 our trigger point is that one moose per square mile for
28 an on/off kind of a mechanism.

29

30 And then the final slide here is the
31 Yukon Innoko Moose Management Plan is intended to
32 provide a framework for proactive management of the
33 Unit 21E moose population. The Department is not
34 recommending wolf control at this time, however, we are
35 recommending adopting this proposal so we have the tool
36 in place to prevent the moose population from declining
37 to a low level from which it would be difficult to
38 recover.

39

40 So that's the presentation I'm going to
41 give in the next couple days.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, appreciate
44 that Josh, very thorough.

45

46 Council members comments on the
47 presentation.

48

49 Tim.

50

1 MR. GERVAIS: What did you say your
2 exploitation rate was on the moose harvest?
3
4 MR. PEARCE: How many moose are taken?
5
6 MR. GERVAIS: No. How do you calculate
7 what you -- what's your allowable harvest rate on the
8 moose?
9
10 MR. PEARCE: Oh, okay, the harvestable
11 surplus. That number was -- four percent was the
12 number that was identified in the Yukon Innoko Moose
13 Management Plan, that's a fairly conservative level.
14 There's areas where they harvest higher than that, so
15 based on our last population estimate just four percent
16 of that number gives us our harvestable surplus.
17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Go
19 ahead, Tim.
20
21 MR. GERVAIS: I'm done.
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any other
24 comments. Ray.
25
26 MR. COLLINS: Yes. Josh, once you do
27 implement, using that one for a trigger, is it going to
28 turn off and on every time it takes one or can you take
29 it -- will you set objectives of what you want the
30 population to be and until that's reached it would
31 continue; is that it?
32
33 MR. PEARCE: Yeah, that's the idea
34 behind this. And one of the things that I mentioned
35 was we'll provide annual updates to the Board and this
36 might be a great time to segway into the collaring
37 project.
38
39 One of the pieces of information that
40 we're really missing is this sightability correction
41 factor, that's really a pretty -- that affects our
42 ability to more precisely measure what the population
43 level is. So as we start to get that information,
44 we're going to start collaring actually in a couple
45 weeks, we'll be out there in the GASH area, and once
46 we're able to get that information, that will help us
47 refine that number more so, that'd be a likely tweak
48 that we would make in the near future. Because you're
49 right, otherwise, you know, it'd be -- you know, just
50 using that one moose per square mile, we only do a

1 survey once every three years, so our ability, there'd
2 be some lag time in there, it could be three years that
3 it's been below or three years that it's been above
4 one.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Robert.

7

8 MR. R. WALKER: Josh, on Page.....

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Robert, could you
11 turn your mic.

12

13 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14 Josh on Page 123, predation population, you're talking
15 about 146, 156 wolves, approximately 18 to 20 wolves
16 per 1,000 square miles, how old is this data here, is
17 it more than five, six years old?

18

19 MR. PEARCE: No, this was actually --
20 we collected this data just a year ago so this is the
21 most recent estimate that we have.

22

23 MR. R. WALKER: Okay, because I was
24 kind of concerned here because it seemed like this was
25 kind of low to what maybe this year is, you know,
26 that's just my estimate and other people's estimate
27 too.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

30

31 MR. PEARCE: Yeah, so you felt that was
32 an old number or, I guess, you think there's more,
33 fewer?

34

35 MR. R. WALKER: I think that you're
36 just a little low here. I mean I would say there's
37 more than 18, 20 wolves per 1,000 square miles. Like
38 for instance what Ken said here in the GASH area, Anvik
39 has got two packs between his place and that's only 20
40 miles up to his cabin so you're looking at probably 20
41 wolves in that one area, 40 maybe at that, so -- and I
42 would say this is a little more than 18 to 20 per
43 thousand miles.

44

45 MR. PEARCE: Yeah, so our total
46 estimate was 146 to 156 and that area between the flood
47 plains of the Yukon Innoko is where most of the moose
48 are in the winter and not surprisingly where most of
49 the wolves are. So as we were surveying, as soon as
50 you got into -- and keep in mind, this is only about

1 half of 21E, so you don't have those same wolf
2 densities throughout the entire unit. It really drops
3 off pretty quickly once you get away from the
4 drainages. So that's the best estimate that we have at
5 this time.

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My question -- no,
8 go ahead, Robert.

9
10 MR. R. WALKER: Yes, also you got to
11 remember, too, five years ago when we did the moose
12 management there was 250 to 350 wolves here, whatever
13 happened to the rest?

14
15 MR. PEARCE: That estimate actually was
16 purely an extrapolation. That was the best number they
17 could come up with the time and they used densities
18 from 19D for that estimate and they extrapolated those
19 densities to all 7,995 square miles of 21E so we felt
20 in the McGrath area, that that estimate was too high,
21 and then also it wasn't based on any real information.
22 Last year we actually went there flew, counted moose --
23 or wolves from airplanes.

24
25 MR. R. WALKER: Okay, thank you.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And have you
28 collared wolves in that 21E?

29
30 MR. PEARCE: No, no wolves have been
31 collared out there.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you intend to
34 collar some wolves in the future?

35
36 MR. PEARCE: That is not part of the
37 present plan. Right now the plan is to have this moose
38 collaring project.....

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

41
42 MR. PEARCE:which I still haven't
43 given the details of.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, the moose
46 collaring project should be priority one. In the
47 future it would be good to collar some of the wolves to
48 see the demographics of where the wolves are at during
49 calving season and where they den and so forth. So
50 just my comment.

1 Other comments on the presentation.
2
3 (No comments)
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Advisory Committee
6 comments. Ken.
7
8 MR. CHASE: No comment.
9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No comment. And so
11 we're at -- the Chair will entertain a motion to adopt
12 Proposal 84 -- State proposal predator control area
13 implementation plans.
14
15 MR. R. WALKER: So moved.
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved. Do we have a
18 second.
19
20 MS. YATLIN: Second.
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Eleanor.
23
24 Discussion on the proposal.
25
26 (No comments)
27
28 MR. J. WALKER: Question.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I want -- I would
31 like a statement on the record.
32
33 I support the predator control area
34 implementation plan with trigger points for predator
35 harvest if the population of moose declines and so the
36 future plans for collaring moose and defining the
37 population more accurately would be advantageous to
38 understanding the moose population and so I'm
39 supportive of the plan with the trigger points.
40
41 So any other comments.
42
43 (No comments)
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, question's
46 been called. Those in favor of the proposal signify by
47 saying aye.
48
49 IN UNISON: Aye.
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
2 sign.
3
4 (No opposing votes)
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I don't see -- I
7 see Proposal 84, which is more less a redundant
8 proposal but do you want to speak to that one, Ken?
9
10 MR. CHASE: No.
11
12 MS. YATLIN: 85.
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Correction, I mean
15 85 is a redundant request addressed by the previous
16 proposal. So having taken action on 84, I don't think
17 -- I feel that we don't need to cover the same issue.
18
19 Proposal 86, same thing.
20
21 So we'll just skip over that one for
22 previous action on 84.
23
24 And then 87, controlled use area,
25 modify aircraft restrictions for the Koyukuk Controlled
26 Use Area, that moves out of your -- go ahead there,
27 Josh.
28
29 MR. PEARCE: Yeah, those two would be
30 the last proposals and the Department 85 and 86 are
31 just take no action based on 84.
32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
34
35 MR. PEARCE: So I guess before I step
36 away from the table, though, I could give you some of
37 the details on that moose collaring project; you were
38 interested in that.
39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, that would be
41 appreciated.
42
43 MR. PEARCE: So in two weeks from now
44 we're supposed to head out, we're going to base out of
45 Reindeer Lake, we're going to have a helicopter out of
46 there and a couple of SuperCubs so you may see us
47 flying around.
48
49 But we have 42 GPS collars and 10
50 conventional VHF collars. So we're going to put out 52

1 total collars on moose. We're going to do half cows,
2 half bulls. The two main objectives of this study are
3 to get movement data and sightability correction
4 information. So we'll use those collars when we're
5 actually out there surveying to determine what
6 sightability is, and then the rest of the year those
7 GPS collars are going to be crucial, as you guys know
8 flying out there can be a real challenge and so they're
9 going to give us a lot of information, safely, without
10 having to go flying, and we're going to use that
11 information throughout the year to determine where
12 moose are moving to, how far they're moving, when
13 they're moving; answer some of those sorts of
14 questions. Because the local perception still is that
15 there's fewer moose out there than there used to be.

16
17 As I pointed out, we're doing our
18 surveys in the winter when the moose have moved down
19 from other areas, most likely, but what's there in
20 September we don't really know, we don't do any surveys
21 then. So the two critical components of this then are
22 going to be the movement information and sightability.
23 We're going to collar a large number of bulls, which is
24 unusual for a moose study because we're interested in
25 movement and bulls is the population -- a portion of
26 the population that's actually hunted, so we're going
27 to try to collar mature bulls so we don't end up with a
28 lot of issues with neck expansion, they've kind of done
29 their growing and we're going to collar adult cows as
30 well.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

33
34 MR. PEARCE: And like I said we're
35 going to shoot for a 50/50 ratio with 42 GPS collars
36 and 10 VHF.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That sounds like an
39 excellent collaring project to me.

40
41 Comments.

42
43 MR. J. WALKER: Just one comment, Mr.
44 Chair.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James.

47
48 MR. J. WALKER: For how long a time
49 period would this take?

50

1 MR. PEARCE: The funding that we have
2 is -- I believe we have four years of funding, these
3 collars can last up to five years so we're hoping to
4 get an additional years worth as well. The more years
5 worth of data we can collect and low snow winters, deep
6 snow winters, all those things affect movement, and
7 these GPS collars are also extremely expensive so the
8 intent is near the end of their life to go recapture
9 these animals and take the collars back off, which
10 also unusual for a moose study, usually they wear that
11 thing for the rest of their life.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James.

14

15 MR. J. WALKER: I guess just one
16 comment, I imagine that the collars will pretty visible
17 in September.

18

19 MR. PEARCE: Yeah, hopefully they will
20 be. And under regulations people can shoot a collared
21 animal if they so choose. I guess I would try to
22 encourage people not to shoot one but it certainly
23 would be legal and these collars will have a bright red
24 flag, visual flag on them, basically it'll be riveted
25 on there. Because the collars themselves actually can
26 get quite difficult to see, they sort of turn moose
27 color after a short amount of time.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, the collared
30 moose where I live and they were white and I see them
31 now, they look pretty brown. They roll around in the
32 mud and stuff.

33

34 So any comments on the collaring
35 project. We have quite a bit of agenda to go through.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So thanks a lot
40 Josh, we really appreciate your presentation here.
41 And I think the Game Board will also enjoy your
42 presentation.

43

44 So we're moving into the Galena area,
45 this Proposal 87, the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee
46 looked at that, it was explained to us that it's
47 actually covered in the hunt conditions what the
48 proponent is trying to achieve and so the Advisory
49 Committee, after much deliberation, did not take that
50 -- just voted that proposal down. It's basically

1 covered and so it's not legal to do what the proponent
2 says is happening, is let landing with aircraft outside
3 the Controlled Use Area, going into the Controlled Use
4 Area and going back out again, without checking through
5 the checkstation so it's a violate of the hunt
6 conditions. And so that's -- don't need to take that
7 one up.

8

9 Proposal 88, the State Staff is not
10 present to go over these proposals with us at this
11 time. Did you want to just -- I will go through these
12 proposals on my own since the Advisory Committee dealt
13 with some of these proposals.

14

15 The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee
16 took up some of these various proposals, and so
17 Proposal 88 cleaned up some of the definition of meat
18 salvage and so forth and I think you were wanting to
19 talk about this one yesterday, Tim, so I need a motion
20 to adopt Proposal 88 for discussion.

21

22 MR. GERVAIS: I make a motion to adopt
23 Proposal 88.

24

25 MS. YATLIN: Second.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded. So go
28 ahead, Tim, you've got concerns about it.

29

30 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah. And one of the
31 main concerns is the way the proposal is written, I'm
32 not fully understanding what their intent is. Perhaps
33 Kenton could come up, if you're familiar with these
34 permits on and off the Refuge.

35

36 This affects our area and I'm just not
37 -- because of the poor quality that the proposal is
38 written, I'm not -- even though I'm somewhat familiar
39 with it I'm not able to make a good assessment on
40 what's going to be the net effect of this proposal.
41 Are you -- do you deal with these permits very much,
42 Kenton?

43

44 MR. MOOS: Through the Chair, Tim. We
45 do not. We basically -- these permits are issued
46 through the State and we have -- as Fish and Wildlife
47 Service and Refuge are taking no position on this at
48 this time.

49

50 I'd have to do a little more reading to

1 comment on the implications, what I feel the
2 implications would be. It would be just a personal
3 interpretation only though.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One clarification,
6 the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee did not take up
7 this proposal, my mistake. I was looking at my notes
8 incorrectly on numbers. And so this proposal has not
9 been taken up by the Advisory Committee.

10

11 Continue with your concerns, Tim.

12

13 MR. GERVAIS: All right. Well, my
14 concern was just that if this proposal went through,
15 could potentially allow two more moose to be harvested
16 out of this Nowitna Corridor that has what I would
17 consider average, okay numbers of moose, but not a real
18 excessive amount. But as I said I don't -- without
19 knowing how many permits are issued and how many
20 permits are utilized it's hard for the Board to have
21 any meaningful discussion about what's going on here.

22

23 So perhaps the Council would just
24 rather ignore this for now.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, this -- oh,
27 Kenton, go ahead.

28

29 MR. MOOS: The way I'm interpreting
30 this is to go back to the green harvest ticket and the
31 upper reaches of the Nowitna River, which is currently
32 -- there's a two mile buffer under a draw permit, so it
33 would eliminate that draw permit above the Susulatna
34 and, again, would make it a green harvest. So, again,
35 I can't speak for what the State feels or anything, but
36 my interpretation of it is, is it would potentially
37 open up some additional hunting pressure from airplane
38 hunters and that does occur up there, and it has in the
39 past.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

42

43 MR. MOOS: So that would be my
44 interpretation of what some of the potential effects of
45 this would be.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you feel that you
48 want to take this proposal any further?

49

50 MR. GERVAIS: No.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we -- you want to
2 vote on the proposal?
3
4 MR. GERVAIS: Sure.
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we could vote on
7 the proposal. I personally feel that there's certain
8 management objectives not -- that that moose population
9 needs -- there was certain restrictions put in place to
10 protect the moose population. I'm opposed to the
11 proposal myself.
12
13 You got a comment there, Eleanor.
14
15 MS. YATLIN: Just a question, possibly
16 from Tim, I was just thinking about Ruby.
17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Did Ruby
19 take this up?
20
21 MR. GERVAIS: No, we didn't.
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And so it is
24 within region so those in favor -- I'll call for the
25 vote. Those in favor of Proposal 88 signify by saying
26 aye.
27
28 (No aye votes)
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to
31 Proposal 88 same sign.
32
33 IN UNISON: Aye.
34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal fails the
36 Western Interior Council.
37
38 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman.
39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.
41
42 MS. WILKINSON: I'm sorry some people
43 didn't.....
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: They didn't vote.
46
47 MS. WILKINSON:didn't vote.
48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are you abstaining
50 or.....

1 MS. WILKINSON: I'm sorry, I just
2 didn't see their mouths move.

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. All voted
5 opposed.

6
7 MS. YATLIN: We all said aye at the
8 same time.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

11
12 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. You could
13 call for a raise of hands in the future votes so she
14 could see.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right, well,
17 we'll raise hands in the future.

18
19 This proposal I was confused about was
20 Proposal 89, the Controlled Use Area for Koyukuk
21 Controlled Use, flexibility proposal. And this one we
22 took up and supported. It clarifies where the
23 checkstation can be, they're going to have a different
24 checkstation position. Do you want to speak to this
25 proposal, Kenton. Did you -- you're aware of this
26 proposal, the checkstation at Ella's Cabin, they've
27 lost the lease or something, they got to move their
28 camp, so there's some issues, that's what this is
29 about.

30
31 Go ahead, Kenton.

32
33 MR. MOOS: Yeah, that's correct, they
34 lost their lease so they're proposing to move the
35 checkstation site down a quarter mile and established
36 tent frames there for weather ports to operate that
37 checkstation out of that location.

38
39 And I don't know if the Middle Yukon
40 submitted -- AC submitted any proposals. I was at that
41 meeting and I don't know if it's appropriate for me to
42 talk about that or not.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: If you were at the
45 Middle Yukon AC meeting and you have their vote.

46
47 MR. MOOS: I don't recall the vote, I
48 do know there was a lot of conversation that a lot of
49 those members were hoping that there would be some
50 flexibility in that location. Some felt that due to

1 the travel that is required currently to get up to
2 Ella's Cabin or the quarter mile -- the site quarter
3 mile down stream was excessive travel for people from
4 Koyukuk and Nulato to get up there to get their permit,
5 come back down, hunt, and then have to go back up to
6 register. They were hoping to see that station moved
7 to the mouth of the Koyukuk River, or towards that.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

10

11 MR. MOOS: That was some of the
12 conversation.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks a lot Ken,
15 we'll see you later.

16

17 MR. CHASE: Thank you.

18

19 MR. MOOS: And, again, I don't know if
20 that was recorded in their vote or not, I can't say for
21 sure.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

24

25 MR. MOOS: But that was some of the
26 conversation and issues that they have.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right, I
29 appreciate just that portion of it.

30

31 And so the basic outline of the
32 proposal's apparent, since we don't have Staff here to
33 present the proposal, does any -- you had questions
34 about this proposal yesterday, Tim, do you want to
35 discuss -- well, maybe we ought to have a motion to
36 adopt the proposal so we can discuss it.

37

38 MR. GERVAIS: I'll make a motion to
39 adopt Proposal No. 89.

40

41 MS. YATLIN: Second.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded. Go ahead,
44 Tim, with your concerns.

45

46 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. My concerns aren't
47 with location of the checkstation, under part four on
48 the salvage requirements, I don't feel for the
49 subsistence registration permits that retaining meat on
50 the bone -- let me make sure I get this right -- for

1 the back meat, or the backstrap, I don't think that's
2 good subsistence practice. It seems to me that that
3 meat is removed before the quarters and is able to
4 place in game bag and kept clean and dry before the
5 moose is rolled over and before -- like normal
6 butchering process that -- that vertebrae back
7 section's going to get rolled over once or twice
8 between your butchering process, it's going to be
9 exposed to rumen and gury and blood, possible urine.
10 If those backstraps are allowed to be taken off the
11 bone they'd be able to stay cleaner and be cooled off
12 better, those backstraps due to their shape and their
13 tendon structure, it's really recognizable what they
14 are, I don't see where that needs to be on the bone as
15 -- as far as an enforcement issue on salvage
16 requirements. I'm okay with the heads being required
17 but I just feel like the backstraps should be able to
18 be taken off the bone.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'll speak to that
21 issue. There's been quite some problems on the Koyukuk
22 River with people going up the river and staying up
23 there, from these guys coming up from Fairbanks or
24 wherever and going up all the way up there and staying
25 up there a long time, with meat boned and in game bags
26 and coming down all green and soured, and so that's
27 where these meat on the bone regulations kind of come
28 from.

29

30 As I've said about moose cutting,
31 there's more than one way to skin a cat and everybody's
32 got a different way to do it.

33

34 So I am opposed to meat coming out in
35 game bags that's been up the river for 10 days stacked
36 together in game bags getting all sour, that's -- I'm
37 concerned about that particular aspect of -- but local
38 people come out quite a bit sooner, but this is a State
39 subsistence hunt, you have to cut through one antler
40 and remain -- and a lot of those guys will go up there
41 with a boat load of guys and some moose get killed and
42 10 days later they come down trying to each get one of
43 their moose and then they come out, and if these
44 backstraps and stuff were boned and neck meat,
45 especially, is thrown into a game bag, stacked on top
46 of one another, it comes out smelling pretty bad, and
47 so that's why that aspect of this proposal was -- the
48 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee supported the proposal
49 as written by the Department in its entirety.

50

1 So I just threw that out there.

2

3 Further discussion by the Council, do
4 you have discussion on this Eleanor, or Jenny.

5

6 MS. PELKOLA: I would like to make a
7 little comment. I've seen a lot of meat wasted because
8 of just what you were saying and a lot of us like the
9 bones, too, you know, that's part of our traditional
10 way we bring everything home. We just don't -- I mean
11 the ribs is the best part and that's what you see left
12 a lot of times. So I guess I'll vote for this, I mean,
13 you know, I'll have to go along with it because I live
14 there, I live around there and I've seen a lot of waste
15 and I don't like to see waste of meat or anything.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Jenny.
18 Eleanor.

19

20 MS. YATLIN: I agree with it because I
21 have seen that on the Koyukuk River and when I lived
22 down Galena in 2003 to 2005, I also saw a lot of the
23 wanton waste and us, you know, living in the villages
24 we skinned a moose right there, take the skin and all
25 the parts and we don't, you know, just leave it in bags
26 for days, we hang them right away, so I would support
27 this.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Further Council
30 discussion.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing no further
35 discussion on the proposal. Those in favor of Proposal
36 89, State Proposal 89 signify by saying aye.

37

38 IN UNISON: Aye.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
41 sign.

42

43 (No opposing votes)

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So support of the
46 proposal.

47

48 MR. R. WALKER: So much for the hand
49 raise, you can't tape it anyway....

50

1 MR. COLLINS: I guess we forgot the
2 hand.
3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, forgot the
5 hand thing so.....
6
7 MS. YATLIN: Okay, this time she could
8 hear the voice.
9
10 (Laughter)
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So moving on.....
13
14 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman.
15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.
17
18 MS. WILKINSON: Excuse me.
19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ann.
21
22 MS. WILKINSON: I'll just interrupt
23 briefly. A little bit ago, the coordinator from
24 Eastern Interior Council brought over the Eastern
25 Interior Council's modified version of the resolution
26 that you all passed yesterday.....
27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh, Tuesday.
29
30 MS. WILKINSON:or the day before
31 yesterday.
32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I told Sue I didn't
34 want to take that up, I don't want to back up on that
35 one again so we can look.....
36
37 MS. WILKINSON: Okay.
38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:so you can hand
40 it to us, but I mean the thing has been.....
41
42 MS. WILKINSON: Okay.
43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:morphed like
45 two or three times already, and so you can pass it out,
46 we still need to go down this agenda.
47
48 So Roy Nowlin is here, are you going to
49 be presenting -- or working for the Galena -- we're on
50 the Galena proposals for the State proposals, you'll be

1 discussing those with us.
2
3 MR. NOWLIN: Well, I.....
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Come to the mic,
6 please.
7
8 MR. NOWLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9 I've got to also cover Fortymile Caribou next door.
10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
12
13 MR. NOWLIN: So I was going to try and
14 be here if.....
15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right, okay.
17
18 MR. NOWLIN:off and on if.....
19
20 MR. J. WALKER: Name.
21
22 MR. NOWLIN: Roy Nowlin, I'm the
23 management supervisor for Division of Wildlife
24 Conservation for the Interior.
25
26 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Roy.
27
28 MR. NOWLIN: Thanks Robert.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I just wanted
31 to clarify why you're in the room here and so we're
32 working through the proposals that were before the
33 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee and so I didn't know
34 if you were going to help us work through these or not.
35
36 And so we're on to Proposal 90, which
37 we looked at yesterday. And so we're going to continue
38 on here through -- let's see, where are we at.
39
40 MS. YATLIN: We did 90.
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We did 90, 91, we're
43 on 92. Proposal 92, the Koyukuk River Advisory
44 Committee adopted that proposal and so we can take a
45 look at that one. It clarifies the proxy take -- does
46 the Council need -- are you familiar with this one Roy,
47 or -- so this was a Department proposal, ADF&G
48 proposal, and so it was our understanding at the
49 Advisory Committee that this clarifies the proxy hunts
50 for the GMUs 21B, 21C, 21D and so did you want to make

1 comments on this proposal from the Department.

2

3 MR. NOWLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 This particular proposal addresses a longstanding issue
5 for these units because the problem that we've had is
6 folks will come up to hunt and they will get, for
7 example, they will try to get a proxy for -- to hunt in
8 the drawing hunts from other folks and then what
9 they'll do is they will get a -- they will get a
10 registration permit also.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

13

14 MR. NOWLIN: And one of the problems
15 that we have is they will -- they will -- then they'll
16 have two -- essentially two permits in hand and what
17 they'll do is they'll abuse this by shooting the first
18 bull that comes along that looks pretty good and then
19 if they see another bull come along that's bigger,
20 they'll shoot that one and then they'll put the --
21 because the drawings are non-subsistence hunts.....

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

24

25 MR. NOWLIN:they'll take the
26 drawing permit and -- and they will use that one to
27 fill their bag limit because it's a bigger moose and
28 then they'll take that as their -- as their large
29 moose, trophy moose.....

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

32

33 MR. NOWLIN:if you will, and then
34 they'll attach the other -- use the subsistence hunt
35 for the smaller bull.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

38

39 MR. NOWLIN: And that just is not the
40 intent.....

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

43

44 MR. NOWLIN:of these hunts. And
45 so by restricting the way we've proposed here, it's
46 going to clean that up and prevent what we consider to
47 be abuse.....

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

50

1 MR. NOWLIN:of the system.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's exactly how
4 your area biologist presented it to the Advisory
5 Committee and we were supportive of the proposal. So
6 thanks for clarifying that and presenting it to the
7 Council.
8
9 I need a motion to adopt Proposal 92.
10
11 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.
12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved, and do I have
14 a second.
15
16 MS. YATLIN: Second.
17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Eleanor.
19 Council discussion on the proposal.
20
21 (No comments)
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's fairly clear.
24 It's to eliminate loopholes for proxy hunting. You got
25 a comment, Tim.
26
27 MR. GERVAIS: Yes. Roy, how much is
28 this happening? You said it's a problem, how big of a
29 problem is it?
30
31 MR. NOWLIN: Yeah, through the Chair, I
32 would have to have Glenn here to give me numbers but
33 it's -- I mean it's something that's been occurring for
34 years and it was significant enough for us that we felt
35 that we should fix the problem. People were -- were --
36 as far as I know -- what I've been told, is that, some
37 folks were showing up with multiple proxies and it -- I
38 can't put any numbers on it for you, but it's 10. 20, I
39 don't know.
40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So, yeah, I -- it's
42 -- it was apparent from the area biologist's discussion
43 with the Advisory Committee that it was a reoccurring
44 issue, it occurs annually in the hunt, and it's not the
45 intent of the working group's deliberation on the plan
46 to have people abusing the subsistence and the drawing
47 hunt simultaneously and so the Koyukuk River is working
48 -- working on that working group I was annoyed to hear
49 that this was occurring and so I'm fully supportive of
50 the Department's remedy for this issue.

1 Further comments, Eleanor.
2
3 MS. YATLIN: I just want to get
4 something clear, you said this was proposed by the
5 State, what was it?
6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal 92.
8
9 MS. YATLIN: Oh, we're on 92 -- I was
10 sure I was on 92, oh, I'm on 90 -- I was looking at the
11 wrong one.
12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right.
14
15 MS. YATLIN: Okay.
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're on 92.
18
19 MS. YATLIN: I was reading the wrong
20 one. I got it now.
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Further discussion.
23
24 (No comments)
25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So.....
27
28 MR. GERVAIS: Hang on, I'm just.....
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim.
31
32 MR. GERVAIS: I wasn't aware that this
33 was such a big issue for these areas. I hunt proxy for
34 elders out at Ruby, quite a -- it's a significant
35 effort to do that and I don't immediately just want to
36 see my right to have a drawing permit thrown out
37 because I want to still harvest moose for elders. I'm
38 looking for some kind of amendment or something that
39 would allow -- achieve the same effect without taking
40 away my ability to put in for a registration hunt -- or
41 put in for a drawing hunt -- have to make a decision
42 between doing a drawing hunt or being able to hunt
43 proxy.
44
45 So, Roy, if this proposal passed then a
46 hunter would need to -- the only way a hunter could do
47 proxy is if they were both registration permits? Isn't
48 there currently -- there's the registration permit
49 areas and the proxy permit areas are in different
50 areas? There's east of the Nowitna Corridor, the

1 Nowitna Corridor and west of the Nowitna Corridor and
2 then the general -- hang on a minute, let me get the
3 right language here -- the drawing permits are for
4 those three areas and then a registration permit is --
5 do you mind if I look this up, where the
6 registration.....

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, you can look
9 it up. The reality is there's a drawing permit defined
10 and then there's a simultaneous registration permit for
11 subsistence and there's antlered destruction on the
12 subsistence permit, and so what this comes down to is
13 the person who draws a permit will not be able to hunt
14 proxy with a subsistence permit proxy.

15
16 That's the up shot of this proposal.

17
18 I'm supportive of that aspect of this
19 hunt. If a person draws the permit they would be fully
20 aware that they would be precluding themselves from
21 participating in subsistence proxy hunts for anybody
22 else, your wife could; somebody else could, but you
23 can't and so that would be the up shot of that.

24
25 The reality is there's people coming
26 down with multiple proxies and having lots of bag
27 limits really is what they're doing, coming down from
28 -- because the subsistence hunter is not necessarily a
29 local person, that could be somebody from up in
30 Fairbanks and they buy you a whole bunch of gas and
31 send you down there with a proxy and you're shooting a
32 lot of moose and so -- and so then trying to trophy
33 hunt also, basically circumventing the idea of the
34 subsistence hunt is antler destruction and trying to
35 come up with the biggest bull and then sawing the
36 antlers of the other bulls. So that can kind of be an
37 issue.

38
39 Tim.

40
41 MR. GERVAIS: So, Roy, you say that --
42 you feel that about 15 hunters a year are abusing this
43 in this region?

44
45 MR. NOWLIN: I was just using that as
46 an example. I don't -- I don't have the numbers. And
47 I -- I -- from what -- I would guess from what I hear
48 from Glenn that it's probably more than that, and this
49 doesn't mean that you can't hunt with a proxy, it just
50 means that you can't -- that you can't have one of these

1 subsistence hunts and I just -- I was just looking at
2 this language, as we were discussing this too, but this
3 would now -- see this change now would expand this to
4 general season hunts or other types of hunts in 24 as
5 well. I mean it's already -- it already says
6 registration hunts, but what this does is expands it to
7 others as well so that this abuse, if you had -- I mean
8 if there were a -- if you had any non-registration
9 opportunity that you couldn't do this either.

10

11 So it's -- in just looking at this I
12 see that that's the case.

13

14 But, anyhow -- any -- I don't have any
15 -- like I said I don't have the numbers but I'm sure
16 it's probably the way Glenn describes this and the
17 number of people that show up -- I mean there's stories
18 about -- about folks shopping around at old folks homes
19 and trying to enlist people who want to get proxies so
20 that they can have this flexibility that I described
21 and that Jack described and that's certainly not the
22 intent of these two hunts.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim.

25

26 MR. GERVAIS: All right. Well, if this
27 abusive proxy is as prevalent as is being conveyed,
28 then I'll withdraw an objection to passing this
29 proposal.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Further
32 discussion.

33

34 Eleanor.

35

36 MS. YATLIN: I just had a question
37 because they do at home -- you know, we do have elders
38 that do have their lifetime licenses and they need to
39 have someone go out hunting for them.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

42

43 MS. YATLIN: And I just wanted to know
44 how that would -- what affect it would have on them,
45 because this does include Unit 24?

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Roy.

48

49 MR. NOWLIN: Through the Chair. You
50 can still get a proxy for that registration -- these

1 registration hunts, it's just that you can't be doing
2 that if you have one of these drawing permits as well.
3 You can still do it for any of the registration hunts,
4 if you want to go and hunt for an elder you can go down
5 that -- go down and get a proxy for the registration
6 hunt for that elder and someone can still go out and
7 hunt for them, so it's not going to stop that process
8 at all.

9

10 MS. PELKOLA: I just have a comment.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Jenny.

13

14 MS. PELKOLA: I think this is a very
15 good idea. It sounds like it's being abused and, of
16 course, I didn't know it was, but if it is I think it's
17 a good start.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Further
20 discussion by the Council.

21

22 Robert.

23

24 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25 Roy, nice to see you again, I haven't seen you for a
26 long time.

27

28 My question is that who is doing this,
29 is it just local people, the transporters or who, you
30 know, there is a price for -- there are sales for
31 antlers also in Fairbanks, it's something like \$3 a
32 pound.

33

34 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: \$8 a pound.

35

36 MR. R. WALKER: \$8 a pound, see
37 somebody knows over here. But is this going into the
38 business there, and also my second question is, it says
39 in here, at the bottom, it says, also the current
40 regulation applies to Unit 21A and 21E outside the
41 Galena Management Area, which is not needed -- the
42 proposal changes -- clarifies the regulation for a
43 permit for the intent for the -- pertains to the Galena
44 area only, I mean we have proxy hunts down in our area
45 and we do go out with elders there so it's not a
46 problem there but it does from here.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Roy.

49

50 MR. NOWLIN: Yeah, through the Chair.

1 Member Walker. Likewise it's good to see you, it's
2 been a long time. This would -- the way the regulation
3 was originally written, it would apply in 21E -- 21A
4 and E but with this change it won't. So it'll be --
5 this restriction would not apply in your area. And the
6 way it was written originally was a blanket for all of
7 Unit 21, and it was realized that it shouldn't -- that
8 it wasn't really applicable for you folks down river
9 and so that was part of the motivation here, was to
10 make sure it was specific to the units where the abuse
11 was occurring. And so it won't affect -- it'll
12 actually make things simpler for down river.

13

14 MR. GERVAIS: The criminals are going
15 to come to you now.

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So, okay, the
20 Council's deliberated the proposal.....

21

22 MR. R. WALKER: Jack.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One more comment.

25

26 MR. R. WALKER: Yeah, you didn't answer
27 my first question, Roy, about the sale of antlers.

28

29 MR. NOWLIN: Boy, you know, I'm -- I
30 don't know what the current price is on antlers. The
31 -- or whether there was that kind of abuse going on.
32 The context that I heard about this has been in people
33 wanting trophy antlers that they could mount, not
34 necessarily sale, and I hadn't heard anything about
35 that at all.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We're pressed
38 for time and so we've deliberated this proposal. I'm
39 in favor of the proposal. And so those in favor of
40 Proposal 92 signify by saying aye.

41

42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
45 sign.

46

47 (No opposing votes)

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal is
50 adopted by the Western Interior Council.

1 And so identify big game prey
2 population objectives for 21B, this is within our area
3 here, it's an Alaska Department of Fish and Game
4 proposal. Do you feel comfortable presenting this
5 proposal, Roy.

6
7 MR. NOWLIN: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. This
8 is a proposal to establish in 21B, these intensive
9 management objectives. This is for areas where the --
10 under State law it's been identified that consumptive
11 uses are the -- are -- are a high priority, and what
12 this would do is set up these population objectives and
13 harvest objectives such that if there is a significant
14 reduction -- or the population declines or if there's a
15 significant reduction in harvest, then the Board of
16 Game will be required under State law, to look at that
17 and look at some intensive management measures, for
18 example, wolf control, or it can include habitat
19 enhancement, other kinds of measures to try to get that
20 -- that moose population back up and get the harvest up
21 to within those objectives. So what this represents is
22 an identification that is important for consumptive
23 uses. And also that there's a -- there's a -- a
24 minimum level, a minimum objective that needs to be
25 achieved.

26
27 And so it's not to say, necessarily,
28 that wolf control would start in there, but the Board
29 would have to take a look at it. It raises the profile
30 of that area, is what it does.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the -- I see a
33 significant portion of 21B is the Nowitna National
34 Wildlife Refuge, does Nowitna have a position on this
35 proposal.

36
37 MR. MOOS: Mr. Chairman. In our
38 conversations with Glenn, you know, this is just
39 identifying it as an intensive management area, he is
40 not proposing any type of actions at this time.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

43
44 MR. MOOS: We have no objections to
45 that at all because we understand that intensive
46 management does not necessarily mean killing of wolves
47 aerially or anything like that, it's just identifying
48 it as an intensive management area, which we do not
49 have any issues with.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thanks for
2 your perspective.
3
4 Council make a motion to adopt Proposal
5 93.
6
7 MR. GERVAIS: So moved.
8
9 MS. YATLIN: Second.
10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
12 This looks pretty straightforward with setting the
13 parameters of the populations, if there was to be any
14 kind of predator control project there would be working
15 with the Refuge on delineation as they did in 21E, and
16 so I -- at this time, this is just preliminary work,
17 and so I am supportive of this proposal.
18
19 Any further discussion on the proposal.
20
21 MR. R. WALKER: Question.
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's been
24 called. Those in favor of Proposal 93, signify by
25 saying aye.
26
27 IN UNISON: Aye.
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
30 sign.
31
32 (No opposing votes)
33
34 MR. R. WALKER: What happened to the
35 hand raising.
36
37 (Laughter)
38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Say again.
40
41 (Laughter)
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, the hand raising
44 thing, yeah.
45
46 MS. YATLIN: We're all saying aye.
47
48 (Laughter)
49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal 94 was to

1 reduce the Kanuti Controlled Use boundary of Unit 24B
2 and Glenn presented to the Koyukuk River Advisory
3 Committee an extensive reduction in the Kanuti
4 Controlled Use Area. And so people in Koyukuk River
5 Advisory Committee were annoyed with that amount of
6 reduction. They felt that there should have been an
7 exemption for residents who live within the Controlled
8 Use Area to fly home with and utilize moose and so the
9 Advisory Committee was opposed to the proposal because
10 of the vast reduction of the Controlled Use Area.

11
12 And so the Chair will entertain a
13 motion to adopt Proposal 94.

14
15 MS. YATLIN: Move to adopt.

16
17 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
20 I'm very opposed to this proposal.

21
22 The proponents should be -- for the
23 record the proponents should have made a proposal to
24 exempt themselves to be able to fly to their private
25 lands within the Controlled Use Area and explored other
26 avenues than eliminating a large portion of the
27 Controlled Use Area.

28
29 You got a comment there Mike, go ahead.

30
31 MR. SPINDLER: Yes, Mr. Chair, Kanuti
32 Refuge has a position on this, and we're opposed to
33 this proposal.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

36
37 MR. SPINDLER: And just as a point of
38 clarification, the proponent is a resident of Homer,
39 and spends seasonal time at a cabin just inside the
40 Controlled Use Area and is annoyed with the fact that
41 he can't fly his airplane into his trapping cabin to
42 hunt during the moose season. And that's the reason
43 the proponent has submitted this proposal.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the proponent
46 doesn't specify -- the proponent alludes that he's more
47 of a long-term resident, not seasonal.

48
49 MR. SPINDLER: In the experience that
50 I've had in the last five years at Kanuti, I've seen

1 the proponent living at that cabin approximately maybe
2 one to two months out of every year during trapping
3 season.

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, well, that's a
6 problem.

7
8 MR. R. WALKER: Jack.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, go ahead,
11 Robert.

12
13 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14 Mike, have you approached him about purchasing this
15 lot, this land, this cabin so it wouldn't be an issue?

16
17 MR. SPINDLER: No. This is a situation
18 where it's a lease from Doyon Corporation and Doyon has
19 decided to lease that land to the individual for a
20 trapping cabin site and so the individual is trapping
21 out of that cabin and, you know, is exercising every
22 right to trap on the Refuge and on the public lands
23 around there.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Eleanor.

26
27 MS. YATLIN: For the record, when we
28 were living in Bettles, we had a fish camp around 20
29 miles below Bettles for fishing during the summer and I
30 believe -- let's see we moved there in '89, that summer
31 we saw them there, they came up by boat, and then '90
32 they stopped there again during the summer and the fall
33 hunt, and after that, maybe three summers in a row out
34 of the 10 years we were up there we saw them and then
35 the rest of the time they were not there.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

38
39 MS. YATLIN: All -- until we moved in
40 '98.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, this is a vast
43 reduction of the Controlled Use Area and so it's
44 unacceptable to the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee.
45 Further deliberation on the proposal.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
2 Proposal 94 signify by saying aye.
3
4 (No aye votes)
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to
7 Proposal 94, same sign.
8
9 IN UNISON: Aye.
10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal
12 unanimously.....
13
14 MR. R. WALKER: But Ann has to have the
15 hand.....
16
17 (Laughter)
18
19 MS. WILKINSON: Yes, yes, I can.....
20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal
22 unanimously fails.
23
24 So we're moving on down our list here.
25
26 Proposal 95. What was this, wait a
27 minute.
28
29 MS. YATLIN: 95.
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Why is this one
32 here, no, that's not right.
33
34 MS. YATLIN: No, it's 100, it's on our
35 agenda.
36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Wait a minute, let
38 me get back to my agenda, I'm just flipping through
39 this book here, yes, Proposal 100.
40
41 Proposal 100 is my proposal that I
42 submitted to the Board of Game. The Department --
43 let's take up Proposal 104 first. This Proposal 104 is
44 why I'm making these various other proposals. And so
45 Proposal 104 is an Alaska Department of Fish and Game
46 proposal, and Roy took off on me but -- he had to go
47 over there -- I'll discuss this proposal.
48
49 Proposal 104 by the Department expands
50 season and bag limits for caribou in Unit 26B, which is

1 on the North Slope of the Brooks Range, the Dalton
2 Highway goes right through Unit 26B and the Central
3 Arctic Caribou Herd that calves by Prudhoe Bay stays on
4 the North Slope and calves and inhabits the North Slope
5 through August and September and there are hundreds,
6 literally -- there were 1,400 and something hunters
7 that accessed that herd by the Department's data this
8 fall. The herd was censused at 32,000 previously; in
9 '08 they censused the herd, there were two Porcupine
10 radio collars in 2008 and they censused the herd right
11 next to the Arctic National Wildlife Boundary and in an
12 aggregate they found -- it was calculated at 67,000
13 caribou, and so it appeared that there was this huge
14 expansion of the population and so the Department is
15 expanding season -- a bag limit by 150 percent, going
16 from two caribou limit bulls could be taken from July 1
17 to October 1 and then cows could be harvested, two cows
18 could be harvested or any caribou after that. It
19 expands the bag limit to five caribou and cows can be
20 taken -- five bulls from July 1 to September 1, and
21 then after September 1 it's five caribou, five cows,
22 calves and everything. When 50 percent of the hunters
23 are there they're going to have people shooting cows
24 and calves right during the migration of the herd, and
25 the herd's starting to aggregate and move over the
26 Brooks Range and I'm very concerned that this is
27 exactly what we did to Mulchatna.

28
29 We had exactly the same expansion of
30 season and bag limit and multi-sex hunt.

31
32 My concern, my primary concern is that
33 two of the collars that they had were Central -- or
34 Porcupine Caribou that had broken off from the
35 Porcupine Herd and they had to recollar -- they
36 wouldn't go back home, they just stayed with -- and
37 what they did is, they just -- the Central Herd is
38 joined -- was portion of the Porcupine Herd, and is now
39 being called Central Arctic Caribou, well the Porcupine
40 Herd is falling off, they think it's less than 100,000.

41
42 So I'm very, very concerned about this
43 Proposal 104 and I am very opposed to Proposal 104.

44
45 In the analysis and discussion with the
46 area biologist, real nice lady, Beth Leonard, she
47 calculated harvest revolving around the sporthunters
48 that are coming to that area and through an analysis of
49 harvest data and it's my impression that they have a
50 huge under-reporting problem. The Board increased the

1 bag limit from one bull caribou to two bull caribou,
2 two caribou in 2008 and this year we saw hundreds of
3 caribou go down the road, stacks of antlers tied on top
4 of vehicles going south, and so she says that this fall
5 preliminary harvest data shows 577 caribou, I says you
6 got a big under harvest under-reporting problem. She
7 also -- I got into her management report and her
8 management report says that she's taking in subsistence
9 harvest as Nuiqsut and Kaktovik, well, the Central
10 Arctic Herd, the radio collars will show that the
11 Central Arctic Herd inhabits the whole south -- central
12 south slopes of the Brooks Range, and so the radio
13 collars come through Anaktuvuk Pass, Anaktuvuk Pass
14 harvest data shows that they harvest between five to
15 700 caribou, those caribou can be from various herds.
16 But if it is Central Arctic Herd coming through they'll
17 kill a whole bunch of those caribou. Those caribou
18 come down to Allakaket and Alatna and so the caribou
19 that are currently just above Allakaket and Alatna on
20 the Alatna River, right now, are Central Arctic
21 Caribou. So people harvest those at Allakaket and
22 Alatna. They don't have harvest -- aren't including
23 harvest data for Bettles and Evansville; they're not
24 including harvest data from Wiseman and Coldfoot,
25 neither Arctic Village nor Venetie. And I just talked
26 to one of the Council members in the Eastern Interior
27 and he told me that Venetie's killed 500 caribou this
28 year, that's part of the Central Arctic Herd that's
29 wintering down there.

30
31 So the State of Alaska's harvest data
32 is vastly under-estimating the harvest of that herd,
33 taking in only data from harvest reporting by people
34 driving on the road and the few caribou that are killed
35 up by Nuiqsut and Kaktovik from the Central Arctic Herd
36 does not entail the entirety of that herd.

37
38 The Department wants to kill five
39 percent of that herd.

40
41 And their previous proposal, I have
42 their first proposal, it was to reduce the herd size
43 because they felt it was going to crash, well, I says,
44 that's some old wive's tail that caribou crash --
45 caribou don't crash, caribou get shot out; that's what
46 happens to caribou. They don't crash.

47
48 And so I'm very concerned with this
49 massive expansive bag limit and hunting -- harvest
50 opportunity for multi-sex during migration that the

1 lead cows will be eliminated and range knowledge and
2 there's a huge amount of issues. And so I don't want
3 to see Mulchatna happen again.

4
5 That's kind of the Department's
6 proposal in a nutshell, Proposal 104.

7
8 So the Chair will entertain a motion to
9 adopt Proposal 104.

10
11 *MR. J. WALKER: I so move.

12
13 *MS. YATLIN: Second.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And seconded. The
16 Advisory Committee -- the Koyukuk River Advisory
17 Committee opposed Proposal 104 when I explained to them
18 the extent of the range and Glenn Stout, the area
19 biologist actually presented radio collar telemetry to
20 the Advisory Committee of where Central Arctic Caribou
21 were and those caribou were just above Allakaket at
22 that time. And so the likelihood that this proposal
23 will damage the Central Arctic Herd to the point where
24 the herd will not migrate and feed the various villages
25 within our region is highly likely after seeing what
26 happened to the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

27
28 Any discussion from the Council on this
29 proposal.

30
31 Tim.

32
33 MR. GERVAIS: Well, not about the
34 proposal but about the situation. I know several times
35 today we haven't been able to accurately discuss
36 proposals put forth by Department of Fish and Game
37 because they don't have adequate representation or even
38 communication of any sort to help us with the decision
39 process, I think that's bad.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I will express that
42 same view. I feel that the assistant area biologist
43 should -- they have assistant area biologists, and so
44 the area biologists are very, very busy getting ready
45 for the Board of Game, but the assistant area biologist
46 could have attended our meeting so I would have
47 encouraged at least the assistants; I understand the
48 Board of Game is near -- tomorrow, and so that there
49 may -- they're tight on Staff, but we should have had
50 at least some kind of State representation here.

1 Did you have a comment, Mitch -- Polly
2 -- you got a comment first, Polly.

3
4 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
5 was just going to say that, I mean part of the problem
6 was the scheduling of the meeting. We had to schedule
7 this meeting this week because we've got the Yukon
8 deferred fisheries proposals that we have to get ready
9 for the Federal Board that's meeting in April and then
10 the wildlife proposals, so we -- OSM has to assume some
11 of the responsibility for the scheduling because it did
12 conflict with the Board -- you know it's conflicted
13 with the prep time for the Department, so it's not
14 entirely -- you know, we have some responsibility here
15 and so it's not entirely fair to just stab at the.....

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. No, I'm
18 not.....

19
20 DR. WHEELER:criticize the
21 Department, I mean.....

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:I'm not
24 stabbing at them.

25
26 DR. WHEELER:I mean it's our
27 fault as well. And we'll make sure that when we
28 schedule subsequent meetings we're going to try to the
29 maximum extent possible to avoid these kinds of
30 scheduling conflicts but we all know that there's a lot
31 of meetings going on and, you know, there were other
32 issues that we had to address, the Yukon Fisheries
33 proposals drove the scheduling of this meeting for
34 sure.

35
36 Mr. Chair.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Right.
39 Thank you, Polly, I appreciate that perspective.

40
41 Mitch.

42
43 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
44 And I do take your comments on board, this has been an
45 ongoing problem for us. I've only been here for three
46 weeks but in that three weeks we've known about these,
47 both the Western Interior and Eastern Interior RAC
48 meetings and George and myself have gone out of our way
49 to try and get Staff to attend these meetings, phone
50 calls, emails. I'm not trying to pass it off, but they

1 have been preoccupied with the Board of Game
2 preparations.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

5

6 MR. CAMPBELL: So I think after
7 yesterday we put even more an effort to try and get
8 some Staff to attend, hence, that's why Roy Nowlin and
9 Josh turned up as well.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

12

13 MR. CAMPBELL: And I understand there's
14 some really important issues on the table, in
15 particular, the one we're just talking about now with
16 caribou that needs to -- the biological information
17 needs to be clarified before you can make a robust
18 decision through the Council. We can only endeavor to
19 get Staff to come to these meetings but sometimes it's
20 out of my control.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Well, I do
23 want to say that, you know, the State is in preparation
24 for the Board of Game, but if they don't have their
25 slide shows ready by now they're in a world of hurt.
26 So there are -- even with the preparation of a biotech
27 to present the biological parameters would have been
28 appreciated. So I appreciate your trying to get some
29 kind of representation here.

30

31 So it is -- you can see we have to
32 wrestle, although I have conferenced with the area
33 biologist, Ms. Leonard on this issue, and I'm fully
34 apprised of the data that's going to be presented, and
35 I'm also apprised myself, I've been in the subsistence
36 division's harvest data for the affected communities
37 and so I would like you to write down those affected
38 communities as Venetie, Canyon Village, Arctic Village,
39 the sharing for Fort Yukon, which also have customary
40 and traditional use of caribou in Unit 25A and their
41 relatives, Anaktuvuk Pass, Allakaket, Alatna, Bettles,
42 Evansville, and Wiseman, Coldfoot as affected
43 communities that are not entailed within the harvest
44 data. I do want -- I would have liked to have known if
45 there's a customary -- a State customary and
46 traditional finding for the Central Arctic Caribou
47 Herd, that's what I would have liked to have had
48 knowledge of. And so that's what I have not been able
49 to find out. I've requested that from Subsistence
50 Division but they're probably also busy.

1 And so I'm very, very concerned that
2 the data used in the formation of the proposal was
3 completely inadequate and could possibly, with the kind
4 of bag limit harvest capacity, could possibly exceed by
5 100 percent, the -- even if you just take the
6 sporthunters and you give them five -- shoot -- if they
7 kill half of their bag limit, they could still exceed
8 the harvestable surplus by over 100 percent. This is a
9 very concerning issue to me, with an expanding
10 interest, after Mulchatna has gone down.

11
12 I've had lots of people from Anchorage
13 wanting to come up.

14
15 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, duly noted.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so I don't feel
18 that the proposal was adequately thought out by the
19 Department, and I want that conveyed back to the
20 Department.

21
22 And so any further discussion on the
23 proposal.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, those
28 in favor of Proposal 104 signify by saying aye.

29
30 MR. R. WALKER: Aye.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You're in favor of
33 the proposal.

34
35 MR. R. WALKER: Well, you were in
36 favor.....

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm not in favor,
39 I'm adamantly opposed to Proposal 104 that's going to
40 increase bag limit 150 percent and possibly decimate
41 the Central Arctic Caribou Herd.

42
43 MR. R. WALKER: Just for the record, so
44 you're voting in our area, you voted for.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, you can vote
47 for the proposal, I just wanted to clarify that for the
48 record.

49
50 Those in favor of the proposal hold

1 your hand up.

2

3 And so Robert is for the proposal.

4

5 Those opposed to Proposal 104, same

6 sign.

7

8 (Council members raise hand)

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so I have seven

11 opposed, one for the proposal.

12

13 So going back to Proposal 100, it's to
14 increase season and bag limit change, that's out of our
15 region, I just wanted the Council to be aware of the
16 proposal.

17

18 The proposal's the reactionary
19 proposals that I made. The Department was asking me,
20 well, we want to expand -- possibly expand opportunity
21 because there are more caribou and I says, well, you
22 can do that by lengthening the season but maintaining
23 the same amount of bag limit, and so Proposal 100 is to
24 expand the season from ending in the end of April and
25 moving the season up through July for velvet antlered
26 bulls and antlerless cows, or basically cows that have
27 dropped antler that are not pregnant in the springtime.

28

29 Proposal -- I'm just going to go over
30 these proposals. Proposal 101 is for the North Slope
31 of the Brooks Range. I'm concerned about these hunters
32 walking off the road and shooting five -- two caribou
33 or five caribou or a huge pile of caribou and not being
34 able to pack them all back because it's five miles back
35 and forth. And I'm also concerned about increasing
36 opportunity on the North Slope in 26B.

37

38 And so I want the Council and the
39 record to show that I have made other proposals to
40 accommodate additional hunting opportunity for the
41 Board of Game to look at and dissociate away from
42 expanding the hunting opportunity by 150 percent on bag
43 limit.

44

45 And so those -- I'm not going to have
46 the Council vote on my other proposals, I just wanted
47 the Council to be aware of those proposals. And so
48 we're finished with the State proposals that I felt the
49 Council should cover. Does the Council feel that
50 there's any other State proposals -- oh, there's one

1 other State proposal that I can think of and that's
2 Proposal 3, and does anybody have a Game Board Book. I
3 got a Game Board Book in my case.

4
5 MR. COLLINS: Is that the one on
6 trapping?

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The trapping one.
9 Proposal 3 in the Board of Game Book is to unlawful
10 methods of taking of furbearers, it requires trappers
11 to check traps in all areas of Region 3, Game
12 Management Units as follows:

13
14 It requires for trappers to check their
15 traps within 72 hours time period in
16 the Interior Region of Alaska. This
17 regulation would stipulate that the
18 trapper must check dry land traps at
19 least once within a 72 hour period of
20 time and remove any captured animal
21 from the set.

22
23 It could read similar to the Unit 1C
24 regulation that states:

25
26 That all traps and snares must be
27 checked within three days of setting
28 within three days thereafter.

29
30 And so the Koyukuk River Advisory
31 Committee reviewed this proposal and was opposed to
32 this proposal because this is the Interior of Alaska
33 and most of the furbearer -- it's cold country, most of
34 the fur animals are in a preserved state and there's no
35 need to be checking traps every three days. Some of
36 the reasons given that they were opposed was that it
37 would be very expensive to travel all of the extensive
38 traplines in the Interior of Alaska. Fur densities of
39 fur animals is much lower so you have to have very long
40 lines and you have to be able to check various lines
41 periodically, and so a three day check requirement
42 would cause a tremendous additional cost and energy.
43 And so the Advisory Committee was opposed to the
44 proposal.

45
46 The Chair will entertain a motion to
47 adopt Proposal 3 and I intend to vote against the
48 proposal.

49
50 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.

1 MS. PELKOLA: Second.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded
4 and.....
5
6 MS. WILKINSON: Who moved it.
7
8 REPORTER: James Walker.
9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Jenny.....
11
12 MS. YATLIN: James.
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jimmy.
15
16 MR. J. WALKER: James, Jimmy.
17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James.
19
20 (Laughter)
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And seconded by
23 Jenny.
24
25 Further discussion on the proposal,
26 whether the Council feels that it should be required to
27 check traps every 72 hours for dry land trapping in
28 these Game Management Units within the Interior of
29 Alaska.
30
31 (No comments)
32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Further comments.
34
35 Ray.
36
37 MR. COLLINS: Well, I think it should
38 go on the record that not only is it impractical on
39 longer traplines to be able to trap it because of -- or
40 check it because of the cost and so on but that most
41 animals in the Interior that are within trap -- that
42 are in a trap more than two or three days are already
43 dead and with the cold weather to preserve so you're
44 not -- martin itself very seldom live more than 24, 30
45 hours.
46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.
48
49 MR. COLLINS: So if they're concerned
50 about the animals being in the trap alive for a long

1 period that's not going to happen.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.
4
5 MR. COLLINS: It's not reality.
6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, there's no
8 chance of -- or no concern of spoilage. So further
9 discussion. That was good comment for justification.
10
11 Further discussion.
12
13 MR. R. WALKER: I have a question.
14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, go ahead
16 there, Robert.
17
18 MR. R. WALKER: Yeah, I think that.....
19
20 MS. WILKINSON: Excuse me. Excuse me.
21
22 MR. R. WALKER:hey, if they
23 require trappers to check.....
24
25 REPORTER: Robert.
26
27 MS. WILKINSON: Excuse me.
28
29 REPORTER: Robert.
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Could you turn on
32 your mic there Robert.
33
34 MR. R. WALKER: Oh, yeah. A
35 requirement for trappers to check their traps within a
36 72 hour time period in the Interior Region of Alaska,
37 why Interior Region Alaska; I mean what the hell,
38 there's other parts of the state too, you know.
39
40 (Laughter)
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, it's the
43 Region 3 is open for.....
44
45 MR. R. WALKER: It should read
46 regionwide, it shouldn't say just the -- I would say I
47 would go against it because they're just targeting the
48 Interior.
49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I think the

1 proponent is probably going to go region by region as
2 the Board of Game meets and keep making -- probably
3 other proposals have been submitted is what my
4 impression is.

5
6 MR. R. WALKER: Yeah, I mean Interior
7 Region.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So further
10 discussion on the proposal.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, those
15 in favor of Proposal -- State Proposal No. 3 signify by
16 saying aye.

17
18 (No aye votes)

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to
21 Proposal 3 same sign, aye.

22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And.....

26
27 MR. R. WALKER: Oh, hands for Ann.

28
29 (Laughter)

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, well, we all
32 -- so we've explored all the State proposals that I
33 feel we should look at.

34
35 Agenda Item 10, review and approve the
36 Draft 2009 Annual Report, which is in our -- it's in
37 our packet, the brown packet here, the annual report.
38 Is that where it's at, let's see, yeah, that's in our
39 packet, right, Ann; it's yellow?

40
41 MS. WILKINSON: (No microphone)
42 Yellow.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The yellow copy is
45 our annual report, draft copy.

46
47 These were our annual report topics
48 that we identified at our last fall meeting in Aniak
49 and these were sent out to the Council for your review
50 and I don't see any additions that I would care to take

1 up at this time.

2

3 Do Council members have any comments on
4 our annual report, we have to submit the annual report
5 at this meeting.

6

7 Go ahead, James.

8

9 MR. J. WALKER: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I
10 don't know whether this is a typo or what, but it says
11 the October meeting in Anvik, it should say Aniak,
12 shouldn't it?

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, oh, it does say
15 Anvik, whoops.

16

17 MR. R. WALKER: We had a meeting there.

18

19 (Laughter)

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, that was a
22 typo. You got that Ann.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So any other
27 corrections to the annual report, appreciate that
28 catch.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead Polly.

33

34 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. This is just
35 a thought, and I'm just going to throw it out there.
36 But on the very first day of the meeting on Tuesday we
37 had Mr. Pat Pourchot here talking about the subsistence
38 review.....

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

41

42 DR. WHEELER:or the review of the
43 Federal Subsistence Management Program.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

46

47 DR. WHEELER: Now, I know that wasn't a
48 topic that was specifically identified at your meeting
49 in Aniak because the announcement came after your
50 meeting in Aniak.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.
2
3 DR. WHEELER: But it did happen in
4 2009, at least, it started in 2009, so that may be
5 something that you want to consider adding to your
6 annual report. And I'm not trying to create problems
7 here, it's timely, and it's one of those issues that
8 did pop up so it may be something you want to consider,
9 Mr. Chair.
10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. That's
12 actually a good idea, Polly, and I would like to
13 address that.
14
15 Maybe we could go to a quick break and
16 I can find my -- I have some points that I presented to
17 the Department of Interior and I could put those out
18 for the Council and they may be inserted into the
19 annual report and so I sent those out by email to the
20 Council and was supposed to be sent out.
21
22 MR. R. WALKER: Jack, we only have an
23 hour left here in the building here before we.....
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, we actually
26 don't even have that, we've got about a half an hour.
27
28 MS. PELKOLA: I thought we had.....
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, Salena's
31 thinking she can get us a little bit more time.
32
33 MR. R. WALKER: Oh, that would be good.
34
35 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I've got
36 two points that I'd like us to consider. One would be
37 that if we review the action of the Board is that we're
38 concerned about them being able to act in a timely
39 manner to changes in weather and conditions and so on.
40 And, therefore, we wanted to reconsider with dealing
41 with it every two years.
42
43 And the second would be the composition
44 of the Board, we're concerned with not making --
45 assuring that knowledgeable individuals are seated on
46 that Federal Board.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.
49
50 MR. COLLINS: So that they're fully up

1 to date and able to act on subsistence issues.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. The
4 continuity of the Board members was one of my issues
5 that I brought up, the rotation of the Regional
6 Directors and there needs to be better focus of the
7 seated Board members.

8

9 Some of the points that I brought to
10 the DOI was to go back -- if possible go back to the
11 one year cycle. I think that it's advantageous to be
12 reactive in a more timely manner to subsistence needs,
13 the two year cycle's driven more special action
14 requests. If the Department of Interior can vector
15 more money at that, that would be better.

16

17 How does the Council feel about that
18 point, going back to a one year cycle, more responsive
19 to subsistence regulations.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is the Council
24 agreeable to that.

25

26 MR. J. WALKER: Yes.

27

28 MR. R. WALKER: Yeah.

29

30 MS. YATLIN: Yeah.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.

33

34 MR. COLLINS: Well, I was going to say
35 until such time as a management plan is in place that
36 will deal with -- like that winter hunt, they're
37 proposing it to be four years, you know, but there's a
38 lot of other issues that change from year to year. So
39 they go back to a one year cycle until such time as
40 management and regulations are in place that will
41 respond quickly to needs, like ability to open and
42 close hunts and things like that.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Another
45 point that I would like inserted is that deference be
46 returned back to the RACs on taking -- on issues
47 relating to taking of fish and wildlife, customary and
48 traditional use determinations as found in .805(3)(a),
49 it says RACs shall review proposals, regulations,
50 policies, management plans and other matters relating

1 to subsistence use of fish and wildlife within the
2 region. And so I have always felt that the RACs should
3 have deference on all issues relating to fish and
4 wildlife management for subsistence. And so I would
5 like that inserted into our annual report.

6

7 Does the Council feel comfortable with
8 that.

9

10 (Council nods affirmatively)

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing affirmative.
13 And I feel that under rural determinations, that
14 pooling of communities as was designed by the
15 University of Alaska, I perceive, should be eliminated.
16 Communities should be analyzed for rural status on
17 whether they meet the subsistence criteria, not whether
18 they just happen to be in close proximity to a non-
19 rural -- a community that may not meet the eight
20 criteria. And so I feel that pooling communities,
21 which happened in Southeast should be avoided and
22 communities should be evaluated on their own standings.

23

24 Does the Council feel comfortable with
25 that idea as part of our annual report.

26

27 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

28

29 (Council nods affirmatively)

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I also felt that
32 Native lands should be managed by the Federal
33 Subsistence Board and not the Board of Game and Board
34 of Fish as found in .801 of ANILCA, .801 specifically
35 speaks to the Federal public land, the Native
36 corporation lands as being -- or the Native lands as
37 being very important for subsistence harvest and it was
38 my perception that Congress intended that the state of
39 Alaska manage Native lands for a rural priority and
40 when they fell out of compliance so did the State fall
41 out of compliance on managing those Native corporation
42 lands and so I feel that the Native corporation lands
43 should be managed by the Federal Subsistence Board.
44 And I perceive obstinance or resistance by the
45 Department of Interior about that one, but I still feel
46 that the Council should put that in the annual report,
47 because I feel it is part of the law, and it would make
48 our job, the checkerboard would go away around the
49 villages, if that happened. If the Federal government
50 managed all of the Native corporation lands the

1 checkerboard would go away and would make our job way
2 easier.

3

4 So how does the Council feel about
5 that, to be inserted into our annual report.

6

7 MS. YATLIN: Yeah.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Comfortable with
10 that. Robert.

11

12 MR. R. WALKER: Yes, Mr. Chair, I am
13 comfortable with that.

14

15 I still have, you know, still not real
16 happy with a lot of issues that -- but I would say,
17 yes, you know, and I would think, you know, after this
18 meeting here that you should write to the -- put in
19 your report for next time that you wrote a report to
20 the four tribes in 21E explaining to them why you went
21 with the commercial rather than the subsistence because
22 I am not comfortable with this -- and when I go back
23 I'm going to tell them that you instigated, you wanted
24 to help push this forward. I'm going to tell Gabe and
25 Eugene and them that, you know, that's got to be in
26 your report also. Clear.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, on the annual
29 report, I can -- I can speak to that issue after we get
30 done with the annual report.

31

32 And so the Native corporation lands I
33 feel should be included as they are in Title .801 of
34 ANILCA that the Native corporation lands were important
35 enough for Congress to include within the ANILCA law,
36 to be managed for a rural priority, and it's apparent
37 to me, it may need a court action.

38

39 Any discussion on that aspect, yea or
40 nay on including Native corporation lands under the
41 Department of Interior review.

42

43 MS. PELKOLA: Jack.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

46

47 MS. PELKOLA: I would feel the same as
48 you do about including that in there.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. The Koyukuk

1 River Advisory Committee, the villages along the river
2 were very supportive of that idea. And so those are
3 the points that I had. Any further points that should
4 be included into the Department of Interior review for
5 the Subsistence Program.

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Hearing none, do I
10 have a motion to adopt the draft annual report, with
11 the inclusion of the Department of Interior review
12 points into the annual report to the Federal
13 Subsistence Board.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do I have a motion
18 to adopt the annual report.

19

20 MR. R. WALKER: That's with the.....

21

22 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

23

24 MR. R. WALKER: That's with the
25 correction?

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's with the
28 correction of Aniak instead of Anvik and then the
29 inclusion of issue seven, the DOI points that we just
30 laid out.

31

32 I had a motion and a second.

33

34 Who motioned.

35

36 MR. R. WALKER: So moved.

37

38 MS. PELKOLA: Second. Second, I guess.

39

40 MR. R. WALKER: Yeah, second.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, Jenny motioned
43 and Robert would be the second.

44

45 Further discussion by the Council on
46 the annual report.

47

48 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's been

1 called, those in favor of the annual report as
2 described signify by saying aye.

3

4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I'll go back
7 to your question to myself, why I voted on the drawing
8 permit hunt that was presented in 21E.

9

10 I voted with the management plan and
11 because the harvest was less than 50 percent -- or
12 actually one-third of what they were even taking and
13 that we are working under ANILCA law, I described all
14 those various issues on the record, and I can write
15 that up for the GASH communities and I can respond to
16 those GASH communities of why I -- because there is a
17 management plan and it's actually -- we cannot preclude
18 non-subsistence uses just arbitrarily, and so that's
19 why there's -- in any Federal Board action they cannot
20 arbitrarily exclude unless there's a lack of a
21 subsistence -- or not meeting subsistence needs, and so
22 that's why I voted for the plan and I still endorse the
23 plan and the plan -- they're still not -- the sport
24 opportunity is not being met, it's still -- there's
25 still additional harvest opportunity there and I didn't
26 feel that it was unreasonable to lengthen the season by
27 five days. And so I will write that -- do you want to
28 make a note.....

29

30 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

33

34 MR. R. WALKER: I believe when we met
35 the Yukon Innoko Moose Management Plan, Roy should have
36 been still here, because he was one of the people, too,
37 that if there was going to be any changes to the
38 management there, they would have to have some kind of
39 an informal meeting to agree and I think maybe we kind
40 of like went over the committee's head here.

41

42 I was just wishing Roy was here, is Roy
43 still around here or did he leave?

44

45 MR. CANNON: He's next door.

46

47 MR. R. WALKER: He's next door. Could
48 you get him, Rich, please. Maybe he could help me out
49 here or correct me or something.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Innoko Plan is
2 in place and it's been voted on by the Federal
3 Subsistence Board, it's been voted on by the Board of
4 Game and it's in place and it sets 30 moose to be
5 taken, they only took nine moose or 12 moose, what is
6 it.....

7
8 MR. COLLINS: Seven moose last year.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seven moose. They
11 only took seven moose. And so there's up to 30 moose
12 allocated for that hunt and they're not even meeting
13 that and so I don't see how I can vote against the
14 proposal when the reality is they're not even taking
15 what the harvest plan -- the plan provides for 30 moose
16 to be taken by drawing permit, and so I can't oppose
17 non-subsistence use because it's not legal under the
18 ANILCA law. And I'll explain that to the GASH
19 communities. And so I need you to make a notation for
20 me, Ann, so that I can write that letter, and I will
21 write that letter to the GASH communities.

22
23 Polly.

24
25 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. I was just
26 going to make a suggestion. I talked to Ursula, or
27 Tina did, we can have the room until 4:45 maximum
28 today.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

31
32 DR. WHEELER: So we have a little bit
33 of time. It might be a good idea, I'm sensing people
34 are kind of getting tired, maybe have a five minute
35 break, just to.....

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. We're almost
38 done here.

39
40 DR. WHEELER: I know we're almost done
41 but.....

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And Roy has shown up
44 just to address this issue.

45
46 DR. WHEELER: Okay. Okay.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I need to kind of
49 get him up here.

50

1 DR. WHEELER: All right, no problem. I
2 was just trying.....

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would like to go
5 to a break but Robert wants to talk to Roy real quick
6 here.

7
8 MR. R. WALKER: Yeah, I want to ask
9 something.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So go ahead and
12 describe your question for Roy there, Robert.

13
14 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
15 Welcome back, Roy. I didn't mean to -- but I got a
16 question. The last time we met in Shageluk with the
17 Yukon Innoko Moose Management, when we did decide it to
18 be 30 permits, if it was to be changed wouldn't we have
19 to have a meeting again here to approve it or would it
20 already be approved by the State Fish and Game and
21 Federal Board? I'm just kind of curious here, Roy, I
22 think that -- I don't know if we overstepped our bounds
23 but correct me here and if I am satisfied with your
24 answer then, hey, all right.

25
26 MR. NOWLIN: Through the Chair. Member
27 Walker. Sorry I had to leave but we've got -- I'm
28 trying to juggle a couple things here, we've got
29 Fortymile caribou and Chisana caribou going on the
30 other side.

31
32 These permits are for the winter
33 antlerless hunt, right?

34
35 MR. R. WALKER: Summer, fall time.

36
37 MR. NOWLIN: Okay.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, let me explain
40 the -- which proposal was that -- I lost all my.....

41
42 MR. COLLINS: It added five more days
43 of hunting in the fall.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Five more days for
46 the drawing permit in 21E, and it's the Department's
47 proposal to increase an additional five days because
48 the harvest is seven moose this last year and a
49 declining number of actual applicants and so the
50 Department's proposal was to increase the season by

1 five days and the question revolves around the harvest
2 -- the Innoko Plan provides 30 -- an allocation of 30
3 moose to be harvested by drawing permit, and so the
4 proposal is to increase the amount of season to meet
5 more towards that harvest objective of 30 bulls. And
6 so the Council was split, I'll give you a little
7 history, and so the Council -- there was -- the Walker,
8 James and Robert Walker voted against it because they
9 felt that we were increasing harvest opportunity but I
10 voted for the Department's proposal because under .815
11 of ANILCA We cannot preclude non-subsistence uses if
12 there's resource to be harvested and so I'm voting with
13 the Department because we're still staying within the
14 30 moose harvest range, the harvest range isn't being
15 met, and I felt that there was no reason not to
16 preclude the proposal. And so at that point Robert's
17 question to you is, are we actually voting -- or are we
18 actually increasing harvest opportunity, and, if so,
19 there needs to be an additional meeting; that's the
20 question.

21

22 MR. NOWLIN: Yeah. I think I
23 understand the question now. We've had quite a bit of
24 discussion internally about this proposal and whether
25 or not it was consistent with the management plan, the
26 Moose Management Plan, and we felt that it was because
27 we're still -- in the Management Plan, I believe, what
28 we did was we had decided that we would put a cap on
29 that non-resident harvest of moose down there and what
30 we found is that the -- under the current -- under that
31 drawing the way -- the drawing hunt, the way we put it
32 in place is that it's way under subscribed. And we're
33 -- and there's -- and so what we wind up doing is just
34 giving out the permits over the counter and so we felt
35 that we would still be honoring the management plan if
36 we supported a longer season in there and still -- but
37 still didn't exceed the number of moose that -- and we
38 don't think we will, and issue more permits and
39 potentially -- although I'd have to review the numbers
40 on that one, but we didn't feel that we were being
41 inconsistent or not honoring that plan by putting that
42 proposal because there was so -- it was so under
43 subscribed.

44

45 And what's essentially happened, I
46 believe, with this, is that, we were concerned at the
47 time we did the plan, that there was an increasing --
48 there could be an increasing number of moose being
49 harvested by non-residents there, and, in fact -- and
50 we were concerned about that because if you recall, and

1 I'm sure that this is in your mind but for the benefit
2 of the other Council members, we had drastically cut
3 back on the moose season over in 19A and we were
4 concerned, we were all concerned that maybe there was
5 going to be a lot of non-resident hunters that were
6 going to transfer their effort over into 21E and for
7 that reason we needed to put a cap on it. Well, that
8 really hasn't happened and so -- and we can reduce the
9 number of permits that we're issuing, too, if we see
10 that harvest spikes, but we felt that if -- that we
11 could easily lengthen that season a bit and that it
12 would -- all's it would do is just maintain the cap on
13 the number of moose that were being taken, it wouldn't
14 cause us to shoot way over what we thought was
15 appropriate there and we what we'd agreed on the plan.

16
17 I hope that's what you're looking for
18 for information.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James, you got a
21 comment.

22
23 MR. R. WALKER: I do.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Or Robert, go ahead.

26
27 MR. R. WALKER: Let James and then I'll
28 go.

29
30 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you. Mr. Chair.
31 In regards to the number of permits as they are
32 available, if there was 30 permits available and they
33 were not utilized, what's the rationale to increase the
34 number of days?

35
36 MR. NOWLIN: Okay, we're getting there,
37 I hope. Through the Chair.

38
39 If they're not -- we had a lot of
40 permits that weren't being used, people weren't just --
41 they weren't applying, so the idea is that if you
42 increase the season length it's probably going to
43 increase or going to mean that there'll be more
44 interest in the permits that are available, so that's
45 what'll happen. And you could have also more success
46 because you'd be pushing -- that season will push it
47 back into the rut, or closer to the rut, and so what's
48 going to happen is that you're probably going to get
49 some more moose taken, but there's fewer moose that are
50 being taken than what we anticipated when we did the

1 plan right now, and there's fewer -- there's less
2 demand for that so we felt that if that season were
3 lengthened a bit that it would still be consistent with
4 the plan and we wouldn't go over -- there'd be more
5 moose taken, yes, but we still would not be going over
6 what we had agreed in the plan.

7

8 MR. J. WALKER: I guess I understand
9 some of the portion of it but I don't entirely
10 understand the reason why the extra five days is needed
11 if there is sufficient permits available.

12

13 MR. NOWLIN: It's not so much -- there
14 is -- there is permits that are not being used, you
15 know, people are not even applying for the permits that
16 we're offering, you know, they're not even putting in
17 on the draw, and so at this point -- maybe I should
18 back up a little bit and say, well, and what we would
19 do in a situation like this, if it were outside of this
20 plan, what we would do is we would look at this and we
21 would say why do we even have a drawing, why don't we
22 just open it up to a general hunt, you know, harvest
23 ticket hunt, because why are we -- why do we have a
24 restriction in there if -- if -- because -- because
25 when we put drawing hunts in place is because we have
26 more demand for the moose than what we can supply. And
27 so in order to have a fair way to distribute those
28 permits we say, okay, we're going to have a drawing,
29 and so those people that want it will apply for the
30 drawing and then, you know, maybe you'll have a hundred
31 people that apply and you'll have 40 permits and so the
32 first 40 that get drawn -- their names drawn out of the
33 hat get the permits, but in this case, you know, we
34 have these permits and we don't even have as many
35 people applying as we have permits. And so.....

36

37 MR. J. WALKER: I understand that
38 portion of it. But what is the rationality to increase
39 the extra five days if the permits available are not
40 being utilized?

41

42 MR. NOWLIN: Hum. Well, what I -- what
43 I was trying to get at here is that if we're going to
44 continue this hunt then -- if we're going to ask people
45 to apply for permits then it should be something that's
46 attractive to enough people to apply for it. I know
47 that may seem backwards because -- but we're in an
48 interesting situation here because we have a management
49 plan that we've agreed to and in that management plan
50 we agreed that we would put a cap on non-resident

1 hunters, which we did. So if we're going to continue
2 that then this proposal came -- I mean we didn't make
3 this proposal, by the way, this didn't come from the
4 Department, it came from an outfitter, or just a guide
5 or an outfitter that's out there, I'm not familiar with
6 the person, so we saw this and we thought, well, okay,
7 this guy wants to have a few extra days, there's extra
8 moose that could be taken, within the terms of the
9 plan, the folks who agreed to the plan wanted to keep
10 the drawing in place, so why not let him do it. Why
11 not give them a few extra days so that they can take
12 some of these moose that are available, that are being
13 made available under drawing.

14

15 Now, the alternative is that we could
16 go to the Advisory Committee or the planning group
17 again and reevaluate this whole thing. Do we really
18 need to have this drawing. And we're kind of between a
19 rock and a hard place here because we're trying to make
20 sure that we honor the plan and at the same time be
21 reasonable when someone sees that -- in this case an
22 outfitter or a guide, sees that, there's permits that
23 are not being used there and he's saying, well, give us
24 a few more days so that we can have a chance to take
25 those moose that are available and so our reaction to
26 that was, well, we can give him those few days and we
27 can still honor our commitments to the plan. So, you
28 know, this is a problem. We should probably go back
29 and revisit the concept again with the people that
30 participated in the planning process.

31

32 MR. R. WALKER: You know, Roy, too, you
33 know, we could also end up like 19A or 19B where
34 there's no more moose there, the Holitna, we could
35 probably end up -- because, you know, 21E, it's kind of
36 like maintaining its own but a lot of moose are still
37 migrating out of this place. All the moose down in
38 Unit 18 just weren't born over the last three or four
39 years. So I mean when you look at their moose
40 population and ours, and you look at 19 -- I mean 21A
41 and 21D, there's no more moose up there, it's all shot
42 out. We're just trying to maintain here something
43 where our people could have a subsistence moose hunt
44 for the next 20 years, but apparently, I guess, the
45 ADF&G has other ideas for this.

46

47 I'm just kind of curious, you know, how
48 could you guys just go ahead and do this and, you know,
49 even the AC Board they voted against this, I'm kind of
50 surprised, you know, at some of the things here that --

1 you know, I'll go great lengths for subsistence, I
2 will, and I've never voted for a commercial hunt in my
3 life, everything I've done is for the people that live
4 there and I will continue to do that.

5
6 So, thank you, Roy.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim. You
9 got a question, Tim.

10
11 MR. GERVAIS: Yes. Whoever made this
12 Yukon Innoko Moose Management Plan, which, hopefully it
13 was people from the GASH villages, they set it up so
14 that 30 non-resident moose could be taken per year so
15 those people that made this plan are responsible for us
16 today having to take this action to increase the amount
17 of days of non-resident hunting per year. So you're
18 not the victim here, you guys are responsible for it
19 because you guys set it up for 30 non-resident moose
20 per year to be taken out of that unit.

21
22 MR. R. WALKER: Well, actually when you
23 look at it, the guys.....

24
25 REPORTER: Robert. Robert.

26
27 MR. R. WALKER:you know the ones
28 that suggested that -- the guy who wrote the proposal
29 right here, he's the one that suggested it, he brought
30 it to our attention. He was sitting there at the
31 meeting. He said, hey, September 20th is great for us.

32
33 MR. GERVAIS: Because he looked at the
34 moose management plan that you guys created and agreed
35 to and he said, I'm not getting my fair share of moose
36 based on this management plan so it's your.....

37
38 MR. R. WALKER: I'm not going to sit
39 here and argue about it, I mean I just made a point
40 here, Roy brought the answers to us and I think we can
41 go with that.

42
43 Roy.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Roy.

46
47 MR. NOWLIN: Yeah, through the Chair.
48 If we felt that the folks who participated in the plan
49 didn't agree with our interpretation here we'd sure
50 look at this again, you know, our support of this

1 proposal, and it's -- in this case it's really an
2 allocation issue because it's a question of who gets
3 those moose. And whether they're going to stay there
4 on the ground or whether they're going to be taken by
5 these non-resident hunters. And normally Division of
6 Wildlife Conservation, at my level, anyway, would not
7 get involved in an allocation issue. And so if we felt
8 that the sentiment of the people who participated in
9 the plan was in opposition to this proposal, I can tell
10 you that we'd back away on our support from it real
11 quick.

12

13 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, Robert.

16

17 MR. R. WALKER: I'm just going to leave
18 it at this. I think Roy was good enough here to come
19 in here and to explain the situation here. And I don't
20 know about how James feels here, but I'm -- I'm going
21 to have to let this go right here. I'm not going to be
22 satisfied with it but, anyway, Roy, I appreciate you
23 coming in and giving us your -- 15 minutes of your
24 time.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate you
27 coming in also.

28

29 If the Department is supportive of the
30 stakeholder's concerns about this proposal, the Chair
31 would entertain a motion for reconsideration if -- as
32 the dissenter, if you would like to make that motion.

33

34 Robert.

35

36 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chair, thank you.
37 This is just going to be hard because, you know, I mean
38 when we -- and you discussed it and the other Board
39 voted, I mean that's just like going back to the other
40 proposal where I and James weren't here to vote, but
41 everybody was here to vote today. And if we're going
42 to sit down and reconsider, you know, I'd like to hear
43 the other members say that, you know, it'll be okay but
44 I'm not going to ask them to do it because everybody
45 has their own way of doing things and I'm just going to
46 have to let them reconsider themselves, this issue
47 here.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I supported the
50 proposal because the harvest was seven moose this last

1 year, additional season would -- if it doubled it would
2 be 14 moose and there's a 30 moose quota and so that's
3 why I supported the proposal.

4
5 I will write a letter to the GASH
6 affected communities explaining what my line of
7 thought, that the plan that we reviewed, gave that 30
8 moose quota and that's not even getting anywheres close
9 to being taken, and so as a signor to the plan I feel
10 that there's -- if they're not even meeting, you know,
11 there's an allocative -- everybody agreed the 30 moose
12 could be taken and they're not even getting close to
13 that and if additional season is needed to take that
14 allocation then that's -- I was agreeable to that
15 proposal. So the Council has supported the proposal.
16 And so I will, as Chair, explain my vote, and I will
17 explain the ANILCA law process that I feel that I must
18 review, the .815 that does not -- and especially with
19 this plan that allocated this 30 moose to the
20 sporthunters.

21
22 Ray.

23
24 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I
25 think we need to be careful in our language here. I
26 don't think the plan calls for an allocation of 30
27 moose, it calls for a cap on the harvest at 30 moose
28 and that's a different thing. In other words they can
29 take up to 30 but you didn't give them 30 moose in the
30 plan, they said they would be capped at 30 so it
31 wouldn't exceed that.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

34
35 MR. COLLINS: So there is a difference
36 between allocation and cap. This has come up in the
37 North Pacific Fisheries and others and so on when
38 they're talking about -- so be careful in our language
39 is what I'm saying.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

42
43 MR. COLLINS: Because I don't think the
44 plan intended it to be an allocation.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

47
48 MR. COLLINS: It was a cap.

49
50 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead,
2 Robert.

3
4 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr.
5 Chairman. The tribal chief there says, you know, we're
6 being -- people are coming on our lower portion of 21E
7 and, you know, hunt -- they get a winter hunt here and
8 we have our -- another guy here asking for an extension
9 on time on 30 moose, I mean it's kind of like pushing
10 them into a position of where, you know, I -- I would
11 go and support them in that manner, so would James, to
12 insure that -- you know, once that door is open it's
13 going to be open and that's one of the things that we
14 want to careful of how far we want to open it before
15 the flood piles in and does this.

16
17 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chair.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead,
20 James.

21
22 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you. I guess,
23 Ray -- Roy, sorry, it's just not too clear in my mind
24 on this individual's request. It appears he needs an
25 extra five days to write a letter to get a permit to
26 increase his hunting time. But if there's already 30
27 permits available he could apply for those permits
28 through the first part of the September hunt.

29
30 MR. NOWLIN: Yeah, through the Chair.
31 That is true. I mean he could -- he could run more
32 hunters in there potentially because during that --
33 during that time period. This is a real tricky concept
34 here and I'm a little nervous about this and the reason
35 I am is because like I explained earlier, this is
36 really allocative and we always get real nervous and
37 the only reason we go there, in this case, is because
38 of the plan. And there's a good deal of
39 interpretation, and your interpretation of that could
40 be -- I mean is -- is just as valid as ours. And
41 that's why I mentioned that if we felt that there was a
42 disagreement with our interpretation of it that we
43 would change our position on this proposal but it's --
44 I'm looking for feedback, I guess, and that's why I
45 wanted to stay here is because I wanted to hear more of
46 the conversation here is because we can change our
47 position on these proposals right up to the time it
48 goes on the table at the Board of Game meeting but we
49 do need to have good justification for doing that.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim.

2

3 MR. GERVAIS: It was my understanding
4 when we were deliberating this that there was 30 non-
5 resident moose allocation. I've never read this Yukon
6 Innoko Moose Management Plan, if it is just a cap, as
7 Ray's suggesting it is, then I would recommend that the
8 Board, the Council redeliberates this and defines what
9 does this 30 non-resident moose per year, what does
10 that really mean?

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: To expedite this
13 issue and with enlightenment from the Department on
14 their position on this proposal, the Chair will
15 entertain the motion from the dissenters for a
16 reconsideration vote.

17

18 MR. COLLINS: No, Mr. Chairman, it has
19 to be on the prevailing side. Somebody from the
20 prevailing side.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, the prevailing
23 side.

24

25 MR. COLLINS: So I'll move
26 reconsideration.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, on the
29 prevailing side.

30

31 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's moved and
34 seconded to vote reconsideration of State Proposal 81,
35 which would lengthen the season in Unit 21E an
36 additional five days for non-resident hunters, after
37 further discussion with the Department. It clarifies
38 that it's not an allocation of 30 moose, but a harvest
39 cap of 30 non-resident moose. I've changed my vote to
40 oppose Proposal 81.

41

42 And so further discussion on the
43 proposal.

44

45 MR. COLLINS: I propose to do the same
46 for the reason that there are permits available that
47 are not being utilized so we're not denying opportunity
48 and so I also will change my vote to no.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So further

1 discussion by the Council.

2

3 MS. PELKOLA: I will also change my
4 vote to no.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So more discussion.

7

8 MR. GERVAIS: So can somebody confirm
9 that it is a cap and not a quota?

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Department says
12 it's a cap, not an allocation.

13

14 MR. NOWLIN: Yeah, that's my
15 understanding of it is it was a cap, and I see Bob --
16 Member Walker shaking his head, too, that he agrees it
17 was a cap and so I mean that's my understanding of it
18 so and, Bob, you were on the planning group as well, I
19 believe, so two of us together having the same
20 recollection of why that carries a lot of weight for
21 me.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Further discussion
24 by the Council.

25

26 You got one more comment, Robert.

27

28 MR. R. WALKER: You know, Roy, it was
29 really a long drawn out process, something that took
30 like six weeks to do this and it wasn't cheap, it was a
31 lot of effort and a lot of time, a lot of people and a
32 lot of money, too, it took -- and a lot of people
33 volunteered to travel with their own snowmachines,
34 their own time and their own place to camp, it took a
35 lot of time and I would like to have a meeting with our
36 -- with the Yukon Innoko Moose Management Committee
37 and, you know, if there is to be an extension that I
38 think it should be called a common courtesy just to
39 approach them and say, look, you know, we're going to
40 have a meeting here, get Randy Rogers and sit down and
41 say, you know, we have to go over this again because
42 it's been like almost six, seven years now, and maybe
43 if there has to be modifications it could be done then
44 and then approach the AC board, approach the RAC Board
45 and go before the Board of Game.

46

47 I think that would be a procedure here
48 where I would feel comfortable, where I would -- you
49 know, where all the constituents that live in our area
50 would be comfortable and not have hard feelings towards

1 this, and that's my thought, that's what I'm going to go
2 with.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're short on
5 time.

6

7 MR. R. WALKER: Okay.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And we were confused
10 by the proposal, it said a quota was set and that's
11 where we got the allocation in the language in the
12 proposal and so certain Council members, including
13 myself, was confused by the proponent's language in the
14 proposal and you've clarified that it's a cap for -- I
15 need to expedite this meeting.

16

17 So those in favor of Proposal 81
18 signify by saying aye.

19

20 MR. GERVAIS: Aye.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One vote for the
23 proposal.

24

25 Those opposed to Proposal 81 signify by
26 the same sign, aye.

27

28 IN UNISON: Aye.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Proposal 81
31 under reconsideration vote fails and so we need to go
32 to time out, OSM is -- we have to get out of this --
33 and so we will have a very short break.

34

35 MS. WILKINSON: No, you have to stop.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, it's stopped.

38

39 MS. WILKINSON: Yeah, Mr.....

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, we're done for
42 the day, we come back and where are we going to meet?

43

44 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

47

48 MS. WILKINSON: Well, all we have left
49 is the elections and pick the.....

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.
2
3 MS. WILKINSON:pick a place.
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, that's what I
6 was wanting to do was just.....
7
8 MS. WILKINSON: Can you do that in five
9 minutes?
10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Can we do this
12 election in five minutes, Council.
13
14 MR. J. WALKER: Move to retain the
15 Chairman.....
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we can stay on
18 the record, I think we can complete our agenda within
19 five minutes.
20
21 REPORTER: No, no, you still have --
22 Jack, turn your mic off a minute.
23
24 (Pause)
25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we can stay on
27 the record a while longer. So the last agenda is
28 election of officers and meeting dates.
29
30 I would like to be at the Board of Game
31 meeting because we have very important issues there.
32
33 I think actually we've got up 15 to 20
34 minutes to complete our meeting here and I would really
35 like to finish this meeting right now.
36
37 MS. WILKINSON: Okay. Okay.
38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so election of
40 officers. The Chair will open for nomination of the
41 Chair.
42
43 MR. R. WALKER: I move to nominate Jack
44 as Chair.
45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: On the record.
47
48 MR. J. WALKER: On record I'd like to
49 nominate Jack for Chair.....
50

1 MS. PELKOLA: Do you need a second.
2
3 MR. J. WALKER: To retain Jack for
4 Chair.
5
6 MS. PELKOLA: Second.
7
8 MS. WILKINSON: Well, who -- who -- was
9 there a second.
10
11 MR. R. WALKER: Also, Mr. Chairman, I'd
12 like to second that and nominate Ray as the vice-Chair.
13
14 MS. WILKINSON: Well, I -- well
15 wait.....
16
17 MS. PELKOLA: I'll second. Second both
18 of them.
19
20 MS. WILKINSON: Okay. Okay.
21
22 MR. J. WALKER: Second.
23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And you had a
25 comment, Ray.
26
27 MR. COLLINS: Well, I was just going to
28 ask if there's any members who feel that we need to
29 change members and if not maybe we could move to
30 reinstate the current members for another year, unless
31 there's feelings that people want a change.
32
33 Anybody interested?
34
35 (Council shakes head negatively)
36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Council seems
38 satisfies so we shall vote on.....
39
40 MR. COLLINS: Do you want to reconsider
41 your motion then and make that then -- move that
42 we.....
43
44 MR. R. WALKER: Okay. Yes, Mr.
45 Chairman, I'd like to reconsider my vote here and
46 nominate both Ray and.....
47
48 MS. WILKINSON: Well, wait.....
49
50 MR. R. WALKER:Jack as President

1 and vice-President -- or Chair and vice-Chair.
2
3 MR. COLLINS: Well, you have Micky
4 for.....
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And Micky.
7
8 MR. R. WALKER: And Micky for.....
9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Secretary.
11
12 MR. R. WALKER:secretary.
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so retain the
15 current officers is the motion. Do we have a second to
16 that motion.
17
18 MS. WILKINSON: Well, but.....
19
20 MS. PELKOLA: Second.
21
22 MS. WILKINSON: Okay. Okay.
23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded. Those in
25 favor of the motion to retain the current officers of
26 the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council signify
27 by saying aye.
28
29 IN UNISON: Aye.
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so the last
32 thing is the date of meeting and location. And so that
33 should be in the back of our book, a calendar and so
34 our -- the windows are portrayed in October. And so
35 our Western Interior is slated for the 5th and 6th in
36 McGrath; is that still current and.....
37
38 MS. WILKINSON: Yes, it is.
39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:is that still
41 agreeable to the Council, the 5th and 6th in McGrath.
42
43 (Council nods affirmatively)
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have to look
46 at the spring window now, Ann?
47
48 MS. WILKINSON: Yes.
49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so my opinion is

1 that we should return to Galena for our spring meeting.
2 I prefer a March schedule of sometime because of the
3 weather conditions and so forth, and is there any other
4 Council member suggestion for meeting location and
5 dates.

6

7 Go ahead, Tim.

8

9 MR. GERVAIS: If you're going to go
10 with March I would opt to go earlier in March, that
11 first week of March.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I also like that
14 one.

15

16 MR. R. WALKER: The Iditarod goes
17 through Galena.....

18

19 MR. GERVAIS: This year.

20

21 MR. R. WALKER: This year, oh.

22

23 MS. PELKOLA: I would just like to say
24 that March is pretty busy in Galena so I don't know,
25 we'll have to work it out somehow.

26

27 MS. YATLIN: The first week, well, I
28 would say that we have basketball fans there and if
29 there's regionals you'll have nobody at the meeting.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. So we can
32 set first pick, and the possible dates would be the 1st
33 of March and the 2nd as the first pick, second pick
34 would be March 8th and 9th, would that be agreeable,
35 Jenny, until we could find out?

36

37 MS. PELKOLA: Yeah, I guess so, it's
38 hard to tell what's good.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do most of the
41 Council members feel that the 1st and 2nd of March,
42 which is a Tuesday gives us a Monday travel, my air
43 carrier doesn't fly on the weekend, and so the 1st and
44 2nd is good for me, we have to be able to travel on
45 weekdays.

46

47 MR. R. WALKER: That'll work Jack.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we'll suggest
50 that the meeting place is Galena, is that agreeable to

1 the Council.

2

3 MS. PELKOLA: I agree.

4

5 MR. GERVAIS: Do you want to go to
6 Huslia. We should go to Allakaket.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we can't -- at
9 this point we're still stuck in Regional hubs.

10

11 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Robert.

14

15 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. Are we
16 still stuck with the hub deal here?

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're stuck so far.

19

20 MR. R. WALKER: Can we, like, go to
21 Allakaket or Alatna or Huslia or Hughes or someplace?

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We would like to but
24 at this point the Department of Interior has not given
25 directive on that.

26

27 Ann.

28

29 MS. WILKINSON: Even though you don't
30 have a lot of time to discuss it right now, you do have
31 the option of going to a non-hub community if you come
32 up with a good justification for it and a cost
33 comparison and that can be done after this meeting.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. If we --
36 during, you know, I don't see a pressing issue to go to
37 one of those other communities at this point, and so I
38 would still slate Galena unless we can identify a
39 pressing -- I do want the option of village, that's
40 what I do want to have, but at this time I don't have
41 an area of concern within our region. So it's just
42 agreeable to the Council Galena the 1st and 2nd of
43 March is our spring meeting.

44

45 And so at this time the Chair will
46 entertain a motion to adjourn the meeting.

47

48 MS. YATLIN: So moved.

49

50 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded
2 by Jenny and Eleanor. Those in favor of adjournment,
3 signify by saying aye.

4
5 IN UNISON: Aye.

6
7 (Off record)

8
9 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 166 through 338 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 25th day of February 2010, at Fairbanks, Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 10th day of March 2010.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 9/16/10