

1 WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 McGrath, Alaska
7 February 29, 2012
8 9:00 a.m.
9

10
11 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
12

13 Jack Reakoff, Chairman
14 Ray Collins
15 Timothy Gervais (Telephonic)
16 Carl Morgan
17 Jenny Pelkola
18 Pollock Simon
19 James Walker
20 Robert Walker
21 Eleanor Yatlin
22
23
24
25 Regional Council Coordinator, Melinda Hernandez
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Recorded and transcribed by:
43
44 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
45 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
46 Anchorage, AK 99501
47 907-243-0668/sahile@gci.net

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(McGrath, Alaska - 2/29/12)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good morning. We have a tight agenda today, so we're going to go over a lot of issues. Since we've got to get rolling, Eleanor Yatlin will be -- we've got a few people online. We're going to call the roll. Melinda or Jenny. Do you want to call the roll.

MS. PELKOLA: Robert.

MR. R. WALKER: Yes.

MS. PELKOLA: Donald Honea.

(No response)

MS. PELKOLA: Pollock.

(No audible response)

MS. PELKOLA: Ray.

MR. COLLINS: Here.

MS. PELKOLA: Jack.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Here.

MS. PELKOLA: Eleanor. On their way, I guess. Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: Here.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim's online.

MS. PELKOLA: Okay, Tim's online. James.

MR. J. WALKER: Here.

MS. PELKOLA: Jenny. I'm here. And Carl.

MR. MORGAN: Here.

1 MS. PELKOLA: We have a quorum.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have a welcome
4 and introduction, but there's a lady that has to catch
5 an aircraft, so we're going to move her right up to the
6 front of the docket here. Do you want to step up to
7 the mike and give us your presentation. Since you're
8 tight on schedule, we'll go back over the introduction
9 of our guests. Yes, right here at the mike. State
10 your name for the record and your project you're going
11 to discuss.

12

13 MS. STUBY: Good morning. My name is
14 Lisa Stuby. I work for the Alaska Department of Fish
15 and Game, Sport Fish Division in Fairbanks. I'm just
16 going to briefly introduce a project I received funding
17 from the Office of Subsistence Management for. It's a
18 continuation of a project I've been doing since 2007
19 where I've radio-tagged sheefish and just documenting
20 spawning areas as well as timing into the spawning
21 areas, overwintering areas, feeding areas.

22

23 We've gotten great information from
24 these 119 radio-tagged fish, but one thing that none of
25 my tags ever did was go up to Highpower Creek, which
26 had been documented and known as a spawning area by the
27 people who lived in Telida and Nikolai and was
28 documented by a fisheries biologist, Ken Alt, back in
29 the '70s. So the continuation of the project is
30 basically this summer in late August or early September
31 we're going to deploy 15 radio transmitters into
32 sheefish. Hopefully they're heading up that way, above
33 the mouth of the east fork, which the Tonzona is
34 another spawning area, and also near Telida too just to
35 see and document where the fish may be going now.

36

37 I was just in a public meeting in
38 Nikolai yesterday and got to talking to some folks. I
39 know looking at Ken Alt's old report he mentioned that
40 the spawning -- the gravel and the substrate that the
41 fish spawn in, the ground, was sandy and had cobble.
42 When I visited that with our area management biologist,
43 John Chythlook, back in 2010, it was very different.
44 It was very organic and peaty and very mucky and
45 totally unlike sheefish spawning habitat. Just from
46 talking to some folks in Nikolai, they were saying that
47 maybe there might have been some sloughing of
48 permafrost or something. I mean I really don't know
49 what's going on, but possibly the habitat might have
50 changed and the sheefish may have gone elsewhere.

1
2 So the whole idea of the project is to
3 try and capture and
4 tag the spawning population that's heading up into this
5 area and to document and collect some genetic samples
6 of where the sheefish may be spawning and then
7 hopefully there's still sheefish heading up there.

8
9 I talked to another man in Nikolai who
10 said that, yeah, he hasn't caught a sheefish since
11 1994, but we're going to get out and at least try to
12 see what we can see. I have a handout as well.

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have the handout
15 before us. Does the Council have any questions
16 regarding this project from the presenter?

17
18 (No comments)

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My question would be
21 why don't you overfly the spawning area and locate the
22 sheefish and then catch them and implant telemetry on
23 those particular fish instead of trying to do it
24 downriver. Is there some protocol?

25
26 MS. STUBY: Oh, no, no. I'm just
27 trying to give enough -- sheefish can be a bit hit or
28 miss. Just looking at the timing of sheefish into the
29 big river or middle fork spawning areas, they can show
30 up prior to spawning anywhere from a week before, they
31 spawn late September, early October, to two months
32 ahead of time. So it can be a bit hit and miss trying
33 to actually catch and put tags out. I just want to
34 kind of expand the area and give us more options. Plus
35 look and see too and document any other spawning areas
36 that the sheefish may go to.

37
38 As far as flying over, I've tried it a
39 couple times in a Super Cub flying very very low. The
40 Swift River, people call it the Denali Fork, is
41 glacially fed and very occluded. You can't see through
42 it. High Power is also very tannic and can't see
43 through it unless you get into the main stem. Oh, no,
44 if we could see them, that would be skookums.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I live up in the
47 Koyukuk and I've seen sheefish from the air in the
48 Alatna and the Kobuk Rivers, so they're really easy to
49 see. That's why I mentioned it.

50

1 MS. STUBY: Right. The middle fork,
2 we've flown over it and, yeah, they were right there,
3 like silvery soldiers all lined up. But, yeah, no, you
4 just can't see them.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Middle fork of
7 which?

8
9 MS. STUBY: Middle fork of the
10 Kuskokwim, just above Windy.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any other
13 questions. Go ahead, Robert.

14
15 MR. R. WALKER: You have the Swift fork
16 upper end of Telida and then you have the Swift River
17 down by -- above Red Devil here and we're talking about
18 the one up by Telida?

19
20 MS. STUBY: Yes, sir. Yeah, there's a
21 Swift River and a Swift Fork. According to the USGS
22 map, I'm trying to learn the local names because it
23 does get a little confusing.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions.

26
27
28 (No comments)

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Appreciate
31 that project. That sounds -- sheefish are a very
32 sensitive fish and are highly sought by sports
33 fishermen and fairly sensitive to catch and release
34 fishing. So I'm prone to want to track those
35 populations and understand them before any kind of use
36 occurs that may damage the population. The catch and
37 release on the Kobuk is extremely high. The Gates of
38 the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission had the
39 Department of -- Sport Fish Division look at catch and
40 release mortalities and it was upwards of 3 percent
41 when handled absolutely correctly and I've seen bad
42 things happen on national TV to sheefish. People
43 putting their hands in their gills, landing them on the
44 gravel, so I do feel this is a very worthwhile project
45 and I appreciate your work on it.

46
47 MS. STUBY: Thank you.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. I hope
50 you have a good flight back. So we'll go back down to

1 our agenda now. Lisa had to catch an airplane, so I
2 had to push her up to the front here. So we're at
3 welcome and introduction of our guests. We'll go
4 around the room here and we'll start over here on the
5 right side, this lady sitting over here on my right.

6

7 MS. MIKOW: Hi, I'm Beth Mikow with the
8 Department of Fish and Game, Subsistence Division in
9 Fairbanks.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you,
12 Beth.

13

14 MR. THALHAUSER: Mike Thalhauser with
15 the Kuskokwim Native Association in Aniak.

16

17 MR. PEIRCE: Josh Peirce, Alaska
18 Department of Fish and Game in McGrath.

19

20 MR. HILL: I'm Jerry Hill with the
21 Innoko Refuge here in McGrath.

22

23 MR. PAPPAS: George Pappas, Fish and
24 Game, Subsistence Liaison Team out of Anchorage.

25

26 MS. INGLES: Palma Ingles, OSM,
27 Anchorage.

28

29 MR. MEARS: Jeremy Mears, Fish and
30 Wildlife Service, Fairbanks.

31

32 DR. JENKINS: David Jenkins, Office of
33 Subsistence Management out of Anchorage.

34

35 MS. STUBY: Lisa Stuby, Alaska
36 Department of Fish and Game, Fairbanks.

37

38 MR. SLOAN: Bo Sloan, Innoko National
39 Wildlife Refuge here in McGrath.

40

41 MR. WHITWORTH: Kevin Whitworth, here
42 in McGrath.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. This morning
45 I made a radio announcement on KSKO and had a little
46 interview, so I encouraged the public to come down here
47 and voice any concerns. I told the public that I would
48 try to get them to sign in and try to move them into
49 the agenda right away so they don't have to wait. I'm
50 encouraging a public platform.

1 So review and adoption of the agenda.
2 Has the Council reviewed the agenda items? We have
3 currently a full agenda. The State Board of Game
4 comments is going to take -- there's approximately 20
5 proposals that would affect this region, so we're going
6 to need to take time on those. We have the Dalton
7 Highway sheep issue that might take a little bit of
8 time for up north and then our agency reports, but
9 otherwise -- the Chair recognizes Eleanor Yatlin has
10 arrived. Eleanor, we just had one presentation on
11 sheefish and it's in your handout that should be in
12 front of your mic there.

13
14 Any comments on the agenda from the
15 Council.

16
17 MR. GERVAIS: I have a comment, Jack.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

20
21 MR. GERVAIS: I don't have a copy in
22 front of me, but I was wondering if I could add a
23 couple of short items.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim, do you have
26 internet where you're at?

27
28 MR. GERVAIS: Negative.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Negative. Okay. Go
31 ahead with a couple additions.

32
33 MR. GERVAIS: I'd like the Council to
34 discuss potentially drafting a letter to our state
35 senators and representatives regarding the DNR has
36 changed their mission statement and removed the clauses
37 that address conservation and protecting resources for
38 future generations and I feel like we should discuss
39 this as a Council and communicate to the legislature
40 that we'd like to have that put back in.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim, we've gotten
43 into this before and this violates the Hatch Act and
44 this Council cannot directly communicate with any kind
45 of political entity. Our correspondence has to go
46 through the Federal Subsistence Board and so we can
47 draft a letter to that effect encouraging the Federal
48 Subsistence Board with our concerns about future
49 generation and conservation and those items that you
50 would like.

1 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. That would be
2 appropriate.

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you want to put
5 that down as an agenda item, action item somewhere on
6 this agenda. Let's see here. Something like new
7 business item C on the agenda under 11. So it would be
8 a letter to the FSB regarding the DNR mission
9 statement. So that's on the agenda. Your second item,
10 Tim.

11
12 MR. GERVAIS: I'd like somebody from
13 Fish and Game to give us a short explanation of what's
14 going on with the Emmonak Field Office. They had to
15 close the office last year for some kind of vandalism
16 concern and I'd like to get some information on what's
17 going on there and if they need to move the field
18 office to a different village.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We can
21 request that information to be presented from the State
22 and U.S. Fish and Wildlife fisheries when they make
23 their agency report. That's on the agenda.

24
25 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. And the last item
26 I had is I'd like to revisit the king salmon bycatch
27 numbers that are occurring on the directed chum fishery
28 in July.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Let's see
31 here. That would be under fisheries.

32
33 MR. GERVAIS: I know we've got a full
34 agenda. So you, as Chairman, make the call whether you
35 have time to deal with these.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, we do want to
38 discuss fisheries issues because this is a call for
39 Federal fisheries proposals, so we want to thoroughly
40 vet any fisheries issues. So we will put that under --
41 where would this be, Melinda? I'm missing it. Any
42 fisheries discussion.

43
44 MS. HERNANDEZ: Number 9.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, under A,
47 fisheries bycatch and the directed chum and call for
48 proposals. That will be under our discussion, Tim,
49 under 9, regulatory proposals A. So if you can jot
50 that down in your notes. If you can get a hold of the

1 internet, you can download the whole.....

2

3 MS. HERNANDEZ: Does he have a fax
4 machine?

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have a fax,
7 Tim?

8

9 MR. GERVAIS: No, but maybe at lunch
10 break I can go to the library and download that.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: If you go to the
13 Federal Subsistence Board website and you go on
14 Regional Councils and then you go onto our whole packet
15 if you've got fast enough bandwidth you can download
16 the whole thing and you can see our whole agenda and
17 then everything we have before us except for a few
18 handouts.

19

20 Any further agenda items by Regional
21 Council members.

22

23 MR. MORGAN: Jack.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead, Carl.

26

27

28 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, Jack, I don't know
29 if this is appropriate, but I'd like this to be entered
30 into the record just so it's there, to have a special
31 recognition to Ron Sam and his contribution to this
32 Council, what he's done for it, and I'd just like it
33 part of the record. Plus I would like to have
34 everybody please stand in a moment of silence for him.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I was going to do
37 that after we adopt this agenda and I was going to move
38 right into that Ron Sam issue because it was a huge
39 loss to subsistence when we lost Ron Sam. So we'll
40 actually add that as 4A, recognition of Ron Sam, so
41 it's a point on the record.

42

43 Any further agenda items, concerns of
44 the Council to be included in the agenda.

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: If none, the Chair
49 will entertain a motion to adopt the agenda as
50 reviewed.

1 MR. SIMON: So moved.

2

3 MS. YATLIN: Second.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Pollock,
6 seconded by Eleanor. Those in favor of the amended
7 agenda signify by saying aye.

8

9 IN UNISON: Aye.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
12 sign.

13

14 (No opposing votes)

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the agenda is
17 adopted. We'll move into sort of a roundtable
18 discussion first for Ron Sam and Council members
19 appreciation on the record for all the work he's done
20 for this Council. I forget exactly what date. It was
21 like three weeks ago Ron passed away. Any Council
22 members want to say a few words about Ron. Pollock.

23

24 MR. SIMON: My name is Pollock Simon,
25 Sr. I live in Allakaket and Alatna is just across the
26 river where Ron Sam lived. Ron and I kind of grew up
27 together. As boys we raced on the runway the 4th of
28 July and then later on in his teens it was just like we
29 were side by side. You know, just like racing on the
30 runway and going to meetings sitting side by side. It
31 was a great loss, a great friend. He sat on a lot of
32 committees, advisory committees, Fish and Game, Fish
33 and Wildlife, he sat on village corporation boards and
34 councils. Any board he sat on he talked lots and smart
35 and he eventually became a chairman of the board. He
36 did that most of his life and I kind of miss him. When
37 you remember Ron Sam, he lived his life and he enjoyed
38 what he did. He sat on this board for many years as
39 chairman. We remember that, you know. We'll keep him
40 in our prayers and things like that when we're having a
41 meeting. It's good to recognize a person like that.

42

43 I thank this board, Mr. Chair, for
44 recognizing him.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock.
49 Those are very nice words. Any other words from the
50 Council.

1 Robert.

2

3 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Jack. Ron
4 was a really unusual person because it was so smart
5 here. One day I had to ask him a question. I said,
6 Ron, what is 899×750 . It took him four seconds to
7 give me the answer. I mean that's how smart he was.
8 When we'd do our work together being on the board and
9 other boards, we'd do our work together, and he'd be
10 done like 10, 15, 20 minutes before I would be done.
11 He understood, he read everything. Somehow he
12 formulated his plan a lot quicker than a lot of us
13 would do. One of the things he said when he was in the
14 Service, he was encryption, what do they call that?
15 Crypto. He said it would take an average person six
16 hours to do his daily work and it would take Ron half
17 an hour and he'd be done for the day. This is the kind
18 of person he was. Just a mathematician. A brilliant
19 genius. When it came down to do things, he was
20 dedicated. I like that. He never gave up on a lot of
21 things he did. I seen him for the last time January
22 the 17th, I gave him a bag of salmon strips and he said
23 he didn't know how he was going to go from here on, so
24 he told me goodbye and that was it for Ron. I didn't
25 get to make it to his funeral due to the cold weather,
26 so I take my hat off to him because of what he did for
27 this part of the country. Not only for our area but
28 other areas too to be recognized. Lower Yukon, Eastern
29 Interior. Even he's been talked about in the Norton
30 Sound area. They read what he has done.

31

32 So his legacy is going to carry on a
33 lot farther than a lot of people's will. A lot further
34 than mine probably.

35

36 Thank you, Jack.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments.
39 Jenny.

40

41 MS. PELKOLA: Jenny Pelkola. I'd just
42 like to say when I first got on the board Ron was the
43 chair and I thought, man, that guy is really smart. I
44 just looked up to him and I thought, wow, you know,
45 someday I'd like to be like that, but I'm more quieter
46 than he is. But like I say he was so smart and Robert
47 hit it right on the head when he said that he was
48 smart. He was. He was silly in his own ways too. I
49 know this board is going to miss him. I was really sad
50 when he said he wasn't going to run for the board

1 anymore and I thought, wow, that's a -- you know, we
2 need those kind of people on the board. But I'm sure
3 he had his other routes in life and he enjoyed
4 everything and it was good knowing him.

5
6 Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Jenny.
9 James.

10
11 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Jack. I
12 would just like to say that I respect Ron Sam for his
13 services throughout the years. Not only to this board
14 but other boards that he served on. I served with him
15 on other boards in different capacities. He was always
16 there for people's care and concern and I'd just like
17 to say that I respect his services.

18
19 Thank you.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks. Any other
22 comments. Eleanor.

23
24 MS. YATLIN: My name is Eleanor. Ron
25 was a really good friend to both Al and I. Everybody
26 said everything about all the different boards he
27 served on. The one I always think about was when we
28 first started our corporation. He was the president
29 for many years for Huslia, Allakaket, Alatna. He
30 started it and it's still carrying on. It's because of
31 his dedication and his knowledge of all the people in
32 that area. That's what I believe and I think a lot of
33 people knew that. That was what I wanted to say about
34 him.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Eleanor.

37
38 MS. YATLIN: I need a higher chair.

39
40 (Laughter)

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Find a booster.
43 Ray.

44
45 MR. COLLINS: I only knew Ron in
46 connection with the board here, but I sure appreciate
47 getting to know him over the years and all the
48 contribution he made here. I always enjoyed his smile
49 too. He always had a friendly smile and liked to joke.
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Any
2 other comments.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My comments would be
7 Ron came onto the Council and hit the ground running.
8 Ron immediately accelerated to the front of the pack
9 and was a great leader, strong, tight line all the
10 time. He incorporated the Council with him. Even when
11 he retired from the Council I would call Ron about
12 different issues and he would -- I'm going to miss his
13 -- I would actually ask him about various issues, what
14 should we do about this or that. Well, we've lost
15 that, so I really really was sad. I called Ron back in
16 the early winter and he says don't worry about me, I'm
17 going to be all right, I'll be all right. Well, I was
18 sad to hear that he didn't make it. He's up there in a
19 better hunting ground.

20
21 He told me he was trained as a kid by
22 the elders to be a leader. They recognized his
23 intelligence and he was trained since he was a little
24 kid to be a leader and was pushed out as a young
25 teenager into a leadership position. He minced no
26 words. If he thought it was BS, he'd tell you on the
27 record that it was. One time I spoke against a certain
28 proposal and I said I hoped that that didn't offend
29 that person. He says, no, we're professionals. We
30 don't take this stuff home. He didn't hold animosities
31 against people. Ron was just a great person in
32 general, so he's a great loss.

33
34 We will stand at this time for a moment
35 of silence.

36
37 (Moment of silence)

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Would
40 you care to do a benediction, Ray.

41
42 MR. COLLINS: Sure.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So if we can do a
45 benediction also at this time.

46
47 (Benediction)

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ray. We're
50 to the election of officers. I'll turn the gavel over

1 to Melinda, who will act in this capacity. Go ahead,
2 Melinda.

3

4 MS. HERNANDEZ: Good morning, everyone.
5 Melinda Hernandez, OSM. I'm the acting Council
6 coordinator for the Western Interior Region. I will go
7 ahead and open up the floor for nominations for a
8 Chair.

9

10 MR. R. WALKER: I nominate Jack Reakoff
11 for Chair.

12

13 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

14

15 MS. HERNANDEZ: All right. We have a
16 nomination for Jack Reakoff for Chair. Robert made the
17 motion, seconded by James.

18

19 MS. PELKOLA: I make a motion to close
20 the nominations.

21

22 MS. HERNANDEZ: A motion has been made
23 to close the nominations. Jenny, do we want to do a
24 roll call since this is a new election.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 MS. PELKOLA: Robert Walker.

29

30 MR. R. WALKER: Yes.

31

32 MS. PELKOLA: Donald is not here.

33 Pollock Simon.

34

35 (No audible response)

36

37 MS. PELKOLA: Ray Collins.

38

39 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

40

41 MS. PELKOLA: Jack Reakoff.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

44

45 MS. PELKOLA: Eleanor Sam. Eleanor

46 Sam.

47

48 MS. YATLIN: Yatlin.

49

50 MS. PELKOLA: Oh, I mean -- sorry.

1 Eleanor Yatlin.
2
3 MS. YATLIN: Here.
4
5 MS. PELKOLA: Timothy Gervais.
6
7 MR. GERVAIS: Yes.
8
9 MS. PELKOLA: James Walker.
10
11 MR. J. WALKER: Yes.
12
13 MS. PELKOLA: Jenny Pelkola, yes. Carl
14 Morgan.
15
16 MR. MORGAN: Yes.
17
18 MS. HERNANDEZ: All right. It's
19 unanimous. Jack Reakoff has been nominated and put
20 into the place of the Chair for the Western Interior
21 Council. I'll turn it back over to Jack.
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. I
24 appreciate your confidence in my chairmanship. So we
25 move to the vice Chair. The Chair opens the floor for
26 nomination for vice Chair.
27
28 MS. PELKOLA: I nominate Ray Collins.
29
30 MR. SIMON: Second.
31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Pollock.
33 Other nominations.
34
35 MR. R. WALKER: Make a motion
36 nominations be closed.
37
38 MS. YATLIN: Second.
39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion to close and
41 seconded by Eleanor. Those in favor of Ray Collins as
42 vice Chair signify by saying aye.
43
44 IN UNISON: Aye.
45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
47 sign.
48
49 (No opposing votes)
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Chair opens
2 the nomination for secretary.
3 MR. J. WALKER: I nominate Jenny.
4
5 MR. R. WALKER: Second.
6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded
8 by James and Robert Walker.
9
10 MR. MORGAN: Motion to close
11 nominations and ask for unanimous consent.
12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion to close.
14
15 MR. R. WALKER: Second.
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Robert.
18 Those in favor of Jenny as secretary signify by saying
19 aye.
20
21 IN UNISON: Aye.
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.
24
25 (No opposing votes)
26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we've moved
28 through the election and I want to recognize that Ken
29 Chase has arrived. Welcome to the meeting, Ken.
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Review and approval
32 of the minutes from our fall meeting on 4 of our
33 agenda. Did you get the minutes from our fall meeting,
34 Tim?
35
36 MR. GERVAIS: Yes, I did.
37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any comments
39 or corrections from the Council on the minutes.
40
41 MR. COLLINS: Move approval of adoption
42 of the fall minutes.
43
44 MS. PELKOLA: Second.
45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny.
47 Comments. These were sent out quite a while back for
48 Council review.
49
50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing no further
2 comments on the minutes, those in favor of adoption of
3 the minutes from the fall meeting in Aniak signify by
4 saying aye.

5
6 IN UNISON: Aye.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
9 sign.

10
11 (No opposing votes)

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the minutes are
14 approved. So Council membership reports. We'll go
15 around the room and the Council can enumerate any
16 concerns that they may have for this meeting and for
17 fish and wildlife management under the Federal system.
18 Eleanor.

19
20 MS. YATLIN: One was the winter moose
21 hunt in Huslia. Actually two people called me up and
22 said they would like -- I really don't know what the
23 office in Galena, Koyukuk/Nowitna office, what they're
24 proposing, but I was thinking that the feedback I got
25 was they would like to see it in mid March rather than
26 mid April if they -- they would prefer -- they were
27 talking mid April, I believe.

28
29 The other concern was some residents in
30 Huslia asked me to get some information on how to
31 manage more our Federal subsistence and whatnot at the
32 tribal level or village level. I was asked to get more
33 information on that and input, I guess, and that was
34 from several different residents in Huslia.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So your residents
37 are requesting more tribal consultation from the Refuge
38 itself? More interactive with the tribal council?

39
40 MS. YATLIN: Yeah. Because I do call
41 them. I call them before I come to this meeting. I
42 announced that we are going to have our WIRAC
43 meeting.....

44
45 MR. VENT: Hello.

46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Stand by. You're
48 online there Darrell. You're wanting to say something,
49 but Eleanor is still talking. I will take your comment
50 right after Eleanor is finished.

1 MR. VENT: Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Continue, Eleanor.

4

5 MS. YATLIN: Yeah, I do call people and
6 ask for their input. That was two of the concerns.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I appreciate
9 those concerns. Darrell Vent from Huslia is on the
10 line and he's wanting to make a comment interspersed
11 with your particular line of thought. Go ahead,
12 Darrell.

13

14 MR. VENT: Good morning, Chairman. I
15 had one comment on that moose hunt, the winter hunt.
16 The reason that a lot of people use that moose hunt for
17 in the winter is we need to get the sinew, romain (ph)
18 for snowshoes, sleighs. We can't use the fall because
19 the moose is too thick, the moose hide, so we kind of
20 depend on that moose hunt, you know, to make the romain
21 for the sleighs and snowshoes. So we're grateful that
22 we get, you know, the five moose, but we're kind of
23 wondering about -- they've got the bag limit at 5 cows
24 and 5 bulls, but we don't normally use bulls in the
25 winter. So I guess the wording on that I'd have to
26 look into maybe for the resolution on that.

27

28 Considering our natural resource, I'm
29 glad Eleanor brought that up. We're looking into trying
30 to find ways to get ourselves more involved in the
31 Federal process compared to some of the issues, the
32 problems that we have with the State right now. We're
33 trying to get more involved on the tribal level. I
34 thank her for her comments.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: On our agenda here
37 is the tribal consultation process, so you should be
38 listening for that when that's presented. The response
39 to the moose hunt issue is the data from the fall
40 survey in November with the State and Koyukuk/Nowitna
41 Refuge show that the cow moose numbers for the Huslia
42 Flats had gone down. So the Federal Subsistence Board
43 has delegated the authority to the Advisory Committees
44 and the RAC Chair to review the data.

45

46 If the cow population goes down, then
47 it's understood at the Federal Board level -- there was
48 a new regulation passed in 2010 to the effect if the
49 cow level goes down, then it's not biologically
50 supported to have a cow harvest. The fallback was this

1 April bull hunt and the reason it's an April hunt is
2 because the State is very reluctant to see any kind of
3 mistake in take of cows in March. Bulls don't start
4 actually growing antler until April, so that's why
5 there's -- it's either no April hunt or no moose hunt
6 at all.

7

8 So there's the option of -- right now
9 the cow numbers have fallen off, so we can't have the
10 March cow hunt with any kind of cow quota, five cows.
11 If we want a mid March bull hunt, the State is very
12 non-supportive of any winter hunts let alone a mistaken
13 cow and people can be prosecuted even under the Federal
14 regulations. So now we have this fallback hunt from
15 April 10th to April 15th when bulls actually have
16 antlers. Just has to be showing antler. But that's
17 the reason. So that's all we have right now in
18 regulation.

19

20 I don't think that we could actually
21 get a proposal passed. The State and Federal
22 Subsistence Board -- the State Board doesn't want to
23 have any winter hunts in the Koyukuk Controlled Use
24 Area and the Federal Subsistence Board doesn't want to
25 see any cow harvest if the population is falling. That
26 can't be biologically supported. Those are the reasons
27 why we're kind of stuck with having this bull hunt or
28 no hunt. I just wanted to explain that on the record.

29

30 Did you understand all that, Darrell?

31

32 MR. VENT: Can I make a comment?

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

35

36 MR. VENT: Okay. You know, the reason
37 they wouldn't let that State Board of Game, the Fish
38 and Game meeting, one of the comments that he was
39 talking of is that, you know, our cow count is low.
40 Well, I mentioned to him, you know, we are in a vast
41 area here. He takes a lot of the information from down
42 around the Dulbi Slough area and when we look up into
43 our area, around the Dulbi and the Huslia River area,
44 the Treat Island area, our people see the count
45 different, you know. We go down that way, we hardly
46 see tracks down there before the Dulbi Slough because
47 that place is overhunted. But then, you know, it
48 reflects onto our area, which is around Huslia, where
49 we have a high cow count, you know.

50

1 So his biological data and what our
2 elders are telling us are two different stories. So
3 you can see where my point comes from is that, you
4 know, we have our data, they have their data and a lot
5 of times our data is overruled by their data.

6
7 We would like to be more involved in
8 this process concerning what our elders tell us and
9 what the State is telling us are two different things.
10 A lot of times we have to abide by their law, but, you
11 know, that makes us go out and do some illegal hunting
12 because they need that moose. So it's an issue I think
13 you need to start learning more about the Federal
14 bosses. Eleanor's comment about that, I support that.
15 Okay, thank you.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks Darrell. I
18 do see that the Koyukuk/Nowitna Refuge needs to go to
19 Huslia, bring the biological data and how the
20 biological data is actually obtained and I would
21 encourage the Koyukuk/Nowitna to take people on the
22 surveys -- haven't you flown on some of that survey
23 stuff, Pollock?

24
25 MR. SIMON: Yes.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So other refuges
28 will take people out and so explain how the biological
29 data is, but the reality is the Federal Subsistence
30 Board and the Board of Game look at how these
31 scientific analysis -- you know, they've got all these
32 little squares and they fly intensively and they count
33 all the moose and this is how the data is obtained.
34 Currently last fall the cow numbers on the Huslia Flats
35 were down, so I do feel that the Refuge needs to enter
36 into a discussion with the tribes and I don't see
37 anybody here from Koyukuk/Nowitna, but you can bring
38 that back to them, Vince, since you're a subsistence
39 coordinator.

40
41 MR. MATHEWS: They'll be here at 10:00.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So we'll make
44 sure they're aware of that. So that was Eleanor's
45 comments. Carl, do you have concerns.

46
47 MR. MORGAN: I was looking at the
48 October 11 comments that I made at that time and I
49 sound like a broken record. The same comments that I
50 made then are about the same. It seemed like the Tier

1 II moose hunt seems to be working better and moose are
2 coming back. However, like most of the state, we've
3 got a record number of snow, so I think our calf
4 survival is going to be -- we're going to have to pay
5 close attention to that.

6
7 My concern also with the Mulchatna
8 Caribou Herd. I heard some talk that they may close
9 that season early. So if they're already talking about
10 closing that season early, survival rate though, the
11 condition of that herd must be dismal. It's not
12 rebounding like it should be and I think they should
13 put more restrictions. I hate to say it, but we should
14 close it down to non-residents. Close the non-
15 residents out.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There are proposals
18 in the State proposals that actually do that, close the
19 non-resident hunt in Unit 19, so we'll get into those
20 proposals and I also have very serious concerns for the
21 Mulchatna Caribou Herd right now with its biological
22 health. So thanks for your comments, Carl.

23
24 MR. MORGAN: Uh-huh.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Pollock, you have
27 some comments.

28
29 MR. SIMON: Yeah, thanks, Mr. Chair.
30 The moose is pretty scarce around Allakaket area. It's
31 been that way for the last few years. It's good moose
32 though. At the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee
33 meeting approached the State for intensive management
34 maybe ten years ago and this past year it was finally
35 approved. So it's going to be a five-year project and
36 Glenn Stout of Fish and Game said he's going to start
37 collaring calves this fall or winter maybe. Check the
38 survival rates, see how they die or something like
39 that. Then the next four years shooting wolves. The
40 people of Allakaket is kind of excited about wolf
41 control that could work around Allakaket and bring the
42 moose back.

43
44 I had to go to Nushagak this fall,
45 November. They said the
46 caribous are charging through the village. I never saw
47 caribou for 10 years. That was not all. The next week
48 there was more caribous coming. At this time there's
49 plenty of meat now. No moose meat, but there's caribou
50 meat. Some of them stay behind Allakaket all winter

1 with a little fat on them, so that's good.

2

3 I have bad news that we don't get much
4 salmon due to the salmon crash. Sometimes we get
5 enough chum salmon in the spring run, but fall time
6 chum run is not that good. The king salmon run is
7 pretty poor the last few years.

8

9 It's kind of tough. The moose
10 population way down and no salmon and food prices in
11 stores really high, gas prices too high and trapping is
12 poor, but things might get better. We might get our
13 moose back due to wolf control and hope the salmons
14 come back.

15 I'm glad to be here, my first time in
16 McGrath. I've been on this board the first three years
17 it was formed, but never had a meeting in McGrath. I
18 met Ray. He lived here for many years.

19

20 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock.
23 Pollock is talking about the proposal to have an
24 intensive management, micro intensive management around
25 Allakaket. That's a proposal in the State proposal
26 packet. The State has drawn up the intensive
27 management program, but the Board of Game has to
28 approve it. So it's very necessary that we get local
29 people from Allakaket. It would be nice if Tanana
30 Chiefs would send some delegates to the Board of Game
31 meeting. I contacted Orville Huntington at TCC to try
32 and get some funding to get attendance to support that.
33 There is going to be a large opposition at the Board of
34 Game process, so there's going to be a need for
35 delegates, but it's not actually past the Board of
36 Game.

37

38 Go ahead, Carl -- correction, Ray.

39

40 MR. COLLINS: I'll be attending the
41 InterAgency meeting on fisheries at the end of March
42 here. It's really important we stay on top of that
43 because the escapement goals weren't met on Kuskokwim
44 too, so I hope we don't get in dire straits like you
45 have on the Yukon on the king salmon. There's also a
46 fisheries meeting down in Bethel going on this week and
47 I think maybe Carl and some other people are going to
48 be down there. They had window closures last year and
49 it did let more fish come upriver and I'm hoping that
50 they will buy into that again and allow those windows

1 to get fish upriver because I think it was proven as a
2 good move. We're going to be on the rebuilding process
3 on the Kuskokwim too on kings.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. The WIRAC has
6 concentrated quite a bit of effort on the Yukon, but we
7 need to really -- I was thinking we really need to
8 start thinking about the king salmon decline on the
9 Kuskokwim River. The AVCP state of the salmon meeting
10 next week, the 6th, I think, of March or later this
11 week I guess that would be. We need to have a delegate
12 down there, so we'll have to try to think about
13 appointing a person to attend that meeting. It's a
14 very important meeting and they're going to make two
15 resolutions, one for the Kuskokwim and one for the
16 Yukon River.

17

18 Robert.

19

20 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21 I sat in on a GASH meeting we had in Anvik with Bo and
22 Chairman Ken. I think Mr. Peirce was there also. So I
23 kind of like sat in and listened there. They wanted a
24 report on the fall meeting we had down in Aniak about
25 the customary trade with the Kuskokwim and I told them
26 that's what I knew. I didn't know what happened after
27 that because if it did go before the Federal Board of
28 Game here did they pass it, did they leave it as it is
29 or what. It was an interesting meeting. I sat down
30 and listened. I took part in some of the activities or
31 some of the agenda items that GASH had there. I did
32 find it very interesting to sit and listen to their
33 meeting. It's been a long time since I've been to a
34 meeting. Thanks for inviting me to that one.

35

36 The February/March hunt here, questions
37 from Holy Cross. I told them -- I said same as last
38 year. There's no difference. If you don't turn your
39 permit in after the season is over, you probably
40 wouldn't get one next year. I don't know how many
41 moose have been taken. I guess Bo could give a report
42 on that later on.

43

44 The fisheries are going to be discussed
45 here later what we're going to do about the windows.
46 We'll talk about that later. Just pretty much here the
47 same. We're having problems with the salmon. We'd
48 like to have another report on our freshwater fish too
49 because I think they're doing a proposal for the
50 portion below Holy Cross, the Paimiut area for pike

1 because a lot of people from the Kuskokwim are coming
2 over and taking 20 and 30 pike at a time. There's 10
3 or 12 sleds over there fishing through the ice. It's a
4 question of when it's going to be cut off or run out.
5 No disrespect to them because they don't throw them
6 away, they eat them. So it would have to be a proposal
7 to adjust or have a regulation saying how many you can
8 have or how many can you catch per day. Some of them
9 stay for like a week over there in tents fishing. This
10 is a pretty interesting issue here that will be coming
11 up here.

12

13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Robert.
16 Under Federal subsistence regulations there has to be a
17 customary and traditional use determination and this
18 Council may want to look at C&T for pike as one way to
19 address customary and traditional use, but we may be
20 back to the moose issue all over again. I just wanted
21 to point that out that Federal regs have customary and
22 traditional use of fisheries.

23

24 MR. R. WALKER: Jack, I guess when the
25 chairman of the GASH board makes his report you can
26 also emphasize what they're doing now.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We'll
29 probably look at that a little further. James.

30

31 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
32 I just have a couple comments. One is that we, like
33 everywhere else in the state, is having a snow issue
34 problem. In looking at and hearing some of the reports
35 from the locals there that they're seeing a lot of
36 calves are dying due to snow conditions. I'm curious
37 to see if the Innoko Refuge has any figures at all
38 pertaining to predator kills versus starvation kills.
39 Again, I'd like to hear what Ken has to say as far as
40 GASH is concerned to see what the local representatives
41 have to say regarding the moose seasons and fishing
42 seasons.

43

44 That's all I have.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, James.
47 Jenny.

48

49 MS. PELKOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
50 can't remember if it was last weekend or the weekend

1 before they had that YRDFA meeting in Galena. First
2 time I did attend one I just went on my own. I really
3 learned a lot from them. They talked about pulse
4 closures and windows. It was very interesting. It was
5 good to have all those people there. A lot of them are
6 still concerned about windows versus pulse, so I'm glad
7 we're going to be discussing that later. I did go to a
8 meeting in Anchorage regarding that. Of course it was
9 a split decision, but we all tried to come to a
10 consensus on what will work on the Yukon all the way to
11 Canada. It's still bouncing around and hopefully one
12 day we can settle on that.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks Jenny. Tim.

17

18 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
19 sent an email through Melinda to YK Delta RAC.
20 Unfortunately I got it there halfway through their
21 meeting and I wanted to start a discussion where they
22 could look at some alternate harvest techniques or
23 timing techniques to minimize the negative impact on
24 the king salmon bycatch during their commercial chum
25 fishery and I didn't hear anything back on that, so I
26 don't know if it was too late.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim, Melinda is
29 trying to answer that question. Go ahead, Melinda.

30

31 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, Tim. When the
32 email came, the meeting had already ended for the
33 evening, but the chair has reassured me that it's going
34 to be passed along.

35

36 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. Thank you. And
37 then the only other issue I had is I wanted to discuss
38 with Nowitna representatives when they come in -- the
39 Fish and Wildlife Service just went through a -- I
40 don't know what the correct term is. They went through
41 a cycle where commercial guides bid on the guiding
42 commissions for the refuges and affected several
43 refuges around the state, but in their scoring system
44 for the awarding of the areas they really didn't have
45 very much interaction with the local communities as far
46 as how they're staying out of subsistence areas, how
47 much meat is ending up in the communities and how much
48 local hire is coming from the local communities, so at
49 the appropriate time I'd like to talk it over with the
50 Refuge representatives. That's all I have for now.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Tim,
2 Koyukuk/Nowitna will be here and make an agency report
3 and you can bring that up when they're here. There are
4 some flaws in the Federal Refuge guide selection
5 process and I've got some issues with some of -- the
6 sale of guide permits. Once a qualified guide gets a
7 permit they can actually sell it and that can be to
8 someone who's not very qualified, so I have some
9 problems with some of these guide use permits. So
10 we'll talk about that with Koyukuk/Nowitna about what
11 their flow of resource through the communities.

12
13 I will give my Chair's report, which is
14 basically my comments as a Council member. I attended
15 the Federal Subsistence Board meeting in mid January.
16 Again, I very much dislike traveling in extremely cold
17 weather when it was 60 below zero trying to get to a
18 meeting and leaving my family to fend for themselves.
19 I continuously try to tell the Federal Subsistence
20 Board that they're out of sync with reality.

21
22 Robert brought up what happened to the
23 customary and traditional use proposal for 21E. Well,
24 that proposal is tabled until the Yukon Delta RAC -- it
25 got dropped off of their agenda in the fall, so they
26 didn't actually look at that and they did just the
27 other day. Then Seward Pen has to look at it also.
28 The Federal Subsistence Board will take action on that.
29 When will that be, at this meeting in Southeast,
30 Melinda?

31
32 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, Jack, that's
33 correct. They're going to be taking this issue up.
34 The Board will be meeting in Juneau the week of March
35 21st and that will be available by teleconference.
36 I'll be sure to send out that information for anybody
37 who would like to listen in on the discussion.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would encourage --
40 that Federal Subsistence Board agenda should be
41 disseminated to the RAC members and also to the
42 communities in that area that will be affected. The
43 GASH communities and the Kuskokwim communities that
44 would be eligible. With the call-in number and
45 passcode so people can call in and comment. I will try
46 to be on that teleconference myself on proposal 10-69,
47 the customary and traditional use determination for
48 moose in the lower portion of 21E.

49
50 Going back to the Federal Subsistence

1 Board meeting, several of our proposals of the position
2 of the Western Interior Council were on the consent
3 agenda. The ones that weren't on the consent agenda
4 the Board adopted the position of the Western Interior
5 Council, so we had basically 100 percent success, which
6 can me kind of a positive thing. The Federal
7 Subsistence Board seems to be more willing to listen to
8 the Regional Advisory Councils since the DOI review
9 process. So they seem to be deferring to the Councils
10 a little more than they were.

11
12 I also attended the Koyukuk River
13 Advisory Committee meeting and my co-chair was not
14 available, so I chaired the meeting. Pollock was on
15 the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee and we went
16 through the State proposals and took positions on the
17 ones that affected the Koyukuk River, but not expansive
18 to the McGrath area. This Council will have to look at
19 some of the McGrath area proposals.

20
21 I've been dialoguing with Steve Hayes
22 on the test fisheries. I feel as just as a person, not
23 as the RAC Chair, I feel that the use of 8.5 inch
24 gillnet on the Lower Yukon River and test fisheries
25 takes a very large percentage of large females. When
26 everybody else is on conservation measures using 7.5-
27 inch gear, I can see -- they make valid reasons for
28 getting some indices, but I don't feel that taking
29 1,500 to 4,000 king salmon, cream of the crop,
30 basically all the largest, fattest most productive
31 females, should be continuing. I feel that they need
32 to look at modulation of that indices. So that's
33 something I've been doing for the past two weeks. Kind
34 of going around and around, kind of leveraging, kind of
35 pushing them towards looking at this issue and I'm
36 happy to hear that the Federal Fish and Wildlife has
37 heard this and looking at that.

38
39 We have about 30 inches of snow where I
40 live in the Brooks Range. There's quite a few caribou
41 on the south slope of the Brooks Range, like Pollock
42 sees there by Allakaket. Those are Western Arctic
43 where he's at, but we're getting Central Arctic
44 caribou. So those caribou get around the Dalton
45 Highway and a truck went right through the herd of
46 caribou about three days ago and killed seven at one
47 whack. Literally whack. So there are quite a few
48 caribou on the south slope. The snow is a little hard
49 and they're a grazer, so they've got to dig down
50 through that snow. So they're not in especially really

1 good condition, so I won't be taking any caribou until
2 they show up -- until they start getting a little
3 fatter towards April.

4
5 I'm still concerned about the Dalton
6 Highway dall sheep. Harvest by hunting guides and the
7 Bureau of Land Management's issuance of lots of permits
8 for hunters for dall sheep, when they never used to
9 issue any dall sheep guided hunter permits inside the
10 Dalton Highway corridor except for the last two years
11 and last year they issued up to 17 permits and some of
12 the guides aren't reporting their take on BLM lands.
13 They're on the internet. They show sheep that are
14 actually taken on the Dalton Highway corridor and
15 they're reporting zero.

16
17 So I feel they have a huge enforcement
18 problem. I pointed out to their enforcement people a
19 certain individual that's violating the permit process.
20 They basically sort of cover up their activities. I
21 think BLM doesn't have enough personnel. There's one
22 trooper in Coldfoot and he has a 73,000 square mile
23 coverage area and he's just one guy and he's got
24 thousands of hunters coming to hunt caribou on the
25 Dalton Highway. He can't keep track of all this stuff.
26 So BLM is talking about kicking in a little bit of
27 enforcement. I'm trying to get the number of permits
28 reduced.

29
30 There's a proposal in the State
31 proposal book that actually would limit the number of
32 guided hunters to only four non-resident hunters in the
33 Dalton Highway corridor in Unit 24A.

34
35 I'm still very concerned about the
36 Mulchatna Caribou Herd. There was a proposal that we
37 kind of missed in the Federal proposals regarding the
38 Mulchatna Caribou Herd. The data shows that there's
39 only 16, 17 bulls per 100 cows when that herd got shot
40 out, shot out to 14 bulls per 100 cows, with one large
41 bull in 2007. There was only one bull ratio of one
42 large bull per 100 cows.

43
44 The State likes to display it in
45 percentages of the herd, but the reality is there
46 weren't any big bulls, so that is a real problem. I'm
47 real concerned about the younger bulls that are
48 breeding and rut stressing and still having high
49 mortalities. I do not feel that there should be any
50 targeting of large bulls by non-resident hunters or any

1 hunters. The large bulls, we have none to give, zero
2 to give right now. So I'm real concerned about the
3 Mulchatna Caribou Herd. There are some proposals in
4 the State proposal book.

5
6 So that would be my concerns at this
7 point. We're about quarter to 10:00. How is everybody
8 feeling? A little short break? Okay, we'll take about
9 a five-minute break.

10
11 (Off record)

12
13 (On record)

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to bring
16 the meeting back to order again as soon as the RAC
17 members take their seats. We've got a fairly full
18 agenda today, so we'll take a dinner break and then we
19 may have to do some cleanup work after dinner, so we'll
20 try and move as much agenda as we can today so we don't
21 have to have an all night meeting. The Koyukuk River
22 Advisory Committee will meet -- I've gone all the way
23 to 11:00 o'clock at night. We'd prefer not to do that,
24 so we've got to keep on track here.

25
26 We've done the Chair's Report. The
27 .805(c) report. Melinda.

28
29 MS. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chair. The .805(c)
30 report has gone through review. It hasn't been
31 physically signed by Tim yet, but I did leave a copy of
32 the final draft in your blue folder, left-hand side,
33 first letter. So it's gone through all the leadership
34 at OSM for a thumbs up, it just hasn't gotten to Tim
35 for a physical signature quite yet.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that's right
38 side?

39
40 MS. HERNANDEZ: Left side.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So we.....

43
44 MS. HERNANDEZ: It starts with all the
45 statewide proposals. The one specific to Western are
46 there towards the end as well as the crossover
47 proposals.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we need to adopt
50 this annual report. That would be on your left side,

1 second one back. We're looking at the .805(c) letter
2 and this is strictly -- this needs the signature of the
3 Chair of the Federal Subsistence Board. I want to
4 recognize -- we've got a whole bunch of people
5 arriving. I see Pat Pourchot and Pat Pourchot is your
6 special assistant to the Secretary of Interior for
7 Alaska. Pat Pourchot would be over all of the
8 Department of Interior agencies; Fish and Wildlife,
9 BLM, Park Service. Those would be the three agencies.
10 It's quite a land mass. So Pat is going to be here at
11 our meeting today and watching how the Council works.

12

13 We have Shelly Jacobson over here on
14 the right from Bureau of Land Management. You're
15 assistant district manager?

16

17 MS. JACOBSON: I'm out of that now.
18 I'm back to being the field manager for Central Yukon
19 Field Office.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I see Jason
22 Hale over here from Yukon River Drainage Fisheries
23 Association. I see Dave Mills back here from National
24 Park Service Regional Office. Anybody else? Oh,
25 Merben from Bureau of Land Management biologist for
26 Central Yukon Field Office. I wanted to introduce
27 those.

28

29 Any comments on the .805(c) letter from
30 the Council. There's a clicking noise on the phone.
31 Is somebody doing something? Who's all on the
32 conference call? Are you there, Tim?

33

34 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, I'm here. I'm
35 mostly on mute though.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I hear a
38 bunch of clicking. So these are Federal Subsistence
39 Board actions basically just for informational for the
40 RAC. No comments on that?

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're moving down
45 to the Committee reports. Those would be -- what would
46 be the various committees that have taken actions,
47 Melinda? Those would be like the Customary Trade
48 Committee and various ones like that?

49

50 MS. HERNANDEZ: I think those would be

1 committees that are formed on the Council. Like if we
2 had some sort of a subcommittee. I don't think we have
3 any of those right now that I know of.

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Kuskokwim Salmon
6 Committee, the Whitefish.....

7
8 MR. COLLINS: No, that's a working
9 group.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, those are the
12 working groups?

13
14 MR. COLLINS: Well, the Kuskokwim River
15 is a working group.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any other
18 committees. Anybody on a committee?

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm transposing
23 working groups. Go ahead, Robert.

24
25 MR. R. WALKER: Josh, our working group
26 for the 21E and a portion of 21A, we're not active
27 anymore, the moose management?

28
29 MR. PEIRCE: (Shakes head negatively)

30
31 MR. R. WALKER: Is that gone completely
32 or just hanging out there?

33
34 MR. PEIRCE: No, I guess my
35 understanding of it is that working group finished its
36 job. The moose Management Plan was published in 2006,
37 I think. So at some point when we feel it needs to be
38 reviewed again, that might be when that group got
39 revived.

40
41 MR. R. WALKER: Okay.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Josh. We're
44 looking at the agenda here. E is working group
45 reports, which I was transposing to committees. Do you
46 have a working group report, Ray?

47
48 MR. COLLINS: Well, I just commented on
49 that. They'll have a spring meeting coming up, which
50 I'll attend. The interagency meeting. Then the

1 working group will meet at the end of that meeting in
2 March. We'll be looking at what the forecasts are for
3 this summer and they'll be reporting on their studies
4 that they were looking at over the winter of
5 information that was gathered last summer. They'll be
6 reporting on that and I'll be attending that.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jenny, was that
9 Whitefish Working Group working anymore?

10
11 MS. PELKOLA: I just got a report from
12 them, but we haven't had any meetings since a long time
13 ago.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are there any other
16 working groups, Melinda, for this Council?

17
18 MS. HERNANDEZ: I don't believe so. I
19 think all of the reports that you gave on your
20 community concerns and the ones that have been
21 discussed are all the ones.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any Council
24 discussion on the working groups, need for working
25 groups.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None. We'll move on
30 in the agenda. So we're at Action Item 8, this tribal
31 consultation policy. Who is going to give the
32 presentation on that? David.

33
34 DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. Council
35 members. David Jenkins with the Office of Subsistence
36 Management. If you look at Page 15 of your meeting
37 booklet, this is the beginning of the briefing policy.
38 You can see who the working group members are on that
39 first page. This essentially sets out the steps that
40 the working group has taken as it has developed the
41 policy. It used to be called the protocol and it
42 starts on Page 18, the draft policy. There are a
43 couple points I'd like to point out that are
44 significant here.

45
46 This tribal consultation policy flows
47 from Executive Order 13175 from November of 2000 and
48 also from the more recent Presidential Memorandum of
49 November 5, 2009. The Federal Subsistence Board is in
50 the process of developing government-to-government

1 tribal consultation policies and protocols. The Board
2 is intending to take into consideration tribes concerns
3 brought forth through the consultation process before
4 making final decisions. So this is a policy that's
5 attempting to set out and it's in development, this
6 policy, to set out tribal consultation policies and
7 protocols. It's intended, of course, to consult under
8 Title VIII of ANILCA and to deal with subsistence
9 matters that the Board has authority over.

10

11 The goals of the policy are on Page 19.
12 There are seven goals. Let me just briefly mention
13 what they are. Create and maintain effective
14 relationships with Federally recognized tribes, to
15 establish meaningful and timely opportunities for
16 government-to-government consultation, to be responsive
17 to requests from Federally recognized tribes to engage
18 in consultation, to work with Federally recognized
19 tribes to improve communication, outreach and
20 education, to acknowledge, respect and use traditional
21 ecological knowledge, to recognize the importance of
22 coordination and consultation and, finally, to
23 integrate tribal input effectively into the decision-
24 making process. So those are the seven basic goals of
25 this draft policy.

26

27 What you're asked to do at this point
28 is to provide any further input for the working group
29 to consider as it continues to develop this policy of
30 tribal government-to-government consultation.

31

32 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, David. Any
35 Council member comments. Eleanor.

36

37 MS. YATLIN: My name is Eleanor Yatlin.
38 Thank you, Mr. Chair. I know they have these seven
39 goals, but, you know, with our traditional values and
40 what was handed down for thousands of years to us about
41 caring for the land and animals and environment and
42 respect to animals and the land that we live on in
43 order for us to sustain the food and the fish -- the
44 fish and the animals that we live off of.

45

46 The reason I'm bringing this up is
47 because I like this tribal consultation because I think
48 we need more of this. One of the things I mentioned to
49 Jack earlier is when we used to live in Bettles, the
50 people that come through Bettles and Evansville with

1 their catches of caribou, we do not as Native people
2 that live off the land drag four caribou just behind a
3 snowmachine like that and leave the blood and caribou
4 hair all over the place for other people to step on.
5 That's really a lack of respect.

6

7 I just wanted to mention that because
8 maybe with that in mind and our management we'll have
9 some of the tribal input into the management of our
10 fish and game.

11

12 Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate those
15 comments, Eleanor. Any other comments on the tribal
16 consultation process. The Secretary of Interior has
17 requested the Department of Interior and the Federal
18 Subsistence Management move towards these various goals
19 with the various entities that commented.

20

21 MR. GERVAIS: I have a question.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

24

25 MR. GERVAIS: I couldn't quite hear
26 David so well. This is regarding tribal consultation
27 between just the BLM or all the Federal agencies?

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, this is -- go
30 ahead, David, you can answer that question.

31

32 DR. JENKINS: The intention is for the
33 Federal Subsistence Board to find a protocol or policy
34 in which the Board can better consult with tribes on
35 issues that the Board has authority over. So it's all
36 the issues that the Board has authority over and it's
37 an attempt to get into a direct government-to-
38 government consultation process. So, Tim, this is the
39 initial draft policy that points us in that direction.
40 It's still a working draft and the work group will take
41 back recommendations from the various RACs on how to
42 improve this draft and we'll continue working toward
43 that end.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Could you hear him
46 well enough, Tim. Tim. You're still on mute.

47

48 MR. GERVAIS: My comment was going to
49 be at least in one instance with the North Pacific
50 Management Council I don't see where their community or

1 rural outreach program is being aggressive enough in
2 engaging the tribes, but I don't know if that's falling
3 under this program that you're talking about and I'd
4 like to see at least that sector have more dialogue
5 with North Pacific Fisheries Management Council
6 communicating what's going on with the bycatch issues
7 in particular.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My comment to that
10 would be that I feel that the tribal consultation
11 process through the Department of Interior and the
12 Agricultural Department can vector communication to the
13 North Pacific Fisheries Management Council and that
14 would be my impression. Could that occur, Pat, do you
15 think? Come up to the mic. I'll have Pat Pourchot
16 come up. This gets into a real high level, so Pat
17 Pourchot, special assistant to the Interior Secretary
18 will comment.

19

20 (Laughter)

21

22 MR. POURCHOT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
23 don't know how high level I'm going to respond to, but
24 I think the question was a real good one. The North
25 Pacific Fishery Management Council, of course, is
26 located within the Department of Commerce. They too
27 though are under the same presidential order to develop
28 a tribal consultation policy. That's not the policy
29 before you, but it would presumably track the same
30 procedure and the same method. This, of course, is
31 governing -- is a piece of a larger Department of
32 Interior tribal consultation.

33

34 The questioner raises a question that's
35 been raised before, is whether or not the North Pacific
36 Fishery Management Council is, indeed, following this
37 larger call under an executive order for tribal
38 consultation. I think it's worthy of pursuit. In the
39 Secretary's review of the Subsistence Program, there
40 was some recommendation that the Secretaries of
41 Interior and Agriculture would look to the Federal
42 Subsistence Board and RACs for other actions that
43 affect subsistence in Alaska that fall perhaps outside
44 of the Department of Interior or the Federal
45 Subsistence Board purview and he and the Secretary of
46 Agriculture would be open for suggestions as to are
47 there other avenues of communication that should go to,
48 perhaps in this case, other departments of the Federal
49 government.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. That's
2 very important information. Vince, you've got a
3 comment.

4
5 MR. MATHEWS: I participated in.....

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Vince Mathews.

8
9 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Vince Mathews,
10 subsistence coordinator for Arctic, Kanuti and Yukon
11 Flats. I participated in the North Pacific Fishery
12 Management Council teleconference for comments. This
13 question came up and I'm straining my brain to remember
14 the response, but based on my memory their staff
15 indicated they're not bound to tribal consultation, but
16 they are doing outreach through the regional council
17 meetings. So I can call Diana Stram to find out if we
18 want to get a clear answer on that, but that did come
19 up from either Nome or a Lower Yukon village on that
20 specific question. So I can check with Diana if I can
21 get her on the phone during lunch or something to see.
22 By memory, they said they were not bound to tribal
23 consultation, but were outreaching through the RACs.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Interior
26 Department feels that they are under the Presidential
27 Order, so I feel that this Council should transmit a
28 letter to the Federal Subsistence Board -- through the
29 Federal Subsistence Board to the Department of Interior
30 to encourage the Department of Commerce NPFMC to enter
31 into review of the tribal consultation policy that's
32 been drafted and to get better communications on issues
33 that are affecting tribal entities in Alaska.

34
35 Would that be warranted? How do you
36 feel about that, Tim? You brought the issue up.

37
38 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, I think that's real
39 good. I think what Vince's comment highlights is that
40 in my opinion North Pacific Fishery Management Council
41 is mostly interested in only dealing with their
42 industry groups and the outreach they're doing into
43 rural communities, into the tribes, is more token than
44 meaningful and I'd like to see -- I think they could
45 draft better ocean's policy if they do include some
46 input from rural Alaska and from tribal Alaska because
47 what's going on in the maritime environment is
48 definitely affecting a lot of people in the river
49 system.

50

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Tim. Is
4 there an action required by the Council on this draft
5 policy, a motion to endorse the draft policy?

6

7 DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. What the
8 Council is asked to do is provide some input or
9 guidance or suggestions for improving the policy if, in
10 fact, you have any.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I have a --
13 in our annual report topics after contemplating this
14 tribal consultation I do feel that on our annual
15 report, it's issue one that we'll submit to the Federal
16 Subsistence Board and it's in our annual report that
17 we'll go over. There's need for certain slight changes
18 in how regulations are published and when the Federal
19 Subsistence Board meets and the RACs so that tribes can
20 actually have a paradigm shift to where the tribal
21 councils are fishing and hunting in the fall cycle and
22 they cannot participate in active participation with
23 the Regional Councils because they're busy doing
24 subsistence work. The Federal Subsistence Board and
25 the whole process is stuck out of whack, so we're not
26 meshing with the seasonal rounds.

27

28 I would like to at some point when we
29 review our annual report I would like to submit this
30 with the Council's approval these changes that are
31 enumerated in our annual report issue one entitled
32 meeting windows. Would it be good to review that right
33 now, David?

34

35 DR. JENKINS: If you feel it
36 appropriate, sure.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: These directly
39 affect the tribal consultation process. It also
40 directly affects the workings of the Regional Councils
41 and the abilities of the Councils to work with OSM
42 Staff effectively. After thinking about this issue
43 quite a bit and attending Federal Subsistence Board
44 meetings and seeing what the flaws are for January
45 meetings, I've laid out these four different action
46 points in our annual report. That should be on the
47 left side of your blue folder. Second letter. So I'll
48 just read it. It's real brief.

49

50 The meeting windows for the Board and

1 Regional Advisory Councils needs to be
2 adjusted to better suit the needs of
3 subsistence users schedules that
4 revolve around seasonal conditions.
5 One, synchronizing the publication and
6 going into effect of both Federal fish
7 and game regulations. Right now the
8 fisheries regulation is published March
9 30th and that's because the Board of
10 Fish does it. Well, this isn't the
11 Board of Fish. This is a Federal
12 program that deals with fish and
13 wildlife and I feel that the
14 regulations can be published for effect
15 on July 1 as the game regulations are.
16

17 There is little valid reason for
18 publishing Federal fishing regulations
19 for implementation on April 1 through
20 March 31. Fish and Game regulations
21 should follow the same regulatory
22 cycle. This is an important step to
23 provide a user-friendly and meaningful
24 participation of rural users in the
25 Federal process.
26

27 Two, synchronizing the Federal
28 Subsistence Board in mid April after
29 the current Regional Advisory Council
30 spring windows. This avoids the overlap
31 with other meetings of the State. When
32 I was at the Federal Subsistence Board
33 meeting, we had Federal Staff running
34 back and forth between two different
35 meetings and stretching them to the
36 max. I don't like to see our Staff at
37 OSM stressed out to that degree. The
38 Federal Board meeting in mid January is
39 just not the right time because it's
40 overlapping with State and it has some
41 other flaws.
42

43 This avoids the overlap with other
44 meetings of the State, it avoids the
45 post-holiday press of OSM Staff in
46 January and it avoids the travel of RAC
47 members that leave family to fend for
48 themselves during the coldest months.
49 There were several RAC Chairs
50 complaining about that, including

1 myself. The current Board meeting
2 cycle in January overlaps with the
3 Board of Game and Board of Fish
4 meetings and this divides the attention
5 of the OSM Staff and State Staff and is
6 very counter-productive to all
7 participants. This overlap also
8 divides the attention and presence of
9 rural people who need to testify to the
10 Federal or State Boards. This change
11 would allow consistent meeting dates
12 for the Federal Subsistence Board and
13 it would avoid conflicts with the State
14 Board meetings and their Staff.

15
16 These changes allow the current fall
17 RAC meeting window late September to
18 late October to be shifted one month
19 later, late October to late November.
20 Doing this facilitates the ability of
21 rural people and tribal members to
22 engage in review of the Federal
23 proposals during a time when they are
24 not engaged in subsistence fishing and
25 hunting. Tribal members currently do
26 not have time to wrap up harvest and
27 sit down to review Federal proposals
28 and their effects.

29
30 Tribal consultation involves their
31 making informed comments to the
32 Regional Advisory Councils and to the
33 Federal Subsistence Board. The current
34 RACs fall cycle does not provide the
35 tribal councils meaningful input into
36 the Regional Advisory Councils, which
37 the RACs desire and the DOI directive
38 mandates. Nature drives how people
39 participate in subsistence as well as
40 when and if they're able to participate
41 in this process. When the tribal
42 consultation conferences were held this
43 fall only two tribes participated from
44 the +25 communities in this region.
45 One of the main reasons for this low
46 turnout was due to the fact that many
47 people were still out fishing and
48 hunting and cleaning up their camps.

49
50 So I would like that on the record in

1 the tribal consultation comments. Does the Council
2 agree with the annual report topic one and to be
3 inserted into the tribal council comments?

4

5 (Council nods affirmatively)

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see agreement by
8 the entire Council. Any further comments on the tribal
9 consultation policy.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. I
14 think you've got an earful David.

15

16 DR. JENKINS: Thank you.

17

18 (Laughter)

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So moving back into
21 our agenda. So we're in call for regulatory proposals.
22 I think Council members were aware that this is time
23 for Federal subsistence proposals to be submitted to
24 the Federal Subsistence Board and the deadline is March
25 30th. You had an issue, Tim, of bycatch in the
26 directed commercial chum fishery on the Yukon River.
27 Did you have a Federal proposal in mind when you were
28 discussing that issue?

29

30 MR. GERVAIS: Well, I'd like to get
31 some comments of other people on the Council about this
32 before I just say a proposal and stuff. In a condensed
33 form, what the issue is, there was some reported
34 approximately 4,200 king bycatch in the directed chum
35 fishery last year in the Lower River and I believe
36 there was probably another 2,000 fish unreported there
37 and then about another 4,000 that probably dropped out
38 of the 6.5-inch gear. So I feel like the real
39 mortality there was about 10,000 kings and I don't feel
40 that the Yukon systems are strong enough to support
41 that kind of bycatch and wanton waste. Well, I
42 shouldn't say wanton waste because the dropout is not
43 really wanton waste, but it's waste of the resource.

44

45 So I would like to -- I tried to start
46 this dialogue with the YK Delta people because they're
47 the ones that are down there fishing it, so they have
48 the most knowledge about it and it effects them most
49 directly. I'd like to stay away from any kind of
50 proposals that only affect certain gear type, such as

1 what happened in Board of Fish during their last cycle
2 where they just made the drift and setnet people change
3 their gear size.

4
5 So I'd like to hear if Jenny had any
6 comments from her Yukon River Working Group if they
7 discussed this particular issue on the bycatch. My
8 main issue is I'm just trying to limit the amount of
9 salmon waste we have by having that chum fishery being
10 so close to the tail end of the king run.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for those
13 comments, Tim. At their fall meeting we requested that
14 the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program investigate a
15 methodology to enumerate the incidental mortality
16 factor for chinook salmon taken in small mesh chum
17 gear, so there's no statistical guideline for managers
18 to know how many fish are actually being killed and
19 fall out of the nets. When there was discussion of
20 going to 6-inch gear, you heard all the downriver
21 people talking extensively about, oh, no, we can't fish
22 6-inch gear for kings because we'll kill all these fish
23 and there will be white fish floating down the river.
24 Yeah, there's a huge mortality factor that is not
25 recognized by Fish and Wildlife and the Alaska
26 Department of Fish and Game manager, so there's a real
27 need to get an indices about what that drop out
28 incidental harvest factor is.

29
30 I do feel it is an issue. I don't know
31 that it can be in a proposal form, but I do feel that
32 this Council can transmit a letter to the Federal
33 Subsistence Board. Well, we can put it into our annual
34 report. We have item two, 7.5-inch mesh size. We
35 could include 6-inch incidental harvest mortality -- we
36 could just title it mesh size and incidental harvest
37 mortality within the directed chum fishery. It could
38 be another add on to issue number two.

39
40 How would that be, Tim?

41
42 MR. GERVAIS: That's fine.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We could also
45 transmit a letter to the State Board of Fish that we're
46 still concerned about -- they're under call for
47 proposals, so we could transmit a letter to the State
48 Board of Fish that we're still concerned about the
49 Department does not have any scientific information for
50 incidental harvest mortality for chinook salmon outside

1 of the range of the intended fishery for directed chum
2 fishing.

3

4 So there's a real need to recognize the
5 incidental harvest mortality and the need to move away
6 from the chinook passage when they have directed chum
7 fishing and the need to develop a study by the Board of
8 Fish, direct the Department to come up with a study
9 like we were suggesting to the Federal process to
10 develop an indices of what the incidental harvest
11 mortality is using 6-inch gear.

12

13 MR. J. WALKER: Jack, I just had a
14 comment.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

17

18 MR. J. WALKER: Regarding the size, it
19 really doesn't matter. Really what it amounts to is
20 the type of gear. When you get into monofilament with
21 the finer strands and that's really what holds the king
22 there in the net. So in the old-style nets what we
23 used to have was heavy-braided twine and a lot of the
24 drop off there was -- they would drop off and swim
25 away. With the finer monofilament it holds them
26 longer.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's a good
29 comment, James. Appreciate that perspective. Do any
30 other Council members have discussion on this bycatch
31 and incidental harvest mortality? Basically it's
32 unrecognized that there are several thousand chinook
33 salmon that are actually falling off the nets in the
34 directed chum fishery and are not actually incorporated
35 into the king salmon mortality factors. So the longer
36 they fish for chums during chinook passage, the more
37 incidental harvest mortality. There's an unknown
38 number yet unrecognized. That should never be. That's
39 not scientific.

40

41 The Chair would entertain a motion to
42 send a letter to the Federal Subsistence Board -- well,
43 this will be in our annual report, but also a letter to
44 the State Board of Fish highlighting that issue. So
45 the Chair will entertain a motion to transmit a letter
46 to the State Board of Fish.

47

48 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by James.

1 MR. R. WALKER: Second.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Robert.
4 Any further discussion on that issue.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
9 the motion signify by saying aye, letter of
10 transmission to the State Board of Fish on incidental
11 harvest mortality. Signify by saying aye.
12
13 IN UNISON: Aye.
14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
16 sign.
17
18 (No opposing votes)
19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're still under
21 this agenda item A, call for Federal fisheries
22 proposals. Are there other issues that need to be
23 addressed on Federal waters for fisheries proposals
24 from the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council.
25 Any fishing issues. Go ahead, Tim.
26
27 MR. GERVAIS: I have another fishing
28 one, Jack, if it's the proper time. I don't know
29 exactly where we're at with this because I got a little
30 out of sync with what went into the Federal process and
31 what went into the State process. As far as the
32 Federal regulations are concerned, Western Interior
33 submitted a proposal during the last cycle for pulse
34 protection and that was not accepted, is that correct?
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The pulse protection
37 proposal failed. The Federal in-season manager and the
38 State in-season manager have been basically charged
39 with assuring escapement and subsistence needs and so
40 those Boards felt those managers had the authority to
41 protect various portions of pulse to assure escapement
42 of chinook salmon onto the ground and so there was no
43 -- our position is not in regulation right now.
44
45 You had further comments?
46
47 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah. I would encourage
48 the Council to pass a proposal that just basically had
49 similar language we had put in before with pulse
50 protection. First pulse protection and just have the

1 regulation -- I think the last time we put it in for
2 some extended period of time, like 6 years, but just
3 amend our former language to be like two years. I feel
4 like if they're still going to be -- we're still going
5 to be using gillnet gear on the Yukon, which I'm okay
6 with, I still feel like we need to be able to get full
7 age class spectrum into the spawning grounds and I feel
8 like that pulse protection is the best way to do it. I
9 feel like in the State process we have all the RACs on
10 board with that and we just have some poor leadership
11 in the committee cycle that got us over into the 7.5-
12 inch mesh issue and got away from that pulse protection
13 issue. I feel like we can get this consensus from
14 lower, middle and upper river on this pulse protection
15 and I would encourage this Council to go ahead and
16 submit a proposal similar to what we had last time, but
17 just with a two-year sunset on it.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jason Hale is here.
20 They had a big YRDFA meeting down in Galena and they've
21 probably got some enlightenment on this aspect. Go
22 ahead, Jason.

23

24 MR. HALE: Yeah, thanks. Jason Hale,
25 Yukon River Drainage Fisheries Association. We did
26 have a nifty little riverwide meeting in Galena a
27 couple weeks ago. We also had a pretty nice little
28 meeting in January. You guys sent a representative,
29 Jenny, and that was working on a revamp of the King
30 Salmon Management Plan through the Board of Fish. So
31 we're in the middle of a one-year effort to do that, to
32 revamp it.

33

34 Basically right now the current plan is
35 geared for a different fishery. It's geared for a
36 fishery where there are a lot of fish. It wasn't
37 geared lower for lack of need when it was developed,
38 but now we're thinking that it needs to be. The
39 biggest thing of all the recommendations that came out
40 of that meeting was some sort of formalized pulse
41 protection. It was the only topic that everybody
42 agreed on at that meeting. That was representatives
43 from all three RACs, all three of the intertribal
44 groups who operate on the Yukon and the Yukon River
45 Panel and YRDFA. All those folks said, yeah, pulse
46 protection in some form needs to be formalized.

47

48 So at the YRDFA annual meeting a couple
49 weeks ago the YRDFA board agreed with that and then
50 last week at YK RAC they also agreed with that and got

1 a little more specific about how it should be
2 implemented. Whenever I give my update today I'm
3 hoping to go over all the different options that were
4 discussed and have you guys weigh in on that issue
5 specifically and a few more. Getting kind of specific
6 about how it should be put into place. So a resolution
7 along with that would probably be appropriate, but I
8 just wanted to let you know that's something we're
9 working on and I'm hoping to talk to you guys about
10 today.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, I appreciate
13 that. So it's premature to take any action at this
14 point until we've reviewed all of the various aspects
15 on the King Salmon Management Plan and the YRDFA
16 resolution, Tim. So we'll look into that a little
17 further. Your concern is felt by myself also on pulse
18 protection.

19
20 Does any other Council members have any
21 proposals that they would like to be submitted from the
22 Western Interior Council for fisheries.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see none.
27 Nobody's coming forward with any fisheries proposals.
28 The things that Tim's brought out can be addressed in a
29 letter to the Board of Fish and also in resolution form
30 to the YRDFA process and the in-season managers should
31 also be aware of this Council's concerns.

32
33 MS. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chair, may I
34 comment on that.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

37
38 MS. HERNANDEZ: Since we're talking
39 about fisheries proposals, our new Council Coordinator
40 Division Chief Carl Johnson has been working with Theo
41 Matuskowitz in our office and they've kind of done a
42 little summary sheet of how to submit proposals and
43 I've got copies at the back table. You're welcome to
44 take them back to your communities. We're also going
45 to be having that information posted on the OSM
46 website, which I believe is already there. So we're
47 just trying to make the information more available to
48 folks so they have the opportunity to submit proposals.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would suggest that

1 OSM disseminate those to all the subsistence
2 coordinators for BLM, Fish and Wildlife, Park Service,
3 to have those disseminated to the affected Federal
4 lands that have Federal fishery authority on Federal
5 waters.

6

7 Ken, did you want to comment on Federal
8 fisheries proposals, Ken Chase.

9

10 MR. CHASE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
11 Members of the Board. My name is Ken Chase from Anvik.
12 I chair the GASH communities. You can stop me before I
13 really get started if I'm off the beat here. My concern
14 in the committee, we had talked about here a couple
15 weeks ago and it's kind of an unspoken fisheries. It's
16 not known too well to anybody other than the local
17 Yukon people is lamprey fish, known as eels, but
18 they're lampreys.

19

20 Going back 30, 40 years ago the
21 lampreys were used exclusively for subsistence purposes
22 by trappers and hunters and dog team owners on the
23 Yukon River. Back then we had large runs of lampreys.
24 We'd get 10, 12 sled loads of eels a piece and like
25 9-foot sled loads for our dogs for the year. As of
26 late the runs have really diminished and we don't know
27 if it's a change in migration or high seas or whatever,
28 but we started selling lampreys a few years ago to
29 Yukon Delta Fisheries and last year we sold 40,000
30 pounds between Grayling and Anvik. There's more
31 interest now in the fishery because of the monetary
32 value of them. Less people are using them for dogs,
33 but a lot of people are still using them for jarring
34 stuff for themselves.

35

36 I've been approached by a lot of people
37 asking about this and wanting to do something to find
38 out their migration and where they spawn. The State is
39 working with us on it, but it's still a really unknown
40 fish, where they go. They come up in November and we
41 don't know how many runs. We get reports of two or
42 three runs on different sides of the river, but we've
43 never really got a handle on how they migrate and where
44 to. I'm asking I guess this Board to or the awareness
45 of it that there is concern there for the numbers and
46 we'd appreciate something on it.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Council can
49 request -- I don't know if anybody here can comment on
50 the life cycle of lamprey. They're a parasitic fish

1 that attach themselves to -- you've got information on
2 that, George? You used to work in fisheries.

3

4 MR. PAPPAS: (Shakes head negatively)

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, lamprey is a
7 parasitic fish. They attach themselves to salmon. It
8 would make sense when the salmon populations decline
9 there would be less lamprey or prey around for the
10 lampreys. We don't know a whole lot about them. The
11 Council would probably like to be informed at our fall
12 meeting at least if the OSM can provide some
13 information through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
14 fisheries on these lamprey. When they started talking
15 about a commercial fishery for lamprey, I was concerned
16 that they didn't know enough about them to set quota,
17 so I too would be concerned that there would be a
18 depletion factor of that resource.

19

20 I do think that it's a -- at our fall
21 meeting we could actually request a fisheries
22 monitoring -- an issue for fisheries monitoring to look
23 at a little wider prospectus as to what -- where they
24 spawn, what their productivity is and perceived
25 productivity and if there's a need to make a customary
26 and traditional use determination for the use of
27 lamprey for subsistence on Federally-recognized waters.
28 So that would be probably a progression with the
29 lamprey issue. So does that look like a line of action
30 that would be satisfactory for the people of the GASH
31 area?

32

33 MR. CHASE: Yes, thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ken, for
36 bringing that up.

37

38 MR. GERVAIS: Jack, I had a question
39 for Ken.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay, go ahead.
42 Ken, Tim wants to ask you a question.

43

44 MR. GERVAIS: Hi, Ken. This is Tim
45 Gervais. I was wondering if you knew what the volume
46 of the subsistence catch was compared to the 40,000
47 pounds of commercial catch?

48

49 MR. CHASE: No, Tim, not in poundage.
50 I just know -- you know, talk to people that use it and

1 my extended part is just from Holy Cross up to Kaltag.
2 I don't know about the Lower Yukon, how much they use
3 or how much they use compared to years ago.

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions,
6 Tim.

7
8 MR. GERVAIS: No, that's it. Thank you
9 for your comments.

10
11 MR. CHASE: Thank you.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James, you had a
14 comment?

15
16 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17 Ken, I could relate to what you're saying as far as the
18 concern on eels. Like you mentioned there used to be
19 or there still are different runs that go up the Yukon
20 different sides of the bank. I do recall in Holy Cross
21 they used to catch tons and tons of eels right at Holy
22 Cross. With the river changing I think the problem
23 there is that they're not at the same locations where
24 they used to catch them.

25
26 On a different note, and this might be
27 a little funny, but it's regarding the Humboldt squid
28 with the warm water changes in Alaska. Their migration
29 north is going to be a factor interfacing with the king
30 salmon in the ocean and that's going to be a factor as
31 far as escapement up the rivers.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.

34
35 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. It
36 looks like maybe OSM could get involved in doing some
37 historical data from the villages on what the fishery
38 was, how it was conducted in the past and the numbers
39 and so on. One thought I had was they need to know if
40 they're diminishing first. If they're not diminishing
41 and they're no longer using them for dogs, then there
42 probably could be a limited commercial in there of the
43 portion that used to go to dogs, but first of all they
44 need to know what the numbers are.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's a good
47 comment. That goes along with what Tim is asking for,
48 is what is the level of subsistence use. We can put
49 that down as a notation for a fall meeting, Melinda,
50 that we need to possibly have a Fisheries Monitoring

1 Project or at least draw out information from past
2 house-to-house surveys on lamprey eel used for
3 subsistence on the Yukon River. Jenny.

4

5 MS. PELKOLA: As a little girl I
6 remember we used to get some on fish and sometimes
7 they'd wrap around our nets. Upriver we don't fish in
8 November, so I would like to see maybe a test run to
9 see if they come around our area or anything. I know
10 it's big down that way, but in our area no one really
11 fishes for it. I think a study or somebody could come
12 up and see where they are so we can find out if they go
13 Koyukuk River or where they go. I don't know.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That could be part
16 of the action item is for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife to
17 look at providing information to our fall meeting on
18 where lamprey -- I know they go in the Chena River.
19 They catch them in the mud there and they use them for
20 catching ling cods. So they go into different
21 drainages, so I know they're going all over in the
22 Yukon system, but I don't know where all they're going.
23 So there is concern of the lamprey by this Council.

24

25 You had another comment, Ken.

26

27 MR. CHASE: Yeah. The Kuskokwim gets
28 them too, I guess. I don't know how far they go there.
29 Just for your question or your comment, there was a
30 couple boys that live in Nulato now from Anvik and last
31 year they caught them up there somewhere. The ice is
32 like three, four feet thick by the time they get there,
33 so they had to really work at it.

34

35 Thank you.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ken.

38

39 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, they do get them
40 into the Kuskokwim, but we noticed that they are
41 getting fewer.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Robert.

44

45 MR. R. WALKER: If any of the State or
46 Federal biologists here, when they do catch them in the
47 lower portion of the Kuskokwim or lower portion of the
48 Yukon do you think you could tag them and see where
49 they go? I mean I know you have radar tags or
50 satellite tags where you could follow them upriver.

1 MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. I'll get a
2 hold of our staff and during our agency report we'll
3 see if we have some information on lampreys tagging or
4 any current projects.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

7
8 MR. MEARS: And I just wanted to
9 mention too that Fred Bue in my office, Fairbanks
10 subsistence, we have been looking at the lamprey issue
11 as that fisheries developed. One of our lower river
12 projects now we're going to be looking at ammocoetes
13 density, the juvenile lamprey in the banks, just as a
14 beginning project to kind of get an idea of what's
15 going on. So that's one thing. We are looking at it.
16 We don't have a lot of good data yet.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Maybe at our fall
19 meeting we can have a brief on lamprey and a little bit
20 on their life cycle. It is an issue and we're in
21 fisheries cycle. Other comments.

22
23 MS. HERNANDEZ: Let's do a phone check
24 to see who's online.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Who's all online? I
27 heard some people dropping out or coming on. Did
28 somebody else come online on the teleconference? Are
29 you still there, Tim?

30
31 MR. GERVAIS: Yes, I'm still here.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Vince, you've
34 got comments.

35
36 MR. VENT: That was just me. I was
37 coming back on. I was working at the water plant for a
38 little bit, so I'm back online.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I just wanted
41 to track who's online there. We're talking about
42 fisheries issues and it's a call for proposals. Since
43 you're on the line there, Darrell, do you have any
44 fisheries proposals that the Huslia Tribe would like to
45 submit under the Federal Subsistence Program. They
46 have to apply to the Federal waters, which Huslia is
47 within the Koyukuk Refuge. Do you have any fisheries
48 issues?

49
50 MR. VENT: No, not at this time. We

1 have a hard time fishing up there anyway because the
2 water is too high when the fish go by.

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Nothing
5 to be addressed by proposals.

6
7 MR. VENT: Oh, we're talking about, you
8 know, pike managed to increase a lot, but we didn't put
9 a proposal in yet. I'll be working on that sometime
10 later on maybe this year.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We encourage
13 all the tribal Councils to submit proposals also to the
14 Federal program and we can review those in our process.
15 Vince wants to comment here. Go ahead, Vince.

16
17 MR. MATHEWS: You may remember back
18 that Caroline Brown and Dave Anderson did a technical
19 paper on eels. Does that spark your memory? Remember
20 there's a taboo on women being present at the harvest,
21 so she had to find others to do that. So you may want
22 to encourage the Division of Subsistence to attend the
23 fall meeting when you discuss eel because I believe the
24 technical paper was pretty detailed, but it's been a
25 while since I read it.

26
27 MS. HERNANDEZ: It was published,
28 Vince?

29
30 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, it's published
31 because I remember seeing pictures.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's the kind of
34 information that maybe that could all be synapsed. It
35 probably has the harvest information that the Council
36 seeks, so we need to just draw it out. We may not have
37 to do any kind of study if there's already data
38 floating around.

39
40 MR. MATHEWS: I don't know if there was
41 data on it. I just know they went to how it was
42 practiced and what was done with the eel. I know in
43 Holy Cross it's prized.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: OSM can get a hold
46 of Caroline Brown and get that kind of information.
47 Thanks, Vince. Appreciate that. A missing puzzle
48 piece that we just didn't see floating there upside
49 down.

50

1 Any other comments on Federal
2 proposals.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None. Oh, Pollock.

7
8 MR. SIMON: I went to the Yukon River
9 Drainage Fisheries meeting in Galena a couple weeks ago
10 and they formed an elders council. They put us in a
11 circle and all the elders talk about how they respect
12 fish and there was no waste. It was good, I think. It
13 might be a tool here to use to manage either fish and
14 game or fish, you know, because the elders have all
15 this knowledge. It sounded good in Galena. They put
16 us in a circle and each one of us told a story, showed
17 them how we respect the fish and how we appreciate it
18 and there was no waste.

19
20 Thank you, sir.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Appreciate that,
23 Pollock. You called it a tool, the elders are a tool,
24 and I recognize that as a good tool. When YRDFA brings
25 all these various elders, it would be kind of a good
26 question to ask this lamprey eel volume issue from the
27 elders. It might be a good question to ask the elders
28 during one of those YRDFA meetings and get the elders
29 to comment. It's an excellent tool and I appreciate
30 that, Pollock.

31
32 James.

33
34 MR. J. WALKER: I'd just like to say
35 that the mission in Holy Cross kept pretty good records
36 as far as the migration of the game and fish. I do
37 recall some of their books they print out there was a
38 mention of lamprey that passed Holy Cross and how much
39 they caught and when they caught it.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh. So the OSM
42 anthropologist could actually get a hold of those
43 records and actually get some very long-term harvest
44 details from Holy Cross, so that's another resource.
45 Appreciate that, James.

46
47 Any other fisheries issues by the
48 Council.

49
50 Go ahead, Robert.

1 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 When I was at the GASH meeting in Anvik with Chairman
3 Ken and Josh here, they were kind of like getting a
4 proposal ready from the State side to regulate the
5 catch for the day and you stated that we also have one
6 inside our regulation too, right? Federal.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No.

9
10 MR. R. WALKER: The catch?

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, we have no catch
13 regulations on.....

14
15 MR. R. WALKER: Well, anyway, this is
16 what's going to happen here in the next, what, month or
17 so before the Board of Fish meeting.

18
19 MR. CHASE: (nods affirmatively)

20
21 MR. R. WALKER: The GASH committee is
22 going to be putting in a proposal. One of the
23 questions that was brought up that was asked me was
24 where does -- we sit between Y3 and Y2 in that area all
25 the way up to Y4. We didn't have a map to understand
26 where Federal waters started and where State waters
27 started, so there was an issue here. Maybe if I can
28 get this map back to Ken and then he can bring it to
29 his committee at the GASH board and they can go from
30 there. Mr. Chairman.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Typically the
33 Federal waters are delineated near conservation units.
34 Did you have a map delineation for the Federal waters
35 for Innoko, Bo?

36
37 MR. SLOAN: I could probably come up
38 with one.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I know down at
41 Koyukuk it's basically the Northern Innoko Refuge that
42 stops at Galena, the Federal waters end at Galena. So
43 if you look on your map here that we're provided, the
44 area where the Refuge boundary touches the Yukon River,
45 that would normally be the Federal waters.

46
47 MR. SLOAN: I think from this one --
48 Robert, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the issue
49 here with the pike is it was way far south. It was
50 where Yukon Delta runs into the river and whatnot and

1 that boundary was in question.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So down at Paimiut?
4 These BLM lands areas, I'm not sure about the BLM lands
5 and we don't have any BLM people from the Anchorage
6 office that could delineate that. There are areas
7 where BLM -- all BLM lands, do they reserve water
8 rights on the Yukon River, do you know, Shelly?

9

10 MS. JACOBSON: I'm sorry, I don't know
11 the answer to that.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Vince.

14

15 MR. MATHEWS: You can give me a new
16 title, but you can't take the coordinator out of me.
17 Remember back when we went through this whole thing and
18 the new fisheries things. It's only conservation units
19 and Wild and Scenic Rivers on Bureau of Land
20 Management. So Steese, White Mountains -- what's
21 another Wild.....

22

23 MS. JACOBSON: Unalakleet.

24

25 MR. MATHEWS: Unalakleet and et cetera.
26 The rest of the Bureau of Land Management lands do not
27 have -- there's not a Federal Subsistence Program on
28 those lands. So when you look at the area in question
29 on pike fisheries and you see that mustard color there,
30 there's no Federal jurisdiction over fisheries there.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That clarifies that.
33 I never did fully agree with that interpretation. I
34 felt that ANILCA was clear about fish and wildlife use
35 and I felt that the Federal Bureau of Land Management
36 waters that were not conveyed to the State of Alaska
37 they should still fall under subsistence regulations,
38 so I never did fully agree with the Solicitor's
39 interpretation at that time and I voiced that at the
40 RAC meeting back in 1990 or whenever we started dealing
41 with fisheries. ANILCA is clear about fish and
42 wildlife for all Federal agencies. So I never did
43 agree with that interpretation.

44

45 So if that clarifies the issue.
46 Basically on our map here everything that's adjoining
47 with pink is Federal waters at this time and the yellow
48 mustard colored areas are not Federal waters. Those
49 would fall under State jurisdiction and would have to
50 have a State Board of Fish proposal to reduce season or

1 bag limit on pike.

2

3 MR. R. WALKER: I think that pretty
4 much clarified what it is.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That
7 clarified that issue for Robert. Any other discussion
8 on Federal fisheries proposals.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. We're
13 going to move on to 9B, customary trade of chinook
14 salmon and then OSM presentation. David.

15

16 MS. HERNANDEZ: Folks, just to let you
17 know the accompanying handout was left off of the book
18 printing. It's on the right side of your blue folder,
19 first handout.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim?

22

23 (No response)

24

25 (Off record)

26

27 (On record)

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're coming back on
30 record again. We lost Tim for a second and had to get
31 him back. We're down to customary trade. David
32 Jenkins is going to give us an update.

33

34 DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. David
35 Jenkins, Office of Subsistence Management. If you
36 recall, the Tri-RAC Subcommittee on Customary Trade of
37 Yukon River Chinook Salmon developed two
38 recommendations presented to the RACs last fall for
39 review and the subcommittee strongly preferred one of
40 their two recommendations and I'll read it here.

41

42 Customary trade of Yukon River chinook
43 salmon may only occur between Federally qualified rural
44 residents with a current customary and traditional use
45 determination.

46

47 At your fall meeting you voted
48 unanimously to adopt this proposal. At this point you
49 have the opportunity to submit a regulatory proposal on
50 this issue and you can continue to support this

1 particular recommendation or you can develop other
2 proposals as you see fit. Those proposals will be
3 analyzed and the Regional Advisory Councils will
4 provide recommendations at your fall 2012 meetings and
5 then the Federal Subsistence Board will take action on
6 the proposed rule in January of 2013.

7

8 At this point, you can develop a
9 proposal, continue with the first recommendation that
10 the subcommittee generated or go in another direction
11 as you see fit. Mr. Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, David. So
14 this was quite a process to delineate what customary
15 trade is for chinook salmon because of the stock of
16 concern. So customary trade of the Yukon River chinook
17 salmon may only occur between Federally qualified rural
18 residents with a current customary and traditional use
19 determination.

20

21 Would the Council want to submit a
22 proposal to the Federal Subsistence Board using that
23 exact language? The Chair will entertain a motion to
24 submit a Federal subsistence proposal on customary
25 trade. The floor is open for a motion.

26

27 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by James.

30

31 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

32

33 MR. VENT: Hello?

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Stand by. We're in
36 a process here. Jenny seconded.....

37

38 (Off record comments by Mr. Vent who
39 didn't realize he was online)

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jenny seconded the
42 motion to submit the customary trade language
43 recommendation one of the tri-sub committee as a
44 Federal subsistence proposal, short and sweet. Any
45 discussion at this point on.....

46

47 (Problem with conference call)

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll take about a
50 five-minute break and try and straighten this out so

1 Tim can have input into this proposal.

2

3 (Off record)

4

5 (On record)

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to bring
8 the meeting back to order. The update is that the
9 conference call has been blanking out for about three
10 hours at a time and so Melinda is going to try and get
11 Tim on a cell phone so that he can participate somehow.
12 We're very very sorry the people in Huslia can't be on
13 there and maybe it will come up after lunch or
14 something. So if you can get Tim on the phone there,
15 we can lay him -- maybe we can hear him if I put this
16 mic right down against the phone. Will it go to
17 speaker?

18

19 MS. HERNANDEZ: I think this phone
20 will. If not, we'll use Jason's.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we'll get Tim on
23 here in a second. I had a discussion in the back of
24 the room and the issue was brought up about there's
25 currently in 4A a Federal driftnet fishery that's
26 prosecuted simultaneous with the State fisheries, 4B
27 and 4C, and it's prosecuted simultaneously with the 4A
28 drift fishery. There's a permit required for that to
29 fish in Federal waters and the issue has been brought
30 up about eliminating that permit. Benedict Jones
31 wanted a driftnet fishery for 4B and 4C up to Galena to
32 help disperse the fisheries. There was very little
33 participation. There's hardly any good drift sites.
34 The Refuge, YRDFA, the State of Alaska fought the drift
35 proposal. The Western Interior prevailed, but the
36 assistant regional director at the time wanted a
37 requirement of a permit. That's found to be not
38 necessary. It's my personal feeling that the
39 Koyukuk/Nowitna, since they fought for the permit, they
40 should submit the Federal proposal to eliminate the
41 permit. We will review that at our fall meeting. I
42 wanted the Council to be aware of that issue.

43

44 Have you gotten a hold of Tim yet?

45

46 MS. HERNANDEZ: I can't get a line out
47 at all.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does anyone have a
50 GCI phone with.....

1 MR. MATHEWS: The satellite is bad.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, the satellite
4 flaked out.
5
6 REPORTER: It's not a phone issue.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's not?
9
10 REPORTER: No.
11
12 MS. HERNANDEZ: We'll try again in a
13 little bit. We'll keep trying.
14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We've got to
16 move on. We've got a motion to submit a Federal
17 Subsistence Board proposal for customary trade with
18 recommendation one of the tri-committee to limit
19 customary trade of Yukon River chinook salmon may only
20 occur between Federally qualified rural residents with
21 a current customary and traditional use determination.
22 Any further discussion on that proposal submission to
23 the Federal Subsistence Board.
24
25 (No comments)
26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. Those
28 in favor of submitting that proposal signify by saying
29 aye.
30
31 IN UNISON: Aye.
32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
34 sign.
35
36 (No opposing votes)
37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that will be
39 submitted under the Western Interior's letterhead.
40
41 DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. While I'm
42 sitting here.....
43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, David.
45
46 DR. JENKINS:you may like an
47 update on the YK RACs response to this as well.
48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
50

1 DR. JENKINS: The YK RAC elected to
2 submit three proposals on customary trade. The first
3 is the one that you just passed with the addition that
4 this will be recognized only in times of shortage when
5 there's no chinook salmon commercial fishery and there
6 are restrictions on the subsistence fishery. So that
7 was one proposal with that little additional material.

8
9 The second proposal separate from this
10 was the Yukon River salmon should only be used for
11 human food and personal family consumption.

12
13 A third and separate proposal was to
14 define a significant commercial enterprise by
15 establishing a \$750 limit per calendar year per
16 qualified household. So they developed three different
17 proposals. The first one is very similar to what you
18 just did and then these other two additional. Mr.
19 Chair.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those other aspects,
22 the \$750 range and those aspects, we will review the YK
23 Delta's proposals this fall at our fall RAC meeting. I
24 have concerns about setting a price limit like that for
25 customary trade, so I think that needs further
26 discussion. I feel that's fine, they submitted the
27 proposals and we can comment on those proposals.

28
29 Go ahead, Ray.

30
31 MR. COLLINS: I had a question about
32 what this actually means now, what we just voted on.
33 Does that mean that there will be no customary trade
34 taking place outside of the Yukon drainage? Because
35 thinking of customary and traditional now there's other
36 areas of the state rural residents that are Federally
37 qualified that have been purchasing those for a long
38 time. Do they qualify still then or do they have to
39 have a customary and traditional determination on Yukon
40 king of catching them, not eating them?

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: David. That's a
43 good question.

44
45 MR. COLLINS: Because it's a long-
46 standing practice. That's the way people outside,
47 other rural residents got their fish was from the
48 Yukon.

49
50 DR. JENKINS: It's my understanding

1 that this refers to the practice of catching these fish
2 and those with a current customary and traditional use
3 determination of rural residents who can catch these
4 fish are the ones that are affected by this particular
5 proposal. It's an attempt to preclude the exchange for
6 cash of these fish outside of the Yukon River drainage
7 and into urban areas. This is my understanding of the
8 intent of the subcommittee in presenting this proposal.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: To clarify this --
11 go ahead.

12

13 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, but what about
14 other rural areas? I'm talking about like there are
15 people on the Yukon or Kuskokwim that have customarily
16 purchased them from them for their own personal use
17 too.

18

19 DR. JENKINS: I understand, Mr.
20 Collins, and the question would be do they have a
21 customary and traditional use determination for Yukon
22 king salmon and so that's how this proposal reads. It
23 would need to have that C&T for Yukon king salmon to
24 participate.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, that kind of
27 changes things, huh, Ray?

28

29 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I'm wondering if
30 they can get a C&T if they've been eating them for the
31 last 100 years.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The way I --
34 between Federally-qualified rural residents. So the
35 Chair will entertain a motion to submit a Federal
36 fisheries customary and traditional use determination
37 to recognize that people on the Kuskokwim River within
38 the Western Interior Region also utilize chinook salmon
39 through customary trade.

40

41 MR. COLLINS: I'd like some discussion
42 to see whether they want to do that. If they want to
43 limit it to just within the drainage, then I could go
44 along with that. If they don't want to.....

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, that's what it
47 is.

48

49 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Because right now
2 there's only C&T for the Yukon River.
3
4 MR. COLLINS: Right. If that's the
5 preference over there to build on, I'd go along with
6 that.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Would you make that
9 motion to that effect.
10
11 MR. COLLINS: To what?
12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: To submit a Federal
14 fisheries proposal to the Federal Subsistence Board to
15 request a customary and traditional use determination
16 for the use of chinook salmon from the Yukon River by
17 rural residents on the Kuskokwim through customary
18 trade.
19
20 MR. COLLINS: Well, I will only do it
21 if the Yukon residents want that done. I don't want to
22 push it. I don't know how they feel about that.
23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, if you make a
25 motion, get it on the table, then we'll discuss it.
26
27 MR. COLLINS: Okay. I so move.
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do I have a second.
30
31 MR. SIMON: Second.
32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Discussion. James.
34
35 MR. J. WALKER: Question, Jack. Would
36 this -- is this clear as far as the catcher, I guess,
37 in a sense on the Yukon given the opportunity of the
38 Kuskokwim to traditionally trade C&T? Is that the
39 question of the catcher's responsibility or is it the
40 purchaser's responsibility on the C&T?
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: David.
43
44 DR. JENKINS: The subcommittee actually
45 wrestled with this question a great deal over two
46 different meetings, who would be responsible. In this
47 instance there is no permitting requirement. There's
48 just a limitation of keeping customary trades between
49 Federally-qualified rural residents. That's where this
50 language ends. There's no particular enforcement

1 mechanism attached to it, no permitting requirements.
2 It was perceived as the first step in starting to
3 limit customary trades in the context of declining
4 chinook runs. So, beyond that, these other issues
5 weren't well articulated by the subcommittee. So this
6 is the language that came out and you could actually
7 direct your question to Ray and Robert and Jenny, who
8 were all on the subcommittee as well.

9

10 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you. So if you
11 want to go so far as define, say, Kuskokwim, are you
12 going to be talking about other areas in the state
13 also?

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Only within the
16 Western Interior Region because this use has occurred
17 -- I mean the Kuskokwim and the Yukon are so close
18 together, this trade has occurred, but it's within our
19 Western Interior Region and we're responsible to our
20 constituency in the Western Interior Region. So, no,
21 it's not outside to other areas because this is a long-
22 standing trade practice between the upper Kuskokwim
23 where Ray is at and the Yukon River. So I recognize
24 that as long-standing historical trade between the
25 Yukon and the Kuskokwim. I would not want to include
26 other regions, rural resident regions. Only those
27 rural residents on the Kuskokwim River and only for
28 customary trade with the Yukon River C&T.

29

30 Is that clear, Ray?

31

32 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, yeah.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments?
35 You've got a comment, Vince.

36

37 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Vince is fidgeting
40 over there. He used to be our coordinator. I know
41 when Vince fidgets he's got something to say.

42

43 (Laughter)

44

45 MR. MATHEWS: I have to lean on David's
46 comments on this, but my understanding customary and
47 traditional use determinations are not limited to one
48 facet of subsistence. You would be granting customary
49 and traditional use determination for all uses. Dave
50 can talk about that. You can't limit it to just

1 customary trade, correct? So I'm not saying it's not
2 good. I'm just saying that you can't -- if you have a
3 customary and traditional use pattern of it, it's that
4 resource and how it's used, not limiting it to a
5 portion of how it would be used.

6

7 MR. COLLINS: So opening it to the
8 Kuskokwim then would be saying I could go over there
9 and catch the kings myself too instead of buying them
10 is what you're saying.

11

12 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, that's correct.
13 Then the Board would have to -- I would speculate would
14 have to see a pattern that Kuskokwim residents went up
15 there and fished. There probably is a pattern there.
16 I don't know. That's what it would bring up. To
17 remind you that the motion or whatever you passed was
18 in times of shortages. I'm just bringing those facts
19 up to you, that's all. But customary and traditional
20 use determinations is difficult. I think Jack and I
21 know Ray's been involved with them. Once you bring it
22 up, you bring up a whole bunch of other topics which
23 may need to be needed or you may not want them to be
24 brought up. I don't know.

25

26 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I
27 think I would vote against this motion, defeat it.
28 What can still happen is that these restrictions aren't
29 on barter. So if I want to get Yukon fish, I'll have
30 to barter for them with somebody over there and then
31 that's allowed.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's why the
34 discussion process of a motion is very very important
35 to delineate what all the flaws are before you do
36 anything.

37

38 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, James.

41

42 MR. J. WALKER: That would go right
43 back to what's the point of barter or trade when an
44 individual has the opportunity to go over there and
45 fish? That would knock out the trade or the barter.

46

47 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, you wouldn't want
48 to open that.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I think

1 we've highlighted the down side of making a C&T. I
2 thought the Federal Subsistence Board could delineate
3 what a customary and traditional use is through a
4 filter of customary trade, but Vince points out that
5 that's never been done and that might never happen, so
6 we don't want to go there.

7
8 Further discussion on the motion on the
9 floor.

10
11 (No comments)

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
14 the motion signify by saying aye.

15
16 (No aye votes)

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
19 sign.

20
21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion fails. Good
24 discussion. It is a recognized -- I will state for the
25 record that there has been customary trade from the
26 middle and upper Kuskokwim for chinook salmon on the
27 Yukon River. In the future, that should be a
28 recognized aspect of use, but is not warranted as a
29 proposal.

30
31 So we're down to State Board of Game,
32 Region 3, proposals and comments. I've got my Region 3
33 book here.

34
35 MR. R. WALKER: What page?

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That would be on
38 Page 182, is the list of proposals. So the areas that
39 affect the Western Interior Regional Council are the
40 McGrath area and the Galena area. So there's various
41 proposals. There's also a proposal that's in the
42 Northeast Alaska area of Region 3. We don't have the
43 proposals. Melinda, we don't actually have all the
44 proposals for all the RAC members. I have a proposal
45 book and I can -- there's two State proposal books for
46 the -- Vince has got one, so we can share books at the
47 Council level. The State has run out here in McGrath
48 also. A big run on these proposal books.

49
50 We'll start McGrath area for the State

1 proposals. The first proposal is Proposal 154. We
2 have the State assistant area biologist here, so we can
3 rely on the State to lay out the various proposals for
4 the McGrath area. We don't have the Galena area
5 biologist, but we do have -- Proposal 154 is
6 reauthorization of the antlerless moose hunting season
7 in Unit 19D. 154 is on Page 162.

8

9 MR. PEIRCE: Page 221.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, 221. Okay.

12

13 MR. COLLINS: The local fish and game
14 advisory supported that. It just puts it on the book,
15 keeps it on the book.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll get to that
18 when -- the Advisory Committees when we get to the
19 proposal. Did you want to introduce the proposal,
20 Josh. A real short synopsis of what it really means
21 for the Council.

22

23 MR. PEIRCE: I'm Josh Peirce with Fish
24 and Game in McGrath. I'm the assistant area biologist.
25 Proposal 154 would reauthorize the antlerless moose
26 hunting season in 19D. This is a to be announced
27 season. It's a season that's on the books. If we
28 start to see twinning rates fall around here as the
29 moose population continues to grow, we would have the
30 ability to start to put a check on the population
31 basically through some cow harvest. At this point,
32 it's still just an on the book season. We're not
33 proposing to implement it any time soon. We still have
34 excellent twinning rates and the habitat appears to be
35 capable of supporting more moose still.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Chair will
38 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 154.

39

40 MR. SIMON: So moved.

41

42 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Pollock and
45 seconded by Jenny to adopt Proposal 154. We have Tim
46 online. Hello, Tim, are you there?

47

48 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, go ahead.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We've got

1 phone faux pas here. What have we done since you
2 dropped out. We made a motion to submit a proposal to
3 limit customary trade to those users on the Yukon that
4 have customary and traditional use of chinook salmon on
5 the Yukon River. So now we're into State game
6 proposals for Region 3 Interior. We're on Proposal
7 154. Do you have a State Board of Game proposal book?
8

9 MR. GERVAIS: No, not with me, but just
10 carry on.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This is a
13 reauthorization of the antlerless moose hunt for Unit
14 19D as in dog. Josh Peirce has given us a rundown. A
15 motion is on the floor to adopt the proposal.
16 Discussion by the Council on the proposal.
17

18 I'm personally in favor of maintaining
19 these antlerless moose hunts because, as Benedict Jones
20 told us, these things can be very hard to recover and
21 they are. So I'm supportive of the proposal myself.
22 Any further discussion.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Agency comments
27 we got from the State -- the Advisory Committee, Ray.

28
29 MR. COLLINS: The local Advisory
30 Committee supports this.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that would be the
33 amount of input we need. Any further discussion on the
34 proposal, housekeeping proposal.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 MR. SIMON: Question.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
41 called. Those in favor of the Proposal 154 signify by
42 saying aye.

43
44 IN UNISON: Aye.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim.

47
48 MR. GERVAIS: Aye.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same

1 sign.

2

3 (No opposing votes)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So 154 passes.

6 We're at Proposal 155.

7

8 MR. R. WALKER: Do we have a copy

9 machine? We could make copies of all this for

10 everybody. Does anybody have a copy machine?

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This would take

13 quite a while to do.

14

15 MR. R. WALKER: I mean just this one

16 page.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Robert's asking if

19 all these proposals can be copied out.

20

21 MR. R. WALKER: Just this one page.

22 This one right here.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, this one. If

25 you could just run this through a copy machine. We're

26 on Proposal 155. Do you want to give us the rundown on

27 that, Josh.

28

29 MR. PEIRCE: Proposal 155 would close

30 caribou hunting for residents and non-residents in 19A,

31 19B, 19C, 19D, so all of 19, 21A and 21E. Particularly

32 this proposal mentions some of the smaller herds, Big

33 River, Farewell, Beaver Mountain and Sunshine Caribou

34 Herds. The Department's recommendation is do not

35 adopt. The harvest on these herds is extremely low.

36 In particular, Lime Village came up as an issue of

37 concern. They have real reliance on caribou meat down

38 there. This closure would affect their ability to

39 harvest Mulchatna caribou, for example.

40

41 Like I said, the harvest of these herds

42 is low. It's anywhere from -- it looks like about 5 to

43 20 caribou per year from these herds. The harvestable

44 surplus is estimated at 30 to 60 caribou annually.

45 That's that.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This would eliminate

48 harvest of Mulchatna caribou also on State lands.

49

50 MR. PEIRCE: Unit 19A and 19B are

1 already closed to non-resident harvest of Mulchatna
2 caribou.
3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal is for
5 only.....
6
7 MR. PEIRCE: It's for all of Unit 19.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: For non-residents.
10
11 MR. PEIRCE: It's for non-residents and
12 residents.
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And residents.
15
16 MR. PEIRCE: Yes.
17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's not
19 acceptable for the resident harvest.
20
21 MR. PEIRCE: So Mulchatna caribou is
22 already closed to non-residents throughout the range.
23 When the herd was larger, they did come into 19C and D
24 occasionally, but that hasn't happened in a number of
25 years. So 19D and C currently still do have non-
26 resident caribou seasons.
27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see. I'm opposed
29 to the proposal. The Chair will entertain a motion to
30 adopt Proposal 155.
31
32 MR. COLLINS: So moved.
33
34 MS. YATLIN: Second.
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
37 Discussion on the proposal and the Advisory Committee.
38
39 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, we opposed this
40 because the harvest is very low. It's mainly aimed at
41 these small herds we have around here and there's no
42 biological reason to close it. The reason they're
43 being held low is by predation and other things, not
44 the fact -- not hunting pressure because, as Josh
45 mentioned, there's a very low harvest, so there's no
46 need to close it.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What are the
49 bull/cow ratios on these smaller herds, Josh?
50

1 MR. PEIRCE: We don't have data like
2 that. We're lucky to even get a minimum population
3 count once every year, late June or early July. When
4 the conditions are appropriate, we go out and just try
5 to count as many as we can and we're using Super Cubs,
6 so we're not able to get any kind of composition data.
7 It's primarily a naturally regulated herd, so we
8 wouldn't expect there to be low bull/cow ratios.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There's not a lot of
11 targeting of the larger bull component?

12
13 MR. PEIRCE: No. Harvest is very low.
14 Local harvest around here, the Beaver, Sunshine Herd.
15 There's some harvest occasionally from McGrath. People
16 in Takotna primarily use that a little bit more. They
17 can access 21A more easily than we can. It's a bull
18 harvest and people take a bull if they see a bull.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any further
21 discussion by the Council on Proposal 155.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
26 the proposal signify by saying aye.

27
28 (No aye votes)

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to
31 Proposal 155 same sign.

32
33 IN UNISON: Aye.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal 155 fails.
36 Proposal 156 is to close non-resident season for
37 caribou, but as Josh just told us that's already closed
38 for Mulchatna and that's the herd of concern. Josh.

39
40 MR. PEIRCE: Yeah, this would close
41 Units 19C and 19D, which are not currently closed to
42 non-residents. This, in particular, was trying to
43 address the Tonzona Herd, which again, like Ray said,
44 is one of these small herds that we have in our area.
45 The Department's recommendation is no recommendation.
46 It's an allocation issue. The non-resident harvest
47 over the last five years has been one to two caribou
48 per year. Again, it's a bull only hunt. The
49 harvestable surplus for this particular herd is likely
50 15 to 30 animals. Harvest is certainly well below that

1 right now.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Chair will
4 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 156.

5

6 MR. R. WALKER: So moved.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Robert.

9

10 MR. MORGAN: Second.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Carl.
13 The McGrath Advisory Committee's position to oppose?

14

15 MR. COLLINS: I don't think we took a
16 formal action, but we're opposed to it.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There's no need for
19 this reduction. Further discussion on 156.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 MR. J. WALKER: Question.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question is called.
26 Those in favor of Proposal 156 signify by saying aye.

27

28 (No aye votes)

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.

31

32 IN UNISON: Aye.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal 157, that's
35 a State proposal. Josh.

36

37 MR. PEIRCE: Yeah, 157, this has to do
38 with Mulchatna Caribou Herd, which is managed out of
39 Region 4 office. Even though it has overlapped in 19A
40 and B it's not something that our office has addressed.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've got some kind
43 of concerns with the proposal. So the Chair will
44 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 157.

45

46 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.

47

48 MR. MORGAN: Second.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded

1 by Carl. So this lays out an intensive management plan
2 for 157. Do you want to give sort of a brief overview
3 of the proposal?

4

5 MR. PEIRCE: Yeah, sure. Proposal 157
6 is an amendment to the 92125 plan that we currently
7 have in place and it would address predation on
8 Mulchatna Caribou Herd. Currently in Unit 19A we have
9 a wolf control program going on in the Holitna and
10 Stony River drainages, Hoholitna as well. This
11 proposal in particular looks to address calving
12 survival in the Lime Village area. There's a large
13 number of Mulchatna caribou that calve in that area, so
14 it's a targeted approach at wolves on those calving
15 grounds similar to what they've done in the Southern
16 Alaska Peninsula Herd.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One of my concerns
19 is the threshold for bull/cows is only 20 bulls per 100
20 cows. I don't like to see regulations that set
21 objectives that are way below a management objective of
22 35 bulls per 100 cows, which the Mulchatna has. So I'm
23 concerned that some of the trigger points for bull/cow
24 ratio are not healthy for the population. I feel like
25 the Board may want to protect the calves, but they also
26 should recognize that one of the primary concerns is
27 the low number of bulls and the reproductive capacity
28 of this herd. So another objective of the plan should
29 be to get the herd back to where it has a productive
30 breeding component of bulls and especially larger
31 bulls. So that's one of my concerns about the plan.
32 I'd like to make comments to the Board of Game on that
33 particular issue in the proposal.

34

35 I would personally like to know what
36 the discussion was at the McGrath Advisory Committee.
37 Did you take up this proposal?

38

39 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. We had gotten
40 calls from down river wanting to support that. I
41 believe they've had a closure there for five years now
42 for hunting in this area.

43

44 MR. PEIRCE: The season is still open
45 for residents. It's the non-resident season that's
46 been closed.

47

48 MR. COLLINS: Oh, okay.

49

50 MR. PEIRCE: Maybe Member Morgan

1 remembers. I don't remember how many years that's been
2 now.

3

4 MR. MORGAN: I wasn't keeping up, but I
5 know that for residents it's open, but I think they're
6 going to shorten the season. The last I heard they'll
7 probably shorten the season.

8

9 MR. PEIRCE: I guess one thing I'd like
10 to add if I could really quickly is now is definitely a
11 great opportunity to add comments like what you have
12 there because these plans, once they get implemented,
13 tend to be in place for five to six years.....

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

16

17 MR. PEIRCE:before they're
18 reauthorized. So now is the time to get it right.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's my real
21 concern. The plan is setting thresholds for bull
22 management far below any recognized threshold for
23 caribou. I've never seen a bull/cow ratio of a
24 management objective below 35 bulls per 100 cows. It's
25 my sincere opinion that when they went to 14 bulls per
26 100 cows with one large bull per 100 cows by 2007, it
27 caused reproductive failure and the herd crashed. So
28 we're still staggering under no bulls. That's what
29 happened in Unimak. It's what happened on the Alaska
30 Peninsula.

31

32 I'm concerned that this plan does not
33 reflect a healthy bull component as part of the plan.
34 So I would like to adopt the plan with a comment to the
35 Board of Game that the plan should entail a healthy
36 bull/cow ratio of 35 bulls per 100 cows. The Chair
37 will entertain an amendment to the proposal.

38

39 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair. I so move
40 that we attach your comments -- amend the motion to add
41 your comments on the bull/cow ratio.

42

43 MR. MORGAN: Second.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Carl.
46 Further discussion on the Proposal 157.

47

48 MR. SIMON: Question.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is

1 called. Those in favor of the proposal as amended to
2 the Board of Game signify by saying aye.

3

4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And I heard Tim's
7 affirmative.

8

9 (No opposing votes)

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What proposals did
12 you take up at the Kuskokwim Advisory Committee? Did
13 you take up 158? Do you want to give an overview of
14 158 for us, Josh.

15

16 MR. PEIRCE: This one I haven't looked
17 at that closely. The Department has a take no action
18 on this because of 157. This was a proposal submitted
19 by a member of the public again related to a 92125
20 controlled plan.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That makes sense.
23 Proposal 159, do you want to give us a layout of that
24 one.

25

26 MR. PEIRCE: Proposal 159 I'm just
27 looking at here with the -- I've got the State's
28 recommendation here. I'm not as familiar with this one
29 either, but it's again submitted by a member of the
30 public and it looks to make a change to the management
31 objective. If you want I could read -- the State has a
32 do not adopt on this. It's about a paragraph. I could
33 read it if you want me to.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

36

37 MR. PEIRCE: An intensive management
38 population objective of 100-150,000 for the Mulchatna
39 Caribou Herd was established in 2001 when the estimate
40 herd size was 160,000 to 180,000 caribou. Herd size
41 has declined dramatically since then. Surveys since
42 2001 suggests a large size attained by this herd
43 estimated at 200,000 in 1996 likely contributed to the
44 conditions leading to reduce productivity and survival.

45

46
47 In 2009, the Board changed the
48 population objective to 30-80,000. The lower
49 population objectives allowing harvesting at high rates
50 when the herd is experiencing rapid growth regardless

1 of population size relative to objectives. Harvest can
2 still be managed to accommodate herd growth if desired.
3 This harvest may otherwise be lost if managers fail to
4 harvest from a growing population and the population
5 declines before the population objectives are reached.

6
7 This strategy allows managers to slow
8 growth, optimize harvest and evaluate nutrition and
9 range status to prevent the herd from overshooting
10 range capacity. Harvest objectives set at desired
11 levels will still trigger intensive management programs
12 when harvest is not being met even when population is
13 above the lower objective.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You're reading
16 Proposal 159?

17
18 MR. PEIRCE: That's 159, yeah.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's not what's in
21 the book. That's completely different.

22
23 MR. PEIRCE: Proposal 159 in the book
24 says that the Mulchatna Caribou Herd management
25 objective should be 100 to 150,000.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's similar but
28 the language or rationale is different. The
29 Department's do not adopt is because the Department
30 would like to maintain the current population objective
31 of 60 to 100,000?

32
33 MR. PEIRCE: I'm not sure.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: From reading this
36 proposal myself, this individual, Frank Woods, feels
37 that the management objective of 60-100,000 from the
38 current 30-80 objective would give more security to the
39 herd. This individual is talking about the low
40 bull/cow ratios, the harvest of this herd. This
41 individual feels that giving additional objective to
42 the herd would actually seem to give more security, but
43 I am so unclear about his main objective here, so at
44 this time I can't support the proposal the
45 way the proposal is written.

46
47 You didn't take this proposal up?

48
49 MR. COLLINS: No, we didn't take it up.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I do agree with him
2 that the bull/cow ratio is exceedingly low and that's
3 about the only thing I like about that proposal.

4
5 MR. PEIRCE: Typically these IM numbers
6 are used to trigger intensive management, so I'm
7 guessing that's what they're getting at is with a
8 higher number intensive management would be required at
9 a higher population level.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm inclined not to
12 support the proposal. Does the Council even want to
13 take the proposal up?

14
15 (Shakes head negatively)

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No? No interest by
18 the Council of Proposal 159. Proposal 160, did you
19 take this proposal up, Ray, increasing the season for
20 lynx?

21
22 MR. COLLINS: Yes, we did.

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you want to lay
25 that proposal out, Josh.

26
27 MR. PEIRCE: Yeah, Proposal 160 was
28 submitted by a local member of the public here from
29 McGrath and this current lynx season in Unit 19 ends
30 the end of February, so this year in a leap year you
31 have an extra day. This proposal would extend it until
32 the end of March, which is when our wolverine season
33 goes till, with the idea being that incidentally caught
34 lynx in a wolverine set would be able to be kept by the
35 trapper. Currently the trapper is supposed to turn
36 those in to Fish and Game or the Wildlife troopers and
37 surrender them. So it basically would allow them to
38 keep their catch.

39
40 Lynx trapping is not what drives
41 trapping pressure in this area, so we supported this
42 proposal in terms of just allowing people to catch lynx
43 that they caught incidentally.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Chair will
46 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 160.

47
48 MR. COLLINS: I so move.

49
50 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
2 Discussion on that, Ray, from the Advisory Committee.
3
4 MR. COLLINS: Well, as was stated
5 there, just to bring those -- the only trapping later
6 on is for wolverine or perhaps wolf, I think, you can
7 trap during that and incidentally caught lynx they
8 should be able to sell them, not turn them in. So just
9 bringing that season in line with the wolverine season.
10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other discussion
12 from the Council on the proposal.
13
14 (No comments)
15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing no further
17 discussion on Proposal 160, those in favor of the
18 proposal signify by saying aye.
19
20 IN UNISON: Aye.
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.
23
24 (No opposing votes)
25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we've moved
27 through the McGrath portion. Thanks, Josh. Appreciate
28 that.
29
30 MR. PEIRCE: I'm not sure if you have
31 169 on your list, but that was one other one that we
32 took up as well. It's a very similar proposal.
33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, we'll get to
35 that one. We're going into the Galena area. How's
36 everybody doing? The status of the lunch.
37
38 MS. HERNANDEZ: What we're going to do
39 is, since Pat didn't get to come in and visit too much
40 with the Council I really wanted the Council to go
41 ahead and stay here. I've ordered in some sandwiches
42 for you guys and Pat so you have a chance to visit and
43 then for everybody else Suzie's has invited folks down
44 to come and they said they'll have plenty of -- they'll
45 try to be quick too so we can get folks back here. I
46 thought if we broke in about half an hour.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That sounds great.
49 We'll move into these Galena area proposals to the
50 Board of Game. Proposal 161. Is the State prepared --

1 George, are you prepared to present for the State?
2 That's what you get paid big bucks for is to pinch hit.

3

4 MR. PAPPAS: Josh is here for the
5 State.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Josh, we'll put you
8 in the hot seat.

9

10 MR. PEIRCE: Okay. I'll do the best I
11 can. A lot of these proposals I'm not very familiar
12 with though.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal 161 is to
15 split the drawing permit hunt for Unit 21D into two
16 drawing permit hunts. This was submitted by the Middle
17 Yukon Advisory Committee. The Koyukuk River Advisory
18 Committee took this proposal up and there was a lot of
19 discussion about this proposal and the vote was to
20 defer the proposal to the Middle Yukon because it's in
21 21D. But this Regional Advisory Council covers 21D
22 also. So this is an allocation issue. I don't feel
23 that this proposal will affect the subsistence users to
24 a large degree because it's a limited number of permits
25 and it's just when they're actually going to issue
26 them. I don't feel that the Council needs to look at
27 this, but this was right below Eleanor's area there.
28 Too bad we don't have Darrell on the phone to talk
29 about this one.

30

31 The Koyukuk Advisory voted 12-1 to
32 defer the proposal. I don't feel that this allocation
33 issue affects subsistence uses so I don't feel that the
34 Council needs to take it up, but if somebody wants to
35 make a motion to that effect. What do you think,
36 Eleanor?

37

38 MR. YATLIN: If the Koyukuk River
39 Advisory deferred it, then you're on there and Pollock
40 is on there.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I voted to
43 defer it to the Middle Yukon because it didn't affect
44 the Koyukuk River and I don't feel that -- on the
45 Western Interior Council, I don't feel that it affects
46 subsistence users at all. It's just how the drawing
47 permit is going to be executed, so I don't think it
48 affects -- the subsistence hunters hunt on a
49 subsistence registration permit. This is the drawing
50 permit so they can keep the antlers. The sport hunters

1 use that drawing permit. So this is just splitting it
2 up. Middle Yukon wants it. Well, that's fine, but I
3 don't think that the Council needs to actually weigh in
4 on it.

5

6 MR. SIMON: No action.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No action?

9

10 MR. J. WALKER: Okay.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. No action,
13 Eleanor? What do you think? I want you to have a say
14 though.

15 MS. YATLIN: I'm just thinking about
16 what the village would think about this. That's what I
17 was thinking about.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jackie, Darrell, who
20 else was there from Huslia, and they voted to defer it.
21 So it seemed to be the sentiment to defer.

22

23 MS. YATLIN: I don't know if they're
24 speaking for the majority of the people, but, yeah,
25 that's what I was thinking.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, Sean Huffman was
28 there.

29

30 MS. YATLIN: Oh, Sean? Yeah, he's a
31 licensed guide person. Yeah, defer.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So Proposal 161 will
34 not be reviewed by the Council. Proposal 162 is a
35 proposal that the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee
36 looked at very closely. This would allow -- there's a
37 drawing permit for the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area and,
38 let's see, we've got Koyukuk staff here. Let's bring
39 the Koyukuk up to talk about this proposal. This
40 Proposal 162 has some real barbs in it, so we need to
41 talk about this proposal. The Council needs to make a
42 recommendation to the Board of Game on it. Do you want
43 to lay out the proposal real briefly, Kenton, since
44 you've looked at this proposal.

45

46 MR. MOOS: Mr. Chair. Kenton Moos,
47 Refuge Manager for the Koyukuk/Nowitna National
48 Wildlife Refuge. This proposal is put forth by Joe
49 Schuester. It would allow 10 percent of the draw
50 permits to use aircraft or access within the controlled

1 use area. Again, it's just 10 percent of the draw,
2 which would -- I believe there's 50 or 60 permits with
3 10 percent, which would mean about five or six
4 individuals would then be allowed to access the
5 controlled use area by the airplane. That's the short
6 of it.

7
8 There's a number of things that come up
9 with this whole proposal. Biologically speaking at the
10 Refuge, we don't have concerns with this because again
11 a dead moose is a dead moose and if we have 50 permits
12 and of that let's say 25 moose are taken whether
13 they're taken along the river corridor or off in a
14 lake, a dead moose is a dead moose. So, biologically
15 speaking, there's not very many concerns with this.

16
17 Some concerns that have been brought up
18 we do have is, again, this proposal would open the door
19 for airplane use within a controlled use area. The
20 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, locals have been very
21 vocal about maintaining the controlled use area.
22 Again, this would potentially open that door.

23
24 What I see potentially happening is you
25 have registration hunts which locals can use. It's a
26 subsistence hunt. With subsistence priority, I guess
27 one could argue that if you allow a non-resident to
28 access an area by aircraft, why not subsistence users.
29 Let's just put it this way, it opens up a very large
30 door.

31
32 The Refuge has basically taken no
33 position on this because, again, there's conflicting
34 things going on here. I know Joe Schuester, one of the
35 arguments he's making is he's trying to provide for a
36 quality hunt. Again, part of our responsibilities as a
37 Refuge is to provide for quality opportunities for
38 users, both local and non-local users, so that point is
39 something we did consider as well, but we just felt it
40 prudent not to take a stance on this at this time.
41 That's our position.

42
43 The State, I don't know if you have
44 their position or not. It was presented at the AC
45 meeting and they are making no recommendation, I
46 believe, as well. But that's a little bit of the
47 background behind it. Does anybody have any questions
48 regarding it?

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So at this time the

1 Chair will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 162.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: So moved.

4

5 MS. YATLIN: Second.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
8 Council discussion. The Advisory Committee met on that
9 and there was -- I have my notes here. Of course, I'm
10 the chair of the Advisory Committee. There was a lot
11 of discussion and concern about this proposal.
12 Jackie Wholecheese is concerned that the large breeding
13 bulls are a very important aspect and recognized in
14 traditional ecological knowledge as a very important --
15 and that's actually supported biologically. If you
16 read a moose management book, it says that you've got
17 to have three year old and older bulls for a fair
18 amount of interaction with cows and we want to maintain
19 large bulls that have been through many years of deep
20 snows and are smart enough to stay away from wolves.

21

22 The Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan
23 set out management objectives of 30 bulls per 100 cows
24 in trying to keep a healthy population of bulls. We
25 get a heck of a lot of snow. In Huslia right now
26 they've got a lot of snow, so those big, healthy calves
27 can get through that snow. Statistically they will
28 survive some of these deep snow years when smaller
29 calves won't.

30

31 There was concern by locals about
32 maintaining the older bull post-hunt component for
33 breeding. There was concern this plan would crack into
34 the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area and would start giving
35 the Board -- the real concern is to allow State
36 subsistence hunters to use the registration permit to
37 access the Koyukuk Controlled Use -- this almost blows
38 the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan right out of
39 the water. We'd have thousands of hunters wanting to
40 participate in that hunt.

41

42 So there was quite a bit of discussion
43 about this proposal and we were really really concerned
44 that this would eventually eliminate the Koyukuk
45 Controlled Use Area. I spoke to the Federal
46 Subsistence Board about the success of the Koyukuk
47 Moose Management Plan, how the antler destruction
48 regulates the number of State subsistence participants,
49 the drawing hunt allocates some sport use and we
50 maintain a 30 bull per 100 cow, so we have a well-oiled

1 machine working. We do not need to disrupts that.

2

3 So I'm very opposed to the proposal
4 because it opens the door to reducing or eliminating
5 the Controlled Use Area. I'll let the Council talk
6 now. Eleanor.

7

8 MS. YATLIN: My name is Eleanor Yatlin.
9 I'm not Carl. I would oppose this even if it's 10
10 percent. I know this Joe Schuester, he's a guide, and
11 he takes his clients out by plane. That would open up
12 the Koyukuk Refuge for all this different area, so I
13 deeply oppose this. I know probably as many people in
14 the village of Huslia especially would oppose it.

15

16 Like I brought up earlier, I would
17 still reiterate our traditional values. What I saw
18 that happened in Bettles, there's no moose up there
19 now. The caribou -- the outside hunters treat our
20 animal and even the land, you know, and just dragging
21 the moose around or caribou, the animals around like
22 that, we value it in order for us to survive. The
23 people that survived for tens of thousands of years in
24 living off the land because we respect the animals and
25 the lands and everything else. To open this up would
26 be -- I saw it myself, so I know what I'm speaking
27 about.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Eleanor.
30 That's good for the record. Pollock.

31

32 MR. SIMON: In 1972, we formed the
33 Koyukuk River Management Committee. Shortly after we
34 realized that airplanes were flying into the Koyukuk
35 River valley and taking large bull moose. It was a
36 struggle, but we formed a Controlled Use Area around
37 Allakaket and the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area. That
38 kept sport hunters out because we showed that the
39 hunters would eventually deplete the moose population.
40 It was a struggle and a lot of work to get the
41 Controlled Use Area in place.

42

43 I'm opposed to this proposal because
44 you turn around and start changing the boundary line
45 for hunters to come in 10 percent, that's just a start.
46 Before some people wanted to do away with the
47 Controlled Use Area completely. I don't like the idea
48 of start cutting away the boundary lines, like taking
49 10 percent. Maybe next time another 10 percent.
50 Personally I don't like this proposal.

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock.

4 Those are very good comments. Good historical
5 perspective and I appreciate that. Other comments.
6 James.

7

8 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
9 What it looks like to me is that this boils down to an
10 exclusive economic permit. It's unfair to the locals
11 that use other means of transportation other than
12 aircraft, which most do. I feel that any allowance of
13 aircraft in the Refuge area as far as hunting should
14 not be allowed at all.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for those
17 comments, James. Jenny.

18

19 MS. PELKOLA: I'm surprised this came
20 up again. I know in our area we hate airplanes during
21 moose season because they disrupt somebody that's
22 hunting. Some of them just buzz at you and there's
23 like no respect for the local hunters. Some of us,
24 people I know, they don't just hunt right off the
25 river, they have to walk in and then if you see an
26 airplane there -- you know, it happened to us one time.
27 Is that an airplane over there and couldn't figure it
28 out.

29

30 But I know a lot of the breeding bulls,
31 the big ones, are way -- you know, they hide out for a
32 while. That's where the cream of the crop is, is for
33 our breeding to keep our moose alive. I'm opposed to
34 that.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate that,
37 Jenny. Ray.

38

39 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I'm opposed to the
40 use of aircraft in a Controlled Use Area because it
41 defeats the purpose of that, which was to equalize
42 hunting. In other words, everybody is on the ground
43 hunting the same way. I know the way planes are used.
44 They can scout around and they know where the moose is
45 and you spend a lot of time trying to get there and
46 then there's a plane sitting there. They have other
47 areas that they can fly to that boat hunters can't get
48 to, so it keeps them separated.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

1 MR. COLLINS: And there is a proposal
2 in here to review all of them and we certainly want to
3 oppose that.

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There are areas
6 available for aircraft access that aren't within the
7 Controlled Use Area, so this is a longstanding issue.
8 I think one of the primary things that we want to
9 convey to the Board of Game is that this would violate
10 the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan, it would
11 disrupt the plan itself and the plan is working
12 perfectly. So I feel that's a primary reason to oppose
13 the proposal.

14
15 The inroads into the Controlled Use
16 Area and other ways of entrance of the subsistence non-
17 local use by aircraft in the future, this would be
18 Pandora's Box, so we have to oppose this proposal
19 mainly in violation of the Koyukuk River Moose
20 Management Plan and for other reasons.

21
22 Those in favor of Proposal 162 signify
23 by saying aye.

24
25 (No aye votes)

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to
28 Proposal 162 to allocate 10 percent of the drawing
29 permits for moose in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area
30 also signify by saying aye.

31
32 IN UNISON: Aye.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal fails.
35 I heard Tim's affirmative. We have just a very short
36 time, but this Intensive Management Plan for 24B, Glenn
37 Stout has worked extensively on developing this
38 Intensive Management Plan for 24B. The Koyukuk River
39 Advisory Committee was given a slide show, PowerPoint
40 presentation on the Intensive Management Plan. This
41 comes because the people of Allakaket and Alatna have
42 been requesting this for several years.

43
44 Are you familiar with this plan at all,
45 Josh? No.

46
47 MR. PEIRCE: Just from what I've heard
48 Glenn talk about in some of our regional meetings and
49 you sitting on that Advisory Committee up there, I'm
50 sure you've got a lot more detail than I have.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This plan was fairly
2 extensively discussed at the Advisory Committee level.
3 Primarily the moose population is about half of what it
4 was in the early '90s. It had a steady decline. It's
5 limited by bear predation and wolf predation. The
6 management plan would be sort of around Allakaket and
7 Alatna and would only occur on the BLM and the State
8 lands. They would collar calf moose and start doing --
9 would simultaneously have two areas that they would be
10 monitoring. One would be way far away from where
11 people hunt in the southeastern part of the Kanuti and
12 where two moose populations have similar status and
13 they would track how this intensive management would
14 actually effect the moose population.

15
16 The way the State portrayed it, there's
17 a calculation that there would be a savings of about 40
18 moose basically taking the moose out of the wolves
19 mouth and allocating those toward human harvest. This
20 does not address bear trapping because the State
21 recognized that bear control or trapping or anything
22 within the Koyukon Region is not acceptable. So the
23 scientific information that Glenn Stout presented to
24 the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee was it shows that
25 it was a well thought out plan, much better than some
26 of the plans that I've seen, so the Advisory Committee
27 adopted the Proposal 163 for the area near Allakaket.
28 It's the upper Koyukuk village MMA or something.

29
30 MR. PEIRCE: Moose management area.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moose management
33 area. So that's the upshot of that proposal. The
34 Chair will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 163.

35
36 MR. SIMON: So moved.

37
38 MS. YATLIN: Second.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Pollock and
41 seconded by Eleanor. Discussion on intensive
42 management. It's a 1,360-square-mile area around
43 Allakaket and Alatna. Discussion by the Council on
44 intensive management in 24B by Allakaket, Alatna.
45 Support. Discussion. Pollock, you spoke about this
46 Intensive Management Plan in your opening comments.
47 For the record, you're fully supportive. Go ahead.

48
49 MR. SIMON: Yeah, the people of
50 Allakaket, Alatna would really like to get this State

1 program going so we could get some of our moose back.
2 One year alone there was only 13 moose taken because of
3 global warming effect. Moose didn't come off the hill
4 until it gets colder and travel down the river was
5 shallow. If we get more moose, then maybe we'll see
6 more moose on the river. There's over 40 families in
7 Allakaket, Alatna. Sometimes moose meat is spread out
8 pretty thin. People are excited about this State
9 program to catch some moose and so hopefully the Board
10 of Game passes the proposal.

11

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Pollock.
I like to build the record on these various proposals.
Any further discussion on Proposal 163.

(No comments)

MR. SIMON: Question.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
called. Those in favor of Proposal 163 signify by
saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.

(No opposing comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're pretty much
on lunch. So we will break for how long, Melinda,
about an hour?

MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, let's do an hour.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So we'll
break for one hour.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll come back into
session. We're still in review of the Board of Game
proposals. Did you want to make a few comments, Vince,
about the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council's
interpretation of.....

1 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, I called Diana
2 Stram. Dr. Stram was not in, so I was referred to the
3 Deputy Dave Witherell, if I pronounced it right. He
4 says they believe the Secretary of Commerce are not
5 bound to tribal consultation. So I don't remember what
6 action you were going to take, but I believe you were
7 going to say that they should be or some action to
8 that.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Writing a letter
11 through the Federal Subsistence Board to request the
12 Federal Board to look at the Presidential mandate for
13 tribal consultation and bring the Department of
14 Commerce on line with what the President's intention
15 was. That was our intent.

16
17 MR. MATHEWS: They are trying to do
18 outreach, I do want to convey that, through their
19 teleconference and then through attending your
20 meetings. Just so the record reflects that, that they
21 are interested in hearing from the affected communities
22 in river. To their knowledge, they're not bound to the
23 tribal consultation requirement.

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Well, that's
26 a contention. So we're back on the Board of Game
27 proposals. We just got finished with Proposal 163.
28 We're on Proposal 164, eliminate the use of aircraft
29 restriction in the Kanuti Controlled Use Area. This is
30 a proposal that would basically eliminate the Kanuti
31 Controlled Use Area. There was quite a bit of
32 discussion at the Advisory Committee level. This
33 proposal would be a detriment to subsistence uses in an
34 area that's already recognized to have a need for moose
35 harvest and the State is implementing an Intensive
36 Management Plan in portions of the Kanuti Controlled
37 Use Area.

38
39 So the Chair will entertain a motion to
40 adopt Proposal 164 for discussion.

41
42 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Jenny.

45
46 MS. YATLIN: Second.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Eleanor.
49 The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee, especially
50 members like Harding Sam, were very concerned about

1 this proposal. Pollock, do you want to comment about
2 elimination of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area.

3

4 MR. SIMON: Yes, we're opposed to this
5 Proposal 164. I told you earlier that in the Kanuti
6 Refuge there is very limited amount of moose. It came
7 down quite a bit. If the Controlled Use Area is in
8 place, then there's no planes flying in to hunt.
9 There's some big lakes within the Kanuti Refuge that
10 they could land and hunt, but this Controlled Use Area
11 is in place for a purpose. The people of Allakaket and
12 Alatna want to keep it in place.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock.
17 Any other Council discussion. Eleanor. None?

18

19 MS. YATLIN: No.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I pointed out at the
22 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee meeting that the
23 Kanuti Controlled Use Area is right next to Bettles.
24 There's two air taxis permanently stationed there and
25 there are other air taxis from Fairbanks that would
26 have access to the Kanuti easily. It's right adjacent
27 to the Dalton Highway and there was already one air
28 taxi flying with a float-equipped aircraft from the
29 Dalton Highway from Grayling Lake this last season.

30

31 The affect would be a tremendous influx
32 of hunting upon a moose population that's about 50
33 percent of what it was in the early '90s. The State
34 already recognizes that there's a problem with the
35 moose population for even subsistence uses in
36 implementing the Intensive Management Plan, which is
37 Proposal 163. So I oppose Proposal 164 on those
38 grounds for the record.

39

40 Any further discussion. Robert.

41

42 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43 It says right here Controlled Use Area, eliminate the
44 restrictions on aircraft on the Kanuti Controlled Use
45 Area. It's kind of like the reverse from saying yes to
46 no, to no to yes. I would emphasize caution here.

47

48 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Robert. The

1 effect is elimination of restrictions. There's
2 restrictions on the use of aircraft. Vince wants to
3 clarify that. Go ahead, Vince.

4
5 MR. MATHEWS: Out of fairness, as you
6 dealt with the proposals earlier, you asked for the
7 State's position on proposals and I can share the
8 letter that Kanuti Refuge submitted to the Federal
9 Subsistence Board on this proposal. Then there's a
10 letter from OSM on this same proposal going to the
11 Board of Game.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

14
15 MR. MATHEWS: So your record would be
16 complete that you have all the information in front of
17 you.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have any
20 information on this proposal, Josh? McGrath area
21 hasn't had any information on these Galena proposals.
22 Have you gotten any kind of transmission on any of
23 these proposals, George?

24
25 (No response)

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would like to have
28 the State's current position. The State's position
29 changes periodically and I would like to know what
30 their position is right this minute. We know what it
31 was when we had the AC meeting.

32
33 Do you have copies of the Koyukuk
34 Refuge and the OSM position?

35
36 MR. MATHEWS: I can't find the one from
37 OSM, but I do have the one from the Refuge. It's quite
38 lengthy, so I'll just hit the high points. It's a page
39 and a half, but basically the Refuge submitted this in
40 opposition to Proposal 151, which you're taking up
41 later, and 164.

42
43 The main points are if the State
44 Controlled Use Area is eliminated along with these
45 aircraft prohibitions, the Federal Controlled Use Area
46 would remain in effect, but the result of that would
47 end up in a very complicated regulatory climate for
48 airborne hunters and challenges for law enforcement
49 personnel because they would need to know -- and these
50 are the key points -- the exact boundaries of the

1 Federal, State and private lands in order to understand
2 where aircraft would be allowed. Next, which water
3 bodies would be open for aircraft use and where the
4 mean high water mark would be. Then the last one is
5 that the closure of Federal lands to aircraft or
6 hunting and to non-Federally qualified hunters within
7 the Controlled Use Area would remain. This is Federal.
8 So if you guys remember that area, there's these lines
9 and all that.

10

11 So, to be honest with you, when we
12 first looked at the proposal we thought the same thing,
13 lifting it would not be a big deal, but it is by the
14 fact of the complication of jurisdiction.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Robert.

17

18 MR. R. WALKER: Vince. I'm just saying
19 that like the way it's written up is a yes means no and
20 a no means yes. I want to be very careful on how we
21 want to -- we don't want to support it, but if we say
22 no, we might be supporting it. If we say yes, is it
23 just a vice versa of what.....

24

25 MR. MATHEWS: No.

26

27 MR. R. WALKER: Okay.

28

29 MR. MATHEWS: No, the proposal is to
30 request to eliminate that. So if you put forward a
31 motion to adopt, a vote of yes would be to say to get
32 rid of it. A vote no would be to say, no, it maintain.
33 Is that clear?

34

35 MR. R. WALKER: Okay.

36

37 MR. MATHEWS: It's also going to come
38 up with Proposal 151 also.

39

40 MR. VENT: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Darrell.

43

44 MR. VENT: Also on Proposal 162 it had
45 the same wording in there almost for aircraft use in
46 that Koyukuk Controlled use area.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: When you got kicked
49 offline, we actually dealt with 162 and we opposed that
50 proposal, the 10 percent allocation for aircraft use

1 because of fears for the erosion of the Controlled Use
2 Area and violating the Moose Management Plan that's
3 working pretty perfectly at this time. So that
4 Proposal 162 was opposed by the Regional Council.

5

6 MR. VENT: Also I missed out on 161.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 161, we deferred
9 that to the Middle Yukon and the Board of Game.
10 There's a set number of permits that divides it into
11 two different hunts. So like the Koyukuk River did, we
12 deferred it to the Board of Game's discretion on how to
13 deal with that. It has no effect on subsistence use.

14

15 MR. VENT: I actually kind of doubt it.
16 There's been more hunting in our area. I should have
17 brought something up on that, but we got cut off a time
18 ago. Sorry for the interruption there.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The State only
21 decides on so many permits are going to be issued. So
22 if there's 50 permits, they're going to divide them
23 into 25 a piece for each one of these hunts. It's no
24 more moose. It's just the same amount of moose. It
25 doesn't actually have -- and those permits are valid
26 throughout the whole Koyukuk Controlled Use Area. It
27 basically has no effect on -- the registration hunt
28 with the destruction of the antler has an unlimited
29 amount and that's not part of the proposal, so it
30 doesn't actually affect the subsistence users. It
31 affects the sport hunt.

32

33 Moving back to -- oh, Eleanor. Go
34 ahead.

35

36 MS. YATLIN: Mr. Chairman. I would
37 like -- for Pollock and I, I would like Vince to say
38 one more time how it's worded, the way it's worded.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 MR. MATHEWS: I did find the OSM
43 letter. Basically they're all mirroring -- if you boil
44 it down, 164 is on Kanuti Controlled Use Area, it's
45 eliminate the restrictions on aircraft in the Kanuti
46 Controlled Use Area. So it would lift the restrictions
47 so aircraft could go in there.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So if you want to
50 eliminate the Controlled Use Area, you would vote for

1 the proposal. If you want to maintain the Controlled
2 Use Area, you oppose the proposal. So we oppose the
3 elimination of the Controlled Use Area. We want to
4 keep it.

5
6 MS. YATLIN: I just wanted that
7 clarified.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that's the way
10 the Board of Game is going to look at the proposal.
11 They're going to vote it up or down to maintain or
12 eliminate.

13
14 For the record, I want to point out
15 that the Kanuti Wildlife Refuge Staff -- pointing out
16 the disparate private lands. Those private lands are
17 primarily Doyon Corporation lands and those are closed.
18 So there would be encouraging trespass on Native
19 corporation lands because the State has authority on
20 the Native corp lands. So that's another reason to
21 oppose this. This just encourages trespass on the
22 Native corp lands. Those aren't just State lands,
23 those are corp lands within the Controlled Use Area
24 primarily.

25
26 Further discussion on the proposal.

27
28 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
31 called. Those in favor of Proposal 164 to eliminate
32 the Kanuti Controlled Use Area signify by saying aye.

33
34 (No aye votes)

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
37 sign.

38
39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so unanimous
42 opposition to Proposal 164.

43
44 Proposal 165 was looked at by the
45 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area. Glenn Stout displayed the
46 range of the Galena -- this was to eliminate
47 non-resident use of caribou for the Galena Mountain
48 Herd in Unit 24. The Galena Herd doesn't even go into
49 Unit 24, so it's a moot subject. We felt that the
50 proponent didn't understand what the range of the

1 Galena Mountain Herd was and it's actually closed right
2 now. There's no harvest in Unit 21D and B. So that's
3 a moot subject.

4

5 So we're at Proposal 167. It was one
6 that the Koyukuk River took up and it's to increase the
7 wolf season in GMU 21, 22 and 24 from August 10th and
8 extend it from April 30th to May 31. There was quite a
9 bit of discussion about that proposal.

10

11 The Chair will open up the floor for a
12 motion to adopt Proposal 167.

13

14 MR. SIMON: So moved.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Pollock.

17

18 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by James.
21 The Koyukuk comments revolved around -- you could talk
22 to the comments you had about the quality of the fur
23 and so forth, Pollock.

24

25 MR. SIMON: Okay. I can't remember
26 what I said in the Koyukuk Advisory Council meeting,
27 but speaking for Unit 24 moose in my area. Our elders
28 have told us not to kill the animals, take what we
29 don't eat, not in quantity. Like wolf, for instance,
30 the pelt is very important to our people. We use for
31 parka trimmings and ruff mitts and trimming on the
32 boots, mukluks. There are a lot of wolves, so we try
33 to kill the wolves. That's not the way my people look
34 at it. My elders have a different idea. By the end of
35 May some of those female wolves having pups and the fur
36 is fading by the end of April, so we don't shoot the
37 wolves just to hang in the living room. That's not our
38 purpose. I'm always opposed to late season. That pelt
39 is not in quality.

40

41 That's my comments.

42

43 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Pollock.
46 Other discussion from the Council.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Advisory

1 Committee looked at the quality issue, but then looked
2 at also the wolf population is vastly underharvested in
3 Unit 24, 21 and 22. Several of the committee members
4 felt that there would be very few participants. Well,
5 local people wouldn't even take them. It would
6 basically be clients of hunting guides when they're
7 pursuing bears would be the primary harvest. This
8 would allow those people to take a wolf.

9
10 The Advisory Committee voted to adopt
11 with one abstinence, Jackie Wholecheese, from respect.
12 I actually wasn't sure. I thought that possibly
13 Pollock was abstaining from that vote, but I didn't see
14 that reflected in the record. But Proposal 167 was
15 adopted by the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee.

16
17 Any further discussion on the proposal.
18 Do you have discussion, Eleanor.

19
20 MS. YATLIN: No.

21
22 MR. SIMON: Question.

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
25 called on Proposal 167. Those in favor of 167 signify
26 by saying aye.

27
28 IN UNISON: Aye.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
31 sign.

32
33 MR. SIMON: Aye.

34
35 MS. YATLIN: Aye.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So Pollock and
38 Eleanor are opposed to the proposal. The majority
39 supports.

40
41 MS. YATLIN: Where did Ray go?

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't know where
44 Ray went. Ray took off for a minute. So the Koyukuk
45 River took up brown bear baiting Proposal 168 submitted
46 by the Middle Yukon Advisory Committee for Unit 21D.
47 The Chair will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 168
48 just for the record.

49
50 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

1 MR. SIMON: Second.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jenny. Seconded by
4 Pollock. Discussion on the proposal.
5
6 MR. VENT: Yes, Mr. Chair.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Darrell.
9
10 MR. VENT: This Proposal 168, I
11 remember I abstained from voting on it because of our
12 belief on the animal. You know, we hold it in great
13 respect. It's going to be on the lower Dulbi Slough,
14 which is close to our area. The Middle Yukon Advisory
15 put it in, but they didn't give us any input where the
16 proposal would put in and it's concerning some of our
17 area. I talked to some of our elders around here and
18 they stated that they would not like to have the brown
19 bears be baited around the Dulbi Slough area.
20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for the
22 comments, Darrell. We have a motion on the floor to
23 adopt. I'm getting indications that certain Council
24 members would like to defer the proposal. We can vote
25 the proposal up or down.
26
27 MR. R. WALKER: They have to withdraw
28 their motion.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Chair will
31 entertain -- to withdraw the motion? The mover and the
32 second.
33
34 MS. PELKOLA: I'm the mover.
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Would you
37 like to withdraw the motion?
38
39 MS. PELKOLA: Yes.
40
41 MR. SIMON: Withdraw the second.
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Chair will
44 entertain a motion to defer the proposal.
45
46 MS. PELKOLA: So move.
47
48 MR. SIMON: Second.
49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Discussion on the

1 deferral is that this is a very sensitive issue with
2 the Koyukon culture, so the Koyukuk sort of waded into
3 that one basically in support of the Middle Yukon, but
4 they are within the Western Interior Region.
5 Those in favor of deferral of Proposal 168 signify by
6 saying aye.

7

8 IN UNISON: Aye.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And so
11 then.....

12

13 MR. GERVAIS: Hang on a minute, Jack.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

16

17 MR. GERVAIS: I have some discussion on
18 that. Ruby AC passed that proposal also. If Western
19 Interior defers this, you have Koyukuk, Middle Yukon
20 and Ruby in favor of that. Most likely it will pass on
21 the Federal level. I'd just point out if we defer it,
22 then it looks like it would get approved anyway.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's recognized
25 that that's the most likely action of the Board. From
26 the Western Interior Council perspective, this gets
27 into a cultural issue. I was getting indications that
28 people wanted to move away from this proposal.
29 So that's understood.

30

31 Proposal 169 is like the previous
32 proposal. It's to extend the lynx season and I think
33 Glenn Stout told us they actually included Unit 24 and
34 the Galena area to extend the season. His analysis
35 showed that the lynx population is not harvested at
36 optimum and still resources to use, so the Galena
37 biologist included Unit 24. So this would be a season
38 extension for Unit 21 and Unit 24 from November 1 to
39 March 31.

40

41 The Chair will entertain a motion to
42 adopt Proposal 169.

43

44 MR. SIMON: So moved.

45

46 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Pollock,
49 seconded by James. Discussion. Pollock, do you want
50 to speak to that.

1 MR. SIMON: It's the same thing I said
2 about the wolf skin quality. To the extent the lynx
3 trapping season is the same thing, there's no quality
4 in the fur. At the end of this month, February, that's
5 the season right now. There's abundant lynx all over,
6 you know. People want to catch some of this. As soon
7 as it starts warming up, just like about now, the lynx
8 mating season and they start rubbing and hair starts
9 falling off, so the quality of the fur drops way down.
10 In Allakaket we end our trapping right about now, by
11 the end of February.

12

13 Thanks, Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock.
16 Any other Council discussion.

17

18 MR. VENT: Mr. Chairman.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Darrell.

21

22 MR. VENT: They were trying to include
23 Unit 24. Our terrain is very dense around here, so we
24 didn't have no big comeback to lynx like they do down
25 around 21. So I wouldn't support this proposal
26 because, you know, our lynx population didn't increase
27 or anything.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Darrell, for
30 the comments. The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee
31 discussed the quality. A lot of people talked about
32 switching from marten and lynx trapping to beaver
33 trapping.

34

35 Did we lose you, Tim?

36

37 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, I'm still here.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I heard
40 somebody drop off. There was support and there was
41 opposition to the proposal, so we had a split vote. I
42 spoke for the proposal. I live in the mountains in the
43 upper part of Unit 24, so it never melts before the end
44 of March up there, so the quality stays fairly high.
45 So portions of Unit 24 -- we used to have a lynx season
46 that went all the way to the 31st of March and then
47 back when the lynx price went real sky high, then the
48 Department got worried about the lynx population being
49 overharvested because they were 500 bucks a piece.
50 Well, it's not 500 bucks a piece anymore and they're

1 not even harvested at that sustainability.

2

3 So the Koyukuk River opposed by 8 votes
4 and 3 supported. Myself and one person from Allakaket
5 and one person from Huslia supported the proposal for
6 the record.

7

8 Any further discussion on Proposal 169.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 MR. SIMON: Question.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
15 called. Those in favor of Proposal 169 signify by
16 saying aye.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Aye. Those opposed
19 same sign.

20

21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we have -- I
24 don't know where Ray is at.

25

26 MR. J. WALKER: He said he's going to
27 take a nap.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did he really?

30

31 MR. J. WALKER: Yeah, he said he's
32 going home to take a nap.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I thought you
35 were kidding. Okay, Ray went home to take a nap. We
36 have six opposed and one in support. What did you
37 vote, Tim.

38

39 MR. GERVAIS: I'm supporting the
40 proposal.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have two in
43 support of the proposal.

44

45 MR. R. WALKER: And one sleeping.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And one abstaining
48 through sleep.

49

50 (Laughter)

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So then we're moving
2 into periphery proposals that are outside of those
3 areas. One would be 141, which Proposal 141 is a
4 proposal by the Department. Do you want to speak to
5 that one, Josh.

6
7 MR. PEIRCE: Josh Peirce again with the
8 Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Proposal 141 would
9 create a trapping season for black bear. It was a year
10 or so ago that the Board of Game reclassified or added
11 to the classification of black bears. It became big
12 game as well as a furbearer species, but at that time
13 no season was established. The Board asked the
14 Department to put together a proposal that would
15 establish a trapping season for black bears. That
16 rippled through the regulations and you can see this is
17 a fairly lengthy, complicated change to the
18 regulations. There's things like incidental take of
19 brown bear in here, how non-residents would be affected
20 by this. You know, could they participate because of
21 the restrictions on harvesting brown bears by non-
22 residents without a guide.

23
24 So, like I said, the Department was
25 asked to put this proposal together for the Board and
26 the Department's recommendation is no recommendation.
27 It's viewed as a change in the methods basically to be
28 left to the Board of Game to decide. The areas
29 included that would affect us are 19A and 19D. The
30 McGrath Advisory Committee strongly supports this. The
31 Stony/Holitna Advisory Committee strongly supported
32 this. The Central Kuskokwim AC did not meet to discuss
33 this. When I brought it up with the GASH AC, they just
34 passed on the proposal. They weren't interested in it
35 in their area at all, so they took no action on it, I
36 guess. That's the summary of it.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Josh. This
39 was outside of the Koyukuk area, but David James, the
40 Region 3 director, was at our meeting and he requested
41 that the Koyukuk River weigh in on this proposal. The
42 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee took this proposal up.
43 We discussed the proposal fairly lengthy.

44
45 The Chair will entertain a motion to
46 adopt Proposal 141 for discussion purposes to be on the
47 record.

48
49 MR. SIMON: So moved.
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you want to speak
2 to trapping and the sale of black bear, Pollock.

3
4 MR. SIMON: Again in my area we don't
5 snare bears or trap bears. We just hunt for them.
6 I've trapped a lot of them all my life myself, but I
7 wouldn't set a trap for bear. Catch a grizzly, he's
8 pretty riled up. I don't want to dispatch a riled
9 animal. You trap a bear, he's going to be alive, so
10 he's going to be pretty angry. It's okay with our area
11 if they want to take a bear with a trap, that's fine,
12 but in our area, Koyukuk River, Allakaket won't set a
13 trap for bear.

14
15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock.
18 That's good discussion for the record. Any other
19 discussion on Proposal 141.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Koyukuk River
24 took up the proposal and there was unanimous opposition
25 to the proposal for the cultural beliefs of disrespect
26 to bears. Myself, I opposed the snaring because I trap
27 furbearers all winter, so there's already enough anti-
28 trapping sentiment already and this trapping of the
29 incidental harvest of sows with cubs is a big issue
30 with the public. It's hard enough to hang onto wolf
31 trapping and the real predator harvest that we need. A
32 female sow grizzly or black bear has a real poor hair
33 quality. Their natal den, they rub themselves out,
34 there's going to be absolutely worthless skins, so
35 they're going to have to dispatch these cubs, so this
36 is unpalatable on.....

37
38 MS. HERNANDEZ: I don't think we got a
39 second on that.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I thought
42 Pollock seconded.

43
44 MS. YATLIN: He made the motion to
45 adopt. I didn't say nothing.

46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I thought you
48 seconded.

49
50 MS. YATLIN: No, I didn't. I'm not

1 even supposed to talk about it.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Oh. Well,
4 who did? I thought you indicated that you seconded.

5

6 MS. YATLIN: No, no.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay. Out of
9 turn here. So is there a second.

10

11 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we got James to
14 second it. I know that, Eleanor. So the Koyukuk River
15 Advisory Committee opposed the proposal. This bycatch
16 of brown bears and sows with cubs of both species is a
17 big issue that the Board should really contemplate.
18 Basically it's a bycatch of waste because you're going
19 to throw these cubs and you're going to throw these sow
20 skins away.

21

22 I personally wrote to the Board of Game
23 and my own comment. I'm much more in favor of taking
24 bears same day airborne 500 meters from an aircraft in
25 expanding methods and means without the use of snaring
26 of bears, which is driving an anti-trapping sentiment
27 statement. Ray, during lunch, he made reasons that he
28 would be supportive of the proposal and would speak for
29 the proposal because of the high cost of travel and so
30 forth. There's varying degrees of support and
31 opposition for the proposal.

32

33 I feel that when the Board was going to
34 visit this black bear trapping issue back two falls
35 ago, this Council was very incensed that they didn't
36 have enough -- it came up and it wasn't actually within
37 the procedural act. They were acting upon a proposal
38 that they hadn't published for 30 days. This thing
39 popped up and it was like two weeks into publication.
40 So this Council wanted to be able to make comments, so
41 that's why I would like the Council to weigh in on this
42 issue.

43

44 So after all that is there any further
45 discussion of the proposal.

46

47 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
50 called. Those in favor of supporting trapping of black

1 bear, Department Proposal 141 to allow the trapping and
2 sale of black bear, signify by saying aye.

3

4 (No aye votes)

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
7 sign.

8

9 IN UNISON: Aye.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I will register that
12 verbal communication with Ray. I would feel that he
13 would support the proposal. George, you've got a
14 comment.

15

16 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you. George Pappas,
17 Fish and Game. Sorry to interrupt. Could I request
18 the Chair to identify which Fish and Game personnel are
19 on the teleconference. I believe we have multiple
20 people online. Our resources have been split between
21 the Eastern Interior RAC and this RAC, so we have a lot
22 of Staff over at the other one right now. So I don't
23 know who's online, sir.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll poll the
26 conference line here. Who is online? Tim Gervais is
27 online. I know that. Amy Craver, are you still there?

28

29 (No response)

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is anybody else from
32 Alaska Department of Fish and Game online?

33

34 MR. NEWLAND: Eric Newland with the
35 Alaska Department of Fish and Game in Anchorage is
36 online.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Eric. No
39 Division of Wildlife Conservation. So Eastern gets all
40 the bang there in Fairbanks. They got the plushy Pikes
41 Landing Hotel there to have a meeting in. We have Pat
42 Pourchot though.

43

44 (Laughter)

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're moving on
47 to Proposal 151 in the proposal book. 151 is a
48 proposal by the Fairbanks Advisory Committee. Do you
49 want to address that proposal. That was a State
50 regionwide proposal to review the conditions of

1 Controlled Use Areas in Region 3 and repeal those that
2 no longer meet the original intent. Go ahead, Josh.

3

4 MR. PEIRCE: This proposal is similar
5 in nature to that one you guys discussed in the Kanuti
6 Controlled Use Area. In the McGrath area office
7 management area we have three Controlled Use Areas that
8 this would affect. Two of them are related to aircraft
9 and one is related to 40-horse power restriction on the
10 Holitna/Hoholitna River drainages for big game hunting.

11

12 As you said, if this proposal passed,
13 it would -- well, what it's looking to do is review
14 each and every one individually, but throughout all of
15 Region 3 and repeal those that no longer meet the
16 original intent. So the Advisory Committees that are
17 affected by this are on record as opposed to it.
18 McGrath has the Upper Kuskokwim Controlled Use Area.
19 They want to keep that in place. The GASH has the
20 Paradise Controlled Use Area. Again, aircraft, they
21 want to keep that in place. And then the Shag has the
22 Holitna/Hoholitna Controlled Use Area, which is a 40-
23 horse restriction, and they very much want to keep that
24 in place as well.

25

26 So all the Advisory Committees felt
27 that they were still meeting the original intent.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Josh. Also
30 the Koyukuk River Advisory took up this proposal and
31 the Koyukuk River has the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area
32 and the Kanuti Controlled Use Area and the Koyukuk
33 River action was that those Kanuti and Koyukuk
34 Controlled Use Areas are meeting their original intent
35 and are integral in the Koyukuk Moose Management Plans,
36 so that was on the record.

37

38 We're on Proposal, for your
39 information, Ray, 151.

40

41 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So you can speak for
44 the McGrath Advisory Committee on this proposal.

45

46 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. We opposed this
47 proposal and in addition to that we said that Upper
48 Kuskokwim is meeting its intended need and they're
49 already shrunk it to a quarter a year or two ago, so
50 they restricted the area.

1 Actually, another statement would be I
2 don't think they should deal -- this is so serious,
3 that they shouldn't deal with this in one review of all
4 of them. They should deal with each individual unit if
5 they're going to deal with it, so you could comment on
6 that, you know.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Pollock.

9
10 MR. SIMON: There has to be a motion
11 made to talk about it.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, I just was
14 thinking about that. Do you make a motion to adopt.

15
16 MR. SIMON: So moved.

17
18 MS. YATLIN: Second.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded
21 to adopt the proposal for discussion. I got out in
22 front of myself. Thanks, Pollock. The Advisory
23 Committees are opposing this. Do we have a Middle
24 Yukon position.

25
26 Go ahead, Robert.

27
28 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr.
29 Chairman. I just talked with the Chairman of the GASH
30 Board. He said that we would oppose this here for the
31 Paradise Controlled Use Area. He didn't say, but I'm
32 saying that we would like to broaden it to all of 21A.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's what the
35 proposal is, not to expand but to review them to see if
36 they meet the original conditions and eliminate, not
37 for expansion.

38
39 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chair. With all
40 due respect, I'm just saying that so when they do come
41 to say they want to reduce the size, we would recommend
42 that we would go to the full length of 21A. We don't
43 want there to be any kind of reduction whatsoever in
44 the near future.

45
46 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Thanks,
49 Robert. As far as the Paradise Controlled Use Area, it
50 should not be eliminated, but the possibility of

1 expansion.

2

3 So let the record reflect that.

4

5 MR. R. WALKER: Right.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
8 discussion on Proposal 151.

9

10 MR. SIMON: Question.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question has
13 been called. Those in favor of Proposal 151 signify by
14 saying aye.

15

16 (No aye votes)

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
19 sign.

20

21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the opposition is
24 to repeal any of the Controlled Use Areas within the
25 Western Interior Region and that's the opposition to
26 the Board of Game.

27

28 There's Proposal 153 that the Koyukuk
29 River did not take up but should have taken up.
30 Proposal 153 deals with some Game Management Units, but
31 it also deals with elimination of requirement to pick
32 up moose registration permits in remote villages. So
33 I'm supportive of the Board's process of these more
34 stringent requirements that eliminate people filing
35 online and just swamping these hunts with
36 participation. We have customary and traditional use
37 determinations within our region for Unit 18, so I feel
38 that we can speak to this proposal, and in Unit 19.

39

40 So the Chair will entertain a motion to
41 adopt Proposal 153.

42

43 MS. PELKOLA: So move.

44

45 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
48 Discussion on the proposal. I feel that the current
49 regulations allow those who really intend to hunt and
50 rely on that resource the ability to get permits that

1 would be precluded through inundation with online
2 application.

3

4 Does the Department have a position on
5 Proposal 153?

6

7 MR. PEIRCE: Maybe while I look for it,
8 I guess Member Collins maybe could discuss what the
9 McGrath AC talked about because this is pretty
10 important for them.

11

12 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

15

16 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, we took this up and
17 obviously we're opposed to this because currently
18 there's about 300 applicants for those permits and
19 that's both local and statewide. The harvest is right
20 around a little over 100 animals right now. The goal
21 was to be able to harvest 125 to 150 moose just to meet
22 the local needs. The alternate to a permit system
23 would be to go to Tier II, which would be much more
24 restricted. We wanted to avoid that, so now it's
25 already open to anyone in the state, but they do have
26 to pick it up before the season and therefore we know
27 how many people are going to hunt so it allows for more
28 control. People come in statewide. We get about 300
29 permits, but that's manageable. Not four or five
30 hundred or so. We'd have to go to Tier II.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Those are
33 very valid reasons.

34

35 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Further
38 comments on Proposal 153 by the Council.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Hearing none. Those
43 in favor of Proposal 153 signify by saying aye.

44

45 (No aye votes)

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
48 sign.

49

50 IN UNISON: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so we're --
2 let's see here. I have one final Proposal 179. This
3 is for the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area.
4 This proposal was submitted by Thor Stacy, who was a
5 hunting guide who used to live in Wiseman and was very
6 aware of the building concern for the dall sheep
7 population of the Dalton Highway Corridor and submitted
8 this proposal for the Dalton Highway Corridor to be no
9 more than 4 non-resident tags in Unit 24A, which is on
10 the south slope of the Brooks Range, and no more than 4
11 non-resident tags to be issued by drawing permit in
12 Unit 26B on the North Slope of the Brooks Range. So no
13 more than eight non-resident permits would be allocated
14 within the Dalton Highway Corridor.

15
16 There's many reasons for a need for
17 control of the guiding pressure in the Dalton Highway
18 Corridor. This is the first proposal for the Board of
19 Game to step into the arena. So I'm supporting
20 Proposal 179 because we have basically too much hunting
21 pressure from resident and non-resident participation
22 and the sheep population is showing stress. This
23 Council submitted a special action request in the fall
24 to the Federal Subsistence Board to address subsistence
25 harvest that are not being met.

26
27 So the Chair will entertain a motion to
28 adopt Proposal 179.

29
30 MR. SIMON: So moved.

31
32 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Pollock,
35 seconded by Jenny. So I've laid out the proposal. Any
36 further discussion on the proposal.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
43 being called. Those in favor of the Proposal 179
44 signify by saying aye.

45
46 IN UNISON: Aye.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
49 sign.

50

1 (No opposing votes)
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal passes.
4 Did you vote, Tim? Are you still there, Tim?
5
6 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, I voted in favor of
7 it.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We didn't get
10 that. Go ahead, Melinda.
11
12 MS. HERNANDEZ: Just a small
13 correction. The special action that we discussed,
14 remember we didn't submit it yet so that the Council
15 would have a chance to review the letter. Would you
16 like to do that now or would you like to do that later?
17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This would be an
19 appropriate time because of this Proposal 179. Is it
20 in our.....
21
22 MS. HERNANDEZ: It is. Council, the
23 left side of your blue folder there is a draft letter.
24 It's addressed to Mr. Theo
25 Matuskowitz, who is the contact to submit special
26 action items to in the office. Jack and I have gotten
27 this through leadership. It's been given the thumbs up
28 in review through the office, but we wanted to have the
29 Council take a look at it and give blessing before we
30 went ahead and put it into OSM.
31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Melinda.
33 That's what Council Coordinators are here for, is to
34 keep me on track. The Council can review this special
35 action request letter. I reviewed it and worked on
36 some of the clarification. There was a little bit of
37 misunderstanding about the intent of this special
38 action request to meet subsistence needs. So we need
39 the Western Interior Regional Council to endorse this
40 special action request language.
41
42 The upshot of the special action
43 request is that subsistence needs are not being met.
44 Right now we have a 7/8ths horn requirement for dall
45 sheep and with the excessive hunting pressure that's
46 occurring, even those, which are not legal for State
47 hunters, they're supposed to kill full curl sheep,
48 there's a lot of sheep that are mistaken for full curls
49 that are killed and then left in the field.
50

1 The State enforcement seized two dall
2 sheep during the sealing process, but a lot of people
3 walk up to them and go, oh my gosh, that thing is not
4 legal and they walk away and leave it. With one game
5 warden in 73,000 square miles it's almost impossible to
6 find that needle in the haystack. So those sheep are
7 unaccounted, but they are missing when you look at the
8 sheep. There were very few of the 7/8ths sheep left at
9 the end of the sheep hunting season. I couldn't find
10 one even though it's a sub-legal for the general hunt.

11
12 So the special action request would
13 allow subsistence hunters to take half curl, which no
14 female sheep will get to that size. This would allow
15 ram harvest, but in a younger age class where there are
16 some of those available. We need to address this dall
17 sheep problem in 24A and 26B when there's a call for
18 Federal and State proposals again. At this time this
19 is a stop gap to allow people to meet subsistence
20 needs. That's the upshot of this special action
21 request.

22
23 The Chair will entertain a motion to
24 submit the special action request as stated to Theo
25 Matuskowitz.

26
27 MR. SIMON: So moved.

28
29 MS. YATLIN: Second.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Pollock,
32 seconded by Eleanor. Any further discussion on this
33 special action request.

34
35 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

36
37 MR. SIMON: Question.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Fairly understood by
40 the Council. Those in favor of submitting the special
41 action request signify by saying aye.

42
43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed.

46
47 (No opposing votes)

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That concludes that.
50 Proposal 184, we should bring that one up. It would

1 allow the use of cross bow in the Dalton Highway
2 Corridor. Right now this proposal -- currently there's
3 a statutory closure to the use of firearms within the
4 Dalton Highway Corridor on five miles on each side of
5 the road. Also an all-terrain motorized vehicle
6 restriction except for boats and aircraft in motor and
7 highway vehicles on the Dalton Highway Corridor
8 Management Area. Except for the taking with bow and
9 arrow and this proponent would like to include cross
10 bow, the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee took it up
11 and opposed the proposal.

12

13 So the Chair will entertain a motion to
14 adopt Proposal 184 for discussion.

15

16 MR. SIMON: So moved.

17

18 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Pollock.
21 Seconded by James. Some of the reasons for opposition
22 of this proposal, the proponent is vague, indicating
23 that he would like to hunt caribou with a cross bow,
24 but dall sheep are experiencing an excessive amount of
25 harvest as it is and this does not delineate the
26 various kinds of big game that would be allowed. Cross
27 bows are much more efficient than a long bow or
28 compound bow because they're shooting 150-pound pull
29 cross bow and ballistically it's a lot faster. More
30 like a rifle. So at this time the Koyukuk River
31 Advisory Committee opposed the proposal as written.

32

33 Any further discussion by the Western
34 Interior Council on the proposal.

35

36 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question on Proposal
39 184.

40

41 MR. GERVAIS: I have a comment.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

44

45 MR. GERVAIS: I'd just like to say the
46 current state of technology on these cross bows is
47 pretty incredible and if this proposal passes that
48 would really defeat the purpose of having the archery
49 restriction in there because the cross bow has a lot
50 more accuracy than archery. So I would encourage the

1 Council not to approve this proposal.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate those
4 comments, Tim. They're good for the record. Go ahead,
5 Ray.

6

7 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair. I'd like to
8 also add that going to cross bow would probably result
9 in a lot more novice hunters because they figure they
10 can handle that. It's more like a rifle. Whereas the
11 archery, usually the people are trained and are more
12 skilled before they try big game hunting. So you'd
13 have a lot of amateurs out there that want to try it.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, currently in
16 the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area the bow
17 participants have to participate in a class and qualify
18 for the use of bow and arrow. You're right, there
19 would be lots of people that would -- there's no
20 qualification in this proposal, so there would be lots
21 and lots of people that would participate. It would be
22 a novice class. We have enough novices as it is with
23 bow and arrows, so we don't really need a lot more.

24

25 The question is called. Those in favor
26 of Proposal 184 to allow the use of cross bow in the
27 Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area signify by
28 saying aye.

29

30 (No aye votes)

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.

33

34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are we missing any
37 other proposals, Vince?

38

39 MR. MATHEWS: (Shakes head negatively)

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Vince tracked these
42 proposals fairly closely and appreciate that. So we've
43 completed our Board of Game proposals. So we're moving
44 on in our agenda. We're on old business. Review and
45 finalize the draft 2011 annual report to the Federal
46 Subsistence Board. Melinda.

47

48 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes, Jack. The
49 Council, we looked at it earlier. It's on the left
50 side of your blue packet. I think we went over issue

1 number one with the meeting window topics earlier in
2 the meeting, so if everybody is okay with that. I
3 think we added to the 7.5-inch mesh size as well with
4 Tim's comments. If we just want to look over the
5 third, fourth and fifth issues really quick. Carl,
6 we've added the jet boat issue that was brought up in
7 Aniak last year. This is still in draft form, so if
8 there is anything else the Council would like to add or
9 edit, I'm ready to take notes.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you have an
12 annual report in your possession, Tim?

13

14 MR. GERVAIS: No, I do not.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Before us we have an
17 annual report with five topics. Topic one was
18 adjusting the meeting windows of the Federal
19 Subsistence Board, the publication of regulations and
20 the RAC meetings, which we discussed earlier at the
21 tribal consultation portion of the meeting.

22

23 Issue two is your concerns about the
24 7.5-inch mesh on chinook salmon and is it actually
25 meeting its intended intent to achieve healthy chinook
26 salmon run.

27

28 Issue three is analyze the impacts of
29 .804 priority for subsistence. So when we get into an
30 .804 we're looking at another tool for the Federal
31 Subsistence Board and the Office of Subsistence
32 Management to analyze a scoring system that was like
33 the old Tier II hunt where your reliance on the
34 resource -- actually what .804 says is reliance on the
35 resource and direct dependence and alternate resources
36 to be used.

37

38 Currently under .804 like in 19A it's a
39 Federal drawing permit. A new person could be there
40 like two months, just move to Aniak or somewhere and
41 could put in for the drawing permit and draw the
42 permit. They do not have a direct dependence on the
43 resource, they don't have any historical use of the
44 resource. They just show up and can hunt moose and
45 they can take resource.

46

47 When the State Tier II actually
48 delineated a scoring system for participation in .804,
49 so I feel that the Office of Subsistence Management and
50 the Federal Subsistence Board should explore this as a

1 Tier II type system as one of the tools so the Board
2 has two different tools to use. Drawing permit or Tier
3 II scoring permit system.

4
5 Issue IV is preservation practices. The
6 Federal Subsistence Board does not recognize customary
7 and traditional practices of preserving fish for
8 customary trade. The Federal Subsistence Board has
9 deferred to the State health regulations for
10 preservation of customary trade of fish products. The
11 Council recognized the process of making salmon strips,
12 smoking, jarring and freezing as long-standing
13 customary and traditional practices. The Council feels
14 that the Board should recognize customary preservation
15 practices as part of customary trade and the conveyance
16 of customary preserved fish products. These
17 preservation methods are an integral part of customary
18 trade and use of fish region wide. I should add this
19 Council recognizes those practices and the State
20 doesn't even recognize customary trade. So the Federal
21 Subsistence Board should recognize customary
22 preservation practices.

23
24 I've perked George's interest. Go
25 ahead, George.

26
27 MR. PAPPAS: While we're on the subject
28 matter, George Pappas, Fish and Game, I did publish a
29 chronology in customary trade since '72 in Alaska and
30 it discusses that State law does recognize customary
31 trade. It's just not authorized by regulation in most
32 regions of the state. But for your reading interest
33 and pleasure, it's a good document.

34
35 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, well, I'll be
38 very interested to read the State's documentation of
39 recognized customary trade. It's been stated in
40 various meetings I've been at that the State was sort
41 of generally opposed to the customary trade of fish
42 products, so I'm glad to hear that the State does
43 recognize customary trade.

44
45 I do feel that the Federal Subsistence
46 Board needs to recognize that part of customary trade
47 is the preservation practices. The State of Alaska
48 recognizes -- what is it, David? Do you want to step up
49 to the mic here. It's like 24 jarring of jellies. The
50 State allows all kinds of preservations and the sale of

1 preserved products.

2

3 DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. You're
4 referring to a number of exceptions to the health
5 regulations in which the State has specifically
6 exempted some kinds of practices. For example, farmers
7 selling jellies and jams that they've jarred at the end
8 of their roads. These are exempted practices. There's
9 12 or 13 or 14 specific exemption practices, selling
10 breads at fairs and other kinds of processed foods.

11

12 Your point, I think, is that strips may
13 be analogous to some of these already exempted
14 activities in State statutes. The State health
15 statutes may or may not apply to strips.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. So I
18 would like to insert in issue 4 preservation practices,
19 that the Federal Subsistence Board recognize them as
20 exempted practices from State health regulations. Any
21 further discussion on issue 4, Tim.

22

23 MR. GERVAIS: I had a comment, Jack.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

26

27 MR. GERVAIS: Do you want to insert
28 some language in thee too that says preservation
29 techniques precede statehood and State health
30 department on timing, so these practices were occurring
31 way before these health regulations were adopted.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's a valid
34 point. Long-standing preservation practices preceding
35 State regulations and the Federal Subsistence Board
36 recognizes long-standing customary and traditional
37 practices.

38

39 Any further discussion on that issue 4.
40 Pollock.

41

42 MR. SIMON: I got back on this board
43 two years ago and customary trade was on the agenda and
44 last year it was on the agenda. All the meetings I go
45 to there's customary trade. I go to the Koyukuk River
46 Advisory Committee and there's customary trade. Go to
47 the Yukon River Drainage Fisheries and there's
48 customary trade. Is it going to be in every meeting or
49 are we going to come to a conclusion to this or not?

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Much of the
2 customary trade revolves around the customary trade of
3 preserved fish products, so that's -- to even get back
4 on the map. Recognition of customary preservation
5 practices is integral as to customary trade. This
6 issue of preservation practices to the Federal
7 Subsistence Board, the Board has to recognize this as
8 part of customary trade.

9

10 Any further discussion. James.

11

12 MR. J. WALKER: Yes, Mr. Chair. I've
13 got a question. Does customary also include
14 traditional practice?

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. Customary and
17 traditional practice I feel is part of customary trade.
18 David, is traditional practice language, would that be
19 inserted into this?

20

21 DR. JENKINS: David Jenkins, OSM. The
22 phrase you're referring to is customary and traditional
23 use in ANILCA, so they're linked, customary and
24 traditional, and they modify use. As I understand it,
25 your argument is that these preservation practices are
26 customary and traditional practices directly associated
27 with this other category, which we call customary
28 trade. You're suggesting, as I understand it, that
29 they can't be taken apart, that they're integral to
30 each other, they're connected to each other and it's
31 only arbitrarily that they are distinguished one from
32 another. Does that answer your question?

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's exactly what
35 we wanted to know. Go ahead, Robert.

36

37 MR. J. WALKER: I just have one more
38 comment on that. So when you define C&T -- when you
39 say traditional, if they make it in a traditional
40 manner, is that traditional processing?

41

42 DR. JENKINS: That's the argument that
43 the Chair is making and I think it's an argument that
44 you can present to the Board that these preservation
45 practices are customary and traditional practices and
46 they're directly linked to customary trade. As I
47 understand it, Mr. Reakoff is suggesting that the Board
48 recognize this as a practice and a custom and a
49 tradition.

50

1 MR. J. WALKER: Okay.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's the issue.
4 They don't currently do that. We want them to.
5 Robert.

6

7 MR. R. WALKER: I've got one question
8 here. Traditional came first before customary because
9 traditionally things were already being done before the
10 customary came here. I mean customary came after the
11 White man came here and kind of like adopted things. I
12 think some of those things might have been modified.
13 I'm just throwing that out to you because all of a
14 sudden, you know, we're having a -- subsistence is a
15 word that, you know, where did it come from. Tradition
16 already was here.

17

18 I'm kind of like skeptical because all
19 of a sudden the State and Federal government is saying
20 you are subsistence. Well, wait a minute here. We
21 were already traditional here. How can we be
22 subsistence when we're already traditional. Now we're
23 going back to customary trade and we're trying to redo
24 this word for all the rural people. I mean there's
25 supposed to be something here somewhere that where we
26 could understand as a board.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So it's the
29 misunderstanding that the Federal Board -- the Federal
30 Board does not understand that customary preservation
31 practices are part of customary trade. So this issue
32 needs to be pressed with the Federal Subsistence Board
33 that they understand that they have to recognize that
34 customary and traditional preservation practices are a
35 customary and traditional practice and they should be
36 exempted from State health regulations or recognition
37 of State health regulations and that's what this says.

38

39 So we've spent enough time on that
40 particular issue. We've got more. We also have issue
41 5, high traffic of jet boats on the Aniak River and
42 Carl brought this issue up last fall. We feel that the
43 high traffic of boats could have a detrimental effect
44 for rainbow trout and salmon spawning and use in the
45 Aniak drainage.

46

47 So those are the five issues, Tim. Any
48 further discussion on the annual report inclusion of
49 additional language into the high traffic issue. Carl.

50

1 MR. MORGAN: It's fine.

2

3 MR. SIMON: Question.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
6 called by Pollock. Enough discussion on the annual
7 report. Those in favor of the annual report as
8 modified in discussion signify by saying aye.

9

10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.

13

14 (No opposing votes)

15

16 MS. HERNANDEZ: A short break.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks,

19 Melinda.

20

21 (Off record)

22

23 (On record)

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Under old business
26 is B, the Dalton Highway Corridor dall sheep issue.
27 Section 81 special action request. We talked about the
28 special action request and passed that. Merben is
29 going to give us a presentation on this.

30

31 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Chair. Members of
32 the RAC. Merben Cebrian, BLM Central Yukon Office
33 wildlife biologist. Good afternoon. I'm here to
34 present a short PowerPoint regarding the dall sheep
35 issue in the Central Brooks Range.

36

37 What I have here is a compilation of
38 information. I think Shelly distributed some maps to
39 you all. We'll get to that map here shortly. What
40 this is is a compilation of information of data from
41 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Office
42 of Subsistence Management.

43

44 The first slide I have is harvest
45 information from 2000 to 2010 for both State general
46 sheep permits and from the Federal subsistence permits.
47 I have boxed here this column for non-residents in
48 comparison to resident kills on the State harvest.
49 What this here is pointing out to me is that there's a
50 slight upward trend in non-resident kills for sheep in

1 Unit 24A. This is specific to Unit 24A, which includes
2 the Dalton Highway Corridor. There's an increasing
3 trend in the resident kills from State permits.

4
5 In Federal subsistence hunts, there is
6 a dip in 2008 and 2009 of one kill and then years
7 before that an average of about 3 or 4 kills.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One question. Is
10 that from the Federal registration hunt for Dalton
11 Highway or is that inclusive of any Park data or lack
12 of Park data?

13
14 MR. CEBRIAN: This is Federal hunt,
15 yes, sir.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Continue.

18
19 MR. CEBRIAN: This is 2010. In 2011,
20 we have one reported sheep kill in the Federal permit
21 system. I don't have the data for 2011 from the State
22 because the nature of the reporting to the Federal
23 system, we both share databases, there's a delay.
24 There's a one-year delay typically before we get
25 information.

26
27 So, Mr. Chair, what I can gather from
28 this harvest report is there's some -- what lends me to
29 think is that there are some effects from resident
30 kills on the sheep hunting along the Dalton Highway.
31 There's a slight defect from non-resident hunts along
32 the Dalton Highway.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I will comment to
35 that. It doesn't reflect the displacement factor.
36 That's only the kills. When hunting with bows, they
37 will continuously harass the bands of rams. So the
38 displacement factor has a huge effect on subsistence
39 harvest.

40
41 MR. CEBRIAN: When you look at the
42 resident hunters that have applied and gotten a permit
43 compared to the resident hunters who have hunted --
44 let's see here. There's 12 non-resident hunters
45 compared to 52 -- no, compared to 40 that are resident
46 hunters. Then if you look at the success rates, 44
47 percent, it's mostly stable within the last three
48 years, somewhat low the three years before that, and
49 once again here three years before that somewhat
50 stable.

1 But if you look at the number of kills
2 for non-resident, eight out of 12 compared to 15 out of
3 40, there's a higher success rate for the non-
4 residents. These, I'm assuming, are the guided hunts
5 although it does not reflect here in this column that
6 says guide.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Non-residents are
9 required to have a hunting guide to hunt dall sheep.
10 Those are guided hunts.

11
12 MR. CEBRIAN: Those are guided hunts,
13 okay. But, as you can see, 8 out of 12, 6 out of 7, 7
14 out of 9, it's a high success rate compared to resident
15 hunters. I'm assuming these are hunters that walk up
16 the highway.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

19
20 MR. CEBRIAN: Now, the problem with
21 this information is I don't know how many of these
22 eight are on BLM lands or how many of these 6. So this
23 column tells me that there were 8 or so guided hunts,
24 but based on what we know in 2010 there were three
25 reported kills from our permitted guides. In 2011 I
26 think there was one reported kill from guided permits.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This was brought up
29 at the Subsistence Resource Commission. You have
30 certain guides that are not reporting harvest, yet they
31 put the sheep on the internet and on the BLM lands. I
32 reported this to your office and I enumerated you have
33 an enforcement issue. When you have invalid
34 information regarding location of harvest, that's a BLM
35 enforcement issue and I'm assured by the BLM that this
36 is going to be addressed. I wanted to point that out
37 to the Council. There's an underreporting. Guides are
38 getting real reluctant to report that they're actually
39 taking sheep on BLM lands.

40
41 MR. CEBRIAN: Yes, Mr. Chair. We also
42 have one law enforcement officer for the Central Yukon
43 Office and we understand. We are in the process of
44 hiring.....

45
46 MS. JACOBSON: Shelly Jacobson, Central
47 Yukon Field Office. Thanks for the opportunity to let
48 you know we're hiring a law enforcement ranger. The
49 good news is that it's going to be a pilot ranger, so
50 we'll have a little more capability and be able to work

1 more effectively on some of our hunting issues. We're
2 going to be working in tandem with a special agent
3 that's also a flying agent that's going to be stationed
4 in Fairbanks. So we're hopeful of that. But still
5 it's a really low ratio of acreage to law enforcement
6 capability and recently we've been getting detail
7 rangers up, which have some issues, but give us a
8 little bit of extra coverage.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Shelly.
11 Go ahead, Merben.

12

13 MR. CEBRIAN: Okay. Here I just
14 blocked off the number of hunters in comparison to
15 between the State and the Federal permit system. This
16 next slide is a report from ADF&G on population surveys
17 for sheep in Unit 24. The population average within
18 these years between 2002 and 2009 is 1,350. This year
19 was the last year that the aerial surveys were flown by
20 ADF&G.

21

22 What's important to look here at is the
23 number of legal rams and the percent of legal rams in
24 the whole population. Percent of legal rams in the
25 whole population has remained within 2.0 and 3.8
26 percent. In those times, the number of legal rams
27 counted have fluctuated between 31 and 50. Sublegal
28 rams go between 152 and 380 within these years, with an
29 average of 268 over the years 2002 and 2009.

30

31 I don't know when the next survey is
32 that Fish and Game is planning to do. BLM is willing
33 to partner with Fish and Game to perhaps extend the
34 area, as you will see in the next slide here, the area
35 with which they survey. This survey in 2009 was done
36 on the east side of the highway.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One clarification.
39 The survey entailed parts of Unit 25A also.

40

41 MR. CEBRIAN: Right.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It wasn't exclusive
44 to 24 and it didn't reflect the areas associated
45 closely to the road. It was a pretty vast area to the
46 east.

47

48 MR. CEBRIAN: More to the north and
49 east, yes. I haven't gotten information from the
50 National Park Service, who I believe surveys on the

1 west side of the road. They have started a new method
2 of surveying, but it's pretty coarse. It's not one
3 that can look at areas that are small as, for example,
4 Wiseman area. It's a broad type of distance sampling
5 that they're applying.

6
7 This is a map of the survey area that
8 ADF&G conducted in 2009. They conducted this in the
9 summer in July, so this distribution is reflective of
10 where the sheep were in the summer. Their survey area
11 -- as you can see, this is the highway here, so it's on
12 the eastern side of the highway. The boundary for 24
13 is somewhere around here.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Between Koyukuk and
16 the Chandalar.

17
18 MR. CEBRIAN: And then they did survey
19 a small part of Nugget Creek and they did find sheep
20 there. Poss Mountain, they also found sheep here, and
21 a small population here. What we're trying to suggest
22 to ADF&G the next time they do a survey is to include
23 the eastern part or the western part of the highway
24 surrounding the Wiseman area.

25
26 These are locations of rams in the 2009
27 survey. Most of them are on this side of the ridge and
28 in these mountains. There were some rams here and over
29 here and there were some rams detected here.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Back up that slide.
32 I want to point something out to the Council. I notice
33 that the Dalton Highway Corridor has very few ram
34 groups and those move in and out of the Dalton Highway
35 Corridor, so there's actually a very limited number of
36 rams that are available for subsistence and commercial
37 use and the general hunt hunters. The survey data is
38 including all those rams way over in 25A. 25A has a
39 much higher sheep density because of the way the
40 weather is. So I want to point out to the Council
41 there's actually very few ram groups in this highly
42 intensively hunted area. Continue.

43
44 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Chair. When you're
45 out there hunting, do you see choke points or access
46 points that hunters use? I'm assuming that there are
47 some drainages that hunters use, the walk-in hunters
48 anyway.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, they do.

1 There's certain areas that they access into the outer
2 corridor, but most of those places where those ram
3 groups -- in the very first part of the sheep season,
4 August 10th, there's vehicles parked all along the
5 road. Each one of those ram group areas are being
6 hunted from the road.

7

8 MR. CEBRIAN: Right. My thinking is
9 that good for the first person who goes up, but not
10 good for the second, third or much less for 10th person
11 who goes up. Because the first person who goes up
12 disturbs the sheep, they might scatter away from the
13 road and the next person that goes up is left out
14 hanging.

15

16 This is the area of survey in 2004.
17 From talking to ADF&G, Steve Arthur, the sheep
18 biologist, this is the more representative area of
19 where the sheep are in terms of what's available for
20 residents of Wiseman because they have actually
21 extended the survey line out to the west, but they
22 didn't do the same thing in 2009. They only did this
23 in 2004.

24

25 As you can tell, these are ram
26 locations, so there are rams out here on the west side
27 of the highway. One data point in one year is not
28 sufficient for me to say what the status of the
29 population is. Then once again this is done in the
30 summer in July. I believe sheep go up and down the
31 mountains as the weather changes, it gets cooler. So
32 there are sheep on this side of the highway and there's
33 also male sheep, rams, on the eastern side of the
34 highway.

35

36 I took a page out of Caroline Scott's
37 thesis in 1993 that indicated an area wherein there's
38 historic use of Wiseman residents for resources, be it
39 moose, sheep and caribou. Mr. Chair, do you believe
40 this depiction is still accurate? Has the area
41 expanded, collapsed?

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, with
44 increasing hunting pressure to the east, people have
45 been displaced further into the corridor and to the
46 west. So a lot of the areas that were valid then,
47 people are having to avoid user conflict.
48 Accessibility, use of aircraft, various factors have
49 entered into the core area along the Dalton Highway
50 Corridor and the winter use -- a lot of that is winter

1 use with snowmobile and dall sheep are not harvested to
2 a large degree in the wintertime, especially to the
3 east. There's no season. So this is combined winter
4 and summer use and there's been a displacement of dall
5 sheep hunting to the east because of the high intensive
6 hunting pressure to the east.

7

8 So this is a valid -- this has validity
9 in 1993, but it doesn't -- it reflects summer and
10 winter use and it's not valid for dall sheep hunting
11 specifically.

12

13 MR. CEBRIAN: I can see there's some
14 use of the Park area here. Does the Park require a
15 permit?

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We've been trying to
18 work with the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource
19 Commission to get a household survey. They have no
20 permitting. There's a three sheep allowance, but
21 there's no harvest information. That's why it doesn't
22 reflect all of the harvest for subsistence. Some years
23 we can utilize the Park. This last year was really
24 high water. We couldn't get into the Park. We were
25 stuck hunting closer to the Dalton Highway Corridor.
26 So there's timeframes, weather related timeframes when
27 we can use the Park because we have to walk there.
28 There's no motorized access into the Park. We have to
29 walk there, so there's certain times where we can't get
30 into the Park. So that's supplementary to your
31 discussion.

32

33 MR. CEBRIAN: So taking your comments
34 from last RAC meeting, the first one that I've been
35 into and discussing with my manager, Shelly, we have
36 some points to bring to the RAC. There are several
37 listed here. The first one is we've just been funded
38 for land use planning that would include the Dalton
39 Highway.

40

41 MS. JACOBSON: Shelly Jacobson. We
42 haven't received funding, we've applied for funding.
43 According to our State director and just the way the
44 planning budget is going, we may not get the funding.
45 Even if we don't, we have some ability to plan within
46 our existing budget, so we're hoping to start a plan in
47 2013.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you.

50

1 MR. CEBRIAN: And another one is we're
2 revamping the guide permits not only for the Dalton
3 Highway Corridor, but also for the Squirrel River area.
4 What we plan to include in consideration for these
5 guide permits are, number one here, guides and
6 transporters have deadlines to submit application.
7 This year is March 15. Starting next year it's going
8 to be February 15. The objective there is to have all
9 the guides who need their applications in be in at one
10 time and then we can combine the applications and have
11 one Section .810 analysis on the effects of subsistence
12 uses.

13
14 This is going to differ from what the
15 Central Yukon Office has done in the past because I
16 think they've been doing it one at a time before. We're
17 hoping that by doing one Section .810 analysis we can
18 have a more comprehensive look at the problem and see
19 if we can somehow allocate the number of clients that
20 may go out and try to address the issue of crowding,
21 competition and things that have been raised by the
22 RAC.

23
24 MS. JACOBSON: I'm just going to
25 interrupt a little bit to expand that to the rest of
26 the Central Yukon Field Offices. It's true it's
27 happening in the Dalton and this region, but it's also
28 happening throughout the Central Yukon Field Office in
29 terms of that deadline for the guides to get their
30 applications to us. This year it's March 15th. Next
31 year it will be February 15th. What that allows us to
32 do is have plenty of time to do our public scoping,
33 which we've been trying to increase our efforts there.
34 With the new emphasis on tribal consultation I think
35 we'll have plenty of opportunity to come out to
36 communities, take comment on our permits and also in
37 certain areas like the Dalton where we might have to
38 issue the permits every year to make adjustments we can
39 make those decisions.

40
41 MR. CEBRIAN: The following three
42 points are in support of this combined analysis. We
43 would plan to estimate the number of clients that can
44 be sustained in the area. We're going to consider
45 average annual harvest from harvest reports and maybe
46 some reports from the Subsistence Division of ADF&G.
47 We're going to -- I have a plan this summer to have a
48 summer tech to assess the choke points. Like you said,
49 there are some areas where certain access is popular to
50 walk-in hunters and see which points of access are very

1 contentious and which ones we might be able to do
2 something about.

3

4 I had a radio collaring proposal that I
5 ran through with my manager and with ADF&G Steve
6 Arthur. I plan for \$50,000 to put radio collars on
7 rams. Remember we have discussed last RAC meeting to
8 look into the possibility of studying the distribution
9 of rams within the Dalton Highway. So I put in for
10 that proposal. This proposal is subject to budget
11 constraints. Right now it's been ranked low by the BLM
12 hierarchy, but it's in the books and we'll keep
13 fighting for it.

14

15 MS. JACOBSON: I keep chiming in on
16 your talk. We do usually get about \$15,000, which is
17 not a lot in some people's estimation, but we typically
18 split that between the Dalton Highway game population
19 monitoring projects that we cooperate on as well as
20 western Alaska. In any given year we can have some
21 discretion according to what's going on to put that
22 towards just one or two populations. I'd also be
23 interested in some review and discussion on that
24 project proposal if there would be a way we could meet
25 more needs or particularly if we could get something
26 useful done for less money it might stand a better
27 chance of getting funded.

28

29 MR. CEBRIAN: These collars, as you
30 know, are not cheap.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: GPS collars?

33

34 MR. CEBRIAN: Ideally GPS collars.
35 We're going to partner with Fish and Game on doing
36 surveys and possibly expanding the survey area to
37 include the Wiseman area. I'm in the process of
38 getting together with the Park Service to perhaps use
39 some of their methods towards the Dalton Highway
40 Corridor. Right now the Park Service is concentrating
41 their efforts in surveying -- what is the Park
42 lands.....

43

44 MS. JACOBSON: The Gates of the Arctic?

45

46 MR. CEBRIAN: Right. But there's two
47 types. There's.....

48

49 MS. JACOBSON: Oh, in the Preserve or
50 the Park?

1 MR. CEBRIAN: Yeah, the Preserve. And
2 then the last time we met you had some suggestions and
3 some regulatory changes. I changed the bag limits and
4 such. That's it. That's all I have.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Merben.

7
8 MR. CEBRIAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This is a good thing
11 for the Council to see. What happens when you have a
12 road. The governor wants to build roads all over the
13 place, to Nome and stuff. If we get more roads, we're
14 going to be looking at this kind of stuff a whole
15 bunch. It's graphic as to the kind of problems you
16 open this Pandora's Box of issues.

17
18 The 2 percent ram population, that's
19 extrapolated for two game management subunits. That is
20 not reflective of the Dalton Highway Corridor where
21 there's high extirpation. So the high extirpation
22 factors actually affecting the legal -- 2 percent is a
23 very low number. When you look at like the Western
24 Brooks Range or a lightly hunted population, there's
25 typically a 20 to 28 or I've seen 32 percent legal
26 rams, full curl rams, so 2 percent is a pathetically
27 low number for two subunits.

28
29 So when you look at the intensive
30 hunting pressure from the Dalton Highway, the number of
31 legal rams is actually -- and that's what the BLM needs
32 to actually calculate, is what is the harvestable
33 surplus in the Dalton Highway, the BLM lands, and how
34 many of those are going to be allocated to hunting
35 guides. They have a very high success rate, especially
36 outside the corridor with the use of firearms. They
37 have a much higher than the bow hunters.

38
39 And this building problem, you know,
40 the number of rams that are actually enumerated there
41 in 2009 -- 2010 was when guides were permitted to hunt
42 in the Dalton Highway Corridor BLM lands. So that's
43 unreflective of current harvest of the last two
44 seasons, which is high extirpation. The perception is
45 that there was one legitimate guide reporting on BLM
46 lands and then there's unreported harvest, so that's an
47 issue. You got my transmittal on that. I will not
48 discuss that on the record publicly. I consider it an
49 ongoing criminal investigation by the Bureau of Land
50 Management.

1 I've written suggested language for the
2 Council here. Thinking about something to have at the
3 table here after this presentation. Suggested language
4 to address the wildlife population health and user
5 conflicts in and near the Dalton Highway Corridor
6 Management Area. It's not just getting to be dall
7 sheep. This can be building into other species that
8 don't have significant restrictions.

9
10 Dall sheep populations in the Brooks
11 Range is at very low numbers and it's declined
12 significantly since the early 1990s. There is an
13 increasing use of the State of Alaska general hunt for
14 dall sheep where the State resident hunters that access
15 from the Dalton Highway as well as increased guided
16 sheep hunters and I'll state that that's in the last
17 two years that these non-resident guided hunters have
18 been occurring in the Dalton Highway Corridor adjacent
19 on BLM lands.

20
21 Subsistence users are very concerned
22 that the dall rams are having high hunting mortality
23 and associated to the Dalton Highway Corridor
24 Management Area and will continue the decline without a
25 healthy breeding composition. I had various people in
26 Wiseman tell me -- one person tell me they did not hunt
27 because they felt they didn't want to further
28 exacerbate -- they're precluding subsistence activities
29 because they're concerned about the health of the
30 population.

31
32 Subsistence users are also impacted
33 greatly by having to hunt longer and not meeting
34 subsistence needs. Of the eight criteria, economy of
35 time, effort and expense are considered in the eight
36 criteria. So when there's high competition by
37 professional hunting guides, this increases the expense
38 and time, effort and outright expense to the
39 subsistence users. This is an impact that should be
40 recognized in the .810 analysis.

41
42 There's currently a special action
43 request that this Council has just passed for an
44 interim take for half curl and larger rams for 2012 due
45 to the under achievement of subsistence harvest this
46 past season and the Federal Subsistence Board will
47 review this request soon. Guiding has a place in BLM
48 land use, but is the lowest priority that you stated on
49 a conference call with me the other day, Shelly.
50

1 MS. JACOBSON: (Nods affirmatively)

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And should not have
4 all available animals allocated to that user group.
5 When you actually look at the number of legal rams in
6 this very few sheep ram groups down the side of the
7 Dalton Highway Corridor, the numbers of guided hunters
8 actually would be almost full allocation. This
9 precludes the regular resident hunters and highly
10 affects the subsistence hunters because the general
11 hunters mistakenly kill. If there's no legal rams and
12 they're looking at a bunch of sub-legals, they just
13 kill the biggest one there. Well, that might be a
14 7/8th sheep. So those are disappearing and that's why
15 I'm concerned that not just sub-legals in at the half
16 curls and the various rams, but it's the critical
17 7/8ths are disappearing this past season. That's why
18 I'm getting real concerned about a management issue.

19

20 The BLM should reduce impacts to
21 subsistence users and the general hunters for dall
22 sheep and other species by, one, subsistence use is the
23 highest priority of use of wildlife on BLM lands and
24 guiding is not a necessary use. Under .810 there's
25 mitigations for necessary impacts to subsistence.
26 Well, guiding is not a necessary impact to subsistence.
27 So an .810 analysis should reflect that it's not a
28 necessary and the subsistence users don't have to take
29 that. They have a high priority of the resource and it
30 therefore must be limited to a level that does not have
31 a significant impact to the resources or subsistence
32 users.

33

34 The BLM's analysis for ANILCA Section
35 .810 on impact to subsistence use should identify the
36 stated impacts to the health of the resources and
37 subsistence uses. Modulation of the commercial guiding
38 use are warranted on BLM lands and associated Dalton
39 Highway Corridor BLM lands as required by ANILCA
40 management mandates.

41

42 Two, reducing guided hunters of dall
43 sheep and other species to sustainable healthy levels
44 compatible with subsistence and growing resident hunter
45 numbers using survey data and allowance for post hunt
46 healthy breeding populations of males. ANILCA Title
47 VIII mandates healthy populations of fish and wildlife
48 to be managed using recognized scientific principals by
49 Federal land managing agencies.

50

1 Everybody thinks that Title VIII is
2 strictly about subsistence priority. Congress intends
3 health management of fish and wildlife using recognized
4 scientific principals and so allocation of funds for
5 surveys and those kind of things are warranted.
6

7 So I would like this conveyed back to
8 the regional office about these funding allocations for
9 this. ANILCA Title VIII, Section .801, the Congress
10 finds and declares that 3 of .801's continuation of
11 opportunity for subsistence uses of resources on public
12 and other lands in Alaska is threatened by increasing
13 population of Alaska where its resultant pressure on
14 subsistence resources by sudden decline in populations
15 of some wildlife species which are crucial to
16 subsistence resources by increased accessibility of
17 remote areas containing subsistence resources by the
18 taking of fish and wildlife in a manner inconsistent
19 with recognized scientific principals of fish and
20 wildlife management.
21

22 So if the State Board of Game does not
23 react appropriately, it's incumbent upon the Federal
24 land managers to manage for healthy populations. .802,
25 it is thereby declared to be a policy of the Congress
26 that run consistent with sound management principals in
27 conservation of healthy populations of fish and
28 wildlife, the utilization of the public lands in Alaska
29 as to cause the least adverse impact possible of rural
30 residents who depend upon subsistence uses of the
31 resources of such lands consistent with management of
32 fish and wildlife in accordance with recognized
33 scientific principals and the purpose of each unit
34 established, designated or expanded pursuant to Titles
35 27 of the Act. The purpose of this title is to provide
36 the opportunity for rural residents engaged in a
37 subsistence way of life to do so.
38

39 So when people can't meet their
40 subsistence need because of activities that are
41 disruptive to the populations or are basically
42 affecting the health of populations, something needs to
43 be done.
44

45 Implementation of the Department of
46 Natural Resources and Commercial Services Board Guide
47 Use Area regulations as soon as possible. There was
48 nothing in the discussion about your recognition of the
49 current guide use plans that would eliminate several
50 guides in these Guide Use Areas to no more than two

1 guides in all of Unit 24A. So that's something that
2 was missing in your presentation.

3

4 Do you have a comment, Shelly.

5

6 MS. JACOBSON: Yeah, you're right, it
7 was missing. One of the issues -- well, we had planned
8 to bring it up and Merben may have, but when we checked
9 the maps that DNR -- or that were posted on their
10 website with the numbers, we were confused by the
11 numbers we saw for BLM and so we were trying to run
12 that down where the numbers came from. They say on
13 their website that they were the 2009 numbers, but, for
14 example, in this area it just says one for BLM and
15 there were 5, so the numbers are inaccurate. The total
16 statewide may be accurate, but where they've got them
17 listed by guide use area at least for BLM is not
18 accurate. We want to sort that out, but we are trying
19 to partner with DNR on a system that would work for
20 both agencies or at least collaborate to the extent we
21 can on may be as minimal as sharing information but
22 hopefully we can work out a process that can work for
23 both of us, but we're not waiting around for it either.
24 We're doing both. We're trying to come up with
25 something that we think will be better every time we
26 issue a permit as well as coordinate with them.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I feel that the
29 BLM should not issue any future guide use permits that
30 would be disparate to anticipate State and BLM
31 permitting numbers for guides and clients under the new
32 DNR regulations and I talked to -- I forget his name,
33 Bill something.

34

35 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Clark?

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, something.
38 Overbaugh. The BLM is working on a guide selection
39 process one way or another and the regional director
40 wants the BLM to come up with a guide use plan. If the
41 DNR's process fails, it's my impression from talking to
42 him that the director wants a guide use plan as one of
43 the options for the EA. So you should really talk to
44 him about what they're actually planning down there.

45

46 The director Bud Cribley is wanting a
47 guide use plan for BLM lands even if the State system
48 fails. I wanted to make that comment.

49

50 I'm going to finish this off.

1 Elimination of aircraft landing off field in the Dalton
2 Highway Corridor Management area by hunting guides
3 except for Coldfoot, Wiseman and Galbraith airports.
4 This would reduce unfair chase, spotting from the air
5 by guides of dall sheep for an easy pursuit in
6 competition with subsistence users. A management area
7 is designated to reduce user conflicts. The Dalton
8 Highway Corridor Management Area should be used to
9 diffuse user conflicts. Allowing guides to land right
10 on the side of the road and basically find all the dall
11 sheep right next to their camp is not within the
12 prospectus of the guides that are making proposals and
13 should be eliminated.

14

15 So those are the four points that I
16 wanted the Council to review. The Chair would
17 entertain a motion to submit these talking points to
18 the BLM.

19

20 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.

21

22 MR. MORGAN: Second.

23

24 MR. R. WALKER: Second.

25

26 MS. YATLIN: Second.

27

28 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

29

30 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.

33 The Council has heard enough. Those in favor of
34 submission of these suggested language to address the
35 wildlife populations of the Dalton Highway Corridor,
36 especially the dall sheep, 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: Ray stepped out.
46 Thank you for your presentation and I apologize to the
47 Council.

48

49 MR. R. WALKER: Limited time.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have limited
2 time, that's right.

3
4 MR. CEBRIAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. We'll
7 have a very brief overview of the collection of antlers
8 and horns from Dave Mills. Just real brief so the
9 Council is aware of what the Subsistence Resource
10 Commissions are dealing with for this collection issue.

11
12 MR. MILLS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
13 Council members. It's a pleasure to join you here. My
14 name is Dave Mills. I'm the subsistence statewide
15 program manager for the National Park Service.

16
17 This, in a nutshell, is an effort on
18 the National Park Service to address the interest and
19 concerns of two subsistence commissions that are in
20 your area, the Gates of the Arctic Commission, which we
21 have Pollock as the chair, Jack as the vice chair, and
22 the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission, Ray Collins
23 is the chair. So you have good representation on this.
24 It's well covered. They're working hard at kind of the
25 unfinished business of ANILCA and accommodating
26 subsistence uses.

27 So why is this needed? Number one,
28 it's needed because specific regulations within the
29 National Park Service are required in order to allow
30 the collection of things from the land. We have some
31 of that accommodated in the Kobuk River right now in
32 special regulations, but this is looking broader on a
33 statewide basis.

34
35 This proposal and the accompanying
36 environmental assessment, which we have right now, is
37 looking at on a statewide basis just for National Parks
38 now looking at accommodating the subsistence
39 collection, uses of shed or discarded animal parts or
40 plants to make handicrafts for personal or family uses
41 or for barter or to sell.

42
43 This is allowed on most lands in
44 Alaska, so we're just talking about National Park Lands
45 that allow for subsistence. This would only be for
46 subsistence and only with regards to Park lands where
47 it's not currently allowed. We're trying to take a
48 comprehensive approach to consider the various
49 alternatives that could accommodate that activity.
50

1 MS. HERNANDEZ: The materials are on
2 Page 31 in your book.

3
4 MR. MILLS: I could get into some other
5 details. Let me just tell you some other general
6 things about this. So it involves Park Service areas
7 only. If you are already allowed in the National
8 Park, if you hunt an animal, if you can take an animal
9 legally under the Federal regulations, that's just
10 fine. That applies there. You can keep whatever part
11 of that animal you want. You can use it for
12 subsistence purposes. You can use it for customary
13 trade and all those things. You can already do that.

14
15 So what this covers is if you happen to
16 be out on the land and you find something laying on the
17 ground and you want to collect it, you find an antler,
18 you find a horn, plants or whatever, this allows for
19 the non-hunting collection of things that's currently
20 not allowed in general in National Parks. This is an
21 attempt to allow for that for subsistence uses only.

22
23 There's three alternatives that are
24 laid out in the environmental assessment. I don't know
25 if we need to go into the details on those, but what
26 they basically do is provide some options that go from
27 I'll say very little management or wide open management
28 to a little bit more focused eligibility, so we make
29 sure that this is allowed for people that are closest
30 to the resources, and then a little more managed
31 programs in terms of permitting and things like that,
32 so you'll see a spectrum of alternatives that are being
33 considered.

34
35 I just met with the Denali Commission.
36 I know they've been discussing this. They're very
37 familiar with this. They probably know it better than
38 I do. I know the Gates of the Arctic Commission is
39 very familiar with this too. They have spent a lot of
40 time on this. They're the ones who have brought it
41 forward, so we're working with them. I wish Ray were
42 here right now, but they had a good discussion. They
43 had a preferred alternative.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Which alternative
46 did they have?

47
48 MR. MILLS: That was alternative C.
49 What that would allow is working with the.....

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What page is that
2 on?

3
4 MR. MILLS: This is on 2-7 if you look
5 in your book. The top of it says 2012. You look at
6 the bottom of the page, chapter 2-7, description of
7 alternatives.

8
9 So if you look at Alternative C,
10 basically what it does in terms of permitting, it's a
11 discretionary type permit. The Subsistence Resource
12 Commission would work with the Park Superintendent on
13 developing a specific program that works for their
14 area. So it would be a partnership with the Park
15 staff, the superintendent, to decide how best to manage
16 this and what resources need to be focused on.

17
18 The other issue, the eligibility, it is
19 somewhat focused. It addresses some of the needs we
20 heard from the Commissions in the past. It just is not
21 a wide-open system like Alternative B, but it would be
22 in Parks resident zone communities that have a
23 customary and traditional use finding for wildlife that
24 is within that GMU.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're really tight
27 on time.

28
29 MR. MILLS: Sure.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I think that kind of
32 gives the overview to the Council. At the SRC level we
33 want to have the least adverse impact to the
34 subsistence users. So when the Gates of the Arctic
35 Subsistence Resource Commission meets in April, a lot
36 of this language with discretionary was brought out at
37 the Gates of the Arctic subsistence meeting dialogue
38 this November.

39
40 I want the Council to be aware that
41 this is a long-standing issue and this affects
42 subsistence use, resources throughout three different
43 parts of our region. My main question for this Council
44 is after the SRCs have met, can this all be brought to
45 the WIRAC meeting this fall for an endorsement of their
46 position. What would be the Council's allowance for
47 comment?

48
49 MR. MILLS: In terms of the process,
50 this environmental assessment is out for a 60-day

1 review, which closes April 7th. Having said that, I
2 know the Gates of the Arctic and perhaps other
3 commissions have asked for an extension for comments.
4 Basically what this is asking for is which alternative
5 do you like or a combination.

6

7 The next part of the process is to
8 develop an actual regulation that goes out for draft,
9 another review and then final rulemaking.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Offhand, I'm
12 inclined to support Alternative C like Denali did
13 because it delineates some of the concerns that the
14 Gates of the Arctic had. But I would prefer to see the
15 Subsistence Resource Commissions all discuss this and
16 then the Park Service allows the RACs, Eastern Interior
17 and especially the Western Interior RACs, to comment in
18 the fall cycle, which would be outside the 60-day
19 comment period. Can that be accommodated through the
20 Regional Director?

21

22 MR. MILLS: I'll certainly bring that
23 back. We certainly can talk about that at our fall
24 meeting with the Chairs and I'll certainly take that
25 message to the Regional Director. It certainly is a
26 good forum to discuss a lot of this.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: As a Regional
29 Council, our outreach is to the Advisory Committees and
30 to the Subsistence Resource Commissions and I want to
31 let that broader base -- give some status to their
32 recommendations. They might point out some things that
33 one commission may not have seen. So I would prefer
34 that the Regional Office allow the Regional Councils a
35 final comment after taking input from the Subsistence
36 Resource Commissions and that would be at our fall
37 meeting, whenever that may be.

38

39 So that's probably enough coverage of
40 that. I appreciate your bringing that up before the
41 Regional Council.

42

43 MR. MILLS: Thank you.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Subsistence
46 Resource Commissions are an integral part of the
47 Federal process.

48

49 So we're on new business. Review and
50 discuss the Council Charter. Melinda, would you.

1 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, Mr. Chair.
2 Council. Around mid December the Council Charters were
3 received from the Washington office and the new
4 division chief for the Council coordinators made some
5 really good observations. He outlined those in an
6 email to the Washington office. They're on the left
7 side of your folder, the last document.
8

9 There were some pretty substantial
10 changes. The first one that he pointed out was that
11 the three Councils who have 13 members, the number for
12 some reason was dropped down to 10 and he lists four
13 other changes that were made as well, which was pretty
14 alarming because the Council Charters from year to year
15 ordinarily remain the same. So I was really happy that
16 Carl and also Robert Larson from the Southeast area had
17 taken the time to really closely review those. It
18 might have slipped past us otherwise.
19

20 I didn't get a chance to get together
21 with Carl before I left to discuss what the responses
22 have been, but we definitely wanted to make the Council
23 aware of these changes and what's happened.
24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Melinda.
26 When I received this email with five points that show
27 significant changes and in point two, section 4A of our
28 charter, the words recommend the initiation are
29 inserted in place of initiate, I felt that that was a
30 huge erosion of the Federal Regional Council's
31 authority to make proposals. We have to recommend an
32 initiation of a proposal. We can't actually make the
33 proposal ourself. I feel that the Washington
34 Solicitor's Office, I suppose, reviewed these charters.
35

36 When we were asked about the charter in
37 our last spring meeting in Galena I think it was, how
38 the charters were working for us, we said they're
39 working just fine, we don't want any changes. Well, we
40 see five big giant changes that basically I feel strip
41 the .805 authority of the Regional Councils. So I take
42 exception to some of the charter changes.
43

44 I would like these five points
45 submitted as a letter to the Federal Subsistence Board
46 with displeasure to the Solicitor's Office in
47 Washington, D.C. that these are not acceptable changes
48 that violate the ANILCA statutes for a meaningful role
49 in subsistence management by the Regional Advisory
50 Councils.

1 The Chair will entertain a motion to
2 submit these five points.
3
4 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.
5
6 MR. R. WALKER: Second.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jenny moved. Robert
9 seconded. Any further discussion on these highlighted
10 changes that have been brought before the Council.
11
12 MR. R. WALKER: Jack, I have a
13 question.
14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Robert.
16
17 MR. R. WALKER: They didn't mention
18 nothing about the 70/30 so that's fine with me.
19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those would be
21 already in there. These are the changes that should be
22 resubmitted back to the Solicitor's Office for review
23 and we feel that the Federal Subsistence Board has the
24 authority to request the Solicitor's Office confer with
25 their own solicitors and refer back for correct ANILCA
26 alignment with the Regional Council Charters.
27
28 MR. R. WALKER: Question.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
31 called on the motion. Those in favor of submitting
32 these five points to the Federal Subsistence Board to
33 be transmitted to the Federal solicitor in Washington,
34 D.C. signify by saying aye.
35
36 IN UNISON: Aye.
37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
39 sign.
40
41 (No opposing votes)
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Melinda.
44 There's a letter regarding the per diem. Where is
45 that?
46
47 MS. HERNANDEZ: Printed in the
48 materials on Page 55.
49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: In our book. So

1 this is a hunting plan recommendation 11-01.
2 Recommendation that requests an increase in the per
3 diem rate for the State of Alaska Subsistence Resource
4 Commissions and the Federal Regional Advisory Councils.
5 I don't know how many times this issue has come up
6 before Regional Councils and SRCs about the current per
7 diem rates are not reflective of what -- Robert.

8

9 MR. R. WALKER: What is the current per
10 diem rate for the National Park Service?

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: They're a Federal
13 standard, so they would be for each community it has
14 variations and there's some great big chart or book
15 that they have to go through to actually figure out
16 what kind of per diem we're going to get wherever we're
17 at. The upshot of this hunting plan recommendation is
18 that the current -- should I read it into the record.
19 It's a part of the record currently.

20

21 Basically these per diem rates that may
22 apply to the Lower 48 do not reflect the additional
23 high cost of leaving home. Pollock has to leave his
24 dog team. You've got to get people to feed your dogs.
25 They don't have that kind of problem down there in the
26 States. They don't even think about stuff like that.
27 So the realities of Alaska are much different as far as
28 reflection of what the actual reimbursement is for the
29 cost of getting qualified people to serve on
30 Subsistence Resource Commissions and Regional Advisory
31 Councils.

32

33 Do you understand that Hunting Plan
34 Recommendation 11-01, Tim?

35

36 MR. GERVAIS: Yes.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so the Chair
39 will entertain a motion to submit this Hunting Plan
40 Recommendation as endorsed to the Federal Subsistence
41 Board. The Subsistence Resource Commissions can
42 transmit directly to the Secretary of Interior whereas
43 we have to transmit to the Federal Subsistence Board.
44 So we would like to submit this Hunting Plan
45 Recommendation 11-01 to the Federal Subsistence Board
46 for review of per diems to the Council.

47

48 MR. J. WALKER: So moved.

49

50 MR. R. WALKER: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by James,
2 seconded by Robert. Further discussion on the
3 recommendation.
4
5 (No comments)
6
7 MR. J. WALKER: Question.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
10 called. Those in favor of submitting this Hunting Plan
11 Recommendation 11-01 under the Western Interior
12 letterhead to the Federal Subsistence Board signify by
13 saying aye.
14
15 IN UNISON: Aye.
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
18 sign.
19
20 (No opposing votes)
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're in agency
23 reports.
24
25 MR. R. WALKER: One more.
26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I skipped that
28 one. Thank you. A letter to the Federal Subsistence
29 Board regarding the Department of Natural Resource
30 guide use planning. Did you want to elaborate on that
31 Tim any further?
32
33 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah. You mean what I
34 addressed in my opening comments?
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.
37
38 MR. GERVAIS: Yes. Is Kenton available
39 or another wildlife refuge manager there?
40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, Kenton is
42 here. Step up to the mic, Kenton. Ask your question,
43 Tim.
44
45 MR. GERVAIS: Tim Gervais from Ruby. I
46 was reviewing the guide selection criteria in December
47 for the new concessions on the Nowitna Refuge. I
48 imagine they're similar for the other refuges around
49 the state. It seemed to me that the main focus on the
50 point scoring focused a lot about bigger, high-volume

1 guides and there wasn't many points awarded for people
2 that were interacting with the local community,
3 providing meat, you know, donating meat to the
4 community or using local guides or assistant guides. I
5 thought it was not providing good service to the local
6 rural communities in the way you guys were awarding the
7 guide use area scoring criteria.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have a
10 response, Kenton.

11

12 MR. MOOS: Sure. Mr. Chair and Council
13 Member Gervais. This system actually has been in place
14 for a number of years. I believe this is the third
15 cycle that we're going through. It's a five-year
16 permit that's granted with a five-year extension
17 potential, so it's a 10-year permit essentially as long
18 as the guide performs as he says he will. The renewal
19 is somewhat automatic.

20

21 As far as the criteria for the permit,
22 the whole idea behind it, and I'll be the first to
23 admit it, is not a perfect system. However, we do
24 believe it's the best we could come up with. In a
25 perfect world, we would interview each of the guide
26 applicants and so forth, but obviously that puts some
27 serious financial implications on especially those that
28 live in Bush Alaska who have to fly in to interview and
29 so forth.

30

31 This process is used on all Refuges
32 first of all, so it's not just exclusive to the Nowitna
33 or the Koyukuk. All Refuges that have Guide Use Areas
34 use this process. We are currently going through this
35 process. Within the application there's a number of
36 things that the applicant must address, including
37 impacts and so forth to subsistence users. That is
38 actually a fairly major component of it.

39

40 One of the things we're looking for
41 with Fish and Wildlife Service is also a quality
42 experience for the hunter. As many of you know, these
43 hunts -- for instance, a moose hunt on the Koyukuk
44 right now for a non-resident guided moose hunt is
45 15,000, \$16,000, so it's a fairly expensive hunt. One
46 of the things that we are looking for is a quality hunt
47 for the individual because they are paying a lot of
48 money. So quality of the hunt is one thing.

49

50 Knowledge of the area is another.

1 Whether it's the natural resources that are there or
2 the history behind the Refuge and so forth. All these
3 things are addressed in that prospectus. Within that
4 prospectus we do take into account a lot of these
5 things, including -- some other things that are
6 included is past violations. If you have more than
7 three violations, I believe it is, in 10 years, you do
8 not qualify for that hunt Guide Use Area.
9 We look at basically their operational plan. We look
10 at their safety plan. That must be in place.

11
12 So, again, there's a whole facet of
13 things that we're looking at, but quality of the hunt,
14 safety, experience of the guides both for the species
15 they plan on hunting as well as the area that they plan
16 on hunting is important. All those things come into
17 combination. Again, subsistence use and the potential
18 impacts of their operation on subsistence users should
19 be addressed in that prospectus as well.

20
21 Does that answer your question, Tim?

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Your concern
24 revolved more around the allocation of permit scoring
25 towards guides that utilize high volume without any
26 donation of meat to the local communities and you feel
27 that there should be a scoring system that would
28 encompass that. Is that your line of thought, Tim?

29
30 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah. I appreciate
31 Kenton's comments on that. My reason for bringing it
32 up is I feel like the balance of the scoring is set too
33 much on the commercial aspects and it doesn't
34 put enough emphasis on the local users and local
35 communities. So I feel like Fish and Wildlife Service
36 can do a better job of addressing the local users in
37 that selection criteria.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So one question I
40 would have is what would be the likelihood of review of
41 the guide selection process. There's some issues with
42 the current -- I really enjoy the guide selection
43 process. Don't get me wrong. The Park Service and the
44 Fish and Wildlife got a guide selection process and the
45 Forest Service and that's a very positive thing.
46 That's what all of the guides and all of the people
47 want to see is a honing, but there's some issues that
48 criteria for like hire of local people and
49 compatibility with local user groups. Also the sale of
50 those guide permits. That is a big issue on Fish and

1 Wildlife that the qualified guide, as far as I know,
2 can get a guide use permit and then can sell the
3 permit.

4

5 Go ahead, Kenton.

6

7 MR. MOOS: Mr. Chair. It is my
8 understanding that you cannot do that. What you have
9 to do in order for a guide use permit to be transferred
10 you'd have to sell your business, so you cannot sell
11 the permit itself. That is not allowed. I can say
12 that with all certainty. If you sell your business and
13 your business has that Guide Use Area along with it,
14 and I believe that has been addressed, I'll have to
15 check with Brian Anderson on this, but my understanding
16 is if there is an intended transfer of a permit because
17 of the sale of a business, it will have to go through a
18 review and the prospectus that was put forth by the
19 original permit holder, they are held to that
20 prospectus.

21

22 For instance if the prospectus says
23 they're going to have four bear hunters -- let's say
24 somebody buys the business and gets that and then all
25 of a sudden has 14 bear hunters, that is a violation of
26 the prospectus and, therefore, the permit can be
27 revoked. So they are bound by the prospectus that was
28 submitted by the original.....

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I understand that
31 part, but the reality is a lot of guides that would be
32 highly qualified and at the end of their career qualify
33 for the permit and their sale of business to another
34 entity, another guide, would never have competed to
35 obtain the permit. Because they buy the business, they
36 get the permit. So that's the problem and it needs to
37 be addressed. I feel that the whole guide selection
38 process should come up for a review to address that
39 particular issue and also some of the concerns about
40 compatibility with local communities with local hire
41 and so forth. That should enter into a scoring system
42 like Tim's talking about.

43

44 Did you have a comment there, Ray.

45

46 MR. COLLINS: I was wondering. You
47 said they have to address their impact on subsistence
48 use and I'm wondering how that's worded because it
49 would seem in there you could ask them how can you
50 mitigate your impact in your operation and one of those

1 things maybe even suggesting like donated the meat that
2 hunters aren't going to claim in good condition to the
3 local village or hire local hire to help support
4 subsistence hunters in that way. Something that would
5 steer that maybe more to them thinking more seriously
6 about their activity is impacting subsistence and how
7 they could mitigate it.

8

9 MR. MOOS: Mr. Collins through the
10 Chair. Absolutely. Actually that is the case. A
11 great example is I had an off-cycle Guide Use Area that
12 came available and one of the applicants did not
13 address -- there's minimum point scores for these
14 different categories. For each category if you do not
15 obtain the minimal scores, your entire application is
16 thrown out. This particular applicant did not address
17 the things you just exactly brought up. Because of that
18 he did not attain a minimum score and, therefore, I
19 never even saw his applicant. I know he applied for
20 it, there was an appeal on it, but it was not submitted
21 with his package. Therefore, without that minimum
22 score, he was thrown out.

23

24 I do believe with that minimum scoring
25 in these different categories that does address some of
26 your concerns because they are required to have that
27 minimum scoring. Like I said, impacts of subsistence
28 including meat donation is one thing that can be
29 addressed, which allows for additional scoring, hiring
30 of local assistant guides and so forth are all part of
31 that, yes.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James.

34

35 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Jack. In
36 regards along Ray's line of questioning. In regards to
37 the score itself and individuals that have an input to
38 the score system, who are they and how does that
39 process go through?

40

41 MR. MOOS: Council Member Walker,
42 through the Chair. The way the process works is the
43 prospectus is submitted for each Guide Use Area.
44 There's a three-person panel who reviews those
45 applicants, scores them and then forwards a list of
46 best qualified applicants for that Guide Use Area to
47 the Refuge manager. The Refuge manager then goes
48 through those prospectuses as well.

49

50 You have to understand some of these

1 Guide Use Areas there's like upwards of 20, 30, 40
2 even. My understanding down at Kodiak there's up to 50
3 guides applying for a single area. Obviously you can't
4 forward all those names. Typically you get the top
5 three. In my case for a Guide Use Area I get three
6 guide names. I go through that exact same process. I
7 do see their score sheets. The score sheets do not
8 have names on them, so I don't know -- I know who the
9 three panel members are, but I don't know how they
10 score them. And then I review them, but then I go into
11 more detail and then I call past clients, I call
12 references. I do a more in-depth look into the
13 business aspect of it. From there I make the selection
14 typically of the best qualified that have been
15 forwarded to me. So that's the process.

16

17 Sorry. There is an appeal process that
18 potentially can occur as well.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Kenton.

21 Ray.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: Well, where you have
24 somebody that's been in the area, I wonder if in that
25 process you can add maybe contacting the local Advisory
26 Committee to see if they have any comments on that
27 individual's activities so that would be part of the
28 process, at least that information. I don't know if
29 that could be done or not, but you might get more
30 accurate information than to just contact their clients
31 to see how they liked it. Ask how they're impacting
32 the local community.

33

34 MR. MOOS: Mr. Collins through the
35 Chair. Absolutely. For me, I guess that would not be
36 a problem. For some of our Refuges that might be a
37 problem because they have 30 Guide Use Areas that
38 they're looking at, such as Kodiak. To go to that
39 extent you would spend a year doing it. We try to do
40 the best we can and make the best selections we can.

41

42 The thing of it is, we typically have a
43 pretty good idea of all the people who are applying for
44 Guide Use Areas. We've got pretty extensive experience
45 with a lot of these guides, so we do somewhat know
46 what's going on just to be honest with you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: At this point, what
49 would you prefer to do, Tim. Would you like a letter
50 submitted on some aspect of that or is that enough

1 discussion on the guide use selection process for the
2 U.S. Fish and Wildlife?

3

4 MR. GERVAIS: I feel it's probably
5 enough for this meeting. Let me do some research and
6 in our fall meeting I'll find out who it was, somebody
7 in Anchorage I believe, that sets up these judging
8 criteria and then I'll be asking the Council on how to
9 address it with a letter of transmittal.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I think that's an
12 appropriate course of action. You can bring forth
13 various issues and I feel that the Council can write a
14 letter to the Regional Director of the U.S. Fish and
15 Wildlife to see if some of these issues can be reviewed
16 and addressed in an updated guide selection process.
17 So you can bring that forward at the fall meeting.
18 That's enough on that issue. Thanks, Tim. Thanks,
19 Kenton.

20

21 What do you want to do here, Melinda.
22 Do you want to break.

23

24 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. You know, I
25 think we're moving through the agenda really well.
26 We're further than I thought we'd be at 4:15, so why
27 don't we give everybody until 4:30 and then we'll chug
28 through the last of it.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you.

31

32 (Off record)

33

34 (On record)

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to bring
37 the meeting back to order. We're coming back on the
38 record. Are you still there, Tim.

39

40 (No response)

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're on the agency
43 report. OSM is up first. David.

44

45 DR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
46 David Jenkins, OSM. Then you'll have an update on the
47 chinook issue. First this status report. If you give
48 me 45 seconds, I think I can run through this quickly.
49 It's on Page 57. It's the Secretarial recommendations
50 the Federal Subsistence Management Program. Of course,

1 we have Pat Pourchot if he wants to add more details.

2

3

MR. POURCHOT: No, no.

4

5

(Laughter)

6

7

DR. JENKINS: The first two points
8 there are about the new public members to the Federal
9 Subsistence Board. They've been appointed, Tony
10 Christianson from Hyدابurg and Charles Brower of Barrow
11 and their first meeting will be in March in Juneau.
12 Point number three is to review the Memorandum of
13 Understanding with RAC input and there is a workgroup
14 that's been established to do that review based on RAC
15 input from 2011. Then point number four, again with
16 RAC input, to review the rural determination process
17 and present recommendations for regulatory changes in
18 January this year. The Federal Subsistence Board began
19 that process. There will soon be a proposed rule
20 published to solicit comments from the public on the
21 rural determination process. At the same time, there
22 has been a delay of the 2007 rural determinations for
23 five years or the completion of that process, whichever
24 comes first.

25

26

Mr. Chair, that's the review. Thank

27 you.

28

29

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Any
30 questions about the status report of the Secretarial
31 recommendations for the Federal Subsistence Management
32 Program.

33

34

Are you on the conference call now,

35 Tim?

36

37

MR. GERVAIS: Yes, I am.

38

39

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Did you get
40 that OSM report on the Secretarial Review and what's
41 progressing?

42

43

MR. GERVAIS: Yes.

44

45

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any Council
46 comments on the Secretarial Review.

47

48

MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, David.

49

50

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I wanted to comment

1 that the Federal Subsistence Board is addressing some
2 of the concerns that were expressed by the Regional
3 Council Chairs and the Regional Councils regarding the
4 Subsistence Management Program.

5
6 Go ahead, state your name for the
7 record.

8
9 MR. MEARS: My name is Jeremy Mears.
10 I'm with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fairbanks
11 Field Office, Yukon subsistence fisheries. You were
12 handed a 2012 Yukon River chinook salmon outlook and
13 I've got a summary of those comments to read into the
14 record plus another couple of items.

15
16 Yukon River chinook salmon are
17 important to all users in the Yukon area.
18 Unfortunately these stocks have experienced a decline
19 in productivity with run sizes approximately half the
20 historical levels. In three of the last five years,
21 escapement goals to Canada have not been met. In 2012,
22 preliminary estimates of chinook run strength range
23 between 109 and 146,000 chinook salmon, suggesting
24 another below average year, which may not be sufficient
25 to fully support subsistence needs.

26
27 During these low runs it is necessary
28 for all users to look at their harvest and decide how
29 they can reduce their harvest to help ensure adequate
30 chinook escapement. Given user concerns about the
31 future of Yukon River chinook runs, it is necessary to
32 continue efforts in developing a management plan that
33 is focused on rebuilding chinook salmon stocks.

34
35 The initial objectives of this plan are
36 to achieve escapement goals in the Alaska portion of
37 the drainage and meet harvest-sharing commitments with
38 Canada. This plan must also provide for subsistence
39 use of chinook salmon in the Alaskan portion of the
40 drainage and the management of overlapping chum salmon
41 runs.

42
43 Yukon fisheries managers need your
44 continued support in carrying out management strategy
45 options for 2012 that will help in getting fish to the
46 spawning grounds.

47
48 In 2011, the combined efforts of users
49 and fisheries managers allowed us to get enough fish to
50 the spawning grounds even with a below average run.

1 The current trends of low productivity do, however,
2 require conservative management for the next few years.

3

4 During the winter and spring State and
5 Federal fishery managers will attend several meetings
6 to inform fishermen and
7 user groups of the 2012 outlook and to receive input on
8 management options for the 2012 fishing season.

9

10 Yukon River fishery managers are
11 soliciting practical ideas for reducing chinook salmon
12 harvest from resource users on the river. That's the
13 conclusion of the update.

14

15 In addition to this, Fred asked me to
16 get the Council's input on some management options that
17 we are looking at in 2012, which include no fishing on
18 one or more of the first pulse or additional pulses,
19 limiting Districts 1 and 2 to 6-inch gear mesh only for
20 the commercial chum salmon fishery. In 2009, Federal
21 waters were limited to Federally qualified users only.
22 This was not implemented in 2010 or 2011, but it is
23 again being considered in 2012.

24

25 So any comments you have about that
26 that I can take back to Fred would be appreciated.
27 Additionally, you'll notice there was a second page
28 that Jack addressed with the proposal to remove the 4B
29 and 4C driftnet gill fishery.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Not the fishery, but
32 the permit.

33

34 MR. MEARS: Permit. Excuse me. I
35 misspoke.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Koyukuk/Nowitna will
38 submit that proposal is my understanding. The in-
39 season manager would like to have comments on how to
40 protect the Yukon chinook run this year with low
41 productivity return.

42

43 Robert.

44

45 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr.
46 Chairman. I don't want to jump Jason Hale up really
47 quick, but, Jason, aren't you going to have a meeting
48 in April here to discuss these issues here with the
49 managers also?

50

1 MR. HALE: Jason Hale, YRDFA. Thanks,
2 Robert. The meeting that we've had the last few years
3 we're doing, oh, one last time unless the funders
4 change their mind on that. It's going to be April 4th
5 in Anchorage. I'm going to be asking you guys to
6 nominate somebody to go. I think in the past couple
7 years you've sent Professor Walker who's weighed in
8 heavily. But whoever you guys choose I'm sure would be
9 fantastic. We will be talking about these questions in
10 specific along with some other questions and the other
11 questions I'm going to be kicking out to you in just a
12 few minutes.

13

14 So, yes.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So this -- I would
17 like this Council to answer some of those questions so
18 that the representative that attends the YRDFA meeting
19 can understand the Council's wishes of direction.

20

21 On the question should nonrural users
22 be precluded from harvesting on Federal waters, that
23 got into a whole bunch of quagmire with various family
24 members coming out from town to help out and that got
25 to be kind of problematic. I personally would not like
26 to go there. I don't know what the rest of the Council
27 members would feel about that. Robert.

28

29 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. One
30 thing we found out in Anvik is that if you take the
31 fish and you take what you want off of it, you're going
32 to throw the rest of it away. So what we would do is
33 the people who want -- we'd scrape the meat off the
34 bone and jar it, that was what was going to be thrown
35 away anyway, so we didn't have any problem with that.
36 I went to the GASH meeting and I told them about it.
37 They said that is a good way because the law states you
38 can't feed king salmon to your dogs, et cetera, so that
39 was a solution that we found was working.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've done that for
42 years and it's amazing how much meat comes off a fish
43 when you've got a spoon on that backbone and really
44 work it over. You get like -- and it's really nice
45 meat. It's kind of like fish hamburger and it works
46 really good.

47

48 My personal feeling is that I would not
49 like to preclude non-subsistence Federally qualified
50 users from coming and helping with family members who

1 live on the river, they've got lots of kids that moved
2 off to town and they want to come back in the summer
3 and help out elders, so I would not prefer to see that
4 again.

5
6 On the question of pulse protection,
7 full on pulse protection for the first pulse worked
8 good, but it shifts a lot of the fishing pressure onto
9 -- like on the Koyukuk I've been collecting genetic
10 samples and I found out the Middle Fork is a first
11 pulse run and the Jim River is second pulse run, so
12 we've got two different pulses going up the Koyukuk. I
13 don't want to shift all the pressure onto one stock and
14 totally protect one pulse.

15
16 I feel that the managers have to get
17 better at delineating where the pulse is and allowing
18 harvest off the tail end of that pulse. Let the first
19 part of it go unfished and then take off portions off
20 the tail end of those pulses and distribute the harvest
21 sort of equitably.

22
23 Go ahead, Robert.

24
25 MR. R. WALKER: Jack, you don't want to
26 go on to the end of the pulse because that's where 65
27 to 75 percent of the females trail up after the males.
28 I mean you don't want to be doing that.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's the kind of
31 input we need. At least divide the harvest to where
32 you have -- you don't have protections on certain
33 portions of the pulse, but not fishing one pulse shifts
34 all of the harvest then, so you completely decimate
35 like a Chena stock and you don't want to be doing that.
36 So I think the managers have to get better at pulse
37 identification and taking a little bit off of each
38 pulse. That would be my personal opinion.

39
40 MR. R. WALKER: That's not going to
41 work because if you're going to fish six hours a day,
42 you've got to run 20 miles, put your net in, run 20
43 miles back down to pick it up and go all the way home
44 and wait around. It's kind of hard to justify, Jack,
45 because where we live it is kind of hard to be fishing
46 and the price of gas. If you're going to do
47 something, you're going to have to do it long range,
48 not a short pulse. I really think, Jason, with the
49 fish managers meeting coming up I think we really have
50 a lot of good understanding with them because they ask

1 questions and like we say, well, the first pulse we let
2 it go by, that's fine with us, because we understand
3 where we're going to go because a lot of us don't need
4 that much fish.

5
6 Actually, if we put a limit on it, 50
7 fish per family, that's roughly 1,000 pounds or more.
8 I mean you have to be more realistic now because when
9 you look at the stocks of fish now it's going to be
10 lower this year, down to like 150. Some people take
11 like 600 fish per family. That's a little too much.
12 So I think we should start realizing and start going
13 down to 50 fish per family. That's something we have
14 to talk about.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I like that plan. I
17 like a personal limitation of 50 fish per family. What
18 I'm concerned about is like full on trying to get all
19 your fish all at one time on one pulse and basically
20 damaging one of the pulses. So I like your plan. I
21 like you saying those kinds of things. Go ahead.

22
23 MR. R. WALKER: And another thing too.
24 A lot of people don't fish at the same time. I mean
25 Jason might fish maybe the third week, Jim might fish
26 the second week, I might fish the fourth week.
27 Everybody doesn't fish at the same time.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I do like that
30 limitation aspect and I think that should be brought
31 out in the discussion. Everybody is going to have to
32 conserve and that's one way of conserving is not during
33 any one time, but on a level of harvest.

34
35 What do you think about that, Jenny?
36 You're a fisher on the Yukon.

37
38 MS. PELKOLA: I was just going to say I
39 know this was talked about in Galena, that Galena
40 meeting and then in our meeting in Anchorage there was
41 a lot of discussion on it. It's still being bounced
42 around. I too would like to see a limitation. In
43 drifting, I'm right at Bishop Mountain and I could see
44 the same boat going down for every chance they get.
45 Some of them talk about, oh, I got 90 fish today and I
46 got 90. I don't even get 90 where I am, you know,
47 because there's so many of us in the family. I think
48 eventually this is going to happen. Maybe we might go
49 down to 10 limit, I don't know, one of these days to
50 get our fish stock back.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I used to fish down
2 in Bristol Bay and under State subsistence permitting
3 you're only allowed 10 kings on the Naknek River period
4 for subsistence, so there's limitations in other
5 fisheries. I didn't attend the YRDFA meeting. I
6 didn't know they were talking about personal
7 limitations, so I'm glad to hear that.

8
9 More discussion. Go ahead, Jenny.

10
11 MS. PELKOLA: Along with what Robert
12 said, scraping the meat off the backbone, I don't even
13 scrape it, I use the whole backbone and everything and
14 that's the best best fish you can ever eat because it's
15 got calcium and everything right in it. So don't throw
16 your backbones away, just can them.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, you were jarring
19 them up. You can eat the bone.

20
21 MS. PELKOLA: Eat the whole thing.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's good.
24 Further discussion on the management options for the
25 in-season managers for discussion at the YRDFA meeting
26 and for the benefit of the in-season managers.

27
28 MR. MEARS: There was also the
29 Districts 1 and 2 reduction to 6-inch gear during the
30 commercial chum fishery. I don't know if you want to
31 comment on that.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I thought they were
34 already on a 6-inch limitation.

35
36 MR. HALE: You're talking about
37 subsistence, right.

38
39 MR. MEARS: Yeah.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, subsistence.
42 Clarify that again.

43
44 MR. HALE: What they did last year
45 they're talking about doing again and that was to
46 restrict all fishing in the lower river Y1 and Y2 to 6-
47 inch gear. The idea was they wanted to be able to have
48 commercial fisheries on summer chum, which the
49 fishermen said was important to them to get through the
50 winter without increasing the pressures on the kings.

1 So they said, well, jeez, if we go to a chum gear for
2 the subsistence fishery and we know we're going to get
3 some kings in that, then the extra fishing that happens
4 in the commercial where you're going to get some kings
5 incidentally, it offsets it was the idea, so there's
6 not an increased pressure on the king salmon.

7

8 So that's how they justified having the
9 summer chum commercial fishery, so they're talking
10 about doing that again as an option.

11

12 Is that right?

13

14 MR. MEARS: Yes.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Discussion by the
17 Council on that. Go ahead, James.

18

19 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Jack. Just
20 one question I guess in regards to that comment. That
21 all depends on the buyer. In the commercial season
22 down in Y1 or 2, so you eliminate the buyer and so are
23 you going to still put a restriction on size of gear?

24

25 MR. MEARS: I'd have to bring that back
26 to Fred to get a specific answer on that.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: From talking to some
29 commercial fishermen down in Southeast Alaska the
30 salmon market -- the yin to the dollar has gone way up,
31 so the price of salmon is projected to be higher than
32 last year and last year they were getting -- what were
33 they getting for Yukon chums down there?

34

35 MR. HALE: Yeah, about a dollar a
36 pound.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: A dollar a pound.
39 It could be more than a dollar a pound. So the buyers
40 will be there. I don't think there's not going to be a
41 buyer there. I've always had concerns about the
42 incidental harvest mortality with 6-inch gear. The
43 perception is that if they aren't enumerated as catch,
44 but they swam up the river. Well, that's not the way
45 it is. They fall off and they float away. So I'm
46 concerned about requiring 6-inch and there was high
47 opposition. I forget what proposal it was. It was an
48 OSM proposal from the Eastern Interior for 6-inch net
49 and the Lower River showed up in mass to fight that
50 proposal. So I'm surprised that they're talking about

1 6-inch for subsistence use.

2

3 I'm personally opposed to the use of 6-
4 inch gear for chinook harvest. I feel that it doesn't
5 target the majority of the run. You have a huge
6 dropout rate, mortalities and I don't feel --
7 personally I don't feel that that's a good way to go.

8

9 Go ahead.

10

11 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Jack.
12 Again, I want to bring up the issue of types of mesh,
13 monofilament particularly. Monofilament is one deadly
14 catcher of kings regardless of the size of the mesh
15 itself. You know, you don't go fishing for grayling
16 with a halibut hook. You get 6-inch gear with a
17 monofilament line on that thing, you're going to catch
18 a lot of kings because of the fine strand and they hold
19 onto it, gills. So I think you have to define the type
20 of gear what is allowable to allow escapement.

21

22 MR. MEARS: Okay.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You know, the way
25 the net is hung, you can hang the net to where the fish
26 actually ball all up in the web. You can fish a heavy
27 twine size with 6-inch chum gear, so the kings, with
28 all that slack, they can't break that mesh. But you
29 get into a whole Board of Fish proposal about how nets
30 are hung and minimum, maximum twine size. They get
31 into that whole net mesh issue, so that can be very,
32 very problematic and probably will never happen.

33

34 I stated in the fall meeting that I was
35 concerned that Y1 and Y2 were given subsistence harvest
36 opportunities equitable to the upper river where
37 there's no commercial fishery. But, yeah, Y1 and Y2
38 have a commercial fishery and they're going to have
39 bycatch of chinook that aren't going to be sold and
40 those enter into the subsistence fishery.

41

42 The other aspect is Y1 and 2 have all
43 those test fisheries on the lower river and all of
44 those fish go into the subsistence fishery. So what
45 I've been saying is at the fall meeting and I'll say it
46 again, the lower river has far more harvest opportunity
47 for subsistence than the upper rivers. They actually
48 have an inequitable opportunity to get additional fish
49 from bycatch on the directed chum fishery and in the
50 test fishery.

1 So I'm concerned that the managers
2 aren't calculating what those additional harvests are
3 going into the subsistence fishery and they're not
4 taking their equitable share of harvest reduction. I'd
5 like that noted to Fred Bue.

6
7 Any other discussion on the three
8 topics that the in-season manager would like to have
9 answers on.

10
11 (No comments)

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Thank you.

14
15 MR. MEARS: Thank you.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that completes
18 OSM's reports. We're at Fish and Wildlife and we've
19 got Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge, Vince Mathews.
20 Again, for the record, Vince Mathews used to be the
21 coordinator for this Regional Council and Vince did a
22 great job for us, so you're always welcome at the mic,
23 Vince. Go ahead.

24
25 MR. MATHEWS: I just got a huge
26 PowerPoint program. James, did you look at your watch,
27 there?

28
29 MR. J. WALKER: I did.

30
31 (Laughter)

32
33 MR. MATHEWS: No, seriously, you can
34 find it on Page 60, the Kanuti report. Do you want me
35 to cover highlights of those or do you want to at your
36 leisure read them over? Remember the Council has asked
37 over the years, they wanted to know what's going on in
38 each Refuges prior to being a problem. In my opinion,
39 this is where you would see it before it becomes a
40 problem. So it's on Page 60. It's got a Kanuti Beaver
41 up in the corner.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So just hit the high
44 points, Vince. We're kind of running short on time.

45
46 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, the high points
47 there, focusing mainly on moose. If you look at the
48 first page there, I'm not going to go through all of
49 it, but basically the 2011 results reveal that there's
50 been little change in the moose population in the past

1 decade. So even though the moose population estimate
2 is still relatively high, you know, 69 bulls per 100
3 cows, the calf/cow ratio is somewhat improved. The
4 bottom line is that the moose population there's no
5 evidence it's increased in size.

6

7 You've already talked about the
8 Intensive Management Plan and the five-year aspect of
9 that, so you'll be, I'm sure, by Fish and Game Staff,
10 informed as that moves along.

11

12 Any questions on the moose population
13 surveys?

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions from
18 the Council.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And this survey was
23 done in November?

24

25 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, if I remember
26 correctly.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions on the
29 moose surveys.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Continue.

34

35 MR. MATHEWS: Then the next thing would
36 be -- and it's been mentioned with other reports that a
37 lot of these surveys are a cooperative effort and that
38 needs to be noted, especially in declining budgets and
39 be recognized. So on Page 62 the radio telemetry
40 update. That's a cooperative effort between the
41 Refuge, Gates of the Arctic, Fish and Game and BLM.
42 Basically that's radio-collared moose to see where
43 their movements are and their activities. Of course,
44 moose don't live forever. Basically now since that was
45 first done in March of 2008 there are now a total of 39
46 radio collars still working near the Refuge. The
47 reason for that is to collect data from the radio
48 collars that will improve our understanding of habitat
49 use and movements of moose on the Refuge.

50

1 Jack already indicated that with your
2 IM Plan. I know Glenn would do a better job of it, but
3 you have an area where the intensive management is
4 while they're watching another area where there will
5 not be intensive management. So you have an idea of
6 what change levels.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The collaring also
9 helps the Department locate calves to get their calf
10 inventory and also their twin rates, so that's a very
11 important part of moose management in the Upper
12 Koyukuk. Continue, Vince.

13

14 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, and that also
15 allowed me to get up in a plane with Mr. Spindler and I
16 was able to hold my stomach and do that survey with
17 him. You don't see much from the back of the plane
18 finding the moose, but we did well and I held my
19 stomach.

20

21 (Laughter)

22

23 MR. MATHEWS: So that gives you an idea
24 on that. The hunting season you already talked about
25 the results of the Federal Subsistence Board, Proposals
26 57 and 58. That's on the bottom paragraph of Page 62.
27 I think the bottom line on that is you need to realize
28 that for Allakaket and Alatna -- and I'll get my
29 message down to a sound byte, I don't have it yet -- is
30 that there will be one Federal permit that will cover
31 the early August season that's just Federal, the later
32 fall season and then the long winter season. So there
33 will be one permit there.

34

35 For Pollock, you also need to get a
36 permit for the State winter hunt. So Glenn and I will
37 be working to make sure that message gets out to the
38 community on that. You'll look at the reported
39 harvest. That's part of my duties is to track those
40 permits. I have a pile on my desk, but I can't be
41 everywhere. the 2011 data is still pending, so you
42 won't see 2011 data.

43

44 I think Jack already knows this and I
45 hope Council members. I apologize. Jack will know the
46 date. There's a four-year sunset on this December 15th
47 to April 15th. I can't remember what year that is.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 2014 will be the
50 sunset on the State hunt.

1 MR. MATHEWS: So if you were to wear
2 the shoes of the Board of Game and Federal Subsistence
3 Board, you will need to see what was the participation
4 level and what was the success level of those hunts.
5 That is a controversial hunt. So my message to those
6 villages is if you want that hunt, you better start
7 using it. That message has two prongs to it. Use is
8 participation as well as harvest. So please encourage
9 your village people to fill out that -- they may not
10 have gotten a moose, but they hunted X number of days.
11 That data, from my little time with harvest reporting
12 is not there. The Board needs to know participation as
13 well as success.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I want to clarify
16 for the record that it is very important for local
17 people to report their harvest, but also the winter
18 harvest will be much reduced this year in participation
19 because the caribou are present. I want the record to
20 reflect that the caribou have come into 24B and people
21 in Allakaket and Alatna are getting caribou, as they
22 are in Bettles. So that will affect the winter moose
23 harvest. The reliance is shifted towards caribou. So
24 participation can vary with caribou's presence, so I
25 wanted that to be reflected in the analysis and the
26 future for that winter hunt.

27
28 Continue, Vince. Oh, do you have a
29 comment, Tim?

30
31 MR. GERVAIS: No. Go ahead.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead.

34
35 MR. MATHEWS: In full respect to Ron
36 Sam, he was the one that worked very hard to get
37 increased reporting compliance within the Koyukuk
38 River. All the villages need to follow his example.
39 If you remember that meeting in Galena when he pounded
40 on the table, I can still see him there because it was
41 an F15 or whatever taking off and we couldn't hear his
42 swear words.

43
44 (Laughter)

45
46 MR. MATHEWS: But basically he was
47 saying he would not go to another Board meeting without
48 hard data of what the moose are because he would not
49 take the embarrassment that it's reported there was
50 like 1 percent of what the harvest was really going on.

1 That's the power of those reports. I understand the
2 challenges with that. But in full respect to Ron, I
3 want to recognize that because he woke everybody up on
4 reporting. It also resulted in community harvest
5 surveys, I understand, but those are expensive, so
6 people need to step up. Anyway, I got on my soapbox,
7 but it's really clear that that needs to be done,
8 especially with dwindling budgets.

9
10 I think with that, you can look at the
11 habitat inventory. These are to basically give you
12 kind of baseline information for these different areas
13 that's on the bottom of Page 63. So they're looking at
14 to catalog the Refuge, diversity of breeding birds,
15 terrestrial habitats, invertebrates, fire history,
16 and recent fire severity. Obviously that's subject to
17 budget, so it's not sure it's going to go into the
18 future. Again, another budgetary plea there, but to
19 prevent a problem you have to know of it before it
20 becomes a problem.

21
22 The rest I'll leave there. If you want
23 any information on fire management, it's there. No
24 allotments, cabins, or other values were threatened and
25 no action was taken on any of the fires in the Kanuti
26 Refuge.

27
28 I think I'll leave it there because I
29 think you guys can go over the water resources. There
30 is interest in other areas of the region on mining, so
31 these basic baseline information of water quality and
32 that are central to know if there's some change in
33 activities in the area, which might happen to be
34 mining.

35
36 Finally, your Chair brought up the
37 schedule for the Federal Subsistence Board. As a
38 Refuge Staff person, it is difficult to get these
39 reports together when they dovetail with Board
40 meetings, with holidays and et cetera. So in full
41 respect to the Kanuti Staff, they really had to squeeze
42 this in. So hopefully if there is changes in the
43 schedule, that will open up Staff to get these reports
44 in or other reports. I mean it was a challenge.

45
46 Finally, for myself, covering three
47 Refuges, I can't be at Eastern and at Western at the
48 same time. So, if it's all possible that those
49 meetings don't overlap. They can speak for themselves,
50 but it affects others in fishery management to cover.

1 Yes, we can compare notes and that, but it's not the
2 same as being in the room and having the sidebar
3 conversations. I understand you have constraints, but
4 it does make it difficult. With that, I'll see if
5 there's any questions.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks,
8 Vince. Any Council questions for Kanuti's
9 presentation.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Vince.
14 Appreciate that. So we're at the Koyukuk/Nowitna
15 report. Kenton.

16

17 MR. MOOS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
18 Council members. Kenton Moos, Refuge manager for
19 Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge. Along with
20 me today I have Jeremy Havener, who is our new Geoff
21 Beyersdorf, just a little bit bigger and a little bit
22 broader.

23

24 (Laughter)

25

26 MR. MOOS: He's our new subsistence
27 biologist as well. So I hope you guys can get to know
28 him. Real briefly, our moose surveys that we conducted
29 again this year pretty much our populations have been
30 stable with the exception we did have one concern,
31 which played a major role in our call for a winter
32 hunt, a March 1-5 hunt.

33

34 In 24D we did see a decrease in cow
35 populations, adult cows, which we do have some concerns
36 with as well as the State of Alaska. So, because of
37 that, the March 1-5 hunt in 24D, as in David, we did
38 not allow, but as an alternative what we have offered
39 up is an April 10-15 bulls only hunt within that area.

40

41 For 24D, as in David, we did not allow
42 a hunt as well. Again, stable populations, however
43 we've been conservative. Again, March moose hunts tend
44 to be antlerless and there is a high probability of cow
45 harvest, so we do try to remain pretty conservative on
46 that area as well.

47

48 In 21B, which is the Nowitna, same
49 thing there. Fairly low moose densities, so we did not
50 allow a March 1-5 hunt. However, that area does have

1 an extended fall hunt, September 26 to October 1, in
2 which we have minimal participation, but we do have
3 some. So that opportunity is there.

4
5 For the rest of the year here, again,
6 we are pretty much operating at full capacity, so a lot
7 of our biological program is continuing. That includes
8 quite a number of bird surveys, beaver cache surveys.

9
10 We do have a fisheries biologist now on
11 Staff and with that position came some extra funding
12 and he's done an outstanding job doing some inventory
13 of whitefish and so forth on the Refuge that we have
14 not had before. He's put in for some proposals to do
15 some salmon work on the Koyukuk, which I believe has
16 been funded, which would put tags on them at the mouth.
17 The weir sites then hopefully we'll be able to see
18 where those fish are going. But he's doing some really
19 cool stuff.

20
21 We were able to also backfill behind
22 our habitat biologist. The young lady who we have on
23 Staff now who just arrived about a month ago has a very
24 strong database management background and GIS
25 background, so we're very excited to have her on. We
26 think some of our habitat projects that we've got going
27 will continue and hopefully you can be able to expand
28 them somewhat.

29
30 Again, as far as staffing for the
31 Refuge, we are now fully staffed with the exception of
32 one position and that's our law enforcement position
33 and we hope to get that filled and then we will be
34 fully staffed.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Will you have that
37 law enforcement in place by the fall season?

38
39 MR. MOOS: We hope to have that
40 position filled. However, because of training
41 requirements it's six months of training essentially.
42 Three months at the Federal Law Officer Training Center
43 and an additional three months of field training.
44 However, what we would do is, if it's full and that
45 initial training is completed, what we're going to try
46 to do is get some of that field training done in the
47 Galena area, so we're hoping. We've found it very
48 difficult to fill a pilot law enforcement position.
49 There's just not too many pilots out there who qualify
50 for the law enforcement.

1 With that, I know there were some
2 concerns that were brought up earlier and I wasn't
3 here. I apologize for not being here first thing this
4 morning, but I thought I would leave some time to
5 address those concerns.

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions for
8 Kenton on the Koyukuk/Nowitna report.

9
10 (No comments)

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: At this time I don't
13 see any, so thanks, Kenton. So we've got Innoko.
14 Jerry.

15
16 MR. HILL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17 Members of the Council. My name is Jerry Hill,
18 wildlife biologist with the Innoko National Wildlife
19 Refuge here in McGrath. Melinda is handing out a
20 written update of Innoko activities, basically since
21 our last meeting in Aniak until the present. This is
22 to respond to Council member's request for a written
23 report. Hopefully it's sufficient.

24
25 I want to start by talking about our
26 moose program. With that, I'll start with the 21E
27 Federal winter moose hunt for regulatory year 2011-
28 2012. Bruce Seppi with the Bureau of Land Management
29 is kind of filling in for Geoff Beyersdorf, who
30 obviously moved on to Montana. Bruce and I spent time
31 in each of the four GASH villages early in February
32 issuing permits. It was good. I think from last
33 year's information we put out and being the second year
34 of focusing a little more open hunt conditions. It was
35 a good opportunity to get face-to-face contact with
36 potential hunters.

37
38 At this point we've actually issued 46
39 registered permits and 4 designated hunter permits,
40 which is relatively on pace with last year's issuance.
41 As of basically 3:00 this afternoon we have had a
42 report of three harvested moose for the hunt. All them
43 moose actually happened to be cows. There was no bulls
44 in the reported harvest.

45
46 If you recall my presentation at the
47 last WIRAC meeting in Aniak, I am now the primary
48 coordinator for moose monitoring, population monitoring
49 work from here on out. The Koyukuk/Nowitna Staff were
50 generous enough to offer for me to come up to

1 Koyukuk/Galena there in November 2011 moose work. I
2 get to see the program they have set up. I got to
3 actually go and do the GSPE surveys, the trend count
4 areas, stratification, the whole nine yards.

5
6 So beyond just doing the active work, I
7 got to spend a lot of time with their Staff talking
8 about how to develop a moose monitoring program for the
9 Innoko Refuge. That's not just Koyukuk Staff, but that
10 was also the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Glenn
11 Stout.

12
13 After talking with that Koyukuk Staff,
14 we actually worked on developing some trend count areas
15 for Innoko. Specifically for Unit 21A where the Fish
16 and Game doesn't have a lot of wildlife or moose
17 population data. We get the composition data in Unit
18 21E. We focused on three sections of the Innoko in 21A
19 within the refuge. We went from the Iditarod all the
20 way up to the North Fork. There was a middle section
21 there from the old field camp about from Mud River down
22 to Hather. Actually we saw enough moose sign and good
23 enough habitat we were confident we could do a trend
24 count for a future analysis.

25
26 So we ended up using the GSPE units as
27 our framework and we flew the units like we were doing
28 a GSPE mini survey. We didn't fly the 18 units. In
29 the units we counted 115 moose and we were shooting for
30 at least 100 moose minimum. Our bull/cow ratio was
31 82/100 cows and 48 calves to 10 cows. There's a table
32 in that report that shows the total for the entire 21A
33 unit for the Refuge of composition data because we did
34 collect additional data from the other areas we
35 investigated. So that brought the bull/cow ratio down
36 to 79/100 and the calf/cow down to 43 per 100.

37
38 The goal with this trend count area
39 we'll be able to do this every year and get the kind of
40 data that Koyukuk's been collecting and hopefully we'll
41 have it to present in the future.

42
43 As far as the future goes for the
44 actual surveys, we will be working with the Alaska
45 Department of Fish and Game and BLM on Unit 21E GSPE
46 survey here in March 12th. Josh isn't here to speak on
47 it. Basically we're going to do 150 blocks on the
48 GSPE. We'll have five planes in the GSPE survey, but
49 the Department of Fish and Game is actually using
50 collared moose to determine siteability factor to give

1 us a little better estimate.

2

3 From there we're going to do our spring
4 calving survey like we've done in the past couple
5 years. I wish I included that data in the report, but I
6 didn't think of it at the time.

7

8 And then for GSPE for the remainder of
9 the Refuge we're going to plan on doing hopefully the
10 entire remainder of 21A and 21D portions in 2013.
11 Hopefully in the next few years we'll have GSPE data
12 for the entire Refuge.

13

14 So that kind of covers the GSPE and the
15 composition work. We were having discussions about
16 doing a pilot project this summer, a browse survey.
17 Basically the goal for this, the generic goal is to
18 test field methods that qualitatively and
19 quantitatively describe the current condition of the
20 moose browse plant community with respect to
21 distribution abundance and as affected by the moose
22 foraging activities over portions of the Refuge.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those would be the
25 browse index that the State uses similar.

26

27 MR. HILL: It's similar, but not --
28 it's still preliminary. We're just working out the
29 details right now. We're trying to get it to where we
30 can compare that information with the survey data and
31 help us read a little more into the moose population
32 trends. I'll say this, the browse survey that was done
33 in the past was of interest to the GASH AC. This
34 wouldn't be quite the same work. We're trying to do it
35 efficiently by tying it in with another project. We're
36 doing land cover validation. So I don't want to say
37 too much. We're just trying to develop that right now
38 and this summer we'll use it as kind of a pilot project
39 to see how it goes and we can modify it from that
40 point.

41

42 So, like I say, the purpose of that is
43 to kind of get a better idea of the distribution of
44 browse, but also help us interpret our survey results.

45

46 The other big thing we've been doing at
47 the Refuge this fall and winter is working on rural
48 education and outreach. I know you've heard Bo talk
49 quite a bit about we don't do a lot of restoration work
50 that you do on Refuges down south. One of the biggest

1 things we want to do is educate the rural communities
2 on the value of having the Refuge and the resource and
3 resources outside the Refuge in Unit 21E.

4
5 One of those is we actually completed
6 our second offering of the Furbearer Management
7 Trapping Workshop in Anvik early in February. It was a
8 great turnout. We had up to 28 participants at one
9 point. The school was very well involved in this.
10 Unfortunately last year in Shageluk the school was out,
11 but Anvik the students were there, they were
12 interested. We actually had five students write essays
13 on the value of trapping to a subsistence lifestyle.
14 It worked out very well.

15
16 Another thing we'd done is, again,
17 pursued the Alaska Migratory Bird Calendar Contest.
18 Dara, with our Refuge, pursued that with these
19 villages, another opportunity for birds and learn about
20 conservation issues.

21
22 Dara Whitworth, one of our biologists,
23 is actually doing a detail right now with the BLM's
24 Campbell Creek Science Center. She's working with BLM
25 Staff to develop natural resource and science projects
26 that they can bring to the rural villages to get
27 science into their curriculum. It's kind of a request
28 from the Iditarod area school district to have these
29 agencies incorporated into that.

30
31 The last thing on rural education we --
32 Bo and I are certified instructors for National
33 Archeries in the Schools Program, so Bo did an offering
34 of that in McGrath here this past January. We're going
35 to try and bring that into the schools as well.

36
37 Melinda should have handed out one more
38 flyer with a business card. That is a notification
39 that we're updating our Federal management program, the
40 protocol. Kristi Bullock, our fire management officer,
41 is asking for input from interested parties if they
42 want to review that document. So if you're interested,
43 give Kristi a call or an email and she'll provide you
44 with that.

45
46 Lastly on the list of topics here,
47 personnel. We filled our administrative position with
48 Lilly Seavoy. Lilly is the wife of Roger Seavoy, the
49 area game biologist here in McGrath. We did fill the
50 law enforcement pilot position with Tim Bennett, who

1 was down at YK Delta prior to. The only position we
2 have open right now is a refuge information technician.

3

4 One thing I did want to mention
5 regarding the Federal hunt, we are getting some word of
6 some possible illegal harvest out there. Nothing
7 specific, so we're going to work with law enforcement
8 to maybe investigate that. Again, like Bo said, I'm in
9 some conference calls with the GASH AC. The best way
10 to control this stuff is obviously self-policing and
11 we're trying to bring that with us when we're doing the
12 permitting and stuff. So I'd encourage anyone if they
13 hear of anything just let us know. Obviously it's in
14 the best interest of the resource and the villages that
15 are using it.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Questions for
18 Innoko. Eleanor.

19

20 MS. YATLIN: I just have a comment. I
21 really like your detailed written report. All the
22 information is there and I also really like you working
23 with villages and the input you give to your villages
24 about the Refuge and working with the schools because
25 that's the future, the people that we want to educate
26 to be the biologists to work with our natural resources
27 and whatever in our villages. I appreciate that, thank
28 you.

29

30 MR. HILL: Yes, thank you. We feel
31 it's very important as well. There are certain
32 projects that bring back the natural heritage of the
33 villages too, like this trapping workshop, try to get
34 the younger generation down that line or interested in
35 that sort of thing.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.

38

39 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. Yeah,
40 being on the school board, I want to thank you too for
41 your work in the school. We really appreciate that. I
42 had a question. Are you noting twinning rates? The
43 State's been using those a lot for determining the
44 health of the herd, including browse surveys too, but
45 if there's a good twinning rate, it seems to indicate
46 there's good food out there.

47

48 MR. HILL: Yeah, we will. Like I say,
49 unfortunately I don't have the previous data for other
50 twinning surveys, but we will have that data available

1 and I'll put it in that report for the next meeting.

2

3 I guess I have a question about the
4 report, Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

7

8 MR. HILL: Is that better to submit
9 like Kanuti does prior to the meeting or is it
10 sufficient to have it submitted for referral after?

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It would be best if
13 it could be submitted before for myself to review. As
14 long as we have a handout like this to where we can
15 look at some of your projects and review them. Go
16 ahead, Melinda.

17

18 MS. HERNANDEZ: You know, another thing
19 I've noticed since I've been working with this Council
20 is mail, of course, takes forever. Jack's book was put
21 in the mail almost four weeks ago and it still hasn't
22 arrived to Wiseman priority. One thing I'm going to
23 talk to Andrea, our publication person, about is maybe
24 to have you guys send me stuff early regardless of the
25 book printing and then I can just forward on and that
26 way you guys have as much time to review ahead of the
27 meetings as possible.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Another avenue is to
30 email that as an attachment to those Council members
31 that have email so that we can get a hard copy plus the
32 email copy. I've got really poor mail, but I would
33 like to review some of these numbers and then have a
34 hard copy again at the meeting.

35

36 Other comments. Go ahead, James.

37

38 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
39 I'd first just like to say thanks for getting this
40 report really up to date and it's good to see some
41 numbers that we know we could relate to as far as
42 hunting this winter hunt for instance. I also wanted
43 to compliment you guys for coming through and saying
44 that you're going to follow up with the school kids in
45 the schools and that's really a good thing I'd like to
46 say. Thanks.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, James. Do
49 you have a comment?

50

1 MR. HILL: No. I was going to say
2 thank you. We appreciate that feedback. It means a
3 lot to us we're going down the right tack.

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I feel that that's
6 very important to have, work with the community
7 schools. Those are going to be future tribal council
8 members. They have to understand how the processes
9 actually work with the Federal management and the
10 lands.

11
12 I'm also very happy to see this kind of
13 moose data for this Innoko Refuge. I mean we were in a
14 black hole of information when you got here Bo, so now
15 we're kind of getting -- I mean I'm real happy to see
16 these kind of bull -- I had no clue what the bull/cow
17 ratios were.

18
19 MR. SLOAN: Pretty high.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I'm real happy to
22 see these kind of -- this GSPE and collaring and some
23 of these trend count enumerations, so I feel these are
24 very professional and I would like to see your browse
25 enumerations sort of go along the line of what the
26 State is doing because they have indexes that they use,
27 browse indexes. Like Glenn Stout was throwing out
28 these browse indexes, like 5 percent and 32 percent.
29 Then species enumeration of browse, what the
30 predominance are compared to other areas. Sometimes
31 there's willows in one area predominantly that aren't
32 in another area.

33
34 Bo.

35
36 MR. SLOAN: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Bo Sloan,
37 manager of Innoko. I appreciate all those comments.
38 There's a lot of things I don't do well, but hiring is
39 not one of them. I'm pretty good at hiring really good
40 folks.

41
42 (Laughter)

43
44 MR. SLOAN: So that's the reason we've
45 got some of this good stuff. To say just a little bit
46 about the browse stuff without getting into it too deep
47 because we've been batting this around for the past
48 month. Some of the biologist guys have to kind of
49 reign me in a little bit because I come at it a lot of
50 times from a forestry perspective in terms of volume

1 and this, that and the other, but one of the things
2 that I think is real important for us to get to is --
3 and where I think it does differ a little bit from some
4 of those State numbers is -- you know, I want to know
5 what our standing crop is out there relative to browse.
6 What do we have available because that's going to be
7 really really important in times of trying to establish
8 some sort of carrying capacity. Not just what the
9 moose are consuming right now, but what can they
10 consume tomorrow and next year and this, that and the
11 other thing. We need to know the condition of our
12 browse overstory and that sort of stuff. So we'll be
13 going at it from that direction pretty hard. We do
14 have some old data that's really good. Some of the
15 biologists that were here years ago they did a lot of
16 work on browse selection and preference and that sort
17 of thing. So it's really good because we've got a lot
18 of that data on the Refuge so we can specifically tie
19 to it with some of the this new information that
20 hopefully we'll get. I think it's going to help us
21 paint a pretty good picture.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James.

24

25 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Jack. Just
26 one question in regards to size or genetics and size of
27 moose in the area. Have you noticed anything as far as
28 any genetic changes in weight or size?

29

30 MR. SLOAN: You know, I can't say that
31 I've noticed it. It's kind of this would be kind of
32 hearsay, anecdotal stuff, but just going by what Steve
33 White was telling us last year that they definitely
34 were not getting the rack sizes last year that they
35 were getting the year prior and the year prior to that.
36 He said it's fairly noticeable. I'm not sure exactly
37 why. It's got a great bull/cow ratio, but bear in mind
38 that's a pretty low density population. That's one of
39 the reasons we want to get at some of those habitat
40 issues. Maybe a low density population because quite
41 possibly, just kind of from what you say when you're
42 flying around out there and walking around out there a
43 lot of that browse -- I mean its gotten old and rank
44 basically compared to being young and vibrant and
45 highly productive. At least that's what one of the
46 main transporters has said.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That is the critical
49 habitat of the River Corridor, which you're well aware
50 of. That's the area in the wintertime where the moose

1 break or make a moose population. It doesn't matter
2 what's actually back up on the hills. That kind of
3 plays into the shallow snow years with those critical
4 habitats.

5

6 Other comments from the Council.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I really appreciate
11 the good work you're doing there at Innoko. Thanks a
12 lot.

13

14 MR. SLOAN: Thanks a bunch. I want to
15 give one more plug too. We couldn't do a lot of this
16 without our good neighbors to the north, Kenton and
17 them helped us out quite a bit.

18

19 MR. HILL: Yes, I'll second that. That
20 was a great opportunity, so thanks to Koyukuk/Nowitna.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We do appreciate
23 Koyukuk/Nowitna's good work. What's noticeable at
24 Innoko is the vastly increased work that's necessary
25 for this Council to deal with. I mean Koyukuk has kind
26 of continuous moose data coming forward. I'm real
27 happy to see Innoko's progress in the biological realm.

28

29 Thank you.

30

31 MR. SLOAN: We do appreciate it. Let
32 me say one more thing now and I promise I'll leave.
33 It's hard to do these things sometimes, but that GASH
34 winter hunt, I want to say it's you all's hunt. You
35 know, it's the people that live in that community,
36 their hunt. I know I told you that story about my
37 great uncle, you know. I mean if folks are out there
38 killing stuff and they're not turning it in, basically
39 they're stealing from you, so you've got to make a
40 decision on what you want to do. We can do so much of
41 a better job if we have accurate numbers on what's
42 going on. Any help you can give us on getting folks to
43 turn their kill in and getting their permits and let's
44 do this thing right and it will be beneficial to all of
45 us.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. National
48 Park Service, you've got a quick briefing for us, Dave.

49

50 MR. MILLS: Hi. Dave Mills with the

1 National Park Service. I just want to bring your
2 attention to two reports in your book. One from Denali
3 National Park and also one from Gates of the Arctic.
4 As I mentioned before, since we have the chairs of both
5 of these commissions and the vice chair here, I think
6 I'll just defer to them. As I mentioned before,
7 they're really engaged in the process if there's
8 anything in particular you'd like to bring up, I'll let
9 you do that.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.

12

13 MR. COLLINS: We didn't have any issues
14 that came up at our meeting. We're getting good
15 information from the Park on numbers and so on in
16 Denali. We reviewed the antler one and we took a
17 position on that of the proposals on which we
18 preferred.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You were out of the
21 room when I commented to the Park Service that after
22 the SRCs have taken a position that we would like the
23 regional office to allow the RACs to comment on the
24 antler and horn issue at our fall meeting. So I just
25 wanted to let you know that, Ray. I have nothing at
26 this time to comment at the RAC level on the SRC.

27

28 Did you want to say anything about the
29 SRC, Pollock?

30

31 MR. SIMON: No.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Dave.

34

35 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

38

39 MR. COLLINS: I would comment on that.
40 The proposal we favored was the second one that they
41 had of the four and that was the least restrictive and
42 allowing the individual units to decide if they needed
43 further restriction after consulting with the RACs.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I asked which one
46 you selected and that was Option C.

47

48 MR. COLLINS: We didn't want to get
49 into that permitting and other things, all the
50 paperwork involved if we could avoid it.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Gates of the
2 Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission will be meeting
3 in April, so we'll review that and make a
4 recommendation on that antler and horn. Then I would
5 like this Council to be able to review those comments
6 and then make a final comment to the National Park
7 Service.

8
9 The BLM report, is there any further
10 report, Shelly.

11
12 MS. JACOBSON: Just very brief. I'll
13 make it very brief.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

16
17 MS. JACOBSON: I'd like to thank the
18 Chair and the Council and the audience for staying here
19 until 5:30. I'm Shelly Jacobson. I'm the Central
20 Yukon Field Manager. Our written materials were in the
21 form of what Merben presented earlier. Primarily
22 focused on the sheep information and that issue and our
23 report on that. What I'm going to speak to doesn't
24 have a written report to go along with it.

25
26 We mentioned briefly our planning.
27 Primarily BLM is -- you may know this, but we're quite
28 different from the other Federal land management
29 agencies, the Park Service and Fish and Wildlife and
30 that we have a multiple use mission. While
31 conservation is a part of our mission, it's not our
32 entire mission. We're very similar in our management
33 and a lot of our management philosophies as far as
34 revenue generation and other aspects to the Department
35 of Natural Resources.

36
37 What we do is we write plans and we
38 follow them and we do those plans on about a 20-year
39 cycle. So the plans for this area are overdue to be
40 written. The Central Yukon Plan is from the late '80s.
41 The Utility Corridor is from the early '90s. We're
42 into 2012 now. It's time to rewrite those, so those
43 are on the schedule to be rewritten.

44
45 What we do with the plans is we
46 identify basically two types of work. In a zoning way,
47 they tell us wetlands are going to be open for what
48 types of permits and then they also identify data gaps
49 for project work that we need to know in order to
50 answer our management questions and monitor our

1 permits.

2

3

4 So we're a huge field office. One of
5 the nice things that's happening is we're considering
6 changing the boundaries of the Central Yukon Field
7 Office to take areas around the Fairbanks urban area as
8 well as military lands to the south on the Tanana Flats
9 and down towards Northway, which are obviously quite
10 east, and put them in the Eastern Field Office, which
11 will reduce the acreage of the field office that I'm
12 responsible for by about 4 million acres, which would
13 really help.

13

14

15 Right now the span of the office goes
16 all the way from the Canadian border out to the Chukchi
17 Sea, goes all the way up to Milepost 300 roughly on the
18 Dalton Highway and south to here. So we have a lot of
19 area. Within that we manage about 18 million acres of
20 BLM managed public lands and we issue more permits than
21 all the other field offices combined. Most of our
22 Staff is not doing project work of the type that you'd
23 hear in the Park and the Refuge. Because of the number
24 of use authorizations that we're doing, most of our
25 Staff are focused on doing the permitting work for that
26 and monitoring the permits.

26

27

28 So I wanted to just mention on our
29 website -- I'm not going to talk about all of our
30 permits, but I'm just going to talk about a couple of
31 them. Our website, blm.gov, has links that will take
32 you to what we call our NEPA registry. We do NEPA
33 work. There's a law that tells us to do this public
34 permitting process that we use for all the permits we
35 issue, so you can find out what we're working on within
36 each field office by going to that page.

36

37

38 Some of the permits that might be of
39 interest, one that we initiated ourself, was a
40 strategic plan for management of invasive plants on the
41 Dalton Highway and in that vicinity. That's a big
42 issue statewide, but we're starting with trying to
43 implement a management plan on the Dalton. We're
44 nearly done with our environmental assessment. We hope
45 to have it out for another round of public review by
46 the end of March and then be in a position where we can
47 implement and form a cooperative weed management area
48 with some of our partners to start resolving weed
49 issues on the Dalton. The white sweet clover travels
50 many miles every year. It's a huge problem.

50

1 Some of the other, roads to resources.
2 We're not the applicants. We're just cooperating
3 agencies, so I'll just quickly mention that we're
4 participating in review of information as it becomes
5 available from DOT on the so-called roads to resources.
6 We get updates at our RAC meetings as well from DOT and
7 the core, which are the lead on a lot of the projects
8 for the lead Federal agency.

9
10 So we've got the Road to Ambler, which
11 is sometimes thought of, I guess, as a stand-alone for
12 the development of mineral resources in the Ambler
13 mining district, but it's also one of the alternative
14 routes on a road to Nome. So it comes up in that
15 context as well. Including one of the variations on
16 the road to Nome would be a departure off the Dalton
17 Highway in the vicinity of the current road, the winter
18 board to Bettles. So we do permit the winter road to
19 Bettles. That area might be impacted in one of the
20 alternative on the route to Nome.

21
22 We're also working -- the Corps is the
23 lead on the road to Umiat. There's also a separate
24 project called the ASAP, Alaska
25 Stand Alone Pipeline, that the Corps of Engineers is
26 the lead on. We're a cooperating agency. We're
27 reviewing right now both the Alaska Stand Alone
28 Pipeline and the Alaska Pipeline Project, which is a
29 FERC-led, Exxon is the applicant to that one. The
30 State is the applicant of the ASAP. We have draft
31 resource reports that are due on March 5th for internal
32 agency review from the Alaska Pipeline Project and we
33 have a draft EIS for the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline
34 Project. Our review has to be done by March 9th, so I
35 assume those will be coming out for public review
36 shortly after the internal agency review. I know
37 they're scheduling scoping meeting and .810 hearings,
38 Merben, for the ASAP line. They being the Corps of
39 Engineers.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: How long is the
42 comment period on the Foothills Road under the Corps
43 permitting process?

44
45 MS. JACOBSON: We haven't seen any
46 draft materials yet as far as environment reports on
47 the road to Umiat. I don't even know if they've let
48 the contract yet. They're going to contract the
49 document.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you.
2
3 MS. JACOBSON: I just wanted to mention
4 briefly our Coldfoot Visitor's Center is one of our
5 feel-good things. We partner with the Park and the
6 Fish and Wildlife Service to run a visitor's center in
7 the summertime in Coldfoot. That will be open May
8 25th.
9
10 Some of the other changes in our mining
11 and realty programs as well as our recreation. We're
12 increasing fees this coming year or proposing those fee
13 increases, so some of the permit work users will be
14 paying more. We're working with DOT to try to improve
15 our gravel permitting program.
16
17 This summer most of our field staff and
18 biologists and fisheries everyone is sort of doing an
19 intensive field training on mine reclamation and
20 evaluation of our mine sites. Gold is almost -- I
21 think it's close to \$1,900 an ounce right now. That's
22 really amazing and it's taking a lot of really marginal
23 properties and putting them into mine status, so we're
24 starting to see a lot of variation in the quality of
25 reclamation, the ability of the miners. So we're
26 trying to improve our reclamation work and mitigation.
27
28 That's it.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. You said
31 a mouthful.
32
33 MS. JACOBSON: I did. Don't stop me.
34
35 (Laughter)
36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions for
38 the BLM presentation from Shelly.
39
40 (No comments)
41
42 MS. JACOBSON: Thank you.
43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you very much,
45 Shelly. So we're at ADF&G. Do you have any comments,
46 George.
47
48 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you. George Pappas,
49 Fish and Game. Eric Newland, are you still online?
50

1 MR. NEWLAND: Yes, I am. This is Eric
2 Newland.

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Eric.

5
6 MR. PAPPAS: Eric, earlier we had
7 questions from the RAC regarding the status of the
8 Emmonak station for the upcoming season and we also had
9 questions about lamprey, which we'll talk about next
10 year or next meeting. Had questions about bycatch of
11 kings in the directed chum fishery. If the RAC would
12 like to ask Mr. Newland some questions, we could go
13 from there, sir.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you want to ask
16 the first round of questions, Tim. Some of those
17 questions you were bringing up. Are you still on
18 conference, Tim?

19
20 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah. The first question
21 was I wanted to get an understanding of what happened
22 last year when the State decided to close down the
23 Emmonak Field Office early due to some kind of local
24 conflicts. I was also interested to know if the State
25 was interested in finding another community that would
26 be more receptive to having ADF&G Staff there during
27 the summer field season.

28
29 MR. NEWLAND: Mr. Chairman. Eric
30 Newland with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
31 summer fishery management staff. Maybe if I can start
32 by just kind of following up Jeremy Mears update
33 regarding the chinook, give a little bit of a summer
34 and fall update and then move into the concerns if
35 that's all right with you.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

38
39 MR. NEWLAND: Okay. First of all, I'd
40 like to thank Jeremy Mears for providing the U.S. Fish
41 and Wildlife/ADF&G joint 2012 Yukon River chinook
42 salmon update. Like the Federal Staff, ADF&G is very
43 interested in hearing from folks along the river
44 regarding management actions taken the past several
45 years to protect chinook and how to manage the
46 available surplus of summer chum. That being said of
47 what actions worked for folks, what doesn't, what can
48 be improved. Furthermore, the Department is very
49 interested in information fishermen can provide with
50 regards to the new 7.5 mesh size gillnets. Were they

1 more or less efficient? What's the harvest composition
2 they were seeing in their catch, size, sex. And what
3 people are seeing in the spawning streams in their
4 areas.

5
6 Both State and Federal management Staff
7 value all this information and we hope to receive
8 continued input from the resource users in developing
9 the Conservative Management Plan through the YRDFA
10 facilitated planning process this April. I'm sure
11 Jason Hale will address that later in the agenda.

12
13 Unfortunately, as you heard in the
14 chinook update, that 2012 chinook run will be average
15 to poor and may not fully support subsistence needs.
16 As in recent years, initial management will be based on
17 the outlook, so that's that preseason outlook and
18 actions will be taken to protect at least that first
19 pulse.

20
21 In-season assessment information will
22 be reviewed to direct further management action as the
23 run develops. It's unlikely that there will be a
24 directed commercial for king salmon. On the brighter
25 side, summer chum run is expected to be 1.5 to 2
26 million, which will provide for escapement and
27 subsistence with a surplus of 500,000 to 1 million. As
28 in recent years, utilizing the surplus of summer chum
29 for commercial purposes will be contingent on
30 management actions taken to protect a potentially weak
31 run -- gain run that is. I'm sorry.

32
33 We will be considering options we have
34 used in recent years to minimize impacts on a weak
35 chinook run, including delaying the summer chum
36 commercial opportunity until later in the chinook run,
37 prohibiting the sale of chinook salmon during summer
38 chum directed fisheries and considering placing
39 commercial and subsistence fishing periods at the same
40 time.

41
42 As far as the fall season goes, fall
43 season manager Jeff Estenson, has asked me to provide
44 the following outlook for the fall fishery, fall chum.
45 The point estimate is for a run of 1.1 million with a
46 range of 986,000 to 1.2. This should provide for
47 escapement and subsistence with a surplus of 500-
48 700,000.

49
50 The initial fall chum management

1 strategy will depend on how the summer chum/the fall
2 chum relationship looks. First of all, chum preseason
3 forecast is likely commercial fishing opportunity will
4 be offered near the summer and fall transition and
5 continue through the season. It is unlikely there
6 would be subsistence restrictions.

7

8 If the relationship does not support
9 the fall chum forecast, the more conservative
10 management plan will likely be taken. Some commercial
11 fishing opportunity could occur at the summer/fall
12 transition and further in-season assessment will be
13 used to direct management actions as the run develops
14 in August. The coho run is expected to be average and
15 around 219,000. That will cover escapement and
16 subsistence and commercial harvest of 10-70,000.

17

18 The other thing I'd like to get at
19 before we go into the concerns raised previously in the
20 meeting is to remind folks that the AYK Board of
21 Fishery meeting is scheduled for next year, January
22 15th through the 20th, 2013. The proposal deadline is
23 April 10th, 2012.

24

25 Additional information and resources
26 can be found on the web, so if you search the web for
27 ADF&G Board of Fisheries, there should be information
28 available about how to submit a proposal. Upper Yukon
29 residents can contact advisory committee coordinator
30 Nissa Pilcher in the Fairbanks office or Monica Willard
31 of the Board of Fish office in Juneau for assistance
32 regarding submitting a proposal. Again, that date is
33 April 10th, 2012, so you've got about six weeks.

34

35 To get back to the concern raised by
36 Council Member Gervais, the Emmonak Field Office was
37 temporarily closed last year, August 5th. It was in
38 response to Staff members feeling basically unsafe and
39 not being able to sleep at night due to some harassment
40 primarily by teenagers. These issues have been dealt
41 with the Department and the city and other members of
42 the community are dealing with this. At this time
43 we're planning on still going out to Emmo in June and
44 hopefully things will improve. Last year when the
45 office did close it was just closed to the public. The
46 management staff was still there. The Lower Yukon test
47 fishery for the fall chum was still operating. There
48 was limited staff still there. It was just -- the
49 staff that was there to support kind of the public
50 facility was shipped out.

1 It sounded like things are going to be
2 improving, we're going to be working with the community
3 there. The Department doesn't necessarily want to pull
4 out. It's a good place for us to be. We're just
5 hoping for the best and we'll continue to work with
6 them.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks, Eric.

9

10 MR. NEWLAND: And then you had concerns
11 regarding -- you guys talked a lot about the Lower
12 Yukon test fishery and the summer chum incidental and
13 the lamprey. If you want me to address those issues I
14 can as well.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I wanted the Council
17 to be aware that I, myself, and Tim Gervais has
18 concerns about the volume of chinook salmon that are
19 taken with 8.5-inch gear for an indic and the need to
20 look at modulating that downward as you're aware of my
21 transmissions. So everybody is taking restrictions
22 with 7.5-inch gear and I think the U.S. Fish and
23 Wildlife and the Department need to look at the Lower
24 Yukon River test fishery to reduce the impacts to large
25 female chinook. There's 53 percent female chinook and
26 they're very large fish. If a harvest occurs at 1,500
27 and greater, that's a significant number of female
28 chinook, especially when we're looking at 109,000
29 return. We need every last one of those big chinook
30 females on the spawning grounds. I just wanted to
31 voice that concern.

32

33 We'll be wanting to enumerate those
34 impacts further in our annual report on 7.5-inch gear
35 use. That needs to be compared with 8-inch and 8.5-
36 inch gear previous uses.

37

38 Do you have any further comments, Tim.

39

40 MR. GERVAIS: I had a comment on how
41 the Department felt about -- you had reported -- I
42 don't know the exact number right now, but
43 approximately 4,200 chinook bycatch during the chum
44 fishery and I wanted to know if the Department was okay
45 with that number or if they're interested in different
46 timing or techniques to reduce that number.

47

48 One of the reasons I feel it's really
49 significant is to feel that beyond what's reported
50 bycatch, I would estimate you have like 2,000 more

1 unreported kings and then at least 4,000 dropouts on
2 that, so you're getting a mortality of 10,000 kings,
3 which is representing approximately a quarter of the
4 transboundary escapement just for a chum fishery and I
5 feel that the king system can't handle that at this
6 time.

7

8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Response, Eric.

9

10 MR. NEWLAND: Sure. Well, like he was
11 saying, there's approximately 4,200 king salmon caught
12 in those Y1 and Y2 summer chum directed commercial
13 fisheries. The Department has been trying to place
14 periods where -- the first several periods in Y1 were
15 placed on the south mouth and at that time the Lower
16 Yukon test fishery chinook indic in the south mouth was
17 saying that there weren't a whole lot of chinook coming
18 in on the south mouth. So the Department responded by
19 opening only a portion of that District 1, which was
20 restricted just to that portion on the south mouth and
21 those areas were fished.

22

23 Additionally, the other option that
24 we've been employing this past year has been to operate
25 subsistence as well as commercial at the same time. It
26 seems kind of counter intuitive, but because of the way
27 it is set up where you have to close before and after a
28 commercial period to subsistence you actually reduce
29 the amount of time subsistence. But we don't want to
30 impact subsistence fishing opportunity, so we provide
31 subsistence fishing opportunity at the 6-inch mesh
32 level and knowing that there are going to be some of
33 those chinook caught in District 1 but that we wouldn't
34 have to offer it again the subsistence period following
35 that. So actually the only amount of time that you
36 were harvesting salmon in general would be that period
37 of time when both the subsistence and the commercial
38 were open.

39

40 So those are a couple of the options we
41 have used last year. We'll probably be looking at those
42 as well this year depending on what the run looks like.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Explained at that
45 level, I would support the simultaneous execution of
46 subsistence and commercial simultaneous so the fish
47 that are present don't have a protracted two different
48 fisheries occurring, so it has the least amount of
49 impact to the chinook that are actually present there.
50 So I support that.

1 MR. NEWLAND: That's the idea.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments
4 on the State subsistence, commercial and management on
5 the Yukon River.
6
7 (No comments)
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. Eric, I
10 appreciate -- oh, Tim.
11
12 MR. GERVAIS: I just wanted to say we
13 appreciate your guys' hard work on this. We know it's
14 not an easy river to manage. I just want to
15 communicate that Middle Yukon users do appreciate what
16 we get for fish and what we get onto the spawning
17 grounds. So keep up the good work and know what you do
18 is extremely important work.
19
20 Thanks for your effort.
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Eric.
23
24 MR. NEWLAND: If I could.....
25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.
27
28 MR. NEWLAND:say a few more
29 things. I would like to address the concern, Mr.
30 Chairman, that you raised about the test fish harvest
31 and how that's incorporated as well as the fish that
32 are caught in the commercial and how that's tracked.
33 So the test fish harvest is tracked as part of the
34 subsistence survey and those fish are tracked as fish
35 received and not harvested by the household. The
36 personal use comes in or subsistence through personal
37 use from the commercial. So when somebody say in
38 District 1 caught 15 kings in a summer chum directed
39 fishery, they are required to report that as personal
40 use caught but not sold and it's written on their fish
41 ticket and then we track that as well. So test fish
42 harvest, what is given to communities is tracked as
43 well as those fish caught in the commercial is tracked.
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for the
46 explanation on that. Any further comments from the
47 Council.
48
49 (No comments)
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks a lot,
2 Eric. George, you've got a comment.

3
4 MR. PAPPAS: Thanks, Eric, for staying
5 on the -- sticking with us through the solar flares
6 there on the teleconference. We have a subsistence
7 division presentation.

8
9 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you,
12 George.

13
14 MR. BRENNER: I'm Andrew Brenner and
15 this is Beth Mikow. We're at the ADF&G Subsistence
16 Division Fairbanks office and just have a brief update
17 for you. Dave Runfola presented at the last WIRAC
18 meeting in Aniak and gave sort of a detailed overview
19 of our research, but I'd like to provide a little
20 update and I appreciate the time you're giving us and
21 your attention.

22
23 In this little packet I've given you a
24 PowerPoint print off so you can follow along with what
25 I'm saying. Also this subsistence in Alaska, a year
26 2010 update. This is a very broad overview of
27 subsistence as a whole in the state as of 2010 that
28 summarizes some of the Subsistence Division's findings.

29
30 The Subsistence Division at Fish and
31 Game, our mission is to scientifically gather,
32 quantify, evaluate and report information about
33 customary and traditional uses of Alaska's Fish and
34 Wildlife resources. In other words, our job is to
35 collect information about subsistence and then make
36 that information available to all Alaskans, including
37 the WIRAC, so that subsistence uses are recognized and
38 other actions can be taken with that information.

39
40 So we have a number of projects that
41 we've either recently completed or currently underway
42 in communities in the Western Interior Region. The
43 following slides will provide a brief overview of these
44 projects. The first one is index community baselines.
45 The purpose of this study is to develop a method of
46 estimating subsistence harvest in a region or subregion
47 by conducting comprehensive surveys in a sample of
48 communities.

49
50 For each of these communities we do

1 these in-depth subsistence surveys to give a total
2 number of moose, of king salmon, of grouse, of berries
3 that are harvested in a community for one year and also
4 more in-depth interviews with experts in that area of
5 how subsistence has changed over the years and areas
6 that people use for subsistence.

7
8 So in 2011 we completed these types of
9 surveys in five Yukon River communities, including
10 Galena, Nulato and Ruby in the WIRAC Region and ADF&G
11 Staff and Subsistence Division are currently analyzing
12 data and writing the report.

13
14 This project, one reason we're doing
15 this is to explore the possibility of finding
16 relationships in subsistence between nearby communities
17 in a region or subregion. Galena, Nulato and Ruby are
18 sort of this Middle Yukon subregion. One thing just
19 very preliminarily, the number of moose per person in
20 those communities for the sample year was pretty
21 similar. It's findings like that that might allow us
22 in the future to just sample one of those communities
23 and get a broader idea of what's going on in this
24 region once we can figure out what those relationships
25 are.

26
27 This is currently an exploratory
28 approach to collecting subsistence information, so the
29 data is under review and analysis right now.

30
31 The Donlin Creek Mine Subsistence
32 Baseline Project.....

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I didn't realize
35 your presentation was going to be this extensive.
36 Stand by. I have to confer with my coordinator. Not
37 that I don't want to hear this, but we do have a
38 dinner.

39
40 (Off record comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I do want to hear
43 your presentation or at least a synopsis of the
44 presentation, but I did have to clarify that.

45
46 MR. BRENNER: Okay. Just let me know
47 if you need me to.....

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Continue.

50

1 MR. BRENNER: I'll try to give the main
2 conclusions. The Donlin Creek Mine Subsistence
3 Baseline Project is three phases. In 2010 we surveyed
4 Central Kuskokwim Rivers from Kalskag up through Stony
5 River, all those villages, and that report is now in
6 press and it's available. It's a 400-page document
7 that summarizes subsistence for those communities and
8 available upon request and I can get you more
9 information about that afterwards.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Just a moment. You
12 can access that online.....

13
14 MR. BRENNER: Yes, you can.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:on the
17 Subsistence Division.....

18
19 MR. BRENNER: Website, yeah.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:website part of
22 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game?

23
24 MR. BRENNER: Uh-huh. I can give you
25 that. Last year we did a similar continuation of this
26 project for phase two for Lower Kuskokwim River
27 communities, including Akiak, Kwethluk -- help me out
28 here, Beth.

29
30 MS. MIKOW: Akiak, Kwethluk,
31 Georgetown.....

32
33 MR. BRENNER: Akiak, Kwethluk,
34 Georgetown, Napaimiut and Tuluksak and Oscarville. So
35 Georgetown and Napaimiut were included in that at the
36 request of those communities and Donlin even though
37 they're not permanently occupied communities, they were
38 used for subsistence.

39
40 This year we're currently conducting
41 field research. We've done surveys this spring in
42 Russian Mission, Nikolai, Grayling and we're in Anvik
43 still right now and we're in the approval process for
44 McGrath. We're attempting to gain community support in
45 Tuntutuliak, Napaskiak, McGrath and Takotna.

46
47 Finally, the Lower Kuskokwim Big Game
48 Survey is a household survey in Bethel to document
49 harvest of caribou, moose and other large game species.
50 The surveys will provide harvest estimates and

1 information about hunting effort. That survey will be
2 taking place March 8th to 16th, so coming up really
3 soon here and I thought the WIRAC might be interested
4 in that because it will document harvest areas within
5 the Western Interior Region by Bethel residents, which
6 has been an interest in the past.

7

8 Any other questions or save it for
9 later.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, I do want to
12 comment that I'm very
13 happy to see these household surveys and getting
14 current data, which really really helps at the Federal
15 Board and State Board level. So I didn't want to
16 convey the idea that I didn't want to hear that. I
17 just had a side issue. I do feel that this is so
18 important information and we've been requesting this,
19 so I'm very happy to see that these surveys are
20 occurring in our region.

21

22 Any further Council questions or
23 comments. Ray.

24

25 MR. COLLINS: I had this report at our
26 McGrath Fish and Game Advisory. Take a look at this
27 other handout here. About a third or 31 percent of the
28 calories needed in rural Alaska comes from wild
29 produce. It shows how heavily they depend on it just
30 as a summary, whereas in the urban areas they're only
31 about 7 percent. Now we're getting specific on your
32 community. You can see how your dependant your
33 community is. It really shows the importance of the
34 role subsistence plays.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That is a very
37 interesting portrayal there. One question I have asked
38 is enumeration of the amount of wood incorporated into
39 subsistence harvest because that is a very
40 important.....

41

42 MR. BRENNER: Firewood?

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Firewood.

45

46 MR. BRENNER: Yes, our current surveys
47 do ask about firewood harvested as well as berries and
48 vegetation. Even though Fish and Game doesn't manage
49 for those resources, we do recognize that they're very
50 important for subsistence and that's why we include

1 them.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm glad to hear
4 that. Any other questions or comments from the Council
5 on the Subsistence Division presentation.

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, thank
10 you.

11

12 MR. BRENNER: Thank you very much for
13 your time.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What's the wish of
16 the Council? Do you want to finish this agenda?

17

18 MR. R. WALKER: Yeah, let's finish
19 this. Let's get Jason up there and we'll be done.

20

21 MS. HERNANDEZ: We have two more
22 presentations, so if you guys want to get up and get
23 coffee, feel free.

24

25 MR. THALHAUSER: Thanks, Mr. Chair and
26 Council. Mike Thalhauser with the Kuskokwim Native
27 Association. Don't worry, I've been trying to trim
28 this down as we move along, but I'll go as quick as I
29 can. Actually a lot of this presentation was part of a
30 presentation that we gave up in Nikolai yesterday.
31 Lisa Stuby, who gave that first presentation of the day
32 came up with me and so we kind of piggybacked the
33 meeting and that was a real good part of the Partner's
34 Program and different groups working together.

35

36 You guys have all heard a lot of my
37 presentations before, so I won't get into too much of
38 the KNA background, but I'll just sort of go through
39 the new projects that we have in this coming year. I
40 think Melinda handed out a handout for you guys. That
41 goes through all the projects that we did last year and
42 then we have upcoming this year. I'm just going to
43 focus on a new project and a little bit on our
44 education projects, which is kind of new also.

45

46 Like I said, our 2012 projects are
47 similar to the previous ones, our George and Tuluksak
48 River weirs, which you've got the results from from
49 last year and we also finished up the second of our
50 third year on our sockeye run reconstruction project

1 where we were tagging sockeye in Kalskag and recovering
2 those at the weirs. This year will be the last year
3 for that project. I'll focus today just on education
4 projects and mostly on our upcoming Bering cisco
5 telemetry project which is going on close to here.

6
7 So I guess sort of a background on how
8 we got to where we are now. Not this past fall, but
9 the one before KNA came up and did a genetics sampling
10 on the south fork of the Kuskokwim. The reason why we
11 were doing that, and I'll cut to the quick here, is
12 that basically in the whole world that we know of we've
13 only got three spawning populations of Bering cisco;
14 one on the Yukon Flats, one in the Susitna River and
15 one up here on the south fork of the Kuskokwim.

16
17 The other thing we know is we have a
18 commercial fishery just outside of the mouth of the
19 Yukon on Bering cisco and it's sort of analogous to the
20 eels or lamprey that we were talking about before where
21 it's an experimental commercial fishery. I believe
22 that one is 40,000 pounds with the lamprey, but we're
23 looking at 10,000 pounds, which with Bering cisco is
24 about 10,000 fish. So this is kind of what you were
25 talking about with the lamprey study and that we need
26 to start looking into how this could affect fish
27 populations and beginning to finding out what's going
28 on. You know, you can't count the fish until you know
29 where they're going and why they're going there.

30
31 This is the whole reason behind the
32 fish that are caught in this fishery. They're part of
33 a kosher market that's mostly on the east coast of the
34 United States and a lot of the impetus behind that is
35 just kind of a decline in whitefish in the Great Lakes,
36 so the buyers are really snatching up as many as they
37 can possibly get. Who knows if they're Kuskokwim or
38 Yukon or Susitna fish and that was the whole point in
39 getting genetic samples is we can find out whether the
40 fish from that commercial fishery are coming from the
41 Kuskokwim or the Yukon or the Susitna because the
42 Kuskokwim fish that are feeding out there in the Bering
43 Sea swim all the way back up here and end up rearing
44 all the way down there, so we're trying to find out
45 whose fish they're catching. So that was part of that
46 sampling effort.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are you going to tag
49 them on the spawning grounds just to enumerate them in
50 the commercial harvest.

1 MR. THALHAUSER: So the whole point of
2 that project was to get genetic samples from the three
3 different spawning populations and then we also get
4 genetic samples from the commercial catch and that's
5 still being worked out, the genetics information. So
6 if you have Type A in the Kuskokwim, B in the Yukon and
7 C in the Susitna, then you look and see how many A fish
8 were in that commercial catch and then you can find out
9 if, oh, they're just catching Yukon Fish or they're
10 catching Yukon and Kuskokwim fish, which is pretty
11 likely they're catching a mix of both that are feeding
12 out there.

13

14 These are just some I guess bad
15 pictures in this light of where we were fishing. One
16 of the reasons why I really wanted to get up to Nikolai
17 was to show them -- because we ended up talking a lot
18 with the folks up there in our efforts to try to find
19 these fish, which no one had sampled up on the spawning
20 grounds before or no biologist, so it was important to
21 talk to them. We probably would have got frozen in the
22 ice if we would have just went there on our own.

23

24 Here's a picture of the south fork
25 pretty close to where we were actually caught the fish.
26 Here's a map. You can see Nikolai, the airport, just
27 up here. It was about 15 miles as the crow flies to
28 where -- we basically fished, set a net on every little
29 spot we thought might be fishy. I think we spent about
30 a week fishing from here to there catching like six
31 total fish because they had already passed Nikolai and
32 were on the spawning grounds. We got here and the goal
33 was 200 genetic samples and got them like in one net.

34

35 And with whitefish being broadcast
36 spawners, not digging nests, instead they kind of find
37 a spot to gather and get into the big groups that they
38 need and once everything is right condition-wise in
39 numbers of fish they go out into the channel and just
40 eggs and milk into the water and those eggs settle onto
41 the gravel, which is also really specific as with most
42 whitefish. It wasn't really part of the study, but
43 with this two years ago we found pretty definitely the
44 bottom end of where they're spawning in the south fork.

45

46 So while we're waiting for the results
47 from the genetics we wanted to know, A, if they're
48 spawning anywhere else in the Kuskokwim, B, finding out
49 how long it takes them to get up there, what their
50 migration patterns are and finding out how big that

1 spawning area is if it's the only one or is the only
2 one we know of. Finding out how big it is and what
3 kind of habitat they're keying in on. I think Ray had
4 mentioned earlier, like sheefish are really focused on
5 a specific sort of habitat, whether it's water or the
6 substrate, so these kind of areas really need to be
7 protected especially with potential development and
8 things like that. You could go in there and mine some
9 gravel and wipe out a third of the world's population
10 of Bering cisco, so it's a big deal.

11
12 So this is our plan and this is a
13 project that's funded through OSM and has been
14 forwarded on to the actual project phase, so this year,
15 2012, we'll start. In 2012 we'll tag 25 fish at the
16 fishwheels in Kalskag and that's kind of piggybacked on
17 our salmon tagging project, so we get a little more
18 bang for our buck there. That lets us find out if
19 there's any fish going in the Holitna, if there's any
20 fish going up to Aniak, so we have these fixed
21 telemetry receivers along the way that Lisa showed you
22 and they'll tell us whether there's any going up the
23 north fork or anywhere other than where we think.

24
25 Then just to kind of narrow down and
26 make sure we get some fish that make it the whole way
27 that we put tags in up to the spawning grounds we're
28 going to take right around the village of Nikolai, just
29 a good logistic place where we know people there, we
30 know how they fished in the past and they can tell us,
31 oh, the Bering cisco are here so we can go out and
32 start tagging. Those both will hopefully give us -- we
33 go up and fly in an airplane and find out where those
34 fish are, so we fly up along the south fork and say,
35 okay, here's the beginning where they spawn and here's
36 the top of where they spawn, so we can find out exactly
37 how big that is and later find out why.

38
39 So we'll be doing that in 2012 and '13.
40 It's 100 tags total. The reason we split that up is
41 just because if you've ever flown around here in the
42 fall, it's not the most predictable thing and they
43 might not be up there super long, so we're kind of
44 hedging our bets with two years of tagging.

45
46 Then in 2013 after we hopefully have a
47 really good idea of where that south fork spawning
48 population is, the bottom to the top, we're going to --
49 I'm not really sure. It's either driving a boat up
50 from Aniak or my preference would be to float down from

1 above there and do some habitat work along that
2 identified spawning ground and find out what exactly it
3 is they're keying in on. So if it's something like
4 Lisa mentioned with Highpower Creek with the substrate
5 changing, we'll be able to hopefully see that coming.

6
7 Like I said, who knows how long we'll
8 be tagging, but what it means for -- and this is a
9 slide from my Nikolai presentation. What it means is
10 we'll be up there from one to three, maybe four weeks
11 in 2012 and '13 and we're planning on hiring one or two
12 local techs from up there and some from down by Kalskag
13 and Aniak for that portion of the tagging.

14
15 Kevin Whitworth went up there with us
16 and so Council really knows him well and even though he
17 wasn't a co-PI or whatever on the first project, he was
18 really -- we contacted the Refuge when we were coming
19 up through here and he was super eager to go and
20 introduced us to so many people in Nikolai and McGrath,
21 so he wanted to go and follow up with us with the
22 meeting yesterday so I just wanted to give him a big
23 thanks for helping us out because we definitely would
24 have been sleeping in cold tents a lot more than being
25 able to stay with people in the village of Nikolai
26 while we were up there and meeting a lot of new
27 friends. So that was great.

28
29 That's kind of the plan, so I'll have
30 more on that hopefully next year. Just a couple quick
31 slides on what's new with our education program. Our
32 high school internships went great last year and we're
33 up to 185 that have been through the program. One cool
34 thing about yesterday also was a lot of the folks that
35 were there, parents with their kids there and there was
36 a lot of interest because we talked a little bit about
37 this in our high school internship. We've kind of
38 generally been spreading down and up from just Kalskag
39 to Stony area, so we're hoping to maybe get two or
40 three kids on a charter to make it worth it to get them
41 down from Nikolai or McGrath this year, so that would
42 be great.

43
44 Another overall new thing to mention
45 with our education internships with our program, which
46 is kind of good, kind of bad, for this year we don't
47 have -- our funding ran out for all of our education
48 programs actually last year. It is grant money that's
49 year to year or two to four years. We were able to put
50 our high school internships onto one of the weir

1 projects, so they'll definitely be funded this year and
2 the next year. So that's good that we're still going
3 to have that around. OSM recognized that it does give
4 them and the projects a lot having these local kids
5 being out on the projects and getting to work with
6 biologists and technicians. That will be funded again
7 and also our college internships are funded again. You
8 can see all the projects our college interns worked on
9 this last year, so they were all over the whole
10 drainage. It was a really good year for them.

11
12 This is where it's kind of up and down.
13 The one thing we will lose funding for is our in-school
14 education project. This was the fourth year for this
15 project and it's been basically us putting together a
16 fisheries curriculum and using some that were already
17 out there and going into our local Kuspuk School
18 District and spending anywhere from a week to two weeks
19 in these schools and conducting or implementing a
20 curriculum with the teachers and with the students.
21 It's been a great program, but I guess not having the
22 funding to hire an educator to go into the village and
23 the school has kind of forced us to work more with the
24 district and with a new curriculum director that they
25 have, which is actually, I think, kind of evolving into
26 an even better program where it's not like us going
27 into the schools and the school having their curriculum
28 and us having ours and it's kind of like water and oil
29 in the same jar. You shake it up and it's still in the
30 same jar, but they're still kind of separate.

31
32 What we're getting now is we're turning
33 some of these projects like -- I don't know if you
34 remember our rainbow trout project on the Aniak River.
35 We turned that into a whole week-long lesson, like a
36 block of lessons that works on literacy with students
37 learning to read technical reports. Someone had
38 mentioned the whole point of a lot of these education
39 programs is getting people that are going to be able to
40 be on these councils and without being able to discern
41 and read a report and get what you need out of it.
42 It's pretty tough.

43
44 So we're really excited about the fact
45 that even though that isn't going to keep going, us
46 being able to hire an educator, we're working more with
47 the schools and so it's in a better way, so I'm excited
48 about that. I think that's it.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You're doing great

1 work, Mike. I really appreciate that. Council
2 comments. Go ahead, Ray.

3

4 MR. COLLINS: Well, what I find
5 exciting is what we're learning about the headwaters
6 and the importance of that to the whole river because
7 we're a smaller population up here, but now all of the
8 cisco are spawning right up here. Most of the sheefish
9 are spawning up here. If you think about it, even in
10 the king salmon, there aren't very many spawners up
11 here, but the biggest ones in the river are the ones
12 that are spawning up here because genetically they have
13 to make that long trip. So those few that make it up
14 here to spawn are really important. I'm glad to see
15 that stuff coming out now and the information is
16 getting into the schools.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I had one question.
23 Are you going to do a winter overfly to those Bering
24 Sea cisco spawning areas to see if there's like
25 upwelling or some aspect of geology that maybe has a
26 certain hydrology that they're keying in on?

27

28 MR. THALHAUSER: Well, as far as winter
29 flights, I guess we'll find out. That's the other kind
30 of bonus of having to be a two-year study. I think
31 we'll get some information after that first year, but
32 you mean as far as getting down there and doing habitat
33 work?

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, just flying over
36 the spawning area and looking at what that habitat
37 looks like in wintertime. It might have upwellings,
38 like the Toklat, and there's various places that have
39 specific kinds of hydraulologies that the fish key in on.
40 Just looking at it in winter it give you an aspect of
41 what they actually require and you might actually see
42 other areas in the Kuskokwim drainage that actually
43 have that same type of hydrology.

44

45 MR. THALHAUSER: Another thing with
46 having it be a two year project is we can in the first
47 year spread it out and sort of get the way early and
48 way late thing, so I definitely think more about that.
49 I don't think we necessarily had one planned for that,
50 but having the first year to sort of do something broad

1 and then the next year narrow it down or something.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Just something to
4 think about.

5

6 MR. THALHAUSER: Thanks.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions
9 or comments from KNA.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks a lot, Mike.
14 Really good there. It seems to get a little better at
15 KNA all the time. So, YRDFA. Jason is going to give
16 us a presentation.

17

18 MR. HALE: Holy moly. That's a long
19 day. I'm sitting in the uncomfortable chair, so I
20 won't have to sit up here as long. Maybe I'll rush
21 through it because I'm less comfortable. Just letting
22 you know that. So last on the agenda for the day and
23 you guys have had a long day, so sorry that I'm here
24 for you. And I notice on the agenda it said that you
25 were going to have Jill Klein from YRDFA and not Jason
26 Hale. Despite the lateness of the day and my lack of
27 Jill Kleinness, I'm sure we'll still have a good
28 presentation.

29

30 Mainly because it's Yukon River
31 fisheries talk and that's hot. It's really hot right
32 now.

33

34 So we've got a lot of good stuff to
35 talk about. I've got three things. Two brief, one
36 less brief, but hopefully we can figure out a way to
37 zip through it.

38

39 The first thing is something we've
40 already touched on, the pre-season planning meeting.
41 It's going to be happening April 4th in Anchorage to
42 bring together users like we have the last few years to
43 try and come up with a pre-season plan for this coming
44 year. It may be the last time we get to do this for a
45 while because of some funding concerns for that
46 particular meeting. So we really want to take
47 advantage and get a lot of good input that we could
48 milk for years to come.

49

50 We are mailing today an invitation to

1 every tribal council in the Alaska portion of the Yukon
2 River drainage along with a set of questions. Some of
3 the questions you heard from Jeremy earlier and others
4 you're going to hear from me in a minute. And also a
5 really fancy pretty looking invitation. There's an
6 invitation for one of you.

7

8

(Laughter)

9

10 MR. HALE: All you have to do is
11 nominate a representative from your RAC and they win
12 this lovely presentation. Please nominate somebody if
13 you're game to come to the meeting in Anchorage and
14 plan for this coming fishing season on the Yukon.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That was
17 short and sweet. I do want the WIRAC to be represented
18 at that YRDFA meeting. I would like Yukon fishers to
19 participate. You seem to have lots of ideas, Robert.
20 What do you think about going down there?

21

22

23 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr.
24 Chairman. A lot of the ideas come from tribes in our
25 area, Holy Cross, Anvik, Shag and I do talk to Kaltag
26 and Nulato people and they are concerned about what we
27 are concerned about, just about everybody else. So
28 it's not my ideas, it's their ideas that they bring
29 forth. One of the reasons why they want me to go to
30 that Galena meeting too because they wanted to talk
31 about this further, but I apparently wasn't there.
32 Kind of like due to Mother Nature there, it wasn't me.

32

33

34 So I will talk to them again here and
35 if I am selected to go to the YRDFA meeting, I'd be
36 truly honored because I know most of the people there
37 that do go there from the Lower Yukon. A lot of them
38 are personal friends even though we don't get along on
39 our fisheries deal, but we do get along outside of our
40 fisheries. Once you walk out that door it's another
41 world. But we do see eye to eye when I do talk to them
42 and I do see eye to eye with a lot of people from
43 further up the river. I have talked extensively to
44 convince them that we are not down here doing all these
45 atrocities that you say. Some of them might be true,
46 but the majority of them are not true.

46

47

48 I'd be honored if you did send me to
49 this YRDFA meeting here.

49

50

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Robert, your
2 comments. Ray.

3
4 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair. I move that
5 we appoint Robert to attend the YRDFA meeting.

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion to appoint
8 Robert to attend the YRDFA meeting.

9
10 MS. PELKOLA: So moved.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.....

13
14 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jenny seconds. Any
17 further discussion on Robert's appointment.

18
19 MR. MORGAN: Question.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
22 sending Robert to the YRDFA meeting and getting the
23 beautiful invitation signify by saying aye.

24
25 IN UNISON: Aye.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So now the Council
28 should briefly talk over -- there's a questionnaire
29 here on pulse protection. Oh, go ahead.

30
31 MR. HALE: Part two is the second
32 quicky one, which is bycatch. There's not a lot to go
33 over on this one. This will be very brief.

34
35 Last year 25,500 king salmon and
36 191,446 chum salmon were caught as bycatch in the
37 pollock fishery. Last year was the first year that the
38 cap was in place that we've talked a lot about. I
39 think you guys are all pretty familiar with. Of
40 course, the bycatch number was well below that cap for
41 the kings.

42
43 Right now the North Pacific Fishery
44 Management Council is working on looking at putting
45 some sort of regulation in place on the bycatch of chum
46 salmon. They are going to be meeting toward the end of
47 March to talk about that. This is not the big push.
48 This is not the time to jump in with real specifics.
49 That's going to happen in the fall, either October or
50 December. Right now though if you're game it wouldn't

1 be a bad thing to send them letters between now and the
2 20th of March basically just saying that chum salmon
3 are important to you, important to your people and
4 important to your culture, your subsistence way of life
5 in general just to keep it in front of them. So
6 whether it's from the RAC or your individual tribes or
7 communities or just your household, there's information
8 kind of on the back of this bycatchy looking sheet
9 here. It has an address and if you just wrote a
10 general letter about, hey, chum salmon are really
11 important to me, that would be a good thing.

12
13 In the fall, we'll be hitting you up
14 with a very specific letter supporting a very specific
15 option, but those aren't on the table just yet.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. So the Chair
18 will entertain a motion to send a letter to the North
19 Pacific Fisheries Management Council through the
20 Federal Subsistence Board regarding the importance of
21 chum salmon to subsistence users in both the Kuskokwim
22 and Yukon River drainages within the Western Interior
23 Region.

24
25 MR. SIMON: So moved.

26
27 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Pollock.
30 Seconded by Jenny.

31
32 MR. MORGAN: Question.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
35 called. Those in favor of transmitting that letter of
36 need for chum salmon in subsistence in the Western
37 Interior Region signify by saying aye.

38
39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
42 sign.

43
44 (No opposing votes)

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Register the vote of
47 Tim. Continue, Jason.

48
49 MR. HALE: Okay. And last, but sadly
50 longest, but most important, is the Yukon River King

1 Salmon Management Plan revision. We talked a little
2 bit about this last time I was in front of you guys.

3
4 Basically we're bringing together user
5 groups. Jenny was your representative, but the RACs
6 and Intertribal groups, the Yukon River Panel,
7 processors, YRDFA, plus the managers to try and do a
8 stakeholder-driven revamp of the king plan if the State
9 says it's necessary. They got together in January and
10 said, yeah, we think it's necessary because it's geared
11 for more fish than what we have right now.

12
13 So they came up with some ideas at this
14 meeting and now we are trying to get feedback on those
15 ideas from all sorts of groups. All the RACs. It was
16 in the mailing that went to the tribal councils today.
17 We'll be talking about it more even at that April
18 meeting. That will actually be the last opportunity on
19 the initial draft and then on the 10th of April we'll
20 be putting in a placeholder proposal for Board of Fish
21 to actually revamp the plan or revise the King Salmon
22 Management Plan for the Yukon River. Then we'll take
23 the whole summer and try and tighten it up based on
24 user feedback. Come back in front of you guys and
25 other public groups again in the fall to sort of polish
26 it up and then submit the final polished pretty plan in
27 the fall to them.

28
29 So that's what we're up to. Pretty
30 much the group came up with a bunch of different
31 options there on that little survey looking sheet
32 that's in front of you. The first thing you see on the
33 front page is about pulse protection. Now this is huge
34 because there was actual 100 percent agreement
35 everybody at the meeting pulse protection is the way to
36 go and it should be put into the plan in some way,
37 shape or form. There's also been 100 percent agreement
38 at the YRDFA board meeting on that and at the Y-K RAC
39 meeting on that. So everywhere we presented it
40 everybody said, yeah, this is what we want.

41
42 Of course there can't be 100 percent
43 guarantee on everything, so they didn't agree on how to
44 do it and that's what we're going to talk about here
45 today. Then just as a preview on the back of the sheet
46 there are eight additional items for consideration.
47 These are things there was not full agreement on.
48 There was a pretty big groundswell of support, so much
49 so that we couldn't ditch them, but to move them
50 forward we really need a big groundswell of public

1 support for one of them.

2

3 But really the big thing is what we
4 already have a lot of agreement on, which is the pulse
5 protection, so that's where I want to start. How the
6 YK RAC dealt with this because it's a lot of questions
7 and it's late. How they dealt with it was to say,
8 jeez, our people on our RAC are really pretty well
9 informed. Just read the questions and we'll do a hand
10 vote, record our hand vote and there's your feedback.
11 Whenever somebody wants a clarification on a question
12 in more detail, I'm happy to provide it. I even gave
13 you this stapled, really detailed explanation of
14 everything that you might want to read it at your
15 leisure. It's pretty interesting stuff. But you are
16 really informed. We recognize that.

17

18 I'll proceed however you want, but I
19 would recommend the hand vote thing if you want to try
20 and do it quickly.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We should run down
23 through this sheet to register our -- do you want to do
24 the hand vote methodology, Council. The first pulse
25 protection is, one, not allow any harvest from the
26 first pulse regardless of the pre-season run
27 projection. How many people support complete
28 protection of the first pulse?

29

30 MR. GERVAIS: I do.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I support. So how
33 many -- unanimous support of protection of the first
34 pulse. Allow a harvest not to exceed 50 percent of the
35 passage of the first pulse regardless of -- that's a
36 moot.

37

38 MR. HALE: Yes. Under this first pulse
39 thing there are four options and basically you guys
40 just decided on one of them. By choosing one you're
41 saying you don't like the other ones as much as that
42 one. That's your preferred alternative.

43

44 With that understood, is everybody
45 still cool with their vote?

46

47 MR. R. WALKER: I think we all voted.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm in favor of
50 first pulse protection.

1 MR. HALE: Okay.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So there's just the
4 second and third pulse. Do you want to enumerate
5 those.
6
7 MR. HALE: Yeah, I'll run through them.
8 Second and third pulse basically it says it's based on
9 the in-season assessment. If it looks like it's needed
10 to protect those pulses, if the run is that bad, then
11 they will be protected accordingly based on the number
12 of fish around and how many need to be conserved or
13 not.
14
15 So it would just be based on in-season
16 assessment. Where is the first pulse. I mean you
17 don't know what's coming in, so it's all going to be
18 based on pre-season assessment.
19
20 So this just says that it would be
21 formalized as pulse protection being the preferred
22 management measure on those pulses as they do in-season
23 assessment on the need for protecting something.
24
25 MR. GERVAIS: Excuse me, Jack.
26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.
28
29 MR. GERVAIS: Jason, how long are these
30 pulse protection measures supposed to be in place? Is
31 it forever or a timeline?
32
33 MR. HALE: There could be a timeframe
34 set on it, Tim. Right now we haven't been talking
35 about putting a timeframe on it necessarily. You guys
36 can certainly recommend that that be included, that it
37 be revisited, let's say, in three years, six years,
38 whatever you want. Right now we're talking about
39 formalizing something just into the plan that is going
40 to be straight up on the books.
41
42 Up to you I guess might be the way to
43 say it.
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Would one of the
46 options be like Robert's talking about, like household
47 harvest limit.
48
49 MR. HALE: The best of my understanding
50 on that, that kind of thing is Tier II, which could be

1 a Board of Fish determination if they feel like
2 subsistence needs aren't being met. I'm no expert on
3 Tier II. I suspect there's some people behind me who
4 could speak to it a lot better. From what I
5 understand, we're not quite there yet.

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I mean like an
8 option of like so many fish per household on this
9 second pulse and so many fish on the third pulse.

10
11 MR. HALE: I think the only way to do
12 that is Tier II the best of my knowledge.

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Would the Council
15 support in-season run assessment and restricting the
16 second and third pulses. Those who support in-season
17 assessment and regulatory restriction on subsistence
18 harvest. Who supports in-season assessment and
19 protection?

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I support that.
24 Because if the runs are going really bad, there could
25 be some real problems. Hold your hands up those who
26 support in-season assessment.

27
28 MR. GERVAIS: Can I comment on that,
29 Jack.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

32
33 MR. GERVAIS: Well, what I'm
34 understanding or hearing when you're talking about in-
35 season assessment and actions on the second or third
36 pulses leaving everything to the discretion of the
37 managers and we've had bad success with that in not all
38 but some of the recent years. I mean basically three
39 years we didn't escape of the last five. But, yeah, if
40 it's really bad and have to do additional protection, I
41 support that. But leaving it all up to the discretion
42 of the managers doesn't -- we've got the three years of
43 missing escapement.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, if we have
46 first pulse protection as the first stage to meeting
47 border escapement and some first pulse escapement, then
48 we have to have -- if the Council is going along that
49 line, we would have to have in-season run assessment
50 because we don't have all the harvest on the second

1 pulse. It would completely annihilate the second
2 pulse. So we have to allow the in-season managers to
3 assess that. It's not the best and they don't have the
4 best absolute record, but everybody is human and things
5 mess up. I do feel that the in-season managers should
6 be able to make in-season run assessment and have
7 reduction in subsistence harvest to accommodate
8 escapement for the second and third pulse.

9

10 MR. HALE: And if I may, obviously, if
11 the run's still looking poor and they need to protect
12 more fish after the first pulse to meet escapement and
13 treaty obligations, they're going to do something. It
14 could be any of the many tools they have at their
15 discretion.

16

17 What this is saying is do you want that
18 something to have to be pulse protection as opposed to
19 say cutting time in half or reducing gear size or
20 something along those lines. Okay, well, you're going
21 to do something. Make it pulse protection.

22

23 If you vote yes, then you're supporting
24 that as the thing they do. They're going to do
25 something. They're going to assess the run and do
26 something in those poor years.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Robert.

29

30 MR. R. WALKER: Jason, this was one of
31 the things we talked about before was the windows. We
32 never wanted to get rid of the windows because once we
33 get rid of the windows, then we'd be at the discretion
34 of the managers. I would always keep these windows
35 here because you could always cut them in half, you can
36 cut them to a quarter and you can still use your same
37 net whatever. But to take your net and say, well, we
38 have to chop it in half this year and they're going to
39 have an uproar again. When you have your fishery
40 meetings every week, it's going to be a hollering
41 contest again. That's what usually ends up happening.
42 That's why I say the windows here we always keep them
43 in place because those are the best tools that we have
44 to use. I'll recommend to the Board that's the best
45 thing to use.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Robert.
48 Those are important comments. Any other comments on
49 second and third pulse in-season run assessment to
50 protect those pulses. I would also comment that the

1 in-season managers have to look at the age composition
2 and quality of this escapement. We don't just send a
3 bunch of jacks as escapement. I think that something
4 that the in-season managers and YRDFA really should be
5 looking at is the quality of escapement that actually
6 reaches the grounds. Shooting for five and six year
7 old fish on the grounds instead of four year old males,
8 that's a big deal.

9

10 We're going to take a vote on allowing
11 the in-season managers to assess the run in making
12 appropriate reductions in harvest opportunity. Those
13 in favor of that signify by raising your hand for a
14 count.

15

16 Jenny, do you have a question?

17

18 MS. PELKOLA: I'm a little bit mixed
19 up. We're backing up the second and third pulse by the
20 discretion of the people that makes the rules.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. This allows
23 the in-season managers to assess the run. If those
24 pulses don't look like they can support full on
25 subsistence harvest with the full windows, then they
26 should be able to trim them down to allow like Robert's
27 talking about, trim them in half, a quarter, so that
28 those pulses can meet their escapement needs.

29

30 James.

31

32 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Jack. I
33 just have one problem with that whole pulse system
34 there as far as being the primary factor. The second
35 and third pulse is going to be mixed with the chum run
36 primarily and then you're going to have a hard time as
37 far as saying closing the chum run to protect the king
38 run.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I recognize there'll
41 be a fairly significant chum harvest with people --
42 you're saying that people are trying to get chums, then
43 they would be catching bycatch of chinook. That's a
44 different issue. Let's talk about the second and third
45 pulse protection and the in-season managers. Let's
46 take a vote on that again. Ray.

47

48 MR. COLLINS: Aren't we saying windows?
49 Isn't that the mechanism used to protect pulses,
50 windows?

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's one of the
2 options.
3
4 MR. R. WALKER: That's one of the
5 tools.
6
7 MR. COLLINS: Okay. But if we favor
8 that, should we state that so we know what we would
9 favor.
10
11 MR. HALE: Windows is kind of on the
12 back of the sheet. We're going to be talking about
13 that. The point of windows is not to limit harvest
14 whatsoever. It's to spread out the harvest over the
15 whole run, but not limit it.
16
17 All the question is, is if the managers
18 are going to do something on those second and third
19 pulses, some management action, do you want to say you
20 will have to do pulse protection. That's the tool we
21 want you to pull out of the toolbox first.
22
23 Yes or no.
24
25 That boils down the question.
26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I feel that each
28 pulse needs to meet escapement, so I feel that the
29 managers should have the various options to protect
30 the various pulses so that we meet all the drainages
31 escapement needs, not just one particular area. So I'm
32 in favor of support for the in-season run assessment
33 and the protection of the second and third pulse.
34 We'll vote now. Those in favor of supporting the
35 second and third pulse protections with in-season
36 management discretion, signify by raising your hand.
37
38 (Council raises their hands)
39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we have unanimous
41 vote. Tim?
42
43 MR. GERVAIS: I think so, but are we --
44 I'm not quite understanding. Are we voting this in
45 lieu of the first pulse protection?
46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. This is in
48 addition. The first pulse is protected under our
49 scenario.
50

1 MR. GERVAIS: Then, yeah, if it's in
2 addition, I'm for it.
3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we have unanimous
5 support of second and third pulse protection. Go
6 ahead.
7
8 MR. HALE: Next up is equity. And
9 basically the question is do you believe that fisheries
10 managers should distribute any reductions in
11 subsistence harvest opportunities equitably or equally
12 amongst all users all the way up and down the river.
13
14 Do you think it should be distributed
15 evenly through all districts or not?
16
17 MR. R. WALKER: I support it.
18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So those in favor of
20 equitable distribution of burden of conservation
21 signify by raising your hand in support.
22
23 (Council raises their hands)
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim, are you in
26 support of equity?
27
28 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, certainly.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jason.
31
32 MR. HALE: Next up is something -- on
33 the back of the sheet these are things that did not get
34 universal support even in our room of stakeholders, but
35 let's say at least half at a minimum of people were
36 really strongly supporting them and that's why they're
37 brought forward to the public. If there's a
38 groundswell of support from the public, they'll move
39 forward. Otherwise they'll drop.
40
41 The first one is protection of early
42 fish. We started hearing that term a few years ago
43 with the first year of pulse protection. Those are the
44 fish that trickle in before that first pulse. There is
45 some concern that with all this pulse protection that
46 those early fish are just getting hammered. People are
47 worried about that.
48
49 They're saying, jeez, people know the
50 closure is coming. They want to get some fish in their

1 smokehouses, so they're hammering the early fish is
2 what people are saying. There's a concern that maybe
3 there's a genetic diversity that's going to be hurting
4 from that hammering. So it was brought up, though
5 there isn't specific information on that, so we can't
6 say for sure.

7
8 Really what it boils down to is
9 starting the windows at ice out is more or less what
10 we're talking about as opposed to what's been happening
11 lately where they've been starting it a few weeks after
12 ice out so that people had ample opportunity not only
13 on the early fish but also there's a lot of sheefish
14 coming around that time of year and that's when people
15 get a lot of their sheefish.

16
17 So basically the question is do you
18 think there should be some sort of protection like
19 starting the windows right at ice out to protect those
20 early fish and have them be not quite so hammered or
21 not.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Discussion.

24
25 MR. R. WALKER: Support.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I support that. The
28 2009 planning we talked -- we had an implementation of
29 the first window five days after ice out. I'm
30 supportive of protection of those first fish entrance.
31 So those who support protection of the early fish, the
32 fish that would be prior to the normal implementation
33 of windows signify by raising your hand in support.

34
35 (Council raises their hands)

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Unanimous support of
38 that aspect. Tim.

39
40 MR. GERVAIS: Aye.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Sale of incidentally
43 caught kings by set date or percentage of king run has
44 gone by. Allow the sale of incidentally caught king
45 salmon after a set date after a specified portion of
46 the king salmon run has passed Pilot Station sonar. If
47 the run is weak and we've had subsistence restrictions,
48 I do not feel that the king salmon -- it encourages the
49 targeting of king salmon with chum gear, so I'm opposed
50 to that. Any further discussion on that issue, sale of

1 incidentally caught king salmon at a date or specific
2 time during chum salmon.
3 I'm opposed.
4
5 Those in support of the sale raise your
6 hand.
7
8 (No show of hands)
9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to the
11 sale of incidentally caught king salmon during
12 subsistence restrictions, raise your hand.
13
14 (Council raises their hands)
15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Everybody's opposed.
17 You, Tim? Tim? Did we lose him?
18
19 MR. GERVAIS: No, I just hit my mute
20 wrong. I'm opposed to the sale of king salmon on these
21 weak returns.
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Number three,
24 subsistence in personal use harvest reporting requires
25 improved harvest reporting perhaps through the harvest
26 report forms issued by the Department. Discussion on
27 that. Is the Council supportive of harvest reporting
28 for subsistence fish.
29
30 MR. HALE: The idea is with better data
31 the run can be managed as closely as possible, I guess.
32 So the better they understand what the fishing
33 pressures are on the river and get accurate harvest
34 reporting, the better they can figure out when the
35 closures are necessary and when they're not.
36
37 So that was where that came from.
38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in support of
40 required improved harvest reporting raise your hand.
41
42 (Council raises their hands)
43
44 MR. GERVAIS: Aye.
45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So there's support
47 of number three. subsistence use permit. Households
48 must obtain a subsistence use permit to participate in
49 subsistence fishing. Discussion on that. James.
50

1 MR. J. WALKER: Just a question. Would
2 this, if it was voted on to support that, what would be
3 the procedures to qualify for that and who is going to
4 be implementing it and who is going to be monitoring
5 it?

6
7 MR. HALE: Frankly, all that would have
8 to be worked out if everybody decided they liked the
9 idea of the permit system. The benefits touted are
10 really, you know, you're going to have a super high
11 level of reporting because if you're not going to get
12 your permit the next year unless you report, you're
13 going to report, so people can have a better handle on
14 exactly what's going on and how many users are taking
15 how many fish and that kind of thing that can be
16 enforced. It's good, but then again it's a lot of work
17 to put on people who are used to just going out and
18 getting their fish and an extra burden on people.

19
20 So there's the downside.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'll discuss that
23 issue. I have to get a Fish and Game permit to fish in
24 the upper drainage even for grayling or any kind of
25 fish. It's quite a bit of trouble for me to get that
26 permit. I have to get a hold of Fairbanks and order
27 the permit. So a lot of elders and stuff are going to
28 have kind of a problem with all that. I personally
29 feel that the harvest reporting or the household
30 surveys suffice for harvest reporting and the actual
31 subsistence use permit would be burdensome.

32
33 Another discussion by the Council.

34
35 MR. J. WALKER: Just a comment. If you
36 go through all this procedure and having required
37 permits and everything else, if you're closing the
38 pulse or the second pulse, there will be no issue for a
39 permit.

40
41 MR. HALE: I appreciate that comment.
42 Don't forget really I'm just relaying -- all the users
43 came together and they said here's what we want you to
44 present to people because we like these ideas. I
45 didn't even say a word at the meeting except, hey, does
46 anybody need anymore coffee.

47
48 (Laughter)

49
50 MR. HALE: So I didn't come up with any

1 of this. I am a big supporter of let the fishers
2 manage the fishery as much as they possibly can and
3 that's really what this is. So you saying yea or nay
4 to this is just part of that. I get you and I
5 appreciate your comments for sure.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So those in favor of
8 subsistence use permits raise your hand.

9

10 MR. GERVAIS: I'm in favor of it.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You're in favor of
13 the permit?

14

15 MR. GERVAIS: Yes.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm opposed to the
18 use permit. Any other opponents. Those opposed same
19 sign.

20

21 (Council raises their hands)

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we have the
24 majority of the Council. We have Tim as in favor of
25 subsistence use permits. Concurrent subsistence and
26 commercial periods. As Eric was talking about, I can
27 see the warrant for that. It compresses the fishing
28 together. It doesn't protract it over the whole -- it
29 allows more basically pulse protection to the fishery.
30 I'm supportive of that. Any other discussion by the
31 Council.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
36 concurrent subsistence and commercial periods in
37 Districts 1, 2 and 3 raise of hands.

38

39 MR. GERVAIS: Aye.

40

41 (Council raises their hands)

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Unanimous support of
44 that. Prohibition on the selling of king salmon roe in
45 subdistricts 4A. I don't know a lot about that.

46

47 MR. HALE: So this one was an old one
48 that was on the books, has been on the books for a
49 while and the question is do you expand -- right now it
50 says subdistrict 4A specifically and that's it. Do you

1 expand that to include the entire drainage is the
2 question. It's been pointed out that strictly speaking
3 it's not really legal to do anywhere anyway, so it's a
4 bit of a moot point. At the same time, I know the YK
5 RAC said, jeez, it should be on the books to reinforce,
6 they have to use the whole fish, and so they went for
7 it full bore.

8
9 Up to you, but there's just a little
10 background.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm supportive of
13 that.

14
15 (Council raises their hands)

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim, support the
18 prohibition against sale of king salmon roe throughout
19 the whole drainage.

20
21 MR. GERVAIS: Right now it's only
22 allowed in 4A, is that what I heard?

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The prohibition is
25 in 4A and the question is should it be extended
26 drainage wide.

27
28 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, everything should
29 be equal on the whole river.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So the
32 Council is fully supportive of that. Mesh depth of
33 net. Reduce the allowable mesh depth. This was
34 various proposals to 35 mesh.

35
36 MR. R. WALKER: Oppose it. Another
37 restriction that we already went through. We went from
38 a 8 down to a 7. So oppose this one.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This would be
41 another burden on a new gear type. Those in support of
42 net depth reduction raise your hands.

43
44 (No comment)

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Nobody in support.

47
48 Those opposed same sign.

49
50 (Council raises their hands)

1 MR. GERVAIS: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Eight, windows. If
4 pulse protection is adopted for management of king
5 salmon on the Yukon River, consider how the subsistence
6 fishing periods windows should be applied during times
7 of conservation. Keep the windows is one. If pulse
8 protection is adopted, eliminate windows. Or three, if
9 pulse is protected, eliminate windows after the first
10 pulse.

11

12 MR. HALE: If I can throw a little
13 clarification on this one or a little extra
14 information. By the way, this is the last darn
15 question and then I'm going to shut up. The
16 Subsistence Division did review all this stuff and they
17 said if the group were to go for always protecting the
18 first pulse and the windows were left in place at the
19 same time, there would be a great concern about that
20 amount of limitation, meaning that you're overly
21 limiting people's ability to meet their ANS. The Board
22 of Fish could go along with that anyway and say -- for
23 a short time -- and say, well, okay, it's bad, but we
24 think it's going to rebound with these measures so we
25 can go along with it for three or six years, something
26 like that and see how that goes, but for the long haul
27 that's just not going to fly, you know, having a
28 management structure in place that's not Tier II that
29 does not allow users to reasonably get their ANS.

30

31 So you guys voted for 100 percent
32 protection of that first pulse all the time regardless
33 of the preseason, which is great. It's an option on
34 the table. There was reasonable amount of support for
35 that. If you do that and some of you made it pretty
36 clear you like the idea of keeping the windows as well.
37 If you do them both, it's just something that is
38 probably a short term thing just by the nature of it.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: These are all short
41 term until we recover the king salmon, then we're going
42 to get a lot of fish back and we won't have to worry
43 about all this. But we need to recover the king salmon
44 first.

45

46 David, do you have a comment.

47

48 MR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. David
49 Jenkins, OSM. You might want to revisit number six
50 because the second clause there appears to contradict

1 what you were talking about earlier in the sale under
2 customary trade of strips as an established practice.
3 It says that the regulation would change to read only
4 whole king salmon may be sold. So you may want to
5 rethink that.

6

7

Thank you.

8

9

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, I'm opposed to
10 the sale of salmon roe at all. That's typically going
11 into a commercial market and so I'm opposed to the sale
12 of salmon roe for commercial purposes. That was my
13 interpretation of that. Under State regulations, I
14 feel that this preclusion of the sale of salmon roe
15 would preclude it from entering into the commercial
16 market.

17

18

MR. J. WALKER: Strike that.

19

20

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You want to strike
21 that last sentence?

22

23

MR. J. WALKER: Yes.

24

25

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Council would
26 like that stricken from six. Under eight, we're back
27 to eight again. I still feel that the managers should
28 be able to utilize pulse protection windows and through
29 reductions to accommodate as a tool to accommodate the
30 escapement goal. So if the chips fall to where the
31 people can't meet their subsistence needs to protect
32 the resource, that's just the way it has to be.

33

34

MR. J. WALKER: That's in regard to the
35 second and third pulse?

36

37

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Second and third
38 pulse. So this gives the managers tools to utilize
39 keeping the windows but reducing the windows to
40 accommodate meeting escapement needs. That would be my
41 feeling on that.

42

43

MR. GERVAIS: I've got a question,
44 Jack.

45

46

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim.

47

48

MR. GERVAIS: Jason, I was thinking
49 that the pulse protection is a form of windows. Can
50 you define what he means by windows and what he means

1 by pulse protection briefly.

2

3 MR. HALE: Yeah, Tim. So the windows
4 is that regular schedule you guys are all used to
5 seeing on the Yukon for the past more than a decade.
6 You know, there are open periods each week depending on
7 where you are on the river they vary in length. And the
8 goal of that is to spread out the harvest across the
9 whole run.

10

11 Pulse protection is a specific closure
12 on a pulse of fish that follows that pulse of fish all
13 the way up to the border. So it is specifically aimed
14 at reducing harvest and protecting a slug of fish.

15

16 Does that help?

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does that help, Tim?

19

20 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, that's fine.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The other RACs have
23 addressed the three options, I think throwing a four in
24 would that muddy up the water, Jason?

25

26 MR. HALE: You guys can do whatever the
27 heck you want and we'll take it back and throw it into
28 consideration, but it's going to be harder to factor it
29 in if it's a wildcard. But you can do whatever you
30 want. I'm not going to limit you. Your opinion is
31 valuable regardless.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I feel that we could
34 take option one, keep the windows with the caveat that
35 those windows can be reduced in length to accommodate
36 escapement needs. So as a notation to one, but
37 accepting one. So those in support of keeping windows
38 with variations in length for the managers to conserve
39 chinook salmon raise your hand.

40

41 (Council raises their hands)

42

43 MR. J. WALKER: In regard to the second
44 and third pulse?

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Second and third
47 pulse. So, Tim, are you in favor of keeping the
48 windows.....

49

50 MR. GERVAIS: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:for the second
2 and third pulse? Okay. So we've answered the sheet
3 for you, Jason.

4
5 MR. HALE: Okay. So I'm going to come
6 back and hit you with a much more polished dealio in
7 the fall, trying our best to incorporate everybody's
8 comments. Most of these options are going to go away
9 probably, the ones without a lot of support. The pulse
10 stuff is going to stick around and I'm sure that's what
11 we're going to be talking about in the fall. Outside
12 of that, it's 10 after 7:00 and I can't believe the
13 level of discussion we just had.

14
15 That was insane.

16
17 You guys are good and thank you very
18 much, it's very helpful. I appreciate it.

19
20 Good seeing you.

21
22 Thank you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate all the
25 hard work YRDFA does for the Yukon River fisheries and
26 I really appreciate that.

27
28 So, Melinda.

29
30 MR. GERVAIS: I have a few questions,
31 Jack, please.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay, Tim.

34
35 MR. GERVAIS: The first one, Jason,
36 that 25,500 kings, is that only out of the Bering Sea
37 or does that count Gulf of Alaska bycatch too?

38
39 MR. HALE: Super good question, Tim,
40 and in my attempt at brevity I skipped saying that it
41 was the Bering Sea, Aleutian Islands pollock fleet.

42
43 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Second question.

46
47 MR. GERVAIS: So, Jack, Chairman and
48 Council, are we just going to rely on YRDFA putting
49 together this management plan or should we put in a
50 proposal for a pulse protection just in case?

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: In the fall meeting,
2 we will be able to comment on what YRDFA comes forward
3 with. If it incorporates the first pulse protection.
4 But we can comment to the YRDFA management plan in our
5 fall meeting, so we'll have plenty of time to look at
6 what they've eliminated and what they've incorporated.
7 Jason, do you have a further comment.

8
9 MR. HALE: Yeah. I mean I'm dancing
10 like a monkey to make this clear. It's not just the
11 YRDFA plan. Some stuff comes just out of YRDFA and
12 YRDFA is a great organization, but in recognition of
13 all these other groups who are nowadays involved in the
14 management. I mean the RACs really stepped up and the
15 intertribal groups really stepped up. The Yukon River
16 Panel, jeez, they're doing quite a bit. We're
17 developing it with all of them. So we have as many
18 chairs in the room as everybody else and no more. It's
19 really not just the YRDFA plan. It's easy to say it
20 because we're the ones making the phone calls and
21 stuff. Ultimately it's like the Yukon River
22 stakeholder group plan.

23
24 I know that's just words, but I just
25 want to be clear. It stretches even beyond YRDFA and
26 YRDFA is pretty darn big.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Satisfied with that
29 answer, Tim? Tim?

30
31 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, that's fine. I
32 just wanted to make sure that there was going to be
33 something substantial on the table when we get to Board
34 of Fish.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I agree with
37 your concerns, but I think in our fall meeting we're
38 going to look at a very refined plan from all user
39 groups and entities on the Yukon River. Thanks a lot,
40 Jason. Melinda. We're coming down to the end of the
41 agenda here?

42
43 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes, we're on the last
44 agenda item. So on 13A we're looking at Page 68 of the
45 book to confirm the date and location of the fall 2012
46 meeting. I really appreciate the Council's patience.
47 The word came down from leadership at OSM with the
48 budget constraints to try to do one day meetings where
49 possible. Jack was very gracious in going ahead and
50 meeting that request, but I think we can tell that a

1 one day meeting for this Council just probably isn't
2 going to work in the future.

3

4 So looking at what we set for the fall
5 2012 meeting, we've got October 10th and 11th set. We
6 loosely discussed maybe trying to go to one of the
7 smaller communities if you guys would still like me to
8 do a cost analysis, I will be happy to do that work
9 after I get back to Anchorage.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's my recollection
12 that we were supposed to go to Galena. We were in
13 Aniak last fall.

14

15 MS. HERNANDEZ: Oh, that's right. Is
16 this a typo? Should it be Galena?

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's a typo. We
19 should be in Galena at least as a hub. Pollock.

20

21 MR. SIMON: First, a short comment
22 about the meeting. In the past we had two day meetings
23 and this one is just a one day meeting. In the
24 afternoon Staff is asking questions and we try to put
25 all that into one day. There's not enough time. Can
26 we go back to two day meeting?

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Pollock, when I
29 first started the agenda, it was fairly light, but
30 there was a lot of issues that came up in the last
31 month, so I take full responsibility to agreeing to a
32 one-day meeting and I will not do that again. I
33 understand fully that this Council is far too active
34 for a one day meeting.

35

36 MR. SIMON: I suggested we go to
37 smaller communities. I read this in the back. There's
38 three and a half pages of charter. It doesn't say that
39 we have to be all the time in bigger communities. We
40 could go to smaller communities and actually meet the
41 peoples that we represent. It's good to go to bigger
42 communities, there's hotel and restaurants and
43 everybody got a room, running water, but I've gone to a
44 lot of meetings in the last 30 years and I slept on a
45 gym floor and slept on people's couches and still have
46 a good meeting.

47

48 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I do agree with

1 Pollock. We used to meet in smaller communities,
2 especially where there were burning issues and OSM
3 decided that we were going to meet in the hub
4 communities and McGrath wasn't even on that list, so we
5 got it up to three, but I do feel that a cost
6 comparison -- we can meet in areas and communities with
7 no public comment even though I was on the radio for
8 half an hour this morning in McGrath. I feel that we
9 need to meet in communities that have issues. I
10 remember meeting in Holy Cross and having like 35, 40
11 people out there talking to us about stuff. I think
12 with these Yukon River fisheries Holy Cross would be a
13 great place to meet and could be cost comparison.

14
15 I'll go around the table. Where does
16 the Council feel that our fall meeting should occur.
17 Galena is a fallback, but preferably a smaller
18 community like Pollock is talking about that has real
19 issues. Jenny.

20
21 MS. PELKOLA: I think that's a good
22 idea to go where the issues are. Also I would like to
23 say to follow up on Pollock's comment that this one day
24 meeting didn't work because some of the agencies that
25 were reporting we just sort of hurry up, hurry up and
26 we didn't give them time and we didn't really listen to
27 them and they were rushing. So I want to apologize for
28 that. I think two day meetings we need to go back to
29 and go to the villages where we represent or who has
30 issues.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What do you think
33 about Holy Cross?

34
35 MS. PELKOLA: Sounds good.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other Council
38 discussion. Pollock.

39
40 MR. SIMON: That's fine with me.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other Council
43 members. Tim.

44
45 MR. GERVAIS: I'd be in favor of Holy
46 Cross. I'd like to listen to what the locals there
47 have to say about the way this fishery regulations are
48 coming together. It will be just prior to Board of
49 Fish meeting too, so it would be really good.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, there's two
2 issues. As the Chair, I feel that the fisheries issues
3 on the Yukon River are important and Holy Cross has
4 always had a lot to say about those. Also the 21E
5 Proposal 10-69 will have been dealt with, so I would
6 like to see how people feel about that issue also.
7 Then we're going to be thinking about the winter hunt
8 allocation, so I feel that Holy Cross is also a good
9 place to talk about the customary and traditional use
10 determinations for 21E and the boundaries we've drawn.
11 There's some real issues down there that we need to
12 actually sit down with people of the GASH and talk
13 about those. So I feel Holy Cross is a good place.

14
15 James.

16
17 MR. J. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like
18 to.....

19
20 MR. VENT: Mr. Chair.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Stand by. James
23 Walker is talking.

24
25 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Jack. I'd
26 just like to say too that I'd like to see a two day
27 meeting to be fair to all agencies that are giving
28 reports to the board here and give us justification to
29 review what they have to say and how we implement their
30 suggestions.

31
32 But as far as Holy Cross is concerned,
33 I really don't have no problem as long as you don't go
34 there.

35
36 (Laughter)

37
38 MS. HERNANDEZ: Council, thank you for
39 your comments and I'm definitely going to carry back
40 the message that this one day meeting experiment is
41 done and we're not going to try it again. Also, I
42 think working with James and just doing some planning
43 ahead of time with offsetting the cost of hotel, which
44 usually runs a really big bill wherever this Council
45 goes, if we find community members and other housing
46 locations I think that will take a big chunk off the
47 bill, which will offset the high travel cost.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate that
50 and I have full confidence in Melinda figuring out how

1 to come up with an economical meeting in Holy Cross
2 that will work. Under .805 of ANILCA the Regional
3 Councils are a public platform for the public to
4 comment on issues that affect subsistence, so we need
5 to move back towards -- we need to break away from
6 OSM's problem. We've been straight-jacketed in some of
7 these communities where we get no public comment, as
8 you can see right here. So we need to go back to where
9 we're going to get real input from community members.

10

11 So the meeting date 10 and 11, that's
12 good for me. Is it good for the Council.

13

14 MR. R. WALKER: Yeah, sure.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Council seems to be
17 agreeable with that. Then the spring window and this
18 is preliminary because we have an annual report topic
19 that deals with these meeting schedules.

20

21 MS. HERNANDEZ: The only week that
22 wouldn't work with the other meetings that have already
23 picked their dates, the week of February 25th already
24 has two meetings and they ask us to only do two
25 meetings a week if possible.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Robert's asking when
28 is the Board of Game meeting. March 2nd and goes
29 through the 11th of March. This Council needs to
30 appoint -- typically has representation at the Board of
31 Game meeting, so I would like to have somebody attend
32 the Board of Game meeting if we can. We're going back
33 to our spring meeting window. The 25th to the 1st of
34 March is blanked out. We can move towards the week of
35 the 4th, would be preferable to myself. Go ahead,
36 Pollock.

37

38 MR. SIMON: Yes, Mr. Chair. After
39 having a meeting in a small community, we could go to
40 the bigger community for the next meeting.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's a good
43 comment, Pollock. We could go back to Galena. How
44 does the Council feel about the week of March 4th
45 through the 8th.

46

47 MR. GERVAIS: How about the last week
48 of February.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That week is blanked

1 out. Two other Councils have already taken that week.
2 So we either got the week of 19th through 22nd or the
3 4th to the 5th. The window closes towards late March,
4 but I prefer -- I'm trapping, so I've got a lot of
5 stuff going on towards the end of March. Is the week
6 of the 4th through the 8th good for you, Tim?

7

8 MR. GERVAIS: I can make it work. I
9 prefer the 18th through 22nd, but I can do that 4th
10 through the 8th.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is the Council good
13 with the February -- its a holiday. It's travel on the
14 19th and meeting on the 20 and 21st. How is that for
15 you, Tim?

16

17 MR. GERVAIS: That works good.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is the Council good
20 with those dates.

21

22 MR. COLLINS: We have sometimes
23 weather. We start getting up to mid February and you
24 can have cold and weather and shorter days and so on.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's why I
27 typically try to avoid the middle of February. I've
28 seen 45 below zero lots of times. So the Council is
29 leaning away from those dates, Tim. The first week in
30 March, is that good?

31

32 MR. J. WALKER: The 4th and 5th.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The 5th and 6th or
35 6th and 7th, something like that.

36

37 MR. GERVAIS: I can make those work.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we'll go with
40 those dates. The Council should send a representative
41 to the Board of Game. I cannot attend that. I have
42 family issues going on. Would a Council member
43 volunteer to represent the Western Interior Council on
44 the Board of Game proposals that we took actions on.

45

46 MR. R. WALKER: I'll nominate Tim.

47

48 MR. GERVAIS: What's the date on Board
49 of Game?

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Board of Game is
2 going to meet on the 2nd of March. I hear the Western
3 Interior proposals is right up towards the front of the
4 docket. So it would be travel next week imminent.

5
6 MR. GERVAIS: I don't think so. I'd
7 rather not.

8
9 REPORTER: It's this week, Jack.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. This week.
12 It's coming right up, like day after tomorrow. Carl.
13 Would you attend the Board of Game, Pollock. You don't
14 want to do it. Don can't. He's not here to say
15 whether he can go or not and I can't really appoint him
16 if he can't really accept. Ray.

17
18 MR. COLLINS: I don't think so. I'm
19 going to have somebody else go for me for the local
20 Advisory Committee.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So James or
23 Jenny. The Council can transmit through a record copy,
24 RC, some Staff member in Fairbanks can transmit to the
25 Board of Game the comments in written form through RC
26 to the Board of Game, so we don't have a representative
27 at this time. So that's the end of our agenda,
28 Melinda.

29
30 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So would the Council
33 like closing comments -- or did you have a closing
34 comment, Pat.

35
36 MR. POURCHOT: I would just say I'm
37 very impressed with the work of the RAC and would thank
38 you all for all you service. This is very impressive.

39
40 (Applause)

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pat. I
43 appreciate you attending our meeting and seeing what it
44 is in the trenches at the RAC level and the interaction
45 with the various agencies that you have charge of, so I
46 would take that as a productive thing for understanding
47 and for your direction to OSM on various issues.

48
49 So should we go through closing
50 comments or.....

1 MR. J. WALKER: What about our next
2 meeting in Fairbanks.
3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I thought we had
5 already established as Galena.
6
7 MR. J. WALKER: No.
8
9 MR. R. WALKER: Oh, we did, Galena.
10
11 MR. J. WALKER: No, I don't think.....
12
13 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes.
14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We talked about it
16 -- we discussed it.....
17
18 REPORTER: Jimmy, turn your microphone
19 on.
20
21 MR. R. WALKER: Okay. Turn your mic
22 on.
23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Turn your mic on.
25
26 (Laughter)
27
28 MR. J. WALKER: Sorry.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Where would you
31 prefer to have the spring meeting.
32
33 MS. YATLIN: Fairbanks.
34
35 MR. J. WALKER: Jack, that wasn't my
36 understanding that we -- as far as nominating Holy
37 Cross for the meeting. My understanding was the fall
38 meeting in Holy Cross, right?
39
40 REPORTER: Yes.
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. And then the
43 spring meeting -- the spring meeting we were discussing
44 Galena, going back to a hub community on the Yukon but
45 if you have another location you would like to meet at.
46
47 MR. J. WALKER: Well, I'd suggest
48 Fairbanks.
49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Fairbanks is outside

1 of our region and so that's all fun and everything but
2 -- Melinda, what would be the likelihood of a meeting
3 in Fairbanks. We have met in Fairbanks for joint
4 meetings with Eastern.

5

6 MR. R. WALKER: Eastern.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But we don't have
9 any pressing overlap issues with Eastern and I prefer
10 to meet, at least, in region. Fairbanks is fun
11 but.....

12

13 MR. R. WALKER: I wasn't looking at the
14 fun, I was kind of looking at the Board of Game too
15 also that's going to be there.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, there's no Board
18 of Game meeting in the spring meeting next year.

19

20 MR. R. WALKER: There's not?

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, they're
23 meeting.....

24

25 MS. HERNANDEZ: Since this isn't until
26 winter 2012, why don't we put Galena up there, and I'll
27 make a note and we'll discuss Fairbanks later.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. We can
30 preliminarily put Galena, there is no Board of Game,
31 there is no other meeting that we -- there's no reason
32 for us to be in Fairbanks. Board of Game's meeting
33 this year, in two days, two days from now.

34

35 MR. R. WALKER: Okay.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So, Galena,
38 preliminary if Council members have reasons to meet in
39 another area, maybe something crops up and we need to
40 meet in Huslia or someplace then we'll calculate that
41 also. So preliminary Galena.

42

43 Any other agenda items the Council
44 feels needs to be -- or any other issues the Council
45 needs to deal with at this meeting.

46

47 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you very much.

48

49 MR. COLLINS: I guess we're going to
50 skip closing comments, then is that the idea?

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Council is
2 tired.
3
4 IN UNISON: Yes, we are.
5
6 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I am too.
7
8 MS. HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ray.
9
10 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I had one
11 thing I wanted to mention, Eleanor just showed me
12 something that they're using in their school board,
13 instead of all this, they got iPads, and all this stuff
14 could be loaded on, you could have it all on there at
15 the meeting, you can flip.....
16
17 (Laughter)
18
19 MR. COLLINS:through and read it
20 instead of taking this home and figuring out what
21 you're going to do with it.
22
23 (Laughter)
24
25 MR. COLLINS: Just think about it for
26 the future because then you don't have the mailing and
27 all of that problems going on.
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I'll make a
30 closing comment for the Council just for general
31 purposes. I really appreciate all of the agencies
32 attending the meeting and all the hard work and making
33 presentations. And I very much appreciate Melinda and
34 Salena's participation in keeping -- and all of the
35 work they've done to support this Council's work during
36 this meeting. And so the Chair will entertain a motion
37 to adjourn the meeting.
38
39 MR. R. WALKER: So moved.
40
41 EVERYBODY: Second.
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded,
44 those in favor of adjournment signify by saying aye.
45
46 IN UNISON: Aye.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for being on
49 conference there, Tim, and I know that's a tough job
50 but that's the way the chips fall.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

MR. GERVAIS: Thanks, Jack.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're adjourned.

(Off record)

(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
35

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 224 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC on the 29th day of February 2012, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. in McGrath, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by 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 12th day of March 2012.

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