

1 WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME I

7
8 Aniak, Alaska
9 March 6, 2007
10 9:00 o'clock a.m.
11

12
13 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

14
15 Jack Reakoff, Chairman
16 Ray Collins
17 Donald Honea
18 Carl Morgan
19 Jenny Pelkola
20 Ron Sam
21 Mickey Stickman
22 Robert Walker

23
24
25
26
27
28 Regional Council Coordinator, Vince Mathews

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Recorded and transcribed by:
45
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
47 700 W. Second Avenue
48 Anchorage, AK 99501
49 907-243-0668
50 jpk@gci.net/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

(Aniak, Alaska - 03/06/2007)

(On record)

MR. SAM: At this time I'd like to get started. It is now 9:15. We're in order. Are we ready for the welcome opening remarks? I see Carl here. I think Carl is ready to do it. Do you have anyone lined up for that?

MR. MORGAN: Andy.

MS. MORGAN: Let me get him.

MR. MATHEWS: Ron, while we're waiting for that, we can go through some housekeeping stuff.

MR. SAM: Go ahead. Before you begin, Jack and I will be co-chairing. Pretty quick I'll turn it over to Jack, just for your information.

MR. MATHEWS: Each of you Council Members got one of these blue folders. That's materials in addition to what's in your book. We'll have other handouts and they're not going to be in the same order. I just kind of put them together. But in there you'll have -- you guys have been talking about global warming. This was provided to me by Tetlin Refuge. It's not put together by Tetlin Refuge, but they provided me this on Global Warming Alaska on the Frontline, so it's just informational items.

You guys have been talking for quite a few years about guides and transporters. I happened to be near their meeting, the Commercial Guide Board. I don't know if I mailed this to you already, but this is the professional ethics standards for guides and ethics standards for transporters, and I thought you guys would be interested in having a copy of that.

Mike Spindler, the Refuge manager, or Wennona Brown or other Staff will be talking about the winter season for the Kanuti Refuge. This is the record of decision. Jack and Ron have already received it, but I wanted to make sure the full Council had it. We'll have more discussion about this season that just ended yesterday.

1 Because of your stand on the Mulchatna
2 Herd, we felt it would be wise on the agenda as well to
3 have you have copies of all the Board of Game
4 proposals. I don't want to hoodwink you. The Board of
5 Game is meeting as we speak now. They may have already
6 addressed these proposals. We're going to be linked up
7 to our liaison with the Board of Game. If they
8 haven't, then you guys can comment on them. If they
9 have, then you'll know where the Board of Game stood on
10 these proposals for the Mulchatna Herd.

11
12 I know it's a lot of stuff, but that's
13 the way it goes. You have two letters in here. You
14 guys went forward (microphone off).....

15
16 REPORTER: Hold on, hold on Vince, let
17 me repower the system.

18
19 (Pause)

20
21 MR. SAM: At this time I'd like to go
22 ahead and turn the mike over to Andy Morgan.

23
24 MS. MORGAN: Thank you. As you
25 requested, I did contact our council members. It just
26 so happens we have four out of seven that are here.
27 Our first chairman is Wayne Morgan.

28
29 MR. W. MORGAN: I just wanted to say
30 welcome respective Council Members from Western
31 Interior. Welcome to Aniak on behalf of our council,
32 myself. I'm the chief and we've got our second chief
33 back, Leonard Morgan. Council member Duane Hoffman and
34 council member Marie Kameroff. So we just wanted to
35 say welcome all of you.

36
37 We were going to have a big potluck for
38 you, but since there's no moose in our area, we can't
39 have it. Maybe we'll supply some beaver meat. No, I'm
40 just kidding. We just wanted to say welcome to all of
41 you and glad that you can come here and have your
42 meeting and have us be part of your discussions.
43 Again, welcome.

44
45 MR. SAM: Thank you, Wayne. Any
46 council members want to say a few words. You're more
47 than welcome since this is your home.

48
49 MR. L. MORGAN: No, he already said
50 enough for right now.

1 MR. SAM: Okay. Thank you for those
2 remarks and we feel welcome here. This is not our
3 first time. Again, I'd like to thank the community of
4 Aniak for hosting our Western Interior Council meeting.
5 Jack, do you want to go ahead. Vince, were you done?
6

7 MR. MATHEWS: Just one last thing here.
8 This pink one we'll talk about when we get to Council
9 business. This is something that I've been pushing for
10 for quite a few years. It's a policy on member
11 conduct. We've had no troubles or anything, but this
12 is just to give you some guidelines if we do have any
13 trouble that we have these guidelines. We'll talk
14 about them later. It's not reflective of any
15 performance of any Council. It was just basically to
16 have these guidelines there in the future to have so
17 when we cross these bridges we have guidance for both
18 Council and Staff.
19

20 There are other handouts. It's up to
21 you if you want to stuff them in your folder. This is
22 Jenny Pelkola's first meeting, so she's going to be
23 swamped on this and that's typical of our meetings, but
24 I know from the few times I met with her in the past
25 couple of days she's not afraid to ask any questions.
26 Jenny, that's how this works. Any Council Member at
27 any time the Chair will recognize and no question is
28 out of bounds because you're covering an area that is
29 huge. The Staff that is all present out here is more
30 than willing to help you through these issues because
31 they can be complex. Ron, Jack and the more seasoned
32 members here can help you with the history that the
33 Council may have on these issues, but they are very
34 complex.
35

36 With that, you know how to get in and
37 out of the building. The emergency exits are where
38 they are. I didn't find the washrooms, but I'm sure
39 you will find them. We do have PowerPoint
40 presentations. We can move them to wherever that's
41 needed to be, so let us know on that.
42

43 Lunch is going to be through the Hound
44 House, so 11:00 o'clock I've got to figure out how to
45 organize that. If you have any lodging or situations
46 like that, let me know. That's pretty much it for
47 housekeeping.
48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. My name is
50 Jack Reakoff. I'm vice-chair. I'll be working over

1 some of this agenda with Ron here. We're up for an
2 invocation from an elder on the agenda. Do we have an
3 elder from the community that would like to speak? Also
4 Ray has led our invocations also. Do we have someone
5 from the community, Carl? No. Do you want to do the
6 invocation, Ray.

7

8 (Invocation)

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Down on the agenda
11 here we'll go through the roll call of the Council. Go
12 ahead, Vince.

13

14 MR. MATHEWS: Ron Sam.

15

16 MR. SAM: Yo.

17

18 MR. MATHEWS: Jack Reakoff.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Here.

21

22 MR. MATHEWS: Ray Collins.

23

24 MR. COLLINS: Here.

25

26 MR. MATHEWS: Winchell Ticknor I talked
27 to Sunday. He has an eye appointment in Anchorage, so
28 he's excused, so he's not present. Robert Walker.

29

30 MR. WALKER: Yes.

31

32 MR. MATHEWS: Donald Honea, Jr.

33

34 MR. HONEA: Here.

35

36 MR. MATHEWS: Mickey Stickman.

37

38 MR. STICKMAN: Here.

39

40 MR. MATHEWS: Carl Morgan.

41

42 MR. MORGAN: Yo.

43

44 MR. MATHEWS: Jenny Pelkola.

45

46 MS. PELKOLA: Here.

47

48 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, you have
49 eight of your nine members present. You have nine on
50 your Council, so you have a quorum.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Vince. So
2 we're down to Chair's report and the Regional Council
3 Members concerns. This last meeting we were in Ruby.
4 I chaired that meeting. I worked with Vince and Ron
5 throughout the winter on various correspondence, so the
6 concerns were revolving around the low harvest by some
7 communities within this region. Our Council has
8 identified communities that are not meeting their
9 subsistence needs for moose up around Unit 21B, D and
10 24B. Those concerns are still in place. We have
11 requested special actions for March hunts in 21B and
12 21D and those were denied by OSM for reasons that I did
13 not agree with.

14
15 We had letters transmitted on the
16 importance of plant materials and forestry products to
17 all of the agencies that deal with subsistence, so my
18 feeling is and my reading of the ANILCA law is that
19 ANILCA provides for subsistence priority use for plant
20 materials. Those letters have been transmitted and
21 have yet to receive any kind of reply to that.

22
23 We had concerns about the North Pacific
24 Management Council's allowance of interception of
25 salmon in the Bering Sea and the groundfish fisheries,
26 so we're pushing on those issues. We wrote a letter
27 about the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. I think that it's
28 real -- because the Board of Game is in session on the
29 Mulchatna Herd, the data presented to us last fall was
30 that the caribou herd had fallen from 200,000 to
31 70,000. Now it's reported at 40-something thousand,
32 43,000 or something. I'm very concerned about that, so
33 I want to push the State proposals to tie into our
34 agenda so that we can transmit to the State Board
35 endorsement of certain restrictions that need to be put
36 in place on the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

37
38 That would be my report at this time.
39 I want to go around the table and talk about the Council
40 Members' concerns. I also wanted to welcome Jenny to
41 our Council. She seems to be a very smart lady. We
42 had some moose steaks with her and so forth last night,
43 so she seems like she's going to work out real well.

44
45 You've got your hand up, Vince. Go
46 ahead.

47
48 MR. MATHEWS: Jenny, this needs to be
49 explained. The Council Member concern on the agenda is
50 very important for Staff. This is how we know what

1 issues you have for your area or the region, but also
2 from that sometimes it affects how the agenda is put
3 together to the rest of the day. Also, the next
4 meeting you have, it gives us ideas what topics to put
5 in your annual report. So it is a very important time
6 to share for your area and the region any issues you
7 may know of. It's now been carried on by most of the
8 regions. We started it in Western and Eastern Interior
9 and now it's being done in other regions. We don't
10 know a lot of issues that may be in your area or we may
11 be misinformed on some of those issues, so Council
12 Members can kind of clarify it and then the Refuge
13 Staff, if it affects Refuge, then know, oh, I need to
14 talk to Ron about the deal with the permits that are
15 going to be issued for the Kanuti Refuge which they may
16 not have known about. So it is a very important time.
17 Some Councils just breeze right through it and then the
18 issues come up at the end. Well, the Staff have no way
19 to respond as well as if it was in the beginning.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Vince. So
24 we didn't have any fisheries proposals, so I did not
25 attend or the Western Interior did not attend the
26 Federal Subsistence Board meeting in January. We'll
27 start down on that end with Mickey and go down the line
28 here and lay out our concerns and reports. I know Ray
29 was at some meeting.

30

31 Go ahead, Mickey.

32

33 MR. STICKMAN: One of the biggest
34 concerns for the Nulato area was that the moose harvest
35 for last fall was really low. I think one of the
36 things that they want to see is a moose hunt that
37 stretches out later into the fall rather than earlier.
38 I know that we've been stretching it out into August
39 and making it earlier, but I think if you look at the
40 harvest from the State, especially for the guys in
41 Kaltag, they harvest something like 50 or 60 percent of
42 their moose the last six hours of the moose hunting
43 season last fall. One of the concerns that I have is
44 I'd like to see that moose season stretched further
45 back even into October. Because we have a bulls-only
46 hunt in the area and the success rate depends on the
47 moose moving around and with the way the weather has
48 been going, they're moving later and later. So we just
49 need to be able to stretch the moose hunting season
50 back further.

1 The other concern has to deal with fish
2 and fish size. I guess it's a concern throughout the
3 whole Upper Yukon, so I'll just leave that out on the
4 table for now because I'm not proposing anything as far
5 as fish size.

6
7 That's all I have.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Mickey.
10 Jenny, do you have concerns.

11
12 MS. PELKOLA: Well, I'd just like to
13 echo a little bit of what Mickey said about moose
14 hunting. In our area, Galena area, there have been
15 people who didn't get their moose, so I'd like to also
16 have our moose hunting extended just a little bit
17 longer. Sometimes the weather is too warm and there's
18 a lot of wasted meat out there that probably could have
19 been saved had the hunting been a little later.

20
21 I'm a fisherwoman, I guess you'd call
22 it. I fish all the time in the summer. I'm new on the
23 Board, so I don't really know what to propose at this
24 time. I'm just learning and everybody is feeding me
25 all this information and it's somewhere in my head, but
26 I don't know where yet. But in fishing I'm concerned
27 about the last 18 hours of drifting from Galena to Cone
28 Point or whatever they call it. It's pretty hard to
29 get people to fish at that time because by the time
30 that 18 hours comes you're pretty tired from the
31 fishing opening. I know not very many people use it
32 because it's a new thing and I think at this time I'd
33 just say that maybe in the future we could take a
34 better look at that and see where we could go from
35 there.

36
37 That's all I have to say at this time.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. That was
40 a very interesting comment on the fishery. The Western
41 Interior got that season driftnet allowance, but those
42 were stipulations that we had to make to the Board to
43 even try and get the fishery. The State fought us
44 tooth and nail. Everybody was fighting us on that.
45 It's been shown that the fishery wasn't nearly as
46 expanded as was thought was going to occur. There's a
47 few people that want to fish there and would utilize
48 that. We're up for fisheries proposals at this meeting
49 and so I think that we will submit a proposal to allow
50 a concurrent fishing time with the rest of the fishery.

1 Not the last 18 hours, but the full timeframe with the
2 permits and so forth. I think at this point it's been
3 shown and proven to the Board that there's still
4 limited numbers of people that are going to utilize
5 that fishery, so I think it's an important comment that
6 we need to submit a proposal on more liberalized
7 fishing time.

8

9 Ray, go ahead.

10

11 MR. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12 I think from what we've heard already and in
13 discussions with people here that the issue that I have
14 been raising in recent time is that in our management
15 system we need to get more flexibility. For instance,
16 with extending seasons, it's obvious that in a fall
17 season if there are many subsistence hunters that are
18 not getting their meat, they have not been provided
19 opportunity as required under ANILCA and that, at the
20 same time, if they did have a successful fall hunt in
21 the existing season, it wouldn't need to be extended,
22 but we can't wait until the next meeting to extend that
23 season.

24

25 So somehow we've got to develop a
26 system where local managers could extend that season
27 when it was warranted. We can try to look ahead and
28 anticipate, but it's just too hard to do. I think the
29 same thing is coming up in the winter hunt from what I
30 hear up in the Allakaket where they're provided a
31 season but it's 40 below weather and nobody is able to
32 get out. So, again, they haven't been provided an
33 opportunity. If that was the case, somebody ought to
34 open that because there's not overharvest. Obviously
35 the resource is still there. They just weren't able to
36 get at it at that time.

37

38 I was recently at the Sustainable
39 Salmon Initiative, which is quite an education. They
40 had a meeting in Anchorage and they're learning more
41 about salmon. I guess one thing that came up that was
42 a concern there is they're trying to control the drift
43 fleet and find out where the interception is taking
44 place particularly of king salmon and so on. This last
45 year there was a fairly high harvest in one area way
46 out in the Aleutians and they weren't the immature,
47 they were larger salmon. So what they're trying to do
48 is move those areas around to avoid that interception,
49 but they've got quite a few mature salmon in that
50 intercept fishery out there, so I think we need to keep

1 watching those and hearing what's happening.

2

3 And in the river here, the recent Board
4 of Fisheries approval of the 8-inch mesh size is of
5 some concern to people, especially further upriver that
6 in the commercial seasons that are open down there, if
7 they're allowed to use up to the 8 inch, they're going
8 to be catching more of the large king salmon, which are
9 the spawners. Now in that intercept fishing most of
10 the catch is of jacks and smaller and it's incidental
11 and they're allowed to sell those. We need to consider
12 whether we need to get them to rethink that or not.
13 They eliminated that 8-inch mesh size when they began
14 the program to restore the chinook fishery in the river
15 and they closed all the commercial fishing and so on.
16 This recent action doesn't automatically open up, but
17 it allows the possibility of them opening it up again
18 and I know that's an area of concern.

19

20 I'll stop with that.

21

22 Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ray. Do you
25 have some comments, Don.

26

27 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's
28 good to be here this morning. I'd just like to kind of
29 reiterate on what Mickey was talking about too. The
30 special action proposals that we put in for the Nowitna
31 and Kanuti were not accepted by the Subsistence Board.
32 I have no qualms about that. I knew from the beginning
33 that we'd have to have more justification than that
34 because of the lateness in the year and, you know,
35 being able to -- how to differentiate between a bull
36 and a cow. I kind of had the feeling that some people
37 didn't want to really go for that particular hunt for a
38 bull moose in February or in March anyway.

39

40 So kind of in addressing the concerns
41 of the global warming and stuff, we are just going to
42 have to keep on with the proposal that -- we submitted
43 several proposals and one of them was to lengthen the
44 season of our hunting to about October 1st. That's
45 about all the comments I have on that.

46

47 We had a pretty good meeting and even
48 though most of the Board or a lot of the members
49 couldn't attend it, I think we came out and had a
50 pretty good meeting despite that. I don't know too

1 much about fisheries to want to comment on that at this
2 time.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. You've
7 got comments, Ron.

8

9 MR. SAM: Thank you very much. First
10 off, I alerted to everyone that I was going to resign
11 my chairmanship because of so many different
12 conflicting meetings and operations, all that small
13 stuff that you have a certain window to accept and take
14 advantage of from living out in the Bush. I've heard a
15 lot of good comments all year about how Jack ran that
16 meeting and all that follow-up. The only problem I had
17 with that was trying to sign off on a lot of these
18 proposals and paperwork. How the heck can I sign off
19 on this when I wasn't even there. Being from the same
20 area, Jack and I have always worked closely, so just
21 pick up the phone and sign off on what we think is
22 right.

23

24 As far as the late hunts, just like
25 Mickey's area, I think we got about five or six moose
26 out of 13. That happened on the last day of the
27 season, maybe just meeting the deadline for October
28 2nd, even though they extended that moose season to
29 October 2nd without special action request.

30

31 Again, the climate is changing and we
32 have two areas of fairly good moose population, but in
33 the fall time they're in the small tributaries just off
34 the Koyukuk that we can't get to. That's why we were
35 trying this March hunt, five day March hunt for bulls
36 only, but every morning you wake up and 48, 50 below
37 and then it warms up to about 35. That's way late in
38 the afternoon and people, once they go out, there's a
39 couple people that did go out and they kept seeing the
40 same cow moose that they saw on the way back. By the
41 time they got back, it was 40, 50 below. They had to
42 sit down by a stove and warm up for a good two or three
43 hours. So I think an extension could be more than
44 justified, but then again we'll have to work through
45 OSM and Kanuti Wildlife Refuge manager. He's been
46 trying his best to meet all our needs and concerns, but
47 if the weather doesn't cooperate, it just doesn't
48 cooperate.

49

50 Again, I would like to thank Jack for

1 running the meetings and carrying on through. That way
2 we develop some sort of consistency and continuity on
3 all our proposals and our concerns. I'd like to say
4 thank you and I'll be working with you the rest of the
5 day.

6

7

Thank you.

8

9

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ron. Yeah,
10 Ron and I have worked together very well on various
11 proposals and battles over many various years. I'm
12 willing to start pulling some of my weight here at the
13 front of the team.

14

15

Robert, do you have some comments.

16

17

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18 I'm just glad to be here in Anvik -- I mean Aniak.
19 Somehow I woke up this morning and I thought I was
20 home. I talked to the four tribes in our area, Unit
21 21, Anvik, Grayling, Shageluk and Holy Cross before I
22 came over here. Their concern was predation. It
23 seemed like the biggest issue here among the four
24 villages here. We're kind of like doing our in a sense
25 of direction. Again, the State doesn't want to come
26 out and help us with our predation problem here, so
27 we're kind of like looking at that in a different
28 sense.

29

30

Holy Cross, the chief there stated that
31 they're Y3 and 20 miles or 30 miles above Holy Cross is
32 Anvik, which is in Y4. They're looking at two 36-hour
33 or 38-hour periods and we have two 48's and they want
34 to know how we can address the window issue. I told
35 him that's pretty much State, but I would address it at
36 our meeting here.

37

38

Another issue that was brought up by
39 the three other villages is that the corporation lands
40 and Native allotments here, it seems like an issue
41 going on here for a long time, how are we to have our
42 own private land but still under State management here.
43 In talking with one of the chairman's here, maybe we
44 have to get a letter to AFN here to address this issue,
45 that our corporate and Native allotments should be
46 under Federal jurisdiction rather than the State
47 because we are not being protected enough here for our
48 own private land where guides, transporters, drop-off
49 hunts, is sometimes using these Native allotments that
50 are back off the river and they don't find out until

1 the winter time when they go to their camps that a
2 drop-off hunt has taken place inside their Native
3 allotment.

4
5 Moose is another issue here where we
6 and other tribes think that we're not getting enough
7 here. We have to share our meat with other people that
8 do not get their moose in the fall. I'd like to
9 elaborate a little bit more here, but I know that Carl
10 Morgan is waiting for his turn here.

11
12 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Robert. So,
15 yeah, those are some very important issues that you
16 brought out.

17
18 Carl.

19
20 MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Robert, for
21 being so considerate. We've got the same concerns.
22 It's amazing listening all the way from one end of the
23 table to here that we've got the same concerns here in
24 19A. In 19A we're a little bit different. We've got a
25 Tier II system where not all 19A is open for Tier II.
26 It's closed from Georgetown to Swift River, right where
27 19D starts. So it's completely closed. But there's a
28 lot of concern that most of our residents haven't got
29 their moose last fall. It's not that they didn't try.
30 They were out there a lot. The same concern I got and
31 the same issue they want to express, if we get this
32 Council or the Federal can do something with a little
33 help, maybe a letter to the State Board, that we need
34 to extend the season a little longer. I think we need
35 that opportunity because hardly any -- like you heard
36 the chief make his concern that they didn't catch no
37 moose. So a lot of the people in 19A didn't catch
38 their moose, even under Tier II. Some of them were
39 wondering if they could use their Tier II 19A to hunt
40 in 19B. They still can hunt in 19B if they get a
41 regular moose tag. It's just that they can't use their
42 Tier II tag.

43
44 Another big concern, and I'm glad Jack
45 brought this up, is Mulchatna. I don't know when was
46 the last time we got a caribou down here. Just go
47 right out here to Swift or toward Whitefish Lake or Big
48 Lake or towards the Buckstop Mountains. From 200-some
49 thousand to 70,000 to 40,000, that's scary. We've got
50 to know and we've got to do something before it's too

1 late.

2

3

4 Another big concern we've got, in a
5 sense, we're very subsistence oriented. We have no
6 moose, we've got no caribou hardly and now we've got an
7 eight-inch mesh issue down in Lower Kuskokwim that Ray
8 brought up. Most of the land down there is Federal
9 land. I think we've got something to say about that.
10 I thought the first priority to all the people is
11 subsistence, but it seems like the State likes to
12 forget that a little bit. It's not the first priority.
13 King salmon is our subsistence food. If you take that
14 away from us and open it up -- we're not saying that
15 they will use eight inch, but there's the potential of
16 using it. It's been okayed and that's scary. You know,
17 we fought long and hard up here to drop it down to six
18 inch because king salmon is the number one subsistence
19 fish for us up here and we're very concerned.

19

20 With that, thank you.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks a lot, Carl.
23 Do you have a comment, Robert.

24

25 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
26 Just a small thing that's been taking place since
27 November was the proposals that we had to work with,
28 middle Yukon, lower Yukon. It was a pretty hard-fought
29 battle here and it was pretty long and very intense and
30 a lot of man-hour times and one of the few people I
31 would like to recognize in the crowd here is Tim Andrew
32 from the lower Yukon who has helped us and worked with
33 the middle Yukon. I don't want to say pit ourselves
34 against the Eastern Interior, but we kind of like
35 joined up together and put our forces together and put
36 heads together and finally did beat these proposals.
37 Like I say, I want to be careful in how I say beat the
38 proposals, but I want to say we have to start up some
39 kind of a fish management committee among our RAC's
40 here and our AC's where we have to discuss the salmon
41 issue on the Yukon sometime in the near future, like
42 now.

43

44 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Robert.
47 My comments or my concerns are that the Board of Fish
48 did not address the fish size decline. YRDFA was going
49 to come to consensus on that. They did not come to any
50 consensus on that. My primary concern is that

1 everybody is just trying to pass the buck, so the fish
2 size decline has been stated by the various individuals
3 as being some kind of a marine decline.

4
5 Well, that's not the case with the chum
6 salmon. We have a selectivity with gear size for
7 chinook salmon that's showing a decline. Chum salmon
8 have not declined in size at the same time they live in
9 the same waters in the ocean. The chum salmon have not
10 declined in size, so it's very apparent that we have a
11 selectivity problem.

12
13 YR DFA is weighted toward a commercial
14 harvest component and the Board of Fish is oriented
15 toward a commercial harvest. I am very concerned with
16 a quarter point opening without any kind of runs. They
17 wanted 1,000 fish caught. The run was early and yet
18 they still caught in three hours 900 king salmon. They
19 would have vastly over-exceeded their harvest target.
20 I'm very concerned with the State of Alaska promoting a
21 commercial fishery on the backs of the subsistence
22 fishers.

23
24 I'm very concerned that the Board of
25 Fish and the Federal Subsistence Board have yet to
26 address the king salmon size decline. That's a very
27 concerning thing. I'm very concerned about the
28 Kuskokwim eight-inch gear.

29
30 My personal feelings is that the
31 proposal for six-inch mesh is too small. The correct
32 gear size for king salmon should be targeting around a
33 7.5-inch gear size. The 8.75-inch gear selects 30 to
34 60 pound king salmon, so you're straining the waters.
35 I feel that the State of Alaska is unwilling in the
36 last Board session to address this issue. The Federal
37 Board has to become very aware that this Council is
38 concerned about the eight inch use on the Kuskokwim
39 River and the 8.75-inch gear size on the Lower Yukon.

40
41 I'm also very concerned about the
42 allowance of spring/winter moose hunts. I feel our
43 Council is moving in the right direction, identifying
44 communities that are not meeting subsistence needs in
45 the fall hunts. Contrary to the special action request
46 rebuttal by the OSM Staff biologist, the moose are not
47 moving. They are breeding on time, but they are not
48 moving during the timeframes that we harvest, so the
49 moose numbers of harvest, the communities are not
50 harvesting at the customary levels. This Council under

1 805 of ANILCA, it's incumbent upon this Council to
2 identify communities, their subsistence needs and how
3 much moose they need. We are recognizing that we have
4 several communities that are not meeting their
5 subsistence needs in the fall hunts. Moving our
6 seasons back to the first of October helps. We also in
7 winter hunts access different pools of moose with more
8 economically viable means of transportation. Some
9 snow-go access burns way less gas than river boats, so
10 the snow-go is way more efficient, so economy of time,
11 effort and expense. If these subsistence communities
12 are not meeting their fall needs, we need to have March
13 hunts. We have proposals to allow March 1 to March 5.
14 I think our Refuge manager should be able to float
15 those. If the weather conditions are not correct for
16 harvest, stop the hunt, move it a little bit back.

17
18 Those are my concerns, so throughout
19 this meeting we're going to identify other issues.
20 We're going to move on to review and adoption of the
21 agenda. What do you feel about this agenda?

22
23 MR. SAM: Move to adopt.

24
25 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any discussion on
28 this agenda? I think there's some things that need to
29 be moved to the front of this. These Mulchatna
30 proposals, State proposals, should be moved up a little
31 bit in the agenda. I'm not sure, Vince, on this letter
32 to the AFN on encouraging the AFN to petition for
33 change of ANCSA and management of Native corporation
34 and allotment lands to be under Federal subsistence
35 management. Where would we put that on our agenda.

36
37 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. We could
38 put that under Regional Council business because you do
39 have all these wildlife proposals. I think the Council
40 needs to look at is that the best entity to send the
41 letter to. It may be a copy to them. Something you
42 need to think about. AFN, I believe, has already
43 positioned itself, I think, in support of this, so
44 they're not the decision-maker on this interpretation.
45 The law is that they're not covered by the Federal
46 government, so that would be something that would
47 probably be later on the agenda.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm very in favor of
50 that. It's apparent that the Federal Subsistence Board

1 cannot manage on the corporation lands and allotment
2 lands. I do feel the law has to be changed and AFN is
3 the large body Native entity to do that and I do want
4 to send that letter to AFN. Any other discussion on
5 the agenda here.

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Hearing none. All
10 those in favor of adopting the agenda signify by saying
11 aye.

12

13 IN UNISON: Aye.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

16

17 (No opposing votes)

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None. Approval of
20 our minutes from the Ruby meeting in October this last
21 fall.

22

23 MR. STICKMAN: Move to adopt.

24

25 MR. COLLINS: Second.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Has most of the
28 Council reviewed the minutes from that meeting. We
29 received these minutes from Vince quite a while ago.
30 They seem to be factual and concise. Those in favor of
31 adopting the minutes from the Ruby meeting signify by
32 saying aye.

33

34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

37

38 (No opposing votes)

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moving down to
41 timely organization and agency reports relating to
42 pending proposals. Vince.

43

44 MR. MATHEWS: This is in response to
45 what you did in Ruby in response to others. I believe
46 Koyukuk/Nowitna wants to present a PowerPoint
47 presentation on the status of the moose population and
48 that, which relates to proposals that are down below.
49 I also heard you talk about the Mulchatna proposals. I
50 don't know if Don has been able to connect. We've

1 somehow got to get a hold of our liaison, some message
2 to him to see where the Board of Game is. I don't want
3 to mislead you. I don't know if the Board of Game will
4 automatically take up your comments, but we'd have to
5 get a read-out on that.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are the phones down
8 here or what's the problem? Can you just get on a
9 regular phone?

10

11 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. Don Rivard.
12 What's happened is the lines out are busy. I'll keep
13 trying and hopefully it will happen.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We do have some
16 timely agency and organization -- are there any
17 organizations here from the Kuskokwim that want to make
18 comment early in our cycle. Go ahead, sir. Move up to
19 the mike here and state your name.

20

21 MR. KAMEROFF, JR.: Good morning. My
22 name is Nick Kameroff, Jr. I'm just getting in part of
23 the Advisory Committee here in Aniak, so I appreciate
24 your time and offer for me to come out and state a few
25 of my concerns I have. It's going to echo basically
26 what the Board is saying. I'd also like to share a few
27 other things as well. I was back there trying to make
28 notes because we had our meeting in January of '07 and
29 Board of Fish members heard our concerns here in Aniak
30 regarding the eight-inch fish gear. As you're all
31 aware, salmon is our summer subsistence priority food.
32 We target that. We eat that all year long. The Board
33 of Fish accepting the eight-inch gear for the Lower
34 Kuskokwim River, we're adamantly against that because
35 that targets the salmon stock that comes up our rivers
36 to breed as well as go all the way up the river to feed
37 our other people who benefit from the resource.

38

39 I'd like to note that we're opposing
40 that, but it's still after Board of Fish went out.
41 They had a caucus outside or something. They came back
42 in and they ruled against our wishes. I don't think
43 that was fair because it seemed like they came in with
44 their minds set up, heard all our concerns and when
45 they were done went ahead and voted against what
46 everybody in the Advisory Committee was suggesting.

47

48 Also, back to moose hunting. I don't
49 know, due to climate change or global warming, but I
50 think we need to change our hunting days. Either

1 later, move it from the 5th of September to 25th or
2 even the 10th of September to the 5th of October or
3 something. As you're all aware, it's getting so warm.
4 The moose don't travel until it's cold enough.

5
6 And then right out here for instance
7 last fall, the 20th was the end of our season. The
8 following morning three bull moose strutting out on the
9 island out there saying, hey, we know moose hunting is
10 over, we're here. So there's moose out there. Just
11 people don't see them and it's too warm. Also, my dad
12 and some other elders used to say they know the season.

13
14 I think those are my two main issues
15 and I'll like to also say that we try to work together
16 and not only as Advisory Committees but to the State
17 Game Board, everything, that we all agree that we have
18 to work for our resources for our future children
19 because those resources, once depleted and are removed
20 from the ecosystem, changes our lifestyle. There's
21 hardly any jobs out here and we depend on those
22 resources to help us survive throughout the winter.
23 I'm sure everybody knows that, so I'll just leave it
24 with that.

25
26 Thank you for your time.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. We
29 really appreciate your comments. Koyukuk/Nowitna
30 wanted to make a presentation. How does the Council
31 feel about that? Do you feel that that would be
32 instrumental in our deliberations early in the session?

33
34 Geoff.

35
36 MR. BYERSDORF: Mr. Chair, Members of
37 the Council. We did surveys in November and you've got
38 a couple proposals for our area that I think having
39 that information to make decisions would be helpful.
40 It's a PowerPoint presentation, so it's going to take
41 me a couple minutes to set that up.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Do we have
44 any other stuff we can be going over while you're
45 setting up or should we go to a break for a few
46 minutes. Five minute break.

47
48 (Off record)

49
50 (On record)

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'd like to bring
2 this meeting back to order. Go ahead, Vince.

3
4 MR. MATHEWS: Just so you get a timing,
5 Geoff will be presenting this. We got input from the
6 Board of Game. They're not taking up the Mulchatna
7 proposals until tomorrow, so it's your prerogative, but
8 you may want to move the Mulchatna issue up after any
9 of these timely reports. It's up to you, but that may
10 be the way you want to go.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, we would want
13 to do that. We do want to comment on those Mulchatna
14 proposals. We did comment in a roundabout way stating
15 to the Federal Subsistence Board that we're very
16 concerned about the Mulchatna Herd, but we do want to
17 comment on the proposals on the table.

18
19 Geoff's got a presentation here. I do
20 want to state before we get started that Geoff's going
21 to be leaving Koyukuk/Nowitna and maybe you could brief
22 us on where you're going. I would also like to tell
23 Koyukuk/Nowitna that we would like -- Geoff's done an
24 excellent job and we would like to maintain that kind
25 of involvement with this Council.

26
27 Do you want to say where you're going,
28 Geoff.

29
30 MR. BYERSDORF: Mr. Chair, Members of
31 the Council. Thank you, Jack. I appreciate your
32 comments there. My wife ended up taking a position
33 down in Anchorage, so I'm following her. I'm going to
34 be going to the Kenai Refuge and basically doing my
35 same position. I'm being transferred down to Kenai, so
36 I'll be the pilot and subsistence biologist down on the
37 Kenai. I'll be leaving in 12 more days.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Do you have
40 something to say there, Don.

41
42 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. I just wanted
43 to let everybody know we got through to the outside
44 thanks to Bill and we have Pete DeMatteo on the line
45 from OSM and Terry Haynes from ADF&G, so they're
46 listening in now.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Go ahead
49 with your presentation, Geoff.

50

1 MR. BYERSDORF: Mr. Chair, Members of
2 the Council. One thing I would like to do just before
3 I start this presentation, in listening to your
4 concerns there was a couple things that came up that I
5 wanted to make sure that we're all under the same
6 understanding here. Jenny's concern in regards to the
7 drift gillnetting in Federal waters during the last 18
8 hours of the period. One of the council members in
9 Galena approached me from the city council with this
10 same issue and I was able to work with the Louden
11 Tribal Council and Louden has submitted a proposal to
12 expand the drift gillnetting opportunity in the Federal
13 waters of 4B and 4C, so it's open during the same time
14 period as 4B, 4C, so that proposal is already in the
15 hopper so to speak. I just wanted to let you guys know
16 that.

17
18 The other thing in regards to Jack, I
19 believe you had some concerns, and Ron, with Allakaket
20 and the difficulty that they're facing with this March
21 1 to 5 bull only season. Mike Spindler called me at
22 home this weekend and I was able to work with him and
23 the Allakaket Tribal Council on Monday before I came to
24 this meeting in getting a special action request in for
25 the Allakaket Tribal Council. Don, that will be
26 waiting for your office when you get back.

27
28 MR. RIVARD: I have copies of it here.

29
30 MR. BYERSDORF: Okay. So that's
31 already been submitted. With that, I'll begin my
32 presentation.

33
34 What I was going to start off with here
35 is our moose surveys. We met in October. We didn't
36 start our surveys until November. There are several
37 different aspects to our moose surveys. I was going to
38 talk about the trend surveys that we did in November.
39 We're also going to discuss the twinning surveys that
40 we do in the spring, give a brief overview of the
41 population estimate in 2001 and 2004 and, lastly, what
42 I was going to talk about is we've got a Ph.D. student
43 from I believe UAF that's doing a research project on
44 the Refuge looking at calf performance on winter range.

45
46 First off, in regards to the moose
47 surveys, I was going to break it down. You've got a
48 couple proposals, one for 21B and another one. We've
49 talked about a special action request for 21D and 24.
50 This is the Nowitna River and it's a breakdown of the

1 trend count areas that we have on the Novi. These are
2 the areas that we fly every year to get our bull/cow,
3 calf/cow and yearling bull numbers.

4
5 This is our latest information from
6 2006. As you can see, it looks like the cow numbers,
7 which are in the dark purple on the bottom, are coming
8 up a little bit from what they were in 2005. Our
9 bull/cow ratio is currently 22 bulls per 100 cows. The
10 yearling recruitment is looking really good and our
11 calf productivity is also really good. The one thing I
12 would point out here, you'll notice on the side as far
13 as the observations what the scale is. We're talking a
14 total of only about 400-some individuals down in this
15 area.

16
17 Currently it's a stable population at
18 medium density in the Refuge. I know there's a
19 proposal and the Refuge has some concerns with the cow
20 population and the difficulty in the March hunt of
21 distinguishing between bulls and cows. So we're
22 definitely conservative as far as our cow management in
23 that area.

24
25 The other thing I wanted to point out,
26 in surveys this year, I've been flying surveys out
27 there for the last six years, this is the first time
28 that I have seen triplets. We had triplets on the
29 Novi, on the Dulbi and also on Treat Island. I talked
30 with Katherine Atla, one of the elders from Huslia, and
31 she was saying that's a really good sign as far as
32 things coming back.

33
34 This is the latest I have as far as the
35 moose hunter check station. As you can see, in 2003 we
36 had a spike in the number of hunters and that was the
37 year the State went to the drawing and registration
38 permits. So we ended up getting a lot of hunters
39 coming from the Koyukuk River over to the Novi. This
40 year, in 2006, we had a total of 133 hunters and they
41 took a total of 33 moose. The 18-year average for the
42 Nowitna is 143 hunters and 44 moose. This year we had
43 133 hunters and 33 moose, so it was about a 10 percent
44 decline in hunters and about a 20 percent decline in
45 the number of moose that have been harvested in that
46 area. We've also got a registration permit now on the
47 Nowitna and a drawing permit and I think that that has
48 decreased the number of hunters that we get out in that
49 area.

50

1 The Refuge allowed me this year to take
2 a plane out on the Novi while I was there at the check
3 station and I was able to successfully get upriver and
4 visit with a lot of the hunters out in there. There's
5 been some issues and I think Don is aware of this as
6 far as in the upper Nowitna with sport hunters coming
7 in there. We really didn't see that this year. I
8 spent a considerable amount of time in the upper river
9 and I came across two individuals in planes that we
10 were able to have some law enforcement actions taken
11 and that was about it.

12
13 This is the big one that I'm sure
14 you're all going to be interested in. This is the
15 Koyukuk moose trend survey areas. As you can see in
16 the upper area there to the northeast, that's the
17 Huslia Flats trend count area kind of in the middle
18 there. You've got the Dulbi and then you've also got
19 the Three-Day Slough. Down towards Koyukuk there's
20 Koyukuk, Pilot Mountain, Squirrel Creek and then
21 Nulato/Kaltag there's Kaiyuh trend count area there. So
22 this is what we fly. Every November we fly the trend
23 count areas.

24
25 And this is what we observed this year
26 in the Huslia Flats/Treat Island area. It looks to be
27 a stable adult population. Our bull/cow ratio is
28 really good at 38 per 100 and I think you're aware that
29 in the management plan it calls for a ratio of 30 per
30 100. The yearling bull recruitment was 10 and our calf
31 productivity was 34. It appears that the cow numbers
32 have been stable since 2001. Obviously we've got
33 excellent productivity. We saw 23 sets of twins when
34 we were doing the surveys this year.

35
36 One thing I wanted to point out,
37 historically, this is the highest calf/cow ratio in 11
38 years of surveys up there. The other thing I was going
39 to point out from there, I think you can see it, is
40 we've had an increasing bull/cow ratio. As I said
41 before, we observed triplets for the first time out in
42 Dulbi this year.

43
44 One thing I also wanted to bring up, I
45 think you're aware of the Huslia Wildlife Grant. One
46 aspect of that grant is that the tribe would hire
47 someone there and they also would hire a pilot and work
48 in conjunction with Fish and Wildlife Service in doing
49 some surveys. We were able to successfully do that
50 this year. We worked with Jack Wholecheese from the

1 Huslia Tribal Council and they hired a former ADF&G
2 biologist and they were able to do surveys in some of
3 the areas and help us out with that and it was very
4 successful this year and he's a very enthusiastic
5 observer, so that was good.

6

7 This is the Dulbi and Three-Day Slough
8 data. Again, you'll see stable cow numbers since 2001.
9 The calf productivity is 38 per 100 cows. We saw 38
10 sets of twins in this area. Historically, this is the
11 highest calf/cow ratio in Dulbi since 1999 and it's the
12 highest in Three-Day Slough since 1988.

13

14 We had good, but not great yearling
15 bull recruitment. Here also we're seeing an increase
16 in the bull/cow ratio. Right now it's 25 per 100 and
17 that compares to 17 per 100 in 2003. The Dulbi Slough
18 trend count area had 52 calves per 100 cows and it's
19 the highest ever recorded in that trend count area.
20 And Three-Day Slough does have an improving bull/cow
21 ratio, but it's still below the State objectives of 30
22 bulls per 100 cows.

23

24 As you guys are aware, in the past we
25 have had concerns about this population, but this year
26 it appears that we're having improving recruitment and
27 good productivity. The last thing I was going to point
28 out on here was that the Dulbi River, this is the first
29 time we've observed triplets in that area also.

30

31 Moving down south, this is the Koyukuk
32 River. Benedict Jones' area. Pilot Mountain and
33 Squirrel Creek. We've had stable cow numbers there
34 since 2001. We had good calf productivity, 21 per 100.
35 It has been higher in the last four years. The
36 yearling bull recruitment this year was 4.3 and that
37 has also been higher in the last four years. I think,
38 as Mickey would point out, this is a heavily harvested
39 area by local people and that's suppressing the
40 recruitment of the bulls. Overall, our bull/cow ratio
41 is 22 bulls per 100 cows. Biologically, we feel this
42 is adequate area and it's just indicative of a heavily
43 hunted population.

44

45 The Kaiyuh area that I'm going to show
46 you to the south has a higher bull/cow ratio, but it's
47 got low numbers of moose overall. I think one of the
48 things we're seeing here in 2003, 2004 and 2005, we had
49 really good productivity. Some of those cows are just
50 starting to come online. What we're finding is that

1 once they hit the 3-12 year old bracket, that's when
2 they really start throwing twins out. That's one thing
3 I think you're seeing to the north. We had a lot cows.
4 A lot of the regulations were changed in regards to
5 harvesting cows and those cows are now at a point where
6 they're throwing twins, so you're seeing that effect in
7 Huslia, Treat Island and Three-Day Slough.

8
9 This is the Kaiyuh Slough data. This
10 is Kaiyuh Flats, the 21D area that you guys put in a
11 special action request for. We've got stable cow
12 numbers. It's okay calf productivity, 21 per 100 cows.
13 It does have a high bull/cow ratio. That's one thing I
14 wanted to point out. There's 42 bulls per 100 cows,
15 but this is a low density population. We're talking
16 about 171 moose total for this area. Recruitment isn't
17 great. The other thing I wanted to point out here,
18 when I showed you the Huslia Flats data, as far as the
19 recruitment, the bull/cow ratios, the calf/cow ratios,
20 I'll show you a little bit later, but this area of
21 Kaiyuh Slough is about half of what you see to the
22 north.

23
24 There's been a dip in productivity in
25 this area and, again, I'd point out that there's a
26 younger cohort of cows from the past four years.
27 There's good production, but they're not as successful
28 in their productivity as some of the older cows. We
29 hope that as those cows come on line that there should
30 be an improvement in the recruitment in this part of
31 the population.

32
33 I was also going to talk about twinning
34 surveys. I think the one thing I want to point out
35 here is that the twinning rates have been increasing.
36 I think you're really seeing that up in the Huslia
37 Flats, Three-Day Slough, Dulbi area and that's due to
38 the good productivity that we had in 2003 to 2005 and
39 those cows, as I said before, are coming on line.
40 They're three and four year olds and they're throwing
41 out twins. What we've seen as far as the habitat in
42 the area, it's adequate habitat as far as being able to
43 support the population up there.

44
45 One of the big things that we've seen
46 as far as the factors limiting the population obviously
47 is predation and this is a picture -- when we were
48 doing twinning surveys this last spring, that's a very
49 large black bear on twins. Just took them right away
50 from the cow. What we saw this last year with black

1 bears, we haven't seen as many and that corresponds
2 with what some of the local people have been saying.
3 We think that because of the early spring and the low
4 berries that some of the black bears didn't make it.

5
6 The third thing I wanted to talk about
7 was give you a presentation and you may have seen this
8 before. It may be redundant. The population estimates
9 that we've done, the geospatial population estimates
10 for the entire area, from the Koyukuk all the way down
11 -- up in the Huslia/Hughes area, all the way down to
12 Kaltag, getting an estimate of that population. In
13 2004, when we flew these areas, we had an estimate of
14 7,900 moose, the bull/cow ratio was 30 per 100,
15 yearling bull was 12 and calf/cow ratios were 37. That
16 area of the Kaiyuh, and this is what I wanted to point
17 out before, is that it had a total of 1,400 moose and
18 the density is almost half of what it is to the north.

19
20 One of the other things I want to point
21 out here, in 2001 we flew 291 -- each one of those
22 units is a unit that we flew and counted moose in every
23 single one of those blocks that you're seeing there.
24 In 2004, we flew 452 units. I think what you're going
25 to see is it helped us get a better estimate of the
26 population in that area.

27
28 And this is just a comparison of those
29 two years when we did the population estimate. We
30 counted 8,900 moose basically in 2001, but there was a
31 lot of variance in there. It went all the way from
32 10,000 individuals to about 7,700 individuals. 2004,
33 obviously we flew more units. We got a tighter picture
34 as far as what the population was doing and we have an
35 estimate of 7,900. You can see the fluctuation on that
36 is a lot less than it was in 2001.

37
38 This is just all the trend count areas
39 combined, all the way from the Hughes area and the
40 Nowitna, everything combined, and I guess what I wanted
41 to show here is just that overall we're seeing a stable
42 cow population.

43
44 What I wanted to point out in this
45 picture, if you look at the black line towards the
46 bottom, what you'll see is a reflection from 1998 to
47 2001. The calf/cow ratios were way below the average.
48 In fact, what we see here is that there's some of the
49 worst calf/cow ratios that we've had in 25 years of
50 collecting data out there.

1 The five years since that time period
2 are a normal reflection of what we're seeing. What I
3 want to point out and I think what we're seeing as far
4 as the productivity throughout the Koyukuk is that '98
5 to 2001 cohort is moving through the population, so we
6 see some gaps as far as the age structure in the
7 population there.

8
9 So I guess the take-home message as far
10 as the moose population status that I wanted to convey
11 before you go through a couple of the proposals for our
12 area is that this ripple effect of poor productivity
13 and poor recruitment from the 1998 to 2001 has been
14 followed by really good productivity in 2002 to 2004
15 and 2006.

16
17 So the prime adults, primarily we're
18 talking cows here, that are out there are doing well as
19 far as the breeding and they're producing calves and I
20 think we're really seeing that this year in the Three-
21 Day Slough, Huslia Flats and Dulbi area. The northern
22 area of the Refuge and the middle area of the Refuge,
23 they're recruiting a lot of young moose. They're
24 becoming the prime adults and they're following through
25 as far as productivity and recruitment into the
26 population. The southern area, that Pilot Mountain,
27 Squirrel Creek, the Kaiyuh, they're lagging behind.
28 They're having okay productivity. There has been a dip
29 in the yearling bulls. We expect that. That's a
30 heavily harvested population out there by locals. It's
31 just indicative of a younger population with lower
32 breeding potential. It's younger cows. They're not
33 throwing twins like they are up in the northern region.

34
35 The spring twinning rates that we've
36 been flying are good. It appears that the habitat
37 that's out there is adequate to support the population
38 that's out there currently. As I think we're all
39 aware, the possible limiting factors out there are
40 predators and we're seeing somewhat of an effect from
41 the deep snow in 2004 to 2005.

42
43 So, overall, we've got a stable adult
44 population, excellent productivity, but there are no
45 clear signs of growth at this point. Obviously our
46 area of concern is the Kaiyuh and we're recommending
47 conservative management as far as harvest goes.

48
49 Vince, I don't know if you want me to
50 just hold off on this. It's not really pertinent to the

1 proposals and I'm going to give a Refuge report
2 tomorrow.

3

4 With that, I'll end.

5

6 Thank you.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Does the
9 Council have any questions for Geoff about the
10 presentation.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have one question.
15 You talked about the bear numbers are down. Have you
16 flown a wolf survey inventory this late winter?

17

18 MR. BYERSDORF: If we get snow this
19 next two weeks, we plan on flying wolf surveys on the
20 Koyukuk. We did surveys on the Nowitna and I'll
21 present that data tomorrow. In 2004 we flew and got a
22 wolf estimate and compared that to the last time we did
23 it, which was 1996 and we didn't see much of a change
24 overall as far as the number of wolves and the pack
25 sizes and we're hoping to do the same thing in the next
26 couple weeks on the Koyukuk.

27

28 Again, thanks for bringing that up,
29 Jack. One of the other aspects of the Huslia Tribal
30 Wildlife Grant is that they would work in conjunction
31 with the agencies on doing some predator monitoring.
32 The Huslia Tribal Council is going to be hiring a
33 pilot, plane and they're sending Jack Wholecheese up to
34 help us with doing wolf surveys in that area.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any preliminary
37 numbers on harvest from Huslia or the local area there
38 on how guys are doing catching/trapping wolves?

39

40 MR. BYERSDORF: I haven't. I know of
41 one individual who took five this last month and that's
42 all I've heard. A lot of people were really
43 concentrating on martens because marten prices were up.
44 The Huslia Tribal Council has purchased a bunch of
45 snares and traps and such. That's how they're using
46 their money from the Tribal Wildlife Grant. They gave
47 1,500 each to the Hughes Tribal Council and to the
48 Allakaket Tribal Council. My understanding is that
49 those councils have used that money in different ways,
50 like buying skins and also buying the gas for the

1 trappers to go out. So far all I've heard of is the
2 five wolves being taken out of Huslia and there is an
3 individual in Galena that's taken three wolves so far.
4 That's all I know at this point though.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions.

7
8 (No comments)

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those moose numbers
11 look very encouraging. We've got the same conditions
12 up north where I live. We've got about a foot of snow
13 and the moose are really fat and there's been real good
14 survivorship of calves and yearlings. The cows are
15 looking really healthy right now. Even the bulls look
16 in excellent shape. The wolves are catching moose and
17 sheep and stuff. I caught two wolves. They've got fat
18 on them. I was surprised. I thought they'd have to
19 work a little harder, but they had fat on them. But
20 the moose population is ready to begin a turn. The
21 moose got through a real decent winter two years in a
22 row here and this is an especially good winter for
23 them, so I'm very encouraged by that.

24
25 Any other comments on this
26 presentation.

27
28 (No comments)

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't see any, so
31 we're going to keep moving through our agenda here. We
32 went into the winter moose hunt updates. We've been
33 told that Allakaket has a special action request in. I
34 feel time is of the essence with this particular
35 special action request. I would like the Council to
36 look at that special action request. I feel that our
37 Council should endorse that for the OSM that this hunt,
38 although meaning well, didn't happen because of cold
39 weather and acts of God, so to speak. So I feel people
40 are still in the same position, they still need to get
41 some meat, so I feel that we should endorse this and
42 OSM should give the Refuge manager authority to provide
43 another hunt timeframe within -- let's look this over
44 real quickly here.

45
46 MR. MATHEWS: While you guys are
47 looking it over, Wenona has some information on the
48 hunt that just worked out, so she may have some updates
49 on that that would relate to this special action
50 request.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Wennona.

2

3 MS. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For
4 the record, Wennona Brown representing Kanuti National
5 Wildlife Refuge. Mike did want me to express his
6 regrets for not being able to be here. He is wrapping
7 up and getting things cleaned up from being up there
8 monitoring the hunt. I did speak with him this morning
9 and he had a few things he would like to pass on to the
10 Council.

11

12 First, they had a moose hunters meeting
13 up there before the hunt opened and they had 27 people
14 attend the education session. He said he issued 20
15 permits to local hunters. There were no moose taken.
16 He said there were five people actively hunting that he
17 knew of, four from Allakaket and one from Bettles. He
18 said the temperatures ranged from minus 40 to minus 60
19 overnight. He said the warmest day it warmed up to
20 minus 10, but most days the warmest part of the day was
21 minus 15.

22

23 The Allakaket Tribe had approached him
24 about the special action request and he discussed it
25 with them and hooked them up with Geoff to get that
26 submitted.

27

28 I don't know what the timeframe is on
29 that for OSM taking a look at it and doing any kind of
30 action, but we figured it was probably going to be a
31 couple weeks before that have any action. One thing
32 Mike wanted to emphasize was opening the special hunt
33 to address the need in Allakaket has cost the Refuge
34 about \$10,000. That's not any money from anywhere,
35 that comes out of Refuge budget and a lot of that does
36 go to law enforcement.

37

38 He figures in order to have a
39 successful hunt you need two components. One is
40 education and really talk to the hunters on
41 concentrating on taking the bulls and not the cows
42 because the population can't sustain a cow harvest.
43 And then also having the law enforcement portion to
44 back that up.

45

46 So one of the concerns he would have
47 about a later hunt would be whether or not they could
48 again mount a good law enforcement effort to cover the
49 hunt. At this point they're doing some checking but
50 they don't know. If it comes about and if it's

1 approved, when it would be and then just checking with
2 all the various law enforcement officers as to who
3 would be available to assist with that hunt.

4
5 Another aspect particularly with the
6 law enforcement is that the State was opposed to the
7 hunt, so we're trying to be very careful that if we
8 take animals, that they're only taking bulls. So that
9 is a very important aspect of this hunt.

10
11 He also wanted me to emphasize that he
12 agreed to open the hunt because the need in Allakaket
13 this year, that the local residents only got about one-
14 third of the moose that they normally get, so he wanted
15 to emphasize that he doesn't want to see this become
16 the expected every year because it was addressing a
17 perceived need this year. He would hope in the future
18 that most people will be able to get their hunts during
19 the regular seasons in the fall. That would be the
20 ideal situation. Particularly, also, because not
21 everybody in Allakaket was actually up on board with
22 the bulls only hunt. There again we need to be very
23 careful with how we conduct hunts up there.

24
25 I think that was really about all I
26 have to bring up at this point unless you have
27 question. I'll save the rest until the Refuge report.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Wennona.
30 Do you have questions or comments, Ron.

31
32 MR. SAM: Just a comment. When Wennona
33 mentioned that all the people weren't in total favor of
34 a bulls only hunt, she's right. It was expressed to me
35 that, you know, some of those hunters have no use to
36 hunt because the planes are flying over them all the
37 time. They chase moose away like they did a good
38 portion of last fall during the law enforcement part of
39 it. The area was so well flown that they stated a lot
40 of the moose that might have been available for
41 harvest, they were pretty much chased back into the
42 woods by observations of our law enforcement. I have
43 to admit the law enforcement played a major part in
44 establishing this hunt, so there is a give and take.
45 It's just a matter of finding a happy medium sometime.

46
47 Thank you.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There's a need to
50 maintain the bull harvest and the people understand

1 that. Enforcement to that degree is probably not
2 entirely necessary. What we talked about in Ruby is
3 that the people would check the moose in at Allakaket.
4 Did they discuss that aspect, checking the moose in?

5
6 MR. SAM: Yes, they have an agent who
7 sells the tickets and is aware of all these permits
8 that are out there and it was agreed that he would
9 check every moose harvested to see that it is a bull by
10 the head or the sex organs.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So, you know, I can
13 see how enforcement is a little concerned in
14 maintaining the bulls only, but interfering with the
15 hunt and basically buzzing the moose out of -- you
16 know, if a guy is sneaking up on a moose and the
17 enforcement wants to see if it's a cow or what, it's
18 precluding the hunt in general to have too much
19 enforcement. I feel that checking the moose in,
20 documentation of where the moose were harvested, post-
21 hunt flying all the trails. They can track any snow-go
22 down to a dead moose with ravens flying around it. I
23 mean there's no problem with post-hunt investigation.
24 Enforcement during the hunt and basically interfering
25 with the hunt could be kind of a problem. The winter
26 hunt is much easier to enforce than the fall hunt
27 because you can track.

28
29 I feel that the continuance of this
30 hunt, I feel that OSM should approve an additional
31 five-day hunt. I feel the Kanuti Refuge has gone -- I
32 highly commend them for spending money to implement
33 this hunt and assistance in furtherance of the hunt.
34 It's also necessary funding Kanuti for a continuance.

35
36 Do you have another comment there, Ron.

37
38 MR. SAM: Yeah, I'd like to commend our
39 Refuge manager, Mike Spindler. He's expressed his
40 concerns over this hunt. It was well understood he was
41 sticking his neck out really to establish this hunt in
42 the first place because the State was totally against
43 any kind of extra season or this March season hunt for
44 bulls only.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments
47 from Council Members. Don.

48
49 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
50 Wennona, I had a question. I believe you mentioned

1 something like a way for people to differentiate
2 between a cow and a bull. We discussed this when we
3 discussed the special action for the Nowitna and
4 Kanuti, and we also threw the idea around where we'd
5 bring in some elders or hold something like a couple
6 day seminar or something so local hunters would be able
7 to -- if the fear is that we're going to be taking
8 cows, then from elders or something to differentiate
9 between a cow and a bull. Do you guys have something
10 like that? I mean I have no -- I'm for this hunt and
11 I'm sorry we didn't get it, but one of the things that
12 I thought would have been beneficial is to hold such a
13 thing. So if the fear is we're going to be taking
14 cows, then let's discuss that. Do you have something
15 along there?

16

17 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chair, Councilman
18 Honea. Yes, they did hold a hunters meeting. Like I
19 said, Mike said 27 people came. They went over the
20 regulations and the hunting areas and how to
21 differentiate a cow from a bull. I think some of the
22 elders spoke. I think Councilman Sam was probably
23 there. Mike did say he felt that in principal the hunt
24 should work, particularly if some of the elders go out
25 with the younger hunters to guide and teach them. He
26 said several hunters that he observed himself said they
27 were being very astute in looking for bulls and passing
28 up the opportunity to take a cow. So he said in
29 principle it should work. I don't know if Mr. Sam has
30 any comments about the meeting. Unfortunately, I was
31 out of town and was unable to attend.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ron.

34

35 MR. SAM: Again, this meeting was
36 pretty well attended and it was driven into every one's
37 mind that this was a bulls only. It was also
38 understood that if there was one cow taken the hunt
39 itself would stop. It would just come to a complete
40 stop. Yes, because of the cold weather concerns were
41 expressed, so it was more or less decided to try to
42 team up some elders and some younger people to make
43 sure this was a bull harvest only.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, that's the
46 rub. If one person kills a cow moose, that stops the
47 hunt, so the community is going to be annoyed with
48 that, so it brings it around to where everybody is
49 either on board or there's going to be heck to pay. I
50 feel this hunt has various merits.

1 Back when this Council had fought for
2 an antlerless moose hunt up by Huslia, Mike Spindler
3 was Refuge manager down there and came up with -- we
4 went over criteria for determining bulls from cows.
5 There's some picture publications that they showed,
6 consultation with the elders in the village and pre-
7 hunt and then checking these moose in.

8

9 I feel that this winter hunt for bulls
10 only has safeguards and the State's opposition revolves
11 around the State's basically getting winter hunts
12 stopped in interior of Alaska with the Game Board
13 process.

14

15 That's the area biologist's opinion, is
16 that a winter hunt should not occur and it's not a
17 customary and traditional practice for winter hunts not
18 to occur. When I was a kid in Galena, people hunted
19 moose in winter time. So the bottom line is it gives
20 access to pools of moose that are not harvested in the
21 fall time. You can get the moose that aren't normally
22 harvested in the fall hunts with boats.

23

24 So I feel this special action should be
25 endorsed, it should be moved to the highest priority at
26 the Office of Subsistence Management to review so the
27 Refuge manager has the authority to implement a second
28 hunt before the end of March, when weather
29 accommodates. So I would entertain a motion to endorse
30 the special action request by Allakaket Tribal Council.

31

32 MR. SAM: So moved.

33

34 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

35

36 MR. HONEA: Second.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
39 discussion.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
44 the motion signify by saying aye.

45

46 IN UNISON: Aye.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

49

50 (No opposing votes)

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Unanimous vote. I
2 would like the Office of Subsistence Management to
3 implement this in the most timely of manner.

4

5 Go ahead, Don.

6

7 MR. RIVARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
8 Don Rivard with the Office of Subsistence Management.
9 The Refuge manager has the authority to call a March
10 1st through 5th hunt or not. It's outside of those
11 dates now, so it's going to have to go before the
12 Federal Subsistence Board. The OSM doesn't have the
13 authority to make the call. It's going to be the
14 Federal Subsistence Board. As you can see, we just got
15 this in yesterday and it's before you. It's good
16 timing, actually, that you guys get a chance to weigh
17 in on it and do what you've done.

18

19 Pete DeMatteo will be the lead on this.
20 He and I talked about this yesterday when we saw it and
21 he may have some comments here and he may have some
22 questions that he wants to clarify if that's okay at
23 this point.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's fine.

26

27 MR. RIVARD: There will be an analysis
28 that's done and then this will go to the Staff
29 Committee and then to the Federal Subsistence Board. I
30 think one of the things Pete wanted to find out is what
31 were the dates that they are looking at now. Pete, do
32 you have anything?

33

34 MR. DEMATTEO: Thank you, Don. Mr.
35 Chair. The question I have is what are the
36 temperatures up in that part of the river now? In
37 other words, what are the proposed dates for the
38 emergency hunt? Do you want to wait for the cold snap
39 to be over? I guess that would be one option. Another
40 option would be to just go ahead and pick dates and
41 hope for the best. The third option would be to
42 request that the Federal Board give the authority to
43 the Refuge manager to open the season when the cold snap
44 is over. Unless someone has something else to offer,
45 those are the three options that I see.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pete. Those
48 are pertinent questions. Did you want to answer that,
49 Ron.

50

1 MR. SAM: I did not speak with anyone
2 because the hunt was still going on and we were hoping
3 for warmer weather on the last two days but that never
4 happened. If you watch statewide news, you'll notice
5 that it's registering between 27/28 below up at Bettles
6 and every time we get that we'd check our thermometer
7 and we're always 10 to 15 degrees colder at Allakaket
8 because of no wind, no air movements. I'd say any time
9 toward the end of this month would be fine. Again, I
10 haven't met with anyone, but this is something that
11 we're throwing out because of lack of any better
12 options at this time.

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ron. My
15 personal feeling would be to give the Refuge manager
16 authority to consult with the tribal council when the
17 weather breaks and everybody feels that it's a good
18 time to start. The same stipulations and permits. The
19 cost will be much lower. It's my opinion, knowing
20 about caribou and moose and so forth, that those bulls
21 are getting in better shape every day as the time go
22 on, so caribou keep gaining muscle bulk and weight as
23 time goes on. They get better. The process would seem
24 there would be a lag time and then at least happen in
25 the last two weeks of March. I would feel that the
26 Refuge manager's authority to work with the tribal
27 council would be in order.

28
29 Any further questions, Pete.

30
31 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. My question
32 is, are we modifying the special action request to give
33 Refuge manager authority to open the season at a date
34 later this month in consultation with the tribal
35 council in Allakaket, is that correct?

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It would seem to be
38 the process that the Federal Board would have to
39 authorize that authority, so the special action request
40 is not quite clear about all the ins and outs. We just
41 want this hunt re-implemented because of precludance
42 from cold weather. The Refuge manager is on the
43 ground, in the air and been working with the people and
44 should have the authority to work with the tribal
45 council on when to reimplement the hunt.

46
47 MR. DEMATTEO: Thank you.

48
49 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Another point on this,
4 this is actually the flexibility that we've been
5 looking for, so it gives it a chance to try it out and
6 maybe in the future, instead of being so specific about
7 dates there can be a general time period and then allow
8 the manager to do it. So we could kind of monitor this
9 to see how it works because that may be what we need
10 for the future.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's exactly
13 right, Ray. I failed to catch that, that we might have
14 bad weather. So a range for the Refuge manager to
15 implement in consultation with the tribal council, that
16 would be prudent on our part. I feel that in the
17 future we should have a broader -- that had been in
18 place on the winter hunts down around Koyukuk. They
19 had floated those dates. They could adjust because
20 we've had that cold weather problem before. So that's
21 true. In the future we should set opening date ranges
22 with a five-day season.

23

24 Vince.

25

26 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. Pete, I
27 think you were asking if the Council would endorse
28 this, that the manager would be given the authority to
29 set the dates after consultation. Is that where you
30 were going, Pete?

31

32 MR. DEMATTEO: Correct. Mr. Chair, I'd
33 like to take away from this meeting what the Council is
34 endorsing. We already have the request, but these
35 finer details, I have to walk away from the meeting
36 with it. What exactly are you endorsing as far as the
37 finer details? If I understand correctly, you're
38 saying that you would support that authority being
39 given from the Board to the Refuge manager to open the
40 season when the weather is a little more milder in
41 consultation with the tribal council.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's exactly what
44 my opinion is.

45

46 (Council nods affirmatively)

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm getting head
49 shakes from the Council here.

50

1 MR. MATHEWS: I just wanted it on the
2 record that the Council endorsed that as a group this
3 consultation and date, so then Pete can convey that to
4 those that are here. We do have a Staff Committee
5 member present here that will be addressing this
6 proposal when it gets to that level.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Don.

9
10 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. What I've
11 heard from you is that it sounds like your Council may
12 be putting in a proposal during the next wildlife cycle
13 to maybe make this March hunt still five days but maybe
14 flexible during a certain timeframe.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. It's my
17 opinion with the climatic change and the hardship that
18 people are having to go through and the customary and
19 traditional practice of harvesting moose in winter,
20 that this Council would like to have winter hunts.
21 This is a template hunt thanks to Refuge Manager
22 Spindler that we're working out the details to be
23 implemented. As these moose populations begin to grow,
24 it's imperative that we need to provide for the
25 subsistence users and this Council has identified that
26 there's lack of harvest and that's documented. So
27 we're working out the finer details. This is an
28 excellent test case for how to implement these winter
29 bull hunts. Any further comment on that. Vince,
30 you've got a comment.

31
32 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. We were all moving
33 in the same motion that this should be a continuation
34 of the March 1 to 5 season that didn't succeed. The
35 action that the Council has done is outside that. I
36 shouldn't say the Council did. Allakaket is outside
37 that. It's a special action and you just went through
38 two special actions that were considered not meeting
39 the threshold. So to empower your motion to endorse
40 this action, I just have to cover with you what is
41 considered a special action and then you can see if you
42 want to add into that justification.

43
44 Basically the Board will accept
45 requests for changes in seasons, methods, means, et
46 cetera, only if there are extenuating circumstances
47 necessitating a regulatory change before the next
48 annual cycle for proposals.

49
50 Extenuating circumstances include

1 unusual and significant changes in resource abundance.
2 That's one. Two, unusual conditions affecting the
3 harvest opportunities that could not reasonably been
4 anticipated and potentially could have significant
5 adverse effects on the health of the fish and wildlife
6 populations or subsistence uses.

7
8 I'm not trying to make this
9 bureaucratic, but you don't meet until all this has
10 been done, so you may want to address these. It's your
11 election to give justifications for these extenuating
12 circumstances. Pete is aware of it and the Staff
13 Committee will be and eventually the Board will be.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ron.

16
17 MR. SAM: These circumstances, of
18 course, as to weather, that one is already understood
19 and it should be written. As far as justification
20 goes, we've always had an antlerless moose hunt within
21 this timeframe except -- we still have it on the book
22 except that we agreed to not harvest antlerless moose
23 during the last three or four years that we haven't
24 been able to hunt in March. So that hunt has always
25 been in existence. It's just that we're changing it to
26 bulls instead of cows for, number one, low moose
27 density.

28
29 I cannot see any opposition to our
30 request because we've always had historically and
31 otherwise, we've always had this hunt in existence,
32 only it was for antlerless moose that we agreed not to
33 hunt the last few years. It's always been in the
34 books, it's still in the books and I believe that's
35 justification enough.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Ron. I
38 don't think Pete was on line at the beginning of our
39 meeting here. The proof in the pudding is that the
40 warmer falls are showing that the hunters are not
41 harvesting. Communities are harvesting at about one
42 third of their normal fall harvest. The moose are
43 breeding on time, but as far as the breeding regime has
44 changed, so bulls don't move around earlier in the
45 season, so the access the hunters have to the moose has
46 changed through climatic change. The extenuating
47 circumstance here is that the warmer fall temperatures
48 have precluded hunters from attaining their subsistence
49 needs in the fall time, so we need to accommodate --
50 805 of ANILCA is the Council is to identify subsistence

1 use, levels and needs and we've identified a lack of
2 66.6 percent lack in harvest of moose, so that is the
3 extenuating circumstance. That is why we need a
4 special action request. It did not take place, the
5 harvest did not take place on our March 1 bull hunt.
6 We do have extenuating circumstance here and we do need
7 this hunt continuance and the authority to be delegated
8 to the Refuge manager.

9

10 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Pete.

13

14 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. With this
15 particular special request, I think we can say it's
16 clear there's been a persistent extreme temperature
17 cold snap that's prevented hunters from accessing moose
18 hunting. I think we can also say that unless there's a
19 die-off in the next week or so or two weeks that the
20 population remains the same. That the population
21 determined by the Refuge manager can support the
22 additional harvest that will be brought in through the
23 March season.

24

25 So you have the extenuating
26 circumstance. As far as I know, there's no new
27 conservation concern that would preclude not being able
28 to open the season. So your point is well taken and I
29 will put those issues in the analysis when it goes
30 forward to the Board.

31

32 Thank you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you very much,
35 Pete. Any further discussion on this issue. I think
36 we've mulled that one over fairly thoroughly.

37

38 MR. MATHEWS: I think you may want to
39 take up the Mulchatna Caribou issue. I've already
40 prepped Pete on that, that it would be Proposal 23.
41 That way you're in line if we can get those actions to
42 the Board of Game. I apologize you're jumping around
43 your agenda, but it's Proposal 23. Then you'll have to
44 give us direction on what you want to do with the Board
45 of Game proposals. I believe Terry is still online, so
46 he can cover the State comments when they come up.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We do want to cover
49 these Mulchatna Caribou proposals. Time is of the
50 essence on those. What page in the meeting book?

1 MR. MATHEWS: 176.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So you're
4 going to make the presentation, Don?

5

6 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. Pete DeMatteo
7 is going to do No. 23. If he's not prepared to do it,
8 I can do it. Pete, are you ready for 23?

9

10 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. I'll be
11 presenting Proposal 23 and the analysis can be found in
12 your book beginning on Page 177. This proposal was
13 submitted by the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council
14 and requests the Federal regulations for harvest limits
15 of caribou in Units 9B and 17 align with current State
16 regulations. The open seasons would remain the same,
17 but harvest limits would be reduced from 5 to 3
18 caribou, would remove the restriction on a bulls only
19 harvest in the fall, and allow no more than one caribou
20 to be harvested prior to Nov. 30.

21

22 The Mulchatna Caribou Herd has
23 undergone a drastic decline in population due to a
24 combination of natural mortality, predation, and
25 hunting pressure, so the proposed changes are aimed at
26 maintaining a stable population. This action would also
27 align Federal harvest limits with the State regulations
28 which were adopted by the Alaska Board of Game in March
29 2006, effective for the 2006/07 regulatory year.

30

31 Note that the proposed Federal
32 regulation for Units 17A remainder, 17C remainder can
33 be found in your Council books differs from the
34 proposal as it initially appeared in the proposal book.
35 The areas designated as remainders in Unit 17A under
36 State and Federal regulations are not the same
37 geographical areas. Mr. Chair, if you'd refer to Maps
38 2 and 3, which can be found on Pages 183 and 184,
39 you'll see there is a difference. The remainder area
40 in the first map on Page 183, which is marked Map 2,
41 you'll see the area identified as remainder with a
42 dashed border line there. Then as it is in the
43 modified proposal, as you can see the remainder is the
44 area to the west of the original area.

45

46 The intent of the proponent was to
47 align with State regulations, which retain a harvest
48 limit of five caribou in a geographically comparable
49 area. So the revised proposed Federal regulation
50 reflects this as shown in your book.

1 When the Mulchatna Herd was growing
2 during the 1990s, there were liberal harvest limits and
3 long seasons to allow hunters the opportunity to
4 harvest surplus animals. Numerous modifications have
5 been made to these regulations, including, most
6 recently, reduction of the harvest limit under State
7 regulations that became effective for the current
8 regulatory year.

9
10 Last year, in March 2006, the the
11 Alaska Board of Game adopted new State regulations to
12 reduce harvest limits in Units 9, 17, 18, 19A and 19B
13 and to reduce the fall bull harvest. Results from the
14 most recent photo census conducted in July 2006
15 estimate the herd size to be 45,000 caribou. This
16 updated estimate, indicating a substantially reduced
17 herd size, will have considerable bearing on future
18 management decisions.

19
20 There are currently three Alaska Board
21 of Game proposals for the Mulchatna Herd to further
22 reduce and/or change harvest limits and open seasons
23 across the range of the herd. These proposals will be
24 considered by the Alaska Board of Game during its
25 current meeting in Anchorage.

26
27 The summary table of the Mulchatna
28 Caribou Herd population estimates a composition count,
29 which can be found on Table 1, which is on Page 185 of
30 your books. If you look at the very bottom there
31 showing the most recent surveys, you can see the
32 composition counts for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. The
33 composition size is 2,971. If we look at the
34 components, we can see varying results across there.
35 For instance, in the small bulls and medium bulls, the
36 small bulls we see there's been an improvement, a
37 slight improvement, but if we look at the medium bulls,
38 of course, they're showing a decline over the years.
39 The total bulls in general we're showing declines going
40 back to 1996-97.

41
42 So, Mr. Chair, not knowing any further
43 since this is a cross-over proposal, I can only say
44 that within the population some of the components are
45 showing a decline, some are showing some improvement.
46 The herd s range encompasses approximately 60,000
47 square miles including Units 9B, 17, 18 south, 19A and
48 19B. You can see this in Map 1 in your book.

49
50 The reported harvest figures for the

1 herd from 1999 to 2005, overall harvest has declined
2 and non-resident hunters have significantly declined as
3 well. While non-resident hunters slightly exceeded or
4 were roughly equivalent to resident hunters from 1999
5 to 2003, from 2003 to 2006, non-resident hunters have
6 decreased to about half or one-third fewer compared to
7 the resident hunters.

8

9 Mr. Chair, if this proposal is adopted,
10 the Federally-qualified subsistence users would still
11 have an opportunity to harvest caribou, but their
12 harvest limit would be reduced from five to three
13 caribou. The restriction on a bulls only harvest in
14 the fall would be liberalized to harvest of either
15 bulls or cows. The Mulchatna Herd s range also
16 includes portions of Units 18, 19A and 19B. Therefore,
17 if this proposal were adopted, the regulatory changes
18 should also take place in these units as well.

19

20 Mr. Chair, the preliminary conclusion
21 of the Staff analysis is to support with modification
22 to include Units 18, 19A and 19B. If you turn in your
23 books to Page 186, you can see the preliminary
24 conclusion.

25

26 The conclusion goes forward, based on
27 the Mulchatna Caribou Herd has declined, management
28 concerns necessitate a reduction in harvest. Including
29 the additional units in the modification would align
30 the harvest limits and open seasons with State
31 regulations across the range of the herd.

32

33 Mr. Chair, the Staff modification in
34 Unit 18 mirrors the State regulation, so it shortens
35 the season by one month, from April 15 to March 15.

36

37 I'll also point out, Mr. Chair, the
38 Bristol Bay Council voted to adopt the Staff
39 recommendation. Their intent was to align with the
40 State's current regulation, not necessarily with the
41 Board of Game might adopt it in the current meeting
42 that's taking place in Anchorage.

43

44 With that, Mr. Chair, I'll stop there
45 and answer any questions.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does anyone have any
48 questions for Pete. Ron.

49

50 MR. SAM: Yeah, Pete. Ron Sam. Did

1 you say Bristol Bay adopted the Staff recommendation?

2

3 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes, Mr. Chair. Bristol
4 Bay Council voted to adopt the Staff recommendation.
5 Their intent was to align with the State's current
6 regulation, not necessarily with what the Board of Game
7 might do at its current meeting that's being held in
8 Anchorage. The Bristol Bay's comments indicate that
9 they are not in favor of a one caribou harvest limit
10 for the Federal subsistence regulations. If the State
11 decides the situation is dire enough to reduce the
12 harvest limit to one caribou, then the Council would
13 like all non-resident seasons eliminated.

14

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have not reviewed
18 the State Proposals 76 through 80 and 209. Are there
19 proposals to eliminate non-resident harvest in those
20 proposals?

21

22 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, I'll refer
23 you to Mr. Mathews. I believe he has some information
24 pertaining to your question.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Vince.

27

28 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Sorry
29 to bounce the ball, but I think Terry is online with
30 the Fish and Game on that, so he may want to comment on
31 these proposals. Terry, the Council does have copies
32 of Proposals 77 through 80 and Proposal 209, if you're
33 online, Terry. If not, then we'll walk through them.

34

35 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
36 This is Terry Haynes in Fairbanks. I'm scanning
37 through these State proposals right now and I don't see
38 a proposal that would eliminate non-resident hunting.
39 However, depending on the severity of the issue, the
40 Board of Game could modify any of the proposals that it
41 will be considering at this meeting. If the harvest
42 limit has to be reduced significantly, which it may
43 well be, then just to accommodate subsistence uses
44 under the State regulations there may be a need to
45 consider serious reductions to non-resident hunting or
46 possibly eliminating non-resident hunting.

47

48 So I don't know just how the
49 discussions will go at the Board of Game meeting. For
50 that reason I'll just provide you with our comments at

1 this time. They're on Page 189 of your meeting book.
2 We can't take a position on this Federal proposal until
3 we know what action the Board of Game takes on similar
4 proposals pertaining to the Mulchatna Herd.

5
6 Our recommendation will be that the
7 Federal Board take action that matches action taken by
8 the Board of Game. We know that the population of the
9 Mulchatna Herd has significantly declined and that
10 there probably will be further reductions made to the
11 harvest limit in State regulations. Just how the Board
12 of Game may deal with making those reductions we
13 certainly can't say at this point. Our position on
14 this proposal will be based on what Board of Game does
15 on Mulchatna Caribou proposals. Thank you, Mr.
16 Chairman.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for that
19 information, Terry. Those deliberations are critical
20 as to what is going to happen with this decline of the
21 Mulchatna Caribou Herd. My feeling is that the Federal
22 Subsistence Board should be very concerned with this
23 and this Council stated that last fall in letter form
24 to both the State and Federal Board.

25
26 These proposals here I would concur
27 myself with the Bristol Bay Regional Council that it's
28 imperative that the State of Alaska curtail
29 non-resident harvest, its bull harvest. I know they
30 need the money from it, but this population is in a
31 nose-dive and they need to curtail bull harvest. Those
32 bull/cow ratios are less than 50 percent of what's
33 necessary for a breeding component. This herd is in
34 decline because of those low bull/cow ratios. It's
35 very, very apparent.

36
37 So I would like to work through these
38 Federal proposals here, but I also feel that this
39 Council should transmit to the State Board of Game, who
40 is deliberating at this time, that it's imperative to
41 arrest this bull/cow ratio decline, recover that to 30
42 bulls per 100 cows in the most expeditious manner. So
43 that's the direction I would like to take with our
44 deliberations on the Mulchatna Herd.

45
46 We're going to go back to our Proposal
47 07-23. I would like to discuss this proposal. Do I
48 have a motion to adopt this proposal and we'll work
49 through this proposal.

50

1 MR. SAM: So moved.
2
3 MR. STICKMAN: Second.
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.
6
7 MR. COLLINS: I'd like to make a
8 comment too that as we view this decline in here it's
9 obvious that the more dramatic decline is in the number
10 of large bulls and that is not the fault of subsistence
11 hunters because they do not target those large bulls.
12 So that distortion in the harvest has to be due
13 basically to the non-resident or the sport hunters who
14 are targeting large bulls because it wasn't a decline
15 overall. It shows up more there. In light of that,
16 the subsistence harvesters should not pay the same
17 penalty. In other words, they need to limit the
18 harvest where the problem is coming from and not start
19 cutting subsistence hunters off because they didn't
20 cause that distortion in the harvest.
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I would
23 agree with you, Ray. Vince.
24
25 MR. MATHEWS: This is a good
26 opportunity to help Jenny on this and you guys are
27 doing it, but it sometimes helps to go through -- on
28 the back of your name tag is the procedure for going
29 through proposals. You don't have to do it exactly
30 that way, but it definitely helps. For Jenny, it's a
31 good training opportunity. You already did number one.
32 The proposal was introduced. Presentation of the
33 analysis. We've had Agency comments. I believe Fish
34 and Game have commented on this proposal. We do have
35 comments from Federal Agencies here that I can share
36 and then we'll go into if there are any other groups
37 that want to comment, and then we do have comments in
38 from a local Subsistence Resource Commission on this.
39 So, Mr. Chairman, however you want us
40 to proceed, but we're ready to share some other
41 comments and the Park Service may have some additional
42 comments that I'm not aware of.
43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We'll go
45 through additional comments. You've got a comment,
46 Ron.
47
48 MR. SAM: I've got a question for Ray.
49 Ray, would you be in favor of adopting the Staff
50 recommendation the same way that Bristol Bay voted or

1 did you want to go beyond that?

2

3 MR. COLLINS: I'm not sure what you're
4 asking.

5

6 MR. SAM: Because I'm ready to move
7 this proposal, adoption of this proposal, but if you
8 wanted to add on restrictions on non-resident hunters,
9 I'd like to hear that before I make a motion to adopt
10 this proposal.

11

12 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I think that would
13 be obvious in order to bring that balance back, that
14 that would be one way of achieving that, would be to
15 dramatically limit or eliminate the non-resident
16 harvest, one or the other. I mean if you've reduced
17 them to just one, the non-resident to just one, then
18 that would dramatically limit it. If that's not
19 enough, then eliminate that, I guess, is what I would
20 suggest.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Vince.

23

24 MR. MATHEWS: I think, to get the
25 record clear here, I think Ron was asking the second of
26 the motion was the motion going to be to support the
27 Staff recommendation with modification. That was one.
28 Two was to add in -- and I lost track of the discussion
29 on non-resident hunting. Was that where you were
30 going, Ron?

31

32 MR. SAM: Yes, I was trying to clarify
33 the motion so I can vote accordingly.

34

35 MR. COLLINS: I don't think I was the
36 seconder on that motion though, if that's what you were
37 looking for.

38

39 MR. MATHEWS: I think it was Mickey who
40 was the second on the motion. All we're trying to do
41 now is get a friendly amendment to put before the
42 Council the motion that you would support the Staff
43 recommendation as modified on Page 186, 187, plus a
44 reduction -- and I don't have the terms on that, so I'm
45 going to have to add it in, on the non-resident hunt.
46 Ron made the motion and the second needs to agree to
47 that.

48

49 MR. STICKMAN: Okay, I have no problem
50 with the amendments.

1 MR. SAM: One further question. What
2 would the main motion read then because I was ready to
3 move it.

4
5 MR. MATHEWS: The main motion -- I
6 didn't catch what you were going to do with the
7 non-resident because I was getting lunch ordered. So I
8 need clarification on the non-resident, what that
9 motion was, other than action needed to be taken to
10 address the bull/cow ratio, but I don't know what that
11 action was suggested and I apologize I was distracted.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My perception is
14 that this proposal is to reduce subsistence opportunity
15 for subsistence users and we want the Federal
16 Subsistence Board and the State Game Board to realize
17 that we're willing to take these reductions in
18 subsistence opportunity understanding that the primary
19 problem is overharvest of the large and medium bull
20 component by sport hunting and non-resident sport
21 hunting is a primary focus for large bull harvest. So
22 the concern is the non-resident hunting entity
23 accessing this steeply declining herd and harvesting a
24 component of the herd that is necessary for protection.

25
26 Did you want to make a comment, Steve.

27
28 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
29 I'm Steve Kessler. I work for the Forest Service, but
30 I'm on the InterAgency Staff Committee. We cover all
31 the issues across Alaska. I guess first of all I would
32 like to encourage you to follow the procedures on Page
33 2 where you hear all the different comments. I think
34 this must be what Vince referred to is on the back of
35 your name cards or something. I really recommend that
36 you follow through the process so that we make sure
37 that we have on the record all the comments that are
38 appropriate prior to the Council's deliberation.

39
40 Another comment I would like to make
41 because you have been addressing this already as far as
42 restricting non-residents in some way, I'd like to
43 remind you that we really don't have the authority in
44 our Federal process to restrict non-residents. We have
45 the authority to restrict non-Federally-qualified
46 users. So you can make a recommendation that these
47 areas be closed to non-Federally-qualified users, which
48 would include non-residents and it would also include
49 some residents, depending on the customary and
50 traditional use determination.

1 Based on sort of this discussion that
2 I've been hearing, it seems to me that what you really
3 have here is sort of two separate things. One is
4 you've got this Federal proposal that you want to deal
5 with and then you also have what's going on in front of
6 the Board of Game right now. The Board of Game has the
7 authority to restrict residents or non-residents in
8 this case. Perhaps what you might want to do is
9 address those two issues separately.

10
11 From what I hear, maybe that would help
12 you out. Address this proposal the way we can address
13 it, which is, first of all, do you want to match the
14 current State regulation, do you want to add on to that
15 a restriction to close Federal public lands to
16 non-Federally-qualified. That would be a change
17 through an amendment that you could do or to maybe your
18 original motion the way you were going. But as far as
19 talking about residents and trying to restrict
20 non-residents, that's a Board of Game thing that I
21 think you need to separate out.

22
23 One other points since I'm here is that
24 I was at the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council
25 meeting also and they discussed this for hours and they
26 had really good discussions. As Mr. DeMatteo said,
27 after a lot of discussion they voted to adopt the Staff
28 recommendation on Page 186 and 187 and were very
29 uncomfortable with what the ADF&G recommendation was in
30 Board of Game Proposal 76, if I'm not mistaken.

31
32 Anyway, I just want to maybe help you
33 out with what this Council can do in maybe the most
34 effective way to get through the two issues.

35
36 Thank you.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for your
39 comments, Steve. I appreciate that. That's my mistake
40 by getting the cart in front of the horse on the
41 procedure here. This is a very important issue and got
42 out in front of myself. I'll take responsibility for
43 that. We do want to go through the procedures so
44 nobody has any complaints. We do have this motion on
45 the floor to adopt this Federal Proposal 07-23. We do
46 want the other agencies to comment. The State is in
47 deliberation right now. Does the State have any
48 further comment on this proposal, Terry.

49
50 MR. HAYNES: No, Mr. Chairman. I think

1 I said everything I needed to say. Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Terry.
4 Any other Federal agencies. We've got the Park Service
5 or Togiak Wildlife Refuge, other Refuges down in that
6 area that want to comment.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None. Any Native --
11 okay, AVCP.

12

13 MR. ANDREW: Mr. Chairman, Members of
14 the Regional Advisory Council. Thank you for the
15 opportunity to testify or have a comment on this
16 proposal today. My name is Timothy Andrew. I'm the
17 director of wildlife resources for the Association of
18 Village Council Presidents based in Bethel. We
19 represent a pretty good size number of villages that
20 utilize the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. We are very
21 concerned about the population decline from 200,000
22 down to 43,000, where the population is today. It only
23 took seven years for the population to crash by
24 approximately 160,000 animals.

25

26 We realize there are various causes for
27 the decline. At the most recent Board of Game meeting
28 in Anchorage we did testify that we were in support of
29 the State of Alaska to reduce the resident harvest down
30 to one animal. With the current State regulation or
31 State law, the resident hunter can be anywhere, from
32 Anchorage, from Fairbanks, can be from Juneau.

33

34 So we did advocate for that, but we did
35 not support the State of Alaska in keeping the
36 non-resident season open for that 15-day period
37 primarily because it conflicted with State law. I
38 believe it was 16.05.258, Section 3 and 4, which called
39 for the State to manage its resources for sustainable
40 populations and second for subsistence.

41

42 We do support the more liberal harvest
43 for the Federally-qualified user primarily because our
44 people from our area are extremely dependant on this
45 resource. For the lower portion of the Kuskokwim
46 River, we are currently in a moose moratorium, so,
47 therefore, the limitation of the caribou would severely
48 affect those people in that area. On the Federal side,
49 we would definitely support the more liberal harvest
50 quota.

1 The other thing we would advocate for
2 is for the closure of Federal public land to the non-
3 qualified Federal user as well. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Timothy.
6 You had some very important comments there and I very
7 much appreciate those. Any questions for Tim. Ron.

8
9 MR. SAM: I missed part of it because I
10 was trying to clarify my motion. Are you in favor of
11 adopting the Staff recommendation or you wanted to
12 change it?

13
14 MR. ANDREW: Through Mr. Chair. Yes,
15 we are in favor of adopting the Staff recommendation
16 along with the closure to the non-Federal qualified
17 user as well. In reviewing some of the publications
18 from the Department of Fish and Game, it did indicate
19 from 79 to 85 percent of the harvest of the Mulchatna
20 Caribou is via airplane. As you know, a lot of people
21 within our villages within Units 17, 18 and 19, not a
22 whole bunch more people are users of airplanes to
23 harvest caribou. This is primarily non-resident and we
24 would support the closure to non-resident.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
27 questions.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Any
32 other Native organizations that want to make comment.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There's InterAgency
37 Staff Committee comments.

38
39 MR. KESSLER: I made them.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Made those. So we
42 have the neighboring Regional Councils, but we've heard
43 what Bristol Bay has done on this proposal. Does the
44 local Advisory Committee want to make comment on this
45 proposal.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have a
50 position on the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

1 MR. KAMEROFF: Thank you. I appreciate
2 this opportunity again. My name is Nick Kameroff once
3 again with the local Advisory Council. I believe
4 adopting this resolution or proposal going through will
5 probably benefit our people. I would stress that we
6 need to, as stated, stop the non-Federal user, which is
7 the non-resident hunters, and try to keep the resource
8 for the subsistence users in the area.

9
10 Thank you.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Nick. Did
13 the Resource Commission take up this proposal at all.

14
15 Vince.

16
17 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Lake
18 Clark National Park Subsistence Resource Commission did
19 take up a whole series of proposals, including Proposal
20 23, which is to revise the caribou harvest limits for
21 9B, 17A and 17C. The SRC supports reducing hunting
22 pressure on the Mulchatna Caribou Herd to reverse the
23 declining population trend and allow the number of
24 animals to stabilize. So, according to this, they
25 support the proposal as written.

26
27 Mr. Chairman, that's the only
28 Subsistence Resource Commission that took this up.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have written
31 public comments on this proposal at all?

32
33 MR. MATHEWS: No, Mr. Chairman, there's
34 no written comments that I know of.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we have the
37 motion on the floor to adopt the proposal. The
38 discussion revolving around non-resident use, I feel in
39 the justification it should be strongly recommended to
40 the Federal Subsistence Board that if the State does
41 not close the non-resident harvest and non-Federally-
42 qualified -- well, I don't want to go into the non-
43 Federally-qualified. That's a completely different
44 proposal.

45
46 What I'm stating is that if the State
47 of Alaska Board of Game does not close the non-resident
48 component, which is strictly targeting bulls when we
49 have a terrible bull/cow ratio, it's showing the non-
50 commitment to sustained yield and that this council

1 will submit proposals to close the Federal lands to
2 non-subsistence use within the Western Region. I want
3 that clear to the Federal Subsistence Board in the
4 record.

5
6 Any further comment on the proposal by
7 the Council. Vince.

8
9 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, it might be
10 good to -- lunch should be here any second. I don't
11 know if the Council Members are all clear on what
12 motion is on the table, so we may need to get that
13 clear. What we're struggling with is when you say move
14 to adopt the proposal, that's as submitted. But, for
15 Staff, we need to know if you're moving to adopt the
16 Staff recommendation or whatever else it is. But when
17 you say move to adopt the proposal, that's as it's
18 submitted, nothing else.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ron.

21
22 MR. SAM: My original motion was to
23 adopt the proposal as modified by the Staff Committee
24 and that we go ahead and adopt this proposal consistent
25 with the Bristol Bay Regional Council.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The second is in
28 agreement.

29
30 MR. STICKMAN: Yes.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have a
33 comment there, Carl.

34
35 MR. MORGAN: I was just going to make
36 the comment that also with the State of Alaska
37 sustained yield policy that they've got in law in the
38 books that we should also remind them what is the top
39 number one priority that they always come out and say.
40 Let's implement the priority system that you brag about
41 that you support. Subsistence first and foremost. All
42 other users next in line. I would just like to remind
43 the Board of Game to live up to their priority system
44 that they have implemented.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Comment well taken,
47 Carl. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game, by
48 endorsing a non-resident harvest in a declining herd to
49 this degree is showing that they're not committed to
50 sustained yield management and I feel it's incumbent

1 upon the Board of Game to arrest this and implement the
2 sustained yield management and the State subsistence
3 law. We can't deal with that, but if they don't show
4 that commitment, then the Federal Subsistence Board
5 process and the Council system shall act in favor of
6 the resource and the subsistence users in the future.

7

8 The motion is before the Council to
9 adopt the Staff Committee amendment as adopted by the
10 Bristol Bay Regional Council. We have justification
11 for the declining herd. The Board is well aware of
12 that.

13

14 Those in favor of the proposal signify
15 by saying aye.

16

17 IN UNISON: Aye.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

20

21 (No opposing votes)

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's unanimous
24 consent. So it's probably time to break for lunch.
25 Vince.

26

27 MR. MATHEWS: On the lunch, what we've
28 done, based on recommendations from Angie and others,
29 we got sandwich stuff to make. It's on its way. Tina
30 and I will be chasing you down to help contribute for
31 that, but you'll be making your own sandwiches from the
32 Hound House. Heather Hildebrand with Kuskokwim Native
33 Association is helping put that together. She should
34 arrive any second here.

35

36 Thank you.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We'll break
39 for lunch.

40

41 (Off record)

42

43 (On record)

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to come
46 back to order here and continue with this Mulchatna
47 Caribou issue. Where are we at here, Vince.

48

49 MR. MATHEWS: I think where we're at
50 now is looking at if you want to take up the Board of

1 Game proposals. I put those in your folder thing, 76
2 through 80 and then Proposal 209. I believe Terry is
3 still on line if there's questions about these
4 proposals.

5
6 What we heard this morning, the Board
7 of Game is probably going to take them up tomorrow, but
8 that's just a guesstimate. We have not heard from our
9 liaison that they have taken them up, so that may
10 indicate that they're truly going to get to them
11 tomorrow.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are you still
14 online, Terry.

15
16 MR. HAYNES: Yes, I am, Mr. Chairman.
17 I don't have any additional information regarding when
18 the Board is taking up the Mulchatna proposals. If I
19 hear anything, I'll be sure to pass it on.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you.
22 The State proposals will have a large effect on the
23 Mulchatna Caribou Herd. I've looked these proposals
24 over. My primary concern is inclusion of non-resident
25 harvest. So I would like to discuss with the Council
26 to transmit a letter to the State Board of Game stating
27 the need for restrictions in the harvest of Mulchatna
28 Caribou and the need to eliminate non-resident harvest
29 of caribou. I would also like to make the Board of
30 Game aware that it's the intention of the Western
31 Interior Council to submit a closure to non-Federally-
32 qualified subsistence users next cycle if they do not
33 arrest the high harvest of bull caribou in the
34 Mulchatna Caribou Herd. Is there a discussion on these
35 State proposals from the Council.

36
37 MR. SAM: What were you asking for,
38 Jack?

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm looking over
41 these State proposals. Does any member have a comment
42 that they would like to include to the State Board of
43 Game from the Council other than the intended
44 transmittal to implore them to reduce the bull harvest
45 and especially eliminate the non-resident harvest.

46
47 MR. SAM: Are you looking to direct a
48 letter to them then?

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would like to

1 direct a transmittal to them today. They're taking up
2 these proposals within the next 24 hours it would
3 appear. Do you have a comment, Ray.

4

5 MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I
6 would like to see us write in the transmittal to them
7 to remind them that they are not meeting the State
8 requirement in that they are reducing subsistence
9 opportunities in not eliminating the non-resident
10 opportunities in going to one. They're greatly
11 reducing the harvest by subsistence users without
12 eliminating the non-resident hunting and subsistence
13 has a priority under State law.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Any other
16 comments.

17

18 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Terry.

21

22 MR. HAYNES: I'm sorry to interrupt
23 you, but I guess just a cautionary note. If you're
24 going to submit something to the Board of Game, just be
25 aware that -- you know, focus on your position on the
26 proposals. If you want to make recommendations about
27 what actions should be taken, I think there would be a
28 more constructive way to acknowledge your concerns
29 about the subsistence priority and not assume the Board
30 of Game is going to have to take up the issue of
31 whether or not non-resident hunting should be closed
32 all together. I think a good point has been raised
33 that if the bag limit is reduced as it is, then that is
34 a significant restriction on subsistence uses. What it
35 may take to provide reasonable opportunity for
36 subsistence users is something the Board will have to
37 grapple with.

38

39 I guess with deference to raising
40 questions about closing Federal lands to non-Federally-
41 qualified subsistence users, you know, that's something
42 that -- just be aware that the Federal Board has a
43 pretty high standard to follow there and it would be
44 important to have a good understanding of the migratory
45 route of the Mulchatna Herd to know if they're spending
46 a lot of time on Federal lands versus State and private
47 lands so you would have some sense of the potential
48 benefits of a closure to non-Federally-qualified
49 subsistence users of the Federal lands.

50

1 And I don't know that it's constructive
2 to pose that as a threat, if you will, in your letter
3 to the Board of Game. I think I would urge you to keep
4 a more positive tone if you can. The Board is likely
5 to be more responsive to your comments.

6
7 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Terry. I
10 appreciate those comments, but I'm very frustrated with
11 this situation, with the Department proposing non-
12 resident harvest of bull caribou and reducing the
13 resident hunters, the subsistence hunters to one
14 caribou down from three. That seems to be a very
15 frustrating situation. You're probably right, we don't
16 want to infuriate this Board, but it shows our
17 frustration with the situation of the caribou herd
18 declining.

19
20 The points to be taken are the caribou
21 are an alternate resource for the people in our region.
22 The moose population got shot out and it's down to
23 eight bulls per 100 cows here in 19A. We've had all
24 these escalating problems for our subsistence users.

25
26 We need to try to speak strongly to
27 this Board that they've been derelict in maintaining
28 this bull/cow ratio in the Mulchatna Herd. That's
29 strictly hunter induced. Data is lacking. I've seen
30 no data anywhere in the wound loss rate on caribou,
31 which is generally around 30 percent. The harvest only
32 reflects what's killed. There's a huge wound loss
33 rate. When you've got that many hunters out there
34 banging away at caribou at long range, you've got a lot
35 of wounded caribou.

36
37 I'm very frustrated with this
38 situation, with this huge decline, and still allowing
39 non-resident harvest. That's almost incomprehensible
40 for the Department to propose a non-resident harvest
41 ranging from a month and a half to two weeks long in
42 these proposals. Why is the Department of that
43 position? Do you have a comment on that?

44
45 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, no, I don't.
46 Just because it's in a proposal does not mean that's
47 the action the Board is doing to take.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we'll probably
50 forego the threat of closure to Federal land. I'll

1 take that comment to heart from you. But I do feel our
2 letter of transmittal to the State Board of Game should
3 include the high reliance on caribou at this point
4 because we're on moose moratorium, that the caribou
5 herd is in huge decline, there's a preference to State
6 residents which are users in our region and the other
7 residents of Alaska, are those subsistence users, a
8 dramatic reduction in harvest to one caribou is going
9 to be a great hardship on our subsistence users, and we
10 feel very strongly that non-residents should be
11 eliminated. It's incumbent upon the Board of Game to
12 implement the State subsistence law. So those would be
13 the main points that I would like to see transmitted to
14 the Board.

15

16 Any further comments from the Council.
17 Carl.

18

19 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, good afternoon.
20 Carl Morgan. I really echo your concerns. Any time
21 the population drops by 75 percent we've got to do
22 something. A little over 200,000 to 40,000, that's
23 about a 75 percent drop. I'm very concerned. That's a
24 huge drop. We've only got 25 percent of the
25 population. Yes, the State and the Feds are going to
26 do something, but I think limiting it to the residents
27 and restricting the residents, but not restricting non-
28 residents, I think the Board of Game is not fulfilling
29 their obligation.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments
32 or points that the Council would like to be included in
33 the transmittal to the State Board of Game. Robert.

34

35 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
36 Just reading through that proposal, they also have a
37 cow season. I would recommend to the board that we
38 also make a statement about cows too because the herd
39 has declined so much here and this is the only resource
40 that we have, to help rebuild this herd here. So I
41 would make a recommendation from our board to the State
42 Board also.

43

44 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments.
47 My feeling on the proposals are that there can be, with
48 the bull/cow ratio at the point that it's at and the
49 need for subsistence harvest and the winter hunts, one
50 cow harvest for subsistence could be accommodated if we

1 were rectifying taking resource from non-subsistence
2 users, the non-resident component.

3

4 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5 What I meant to say was it would be for non-residents,
6 it would be for C&T and local residents, kind of in
7 that sense of direction.

8

9 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. I see
12 what you're talking about. So we want to delineate
13 this transmittal, starting out that the moose have
14 declined in the Western Interior Region, we're on
15 moratoriums and hardship on moose harvest in the
16 Western Interior Region. The caribou bull/cow ratio is
17 completely inadequate. We have bull/cow ratios less
18 than half of what they should be. One caribou resident
19 limit is too restrictive for the subsistence users in
20 our region on the State lands, and that the non-
21 resident harvest cannot be accommodated because the
22 non-resident harvest is in the bull component, so we
23 implore the Board of Game to eliminate the non-resident
24 bull harvest.

25

26 Any other insertions in the
27 transmittal.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll vote on that
32 transmittal. Those in favor of transmitting that to
33 the Game Board within the next 24 hours signify by
34 saying aye.

35

36 IN UNISON: Aye.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

39

40 (No opposing votes)

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's unanimous
43 consent on that transmittal. So where are we at now,
44 Vince, in our agenda.

45

46 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I think
47 this gets us back to -- and I don't think there's any
48 other agency reports unless BLM has one that they would
49 like to present before the proposals that relate to the
50 proposals before the Board.

1 MR. CRAIG: (Shakes head no)

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: No. Okay. We've already
4 dealt with the March hunt for the Kanuti area. So
5 we're basically now into your regular proposals. I
6 know we kind of stumbled around on that 23 to follow
7 the steps that are on your name plate so we get a
8 complete record, but that would bring us up to
9 statewide proposals, Proposal No. 1. Don is going to
10 present that and then we'll just walk down this list.
11 We're blessed to have Steve Kessler with the Forest
12 Service here who has attended many of the Regional
13 Council meetings before this, so he'll bring forth the
14 Council recommendations as he understands from those
15 meetings.

16

17 We have four statewide proposals and go
18 from there.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, that sounds
21 good. Go ahead, Don.

22

23 MR. RIVARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24 Don Rivard with the Office of Subsistence Management.
25 We're going to do statewide Proposal No. WP07-01, which
26 begins in your book on Page 31.

27

28 Proposal No. 1 submitted by the ADF&G
29 requests that claws be removed from the Federal
30 definition of fur and that sales of handicraft articles
31 made from claws, bones, teeth, sinew, or skulls of
32 black and brown bears be allowed for sale only between
33 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

34

35 The proponent submitted this proposal
36 because, in the proponent s view, if the definition of
37 fur is not changed, it will allow for unconstrained
38 commercial sale of handicrafts made from bear parts
39 and create market incentives for poaching. Between
40 2002 and 2006 the Federal Subsistence Board considered
41 six proposals regarding the sale of handicrafts made
42 from some of the non-edible parts of bears. The Board
43 has consistently supported the sale of handicrafts made
44 from the skin, hide, pelt or fur of black bear, this is
45 statewide, and brown bear in three different regions
46 and only those three regions, including claws, by
47 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

48

49 The proponent s language for the
50 Federal definition of fur would require the removal of

1 claws from all hides, such as fox and mink, not just
2 bear. Under current Federal regulations, brown bear
3 hides with claws can only be used in handicrafts for
4 sale if the bear were harvested from Eastern Interior,
5 Bristol Bay and Southeast Alaska. Other parts, such
6 as, bones, teeth,
7 sinew, or skulls can only be used from brown or black
8 bear taken in Southeast Alaska.

9
10 This proposal would remove the
11 unit-specific restrictions listed above and would
12 negate the intent of the Board and the Regional
13 Councils in recognizing the diverse customary and
14 traditional uses of bears and bear parts throughout the
15 state. Also the proponent s description for persons
16 eligible to sell handicrafts from the bear parts
17 mentioned would narrow sales only to Federally-
18 qualified rural residents.

19
20 This proposal would unnecessarily
21 restrict the subsistence uses of Federally-qualified
22 subsistence users as specified in ANILCA Section .803.
23 Therefore, the preliminary conclusion is to oppose the
24 proposal.

25
26 The reasons for that is there has been
27 no evidence provided to indicate that current Federal
28 regulations adversely affect bear populations and there
29 has been no evidence provided to indicate that current
30 Federal regulations have led to an increased legal or
31 illegal harvest of bears.

32
33 The current Federal regulations apply
34 only to bears harvested under Federal subsistence
35 regulations on Federal public lands. All meat from
36 bears harvested under Federal subsistence regulations
37 must be salvaged.

38
39 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. So
42 we've got Agency comments. You're online there, Terry.
43 Do you have comments on this proposal.

44
45 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
46 You'll see there are written comments on Page 44 and
47 45. I want to begin by pointing out that our comments
48 this year are a lot more detailed than you've probably
49 seen in previous years. That's because we've included
50 language that deals with some of the broader policy

1 issues that the Department has with some of the Federal
2 subsistence regulations. These are points I'm not
3 going to discuss in reviewing our position on
4 proposals. Just so you know that there is additional
5 language in our comments that we haven't included in
6 previous years.

7
8 The first point I'd like to make is
9 that the intent of our proposal was not to have it
10 applied to species other than bear, so we'd be
11 perfectly comfortable to see an amendment to the
12 proposal to have it apply only to bear claws and not to
13 claws of furbearers.

14
15 Beyond that we have a long-standing
16 concern, as you know, about the potential for the sale
17 of claws to become a commercial enterprise. As Mr.
18 Rivard pointed out, we have not seen evidence of that
19 yet but it does remain a concern to the Department and,
20 consequently, we believe it's important not to have
21 that incentive out there. There are ways to ensure
22 that people have the opportunity to use claws for
23 making regalia or use in ceremonies and to provide the
24 opportunity to use claws without having it become a
25 commercial enterprise. We just don't want to encourage
26 commercial enterprises under the Federal regulations
27 and that was our primary reason for submitting this
28 proposal.

29
30 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Terry. Are
33 there any Federal agencies that have comments on this.
34 Park Service, Fish and Wildlife.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Native Tribal
39 Council, Village Councils.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. InterAgency
44 Staff Committee comments.

45
46 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
47 Steve Kessler with InterAgency Staff Committee. As
48 Vince said, what I'm going to do is give you the
49 positions of other Councils that have already met, so
50 I'll do this on five things. These first four

1 statewide proposals and then later on there's an item
2 on Council composition and I'll tell you what the other
3 Councils did on that also.

4
5 Let me tell you that the Councils that
6 have met so far are Southeast, Kodiak/Aleutians,
7 Bristol Bay and Seward Peninsula. On this proposal all
8 of the Councils opposed this proposal. I have just one
9 comment from the Kodiak/Aleutians that said the
10 regulation that's in place was carefully crafted to
11 represent current regional practices and they did not
12 feel that a change would be appropriate because of
13 that.

14
15 Thank you.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thank you. Do
18 we have any Advisory Committee Comments.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None. We know what
23 the Regional Councils position are. Park Service
24 Subsistence Resource Commission.

25
26 Vince.

27
28 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Lake
29 Clark and Aniakchak Subsistence Resource Commission
30 took up Proposal 1 and they both opposed the proposal.
31 Lake Clark opposes it because it restricts the
32 opportunity of subsistence users to maximize the value
33 they can derive from selling handicrafts made from
34 legally caught bears.

35
36 Let me see what Aniakchak had. They
37 opposed the proposal because -- it's the same, the
38 maximizing. So both Lake Clark and Aniakchak opposed
39 the proposal.

40
41 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. Denali
42 Park SRC also opposed it, but our comments may not be
43 in yet. We just met last week.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Ray. Any
46 written comments on this proposal.

47
48 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
49 They're on Page 43. I'll try to just capture them real
50 quickly for the record. There were two in opposition.

1 One from David McHoes from Skwentna. Mr. McHoes
2 opposes it because he didn't see any biological reason
3 for the change and that most bear populations in the
4 State are harvested well below sustainable levels. He
5 commented that most states and Canadian provinces allow
6 the sale of part or all of the parts of legally
7 harvested bears. He concludes that this would be like
8 telling a trapper he can only sell his pelts to other
9 trappers. Most handicrafts are intended for sale to
10 non-local residents to provide income from outside
11 sources for the subsistence user and to bring money
12 into rural areas. Subsistence harvest does not just
13 relate to personal consumption, but also has always
14 provided a limited amount of cash income to provide for
15 things that a subsistence life might require.

16
17 The AHTNA Tene Nene' Subsistence
18 Resource Commission opposed it because the definition
19 of 25(a) includes all animals, which is too broad of a
20 definition. If trappers caught a coyote, wolf, lynx,
21 they would have to remove the claws before they could
22 sell the furs. They opposed changes to 25(j)(6), which
23 would reopen a statewide selling of handicraft articles
24 made from
25 black bear to only another Federally-qualified
26 subsistence user, which includes the skin, hide, pelt,
27 fur, of a black bear; and it also eliminates claws,
28 which is fine, since we do not support the selling any
29 bear parts.

30
31 They oppose the proposal and you have
32 the summary on that page. Steve already summarized the
33 Regional Councils that have already met. For your
34 knowledge, the Yukon-Kuskokwim meets next week, which
35 relates to your issue on Mulchatna. They'll be hearing
36 your recommendations next week.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any public comments
39 on this proposal.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don't see any. So
44 Regional Council recommendation. We need a motion to
45 adopt the proposal.

46
47 MR. STICKMAN: Make a motion to adopt.

48
49 MR. SAM: Second.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: How does the Council
2 feel on this. Robert.

3

4 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5 Don, on Page 31 here it says skulls of black and brown
6 bears be allowed for sale only between Federally-
7 qualified subsistence users statewide. Can you define
8 that for the record so if anybody else reads our
9 minutes they will understand what this is.

10

11 MR. RIVARD: Yes, that's correct.
12 That's what the proponent is asking, that's the
13 restriction that be on this particular regulation, that
14 it only be allowed for sale between Federally-qualified
15 subsistence users and that it be applied statewide. As
16 I stated earlier, there are regulations in place right
17 now that only pertain to three regions. They made them
18 specific just to three regions. Now this would make it
19 for the entire state. You could only sell these bear
20 parts between Federally-qualified users.

21

22 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Don. That's
23 what I was asking for for the record.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other Council
26 comments on the proposal. Discussion.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This council has
31 been opposed to the sale of bear parts previously but
32 if other regions have wanted to sell bear parts, we've
33 deferred to their prerogative. I personally don't want
34 to oppose other region's management within their region
35 or their abilities to participate in subsistence
36 activities. I personally oppose this proposal, but I'd
37 like to know from the other Council Members how they
38 feel about this proposal.

39

40 MR. MORGAN: I find it ironic that the
41 State is proposing this proposal when they're excluding
42 other residents of the state of Alaska. In ever other
43 proposals they do write we should not exclude any
44 residents of the state of Alaska, yet we're excluding
45 major populations of the state. I just find it ironic
46 that they can turn the other cheek and say we want to
47 exclude residents of the major populated areas of the
48 state, but you subsistence users will be privileged. I
49 just find it ironic. I kind of find it -- it's the
50 two-edged sword again.

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.

4

5 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I am also
6 opposed to this. I think it was well worded in there
7 and said this only applies to legally taken subsistence
8 items and to be able to turn other parts of the animal
9 into cash to help support that lifestyle is good. On
10 the comments of it becoming a commercial activity, it
11 was pointed out I think in someone's comments that this
12 already takes place in Canada and elsewhere and I don't
13 think it's made a major commercial activity over there
14 or led to more poaching. At least it's not mentioned
15 in any of the literature. If that was to happen, then
16 you could always shut it down, but I see no reason to
17 restrict it at this point when it is being done in
18 other areas of North America here where there is also a
19 subsistence lifestyle.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Other
22 comments from the Council. Discussion.

23

24 MR. SAM: Question.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question has
27 been called. Those in favor of the proposal signify by
28 saying aye.

29

30 (No aye votes)

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to the
33 proposal same sign.

34

35 IN UNISON: Aye.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal failed
38 unanimously. So Proposal 2 is to change permit
39 compliance from calendar to regulatory year. So you'll
40 present that, Don. Go ahead.

41

42 MR. RIVARD: Yes, Mr. Chair. Don
43 Rivard here again. The Staff analysis begins on Page
44 47 in your book. Proposal WP 07-02 submitted by the
45 Bureau of Land Management would change the regulatory
46 wording in 50 CFR 100.25(h) from calendar year to
47 regulatory year.

48

49 The proponent also believes that this
50 change would increase compliance with the regulatory

1 requirement, facilitate improved harvest data
2 collection, and lead to better management that will
3 result in a positive impact on the resource.

4
5 You can see the existing Federal
6 regulations there on Page 47. This proposal would
7 affect all Federal public lands and waters in Alaska
8 where Federal permits are used for subsistence hunts or
9 fisheries.

10
11 The consequence for failing to report
12 was originally derived from the State regulations and
13 has been in Federal regulations since the inception of
14 the Federal Subsistence Management Program in 1990.

15
16 This is the first proposal concerning
17 this Federal regulatory penalty clause in the history
18 of the Federal Subsistence Management Program. The
19 current situation allows individuals that did not
20 comply with the permit reporting requirements in a
21 regulatory year, which for wildlife is July 1 through
22 June 30th, and for fisheries it's April 1 through March
23 31st, to legally participate in subsistence harvests
24 later in that calendar year, during the open seasons,
25 through December 31st.

26
27 The State of Alaska has different
28 penalty clause regulations for hunting and subsistence
29 fishing permits. Current State of Alaska hunting
30 regulations use regulatory year wording in the parallel
31 hunting regulatory provision.

32
33 Since the inception of the Federal
34 Subsistence Management Program in 1990 there has been
35 very limited enforcement of this Federal regulation.
36 The BLM-Glennallen Field Office has begun enforcement
37 of this regulation for hunting permits recently.

38
39 Over the years, different Federal field
40 offices have sent out different numbers of reminder
41 letters and some have even collected harvest permit
42 reports by going to the permit holder s homes and
43 meeting with them one-on-one.

44
45 Federal Subsistence Management Program
46 regulations provided for 77 different hunt and fishery
47 permits across Alaska in regulatory year 2005 to 2006.
48 These hunts and fisheries involved brown bear, caribou,
49 elk, goat, moose, sheep, muskox, salmon, trout, char,
50 eulachon, and freshwater fish. That year, a total of

1 5,117 permits were issued and 92.7 percent of the
2 permit reports were returned, so we're getting pretty
3 good compliance there.

4
5 Good harvest data are critical to sound
6 management of fish and wildlife resources. Bureau of
7 Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, National
8 Park Service, and USDA-Forest Service field staff
9 across the state are working closely with subsistence
10 users to facilitate subsistence harvest reporting. I
11 know personally they go out of their way to make sure
12 people comply with these reporting requirements.

13
14 The proposed change would have the most
15 affect on situations where Federal subsistence permits
16 overlap the calendar year. There are Federal permits
17 for brown bear, caribou, goat, moose, sheep, muskox,
18 salmon, and trout that overlap the calendar year. If
19 adopted, this proposal would not change the regulatory
20 consequences for failure to comply with permit
21 conditions.

22
23 There is not a clear understanding
24 among all subsistence users about the fish and wildlife
25 regulations, permit reporting requirements, or what the
26 harvest reports are used for.

27
28 Rural Alaskans continue to subsistence
29 hunt and fish to feed their families as their
30 forefathers did for generations prior to government
31 regulations. There are concerns about the affect that
32 strict application of the ineligibility provision would
33 have on the subsistence way of life. Application of
34 the penalty clause in some areas of rural Alaska will
35 defeat the primary objective of this regulation; it
36 will result in a loss of harvest data reporting.

37
38 The ineligibility provision allows
39 considerable flexibility for Federal field staff and
40 enforcement officers to consider the importance and
41 time sensitivity of the harvest information, and the
42 wide range of rural Alaska issues, traditions, and
43 cultures. There is some flexibility to adjust wording
44 on the permits to this situation. The current
45 regulation also allows field staff and enforcement
46 officers to be responsive to "other unavoidable
47 circumstances.

48
49 It is important to balance the need for
50 harvest information while working with the Regional

1 Councils and the public to do so in a way that is
2 sensitive to rural Alaska issues, traditional values,
3 and cultures.

4
5 The preliminary conclusion then is to
6 support this Proposal WP07-02.

7
8 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9
10 I'll try to answer any questions you
11 may have.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does the Council
14 have any questions for Don so far.

15
16 (No comments)

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Agency comments.
19 Does the State have any comments on this proposal.

20
21 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The
22 Department's comments are on Page 58 of your Council
23 book. The Department supports this proposal for the
24 reasons that were described by Mr. Rivard in discussing
25 the analysis. It's important to have the things lined
26 up so you're not dealing with a regulatory year versus
27 a calendar year and not having the failure to report
28 system have the desired effect.

29
30 We think there are safeguards in the
31 system so that people are not going to be unfairly
32 treated if they forget to submit their permit or their
33 paperwork on time. Even the State's failure to report
34 program does have several steps in the process to give
35 people the opportunity to respond and get their
36 paperwork in before they get penalized. We would
37 certainly expect the Federal system would use the same
38 measures to make sure that people who have a legitimate
39 excuse due to illness in the family, for example, or
40 poor weather conditions, that they're not penalized if
41 they really couldn't get their paperwork in on time.

42
43 So we support this proposal and think
44 it's a really important mechanism to ensure that the
45 Federal reporting system work effectively as it's
46 designed.

47
48 Thank you.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Terry. Do

1 we have any other Agency comments.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have any
6 Native Tribal comments on the proposal.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.

11

12 MR. COLLINS: Are you ready for other
13 groups? The Denali SRC dealt with this. I'll wait for
14 that comment then.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Next on our list
17 here is Neighboring Regional Councils. Steve.

18

19 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20 Steve Kessler, InterAgency Staff Committee. The four
21 Councils that have met, Southeast, Kodiak/Aleutians,
22 Bristol Bay and Seward Peninsula all support this
23 proposal. I would like to mention some comments that
24 were made at the Bristol Bay meeting which I did
25 attend.

26

27 The analysis talks about that the
28 language allows considerable flexibility and how this
29 requirement to -- or this regulation saying that you're
30 not eligible to receive a subsistence permit in a
31 subsequent year. Well, Bristol Bay really didn't agree
32 that this allowed considerable flexibility with the
33 words using unavoidable circumstances. They actually
34 talked about perhaps modifying some other language in
35 here. They were real interested in being sure that
36 somebody who forgets to turn in a report does not get
37 penalized, but somebody who flagrantly abuses the
38 system, well, they should be penalized.

39

40 So what they said though was that this
41 is really a separate topic and they may come forward in
42 the future with another regulation proposal change, but
43 they wanted to just keep this to this very narrow
44 calendar versus regulatory. You can probably expect
45 from them some future proposal to work with the words
46 other avoidable circumstances.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thank you.
49 Any Advisory Committee comments on the proposal.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: SRC comments. Go
4 ahead, Ray.

5

6 MR. COLLINS: I think the Wrangell met
7 on this before. Do you have their comments, Vince?

8

9 MR. MATHEWS: No. The only ones I have
10 are Lake Clark and Aniakchak and then you're bringing
11 in Denali.

12

13 MR. COLLINS: Well, I think the
14 Wrangell had just met. What they did is -- there's a
15 word in there at one place that said they will lose it
16 the next year or something and they wanted to modify it
17 by putting in that they may lose it. They wanted to
18 create flexibility in there and say not that it has to
19 happen, but that it could so that then whoever is
20 implementing this could decide if they're extenuating
21 circumstance. There was a one-word change and then we
22 supported it with that word change. I don't have the
23 wording of the full one in here. There was one place
24 where you could change it from shall lose or will lose
25 to a may, which kinds of builds a little flexibility
26 in. Then when they come up with the regulations on
27 each one they could spell out what those extenuating
28 circumstances were or something.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other SRC
31 comments.

32

33 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Lake
34 Clark and Aniakchak supported for the same reasons,
35 which is changing permit requirements from calendar
36 year to regulatory year would encourage more timely
37 returns of harvest reports.

38

39 That's all I have.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Written
42 comments.

43

44 MR. MATHEWS: There was just one from
45 the AHTNA Tene Nene' Subsistence Committee. They
46 support the statewide proposal to change the wording
47 from calendar to regulatory because it would clear up
48 confusion of ineligibility provisions for those failing
49 to turn in a moose and caribou permit at the end of the
50 hunting season to BLM. So they support this proposal.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Regional
2 Council recommendation, motion to support.

3

4 MR. SAM: Move to adopt.

5

6 MR. WALKER: Second.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Discussion. Does
9 the Council have discussion on the proposal.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My opinion about the
14 proposal is that I'm in favor of the regulatory year
15 structure. I am concerned about ineligibility and
16 inflexibility with the component of the proposal.
17 ANILCA discusses having the least adverse impact on the
18 subsistence users through regulatory structures and so
19 I'm concerned about the rigidity of ineligibility for
20 non-compliance. There should be a mechanism for
21 extenuating circumstances, illness and so forth, if
22 somebody gets hurt or they have a family illness or
23 various reasons why they should have -- excusable
24 reasons for not becoming ineligible for next year's
25 hunt. It's not like sport hunters, you know, they lose
26 their vacation or something. These people may lose a
27 significant component of their food resource. So I'm
28 concerned about that component.

29

30 I feel that our comments should be
31 transmitted to the Board about endorsing the proposal
32 but not being rigid about becoming ineligible. So that
33 would be my discussion on the proposal.

34

35 Any other comment.

36

37 Ray, go ahead.

38

39 MR. COLLINS: Does anybody have the
40 full wording of what the Board adopted last year where
41 it uses the word calendar year instead of the other.

42

43 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. That
44 should be on Page 47, Ray, under existing regulations
45 if that's what you're looking for.

46

47 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

48

49 MR. MATHEWS: Where it goes down three
50 lines it says conservation purposes is required by

1 permit and you fail to comply with such reporting
2 requirements, you are ineligible. Your SRC may have
3 put in you may be ineligible, but I'm speculating, but
4 that's about the only place I can see where you can put
5 that.

6

7 MR. COLLINS: I think that's where it
8 was and it was reported at our meeting that they had
9 just been down to Wrangell, that they were the ones
10 that introduced that down there, too. I guess I'd be
11 happy voting for this if the language that Jack
12 mentioned was in there that we're concerned they need
13 to spell out the extenuating circumstances so that
14 we're not unduly penalizing the subsistence hunter.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposed
17 language states that unless you demonstrate that
18 failure to report was due to loss in the mail,
19 accident, sickness or other unavoidable circumstances,
20 it shouldn't be shall, it should be may.

21

22 MR. COLLINS: That's where it was.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But I am in favor of
25 this regulatory proposal so I intend to vote for the
26 proposal. Any further comments.

27

28 MR. SAM: Question.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question has
31 been called. Those in favor of the proposal signify by
32 saying aye.

33

34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

37

38 (No opposing votes)

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It was unanimous
41 adoption. So on to Proposal No. 3 on statewide
42 proposals. Allow the sale of untanned hides from goat,
43 sheep, caribou and moose. Go ahead, Don.

44

45 MR. RIVARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
46 Don Rivard again with OSM. The Staff analysis begins
47 on Page 60 in your Council book. Proposal WP07-03 is
48 the combination of three separate proposals by Eastern
49 Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council,
50 the Upper Tanana Fortymile Mile Fish and Game Advisory

1 Committee and the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
2 Subsistence Resource Commission.

3

4 The proponents request Federal
5 regulations that allow the sale of raw/untanned hides
6 and capes of goat, sheep, caribou or moose that have
7 been legally harvested on Federal public lands by
8 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

9

10 The proponents state that adoption of
11 this proposal would align Federal subsistence harvest
12 regulations with State of Alaska hunting regulations,
13 which allow for the sale of raw/untanned hides and
14 capes from legally harvested goat, sheep, caribou and
15 moose. Current Federal subsistence regulations do not
16 allow the sale of unmodified nonedible byproducts of
17 fish and wildlife; they must have been made into
18 handicrafts. Raw/untanned hides and capes do not meet
19 the Federal definition of handicraft.

20

21 The proposed sale of raw/untanned hides
22 and capes from animals harvested under Federal
23 subsistence regulations may be consistent with the
24 Federal definition of customary trade. The Federal
25 definition of customary trade is the exchange of cash,
26 with an emphasis on cash, for fish and wildlife
27 resources regulated in this part, not otherwise
28 prohibited by Federal law or regulation, to support
29 personal and family needs, and does not include trade
30 which constitutes a significant commercial enterprise.

31

32 There is a long history of trade in
33 untanned hides and capes that began prior to the
34 arrival of Europeans in Alaska and continues today.

35

36 It is legal for State of Alaska
37 residents to harvest ungulates under State of Alaska
38 hunting regulations on Bureau of Land Management,
39 National Wildlife Refuge, National Preserve and
40 National Forest Service lands and sell the raw/untanned
41 hides and capes from these animals. However, this
42 State of Alaska hunting regulation does not apply to
43 National Park or National Monument lands.

44

45 Effects of the proposal if adopted.
46 The proponent states that adoption of this proposal
47 would not increase harvest but would allow Federally-
48 qualified subsistence users to fully utilize the
49 animals they harvest for food and to obtain cash needed
50 to access traditional hunting areas.

1 The adoption of this regulation would
2 allow Federally-qualified subsistence users to sell
3 raw/untanned hides and capes of goat, sheep, caribou or
4 moose that have been legally harvested under Federal
5 subsistence regulations on Federal public lands.
6 Again, except National Park and National Monument
7 lands. Regional variation in uses of raw/untanned
8 hides and capes can be addressed by region-specific
9 regulations, such as those for brown bear handicrafts
10 and customary trade of fish as listed in the existing
11 regulation section.

12
13 Current harvest limits are not affected
14 by this proposal and there do not appear to be
15 conservation concerns associated with this proposal.
16 This proposal should not affect other user groups.

17
18 The preliminary conclusion then is to
19 support the proposal. The lead author on this is Liz
20 Williams from our office and she would like to have
21 some examples of customary trade of raw and untanned
22 hides and capes. Let me back up here. Most of the
23 examples of customary trade of raw and untanned hides
24 and capes in the literature examples of barter. There
25 are few examples of raw and untanned hides and capes
26 being exchanged for cash. So she would like to know
27 from your Council and other participants for any
28 examples of sale of untanned hides or capes for cash in
29 your region.

30
31 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. Does
34 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game have comments on
35 the proposal.

36
37 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The
38 Department's comments are on Page 69 of your book.
39 Basically the Department doesn't believe this proposal
40 is necessary because the opportunity to sell these raw
41 materials are provided for in State regulation. The
42 point was made that this would not apply to Park and
43 Monument lands. If that's an issue, we would concede
44 that there might need to be another regulation, but we
45 have not heard of any people taking animals from Park
46 lands running into conflict under the State
47 regulations, so we're not sure if this is a real issue
48 or not.

49
50 One reason that it's easier to have a

1 regulation like this under the State regulation is
2 because we don't require that the animals, the
3 harvested animals from which the hides and capes are
4 taken be harvested for subsistence purposes. In other
5 words, there doesn't need to be a customary and
6 traditional use attached to the sale under State
7 regulations. We would believe that if a Federal
8 regulation was adopted that there would need to be
9 findings made to demonstrate that the sale of these raw
10 materials is a customary and traditional practice. I
11 believe that's why Liz Williams is interested in
12 determining if any of the Council Members have
13 information that would provide that kind of
14 illustration of raw hides/capes being sold rather than
15 bartered.

16
17 That's all we have to say right now,
18 Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead,
21 Don.

22
23 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. Our office has
24 put together kind of a question and answer sheet on
25 some of the comments made by the State. There's a
26 couple that are pertinent to this proposal that I think
27 probably I should read right now. Terry, if I
28 misconstrue the comment made by you, you can correct me
29 on this.

30
31 One of the comments of the ADF&G is
32 that the Federal Subsistence Board should make a
33 customary and traditional use determination for
34 individual uses of harvested resources, such as the
35 sale of untanned hides and the sale of antlers. The
36 Federal Subsistence Board's response is that they make
37 customary and traditional use determinations only for
38 the subsistence harvest of a fish or wildlife
39 population by a community or area. The eight factors
40 used by the Board to make C&T use determinations do not
41 constitute a checklist but rather characteristics
42 which, taken together, exemplify historic uses of the
43 resources. The Board makes customary and traditional
44 use determinations for the use of fish and wildlife,
45 not the specifics of each type of use after the
46 wildlife has been harvested. In Section .16b it does
47 not require an individual and specific use
48 determination for each use, such as eating, trading
49 bartering, sharing, selling, crafting, after the
50 harvest of a resource.

1 The other comment by ADF&G is that the
2 sale of untanned hides and antlers is already provided
3 for under State regulations and the Board's response is
4 that this is not true for subsistence harvested
5 products taken under Federal regulations. Section .7b
6 prohibits the sale of fish, wildlife or other parts
7 taken under the Federal subsistence management
8 regulations unless specifically provided for in Federal
9 subsistence management regulations.

10

11 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Those
14 are pertinent comments from the Board. Any Federal
15 Agency comments.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any Native Tribal
20 comments on the proposal.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: InterAgency Staff
25 Committee comments.

26

27 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
28 Steve Kessler with the InterAgency Staff Committee. I
29 think on this one you might want to get your pens out.
30 Four Councils met and each one of them did something
31 different. If you're on Page 59, you can just sort of
32 fill in maybe what each one of them did.

33

34 Southeast Alaska Regional Council
35 modified this proposed regulation. I don't have the
36 exact words, but these are going to be very close. You
37 may sell the tanned and untanned hides -- so the
38 emphasis is not only raw, untanned hides, but also if
39 they're tanned or processed. Tanned and untanned hide
40 or cape from a legally harvested goat, sheep, caribou
41 and moose and they also added deer and elk to that
42 list.

43

44 Kodiak/Aleutians took no action on this
45 proposal. A motion was made, but it died because it
46 lacked a second.

47

48 Bristol Bay Regional Council modified
49 this to say something like you may sell the processed
50 and raw, untanned hide or cape. So they, like

1 Southeast Council, said it could also be processed or
2 tanned in addition to raw and untanned, but they did
3 not identify deer and elk.

4
5 Seward Peninsula supported the proposal
6 exactly as it was written.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thank you.
9 Advisory Committees, any comment on this proposal.

10
11 (No comments)

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Park Service
14 Subsistence Resource Commission comments. Ray.

15
16 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Denali supported
17 because they are a park and they didn't want to be
18 excluded since in other areas of the state you can sell
19 these, so Denali supported it.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Vince.

22
23 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Lake
24 Clark and Aniakchak did take these up. Lake Clark
25 supported with modification and it's somewhat along the
26 lines of what the Regional Councils did. They support
27 with modification. The reference to raw, untanned
28 hides should be deleted to allow the sale of any hide
29 so the subsistence user may maximize the value they can
30 derive from selling parts of legally taken animals.

31
32 Aniakchak just supported the proposal.
33 Let me double check. Again, they just supported it
34 because it maximized the value that can be derived.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have written
37 comments other than that.

38
39 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. There were
40 no written comments on this proposal that I'm aware of.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any public
43 testimony. Go ahead, Nick.

44
45 MR. KAMEROFF: Nick Kameroff here from
46 Aniak. I think we would support that because it would
47 help benefit our people in their efforts to obtain more
48 fuel or much needed items for further such hunts.

49
50 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Nick. So
2 we're to the Regional Council recommendation.
3
4 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I move to
5 support.
6
7 MR. STICKMAN: I second.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.
10
11 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. They were
12 asking for comments. I can think of two personal
13 examples, but maybe one of them is --one of the air
14 taxis in the area, this is a number of years ago, he
15 had a request of a black bear from a doctor or a friend
16 or something, so he offered a free charter in and out
17 of the village in exchange for a bear hide and I
18 provided him with a bear hide, but that could probably
19 fall under barter, although there was a cash value.
20 And then I had a taxidermist out in Washington that had
21 mounted two moose heads. One of them had a bell and
22 one of them didn't and, unfortunately he switched them
23 on his clients, so one of his clients was happy as a
24 clam and the other one was pretty mad when he offered
25 him the other, so he offered to purchase a cape with a
26 hide so he could restore that and I sold him one a
27 number of years ago. So there are some cases where
28 people want specific hides that way.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any comments and
31 documentation of these uses. Ron.
32
33 MR. SAM: Yes. You'll notice that
34 Alatna/Allakaket was written about within their
35 justification. What happened here, this was quite some
36 time ago, but this was before the influx of moose and
37 beaver or whatever that went up to Northwest Alaska,
38 Northwest Arctic. Every so often we do get caribou out
39 of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd that comes through
40 the Alatna/Allakaket area, it hasn't happened the last
41 couple years, but then that pretty much stopped that
42 trade because of the influx of animals migrating --
43 both area moose going north and caribou coming south.
44
45 My personal opinion on this proposal is
46 if we adopt it, support it, it wouldn't hurt us. If we
47 vote it down, it wouldn't hurt us. It's something that
48 I don't think is that massive in size at this time.
49 There will be a few instances but nothing massive or
50 nothing that I would really fight for one way or the

1 other.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments.

4

5 MR. WALKER: Question.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My discussion on the
8 proposal would be that I've sold various sheep and
9 caribou skins and if I get a nice animal, I'll skin it
10 out and sell it sometimes. There's people that used to
11 trade large amounts of caribou skins down to the
12 coastal area from Anaktuvuk Pass and they're in our
13 region, at least their village is in our region.
14 They're represented by Region 10. So there are people
15 in Bettles that I've known that sold skins and they
16 don't look at it a whole lot differently than if
17 somebody is out moose hunting and kills a moose and
18 they saw the horns off and sell those for gas money.
19 If they can make a little bit of money to supplement
20 the high cost of hunting, it falls way within the
21 purview of the ANILCA law under customary trade, so I
22 feel there's no probably with this proposal at all.

23

24 The question has been called. Those in
25 favor of the proposal signify by saying aye.

26

27 IN UNISON: Aye.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

30

31 (No opposing votes)

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Unanimous adoption
34 of the proposal. We're down to Proposal No. 4. Allow
35 the sale of horns and antlers from goat, sheep, deer,
36 elk, caribou, moose and muskox. This is a similar type
37 proposal. Go ahead, Don.

38

39 MR. RIVARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

40 Don Rivard with the Office of Subsistence Management.

41 The analysis starts on Page 72 in your book.

42

43 Proposal WP07-04 is the combination of
44 two similar proposals submitted by Eastern Interior
45 Alaska Regional Advisory Council and the Upper Tanana
46 Fortymile Mile Fish and Game Advisory Committee. The
47 proponents request Federal regulations that allow the
48 sale of antlers or horns of goat, sheep, deer, elk,
49 caribou, moose or muskox that have been naturally shed
50 or removed from the skull of an animal harvested on

1 Federal public lands under Federal subsistence
2 regulations by Federally-qualified subsistence users.

3

4 The proponents state that adoption of
5 this proposal would align Federal subsistence harvest
6 regulations with State of Alaska hunting regulations
7 which allow for the sale of the antlers or horns that
8 have been naturally shed or, if legally harvested,
9 completely removed from any part of the skull of the
10 animal except in Unit 23. State regulations
11 specifically prohibit the sale of caribou antlers from
12 Unit 23, unless the antler is naturally shed or made
13 into an article of handicraft. This prohibition is due
14 to local conservation concerns about the Western Arctic
15 Caribou Herd because of the Asian antler market.

16

17 Federal subsistence regulations do not
18 include the gathering of naturally shed antlers.
19 Gathering of naturally shed antlers is prohibited on
20 National Park Service lands. Current Federal
21 subsistence regulations do not allow the sale of
22 unmodified, nonedible byproducts of fish and wildlife;
23 they must first be made into handicrafts. Unmodified
24 antlers or horns do not meet the Federal definition of
25 handicraft. The proposed sale of antlers or horns from
26 animals harvested under Federal subsistence
27 regulations again may be consistent with the Federal
28 definition of customary trade.

29

30 I gave you that definition before.
31 I'll read it again. The Federal definition of
32 customary trade is the exchange of cash, and that's the
33 operative word here, for fish and wildlife resources
34 regulated herein, not otherwise prohibited by State or
35 Federal law or regulation, to support personal and
36 family needs, and does not include trade which
37 constitutes a significant commercial enterprise. There
38 is a long history of trade and unmodified horns and
39 antlers in Alaska that began prior to the arrival of
40 Europeans and continues today.

41

42 The proponents state that adoption of
43 this proposal would not increase harvests, but would
44 allow Federally-qualified subsistence users to fully
45 utilize the animals they harvest under Federal
46 subsistence regulations for food and to obtain cash
47 needed to access traditional hunting areas.

48

49 The effects of the proposal. If
50 adopted, this proposed regulation would allow hunters

1 to sell horns and antlers from animals harvested under
2 Federal subsistence regulations. However, shed antlers
3 are not regulated under Federal Subsistence Board
4 jurisdiction. The gathering of naturally shed antlers
5 is specifically prohibited on National Park Service
6 lands and on U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service lands
7 without a special use permit from the Refuge manager.
8

9 Authorization to collect animal parts
10 from animals not harvested within the approved Federal
11 subsistence harvest limits would not be consistent with
12 Federal subsistence harvest regulations. So the
13 proposed regulation should be modified to exclude
14 reference to shed antlers or collections from animals
15 obtained outside Federal subsistence harvest
16 regulations.
17

18 Regional variation in uses of horns and
19 antlers can be addressed by region-specific regulations
20 such as those for bear handicrafts and customary trade
21 of fish.
22

23 Current harvest limits are not affected
24 by this proposal and this proposal should not affect
25 other user groups. The adoption of this proposal would
26 not lead to an increase in subsistence harvests but
27 would allow Federally-qualified subsistence users to
28 fully utilize the animals they harvest for food, and
29 also for cash needed to access traditional hunting
30 areas.
31

32 The preliminary conclusion then is to
33 support with modification to address only horns and
34 antlers from animals harvested under Federal
35 subsistence regulations.
36

37 Again, Liz Williams was the lead author
38 on this and if Council members or other participants
39 here know of examples of the sale of unmodified horns
40 or antlers for cash, she would like to hear about it.
41

42 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. Does
45 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game have comments.
46

47 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Our
48 comments are on Page 82 of your Council book. Our
49 comments on this proposal are basically the same as our
50 comments on the previous proposal. We believe the

1 opportunity is being provided under State regulation.
2 We have knowledge that the Office of Subsistence
3 Management and the Federal Board have a different
4 perspective on a couple of issues. We're unaware of the
5 State regulations having been a deterrent to people who
6 wanted to sell these raw items. Again, the customary
7 and traditional use finding, we believe if the Board is
8 not inclined to make those, that there still should be
9 a record created that the sale of these raw parts is a
10 customary and traditional practice because we are
11 talking about in this proposal providing opportunity
12 under Federal subsistence regulations.

13

14 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Do we
17 have any other Agency comments.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Native or tribal
22 comments.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have any
27 InterAgency Staff Committee comments. Steve.

28

29 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
30 Steve Kessler with the InterAgency Staff Committee.
31 First of all, as Don was reading the definition of
32 customary trade, I sort of scratched my head because he
33 said something about not otherwise prohibited by State
34 or Federal law. Just looking in our regulation book,
35 that's what it says on Page 139, not otherwise
36 prohibited by State or Federal law, but then I looked
37 in our codified regulations and if you take a look at
38 that, the definition of customary trade under Part 4
39 does not mention the State, so it reads not otherwise
40 prohibited by Federal law or regulation. So there's a
41 mistake in this book. The State part should be taken
42 out and what Don read is correct for what the book
43 says, but it's not what is in the regulation.

44

45 I also wanted to let you know about the
46 position the other four Councils that previously met
47 took. The Southeast, Bristol Bay and Seward Peninsula
48 Councils all recommended the proposal as modified by
49 Staff recommendation. So as shown on Page 77.

50

1 The Kodiak/Aleutians opposed the
2 proposal unanimously. They said that this is already
3 in regulation and is therefore not needed.

4
5 I think that -- I wasn't at the
6 Kodiak/Aleutians meeting and I would say these are
7 already in regulations, maybe in the State regulations,
8 but certainly it's not in our Federal regulations.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Steve. I
11 would feel that the Kodiak/Aleutian was unclear about
12 the Federal regulation book, so I feel that their
13 confusion on the issue does not play into the
14 deliberation on these Federal lands. Any comments from
15 the Council to Steve.

16
17 Go ahead, Ron.

18
19 MR. SAM: You stated that this is
20 already within State regulations, right, but not in the
21 Federal?

22
23 MR. KESSLER: As I understand it, this
24 is already in State regulation but it is not in
25 Federal. Anything in Federal regulation for customary
26 trade has to specifically be written in our
27 regulations. If you take a look at Pages 72, 73 and 74
28 of the write-up, you can see what is currently in
29 regulation. On Page 73 it talks about the sale of
30 various parts. If there's further question on what the
31 State regulation says, I suggest we talk to Terry
32 Haynes, who is online, about that.

33
34 MR. SAM: Thank you, Steve. If it's
35 not in Federal regulations, I intend to support this
36 proposal.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any Advisory
39 Committee comments.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: National Park
44 Service Subsistence Resource Commission Comments.
45 Denali.

46
47 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Denali supported
48 this because it's actually prohibited right now in the
49 Parks and they thought it should be opened to follow
50 along with State law. I guess it isn't in any of the

1 Federal, so we supported it.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other ones.

4 Vince.

5

6 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Lake
7 Clark and Aniakchak also supported based on allows
8 subsistence users to maximize the value that they
9 derive from legally taken animals.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So written
12 comments.

13

14 MR. MATHEWS: None.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No written comments.

17

18 MR. MATHEWS: There's one written
19 comment. I'm sorry. The AHTNA 'Tene Nene' Subsistence
20 Committee supports it. They support the idea.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Public
23 testimony. Does anybody care to make public testimony.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moving to Regional
28 Council recommendations, motion.

29

30 MR. SAM: Move to adopt.

31

32 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Discussion on the
35 proposal. Robert.

36

37 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
38 There are some groups in our area that do gather the
39 moose antlers after they have dropped off to sell to
40 buy gasoline and oil products during the subsistence
41 salmon fishing, so we do have gatherers in our region.

42

43 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Ron.

46

47 MR. SAM: Again, Allakaket/Alatna is
48 mentioned predominately in this report. Yes, we used
49 to, but that was quite some time ago. I haven't heard
50 of any transactions or bartering between Northwest and

1 the Koyukon people lately. At one time we used to
2 barter for caribou horns and sheep horns. Again,
3 nothing massive, nothing that entertains any commercial
4 enterprises. We used quite a bit of these horns for
5 sinkers for our seining nets because once they're
6 soaked they're pretty heavy and they do their job.
7 That's the only instance I can recall of C&T up in our
8 area.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any comments.

11

12 MR. COLLINS: Jack, when this comes up
13 at the Federal Board, since it's prohibited in the
14 National Parks, we felt it should be supported for the
15 ANILCA-created units. They may not be able to change
16 it in the old parts, but the argument should be made
17 when we go to the Federal Board if it comes up that it
18 should be supported in the ANILCA because subsistence
19 is allowed there and this allows them too.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Under Subsistence
22 Resource comments, the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence
23 Resource Commission has had a recommendation 9901, I
24 think it is, around for many years that addresses the
25 use of plant materials and antler horn to be harvested
26 for customary trade and you have to make them into --
27 not raw sale, but you can pick them up and utilize them
28 for handicrafts. So that recommendation is still out
29 and that's a viable recommendation. So the Council
30 should be aware that Gates of the Arctic has been
31 talking about this issue for many years.

32

33 Any other comments on the proposal.

34

35 MR. WALKER: Question.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Mickey.

38

39 MR. STICKMAN: We don't actively do any
40 gathering in Nulato, but I know the guys down in
41 Kaltag, there's a couple islands in between Kaltag and
42 Grayling where there's a lot of bulls congregate in
43 December and January when they start dropping their
44 horns and I know the guys in Kaltag they go down there
45 and they actively gather horns that are naturally shed,
46 but they do it only on the islands.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments,
49 discussion.

50

1 MR. SAM: Question.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My discussion is
4 that I've picked up antlers. I run them over when I'm
5 trapping and stuff and I've sold those. I've known
6 various people that have utilized those for handicrafts
7 and so forth, so it's fairly widely used over in the
8 area that I'm at, just picking those up. Vince, do you
9 have any additional comments.
10
11 MR. MATHEWS: I don't have a comment.
12 I just need a clarification from Ron on his motion on
13 this proposal. Is it to support the proposal or to
14 support it with modification. The modification deals
15 with the shedding.
16
17 MR. SAM: Support Staff recommendation
18 with modification.
19
20 MR. MATHEWS: Does the second agree?
21 It would be the preliminary conclusion on Page 77.
22
23 MR. STICKMAN: I agree.
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So Mickey is in
26 concurrence. I do agree with the modification
27 recommendation because it is under the Federal Board's
28 purview to limit harvest and so forth. The land
29 managers are in charge of picking up antlers and plant
30 species and so forth, so the land manager, the way I
31 read ANILCA, would be in charge of that kind of thing,
32 but the Federal Subsistence Board would regulate
33 utilization of harvested species, so I agree with the
34 modification.
35
36 Those in favor of the proposal signify
37 by saying aye.
38
39 IN UNISON: Aye.
40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.
42
43 (No opposing votes)
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Unanimous adoption
46 of the proposal. Vince.
47
48 MR. MATHEWS: Not to back you up, but
49 on Proposal 3 there was different actions by the
50 Councils to deal with that raw and untanned hides. You

1 guys stayed with the proposal as is. You didn't go
2 with any of that language that the other Councils
3 wanted on just hides or whatever. I don't want you to
4 back up. I just want to make sure our notes are clear.

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ron.

7

8 MR. SAM: I think all those changes are
9 directed at area specific uses and stuff. I think this
10 proposal, while it may be labeled statewide, it's not
11 really area specific and I think that each region can
12 deal with it as needed. That's what I was trying to
13 get at.

14

15 MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My familiarity with
18 the sale of these hides is that they've been in the raw
19 state. I don't know anybody tanning them previously,
20 but I agree with Ron that it's regional and up to the
21 Federal Board how they implement that.

22

23 We're down to the regional proposals,
24 Proposal 33. Closes the caribou season in Units 21B,
25 21C and 21D and this is Pete DeMatteo. Are you on the
26 teleconference, Pete.

27

28 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes, Mr. Chair, I am.
29 Mr. Chair, if Geoff Byersdorf is still in the room, he
30 is available to present that being it deals with his
31 part of the woods. Also, he's on hand there to present
32 the analysis, if that's okay with the Council.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: He's here. That's
35 just fine, Pete. Thank you. Geoff is at the mike. Go
36 ahead, Geoff.

37

38 MR. BYERSDORF: Mr. Chair, Members of
39 the Council. For the record, Geoff Byersdorf with the
40 Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge. The analysis
41 of Proposal 33 can be found in your books on Page 83.

42

43 This proposal was submitted by the
44 Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge and requests
45 those areas where the Galena Mountain Herd caribou
46 range, in Units 21B, 21C and 21D, be closed to caribou
47 hunting on Federal public lands during the Federal fall
48 seasons.

49

50 Ongoing population declines in the

1 Galena Mountain Herd warrant the need to restrict
2 hunting where the herd ranges on Federal public lands
3 in Units 21B, C, and D. As you're probably aware, the
4 Alaska Board of Game closed the State fall hunting
5 seasons that affect the Galena Mountain Herd in March
6 2004. Adoption of the proposed regulatory change would
7 align Federal and State regulations and prevent
8 additional hunter harvest of this marginal caribou
9 population.

10
11 The proposed regulation can be found on
12 Page 84 and the customary and traditional use
13 determinations can be found on Page 85.

14
15 Current Federal regulations that affect
16 the Galena Mountain Herd provide opportunity for hunter
17 harvest on Federal public lands in the proposal areas.
18 That's 21B, C and D. The remaining to be announced
19 winter season for Unit 21D, north of the Yukon and east
20 of the Koyukuk River, can be opened only when there
21 exists the prescribed mix of one Galena Mountain
22 caribou to every 10 Western Arctic Caribou Herd.

23
24 The Galena Mountain Herd population has
25 undergone substantive declines in recent years and is
26 currently in marginal status. As of December 2006, our
27 last survey showed only 140 individuals in this
28 population. Because of its low numbers, currently at
29 140, this population has low calf productivity and
30 cannot sustain any harvest whatsoever.

31
32 The Galena Mountain Herd is classified
33 as a resident/remnant herd that utilizes the Kokrines
34 Hills east of Galena as its calving range and lowland
35 winter range that spans the area between the
36 communities of Galena and Huslia. The reported harvest
37 for the Galena Mountain Herd since 1976 has been less
38 than 10 animals.

39
40 Adoption of the proposed regulatory
41 change would prevent additional harvest of caribou from
42 the Galena Mountain Herd during the fall season in
43 Units 21B, 21C and 21D. It would also remove the
44 winter season in that portion of Unit 21B that part of
45 the Nowitna River drainage upstream from the Little
46 Mud, which is not within the range of the Galena
47 Mountain Herd.

48
49 Adoption of this proposal would also
50 align Federal with State regulations for the affected

1 areas and would allow the State and Federal managers to
2 open the winter season in that remaining portion of
3 21D. This would bring closer alignment of the Federal
4 and State seasons and also will reduce regulatory
5 complexity for users of the area.

6

7 The preliminary conclusion from the
8 Staff is to support the proposal.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have
11 questions? Go ahead, Ron.

12

13 MR. SAM: What was the total population
14 of this herd?

15

16 MR. BYERSDORF: As of December, it's
17 140 animals. That's down from -- I think there was a
18 high of 300 animals in the 1990s.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions
21 so far. Don.

22

23 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
24 Geoff, I have a question. Under justification for this,
25 I mean I don't think there's existing hunting at the
26 time. Is there an open season? I mean what are we
27 changing?

28

29 MR. BYERSDORF: The State closed the
30 season in 2004 and one of the things that came up in
31 the meeting at Ruby, Tim Craig brought to my attention
32 that under the Federal regs this season was actually
33 still open, that it hadn't been closed on the Federal
34 side. One of our concerns as far as the decline of the
35 population, I think you guys are aware that we ended up
36 going in and putting collars on several individuals in
37 there because we were wondering is there an actual
38 population decline or is this herd mixing with the Wolf
39 Mountain Herd. What we have seen since we put collars
40 on has only been in this year one individual that has
41 mixed with the Wolf Mountain Herd. So what we're
42 seeing is that this is an actual decline of the
43 population. It's not a mixing of different
44 populations.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. State
47 comments. Are you on there, Terry.

48

49 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
50 Our comments are on Page 93 of your meeting book. We

1 basically support this proposal. As Mr. Byersdorf
2 pointed out, it would pretty much align the State and
3 Federal regulations. In looking at our comments, we
4 did seek an explanation for the modification not to
5 eliminate the winter season in the Upper Nowitna
6 drainage portion of 21B. I'm not sure that's a
7 relevant comment in here. It may have carried over
8 from an earlier set of comments that we drafted. We
9 think the proposal is appropriate and will provide the
10 protection, if necessary, for the Galena Mountain Herd.

11

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Terry. Any
15 other Federal Agency comments.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Native tribal
20 comments.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: InterAgency
25 comments.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Any local
30 Advisory Committee comments. I see there's a written
31 comment.

32

33 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. And
34 this one Geoff may want to respond to. The Ruby Local
35 Fish and Game Advisory Committee during its November
36 meeting took action to oppose this proposal. The
37 caribou herd is isolated from any fall hunting activity
38 and only on very rare occasions do animals appear on
39 the Yukon or Melozi Rivers. There is essentially no
40 harvest of these
41 animals and thus this proposal is moot. So they
42 opposed this proposal, the Ruby Advisory Committee.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.

45

46 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47 Yeah, that's why I asked him. I guess the reason we
48 opposed it was that this particular caribou herd is so
49 isolated that we thought it was moot that we even put
50 it on the books because no one -- we didn't know that

1 there was an open season and it's so isolated that no
2 one takes advantage of it, so that's why we opposed
3 that just for clarification.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other Advisory
8 Committee comments. Go ahead, Ron.

9

10 MR. SAM: Don Honea. We have the same
11 problem with the Kanuti Caribou Herd up between
12 Allakaket. We never see them, but for subsistence
13 purposes only, if we actually do run into any, we do
14 want to harvest that caribou that is allotted to our
15 area, so we just kept that one open whether we see them
16 or not and that's just for your information.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Let's see, probably
19 no public comments on this proposal here in Aniak.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So Regional Council
24 recommendations for a motion.

25

26 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, I move.

27

28 MR. SAM: Second.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Discussion. Mickey,
31 go ahead.

32

33 MR. STICKMAN: Just under discussion,
34 Jack, before we vote to take any subsistence
35 opportunity away from the people, I was wondering if
36 the Fish and Wildlife Service is doing anything about
37 the predator control.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: A question regarding
40 predator control. Do you want to speak to that, Geoff.

41

42 MR. BYERSDORF: Mickey, as you're
43 aware, we've been working with your council and with
44 Huslia Council, which in turn is working with Allakaket
45 and Hughes in regards to doing trapping and snaring
46 clinics in some of the villages. As we said, this year
47 with part of that Huslia Tribal Grant there is a
48 predator monitoring portion to that and there's the
49 Predator Incentive Program.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other Council
2 discussion, comment. Don.

3
4 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 Again, just because we had opposed it does not mean
6 that I feel if there's a group of hunters or whatever
7 that is utilizing or taking of this herd, then I would
8 support this proposal. What I'm saying is we just said
9 it was moot and we voted against it. Maybe we should
10 have just as well just been.....

11
12 MR. SAM: Leave it on record.

13
14 MR. HONEA: Right. Okay. Thank you.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other
17 discussion. My personal feelings are that this herd is
18 small but the harvest is very small and sporadic in the
19 harvest data here. On principle, the herd is under
20 protection. Like the advisory committee said in Ruby,
21 it's kind of a moot subject because it is so far off
22 the river. The primary access means would be aircraft,
23 wouldn't it, Geoff?

24
25 MR. BYERSDORF: That's correct.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It would be my
28 inclination to modify the proposal to eliminate
29 aircraft access but maintain the current season on the
30 herd in case a stray caribou came down by the river and
31 somebody might want to get a caribou. What does the
32 Council think about modification. The harvest is very
33 low. The harvest numbers are on Page 91. In 21D,
34 which is where most of that herd primarily lives,
35 right?

36
37 MR. BYERSDORF: Yeah, in the wintertime
38 they're going to be going between the area north of
39 Galena over to Huslia. They're out on the flats there.
40 I guess one comment I would make is that in the
41 wintertime as far as harvest and access it's going to
42 be by snowmobile and I would point out the fact that
43 we're down to 140 individuals in this population right
44 now. The harvest on the State side is obviously
45 allowed if there's a 10 to 1 mix in that population.

46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't know. It's
48 such a low impact on that herd and the harvest is so
49 low and the likelihood of somebody actually bumping
50 into them so fairly slim.

1 MR. SAM: And sporadic.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And fairly sporadic
4 harvest. Are these numbers hard use or is there
5 household to household information that shows a
6 difference or is this your best guess harvest analysis?

7

8 MR. BYERSDORF: As far as the harvest
9 or the population levels?

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Of the harvest.
12 We're talking about the harvest here.

13

14 MR. BYERSDORF: The harvest
15 information, as far as I can determine, is almost all
16 given over from the State. I don't know if Terry has
17 any additional comment on that. What we've seen and
18 what I've presented to you was 10 animals since 1976.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Has Terry
21 got a comment on harvest, subsistence division numbers
22 or anything.

23

24 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. No, I don't
25 have any additional information. I think there are
26 really two ways to look at this proposal. One is I
27 think that your point of view is if very few animals
28 are being taken, why close the season. The other
29 perspective is you have very low numbers in the herd.
30 It is important to close the season just to ensure that
31 if the circumstances arose where those animals became
32 very accessible that they didn't become a target and
33 numbers drop even further.

34

35 We believe it's very important to have
36 State and Federal regulations that are in sync in this
37 case in order to ensure that this little herd is
38 protected.

39

40 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's a point
43 fairly well taken. Is it really worse? The complexity
44 of State and Federal regulation differences for almost
45 no harvest. That's the other issue that we should
46 think about with this proposal, is do we really want to
47 be that far away from the State for now reason.

48

49 Go ahead, Ron.

50

1 MR. SAM: On Page 92, if you read that
2 justification. Adoption of the proposed regulatory
3 change would prevent additional harvest. That's what
4 it says, prevent additional harvest. Adoption of this
5 proposal would also allow the State and Federal
6 managers to open a winter season as they see fit. So I
7 don't think we're actually taking away from our
8 subsistence users so I intend to support this.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The deliberation and
11 the discussion here, I'm inclined to support the
12 proposal also because I don't think it's really worth
13 getting in disparity between the State and Federal
14 regulations and for the protection of the herd. It's a
15 less than one percent harvest rate, but it is a small
16 herd. I intend to support the proposal.

17
18 Any further discussion.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 MR. SAM: Question.

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question has
25 been called. All those in favor of the proposal
26 signify by saying aye.

27
28 IN UNISON: Aye.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

31
32 (No opposing votes)

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal carries
35 unanimously. It's 3:00 o'clock. We're going to break
36 for 10, 15 minutes.

37
38 MR. SAM: 10, 15 minutes

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right.

41
42 (Off record)

43
44 (On record)

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We'll bring the
47 Western Interior Regional Council meeting back to
48 order. It's 3:35. We've got several proposals to go.
49 We're on Proposal No. 34. It's to shift the sheep
50 season 10 days earlier in portions of Unit 24A and it's

1 presented by Pete DeMatteo. Are you there, Pete?

2

3 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes, I am. Mr. Chair,
4 Members of the Council. The analysis of Proposal 34
5 can be found in your books beginning on Page 95. This
6 proposal was submitted by Scott and Heidi Schoppenhorst
7 of Wiseman. They request that the Federal
8 Subsistence Board change the Federal sheep season from
9 August 20 to September 30 season to the August 10 to
10 September 20 season for Unit 24A, except that portion
11 within the Gates of the Arctic National Park.

12

13 The proposed change would revert the
14 Federal sheep season for the affected area back to the
15 season dates that existed prior to the 2004 05
16 regulatory year. The intent of this proposal would
17 provide all users equal access to the affected sheep
18 population, before users hunting under State
19 regulations have disturbed the animals during the first
20 10 days of the State August 10 to September 20 season.
21 The proponent feels that realigning the Federal and
22 State seasons would provide users with access to
23 undisturbed sheep and a better chance for a successful
24 hunt. The proponent also stated that access to the
25 same limited sheep population in the affected area
26 becomes much more difficult after the sheep have been
27 hunted for 10 days by those hunting under State
28 regulations.

29

30 The intent of the May 2004 regulatory
31 change to a later season was to provide opportunity for
32 Federally-qualified users to harvest sheep after they
33 finished hunting moose during the Federal August 25 to
34 October 1 season. As moose and sheep habitats do not
35 overlap, the later Federal season was asked for,
36 because hunters are preoccupied with moose hunting
37 activities early in the season, during much of the
38 previous August 10 September 20 sheep season.

39

40 Mr. Chair, the proposed regulations can
41 be found again on Page 95. Residents of Unit 24
42 residing north of the Arctic Circle, Anaktuvuk Pass,
43 Allakaket, Alatna, Hughes, and Huslia have a customary
44 and traditional use determination for sheep in Unit 24.

45

46 Mr. Chair, at your March 2004 meeting
47 it was stated by the Council that sheep are important
48 to the subsistence needs of Anaktuvuk Pass and Wiseman
49 residents only and are second to caribou for Anaktuvuk
50 Pass and moose for Wiseman residents. The intent of

1 the proposed additional opportunity was to allow
2 Federally-qualified subsistence users who hunt moose
3 additional time to hunt sheep after the subsistence
4 moose season.

5
6 Analysis of results from 2002 to 2006
7 population surveys conducted in the eastern portion of
8 the affected area and adjacent areas to the east,
9 revealed that the affected sheep population has
10 recovered from low levels reported in the early 1990s
11 and is presently stable.

12
13 According to the Department of Fish and
14 Game, Reports from hunters and surveys indicate that
15 large rams were fairly well represented in most of the
16 eastern Brooks Range during the period of July 2001
17 through June 2004.

18
19 The sheep population within the Dalton
20 Highway Corridor is likely to have a better age
21 structure due to the more restrictive harvest regime
22 and significantly lower level of hunting pressure.

23
24 Beginning in 1992, the Bureau of Land
25 Management administered two Federal subsistence hunts
26 within the Dalton Highway Management Area. Federal
27 permit hunt number RS424 in Unit 24 was for residents
28 of Unit 24 north of the Arctic Circle and residents of
29 Allakaket, Alatna, Hughes and Huslia. The second
30 Federal subsistence hunt RS699 was in the Unit 26B
31 portion of the Dalton Highway Management Area.
32 Non-Federally-qualified hunters also were allowed to
33 hunt in the Management Area under more restrictive
34 State regulations.

35
36 The Federally-qualified user group
37 within the Management Area is relatively small,
38 averaging 2.5 sheep harvests per year since 1995.
39 There is little prospect for growth in Federal
40 subsistence hunter numbers, since they are primarily
41 from the small community of Wiseman. The population of
42 Wiseman according to the 2000 census was 21 people.

43
44 Most sheep hunting in the eastern
45 Brooks Range occurs during August and early September
46 when the weather is most favorable. An estimated 80 to
47 90 percent of the sheep harvest occurs before September
48 1.

49
50 The number of hunters, both subsistence

1 and non-subsistence and the sheep harvest in the survey
2 areas is difficult to determine with complete accuracy
3 because the harvest report information often doesn't
4 identify the specific areas involved.

5
6 Mr. Chair, there is no biological
7 reason to adopt the proposed change that would revert
8 the existing season back to August 10 to September 20.
9 The Federal Board provided the existing August 20 to
10 September 30 season in May 2004 at the request of the
11 Council. The Council has stated that local users
12 prefer to hunt sheep after they have finished meeting
13 their subsistence needs for moose in the fall.

14
15 With that, Mr. Chair, the preliminary
16 conclusion is to oppose the proposal. Thank you.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pete.
19 Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments.

20
21 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Our
22 comments are on Page 105 of your meeting book. They're
23 fairly detailed and the essence is that we support the
24 preliminary conclusion to oppose this proposal for the
25 reasons stated in the justification. We don't see
26 there being a compelling case being made to make this
27 season change, so we just recommend that the current
28 regulation stay in place.

29
30 Thank you.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Terry.
33 Federal Agencies.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any Tribal Council
38 comments.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None here that I
43 see. InterAgency Staff Committee.

44
45 (No comments)

46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Local Advisory
48 Committee didn't take up this proposal. The Park
49 Service Subsistence Resource Commission has not met
50 this winter for Gates of the Arctic. Do we have

1 written comments, Vince.

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. I was
4 searching through my files. I thought that Heidi sent
5 me a written comment on this, but I can't find it. I
6 did have extensive phone conversations with her about
7 this proposal and she maintains the proposal as
8 written, August 10th through September 20th.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Regional
11 Council recommendations and motion.

12

13 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Terry.

16

17 MR. HAYNES: Sorry to interrupt. I
18 made a mistake in our comments. We support this
19 proposal instead of oppose it. We are interested in
20 aligning with the State regulations, which is what this
21 proposal would do. It would align the State and
22 Federal seasons outside the Gates of the Arctic
23 National Park. I apologize for the confusion there.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead,
26 Ron.

27

28 MR. SAM: For discussion purposes, move
29 to adopt.

30

31 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Under Council
34 discussion and justification. Do you have a comment,
35 Ron.

36

37 MR. SAM: Just for my clarification
38 purposes, Terry, could you repeat what you said a
39 second ago.

40

41 MR. HAYNES: Ron, the Department
42 supports this proposal because it would result in the
43 State and Federal sheep hunting dates being aligned
44 outside Gates of the Arctic National Park.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This proposal comes
47 from the village I live in. I'm not in favor of the
48 proposal. I've hunted sheep in that area since I was
49 six years old and I'm familiar with how the weather
50 regimes and the sheep movements are. I first started

1 hunting in the Dittrich River upriver from Wiseman when
2 I was teeny little kid.

3
4 I proposed moving the season further
5 back in September and not utilizing the first part of
6 August. Traditionally, August is the highest
7 precipitation month in the Interior of Alaska and the
8 rivers are high and the water is -- it's raining a lot
9 and Unit 24A is pretty hard to hunt where we're at
10 because we can't use riverboat or anything. It's
11 raining a lot and it's bad weather for hunting.

12
13 The subsistence users in the Wiseman
14 area can utilize the Gates of the Arctic National Park
15 August 1 to April 30th, so the season is open real
16 early for hunting for people who want to go hunting for
17 subsistence. Sheep are typically high and way far back
18 in the hills after a long, hot summer. When they fly
19 survey, the sheep are way far away from the river and
20 it's actually in opposition with what the proposal
21 says, that the sheep are easier to get in the early
22 part of the season.

23
24 When the sport hunter shows up, there's
25 lots of competition and the sheep are being driven all
26 over the place, so I don't even bother to go hunting
27 with those guys. They chase them all over the place.
28 So it's more beneficial to the subsistence users in
29 Unit 24A to hunt sheep from August 20th to September
30 30th and there's been several sheep killed since this
31 season change has occurred in the last few years. So
32 it's benefitted and, as the data showed before, there
33 was no harvest before August 20th previously.

34
35 So I'm opposed to this proposal even
36 though my sister made the proposal. This is primarily
37 driven through a user conflict. It was a real rainy
38 summer and there was a couple sheep out in the front
39 and my brother-in-law got in a fight with some bow
40 hunters and that's where this proposal comes from. For
41 the benefit of the subsistence users, we can hunt on
42 August 10th on Unit 26B, the north side of the Brooks
43 Range. It's in the rain shadow, it's dry over there
44 and the sheep are lower and closer to the valley wall
45 and those guys actually hunt over there quite a bit.
46 So this has really no effect on subsistence use really.
47 It's strictly a user conflict driven proposal and I'm
48 opposed to the proposal. That would be my comment on
49 it.

50

1 Ray.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: A question, Mr. Chairman.
4 Why in a subsistence hunt is there a seven-eighths curl
5 requirement? Why not a smaller ram if you're after
6 meat? The harvest is only three or four and there's
7 over 1,000 sheep in the area.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, I would rather
10 just see one ram. Several years ago when the sheep
11 population was declining there was concern about
12 harvesting older ram component and not harvesting
13 throughout the spectrum, so I went along with that.
14 There's a full curl sport requirement and we have a
15 slight advantage. Seven-eighths is like basically a
16 one year younger sheep that we can harvest. I don't
17 really like to shoot those half curls. The mature
18 sheep, six, seven years old is getting that full body
19 bulk and that's the kind we want to get anyway. I've
20 killed 13-year-old sheep that were really good eating.
21 They're not like moose. They don't get tough, they
22 stay good.

23

24 The seasons that we have are the most
25 benefit to the local people. All the other people in
26 the village that hunt sheep utilize the seasons and
27 have taken advantage of the current season and
28 regulatory structure.

29

30 Any other comments or questions.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. Those
35 in favor of the proposal signify by saying aye.

36

37 (No aye votes)

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to the
40 proposal signify by saying aye.

41

42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal fails
45 unanimously. The next proposal is Proposal 35. Revise
46 the moose season and harvest limits for Unit 19A and
47 19B. This is Pete DeMatteo on teleconference.

48

49 MR. MATHEWS: Pete, if you can still
50 hear me, there's also going to be a small report

1 covered later. I don't know if Tim wants to do it now
2 or tomorrow. Jeff Denton looking at this 19A
3 situation. I believe you have the one from Hollis
4 Twitchell and Alex Nick. We could get you copies, the
5 one from BLM, on this 19A moose.

6

7 MR. DEMATTEO: Vince, you kind of got
8 lost in the echo there. I believe you said someone
9 needs to make a presentation before the analysis.

10

11 MR. MATHEWS: No, Pete. I'm just
12 saying that Tim Craig with BLM will possibly be chiming
13 in from Jeff Denton's survey in the area and I believe
14 you have a copy of Hollis Twitchell's and Alex Nick's
15 report.

16

17 MR. DEMATTEO: Very good.

18

19 MR. MATHEWS: That's it. With the
20 Chair's indulgence, I think you just go ahead and then
21 when Tim wants to present Jeff's, that would probably
22 be right after your analysis.

23

24 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. The analysis
25 of Proposal 35 can be found in your books beginning on
26 Page 107. Proposal 35 was submitted by the Western
27 Interior Council. This proposal requests that requests
28 the Federal Board adopt the temporary regulatory
29 actions it took on Special Action requests WSA06-01a
30 and also 01b for moose in Units 19A and 19B.

31

32 Mr. Chair, the proposal makes several
33 requests which are listed by three parts or three
34 elements and they can be found on Page 107 of the
35 analysis, first page of the analysis.

36

37 Essentially the first element of the
38 request is to close the Federal season in Unit 19A
39 north of the Kuskokwim River upstream from but
40 excluding the George River drainage, and south of the
41 Kuskokwim River upstream from and including the Downey
42 Creek drainage, not including the Lime Village
43 Management Area.

44

45 The second one is to request the
46 modifying of the Federal regulations in Unit 19B to
47 allow only the harvest of one bull with spikefork or
48 50-inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines
49 on one side by State harvest ticket during a September
50 1 to 20 season. That's the second part of the request.

1 The third element is a request to
2 revise the Federal regulations in the remainder of Unit
3 19A to adopt a Federal drawing permit system that would
4 work in concert with the State s September 1 through 20
5 Tier II hunt for antlered bulls in that area.

6
7 Essentially this proposal requests that
8 the Federal Board put into permanent regulation the
9 action that it took on the temporary special action
10 from 2006.

11
12 What had to happen for the third part
13 there for Unit 19A was, quite simply, I'm not going to
14 get deep into the biology, moose population for 19A and
15 B, let's face it, is in dire straits. Because of this
16 in 19A we've had to go to an .804 process. An .804
17 process under ANILCA says that a determination needs to
18 be made by looking at all those who are eligible to
19 harvest moose in a given area and see out of all those
20 communities which ones have the highest dependency out
21 of all the ones that are eligible and that
22 determination was done through an analysis, and that's
23 part of the analysis that's in your book. You can see
24 the .804 analysis, which is part of the overall
25 analysis.

26
27 And essentially six communities were
28 fleshed out in the analysis that have the greatest
29 dependency, out of all those who have customary and
30 traditional use determination for moose in 19A of
31 Federal lands.

32
33 So quite simply a drawing permit was
34 established and a total allocation of 20 moose for
35 Federal lands was established and drawing permits were
36 conducted in each of the six villages and the permits
37 were issued to the people who were awarded the permits.

38
39 The report that you have, I believe
40 that Vince just passed out, shows you the results of
41 the drawing permit process and also the harvest. It
42 was a very successful program. Not as many moose were
43 harvested as we first anticipated but the beauty of the
44 .804 process, instead of just shutting the entire
45 harvest down, it still allowed for a, as we say, a
46 humble amount of harvest, for those who had the highest
47 dependency and still addressed the conservation problem
48 of the moose population.

49
50 That's about as briefly.....

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Standby there, Pete.
2
3 MR. DEMATTEO:the other two.....
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Your microphone.....
6
7 MR. DEMATTEO: Say again.
8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Say Pete.....
10
11 MR. RIVARD: Okay, it's back on, go
12 ahead Pete.
13
14 MR. DEMATTEO: Okay.
15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You're back on
17 again. You broke out there for a second, go ahead,
18 back up just a tiny bit.
19
20 MR. DEMATTEO:partially.....
21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Standby a second,
23 Pete. Standby. Your mic keeps cutting out over there
24 and you're not on the record and so we'll try and get
25 that fixed real quick.
26
27 (Pause)
28
29 MR. DEMATTEO: Okay.
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, can you hear
32 me Pete?
33
34 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes, sir.
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead and back up
37 just a tiny bit, you were off record there, and just
38 restate that.
39
40 MR. DEMATTEO: Okay. As I said before
41 that addresses, as briefly as I can the third element
42 of the proposal, where it requests that the Federal
43 Board establish in permanent regulation a Federal
44 drawing permit system for the western part of 19A in
45 unison with the State's September 1 through 20 Tier II
46 hunt.
47
48 The first and second elements of the
49 request, the first one would be to close all the
50 Federal seasons in Unit 19A north of the Kuskokwim up

1 stream, but excluding the George River and south of the
2 Kuskokwim up stream, Downey Creek, and the second part
3 is a request that Unit 19B, to allow only the harvest
4 of one bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers, and
5 that this would be by State harvest ticket rather than
6 the State registration permit that was used previous,
7 and that would be for the September 1 through 20
8 season.

9
10 Mr. Chair. I prepared talking points
11 that go almost to nine pages, and I know you don't want
12 to hear me read those, but that is about as brief as an
13 explanation that I can give. Nothing would be
14 different than the action that was taken by the Board
15 in 2006 for the fall season, it would just put
16 everything that occurred in 2006 into permanent
17 regulation. It's done in cooperation with the State,
18 on the State side there's a Tier II permit system that
19 maybe Mr. Terry Haynes could cover if you have any
20 questions.

21
22 And with that, I'll stop there and
23 answer any questions you have concerning my
24 presentation.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Does the
27 Council have any questions for Pete.

28
29 Go ahead, Don.

30
31 MR. RIVARD: Pete, maybe you'll want to
32 go with your -- read out what your preliminary
33 conclusion is, I don't think you did that.

34
35 MR. DEMATTEO: Yeah, Mr. Chair, for
36 clarification. The preliminary conclusion is to
37 support with modification to delegate authority to the
38 Refuge manager to annually establish the harvest quota
39 and number of available drawing permits. You can see
40 the modified proposed on Page 121 of your books.

41
42 Page 121 of your books. The three
43 elements that I covered are there.

44
45 The first one there:

46
47 Unit 19A north of the Kuskokwim up
48 stream from, excluding the George River drainage and so
49 on; this would close the season there so there would be
50 no Federal open season to address the conservation

1 concerns in that part.

2

3 And then go down to the next block.

4 And here you have Unit 19A reminder and this is
5 essentially where we establish the drawing permit
6 process for 19A remainder, which is the western part of
7 Unit 19A, as I had mentioned before.

8

9 And then the next block, at the bottom
10 there, it says Unit 19B, one bull spike-fork, September
11 1 through September 20th, that would essentially
12 eliminate the language or the provision for one
13 antlered bull by State registration permit, so it'd be
14 one bull spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with
15 four or more brow-tines on one side by State harvest
16 ticket. And you would no longer be required to get a
17 State registration permit.

18

19 And, with that, Mr. Chair, I'll stop
20 there.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thank you.
23 And any questions for Pete.

24

25 MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Carl.

28

29 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, Pete, this is Carl.
30 I see you issued Federal drawing permits at 91, could
31 you correct me on that Federal permit, as soon as you
32 hit 20 moose then you shut the season off?

33

34 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes, Mr. Chair, Mr.
35 Morgan, that is correct. On the Federal side as soon
36 as 20 bulls have been harvested, yes, that would
37 complete the Federal quota. The total allocation
38 between Federal and State is 60 moose. And on the
39 State side, the State has to do the same thing, is
40 monitor the harvest closely.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.

43

44 MR. RIVARD: Yeah, Carl. Mr. Chair.
45 I'd like to just add to that, that was for last summer,
46 the quota was 60, with the Federal having a 20 -- 20 of
47 those 60. And the proposed regulation with
48 modification is to make that more flexible because
49 those numbers may change as the population goes up or
50 down. It may still stay in the drawing permit stage

1 but we may be able to provide more permits or less
2 depending on what the population is doing. That's why
3 you see the language of the proposed regulation on Page
4 121.

5
6 And for last summer there was a quota
7 of 20 and if you look on this report that was handed,
8 on Page 3, there towards the bottom, it says a total of
9 only six moose were reported harvested on Refuge lands,
10 so they didn't even come close to that 20 this summer.

11
12 Thank you.

13
14 MR. MORGAN: Thank you, for answering
15 that question. The next question I was going to ask
16 was how many moose was actually harvested.

17
18 Thank you.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have one question,
25 Pete. I was wondering what your harvest rate objective
26 is, is it five percent of the bull population, two, or
27 what's setting this harvest cap of 20?

28
29 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. If you turn
30 to the report that Vince handed out, I believe there's
31 a table in there, I'm -- let's see.....

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Pete, what I'm
34 asking is, how did you come up with 20 moose to
35 harvest; is that a percentage of the population there
36 or what's the.....

37
38 MR. DEMATTEO: Oh, Mr. Chair, that was
39 determined simply by that it was looked in the past to
40 see through the harvest information how many moose were
41 roughly harvested on Federal lands and it was 20 moose
42 so they went with that.

43
44 And since the harvest success rate was
45 20 percent, actually you have to give out five times as
46 many permits so it turned out to be 100 permits were
47 issued totally with a harvest allocation of 20 moose.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That gives me
50 an idea, rhyme or reason to how that was determined.

1 Any other Council questions for Pete
2 DeMatteo.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So seeing none,
7 State comments.
8
9 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair.
10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead, Pete.
12
13 MR. DEMATTEO: On Page 2 of that report
14 that Vince handed out there is a little chart if you'd
15 like to see permits that were drawn in each of the six
16 villages, if you just want to get an idea of what the
17 interest and how the permits were awarded.
18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Do you feel
20 that there'll be more applicants this next year because
21 -- now that people understand there was a drawing
22 permit, that there may be more applicants?
23
24 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes. Yes, people were
25 told that next year the same process would be in place,
26 that someone from the Federal agencies would be there
27 and in cooperation with the traditional councils, the
28 drawing would take place, yes.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Carl.
31
32 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, Pete, this is Carl.
33 You're saying that you had total of 91, out of that 91,
34 14 of those were permit -- I mean designated hunter
35 permits?
36
37 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes, sir.
38
39 MR. MORGAN: So the total is really 91.
40 That 91 plus 14.
41
42 MR. DEMATTEO: Again the total is 91
43 but out of the 91, 14 requested designated hunter
44 permits, plus 14 -- it's 14 of the 91 requested
45 designated hunter permits.
46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Vince.
48
49 MR. MATHEWS: Also in the report from
50 Hollis and Alex Nick, you know, this wa sa huge effort

1 by the Refuge with the different villages up river, and
2 it took a lot of effort by village coordinators to pull
3 this off. I'd encourage you not to comment on that,
4 it's up to you if you want to, on Page 3, the
5 suggestions from the Refuge that are going to the
6 Federal Board on this issue, I assume they're going to
7 the Board but they're up there and basically what
8 they're asking is, after timely and adequate
9 announcement and notification each of the eligible
10 communities, Refuge Staff would make one trip to each
11 eligible community to conduct the permit drawing and
12 issuing permits. They had to have multiple trips
13 because of weather and multiple factors which is time
14 consuming.

15
16 The second is Federal drawing permits
17 would be available and issued only to those present at
18 the drawing.

19
20 And then you can read the rest, but
21 this is -- as we know .804's and Tier II's are
22 difficult situations in addition to the difficultness
23 of, you know, people having to say that some can hunt
24 and not, there's also the actual administration of the
25 hunt. So the, Council, I just want to make you aware
26 of that, that that's going on and the Refuge analyzed
27 that and came up with these suggestions. You just may
28 want to be aware of, especially Carl, in your area.
29 And, hopefully, tonight, if public do show up, their
30 comments on how this hunt was -- how the hunt went and
31 their concerns, hopefully they'll show up and testify
32 to the Council because it's one of the reasons why
33 you're meeting here. This is a very difficult
34 situation, as Pete said, the moose population is in
35 dire straits.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any other
38 questions. Carl.

39
40 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, just I see on the
41 Federal permit idea, two days to report, we're given
42 two days to report. I think the State was, what, five
43 days, to turn in your report.

44
45 MR. RIVARD: Terry can you answer that.

46
47 MR. HAYNES: I didn't hear the
48 question.

49
50 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, the Federal side was

1 you had two days to turn in -- after you caught a
2 moose, within two days you were supposed to turn it, in
3 other words, it was very necessary to keep an accurate
4 count. What's the State, five days?

5
6 MR. HAYNES: I'll have to check on
7 that. I can't remember what the reporting requirement
8 is for Tier II hunts, if it's different from the other
9 permit hunts or not, and I don't think I have the -- I
10 don't think I have the form here in front of me
11 but.....

12
13 MR. RIVARD: Pete, is that -- go ahead,
14 Terry.

15
16 MR. HAYNES: But as the discussion
17 proceeds, I can try to track that down. It might take
18 me a minute to run out to the front counter, and I
19 better do that just to make sure I get you an accurate
20 answer.

21
22 MR. RIVARD: Pete, do you know if the
23 answer is in the analysis itself on that question?

24
25 MR. DEMATTEO: No, it is not.

26
27 MR. HAYNES: During your Council
28 discussion, after I present State comments I can run
29 out and get that information, Mr. Chairman.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. All right,
32 you can go ahead and make your comments then, Terry, so
33 you can get back out and find that other information.

34
35 Go ahead.

36
37 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, very much, and
38 I apologize for not having that at my fingertips.
39 Before I present our comments, I'd like to -- and this
40 is for Pete's benefit as well, on Page 107 of the
41 analysis, the first paragraph of the discussion, the
42 final sentence of that paragraph says the total
43 harvestable surplus is estimated to be 45 bulls. And I
44 think that was based on some earlier calculations and I
45 think we would recommend that that number be revised
46 back to 60 bulls for the time being. At this point we
47 don't have any solid information to recommend that the
48 harvestable surplus number be changed. So we would
49 want to see that number go back to 60.

50

1 And then another point that was
2 discussed earlier was how was the number 20 decided
3 upon as the allocation for the Federal hunt. That was
4 decided on, in part, when Department Staff determined
5 that the harvestable surplus for this past year for
6 both the State and Federal hunts should be a total of
7 60 moose. And then there was an evaluation that
8 partially involved determining what's the land status
9 in the hunt area. And 20 may have been a number that
10 is in part a harvest estimate but it was also based on
11 the fact that there was about one-third of the land in
12 the hunt area was deemed and two-thirds was State and
13 private land that would fall under the State
14 regulations.

15
16 All that having been said, the
17 Department strongly encourages support for the proposal
18 as modified on Page 121 in the preliminary conclusion.
19 It's very important that these two hunts be closely
20 coordinated and that having essentially the same
21 Federal regulation in place as State regulation is
22 necessary to do that. It is also important to provide
23 the Federal manager with the flexibility to adjust the
24 number of permits and the harvest quota upward or
25 downward in consultation with the Department once those
26 decisions have been made so that we keep these hunts
27 closely coordinated.

28
29 And I agree with the earlier statements
30 that Yukon Delta Refuge Staff did put in a tremendous
31 amount of time communicating with people who were
32 Federally-qualified hunters. Department of Fish and
33 Game Staff visited communities in the area too to
34 provide Tier II applications and to answer questions
35 regarding the State Tier II hunt. We really think
36 there was an excellent effort on the part of, both the
37 State and Federal managers, to ensure that a limited
38 hunt was administered as fairly and as effectively as
39 possible. And none of us like to have Tier II hunts,
40 none of us like to have limited Federal hunts but in
41 this situation where we've got to give that moose
42 population an opportunity to rebound it's really
43 important that we work together, and I think the way
44 this hunt was administered last season was a good
45 example of how we can cooperate to assure that we're
46 protecting the resource and providing hunting
47 opportunity to the extent possible.

48
49 That's all I have, Mr. Chairman, thank
50 you.

1 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Pete.

4

5 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. I'd just
6 like to add that the Bureau of Land Management, Jeff
7 Denton, who no longer is an employee of the Bureau of
8 Land Management also assisted with some of that, I
9 believe in the village of Aniak helping with that
10 process that Mr. Haynes just spoke of.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Didn't know
13 that Jeff Denton was off the BLM. He's been a
14 longstanding supplier of information in the lower
15 portion of this region for the Bureau of Land
16 Management lands, so sorry to hear that.

17

18 So we went through the State comments.
19 I'm very happy to hear that both the State and Federal
20 government worked together to provide subsistence
21 opportunities for people here on the moose population
22 that's in terrible condition. These bull/cow ratios
23 are really bad, but hopefully with the easier winders
24 we're having we'll get a quick recovery on it.

25

26 Any other questions for the State from
27 the Council.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. So do
32 we have any Federal agency comments from BLM. Go
33 ahead, Tim.

34

35 MR. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman. Council
36 members. I really have very little to add. That is a
37 report that was given to me by Jeff Denton to pass
38 around. And if you look at it just real quickly, what
39 you'll notice is that he did a survey of moose in a
40 portion of the Aniak River drainage, Aniak Slough and
41 he didn't get a big enough sample size to really say
42 anything. It might be significant if you look there he
43 saw more bears than he saw moose, and that's all I have
44 to say.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks a lot
49 Tim. And we'll look through this fall composition
50 survey for 19A when we get a chance. So do we have any

1 Native and tribal comments on the proposal.

2

3 Go ahead, Timothy.

4

5 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 For the record, Timothy Andrew with AVCP.

7

8 The only concern that I have -- that we

9 have is the utilization of the language State Tier II

10 permit. Our concern is that the State Tier permit

11 system has different criteria than the Federal

12 qualified user criteria. Within the State Tier II

13 system, anybody from across the state of Alaska can

14 qualify for the hunt. And the Federal managers within

15 this portion of Unit 19A wouldn't be fulfilling their

16 ANILCA mandate to provide for subsistence opportunity

17 if it were open to the State Tier II permittee.

18

19 However, I propose language within the

20 Staff comments to follow the State Tier II permit and

21 insert the language; by a Federally-qualified user.

22

23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Well, the

26 Federal drawing permits are only for rural residents as

27 far as I know. The State of Alaska, they have to

28 administer under their regulations and so what was your

29 -- let me ask you again, what was your -- you're

30 requesting the Tier II be to Federally-qualified

31 residents under the -- the State of Alaska can't do

32 that as far as I know.

33

34 MR. ANDREW: Yeah, my concern is that

35 -- well, there wasn't a whole bunch of people that

36 qualified from Anchorage or Fairbanks within the State

37 Tier II permit drawing that they had or the selection

38 that they had but, you know, I can understand the

39 complexity of the land ownership within Unit 19A, the

40 Refuge, BLM and State land as well. But in order to

41 fully advocate for the Federally-qualified user, you

42 know, if we were to insert the language Federally-

43 qualified user following the State Tier II permit, I

44 think it would fulfill the intent of ANILCA.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I'm still not

49 -- the drawing permit that the Federal government's

50 going to implement will only apply to rural residents

1 of the affected villages here within this 19A area.
2 The State Tier II language, this Council has no
3 authority, really, to influence -- we could comment to
4 the State Game Board on that but.....

5
6 MR. ANDREW: Well, perhaps, you know,
7 Mr. Chairman, if we would move to delete the State Tier
8 II permit it would clarify things for me.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we have to
11 have a State Tier II permit because there's two-thirds
12 of the land mass here is under State control. The
13 State controls the State and Native corporation lands
14 and that's what the rub is, that they have -- without a
15 Tier II permit there would be no hunting on those
16 lands.

17
18 MR. ANDREW: Yes, I totally understand
19 that. But within your authority, I mean you can
20 regulate the Federal drawing permit, but the State Tier
21 II permit system is something that's outside the
22 Federal jurisdiction lands. And maybe somebody else
23 can clarify a little bit more than I can.

24
25 MR. RIVARD: If I may, Mr. Chair, and
26 Pete DeMatteo may help me on this if I don't quite word
27 this right.

28
29 Federally-qualified users can apply for
30 both the Federal drawing permit and the State Tier II
31 permit. If they're awarded a State Tier II permit,
32 then in order to allow more people to have a chance to
33 hunt, we then exclude them from getting a Federal
34 permit as well.

35
36 So it's actually a benefit to the
37 Federal subsistence users. They have two cracks at it,
38 whereas the State people that are not Federally-
39 qualified only can apply under the State Tier II
40 permit.

41
42 So that's why you see this wording
43 under the special conditions, it's for those Federally-
44 qualified users who apply for the State Tier II permit
45 and get awarded one, then we don't want to give them a
46 Federal permit as well, it gives other people a chance
47 for that Federal permit, so that's what that means
48 there.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see.

1 MR. DEMATTEO: That's correct.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
4
5 MR. RIVARD: Okay, Pete's confirming
6 that. Terry.
7
8 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman.
9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Terry, go ahead.
11
12 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, just a
13 couple of points. The State Tier II hunt, you need to
14 report within five days of killing an animal, either in
15 person or by phone to the Fish and Game office in
16 McGrath, and then there are -- if you're unsuccessful
17 you have 15 days to report.
18
19 Another point I'd like to make and this
20 -- I don't know if this responds to Mr. Andrew's
21 question but it's important to remember that if you
22 have a State Tier II permit and you are not a
23 Federally-qualified subsistence user you're not
24 authorized to hunt on Federal lands.
25
26 MR. DEMATTEO: That's correct.
27
28 MR. HAYNES: So if you have a State
29 Tier II permit and you're from Anchorage or Fairbanks,
30 you're not competing with Federally-qualified
31 subsistence users on Federal lands because you're not
32 eligible. If you're a local resident from one of the
33 communities listed on Page 121, if you're Tuluksak,
34 Lower Kalskag, Upper Kalskag, Aniak, Chuathbaluk,
35 Crooked Creek and you have a State Tier II permit you
36 are allowed to hunt on the Federal public lands. So I
37 think the appropriate concern about competition is
38 covered by the Federal public lands not being opened to
39 Tier II permittees who are not Federally-qualified.
40
41 Thank you.
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, very much
44 for that clarification. That was very instrumental
45 into my understanding of how this hunt is being
46 administered.
47
48 Okay, go ahead, Carl.
49
50 MR. MORGAN: Terry, I hope I don't put

1 you in a spot again. I was just wondering, do you have
2 a break down of where these Tier II permits came from?

3

4 MR. HAYNES: I can look on my computer,
5 I think I may have a list of those communities. But as
6 I recall most of the permittees were from rural
7 communities out in that area. But as you go ahead with
8 your discussion I'll see if I have that information
9 handy.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So let's see,
12 now, we were at Native, tribal and village comments.
13 Do you want to make a comment there Nick.

14

15 MR. KAMEROFF: Nick Kameroff from
16 Aniak. Thanks again for the opportunity. I heard a
17 little clarification on my part for the State Tier II,
18 saying that if I had a State Tier II permit I could
19 hunt on State land or Federal land, I commend that, but
20 I would also like to see it reversed, too, if I had a
21 Federal permit I would also like to hunt on State
22 lands. Because last fall I was the lucky recipient of
23 a Federal permit and I state my case, I spent more time
24 hunting for Federal lands than I did hunting for moose
25 and those lands are not marked, Federal lands. So I'd
26 like to see one hand help out the other hand since we
27 see the Tier II being able to hunt Federal and State.
28 I wouldn't mind seeing the Federal permit be able to
29 hunt Federal land and State land as well.

30

31 I think that's my biggest one because I
32 like I stated I spent more time hunting Federal lands
33 than moose.

34

35 So thanks.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does OSM have a
38 statement to answer him there as to why a Federal
39 permit couldn't hunt on the State land?

40

41 MR. DEMATTEO: Don, could you relay the
42 question to me, there was too much echo.

43

44 MR. RIVARD: The question is why
45 Federally-qualified users who get a drawing permit are
46 not allowed to hunt on State lands and they're
47 advocating that they should be allowed to.

48

49 MR. DEMATTEO: Oh, because in the sense
50 the drawing permit is a Federally only hunt so

1 therefore they have to be on Federal public lands which
2 is -- essentially a little bit of BLM lands and a
3 portion of the Yukon-Delta Refuge there in 19A.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Robert.

6

7 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I could add
8 to that.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

11

12 MR. HAYNES: The Federal subsistence
13 regulations can only apply to Federal public lands
14 which is essentially what Pete is saying so the Federal
15 Board is not authorized to allow its hunts to occur off
16 of Federal public lands.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Robert.

19

20 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21 Pete, but you have to realize and understand, too, that
22 people do have State hunting licenses. I mean there is
23 no Federal hunting license to hunt on Federal land, you
24 have to have a State. So this is really confusing
25 here, not only for me, but for the other people that
26 are going to be here to do this hunt. So there is an
27 either or or it's all the same; am I correct here.

28

29 MR. DEMATTEO: Is that toward me?

30

31 MR. RIVARD: Yes.

32

33 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes. The requirement of
34 the State hunting license is an essential request for
35 if you're hunting on State lands or Federal lands, you
36 have to have a current State hunting license. In this
37 particular case, if you have a State hunting license
38 and you draw a Federal permit, you're only permitted to
39 hunt on Federal public lands. Because as Mr. Haynes
40 pointed out, the Federal Board only has the authority
41 to establish that hunt for Federal public lands and not
42 off of Federal public lands.

43

44 On the other hand if you have a State
45 hunting license and you draw a Tier II permit, then you
46 could hunt on State lands.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

49

50 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. I can

1 provide Mr. Morgan with that Tier II information now if
2 you'd like.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

5

6 MR. HAYNES: Of the 200 Tier II permits
7 that were issued 55 went to Aniak residents, 46 went to
8 Kalskag residents, 26 to Bethel, 13 to Crooked Creek,
9 11 to Akiachak, 11 to Chuathbaluk, 10 to Akiak, 5
10 Tuluksak, 5 to Sleetmute, 5 Kwethluk, 4 to Napaimute, 4
11 to Red Devil, and one each to Crow Village,
12 Nunapitchuk, Stoney River, Georgetown, Napaskiak,
13 Napakiak and Kasigluk. So all 200 permits went to
14 rural residents of Unit 18 and 19. So there were no
15 Tier II hunters from the urban areas. And all of the
16 Tier II applicants were, like I say, generally from
17 that part of the state where the hunt occurred.

18

19 Thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right, thank
22 you, Terry. And you got another comment Nick.

23

24 MR. KAMEROFF: Yes, I do. Nick
25 Kameroff again. What I would like to see then
26 implemented for those of us hunting our Federal lands
27 to hunt the moose that we're going to be hunting, I
28 would like to see the Federal people mark those areas
29 so we can have a better chance. Because I know we were
30 given a nice colorful map that shows the State hunting
31 lands, private lands, Federal lands, but it wasn't very
32 big and it was hard to break it down and really tell
33 exactly where you were. So I would appreciate if, you
34 know, in the future that the Feds come out there and
35 put some kind of Federal marker saying, okay, you could
36 hunt here and it goes around one bend and then, oops,
37 it ends again and then a few bends later it comes back
38 on, you're back on Federal lands again. I know it's
39 going to cost a lot of money but, you know, it'd make
40 it easier for a lot of us out here hunting on Federal
41 lands.

42

43 That's my comments, thank you.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

46

47 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.

50

1 MR. COLLINS: Question. Looking at if
2 all of these were Federally-qualified that got the
3 permits, why not all 60 under the State regulations,
4 then they could hunt on State or Federal, they're still
5 weighted to those who -- the ones that qualify are the
6 ones who are the most dependent or the closest to the
7 resource so what would be different if all 60 went
8 under State and then they could hunt on either.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. Well, don't
11 know why the Federal Board process -- because they have
12 authority to manage and they set a quota because of a
13 percentage of land. Don probably could answer that.

14
15 MR. RIVARD: Well, I don't know if I
16 have the complete answer, Mr. Chair. But what you're
17 doing is you're putting the entire process into the --
18 decision into the State of the hand -- the hands of the
19 State, okay. And we have to do the .804 analysis,
20 which we did, and we came up with there were six
21 villages that have priority over everybody else.

22
23 MR. COLLINS: So there is a difference.

24
25 MR. RIVARD: There is a difference. If
26 you notice, again, those six that are listed on page
27 121. And so we have to provide a certain amount of
28 opportunity to those six villages. If you go to
29 completely just the State Tier II, there's no guarantee
30 that those folks are going to get permits. Okay. So
31 there is some allocation issues and that's the way we
32 meet our obligation under the .804.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. Go
37 ahead, Ron.

38
39 MR. SAM: Yeah, just so.....

40
41 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair.

42
43 MR. RIVARD; Well, hold on a minute,
44 Ron's going to talk.

45
46 MR. SAM: Yeah, thank you. Just to
47 answer or alleviate some of Nick Kameroff's fears, that
48 just during this last hunt up at Allakaket, this five
49 day hunt, for the last five or six days before the hunt
50 we had a local State licensed vendor go out there and

1 GPS the whole area where we expected to hunt, so it is
2 possible. It was possible with a snowmachine, I don't
3 know how much harder it would be during a fall hunt for
4 this area, but it is possible and they've done that up
5 there, marked lands. Like you said, one corner of the
6 land will be State and one quarter -- one mile will be
7 Federal, but it was marked and so it is possible.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: How did they mark
10 that?

11

12 MR. SAM: GPS.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But I mean they
15 marked it with flagging?

16

17 MR. SAM: Federal -- no, they put up
18 signs.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

21

22 MR. SAM: So it was easily understood.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It would be my
25 recommendation to the Federal managers to mark the
26 boundaries of the Federal lands for -- there's fishery
27 boundaries and so forth. This is getting to be more
28 and more of an issue, these markers on the beach where
29 people are hunting.

30

31 Any further comments, and then Pete
32 DeMatteo wanted to make another comment.

33

34 Go ahead, Pete.

35

36 MR. DEMATTEO: Well, thank you, Mr.
37 Chairman, but I have nothing.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Or any more Council
40 questions. InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Advisory group
45 comments. Did the Advisory Committee meet on that.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There's no Park
50 Service.

1 MR. SAM: Vince.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, go ahead,
4 Vince.

5

6 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, I don't know if the
7 gentleman from the Advisory Committee wanted to speak
8 but their committee did submit written comments from
9 their November 29th meeting which he has echoed.

10

11 But just for the record, they discussed
12 the restricted harvest in Unit 19 resulting from the
13 Federal special action. By consent the committee felt
14 that the hunt boundaries are so unclear that they are
15 impossible to find. There's an urgent request that the
16 Federal and State agencies, both, clean up their
17 boundaries so that they can coincide with one another
18 whenever possible.

19

20 And, two, land marks and logical
21 markers be specified so boundaries are useful, able to
22 find and use logical drainages, et cetera, as their
23 perimeters.

24

25 The discussion included the regional
26 management boundary between Western Alaska and the
27 Interior regions. And I'm not sure what that last
28 statement means. I think what they meant was the
29 Yukon-Delta regional boundary and Western Interior.

30

31 But anyway that's from Central
32 Kuskokwim Advisory Committee.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we can't
35 delineate the marker between the YK-Delta Council and
36 our Council but I do think that some markers on the
37 beach would help assist the residents and when they're
38 on Federal lands.

39

40 So those are the only written comments
41 we have Vince.

42

43 MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so the Regional
46 Council -- any other public testimony.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. The Regional

1 Council recommendation and motion for adoption.
2
3 MR. MORGAN; So moved.
4
5 MR. STICKMAN: Second.
6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, Carl moved,
8 Mickey seconds. Discussion. Any discussion on the
9 proposal -- Vince.
10
11 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. Just to
12 make it clear, Carl, you're going with the support with
13 modification to delegate the authority to the Refuge
14 Manager.....
15
16 MR. MORGAN: Yes.
17
18 MR. MATHEWS:on Page 121.
19
20 MR. MORGAN: Yes.
21
22 MR. MATHEWS: And the other thing is,
23 just out of courtesy to the community, I don't want you
24 to stop your vote, but if you make it clear to
25 representatives here, that you'll revisit it if people
26 come tonight and testify and provide some information
27 that may -- that you may want to reconsider what you
28 voted on or do whatever. We don't know how many people
29 may or may not show up tonight for the public
30 testimony.
31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So, yes, the motion
33 is to support with modification the Refuge manager to
34 annually establish the harvest quota and sets out this
35 drawing hunt parameters for Unit 19A and 19B.
36
37 Comments, Carl.
38
39 MR. MORGAN: Nope.
40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments
42 from the Council. Ron.
43
44 MR. SAM: Just -- I don't know what we
45 can do about it now, but I would still like to see more
46 clarification on the difference between State Tier II
47 and Federally-qualified users. It seems to me there's
48 some -- might just be some minor differences but I'd
49 like to know about them.
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Robert.

2

3 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
4 really don't -- I really feel for these people over
5 here on this side because it's such a hard time to get
6 a moose over here and to have restrictions to be put on
7 them from the Federal side here, I mean is there any
8 way that we can amend this proposal here to recommend
9 that you hunt both rather than either or. This is so
10 confusing for me here because I mean we're used to just
11 going out and hunting either Federal or State land in
12 21 or up in 21B, 21D, 21E all the way up the river
13 here. And here it's just unbearable, my feeling,
14 because, geez, over here they have a right to hunt
15 moose just as much as we do.

16

17 And, Mr. Chairman, I would recommend
18 that you do look into this if we have to make an
19 amendment into this Federal proposal here, I think we
20 should do it.

21

22 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Robert.
25 Yeah, I feel for the people from the complexity of
26 these regulations but because the Federal managers have
27 to set a more limited criteria and they have to narrow
28 that to the Federal lands and to the Federal users. It
29 actually gives 20 more moose harvest to the area and so
30 that's just kind of this -- the Federal government
31 can't delineate giving authority onto the State lands
32 with a Federal hunt, and so that's the complexities of
33 the dual system. But I do feel that some of the
34 mitigations can be that the Federal managers mark the
35 boundaries of the Federal lands with range markers or
36 however that might be so that people will know where
37 the land boundaries are and which side of the -- where
38 the Federal lands start and end.

39

40 So we have the same thing up there
41 where I live, we got Federal and State lands and
42 there's places where we can hunt and we can't hunt and
43 we know where those are, they're boundaries, and I got
44 a complex map that I have to look at when I'm getting
45 around that area, and so it's just the way it is, I
46 mean it's just kind of the complexities of these -- if
47 you're used to hunting without any -- and with larger
48 populations, but as time goes on, this is the
49 complexities of rural preference, it's zoning in on
50 Federal land. That's where -- if the Native

1 corporation lands were managed by the Federal
2 government for subsistence and the allotment lands, a
3 lot of the lands near villages would then fall under
4 Federal management and the complexities would not be
5 nearly as great.

6

7 Go ahead, Robert.

8

9 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10 Just a quick comment, that you have to drive by a moose
11 because you cannot shoot it because you're Federal-
12 qualified ,if it's on State land, you have to pass it
13 up. It might be the only moose you see all year. I
14 mean over here it's kind of desolated for moose.

15

16 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've had to do that.
19 I've had to drive by moose on State land and couldn't
20 shoot it and that's just kind of the way it goes.

21

22 So any other comments on the proposal.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing no more
27 comments on the proposal I wanted the community to be
28 aware that we're going to take additional comments.
29 We've heard lots of pertinent comments on the proposal.
30 We have a dire straight moose population problem here
31 with eight bulls per 100 cows, it's a bad situation,
32 and so got to bite the bullet so to speak and deal with
33 all the regulations and stuff and hopefully this moose
34 population will turn around real quick and we'll get
35 away from this in an expeditious manner.

36

37 But this management regime seems to
38 address the State and Federal government working
39 together and I'm glad to see that to the best degree to
40 the benefit of the local subsistence users. And so I'm
41 in favor of this proposal.

42

43 And so those in favor of the proposal
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 07-35
4 carries with support for the modification. We're going
5 to go to a break now because Salena needs to fix some
6 of the mics here, and we'll come back in about 10
7 minutes or so.
8
9 Thank you.
10
11 REPORTER: Thank you.
12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.
14
15 (Off record)
16
17 (On record)
18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I guess we'll
20 come back to order again.
21
22 (Pause)
23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we'll bring this
25 meeting back to order again. And we were on Proposal
26 35 and we're going to go through Proposal 36 and 37,
27 shift the fall moose season later for portions of Unit
28 21B and add the March bulls only season in portions of
29 21B and this will be an analysis with Pete DeMatteo
30 again on teleconference and so go ahead -- oh, I guess
31 Geoff's going to do that, so go ahead, Geoff.
32
33 MR. BYERSDORF: I may have jumped the
34 gun. I just thought Pete was going to ask me.
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay.
37
38 MR. DEMATTEO: Geoff, would you please
39 do the analysis.
40
41 MR. BYERSDORF: Thanks, Pete. I guess
42 it's a matter of public record now.
43
44 Again, Geoff Byersdorf with the
45 Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge and I'll be
46 doing the presentation. It's the Staff presentation
47 for Pete on Proposals 36 and 37. And, Pete, if there's
48 anything that I miss in here, please, at the end speak
49 up and let me know.
50

1 Mr. Chair. Members of the Council.
2 The analysis for Proposal 36 and 37 can be found in
3 your book on Page 135.

4
5 Proposal 36 was submitted by the
6 Western Interior Regional Advisory Council and it
7 requests the Federal Subsistence Board eliminate the
8 Federal August 22nd to 31st moose season and change the
9 September 5th to 25th season to September 5th to
10 October 1st for Unit 21B, that part of the Nowitna
11 drainage down stream from and including the Little Mud
12 River drainage. The proposed change would also
13 require a State registration permit during September
14 5th to 25th and a Federal permit from September 26th to
15 October 1st.

16
17 Proposal 37, also submitted by the
18 Western Interior Regional Advisory Council requests
19 that the Board establish a March 1st to 5th moose
20 season in Unit 21B, that portion of the Nowitna River
21 drainage down stream from and including the Little Mud
22 River drainage with a one bull harvest limit.

23
24 The proposed regulatory change would
25 require a Federal registration permit that would be
26 issued to the heads of households only, as you guys
27 discussed at your Council meeting there in Ruby.

28
29 The proponents intent for these
30 proposals is based on local reports of warmer than
31 normal temperatures that have occurred during the Unit
32 21B fall moose season in the lower Nowitna drainage.
33 The proponent claims that the October 1st extension
34 would provide a few days of cooler temperatures that
35 are conducive to fall bull movements and hunter access
36 to the resource. The proponent claims the proposed
37 March 1st to 5th season would provide Federally-
38 qualified users who did not harvest a fall moose during
39 the fall season with the opportunity to take a moose in
40 the spring. The proponent feels that the warmer than
41 normal fall temperatures have significantly affected
42 the local fall moose harvest in Unit 21B stating that
43 moose generally do not exhibit seasonal movements to
44 rivers and streams until the presence of cooler fall
45 temperatures.

46
47 Mr. Chair. Members of the Council.
48 The proposed regulation changes can be seen on Page
49 136.
50

1 And continuing on Pete does give a very
2 short list as far as the regulatory history here. I'm
3 going to go skip beyond that and start off with at
4 recent meetings that were held in Ruby and also with
5 the Koyukuk River Fish and Game Advisory Committee in
6 Fairbanks some of the elders and some of the residents
7 pointed out that identifying a bull moose in March can
8 be confusing and that cows could inadvertently be
9 harvested as a result.

10

11 Local residents also made statements
12 that they were in support of eliminating the new August
13 22nd to 31st season because hunters preferred hunting
14 during the October 5th to 25th season.

15

16 Overall the biological analysis shows
17 that the lower Nowitna River moose population is
18 considered stable at low densities with good
19 productivity and recruitment and moderate improvements
20 in the adult and bull/cow numbers that were observed in
21 2006 as compared to the 2005 surveys. This population
22 can only remain stable at the current harvest levels.

23

24 Analysis of results from comparison of
25 Ruby residents annual total need for moose versus the
26 reported moose harvest during the last six years
27 revealed that Ruby hunters have not fulfilled their
28 large animal needs in recent years. And just as a
29 comparison here, what I wanted to point out, that the
30 Alaska Department of Fish and Game harvest ticket
31 reporting for 2006 shows that 12 moose were taken out
32 of Ruby, this compares to the State's five year average
33 of 15. Results from this comparative analysis support
34 the proponent's claim that Ruby residents are not
35 meeting their annual subsistence needs.

36

37 Some of the effects of Proposal 36, you
38 know, obviously if this was adopted it would bring the
39 Federal regulations out of alignment with the State
40 regulations. If the Federal and State regulations are
41 not in alignment, as you're aware, it's going to have
42 mixed blocks of Federal, State land with consequence
43 complexity as far as law enforcement on those lands.
44 Another effect is that researchers and natural resource
45 managers agree that extending the season further into
46 the rut could have some negative effects on breeding
47 behavior and breeding success. Analysis from those
48 studies has also revealed that the average breeding
49 date for Alaskan moose is October 5th with a range from
50 September 28th through October 12th. Further analysis

1 from these same studies revealed that there's very
2 little differences among years in all the studies
3 suggesting that photo period rather than the ambient
4 temperature is what's influencing rut timing.

5
6 Therefore, adoption of the proposed
7 season could lead to a decrease in breeding success in
8 subsequent reduction in calf production.

9
10 The proposed season extension of
11 September 26th to October 1st would provide opportunity
12 for Federally-qualified users to hunt moose in the
13 affected area of 21B during a few days when
14 temperatures may be cooler.

15
16 Adoption of this proposal would
17 eliminate the new August 22nd to 31st season but it
18 does not deny opportunity as the proponents in the area
19 have stated that local residents favor hunting during
20 cooler weather which may be present during that time
21 period.

22
23 The current State regulations provide
24 for an August 22nd to 31st and a September 5th to 25th
25 season.

26
27 Adoption of the season extension would
28 then provide a total of 37 days of hunting opportunity
29 between the Federal and State seasons for that portion
30 of Unit 21B.

31
32 Adoption of the proposed regulation may
33 create the need to establish a Federal permit system
34 for the Federal only season from September 26th to
35 October 1st. The proposed six day extension is not
36 expected to have any detrimental impacts on the
37 existing bull moose population. Total annual harvest
38 for the affected area is not anticipated to change
39 significantly.

40
41 That's all I have for the analysis of
42 Proposal -- the effects of Proposal 36.

43
44 Continuing on to 37, which is the March
45 1st to 5th season. If Proposal 37 were adopted it
46 would bring the Federal regulations out of alignment
47 with the State. It would also have mixed blocks of
48 Federal and State land and as we've stated before, with
49 the difference in the Federal and State lands there's
50 going to be some law enforcement issues that would need

1 to be addressed.

2

3

4 Adoption of the proposed regulation
5 would create the need to establish a Federal permit
6 system for the to be announced season. Because the
7 subsistence wildlife regulations lack a definition of
8 the head of household, it's not possible to determine
9 who is going to qualify as the head of the household.
10 Federal permits would be limited to one per household
11 if adoption of this proposal requires a Federal permit
12 system.

12

13

14 Hunters that harvested a fall moose
15 would be ineligible to harvest a bull moose during the
16 proposed March season. The Federal Board has
17 recognized the difficulty that hunters may have in
18 distinguishing between cows and bulls after their
19 antlers have been shed and March seasons are commonly
20 authorized only when there is a harvestable surplus of
21 cows. Because the affected moose population has
22 remained stable at its size and density since the late
23 '80s inadvertent harvest of cows during the proposed
24 March season could lead to less productivity and
25 population decline.

25

26

27 And with that, Mr. Chair, members of
28 the Council, the Staff's preliminary conclusions are
29 for Proposal 36 support with modification of a special
30 condition that the Federal permit have a condition that
31 the upper half of the palm be cut and forfeited. And
32 for Proposal 37 it is to oppose the proposal.

32

33

34 And that's the end of my presentation
35 unless Pete has any other comments.

35

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. You have any
38 comments, Pete.

38

39

40 MR. DEMATTEO: No, Mr. Chair, Geoff did
41 a good job. Thank you.

41

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right, thank
44 you. Any questions from the Council so far.

44

45

46 (No comments)

46

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, the
49 State have comments, Terry.

49

50

50 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 The Department's comments begin on Page 147 and
2 continue on 148 and 149.

3
4 The Department doesn't support either
5 of these proposals. We've consistently had concerns
6 about seasons extending too late into September because
7 of potential entering into the rut. We also have
8 opposed these early spring seasons and I don't think I
9 need to go through all the reasons, the Council's aware
10 of these concerns we've had over the past two years.

11
12 The net effect of adopting Proposal 36
13 would be to add six days to the Federal season,
14 obviously, but Federally-qualified hunters would still
15 have 10 days early in the season. So Federally-
16 qualified subsistence users would not only be able to
17 hunt under the Federal regulations but there'd be
18 additional opportunity remain open to them under the
19 State regulations.

20
21 And I guess I'll stop there and try to
22 answer any questions you might have.

23
24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Terry.
27 Any questions for the State.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any Federal
32 agency comments.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any tribal comments.
37 Don.

38
39 MR. HONEA: Yeah. I guess I'm confused
40 why these two are lumped together when one of them
41 obviously has been rejected already and why is 37 up
42 for debate.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, 37 has not
45 been rejected, 37's -- did you reject that at the
46 Advisory Committee level or.....

47
48 MR. HONEA: No, the State.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, this is a

1 Federal proposal, it's still a viable proposal.
2
3 MR. HONEA: Oh, okay.
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Staff Committee
6 has opposed 37, the Council has not come to a position
7 on the proposal. We don't necessarily have to go with
8 the Staff Committee.....
9
10 MR. HONEA: Oh, okay.
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:that's their
13 opinion and we got our own opinions so we can comment
14 on both proposals.
15
16 MR. HONEA: All right, thank you.
17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And, so Don.
19
20 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. Just to make a
21 clarification this is a Staff analysis, and a Staff
22 recommendation, it's not Staff Committee, Staff
23 Committee comes in later on in the process.
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, excuse me.
26
27 MR. RIVARD: Thank you.
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I thought that was
30 more of a Staff Committee opinion. So I guess that's a
31 biological Staff position then.
32
33 MR. RIVARD: Yeah, it's Pete DeMatteo
34 as the lead author in consultation with the Refuge
35 Staff.
36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for that
38 clarification. Any tribal comments from any of the
39 affected areas there.
40
41 (No comments)
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You got something
44 there Vince.
45
46 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I'm kind of like
47 the tape recorder over there, I'm usually about 20
48 seconds behind and when they said cut through the palm,
49 it cut through my brain.
50

1 (Laughter)

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: And so I was just
4 consulting here where that had surfaced because it
5 wasn't in your written material. And so if you have
6 any questions about why that's now there, please, ask
7 so Pete or Terry can explain that so that's what I was
8 checking with Geoff over here because it didn't jive
9 with what I had in front of me. And you don't have to
10 take any action on it, it was just I didn't understand
11 where that came from.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Did you want
14 to explain that Geoff so the Council's clear.

15

16 MR. BYERSDORF: Yes. Mr. Chair.
17 Members of the Council. The reason that came up, is we
18 were discussing under the current State and Federal
19 regulations it requires a State registration permit
20 from August 22nd to 31st and September 5th to 25th.
21 Under that State registration permit subsistence users
22 are required to cut the palm of one of the antlers and
23 forfeit that. In order to maintain consistency with
24 that regulation, with the September 26th to October 1st
25 season we'd like to see that continued.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

28

29 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.

32

33 MR. COLLINS: Again, point of
34 clarification. The later season, though, is only for
35 subsistence hunters, right?

36

37 MR. BYERSDORF: Right.

38

39 MR. COLLINS: So you're not trying to
40 separate like the State is between those who are
41 claiming subsistence but really after trophies so
42 there's a different issue involved in that later season
43 than.....

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's actually
46 true.

47

48 MR. COLLINS: I have more comments, but
49 I'll save them for when we get to discussion.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So did you have any
2 comment on that antler cutting thing, Don -- go ahead,
3 Ray.

4
5 MR. COLLINS: Well, that's what I was
6 saying, I would oppose that because if you look at the
7 -- on the Federal hunt now we're allowing those antlers
8 to be used in trade and/or handicraft or whatever, some
9 people carve in antlers and do other things with those
10 that would require the whole antler there plus you can
11 sell them to somebody else who does want to do that
12 with them, who wants to carve and so on and so you'd be
13 destroying some of the value of doing that of a
14 subsistence resource that was legally taken and we
15 don't have the requirement that they have on the State
16 side to distinguish who are true subsistence dependence
17 and who are really using that to sport hunt.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don.

20
21 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. No,
22 I have no problem with that, I have no problem with the
23 cutting of antlers. I want clarification, though, for
24 -- because there are two different proposals here, how
25 are we going to make a motion to either support one or
26 the other or do it as a block, what are we doing here?

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.

29
30 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. Don. Because
31 the Staff preliminary conclusion breaks out both, you
32 would need to deal with both as well as a Council,
33 separate recommendations on each one.

34
35 MR. MATHEWS: Don, just take them up
36 separately. Take up 36, which is dealing with the
37 extension to October 1st, dropping the August, run that
38 by the Council and then bring up the second proposal,
39 37, which is dealing with the March season. It will
40 make it easier for everybody.

41
42 And I do have written comments from the
43 Advisory Committee, I don't know if you're at that
44 phase or not.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Yeah, we're
47 through -- I think we are at Advisory Committee
48 comments so go right ahead.

49
50 MR. MATHEWS: And Donald can add into

1 this, but basically the Advisory Committee in November
2 took action to support 36, Proposal 36 is to move it
3 later into fall, so we keep everybody tracking on this,
4 they felt that the early season was not much of
5 interest to subsistence users and it'd be better to
6 have it replaced with an extension of the regular
7 season. The warmer fall seasons and lack of bull moose
8 movements were the main reasons for supporting Proposal
9 36. That's to move it into October.

10

11 On 37, which is a spring hunt in March,
12 they supported it with modification. And hopefully I
13 get this straight. The 1 through 5 date were opposed
14 by the committee because the inability to differentiate
15 between bulls and cows in March. The committee
16 supported the proposal with the amended dates of
17 December 1 through the 10th for this reason. So they
18 -- I suppose a quick way of saying it, that they
19 supported a winter season that would be in December. I
20 would gather it would be for bulls only. Maybe Don can
21 clarify that.

22

23 But that's -- and I have their full
24 notes over on the other side of the room but this is my
25 summary.

26

27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, Don.

28

29 MR. HONEA: Yeah, okay, thank you
30 Vince. For clarification part, that was just -- just
31 that we always used to have a December hunt and so
32 that's where that December date came in there. But the
33 comment was made by how could you differentiate between
34 a cow and a bull in March, so our comment back was,
35 hey, it could be February, January but we just threw in
36 a December one, the date on there. And that was kind
37 of along the lines of, you know, not knowing -- I mean
38 knowing that this was not going to probably going to
39 come about anyways.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, the Koyukuk
42 River Advisory Committee has talked long and hard about
43 this December bull moose thing and the people in Huslia
44 and on the Koyukuk they're very opposed to being forced
45 to harvest bulls in December because they're all run
46 down coming out of the rut, they're all blue meat and
47 beat up and they haven't healed up. And by later in
48 winter they're starting to recover and come back with
49 some muscle bulk, the weather, the sun in the day time
50 gives them a little chance to heal up and they're

1 starting to come back. And they're still not fat like
2 a cow but they're a lot better than they are in
3 December.

4

5 And so that's why we, on the Koyukuk,
6 have always opposed the December bull hunt, that's the
7 reason, although they got antlers and you can tell what
8 they are. You know, you can -- those big bulls start
9 losing antlers at the end of November, you could
10 actually -- there could be bulls running around without
11 any antlers.

12

13 Ron.

14

15 MR. SAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If I
16 remember right we kept that December 1 through 10th
17 hunt in the books and it's available. I don't think we
18 rejected it or pulled it off in any way shape or form.
19 It is available for all our Federally-qualified
20 subsistence users. I don't think we pulled it off the
21 book, and I think that's why we kept it there, Don,
22 whether it was pulled off or not. Because for any
23 subsistence uses -- purposes, we like to keep them on
24 the book.

25

26 Do you know if they still have it on
27 the book for Nowitna region, Geoff, 21B.

28

29 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair.

30

31 MR. BYERSDORF: Through the Chair to
32 Member Sam, that is no longer on the books, on the
33 Federal regs for Unit 21B, the remainder portion.

34

35 MR. SAM: We kept it on the books for
36 the State.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, I think the
39 State did away with that, too, when they went to the
40 August.

41

42 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair.

43

44 MR. BYERSDORF: That's correct.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.

47

48 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
49 reason I believe that we come up with this December
50 date was because it was on the books before and that

1 was a State hunt, that was a State authorized hunt on
2 State land or whatever, et cetera, but that's where
3 that particular, you know, we could have -- it could
4 have been anywhere in that interim between March and
5 December. But it's not particularly December, we just
6 threw in a date of December.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

9

10 MR. SAM: Geoff.

11

12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead, Geoff.

13

14 MR. BYERSDORF: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15 I guess where I'd like to point out where that December
16 1st through 10th season came from Don was the
17 individual who was interested in seeing that season
18 originally in Unit 21D there was a December 1st through
19 10th season and there wasn't one in 21B. So basically
20 the Ruby residents could go out the road and they could
21 hunt on the right-hand side but they couldn't hunt on
22 the left-hand side and that was confusing to users. So
23 this individual's thought was to try and get a proposal
24 in to get both sides of the road lined up so they could
25 hunt either side, however, on the State side that has
26 now gone away so this would bring it back out of
27 alignment, and I don't know that that individual was
28 aware of it.

29

30 The other thing in regards to that is
31 this particular person lives out on the Nowitna Refuge
32 year-round, their only opportunity -- when they get a
33 moose they have to jar all the moose and they wanted a
34 chance to have fresh moose meat at some point and they
35 felt that that March 1st to 5th season was too
36 difficult to distinguish the bulls from the cows for
37 them.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're
40 deliberating actually two different proposals. I think
41 that we should work through this Proposal 36 first. So
42 we've taken some comments on both proposals so we're
43 going to come down to any written comments on -- let's
44 do written comments here and then let's get Proposal 36
45 on the table.

46

47 Okay, go ahead, Ron.

48

49 MR. SAM: Mr. Chair, thank you. I move
50 to adopt Proposal 36.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you want it as
2 modified to cut the top portion of the palm or just
3 adopt the proposal as written.

4
5 MR. SAM: Adopt the proposal as
6 written. Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

9
10 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Mickey.
13 Discussion by the Council on Proposal 36 which is to
14 eliminate the August component and go to September 5th
15 through October 1st. And so there was high reception
16 by that in Ruby when we were there last fall and so
17 that's where this proposal was driven from.

18
19 Go ahead, Ron.

20
21 MR. SAM: I want to add on to your
22 conviction in getting this proposal passed. The reason
23 -- one of the reasons, the main reason we extended our
24 season up at 24B is that we eliminated all the process
25 that we have to go through by going after a special
26 action request every fall. So that is our attempt at
27 trying to make sure that we meet our subsistence needs
28 due to weather, climate changes.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So comments. We
31 should be driving justification comments delineating
32 our traditional knowledge is showing that moose aren't
33 moving as much during the September season or they're
34 moving further back in date. I don't feel that the
35 State and the agency comments regarding disruption of
36 the breeding process, the primary -- at that time in
37 late September those big bulls are with a cow, yards of
38 cows, and that's one really hard unit to sneak up and
39 so most of the moose that are going to be harvested are
40 satellite bulls that are traveling around younger bulls
41 is what most people are going to be encountering.
42 Those big yards of cows and bulls are real hard to get
43 into. So the likelihood of those large breeding bulls
44 gets fairly -- they're fairly stationary with those
45 cows.

46
47 And so I don't feel that -- I also
48 looked in State regulations and there's multiple moose
49 hunts down on the Kenai Peninsula and stuff that have
50 hunting way into October and so if the State has that

1 kind of conviction then they should eliminate their own
2 hunts in October.

3

4 And so I feel that our objective here
5 is to provide for subsistence needs when cooler weather
6 when meat can be held.

7

8 And those are some of the
9 justifications that I can think of. And does the
10 Council got any more justifications for this proposal.

11

12 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.

15

16 MR. COLLINS: We're consistently
17 hearing from the hunters who are in the field and have
18 been for a long time that the rut itself may not be
19 delayed but the movement of the bulls has been
20 definitely -- or the moose has been affected by the
21 weather. And in having discussions this fall with
22 biologists and others and thinking about why that is.
23 When the leaves are staying on the tree longer and you
24 don't have any cold weather, the moose ability to call
25 and to hear those calls or hear the cows calling, it's
26 not there and so I think some of them are not moving
27 around because of that delay and it's harder to see the
28 moose because the leaves are on but I think it's also
29 interfering with their ability to hear. Used to be in
30 September we'd get cold, clear nights earlier in the
31 season and you could sit out there and hear moose
32 calling over the place, you can't do that now. Even if
33 they're calling the sound is being deadened by the
34 weather or something.

35

36 So it may not be delaying the rut
37 itself but it's definitely delaying the movement.

38

39 The other thing, the reason for
40 eliminating that cutting of those antlers, example in
41 McGrath, we're donating those to the school this
42 winter, if you don't want your antlers, because there
43 is a market for those, and they're selling it and using
44 the money in their sports program. And, again, it's
45 the whole antler that's -- the whole palm that's sold,
46 it's salable and they pay so much a pound for it. So
47 you're destroying part of the value if you're cutting
48 it. And I don't think we need to for this late hunt as
49 I stated before.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments.
2 Don.

3
4 MR. HONEA: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 Under comments on this particular one after hearing
6 public comment from the village of Ruby, from the
7 people, I would advocate that we strongly support this
8 one. And because of the -- I don't think the cutting
9 of the palms would make so much more difference than
10 people just having that chance to be able to have
11 another week of getting a moose because like we said
12 after hearing public comments, the moose were really
13 late out there and talking to local trappers this
14 winter, that there is, indeed, moose back there in the
15 woods. There's a lot of them that didn't come out.
16 And even a week after the season closed, on the
17 Nowitna, I was up there, and we still didn't see any.
18 So it was several weeks behind.

19
20 So if anything I would -- if I had a
21 choice between the two, I'd advocate for this
22 particular 36.

23
24 Thank you.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So any more comments
27 on this Proposal 36 as written.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It would appear that
32 the Council is not in favor of the modification to cut
33 the antler because it's not at the time when we're
34 delineating between urban subsistence hunters and rural
35 subsistence hunters.

36
37 Got comment, Geoff.

38
39 MR. BYERSDORF: I just wanted to
40 comment on that through the Chair, to member Collins.
41 That was just put in in regards to looking at the
42 Federal registration permit system and consistency with
43 what has been done with the State. And the reason why
44 I stated that was I wanted to get feedback from you
45 guys, you know, what are your thoughts on that.

46
47 And in regards to the analysis and as
48 far as effect on breeding productivity and such, I
49 guess the way that I see things as a biologist, what
50 I'm supposed to do is bring to the Council the pro's

1 and con's. And so I'm just proving you the information
2 and you make the decision.

3

4

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ron.

5

6

MR. SAM: Thank you. Excuse me, but we
7 are just making a recommendation to be brought before
8 the Federal Subsistence Board, these are nothing more
9 than recommendations and I strongly feel that we go
10 ahead with making these recommendations.

11

12

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So, yeah, my feeling
13 is that I've heard that rebuttal that this season being
14 this far late -- the primary -- the State has been
15 opposed because it gets out of alignment with their
16 seasons, and that's -- that's their prerogative to have
17 that opinion. But in reality the most likely moose to
18 be harvested during this timeframe are bulls that are
19 traveling or are getting kicked away from those
20 breeding aggregates and they're moving between breeding
21 those younger bulls -- those two year old bulls are
22 moving all over the place and that's the primary ones
23 that are going to get killed. And that's the primary
24 ones that we want to harvest anyways. And so I don't
25 feel that that's -- with the adequate bull/cow ratio
26 and we've got about 25 bulls per 100 cows in that 21B
27 or something like that, I think that there's plenty of
28 medium size bulls that will -- and small bulls that
29 will get harvested in the extension.

30

31

But we should -- I would like to see
32 data collected on the moose that are harvested, and
33 that last component as to what we are actually
34 harvesting if this was to pass. And so it's a Federal
35 registration permit and so you'll be able to tell
36 what's being harvested.

37

38

Comment, Geoff.

39

40

MR. BYERSDORF: I guess the only
41 comment that I had, Mr. Chair, is that I would probably
42 do similar to what we've been doing like with the March
43 1st to 5th hunt in Huslia, and with the drift
44 gillnetting as far as making extensive efforts to
45 conduct outreach and let people know what this new hunt
46 would be about, where they could hunt, what the permit
47 system is about, and Don's seen me in Ruby before, you
48 know, going through just step by step with a lot of the
49 local people there so I would probably ask -- I'm
50 leaving but I would ask our Refuge to maintain that

1 level of consistency.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I've very
4 satisfied with the Koyukuk/Nowitna's outreach to the
5 local villages and they've been very instrumental in
6 implementing a lot of the regulatory changes that this
7 Council has proposed and has been adopted.

8

9 So any further comment on Proposal 36.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing no more
14 comment, those in favor of Proposal WP07-36 signify by
15 saying aye.

16

17 IN UNISON: Aye.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

20

21 (No opposing votes)

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None. So it's
24 unanimously adopted with justification. Coming to
25 Proposal 07-37, which is to have a March 1 to March 5
26 bull hunt in the same area. We got a motion to adopt.

27

28 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

29

30 MR. SAM: Second.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
33 Council discussion on this proposal.

34

35 MR. WALKER: Question.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Discussion. Ron.

38

39 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. The
40 question has been called, Mr. Chairman.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would actually
43 prefer to have some discussion on the proposal so that
44 we can state our points and justification is very
45 instrumental in getting Board approval. So, Ron.

46

47 MR. SAM: Okay. If the State took away
48 that December 1 through 10th hunt, I feel that we
49 should institute at least a five day hunt some time or
50 another and I would recommend a March 1 through March 5

1 at the call of the Refuge manager. It could be a heck
2 of a call but it is a call and it would provide for
3 subsistence activities or subsistence opportunities to
4 our people in Unit 21B.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you have --
7 okay, do you have comment there Vince.

8
9 MR. MATHEWS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I
10 don't want to put words in your mouth but in the past
11 you guys have been very cautious when you have an
12 Advisory Committee that's logged in with it's position.
13 And your action, if you were to adopt this motion,
14 would be opposite to what the Advisory Committee was
15 saying. If I understood what they were saying, they
16 did not want a March season because they could not
17 identify between the bulls. So that's the only caution
18 I'm giving you.

19
20 You can do that, you can go against the
21 recommendation, but you've not done that in the past
22 with Advisory Committees.

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So, Don, do you want
25 to clarify again. My understanding, from what Don was
26 saying, that they were basically giving a range and one
27 of their concerns was that they couldn't identify
28 bulls. But between December and March was the range
29 that you wanted some kind of a winter hunt, didn't you
30 want, Don?

31
32 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For
33 clarification point there, I believe that like the
34 deciding factors in these things are like being able to
35 tell between a cow and a bull and we had a discussion
36 in Ruby last fall at our regional meeting about this
37 where Benedict Jones brought up the idea and I thought
38 it excellent here some local person brought up the idea
39 that you come out here and you have local elders and
40 people that know how to tell the difference between and
41 a cow, the colors and stuff like that, I mean, and the
42 way they -- you know, the droppings and there's a lot
43 of different ways and if we could utilize those elders.

44
45 And I think just saying that we are
46 going against the Ruby Advisory Fish and Game, there
47 was one particular person on there who was vocal about
48 going back to the December hunt, like I said that
49 wasn't a definite date, it was just an idea of a March
50 -- March hunt. Because I think the whole idea, too,

1 was kind of conflicting in that -- since it would be on
2 the National Wildlife Refuge we'd have a -- they'd have
3 a time, like the local guy mentioned here, of trying to
4 find out where Refuge lands started and it would be
5 logistically kind of a nightmare.

6
7 So those things and all -- you know,
8 kind of opposing us and we never did put this forth
9 before, it was kind of half hearted, but -- but the
10 idea, that December date came back before -- I mean
11 going back to a State hunt years ago, four or five
12 years ago or whenever it was discontinued, that's where
13 that particular date came on there and I don't want
14 that to be upholding our decisions, anywhere on that
15 date.

16
17 So speaking as vice Chair of the Ruby
18 Advisory, that's what they had in mind when they made
19 that decision.

20
21 Thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Mickey.

24
25 MR. STICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
26 just was thinking and, you know, Geoff just told us
27 that the March 1st through the 5th wasn't on the books,
28 but the 1st through the 10th of December was on the
29 books and I think we should be sticking to what's on
30 the books and be trying to work with that instead of
31 ending up with nothing.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There is no December
34 1 to 10, they took it off the book.

35
36 MR. STICKMAN: Okay.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We don't have a
39 Federal hunt at that time.

40
41 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.

44
45 MR. COLLINS: Maybe it's time to
46 attempt that flexibility we were talking about. What
47 if we make a motion to request the authorization of a
48 five day winter hunt to be set by the Refuge manager
49 after consultation with the local community and see if
50 they'd go that way and then they can pick the

1 appropriate time.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My feeling is that a
4 March season is a better timeframe. I got reasons why
5 I prefer the March season, the bulls are coming back,
6 they're in better shape, the light's back, you can see
7 that pedestal a lot easier when there's good sunlight.
8 It's good dry weather. People can dry the meat and it
9 gets really dry this time of year, and so it's real
10 easy to dry the meat in the late winter. There's
11 several reasons why I actually would prefer that March
12 season and up in Huslia they prefer that March season
13 because of that, because they're drying meat and so
14 forth.

15

16 I do feel that a floating, sometime in
17 March, the Refuge manager having the five day hunt
18 authority to float in that March 1 to 3, with a five
19 day season floating in there, a little bit more
20 flexibility at that time of year, but the Refuge
21 manager could implement a December 1 to December 5 hunt
22 and I would be -- I'm fairly opposed to that, myself,
23 because the moose are in such poor condition. At that
24 time it's getting dark, harder to -- you can tell them
25 apart, bulls from cows, but that's the only thing.
26 They're pretty blue -- if you've ever ate one of those --
27 even a two year old are really tough, I'm going to
28 have to -- I'd have to borrow Carl's pressure cooker
29 all winter for that one.

30

31 (Laughter)

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that would be my
34 opinions about that. Ray.

35

36 MR. COLLINS: But, Mr. Chairman, if the
37 local people want -- would prefer that to March, I
38 can't see why not giving them that option, if they're
39 the ones that are going to actually be hunting. I
40 understand what you're saying there but I think, again,
41 in light of what Vince was saying, usually we've
42 deferred to local residents, or the local people as to
43 which they prefer.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ron.

46

47 MR. SAM: If we defer, if this proposal
48 was to come back in the same shape and form next March
49 anyway, I'm pretty sure they would. I think that if we
50 were to make a recommendation right now we'll just go

1 with it and see what they think about it.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So there's two ways
4 we can go on this, and we could go for a five day
5 season to occur between December 1 and March 31 at the
6 consensus of the Ruby community with the Refuge
7 manager, that would be one modification. Or one is
8 just to uphold our proposal and support the proposal as
9 written.

10

11 And so how would the Council prefer to
12 deal with this.

13

14 MR. HONEA: I would prefer to go with
15 the proposal with the modification.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So it would seem
18 that Don is more inclined, as vice Chair of the Ruby
19 Advisory Committee, to have us modify the proposal a
20 five day season to occur with the concurrence of the
21 Ruby Advisory Committee between December 1 and March
22 31. And so would the mover and the second be willing
23 to modify that proposal -- the motion.

24

25 MR. SAM: (Nods affirmatively)

26

27 MR. STICKMAN: (Nods affirmatively)

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And I see a
30 concurrence to modify the proposal. And so I feel that
31 that's brought the Council more into a consensus
32 so.....

33

34 MR. SAM: And we meet Ruby's concerns.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:and we meet
37 Ruby's concerns. So the modified proposal is one bull
38 to be harvested with stipulations, one permit per
39 household and the hunt to be administered -- a five day
40 hunt to be administered between December 1 and March 31
41 on Federal Refuge land -- Federal public lands.

42

43 So any additional comments.

44

45 MR. SAM: One final one. Again, this
46 is just a recommendation, a recommendation only, the
47 Federal Subsistence Board will deal with it as they see
48 fit, again, we're just making a recommendation and
49 trying to meet the subsistence needs of Unit 21B.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's recognized that
2 their subsistence needs not being met, and so to the
3 best degree of this Council, was an attempt to meet
4 those needs.

5
6 Those in favor of the proposal -- go
7 ahead, Don.

8
9 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. I just wanted
10 to clarify. I just wanted to make sure, if you look on
11 Page 137 of the proposed Federal regulation, you're
12 still talking about the same geographical area,
13 correct, is that Unit 21B, that part of the Nowitna
14 River drainage.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

17
18 MR. RIVARD: And all you're doing is
19 modifying the season.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

22
23 MR. RIVARD: You want one bull, a five
24 day season between December 1st through March 31st and
25 one permit per household; that's what I have down, is
26 that correct?

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's exactly.

29
30 MR. RIVARD: Okay.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Exactly the same
33 area, same stipulations, just a floating, more of a--
34 which we've been talking about as being more fluid with
35 the subsistence user's needs between December 1 and
36 March 31, a five day season to be implemented by the
37 Refuge manager in consultation with Ruby and the
38 Western Interior Regional Council.

39
40 And so any further discussion.

41
42 MR. SAM: Question.

43
44 MR. STICKMAN: Call for the question.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
47 the proposal as modified, signify by saying aye.

48
49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

2

3 (No opposing votes)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None. The proposal
6 carries unanimous. So we are down to Proposal 55. Bow
7 and arrow hunting only of sheep in the Dalton Highway
8 Corridor Management area and this proposal is on Page
9 150, and Tom Kron, is he on.....

10

11 MR. RIVARD: Pete.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, Pete's going to
14 do this one. Go ahead, Pete.

15

16 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. Members of
17 the Council. Proposal 55 was submitted by Jeffrey
18 Faulkner of Glennallen and this proposal would require
19 the Federally-qualified subsistence hunters use a bow
20 and arrow to hunt sheep in the Dalton Highway Corridor
21 Management Area during the period of time when the
22 State of Alaska has an archery only hunting season.

23

24 The proponent describes his own sheep
25 hunting experience and observed that had he been on the
26 animal he would have been concerned for his own safety.
27 The proponent noted that the archery hunters in the
28 archery only corridor that work to get close to the
29 animal for fair hunting should not have to compete
30 with long range rifle subsistence hunters. The
31 proponent states that the Federally-qualified
32 subsistence hunters have access all the rest of the
33 year to animals and can hunt with a rifle at any other
34 time.

35

36 Section .802 of ANILCA states that the
37 utilization of public lands in Alaska is to cause the
38 least adverse impact possible on rural residents who
39 depend on subsistence uses of the resource and that
40 subsistence shall be the priority consumptive use. It
41 was the intent of Congress to allow consideration of
42 improvements in weapons, technology and techniques for
43 subsistence harvest on Federal public lands.

44

45 The biological data for sheep
46 populations within the Dalton Highway Corridor is
47 relatively good. The Federal Subsistence Management
48 Program established Federal registration permit hunts
49 in Unit 24A and the Dalton Highway Corridor portion of
50 Unit 26B in 1992. For regulatory years 1994/95 to

1 2006/2007 for both hunts combined, subsistence hunters
2 reported an average harvest of 2.7 sheep per year.

3
4 The proponents believe that subsistence
5 hunters have access all the rest of the year to the
6 animals and can hunt with rifle at any time is not
7 correct. If this proposal is approved, the Federally-
8 qualified sheep hunter in Unit 24A would have 10 days
9 to hunt with a rifle and the Federally-qualified sheep
10 hunter in Unit 26B would have zero days to hunt with a
11 rifle. The Dalton Highway Corridor Federal subsistence
12 sheep hunt with firearms has been in place for 15
13 years.

14
15 Proposal 55 is the first regulatory
16 proposal since this regulation was put in place, that
17 is, seeking to require Federally-qualified subsistence
18 sheep hunters to revert to using a bow and arrow in
19 this area.

20
21 Rural subsistence hunters are hunting
22 to feed their families, have a limited opportunity to
23 purchase food and the cost of food is prohibitive when
24 -- given where they live. Use of bow and arrows is not
25 an efficient way for subsistence hunters to put food on
26 the table. Taking a legal ram with a bow and arrow is
27 extremely challenging compared with taking one with a
28 rifle. A relatively small percentage of hunters within
29 the Dalton Highway Corridor are Federally-qualified
30 subsistence hunters. The presence of archers and rifle
31 hunters in the Dalton Highway Corridor during the same
32 time is not unique to the Dalton Highway Corridor.
33 These two types of hunters utilize the same areas
34 during the hunting seasons across most of Alaska. The
35 densities of sheep hunters in the Dalton Highway
36 Corridor is relatively low compared to the density of
37 hunters in other hunts in many other areas of Alaska.

38
39 Mr. Chair. The preliminary conclusion
40 for Proposal 55 is to oppose the proposal.

41
42 Thank you.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thanks, Pete.
45 We got State of Alaska comments, are you on line there,
46 Terry.

47
48 MR. HAYNES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The
49 Department's comments begin on Page 161. The
50 Department has had longstanding objections to the

1 Federal regulation that authorizes the use of firearms
2 for hunting on Federal lands in the Dalton Highway
3 Corridor. State law prohibits the use of firearms for
4 hunting in the corridor so we support a proposal that
5 would allow the use of -- would allow the use of bow
6 and arrow in this area.

7

8 And we realize that that's inconsistent
9 with how the Council is likely to view this proposal,
10 but we'll just go on record supporting these proposal.
11 And I think that's about all I have to say on that one.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for your
16 comments. I personally have been well aware of the
17 State's position on subsistence use of the Dalton
18 Highway Corridor. For many years we worked trying to
19 get the Game Board to return subsistence hunting to --
20 even under rural subsistence management, the Game Board
21 refused to allow subsistence use by rural residents in
22 the Dalton Highway Corridor. The Wiseman Village has
23 been there and the people have been residents of that
24 area for over 100 years, Wiseman is older than
25 Anchorage. And so the State of Alaska's failure to
26 recognize subsistence use, Wiseman is a resident zone
27 community recognized by the Gates of the Arctic
28 National Park. We have longstanding customary and
29 traditional use of that area and long document -- rich
30 documentation by Bob Marshall and various authors over
31 many, many years.

32

33 And so I'm somewhat baffled as to the
34 State's position on not recognizing customary and
35 traditional use there within the Dalton Highway
36 Corridor by the Wiseman residents.

37

38 So thanks for your comments.

39

40 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

43

44 MR. HAYNES: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I
45 appreciate your point of view. I might just point out
46 that in order to allow firearm hunting in the Corridor
47 in State regulations, it requires you change the State
48 law. IT's not something the Board of Game of the
49 Department can do, so just recognize the kind of change
50 that would be required to do what you would like would

1 have to be done by the State Legislature.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, the Department
4 of Fish and Game didn't even entertain providing a
5 statutory change for subsistence even pre-Federal
6 Subsistence Board, so this has been a long standing
7 opposition. The primary use of the Dalton Highway
8 Corridor has been for high quality hunt management and
9 subsistence has never been in the preview. During the
10 construction of the Pipeline the history of the area is
11 that the people went into great hardship without being
12 able to harvest during the construction of the
13 Pipeline. Those are things that have been forgotten
14 and that's water under the bridge.

15

16 We've had a Federal subsistence hunt
17 now for 15 years and so everything is working just
18 fine.

19

20 My personal comments will come about
21 this proposal about the safety issue. I have
22 documentation from subsistence users that refute this
23 individual's concern for his own safety when he's like
24 two miles away from the actual hunt occurrence.

25

26 So we're going to continue with the
27 Federal agency comments. Do we have one from BLM on
28 this proposal.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None. Any tribal
33 comments.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don't see any of
38 those. Advisory Committee.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Koyukuk River
43 Advisory Committee has not taken this up. And Gates of
44 the Arctic National Park Subsistence Resource
45 Commission has not met either.

46

47 Summary of written comments, Vince.

48

49 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. To
50 save time they're gone on Page 161. Scott

1 Schoppenhorst of Wiseman Village basically opposes the
2 proposal. He gives various reasons and gives
3 suggestions to the bow hunters, that, if there is a
4 safety concern that they should probably wear blaze of
5 orange, as they do in other states. And he echoes what
6 you just said that he observed this hunter, talked to
7 this hunter, the distance away to be able to identify
8 this hunter in the field, they were able to point him
9 out, et cetera, so there was no safety concern present.
10 So that's in brief summary. It was a very long letter
11 from Scott. But anyways, that's briefly, he's
12 adamantly opposed to this proposal.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Vince. I
15 also talked -- this was -- the letter was written by a
16 neutral entity that happened to encounter the
17 individual who made this proposal, who made this
18 proposal, who claimed he had a safety issue. He was
19 actually standing in the valley with a styrofoam cup in
20 his hand on the side of the Dalton Highway looking up
21 at the mountain and was disgruntled because one of the
22 subsistence users from Wiseman was already up on the
23 hill and hunting the sheep that he'd attempted to take.
24 So this is basically a disgruntled hunter.

25

26 I feel that it's almost purgerous to
27 claim a safety issue when you're two miles away from a
28 hunting party. And the individual who actually went up
29 there and got the sheep, a subsistence user, looked
30 down in the valley, seen somebody going around by his
31 car, and was actually concerned for his vehicle, he
32 thought the guy was going to break into his vehicle.
33 So this is primarily a user conflict and so that's
34 where this proposal is driven from.

35

36 Continuing on with, if there's no more
37 written, coming to Council recommendation for a motion.

38

39 MR. SAM: Move to adopt.

40

41 MR. COLLINS: Second.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So under discussion,
44 we've had various discussions here on this proposal.
45 Any time you have user conflicts you'll get into a fire
46 fight of various proposals sometimes and so the
47 realities are there is a subsistence priority. We do
48 not have access to the Dalton Highway sheep population
49 year-round, we only have a limited hunt period of time,
50 contrary to the proponent's proposal. There was no

1 safety issue. And as far as -- to my knowledge I have
2 never known of a safety issue between a firearm hunter,
3 because we don't just random -- we're not just blazing
4 away off into the woods, we're not sound shooting,
5 we're actually specifically trying to shoot an animal
6 in a specific lethal area, it's not just random
7 shooting.

8

9 And I've talked to the enforcement
10 Officer, Kurt Bettingfield, there, and there was never,
11 to his knowledge, been a safety issue in the Dalton
12 Highway Corridor. There's really only about five or
13 six people households that are going out hunting and so
14 it's fairly uncommon for me to encounter bow hunters in
15 the field and if the bow hunters are hunting an animal,
16 I leave them alone, go on and hunt a different animal.

17

18 So there's really no conflict here
19 other than just user conflicts, that happens all over
20 Alaska. Subsistence hunters are hunting in a swamp and
21 people show up and conflict with your hunt and that's
22 just basically what this proposal is all about.

23

24 Any other comments on the proposal.

25

26 Ron.

27

28 MR. SAM: Yeah, as far as I know there
29 has never been subsistence hunter out of Alatna,
30 Allakaket, Anaktuvuk Pass, Bettles, Evansville or
31 Steven's Village that utilize sheep hunting up there
32 for subsistence purposes. And it says that we may use
33 firearms but I just haven't come in contact with anyone
34 from these six villages that utilizes sheep hunting for
35 subsistence purposes.

36

37 I know of quite a few instances where
38 people holding State tickets go out there and hunt,
39 whether for subsistence or sport, but that's the only
40 hunters that I know along the Corridor that utilize
41 this area.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Dalton Highway
44 Corridor, because it's a real steep drainage and really
45 hard to get up into, a lot of people from down river,
46 Allakaket, Alatna, they prefer to go up the John River
47 and Alatna River drainages that have deeper water
48 access to get up into the mountains and so they're --
49 but because they're within our customary and
50 traditional use area determination for Unit 24, they

1 qualify to hunt there if they chose to and so that's
2 why they're listed as having access to the Dalton
3 Highway Corridor with firearm.

4
5 Any other comments from the Council on
6 this proposal.

7
8 MR. STICKMAN: Call for the question.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's been
11 called. Those in favor of the proposal, signify by
12 saying aye.

13
14 (No aye votes)

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to the
17 proposal 07-55 signify by saying aye.

18
19 IN UNISON: Aye.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal fails
22 for the previous justifications. We're down to
23 Proposal -- how are we doing on time here, 6:00
24 o'clock, what do you say, Vince.

25
26 MR. MATHEWS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I
27 think it'd be fair to say, and you can correct me if
28 I'm wrong, based on the record you placed on Proposal
29 55, based on the analysis in front of you in your book,
30 the same request applies for 58. There's no difference
31 other than I believe it's a different species, correct?

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's correct.

34
35 MR. MATHEWS: So it may be we can go
36 through the whole motions of working through this
37 proposal, but it comes to the same issue that you've
38 laid out in 55. So the Council could say, based on the
39 analysis that's in front of them, based on their
40 knowledge -- their discussions and knowledge of the
41 area use, that you would make a motion to address 58.
42 But you can go through the whole thing if you want to,
43 we're here.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I -- Ron, go
46 ahead.

47
48 MR. SAM: Move to adopt Proposal 58.

49
50 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal's been
2 moved forwarded and seconded. Proposal 58 is basically
3 a carbon copy only for the -- the justification for
4 moose, it's basically trying to do the same thing
5 causing subsistence hunters to hunt with bow and arrow.
6 All of the previous justifications for opposition to
7 Proposal 55 are in place.

8
9 Don.

10
11 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. The only
12 thing, and Steve pointed this out, we'd encourage you
13 to just make sure that there's no public comment out
14 there or if there's somebody in the audience or
15 something.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

18
19 MR. RIVARD: We still need to provide
20 that opportunity to comment.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So we're
23 streamlining this comment process. Basically it's the
24 same type of proposal with moose. We'll give State
25 opportunity to comment. You have comment on this
26 Terry.

27
28 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Our
29 comments would be very similar to what we presented on
30 the previous proposal so I don't think I need to go
31 into any more detail on that.

32
33 Thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And I
36 appreciate your perspective but we also have our
37 position. Any Federal agency comments.

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: In any Native
42 organization comments.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There were no
47 Advisory Committee positions taken on this proposal,
48 nor did the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource
49 Commission comment.

50

1 Do we have any written comments other
2 than that previous one that was stated.

3
4 MR. MATHEWS: No. No, different than
5 what Scott presented on 55.

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Basically the
8 previous written comment was of the same position.

9
10 So there's a motion on the floor and
11 seconded to adopt this proposal. The same
12 justification, this proposal is in opposition to
13 subsistence -- for people to meet subsistence needs in
14 the affected area and so I'm opposed to the proposal.

15
16 So is there any further comment by the
17 Council.

18
19 MR. STICKMAN: Call for the question.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's been
22 called. Those in favor of the proposal 58 signify by
23 saying aye.

24
25 (no aye votes)

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to
28 Proposal 58 signify by saying aye.

29
30 IN UNISON: Aye.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal fails. And
33 it's about 6:07 and what do you want to do here Vince.

34
35 MR. MATHEWS: Well, Mr. Chairman, we've
36 announced that there'd be a 7:00 public testimony
37 section so I don't know how we want to handle it. The
38 full Council does not have to be here but it'd be nice
39 to have one or two members to hear those comments and
40 then, of course, we have to have the court recorder.

41
42 (Laughter)

43
44 MR. MATHEWS: I don't know if Carl has
45 any idea if there's going to be people coming in from
46 the community or not, but, still someone could show up
47 so we can't just not be present.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So let's see, what
50 does the Council want to do.

1 MR. SAM: I say we keep going. I think
2 we could defer most of these to the home region.

3
4 MR. WALKER: Home region, yeah.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Well, we'll
7 keep going and we'll keep working through this agenda.

8
9 You guys want to take a little bit of a
10 break first.

11
12 (Laughter)

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Robert.

15
16 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17 On Proposal 23, Proposal 26, 27, 28, 31, 64, 29, 30 and
18 32, Mr. Chairman, I recommend that we defer this back
19 to the home region. I believe that the Lower Yukon
20 Kuskokwim did not meet yet so we should not recommend
21 anything until they have a meeting and discuss this
22 before we support or oppose their proposals.

23
24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Vince.

27
28 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I think Robert
29 didn't mean to include 23. You already dealt with 23.
30 So you're just talking about all the Unit 18 proposals,
31 which are 26 through -- well, they're all there below
32 23, I won't read those, those are Unit 18 proposals.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ron.

35
36 MR. SAM: Yes, if we were deferring to
37 a local advisory, our own local advisory committee from
38 Ruby and we were dealing with more of a State issue
39 than anything else, if we defer to them, I feel that
40 it's only proper that we defer all these proposals to
41 the home region.

42
43 MR. STICKMAN: Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Mickey.

46
47 MR. STICKMAN: I'd like to second that
48 motion and call a point of order.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Well, it

1 would be sort of the consensus of the Council that
2 these Proposals 26, 27, 28, 31, 64, 29 and 30 and 32 be
3 deferred to the home region and so those in favor of
4 deferring -- go ahead, Don.

5
6 MR. RIVARD: As I stated previously,
7 because this is a public meeting and this was announced
8 that you would be taking these up, you probably should
9 at least take public comments and the State as well
10 before you vote on anything. That would be my
11 recommendation.

12
13 Thank you.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're moving
16 towards deferring those. We do want to take public
17 comment, though. And good thing we got Don here to
18 keep us on track.

19
20 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, Carl.

23
24 MR. MORGAN: By deferring we're not
25 taking any action.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

28
29 MR. MORGAN: Therefore, we're not
30 opening up all these for public comment, we're
31 deferring to the home region, which is the Lower Yukon-
32 Kuskokwim. We want them to make the action because it
33 affects their region more than it affects ours. And I
34 think we've done that before, deferring, we've done
35 that, and I think we've got a history where we've done
36 this before in different other meetings by deferring
37 any action we take to the home region. So we don't --
38 I believe we don't need to take any public comments or
39 anything on this by deferring to the home region.

40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Vince.

42
43 MR. MATHEWS: I understand what Mr.
44 Morgan said. I just know that there's Staff here from
45 Association of Village Council presidents. They may
46 want to come up to the mic, that may just solve all
47 that. Again, you know, Carl is correct on deferring
48 but maybe AVCP wants to enlighten on you on something
49 you would not defer.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We want to
2 give everybody a -- the Council is required to be a
3 platform for public comments so it's incumbent if you
4 have comment, Tim, go right ahead.

5
6 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7 Timothy Andrew with AVCP. It was my intention when we
8 reached these proposals to recommend deferral and I
9 thank Mr. Walker for making that motion.

10
11 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So we're
14 going to -- then we'll vote on that to defer.

15
16 MR. SAM: Yes, we have a motion on the
17 table.

18
19 MR. STICKMAN: Call for the question.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Those in
22 favor of deferral signify by saying aye.

23
24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

27
28 (No opposing votes)

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None. Unanimous
31 consent to defer these various proposals 26 through 32
32 and 64. So Robert.

33
34 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
35 I believe that we're kind of like tabling after we
36 deferred. So I believe in our next meeting, do we have
37 to bring this up again here to discuss it.

38
39 Ron, correct me, here.

40
41 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

42
43 MR. SAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
44 Robert, I think in the past we have done this, and we
45 have taken this action, and when we defer to the home
46 region we accept -- we go on record as accepting
47 whatever actions they will take. They're the ones that
48 have to live with these proposals and their
49 consequences and I believe that by deferring we accept
50 all their actions or whatever actions they will take.

1 I think that's how we did it before.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don.

4

5 MR. RIVARD: Well, I don't want to
6 muddy the waters, much, but I guess I should say this.
7 What my understanding -- your intention is, you're
8 basically taking no action and saying you're deferring,
9 you're saying you're deferring to the home region to do
10 whatever they're going to do.

11

12 Deferring in this kind of context means
13 that it's going to be taken up at a later date. So
14 what you're really kind of doing is taking no action on
15 these proposals.

16

17 I think that's what you're doing, all
18 right.

19

20 MR. SAM: Fine.

21

22 MR. RIVARD: You might want to confirm
23 that on the record.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the understanding
26 is that we're taking no action on these proposals and
27 deferment and so we we're going to see what the home
28 region, YK-Delta's going to do on them. If they have
29 affects in the future to this Council we may take them
30 up at a future date.

31

32 And so we're down here to the evening
33 session, we're ahead of schedule 45 minutes.

34

35 (Laughter)

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we'll go smoke a
38 half a pack of cigarettes and wait for the evening
39 session.

40

41 MR. WALKER: You smoke, Jack.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm going to take it
44 up.

45

46 (Laughter)

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, we're going to
49 break.

50

1 (Off record)

2

3 (On record)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Western
6 Interior Regional Council's convening for our evening
7 comment open forum and it's 7:15. And so AVCP wanted
8 to make presentation here, go ahead, Tim.

9

10 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11 This is going to be real short and sweet. Since we are
12 not going to be here tomorrow to provide our concerns
13 that we have in the area, we'll just do a short, quick,
14 five minute, or maybe even less, maybe even less of
15 some of our concerns.

16

17 We share the same concerns as many of
18 you with the Mulchatna Caribou Herd declining from
19 200,000 to 43,000. And in conducting some of the
20 research about the caribou herd, we've heard that the
21 population has declined down to a thousand animals at
22 one point before but that's way before our comfort
23 level and would not want to see the continuing decline
24 occur over the years. And in our attempt to address
25 the continuing decline, we are currently proposing to
26 the Alaska State Legislature to fund a Mulchatna
27 Caribou Working Group to convene perhaps by this fall
28 and this would consist of primarily subsistence users
29 and it would also consist of guides, transporters, the
30 government regulators, including the State of Alaska,
31 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and sport interests as
32 well. And our goal would be to develop an effective
33 management plan through a collaborative and
34 deliberative dialogue between the different user groups
35 outlining exactly what we want as far as the population
36 goal. I know there's a current population goal of at
37 least 100 to 150,000, but is that a sustainable
38 population for the current use we have, is that a
39 sustainable population amount for the current habitat,
40 we don't know. So, you know, a lot of questions may
41 come during this process in which, perhaps, we may have
42 some new research come up if we can possibly come up
43 with any additional dollars. And unfortunately most of
44 our funding sources that we get for any kind of
45 wildlife research is from the Federal government, and
46 very little from the State, and I'm not sure if the
47 Regional Councils can do resolutions or letters of
48 support for something of this nature but, you know, if
49 you are able to do it we'd really, really appreciate
50 it.

1 It's at its infancy state right now.
2 We just started dialogue between us and -- between AVCP
3 and BBNA and hope to get it finalized prior to the
4 conclusion of the Alaska State Legislative Session in
5 May.

6
7 We continuously have concerns for the
8 Unit 19 moose situation up here. We know that the Tier
9 II system has a big affect on a lot of people that
10 reside in this area. There used to be and still is --
11 still continue to have a large dependence on moose and
12 caribou. But with the dwindling moose and caribou
13 population, where it is today, there's not really a
14 whole lot of choices for meat resources with the
15 exception of beaver, perhaps moose in 21E -- both in
16 21A and 21B, I believe it was -- or 21E and 21A just
17 right on the other side of the mountain range there.
18 And of course the lower Yukon moose population as well.

19
20 Those being the only alternative meat
21 resources, I mean it's a dire situation for people that
22 reside in this area and we are extremely, extremely
23 concerned about that.

24
25 In the lower Kuskokwim area, we
26 currently had the moose moratorium that is in effect
27 between the community of Lower Kalskag down to
28 Tuntutuliak and it's a third year moratorium, we don't
29 know what the current moose population is down below
30 there but with the dwindling caribou population that
31 doesn't leave much alternative meat resources for them
32 also. So we're concerned about, you know, not only
33 people up here but also people in the lower parts of
34 the river.

35
36 And I believe that is about it for our
37 wildlife resources and I really thank you for this
38 opportunity to get you informed as far as what AVCP's
39 concerns are at this point.

40
41 Thank you, Mr. Chair. And we'd be
42 happy to answer any questions if you have any.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Robert.

45
46 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47 Tim, you know, I brought this up here in the past here
48 with Unit 18, have your board or have AVCP or have the
49 lower Yukon Kuskokwim RAC come to consensus about
50 dividing Unit 18 into A and B, is that in the future,

1 are you looking at this, are you talking about this or
2 is it still in the planning process?

3

4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5

6 MR. ANDREW: Through the Chair. Mr.
7 Walker. Yes. we've considered it at least twice since
8 I've been employed with AVCP. I've been there for
9 about 10 years, so it's been about twice that we've
10 brought it up during the convention. But the people,
11 the 56 villages said, no, we want to be a one unit
12 area, we want to be in unison rather than subdividing.
13 And I don't know what the current sentiment is like
14 within the region but, you know, that's certainly
15 something that we can probably bring to our October
16 convention for them to consider if need be.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, go ahead,
19 Robert.

20

21 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22 You know because a lot of times when we have issues
23 here in Western Interior or even our GASH board,
24 sometimes when we have to deal with the lower Yukon, we
25 also have to deal with the Kuskokwim too. And a lot of
26 our fishing issues are directed because we're on the
27 Yukon, too, and our fishing issues are more or less
28 directed to your area, the lower Yukon with our middle
29 Yukon and to have to address issues that have to do
30 with the Kuskokwim sometimes get a little frustrating
31 for us. So you have to look at this, you know, try to
32 be parallel with us, but, again, you know, it's up to
33 you guys.

34

35 Thank you, here, Tim. Thank you, Mr.
36 Chairman.

37

38 MR. ANDREW: If I may, Mr. Chairman,
39 because one of the things that one of my Staff members
40 has pointed out to me is the other thing that we're
41 concerned about is the current bycatch by the high seas
42 trawl fishery. At the end of January it was at 46,000
43 and historically, I mean within the last five years or
44 so, the average has been about 80,000 within the year.
45 But within one month alone at the start of the pollock
46 season, the high seas trawl fishery had already caught
47 46,000. You know, with continuing bycatch of that
48 magnitude, I mean a lot of those fish come to the
49 Kuskokwim and the Yukon Rivers. So whatever pressure
50 we can possibly put out to the North Pacific Fishery

1 Management Council to reduce the bycatch, you know,
2 let's all do it within the RAC's, both Western
3 Interior, YK RAC on the Kuskokwim side and the Tri-RAC
4 on the Yukon River side to try and reduce that bycatch.

5

6 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.

9

10 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Tim, I noticed on
11 that bycatch when I was in at the salmon symposium in
12 there, too, that they were mature fish, they weren't
13 the small ones that they were getting in the bycatch,
14 there were some that were getting closer to their
15 return date, which is a big concern, too, I guess.

16

17 But I had a question for you, when do
18 you anticipate that moratorium being lifted on moose
19 down there so that there would be some local hunting,
20 do they have a goal that it has to reach or where are
21 you in that process, you know?

22

23 MR. ANDREW: We have a current
24 population goal of at least 2,000 moose before the
25 moratorium is lifted. And the Department of Fish and
26 Game and Fish and Wildlife Service were supposed to do
27 a survey within the month of February but snow
28 conditions were not conducive to the surveys. And,
29 hopefully, some time soon, when we get at least a foot
30 of snow they'll be able to go out and determine what
31 the moose population is like.

32

33 As far as the moose hunting season
34 opening in the lower Kuskokwim Corridor, you know, I
35 don't know what it's going to be like, whether we're
36 going to open up in a Tier I or Tier II moose hunt.
37 You know we have 6,000 people and I'm not sure what,
38 probably another 4,000 people within the lower
39 Kuskokwim Corridor or within that Unit 18 area, so a
40 pretty good size population with low moose numbers, I
41 don't know how it's going to open. But, you know,
42 that's something that we really need to explore is
43 perhaps developing a good moose management plan that
44 would allow for some hunting to occur as the population
45 continues to grow.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
48 questions or comments. Ron.

49

50 MR. SAM: Thank you for coming back,

1 Tim. Addressing your concerns about the Mulchatna
2 Herd, can you get a stand or a paper before us sometime
3 tomorrow that we may deliberate on how to handle it and
4 how to support your proposal or a stand on the herd, if
5 you can get a paper in by tomorrow sometime.

6

7 MR. ANDREW: Yeah.

8

9 MR. SAM: Okay.

10

11 MR. ANDREW: Yeah, we'll at least be
12 able to get some kind of a paper before you before we
13 leave.

14

15 MR. SAM: Yes, because I intend to
16 support and your recommendations for rebuilding this
17 herd. I intend to do that.

18

19 Thank you.

20

21 MR. ANDREW: Okay, thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So you've approached
24 Alaska Department of Fish and Game so far or just in
25 the infancy stage, who.....

26

27 MR. ANDREW: Yeah.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:have you talked
30 to, which agencies then?

31

32 MR. ANDREW: We've talked to the
33 Department of Fish and Game wildlife biologist in
34 Bethel for Unit 18. We have yet to talk to the Unit 17
35 manager, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. But
36 we are currently -- or we sent off a notice out to
37 Bristol Bay Native Association to try and solicit their
38 support for this program to determine their level of
39 participation that they desire as we develop this
40 proposal.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. The caribou
43 management plan should have been in progress, it should
44 have been initiated when the herd initiated the decline
45 and it's going to be hard to arrest this decline with
46 these -- my feeling is that the bull/cow ratio is the
47 primary reason why this herd has crashed. We've seen
48 this before. Look at this moose population right here,
49 eight bulls per 100 cows, it's on the rocks. You go
50 below 30 bulls red lights should start lighting up,

1 below 20 things start flying apart, 12 bulls per 100
2 cows on caribou over there -- a few years ago things
3 didn't happen fast enough and we do need a caribou
4 management plan and I'm with Ron, we need to -- this
5 Council needs to endorse that. We would like to get a
6 transmittal on you ideas, work on the same sheet of
7 music.

8

9 And so I would like to see a
10 recommendation to the Federal Subsistence Board from
11 this Council to endorse a caribou planning group for
12 the Mulchatna Herd.

13

14 MR. ANDREW: Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for bring
17 that to our attention.

18

19 MR. ANDREW: Thank you very much.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other questions
22 from the Council.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Vince, you got
27 something.

28

29 MR. MATHEWS: No, I just need to ask
30 Carl, do we need to pack up the whole show here for
31 tonight.

32

33 MR. MORGAN: No.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Okay, so you
36 can leave your stuff here. And then as far as
37 electronics we can leave it.

38

39 MR. MORGAN: I promise we won't come
40 back later.

41

42 (Laughter)

43

44 MR. MATHEWS: But we can leave like the
45 computers and stuff.

46

47 MR. MORGAN: Yes.

48

49 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, thank you.

50

1 MR. SAM: Thank you, Tim.

2

3 (Pause)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have no other
6 commenters that have arrived to comment and the
7 community was aware that we were going to be taking
8 comments.

9

10 We did receive comments from
11 individuals here in Aniak during our session this
12 afternoon, so I think we've fulfilled our obligation to
13 the community to take comments, and so we'll adjourn
14 until tomorrow morning.

15

16 Carl.

17

18 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I'd just like to add
19 that the people here in this part of the region from
20 Kalskag all the way up to Stoney River and probably,
21 you know, above, do realize and they voluntarily, they
22 went and agreed with this management plan, I mean they
23 did it very reluctantly but they knew they had to do
24 something. The do nothing approach was not an answer.
25 We had to make those sacrifices in fish, we voluntarily
26 stopped fishing chum when the chum crashed. They
27 didn't restrict us but the Department of Fish and Game
28 asked us if we'd volunteer -- quit trying to fish for
29 chum salmon so we did. I mean this part of the river,
30 this upper middle Kuskokwim has recognized and has done
31 and has gone over and beyond the steps of trying to be
32 conservative recognizing the do nothing approach is not
33 the answer.

34

35 You know, we all want more fish, we all
36 want more moose, we know we have to do something. And
37 reluctantly we agreed with Tier II. We've closed part
38 of the upper Kuskokwim, middle Kuskokwim, completely,
39 no hunting at all, zero. I mean they volunteered.
40 That came from the people from this part of the
41 country. So I think the fault in this got to -- as --
42 you know as much as I don't like to point fingers is, I
43 think somebody some place since it is mostly State land
44 has made a grave error and they should have made that
45 judgment call five, six, seven, eight years ago. They
46 seen the trend, they seen the moose count, and, you
47 know, they've given up their winter hunt completely.
48 We used to have a February hunt, we gave that up
49 because we know the moose was getting low. We tried to
50 push predator control you know how that went, but

1 finally we got something. That's one thing good that I
2 think that I can put one mark for the Murkowski
3 Administration, he went ahead and bite the bullet and
4 implement that.

5
6 You know, so I'd just like to let you
7 know that the people here know. They're frustrated,
8 yes. They're disgusted, yes. But they're willing to
9 go that extra mile to increase the population.

10
11 Thank you.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Carl.
14 Ron, you had a comment.

15
16 MR. SAM: Just one. I'd like to thank
17 Tim and Art Ivanof for coming before us and just
18 talking with Nick Kameroff, he will be making some more
19 presentations as the proposals come up that, not only
20 concerns the whole region, but a lot of the area --
21 specific ones too. He said he will be back.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments
24 by the Council.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Vince.

29
30 MR. MATHEWS: Well, once you --
31 transportation, Heather can give rides, and then I
32 don't know if Carl's giving rides and I think my red
33 truck came back, I'm not sure.

34
35 (Laughter)

36
37 MR. MATHEWS: It may be in the ditch
38 but anyways.....

39
40 (Laughter)

41
42 MR. MATHEWS:so there's rides for
43 those. And then for other people who are not part of
44 the Council we can get you, with those same vehicles,
45 to where you're staying.

46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So we'll
48 adjourn until.....

49
50 MR. WALKER: Recess.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: oh, recess
2 until tomorrow morning at what time, Vince? What time?

3

4 MR. MATHEWS: What?

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What time in the
7 morning?

8

9 MR. MATHEWS: 9:00.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 9:00 a.m. Okay,
12 9:00 a.m., tomorrow morning.

13

14 (Off record)

15

16 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, 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 168 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 6th day of March 2007, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at Aniak, 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 18th day of March 2007.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 03/12/08