

1 WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE  
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3  
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5  
6 VOLUME I

7  
8 Koyukuk, Alaska  
9 March 7, 2006  
10 9:00 o'clock a.m.

11  
12  
13 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 14  
15 Ronald Sam, Chair  
16 Ray Collins  
17 Benedict Jones  
18 Carl Morgan  
19 Jack Reakoff  
20 Mickey Stickman  
21 Winchell Ticknor  
22 Robert Walker  
23  
24 Regional Council Coordinator, Vince Mathews

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 Recorded and transcribed by:

45  
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC  
47 3522 West 27th Avenue  
48 Anchorage, AK 99517  
49 907-243-0668  
50 jpk@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

(Koyukuk, Alaska - 3/7/2006)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN SAM: We're on then.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. I'll start with the work session, just real quickly. This will go quickly, this is just to give you an overview, if you don't have a meeting booklet please let me know and we can try to get you one. The meeting booklet is what you have to follow through.

On the front pages is the agenda and then the far right are the pages to go to on those topics. Let me grab my book while we're doing this. Okay, so we'll be tracking through the agenda, once you guys approve it and that basically goes through the normal process.

Call to order.

Roll call.

Establishment of quorum.

Introductions.

Council member concerns. We do have a new Council member here. This is a very valuable time for Staff and for Council to share concerns of your area or concerns that you might have within your region. It helps us with developing the agenda and possibly other items.

That's followed by the adoption of the agenda.

Then you go through the minutes.

And then we've added a new section here, a new order to things. We've been trying to do the best to maximize the agency reports, so this is an experiment to do that. And basically agencies have the opportunity, if they have reports or data that is needed to look at the proposals and they can request to the Chair to make their presentation prior to the proposals. They have rightfully complained that they

1 may have data that might have helped you make your  
2 recommendations on proposals but they couldn't present  
3 it until later or they felt they couldn't. So this  
4 gives them an opportunity.  
5

6 Right now we have Brad Scotton from  
7 Koyukuk/Nowitna Refuge that's going to take advantage  
8 of that.  
9

10 Okay, on the second page of your agenda  
11 is on the back of your name tag, let me make sure it  
12 is, yeah, so if you're wondering what order we're  
13 following in the proposals, it's on the back of your  
14 sheet. It's also in your packet here. It's in pink.  
15 Why are we doing that? Well, for those that have been  
16 on the Council a long time, and Winchell and I went  
17 through this last night. Your recommendations go  
18 through to the Board. If your recommendation just says  
19 you support or oppose the proposal, no one knows why.  
20 So this procedure is kind of set up to allow you to get  
21 to that why. So I'll introduce the proposal and then  
22 there'll be the presentation of analysis, it will  
23 either be Staff that are present here or Pete DeMatteo  
24 or Don Rivard, on line. And then it's followed by  
25 agency comments, if Fish and Game has a representative,  
26 they'll present their comments or I'll try to summarize  
27 them. Federal agency comments, and then all the rest.  
28 The InterAgency Staff Committee members are here, they  
29 may want to get up to the mic, they do review the  
30 proposals and the analysis, they may have some  
31 additional questions the Council to consider. So  
32 they're here to help. I highly encourage you to get  
33 them up to the microphone when that's needed. Advisory  
34 groups, I've collected as many as I can on the  
35 neighboring Regional Councils, local Advisory  
36 Committees, on that you'll have to give me some  
37 latitude because the committees took up State  
38 proposals, which are parallel to Federal proposals, so  
39 with your indulgence we can cover those. And then the  
40 Subsistence Resource Commissions. Denali has met and  
41 has provided comments. And Wrangell-St. Elias has met  
42 on State proposals and provided those.  
43

44 Okay, and then we have summary of  
45 written comments. We do have a few of those that were  
46 submitted.  
47

48 Then it's open to an open mic, which  
49 anybody from the public can come up, all you got to do  
50 raise your hand and Ron will recognize you and you come

1 up to the mic and identify yourself and you can  
2 testify.

3

4 Then you guys get into the Council  
5 recommendation. Most all of you know this, you start  
6 off your motion in a positive, even though you may be  
7 against the proposal. You can say I move to support  
8 this proposal to get it on the table, I'm actually  
9 going to vote in opposition to it if you're concerned  
10 that the public may misunderstand why you're supporting  
11 a proposal that they know very well you'd be against.

12

13 Okay, then you have your discussion and  
14 justification. Those questions will help you, they  
15 came out of the meeting in Anvik. So if you could kind  
16 of use them I'd appreciate it. You would make your  
17 motion and then you would reply to your motion, is  
18 there a conservation concern, if there is then express  
19 it. And how will your recommendation address that  
20 concern. Is your recommendation supported by  
21 substantial evidence including traditional ecological  
22 knowledge. I went through this with Winchell last  
23 night, so he should be familiar with that. And then  
24 how will this recommendation address the subsistence  
25 needs involved. Will it be detrimental to subsistence  
26 users. You need to note that, if you do know that that  
27 is the case. But you may say it is detrimental to  
28 subsistence users but the biological reasons compel you  
29 to take that action, something to that effect. Will  
30 this recommendation unnecessarily restrict other uses  
31 involved. If you could note that that would be great.

32

33 If myself, or I think Tom Kron's taking  
34 notes, right?

35

36 MR. KRON: (Nods affirmatively)

37

38 MR. MATHEWS: If we don't understand  
39 why you took an action, one of us will probably getting  
40 back to the Chair or the mover of the motion during the  
41 meeting. We can't do it afterwards. We can get  
42 clarification on your words, but we can't get you to  
43 give your justification once the meeting adjourns.

44

45 So you guys are very good at this but  
46 it empowers your Chair or whoever goes to the Board  
47 meeting, in front of the Board, to have this full  
48 justification. It doesn't take long, it's just a  
49 couple of sentences.

50

1                   Okay, then after we go through that,  
2 you see the proposals that are in front of you, we go  
3 with statewide proposals, then we go regional  
4 proposals. We already have a request to change the  
5 order of Proposals 35 to 36, start off with 36, and  
6 then go to 35. I'll bring that up when you bring the  
7 agenda, that's because of the information that's  
8 provided in the analysis. Crossover proposals, right  
9 off the bat that one first is going to set you back,  
10 those 10 proposals are basically looking for  
11 information so it may take some time or it may not so  
12 don't look at the total number of proposals and kind of  
13 panic. A lot of these are going to be fairly  
14 straightforward discussions.

15  
16                   Then that brings us all the way through  
17 the second day. I just arbitrarily set 5:00 o'clock as  
18 the time for people from the community here to speak  
19 but obviously they can get the Chair's attention and  
20 ask to speak before that if their time schedule doesn't  
21 allow them to come at that time.

22  
23                   Wildlife issues. There may be, if the  
24 State shows up, pending Interior proposals. The Board  
25 of Game starts March 10th this week so I'm not sure  
26 they're going to make it here.

27  
28                   Fishery topics is basically Karen Hyer  
29 will be here, she should be on the plane any minute.  
30 She's going to present the age, sex and length for  
31 chinook salmon and she is bringing copies of that.

32  
33                   The Partners for Fishery Monitoring.  
34 Kim Elkin cannot make it, she has a conflict. David  
35 will be here assuming the claims are here.

36  
37                   Then we get into the .805c letter, I'll  
38 cover that but basically that's the Board's response to  
39 your actions. Did they adopt your recommendations or  
40 not, and if they didn't why not.

41  
42                   My understanding Fish and Game will be  
43 here and either Gerald Maschmann or John Gerken from  
44 the Federal office will be here to give you an outlook  
45 for the upcoming fishing season. Then we get into call  
46 for proposals. We have forms on that if you want to  
47 submit fisheries proposals.

48  
49                   Annual report is in your packet. I'll  
50 cover the packet in a minute. But for Winchell, I

1 didn't talk about annual report last night. The  
2 Council has the option of submitting an annual report  
3 each year. These are topics that are generally outside  
4 of the proposals. They can be topics on like global  
5 warming, fish size, need for additional studies, things  
6 like that. So annual report is brought up at this time  
7 and then submitted and the Board looks at it and gets  
8 back to you at your upcoming meeting.

9  
10 We do have some reports from OSM,  
11 Office of Subsistence Management. A briefing is in  
12 your book on rural determination process. You  
13 requested that you guys be kept informed of that  
14 process even though there's no areas within your region  
15 that are being considered for review.

16  
17 There will be a presentation on the  
18 draft closure review policy and then the subsistence  
19 use amounts briefing will be a joint presentation. So  
20 that will be talking about the subsistence use amounts.

21  
22 And then you've asked -- well, no, it's  
23 Eastern Interior that asked, but we've done it in all  
24 10 regions, to give you guys updates on the Avian flu  
25 situation and that's in your packet.

26  
27 Then it's open for organizational  
28 reports. And it depends on who's here and who wants to  
29 speak and you can set time limits on that, but realize  
30 that the Staff have been waiting two days to present.

31  
32 Then it's Regional Council business.  
33 The charter, just to give you a copy.

34  
35 Then this is the time when you elect  
36 officers. To my knowledge there's no appointments you  
37 need to make but if some do surface then we will  
38 address those. For Winchell, we covered that last  
39 night, that you guys appoint to the Gates of the Arctic  
40 Subsistence Resource Commission. And then you usually  
41 reaffirm your Yukon River Coordinating Fishery  
42 Committee members.

43  
44 And then briefly correspondence sent  
45 and received.

46  
47 Then we set future meeting plans.

48  
49 And then closing comments.

50

1                   So that is pretty much how that is  
2 organized.

3  
4                   As I stressed with Winchell last night  
5 and I'll stress with all the Council members, if you  
6 don't understand what's being presented, if we get off  
7 into a lot of acronyms, you know, like OSM, ANILCA,  
8 NPS, whatever we do, please stop us and say what are  
9 you saying. We use a lot of acronyms around the office  
10 and forget in the public that they don't know that OSM  
11 is Office of Subsistence Management, or NPS is National  
12 Park Service. So please stop us any time on that and  
13 if there's any questions, stop us, talk to the Staff,  
14 that's why they're here. For Winchell when topics  
15 really get going that table there will be full of Staff  
16 there, do not hesitate to ask questions of any of the  
17 Staff about the topic that's why they're getting up to  
18 the table so you can make the best recommendation.

19  
20                   That's pretty much how we have it. You  
21 do have a -- hello, Mickey, you still on the line?

22  
23                   MR. STICKMAN: Yes.

24  
25                   MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mickey doesn't  
26 have this because I can't get it to Nulato, but he'll  
27 track through the book. In your folder thing here, I  
28 tried something new this year, so hopefully it will  
29 work. The pink thing is on the packet, the back of  
30 your name tag, I should say. Then I took all the  
31 copies that we didn't get in the book and numbered  
32 them. So when we talk about or if Randy comes and he  
33 talks about the Draft Innoko Moose Management Plan,  
34 that's copy No. 1. Then copy No. 2 is the, let's see  
35 that's the .805c letter because we couldn't get it into  
36 the book in time. The annual report is No. 3, et  
37 cetera, et cetera. So hopefully that will work for  
38 you. We'll call up the number and then that way you  
39 guys will know which one to pull up.

40  
41                   So that's what that booklet is for.

42  
43                   And then other Staff may have other  
44 handouts. For them, we have to keep a record of the  
45 meeting so a copy needs to go, in addition to the  
46 Council members, needs to go to myself and Salena Hile,  
47 the court recorder, so it's officially on record. No  
48 bid deal, just the easiest way is to give us the copies  
49 and then we'll hand them out.

50

1                   Let's see what else do I need to cover  
2 on housekeeping. Okay, that's pretty much that.

3  
4                   For logistics here, the school has been  
5 very, very gracious here so we need to make sure we  
6 reply in kind. Well, we all know where the bathrooms  
7 are, but, anyways, if there's an emergency we go out  
8 through that door over there to your right. We've  
9 never had an emergency at the meeting but we should  
10 always be prepared and then we'd probably meet out in  
11 front of the school and do a head count and go from  
12 there.

13  
14                   The students, because of the  
15 graciousness of the principal, will not be using the  
16 gym and they will be pretty much out of our way but do  
17 make them feel welcome to ask you questions because  
18 they are the future leaders for this whole area and  
19 possibly on this Council.

20  
21                   Lodging for Council members, we're  
22 covering all that, that will be through the tribal  
23 council, so don't worry about that. For Staff and  
24 others that are staying in the school, the rate is \$35  
25 a night. It can be paid by check or cash. If you make  
26 a presentation to a class that you arrange ahead of  
27 time you only need to pay \$20. Again, the principal is  
28 really, really helping us out here.

29  
30                   So that is that.

31  
32                   Now, to meals. Breakfast will  
33 generally be at 8:00. The tribal council is putting  
34 that together and that runs \$10 a breakfast and Salena  
35 and I are keeping track so we'll be putting a check  
36 next to your name if you eat breakfast, and then we  
37 need to collect that money. Tuesday night is a special  
38 fundraiser. Last night for those that were here it was  
39 announced that the meeting of the Denakkanaaga is going  
40 to be here in spring or summer so they're trying to  
41 raise funds, that's a huge, huge meeting. So Tuesday  
42 night, tonight's meal, I think is a spaghetti feed,  
43 that is going to be a cost per plate and if I got it  
44 wrong, Cindy will correct me, but I believe it's \$12.  
45 Well, stay tuned, it's either 12 or 15, you can pay  
46 more. There's no problem with paying more, don't worry  
47 about that. They have huge expenses coming with the  
48 Denakkanaaga. I've been to one and that's a massive  
49 undertaking and I'm sure they'll do well. Breakfast on  
50 Wednesday, again, is \$10, and then dinner on Wednesday

1 is another potluck. Lunch, I have had flown in, we'll  
2 have the donation can out, if we can kind of cover some  
3 of that cost and then the excess will go to  
4 Denakkanaaga.

5  
6 Am I leaving anything else out, no, I  
7 think that's pretty much it. On logistics, oh, yes,  
8 that's right, Salena has reminded me, for the Council  
9 members I don't need this but I will get theirs, but  
10 for other people that have traveled into this  
11 community, Cindy has asked and I started to generate a  
12 list when people are departing from Koyukuk by plane.  
13 If you're doing snowmachine you should be telling  
14 somebody else but don't tell me.

15  
16 (Laughter)

17  
18 MR. MATHEWS: But for those on a plane,  
19 we need to get a full list and that way she can share  
20 this with the agents in the village. So I will do the  
21 Council members, other Staff this sheet will be up  
22 here, and then just write down your name, departure  
23 date, time and air carrier, that way the agent, you  
24 don't have to bother the agent.

25  
26 I can't think of anything else. We are  
27 teleconferencing in Pete DeMatteo and Don Rivard, so if  
28 you do have questions and they don't understand I might  
29 have to insert myself on that, it's no big deal. But  
30 if you can't hear them or they can't hear you, we'll  
31 improve that as best we can and we also have back ups  
32 if for some reason the phone line does not work.

33  
34 And that's it for the work session  
35 unless there's questions.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Vince.

38  
39 (No comments)

40  
41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. If not, for  
42 the general public's information, a few years back  
43 between State and the Federal system, they had so many  
44 meetings that the Governor and the President of the  
45 United States, Department of Interior, that we had to  
46 seat at least three commercial interest people on our  
47 Federal Subsistence Council, and that's where all this  
48 paperwork generated from and that's why we have to go  
49 through this every time we start a meeting. At one  
50 time we all had to swear whether we were for

1 subsistence or for commercial interests and we had to  
2 declare at that time that we had no conflict with  
3 either commercial or subsistence issues, and that's why  
4 we have this work session at the start of every  
5 meeting.

6  
7                               As Vince said, we've got to be prepared  
8 -- are you still a Boy Scout Troop leader?

9  
10                              MR. MATHEWS: Yes. You can see all the  
11 grey hair.

12  
13                              (Laughter)

14  
15                              CHAIRMAN SAM: That's our coordinator,  
16 he's done a lot of work for us, you'll see he helps us  
17 out quite a bit throughout the meeting. He's the only  
18 one that takes care of all our correspondence, all our  
19 requests, all our concerns and without our court  
20 recorder, Salena, I'd like to thank our two front  
21 people here at the front table, Vince and Salena. So  
22 please bear with us.

23  
24                              As you go along, if you note if we have  
25 local people traveling from Kaltag, Nulato, Galena,  
26 Ruby, if they want to travel right back out we'll  
27 recognize you at any time as Chair, we'll recognize  
28 anyone from Koyukuk that wants to testify. I'll just  
29 let you know that you're hosting this meeting, we'll  
30 give you all the time you want. We will call a special  
31 evening session just for you people for your local  
32 concerns, if needed, if you request it just let Vince  
33 know, Tina know or myself know.

34  
35                              So at this time I'll call the meeting  
36 to order, it is now 9:37. So just before we begin, I  
37 would just like to thank the host village of Koyukuk  
38 for putting on the great feed last night and making us  
39 feel more than welcome.

40  
41                              Benedict do you have any welcoming or  
42 opening remarks from elders before we go into  
43 deliberations.

44  
45                              MR. JONES: Yeah, I just want to  
46 welcome the Council, Western Interior, and Staff  
47 members to Koyukuk. This is our first Western Interior  
48 meeting in Koyukuk and I really appreciate all the  
49 people coming here.

50

1                   As you can see on the wall there,  
2 they're the home of the Koyukuk Raiders. What that  
3 means, the Raiders, back in 1851, the Koyukuk River  
4 Native fought with the Nulato peoples, that's why they  
5 call it the Raiders. At that time the historic places  
6 Koyukuk wasn't established in those years but they had  
7 camps here and there up the Koyukuk River, one up here  
8 at about eight miles and the one at Kateel was the main  
9 fort, and then the Dulbi was another, so a lot of  
10 people from Dulbi that migrated through Allakaket over  
11 to Yukon River, Rampart, Stevens Village, and this is a  
12 historic place. This place was established somewhere  
13 when the telegraph station was stationed here, they  
14 called it Koyukuk Station so they run a telephone line  
15 all the way from Canada to Nome. It went through the  
16 village, they had a little relay station here. At that  
17 time they had a telegraph station every 20 miles for  
18 the mail carriers from Fairbanks, Valdez all the way  
19 over to Nome. So one of the stations was here at  
20 Koyukuk and at Fish Mountain, Galena wasn't established  
21 back in the 1900s, Old Loudon was the main village  
22 there.

23

24                   So I want to welcome you all to Koyukuk  
25 and I hope you have a productive meeting. As I'm going  
26 out as a Council member, my term's going to end this  
27 fall. So I didn't reapply but I really appreciate my  
28 service to all you people for the benefit of the Yukon  
29 and the Western Interior Committee.

30

31                   Thank you.

32

33                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Benedict very  
34 much. I sure appreciate the welcoming remarks. And  
35 for the Council members and for our Staff members, you  
36 can see some of the elders, revered elders pictures up  
37 there, so if you have any questions about them you  
38 could probably get your answers from Benedict.

39

40                   So at this time I'll call an invocation  
41 by local elder.

42

43                   MR. JONES: I'll do it.

44

45                   (Invocation)

46

47                   Bless oh Lord for our wildlife and game  
48 for preserving this earth with our  
49 nourishment through our land, water and  
50 providing us our nourishment and our

1 food. So bless oh Lord for all the  
2 Staff and the Council members traveling  
3 through this Yukon River and those  
4 that's traveling by snowmachine, to  
5 guide them safely home to and from  
6 Koyukuk.  
7  
8 With that, I want to thank you Lord for  
9 blessing us with our meeting and  
10 guiding us through a safe meeting.  
11  
12 Thank you.  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Remain standing please.  
15 A moment of silence and prayers for Huslia.  
16  
17 (Moment of Silence)  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Again, I  
20 would like to thank Benedict for the moving welcome and  
21 invocation, what he said says it all. We hope  
22 everybody down here remains safe at home too.  
23  
24 Before we go into roll call, I would  
25 like those chairs separated so all our guests can sit  
26 down. There's a lot of them by the doorway, if we  
27 could spread them around a little bit.  
28  
29 Thank you.  
30  
31 Vince, roll call.  
32  
33 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.  
34 Robert Walker.  
35  
36 MR. WALKER: Yes.  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Donald Honea is not able  
39 to make it due to work so he's an excused absence. Tom  
40 Kriska moved to Fairbanks and so he's no longer a  
41 qualified member so he's submitted a letter of  
42 resignation.  
43  
44 Mickey Stickman, are you still on line.  
45  
46 MR. STICKMAN: Yes, Vince.  
47  
48 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, so Mickey's here.  
49 Ron Sam.  
50

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Here.  
2  
3 MR. MATHEWS: Ray Collins.  
4  
5 MR. COLLINS: Here.  
6  
7 MR. MATHEWS: Jack Reakoff.  
8  
9 MR. REAKOFF: Here.  
10  
11 MR. MATHEWS: Benedict Jones.  
12  
13 MR. JONES: Here.  
14  
15 MR. MATHEWS: Carl Morgan.  
16  
17 MR. MORGAN: Here.  
18  
19 MR. MATHEWS: Winchell Ticknor.  
20  
21 MR. TICKNOR: Here.  
22  
23 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, based on  
24 nine you have a quorum with seven.  
25  
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Vince. Could  
27 you do the honors by introducing all our Staff.  
28  
29 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, I always get one or  
30 two names wrong but I'll do my best.  
31  
32 Up on the top bleacher we have Greg Bos  
33 who's on the InterAgency Staff Committee. Again, I've  
34 talked to you guys about it, they're here to help you  
35 so do utilize them. Next to him is the next  
36 InterAgency Staff Committee for the Bureau of Indian  
37 Affairs, that's Warren Eastland. Greg Bos is with Fish  
38 and Wildlife Service, if I didn't say that. Next to  
39 them is Tom Kron, who has been at most of your  
40 meetings. He's Division Chief for Office of  
41 Subsistence Management. And I'm going to guess, I  
42 think it's Kenton, and I hope I get the last name right  
43 because I've been real nervous about this but I think  
44 it's Moos.  
45  
46 MR. MOOS: Close enough.  
47  
48 MR. MATHEWS: Close enough. It's M-O-  
49 OS. But anyways, that's the new Refuge manager for  
50 Koyukuk/Nowitna, so hopefully there will be time when

1 you get to know him and meet him in different  
2 locations.

3  
4 I don't know who's next to him.

5  
6 MS. ROBERTS: I'm Marilyn Roberts,  
7 Council member from Koyukuk.

8  
9 MR. MATHEWS: So it's Marilyn Roberts,  
10 Council member from Koyukuk.

11  
12 Right, she cooked us breakfast this  
13 morning, which was way more than I ever expected we  
14 would have, so for those on line you missed the  
15 strawberries and cream, so you'll have to come to the  
16 meetings in the future.

17  
18 It's Trooper Sears, correct, out of  
19 Galena.

20  
21 TROOPER SEARS: Yes.

22  
23 MR. MATHEWS: He's been attending  
24 several meetings. It's great that he's here. I think  
25 he's responding to your request that you guys like to  
26 talk things through with him so it's great that he's  
27 present.

28  
29 Then as we work back over to the left  
30 we have Wennona Brown who is the subsistence  
31 coordinator for Kanuti as well as Arctic Refuge and  
32 Yukon Flats.

33  
34 Then we have Mike Spindler who is now  
35 the Refuge Manager for Kanuti here.

36  
37 Then we work back up to Geoff  
38 Beyersdorf, the subsistence coordinator for  
39 Koyukuk/Nowitna.

40  
41 Then it's Brad Scott, right.

42  
43 MR. SCOTTON: Scotton.

44  
45 MR. MATHEWS: Scotton. He is the  
46 biologist for Koyukuk/Nowitna. He's been at some of  
47 your meetings.

48  
49 And I'll continue with some of the  
50 Staff and then we'll have the other people come up to

1 the mic.

2

3 We have Dan LaPlant, who is the liaison  
4 to the Board of Game for this program as well as other  
5 duties, so when he leaves here he goes right to the  
6 Board of Game. So if, perhaps, you guys talk about  
7 Board of Game proposals, he may be an avenue to get  
8 those information, or will directly fax them to Board  
9 of Game Staff.

10

11 With that there's several people from  
12 the village here or surrounding villages that I don't  
13 know so they may want to come up to the mic and  
14 introduce themselves.

15

16 I'll ask Percy to introduce our local  
17 guests.

18

19 MR. LONITZ: Okay, over here we have  
20 elder Annie, she's a respected elder of our village.  
21 I'm going to let the rest do their own introductions,  
22 they can have their own privilege.....

23

24 (Laughter)

25

26 MR. LONITZ: .....instead of me doing  
27 it.

28

29 CINDY: I'm Cindy (away from  
30 microphone. I'm the tribal administrator for Koyukuk  
31 Tribe.

32

33 MR. LONITZ: Percy Lonitz, First Chief  
34 for the Koyukuk Tribe.

35

36 MR. JONES: Harry Jones. I'm tribal  
37 Council member.

38

39 MR. KRISKA: Dale Kriska, visiting.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Visiting.

42

43 (Laughter)

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you all for being  
46 here. I sure appreciate, again, the welcoming dinner  
47 we had last night. I'll briefly give the Chair's  
48 report.

49

50 For the local people's benefit, we have

1 Bobby Nicholas joining us from Kaltag. We have two  
2 meetings a year. And as Chair you go down to  
3 Anchorage, twice, maybe three times extra a year, and  
4 Coordinating Fisheries from the Yukon and Kuskokwim,  
5 they meet an extra two or three times a year.

6  
7                   So, again, for your information we'll  
8 have that donation box out tonight again because  
9 talking with Percy and his wife, they're raising funds  
10 for a school trip, they're going all the way down to  
11 Santa Fe, so if you feel like donating, feel like  
12 donating when you see that box, please do that.

13  
14                   And my last meeting down at Sheraton  
15 Hotel in Anchorage, we had a bunch of things to cover,  
16 what we work on all year plus new issues and because of  
17 the few proposals that we had on fisheries it always  
18 will seem like it's YK-Delta against Middle Yukon, and  
19 sometimes Eastern Interior, so we cover the whole Yukon  
20 River drainage. And it surprised the heck out of me  
21 down at Anchorage that YK-Delta, for two proposals, one  
22 that we submitted and one that Eastern Interior  
23 submitted, YK-Delta brought in 15 people to testify  
24 against both those proposals. So the more you learn  
25 about the system, the more you want to -- even us, go  
26 against us, if you think we're wrong, or back us up,  
27 it's your pleasure and we're here for one purpose and  
28 that is to serve you.

29  
30                   I'm getting kind of tired so I'm kind  
31 of resigning as Chair at the end of this meeting  
32 because it seems like my phone rings off the hook, half  
33 the time I come home from traveling, I get about 20  
34 calls to return and sometimes I can't catch up. And as  
35 you all know the State Board of Game is also meeting in  
36 Fairbanks every two years to cover Interior interests.  
37 Randy Roberts left me a message that he wanted to be  
38 one of the first on the agenda to make a brief report  
39 and get back on the plane to get ready for the State  
40 Board of Game. Because a lot of these proposals that  
41 we will be covering will be covered at that State Board  
42 of Game also. The more we work, the more we slip away  
43 from each other, every other meeting we have to come  
44 back and get back to work with the State, instead of  
45 working against them the State land is adjacent to  
46 Koyukuk Wildlife Refuge or any other Refuge or any  
47 other Federal lands that surround us. They know that  
48 subsistence is important to us, that we have a  
49 different way of going about it, but we do try to work  
50 together.

1                   On our agenda, we have an evening  
2 session at the call of the Chair if we get behind on  
3 our business, and at that evening session, all the  
4 locals that want to express any concerns that you have,  
5 whether it's on the agenda or not, whether it's under  
6 proposals or not, this is your home, we will recognize  
7 you on any issue that you care to bring before us.

8  
9                   If you testify you'll come up to the  
10 head table, press the microphone on and off, like that,  
11 state your name and state your concern.

12  
13                   Again, we'll have a fundraiser tonight  
14 and I hope that the students that we're trying to help  
15 go on this trip have a good safe trip and an  
16 educational one and that's why we want to see them go.

17  
18                   With that, I will start at Carl Morgan  
19 to express Regional Council member concerns.

20  
21                   MR. MORGAN: Yeah, thank you, Mr.  
22 Chairman. I'm very pleased to be here in Koyukuk  
23 again. I've got some concerns and I'm sad to hear  
24 Benedict is not going to be reapplying, he's going to  
25 be missed very much, a lot of knowledge and traditional  
26 and he brings a lot of good ideas and very, very  
27 important statements for this part of the country and  
28 this area. You're very blessed to have him being your  
29 representative here.

30  
31                   Anyway my concerns are that there are a  
32 lot of issues coming up in the Interior of the moose  
33 populations dwindling, not only in the Federal side  
34 also on the State side. And I also am a member of the  
35 State Board of Game, and I don't know if that's a  
36 blessing or a taboo.

37  
38                   No.

39  
40                   (Laughter)

41  
42                   MR. MORGAN: No, it makes me wonder  
43 sometimes.

44  
45                   There's, like 19(A), there's some areas  
46 that the population is dwindling, some areas may have  
47 to go in complete closure or some areas might have to  
48 go to Tier II, some recommendations are to go State  
49 Tier I. But I think it's going to change. The thing  
50 that really worries me, if we do that, then we force

1 the issue, we force the population to move to another  
2 part of the region that doesn't have a problem that we  
3 could have it, so we're looking at that, so we need to  
4 make sure that stock and that population stay healthy  
5 too.

6  
7 I've got a very concern about that.

8  
9 I know up here it's the same thing, you  
10 know, if we do any more restrictions, we got to look at  
11 who we're going, it's like squeezing, we make a  
12 restriction here and like a balloon, you squeeze that  
13 and it pops up over here, the population just sits,  
14 whether from urban or rural.

15  
16 And I think we should start looking  
17 outside of the box and there's some serious issues  
18 coming up with the moose and the caribou in our area  
19 from about 280,000 and now we're down to 80, less, both  
20 on the State and Federal biologists I talk to, it went  
21 down to 80,000 caribou and not very many big bulls.  
22 So, you know, that's another concern we got.

23  
24 But anyway, I always try to stay  
25 focused here, try to stay with this Western Interior  
26 Federal Advisory Group meeting because like I said I  
27 also belong to the Alaska Board of Game, so I'll be  
28 leaving from here with Ron and other people to be at  
29 the Fairbanks meeting. And I hope we're very  
30 productive and accomplish something real good here.

31  
32 Thank you, very much.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Carl.  
35 Robert.

36  
37 MR. WALKER: Thank you,. Mr. Chairman.  
38 Welcome Staff, elders, distinguished guests and my host  
39 where I stayed last night. Welcome to you Vince.  
40 Tina.

41  
42 My concern is that our February 1  
43 through 10, Federal subsistence hunt in Unit 21, we  
44 still have to do a little education for some of our  
45 hunters. We're having problems, they're making  
46 complaints about the State protection and State  
47 protection, when I asked them, they said they were not  
48 on Federal land and we're still having confusion about  
49 who owns the low water mark, and I tell them to the  
50 State, which is true, and some people are being cited

1 for shooting moose on State land.

2

3 I talked to Trooper Poddle (ph) down in  
4 Aniak, and, you know, we have to get more information  
5 to our hunters for the Federal subsistence hunt. We  
6 have to have better maps to show where Federal land is.  
7 The State and the Federal government should work  
8 together on this here. It is confusing because you  
9 could be a half a mile off and you could be on State  
10 land and you're shooting a subsistence moose on State  
11 land and you will be cited by Fish and Game, State Fish  
12 and Game.

13

14 That's one of the things that I think  
15 needs to be worked on in the next year before our next  
16 February hunt.

17

18 Another thing, too, I didn't see Polly  
19 Wheeler here. I was kind of wondering why. And I  
20 didn't see Jeff Denton here from the BLM. So, again,  
21 thank you for being in Koyukuk, I've been here before  
22 and it's always a pleasure to come back here, and,  
23 thank you, again, Mr. Chairman.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Robert.  
26 Benedict.

27

28 MR. JONES: Once again, my name is  
29 Benedict Jones from Koyukuk, I'm an elder chief of  
30 Koyukuk. My concern is that last fall when the bull  
31 only season was open, there's a lot of young bulls that  
32 were taken at the fall season. And I'm concerned about  
33 that, the future generation, the moose population,  
34 because those will be our breeding stock 15 years down  
35 the line. So the bulls are declining due to cow ratios  
36 so the peoples that hunted longer during the fall  
37 season and the price of gas has gone up. Average for  
38 individual hunters last fall just for the cost of their  
39 gas is in the neighborhood of thousand dollars.

40

41 So we had a teleconference on the  
42 extended season that the Western Interior submitted,  
43 and the Middle Yukon Advisory opposed that because they  
44 said the rut season, late, because it extended from  
45 September 25th to the October 1st, so they opposed  
46 that.

47

48 And my concern, we had a meeting Yukon  
49 Fisheries Association in Ruby about three weeks ago and  
50 all up and down the Yukon into Canada, their concern is

1 that king salmon are getting smaller. Forty years ago  
2 average catch of kings were 40 pounds but now I talked  
3 to the commercial fishermen down at the mouth and they  
4 said their average is only 20 pounds and so the weight  
5 loss and length of the fish is declining.

6  
7                   The whitefish population is going down  
8 drastically fast. Two years ago I used to catch  
9 between a hundred or 200 whitefish per day but last  
10 fall I was only catching like 15 fish a day. And  
11 there's the concern about that there's some kind of  
12 parasite in the whitefish. they're just like the summer  
13 chum when their head get rotten, their skin rotting off  
14 of them, we never seen that in the whitefish before.  
15 So the people in Tanana that do those biological  
16 studies they said the heart, there's white spots in  
17 their heart and they look at it in the microscope and  
18 you could see that white spot moving so there's some  
19 kind of disease developing in the whitefish. We're  
20 concerned about that because that's our main diet in  
21 the winter when we stock up with whitefish in the fall  
22 just before freeze up.

23  
24                   The habitat is changing drastically for  
25 the whitefish because there's no more bugs in the  
26 sloughs, lakes and creeks, those little black beetle  
27 bugs, that's where they live in the summertime. So  
28 their flesh is declining.

29  
30                   As for the winter hunt the bull only  
31 season this fall, it was kind of hardship for the  
32 people, individual hunters here, they had to hunt  
33 longer days, travel further because they couldn't spot  
34 any bull moose even though they had their horns, they  
35 had to go -- a friend of mine had to go out several  
36 days just going out every day to try to spot a bull,  
37 all we see is cows, cows, cows and the bulls that he  
38 see are too young so they're concerned about the winter  
39 hunt on a bull season.

40  
41                   What I'd like to see sometime, we draft  
42 a letter but one of our Council members lost the  
43 letter, what we proposed to the Middle Yukon, is that,  
44 fall hunting season, I'd like to see for elders, like  
45 me, to have two or three days cow seasons because it's  
46 kind of hardship for us elders going out alone and try  
47 to spot a moose. If you spot a mile back you have to  
48 have help, younger -- come back and it's kind of a  
49 waste of time if you're up a hundred miles up and try  
50 to get help from somebody. And not only that the cost

1 of gas. So I'd like to see sometime in the future for  
2 the elders to have maybe 15 to 20 moose per fall season  
3 to harvest cows in the last two or three days of the  
4 season.

5  
6 And so that's all my statement right  
7 now.

8  
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, very much  
10 Benedict. While I'm on this side of the table, Mickey  
11 you still on line?

12  
13 MR. STICKMAN: Yes, I am Ron.

14  
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: yes, go ahead and  
16 express your concerns, please.

17  
18 MR. STICKMAN: Okay, Ron, and the rest  
19 of the Council and to all the community members there,  
20 my name is Mickey Stickman. I'm the first chief of the  
21 Nulato Tribe. First of all I just wanted to say that  
22 I'm sorry that I couldn't be there in person because  
23 I'm stuck in meetings.

24  
25 But like Benedict, I went to the Yukon  
26 River Drainage Fishermen's Association meeting three  
27 weeks ago, about, and one of the biggest concerns there  
28 was, like Ben said, was the size of fish. And through  
29 their studies what they found was, like Ben said, even  
30 though the fish that they're catching is smaller, if  
31 you go back 10 years ago and catch a six or seven year  
32 old fish it's going to be anywhere from 50 to 60  
33 pounds, but now if you catch a five or six year old  
34 fish today it's going to be anywhere from 20 to 25  
35 pounds. So one of the main things was size.

36  
37 And the other was they sent out a  
38 survey just recently and that was one of the things I  
39 put in the survey was fish size and then I wanted them  
40 to continue the riverwide consultation. And then the  
41 third and last one was I wanted to let them know that  
42 my main concern was of subsistence use because, well,  
43 Ben will probably tell you guys that when we were there  
44 they were considering opening the subsistence -- the  
45 commercial fishing for kings on the lower Yukon. They  
46 were trying to get a set date and they usually wait  
47 until the mid point of the run before they have a  
48 commercial opening so they have a pretty good idea of  
49 the size of the run but now they're considering having  
50 a commercial opening in the first quarter point, before

1 the first quarter point. So even though as a whole,  
2 the Yukon River, the Board there agreed with the  
3 concept, one of the things that really concerned me,  
4 you know, even though it's going to happen if the run  
5 doesn't improve after that, it could have an affect on  
6 subsistence fishing further up the river.

7  
8 The other one I have is on moose  
9 hunting. The Nulato Tribe wrote a letter to the State  
10 Department of Fish and Game, they wanted to have a  
11 longer season but like Ben said, the Middle Yukon  
12 Advisory Committee shot that down but I guess they  
13 actually -- well, in reality they approved the season  
14 that goes into August into later in September. So the  
15 only thing we can do is watch and see how that plays  
16 out.

17  
18 That's the only concerns I really have  
19 and once, again, I'm just sorry that I couldn't be  
20 there. And I welcome Winchell Ticknor to the Council.

21  
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Mickey,  
23 you're here with us. When Benedict and Mickey talk  
24 about fish just for the public information, at our  
25 October meeting, we have two meetings a year, we talk  
26 about our October meeting, it's strictly supposed to be  
27 strictly for fish and our March meeting, which we  
28 consider the main one is mostly for game, moose. Just  
29 so you know it's one of our most important meetings of  
30 the year, here, at Koyukuk.

31  
32 Thank you, again. Jack Reakoff.

33  
34 MR. REAKOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
35 I'm Jack Reakoff from Wiseman, up in the head of the  
36 Koyukuk River, and I want to thank Koyukuk Village for  
37 hosting this meeting down here. I really appreciate  
38 the nice cover dish last night. And I'm really sad  
39 that Ben is leaving our Council, Ben has brought a lot  
40 of information about customary and traditional use  
41 around this lower Koyukuk area.

42  
43 Some of my concerns are -- myself, are  
44 there's still this all terrain vehicle bill going  
45 through the Legislature for the Dalton Highway Corridor  
46 and the upper part of this, and that all terrain  
47 vehicle bill, we know there's a closure on the use of  
48 all terrain vehicles from the road, if that bill passes  
49 it will have a huge affect on the people in the upper  
50 part of the drainage and there will be a lot of hunters

1 that will be accessing resources that have been under  
2 control right now.

3

4 That bill is in the House. It's passed  
5 out of the Senate.

6

7 The moose proposal that the Western  
8 Interior Council for the September 25th extension to  
9 the 1st of October, our Council put that out -- decided  
10 to put that out throughout the whole -- almost all of  
11 Unit 21 and 24. It was a good thing that the Advisory  
12 Committees went through that and decided how they  
13 wanted to see the subsistence needs met. Ron and I  
14 kept getting special action requests from a couple  
15 different areas for people not meeting their  
16 subsistence needs, and so that proposal sort of spurred  
17 people into thinking about how to try to meet those  
18 needs. So the Middle Yukon has decided they want more  
19 season in August instead of October. And the Koyukuk  
20 River Advisory Committee met by teleconference on the  
21 28th of February and we discussed that proposal also.

22

23 People from down around Huslia and down  
24 river didn't want that October portion but Unit 24 has  
25 now been divided into four different subunits and so  
26 Unit 24(B) area around Allakaket, it was decided to try  
27 to go to the Board of Game and get that extension, the  
28 bull/cow ratio is up there 60/70 bulls per 100 cows and  
29 people are having a hard time getting meat up there.  
30 So in the hot falls the moose aren't moving around and  
31 it gives people opportunity to try and get a moose  
32 then.

33

34 Our snow depth up there in the upper  
35 part of the drainage is about between two and three  
36 feet of snow and so the moose are doing real well and  
37 we're seeing way less wolves up there for some reason.  
38 I'm seeing about a third of the wolves that I seen last  
39 year. I had 28 wolves on the area I was trapping last  
40 year and I caught seven of those and this year I've  
41 only seen nine wolves tracks all winter, and that's  
42 counting every wolf that came through the country all  
43 winter. And so I'm not sure what's going on up there  
44 for wolves, whether they got disease or they just went  
45 to the north or what in the world happened to them but  
46 we're seeing a lot less wolves up there.

47

48 So that's my report and thanks for  
49 hosting us.

50

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. While  
2 it's still fresh on my mind, I attended 40 hour  
3 training down at Juneau and there was no time to meet  
4 with Kookesh and Representative Woody Salmon, but I did  
5 get a hold of them by phone and the last time I talked  
6 with Woody Salmon's office he said that the proposal  
7 for off road vehicle use on the Dalton is put on hold  
8 and he's going to hold it there as long as can because  
9 he's totally against it too. So I tried.

10

11 MR. REAKOFF: Good.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, Winchell.

14

15 MR. TICKNOR: Good morning. My name is  
16 Winchell Ticknor, I'm from Nikolai. I want to thank  
17 the people of Koyukuk for hosting this meeting. This  
18 is my first meeting on this board. I was not sure if I  
19 was coming here but I found out about a week ago I was  
20 appointed to this board for three years but I was  
21 originally for one year but then my term was up and I  
22 didn't attend one meeting but now I'm here and I want  
23 to thank the people here.

24

25 My concern is that the moose in our  
26 area is not very healthy yet and I sat on the Fish and  
27 Game Board for several years. At one time I thought  
28 that we were going to go Tier II hunt but fortunately  
29 that didn't happen, we are in registration now in our  
30 area.

31

32 I am concerned about other predation,  
33 with the whitefish, the fish in our area is not very  
34 abundant anymore. I think some of our whitefish in our  
35 spawning areas are being blocked by maybe beaver dams  
36 and I'm concerned about these things.

37

38 And I'm very happy to be here and I  
39 want to thank you for inviting us here.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Winchell.  
42 I'm glad you not only accept your presence, welcome to  
43 the club. Every once in awhile you'll notice that we  
44 get on the hot seats, against ourselves but that's how  
45 we resolve our issues. Thank you for being here.

46

47 Ray.

48

49 MR. COLLINS: Thank you. This is my  
50 first time in Koyukuk, and I want to thank you for

1 hosting this meeting, it's good to be here.

2

3 As Winchell stated in our area we've  
4 been concerned a long time with predation there and we  
5 did get a program in place but they had to study for  
6 about three years first to find out what was causing  
7 all the mortality on the calves. The good news is that  
8 we are getting higher calf survival because of the  
9 predation. They did two things, they flew a lot of  
10 bears out of there, you may have heard of that, in  
11 fact, some of them may have ended up over here, I don't  
12 know where they took them. They took 90 bears within  
13 miles of McGrath one year and the next year they flew  
14 out 45 bears, and as a result of that and then the  
15 implementation of wolf control, we saw higher calf  
16 survival.

17

18 Even last year when we had deep snow  
19 and lost some of our calves, calf survival was higher  
20 than it had been before the predator program went into  
21 place. And this year we've got about 50 percent  
22 survival rate of calves into January so we're seeing it  
23 turning around. But they're not going to do any more  
24 bear removal there, so it's just a reminder to us that  
25 local people have a responsibility too if they're going  
26 to manage the game in the area, and if you're getting  
27 an increase bear population, if you don't harvest some  
28 of those bears, you're going to see increased predation  
29 on the calves because they, as well as the wolves are a  
30 factor.

31

32 The price we had to pay for that  
33 implementing the program, we've closed the area around  
34 McGrath for 20 miles for hunting and so with the higher  
35 gas prices last fall they have to travel 20 miles out  
36 of town before they can even start hunting, and it's  
37 pushed some of the hunting up closer into Winchell's  
38 area there because it's opened up in the North Fork.

39

40 So as Carl said, we do have to think  
41 about the actions we take because we displace hunters  
42 and cause more pressure on other areas, so we've got to  
43 work -- and we can't just manage Federal lands, we've  
44 got to look at both the State and Federal lands in all  
45 these programs.

46

47 I guess one of my concerns is that if  
48 we do have problems with wolves in your area on Federal  
49 lands it's going to be more difficult to implement the  
50 Federal wolf control on those Federal lands. So that's

1 why I think it's important where we have the State  
2 programs going around McGrath to see what the results  
3 are because it has bearing on other areas of -- what  
4 we're trying to do is turn the moose population around  
5 quickly and that's why closed it to hunting there. And  
6 we'll know this next year, we're just getting some new  
7 breeding cows coming into the population now after  
8 three years. So what happens this next year will be  
9 critical to see whether we start seeing an increase in  
10 the breeding population.

11

12 But other than that I don't have any  
13 special concerns. Although with the closure of the  
14 moose hunting potentially down river from us that may  
15 see more hunters coming up in our area, too. So we've  
16 got to actively manage these populations if we're going  
17 to keep our moose numbers up.

18

19 Thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Ray. Sure  
22 appreciate those comments.

23

24 And what Ray was alluding to when  
25 displace hunters, when we formed the Koyukuk River  
26 Moose Management Working Group under Randy Rogers and  
27 cut down the numbers that moose could be harvested in  
28 lower Koyukuk we ran into the Chair of the Northwest  
29 Arctic, that is, Willie Goodwin, and you just sent  
30 those hunters up our area is what he said.

31

32 (Laughter)

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: So what Ray is talking  
35 about is true. You displace them in one place they go  
36 another place, that's all it amounts to.

37

38 So at this time the Chair -- Benedict.

39

40 MR. JONES: Yeah, I just got an  
41 additional concern about Koyukuk Controlled Use Area.  
42 We had a teleconference a couple weeks ago and they  
43 want to open up the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area for  
44 aircraft use, and this proposal is introduced by Collin  
45 Brown of Galena. I was opposing that but they wanted  
46 only a mile and a half corridor area outside so I tell  
47 them, no, you couldn't do that, that that mile and a  
48 half was too short so I asked for 10 mile corridor and  
49 they settled down on three miles on each side of the  
50 Koyukuk River.

1                   And my concern was about that they were  
2 going to eliminate the Tree-Day Slough, whole Three-Day  
3 Slough area to aircraft use and I told them, no, you  
4 couldn't do that because that's part of the Koyukuk  
5 River drainage. The Koyukuk River water drains through  
6 the whole Three-Day Slough so we put a six mile  
7 corridor area in that area too.

8  
9                   That's my concern.

10  
11                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Benedict.

12  
13                   Vince.

14  
15                   MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. In  
16 response to Robert Walker on two Staff people, I do  
17 have updates on that.

18  
19                   Jeff Denton did leave me a voicemail  
20 message just before I caught the plane that he's unable  
21 to make this meeting, he just completed a survey. I  
22 don't remember which it is, so he would not make the  
23 meeting.

24  
25                   For Polly Wheeler, that was the  
26 decision that, this meeting, as Ron said earlier is  
27 mainly a wildlife meeting, and that the fishery topics  
28 as far as monitoring projects were basically an update  
29 so it was a decision that the Fishery Information  
30 Service Staff would not be here. Karen Hyer will be  
31 here to do the age, sex and length presentation. She's  
32 with the Fishery Information Service, but Polly will  
33 not be at this meeting, unless someone knows different  
34 but that's how I understood it.

35  
36                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Do you have  
37 anything more on that, Robert?

38  
39                   MR. WALKER: No.

40  
41                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you. At  
42 this time the Chair will entertain a motion to adopt  
43 the agenda.

44  
45                   MR. STICKMAN: So moved, Mr. Chair.

46  
47                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

48  
49                   MR. REAKOFF: Second.

50

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved and seconded by  
2 Mickey Stickman and Jack Reakoff to adopt the agenda as  
3 presented.  
4  
5 All those in favor of the motion  
6 signify by saying aye.  
7  
8 IN UNISON: Aye.  
9  
10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sing.  
11  
12 (No opposing votes)  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried.  
15 Approval of October 2005 McGrath meeting minutes.  
16  
17 The Chair will entertain a motion to  
18 adopt the minutes as presented. They're lengthy but we  
19 all had time to go through them.  
20  
21 MR. JONES: So moved.  
22  
23 MR. STICKMAN: So moved, Mr. Chairman.  
24  
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Benedict, and  
26 I'll take it as a second Mickey.  
27  
28 MR. STICKMAN: Okay, Mr. Chair, second.  
29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you. How  
31 much time do you want to go through the minutes, we've  
32 all had them for awhile.  
33  
34 (Pause)  
35  
36 MR. JONES: Call for question.  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called  
39 for. All those in favor of adopting the McGrath  
40 meeting minutes signify by saying aye.  
41  
42 IN UNISON: Aye.  
43  
44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Those opposed, same  
45 sign.  
46  
47 (No opposing votes)  
48  
49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. At this  
50 time we'll take a 10 minute break because we'll have a

1 slight change on the agenda. Before we start going  
2 into wildlife proposal review and recommendations,  
3 we'll have Brad Scotton to cover a lot of these  
4 proposals because this deals with the Koyukuk/Nowitna  
5 Refuge.

6  
7 So at this time we'll just go ahead and  
8 take a 10 minute break.

9  
10 (Off record)

11  
12 (On record)

13  
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: If we can find our way  
15 back to our seats, I'd like to begin.

16  
17 (Pause)

18  
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'd like to call the  
20 meeting back to order. We have two speakers that will  
21 cover game, mainly moose and wolves and both the  
22 Koyukuk/Nowitna Wildlife Refuge and the Kanuti Wildlife  
23 Refuge. They have a lot to do with our proposals that  
24 we will be going through, so at this time, Vince.

25  
26 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just a  
27 couple of housekeeping things.

28  
29 One, some people on line are having a  
30 hard time hearing so if we could speak a little closer  
31 to the microphones that will help.

32  
33 The other thing is we do have a sign up  
34 sheet over here. The reason for the sign up sheet is  
35 to make sure we capture that everybody's here.

36  
37 And then lastly we got in the final  
38 figures, Robert, doesn't need to get his dice out,  
39 dinner is going to be \$15 for adults and \$8 for kids.  
40 This is the fundraiser tonight that is a price per  
41 plate, so it's \$15 for adults and \$8 for kids.

42  
43 Thank you.

44  
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Vince. Brad.

46  
47 MR. SCOTTON: Mr. Chairman. Members of  
48 the Council. I very much appreciate the opportunity to  
49 be here today. By way of introduction of myself, some  
50 of you know me, many of you do not. Just real quickly,

1 I am the wildlife -- lead wildlife biologist for  
2 Koyukuk/Nowitna Refuge based in Galena. I've been in  
3 Galena for four years. I've worked as a professional  
4 wildlife biologist in Alaska for the last 12 years, and  
5 prior to that, worked as a fisheries technician and  
6 wildlife technician in Alaska for five years prior to  
7 that. I've worked in various parts of the state, from  
8 Unit 13 over around Glennallen, I've worked on projects  
9 in McGrath, Dillingham, I've flown surveys on the North  
10 Slope and the Brooks Range. I'll tell you this country  
11 around here is rich and wonderful country and I love it  
12 in Galena and in this areas. So kind of a compliment  
13 to the area, and just to give you a little bit of my  
14 background because I don't get the opportunity to  
15 travel to all the meetings, certainly I have to admit I  
16 avoid them a little bit because I prefer to spend my  
17 time doing the surveys and collecting the data, but  
18 it's absolutely critical that you have some of this  
19 information to make wise decisions.

20  
21                   What I'm going to do here, I'm not  
22 going to speak to any specific proposal specifically,  
23 I'm just going to provide some of the data that we  
24 collect annually on the Refuge that may help you in  
25 making decisions and I'll be available to answer  
26 questions. Mostly what I'm going to cover is just a  
27 little bit about moose and the most current data that  
28 we have. And much of this is collected jointly with  
29 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Every November  
30 we try to fly trend surveys on Koyukuk Refuge and  
31 Nowitna Refuge, and I'll cover these in detail a little  
32 bit later.

33  
34                   We also fly some twinning surveys in  
35 May right when calves are being born and it gives us an  
36 idea of productivity of the population, what percentage  
37 of cows that have calves are having twins, and that  
38 gives us a good idea of nutrition and some other  
39 things.

40  
41                   We also periodically do large scale  
42 population estimates. These are different than trend  
43 surveys, in that, they produce an actual estimate in  
44 number for a large area. We don't look at the whole  
45 thing, but we sample parts of it and then we make  
46 estimates from there and I'll go over some of those  
47 that we've done recently.

48  
49                   Briefly, I will just touch on a current  
50 research project we've just started on Koyukuk and

1 northern Innoko, otherwise known as the Kaiyuh Flats  
2 project, and just cover that briefly.

3

4                   Then I'll talk about wolves a little  
5 bit.

6

7                   Game Management Unit 21(B) contains  
8 Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge and just to  
9 geographically give you the areas I'm going to talk  
10 about, this center area right now is a trend count  
11 area. The pink area, it's overlaid with a bunch of  
12 squares, that's an area we try to fly every single year  
13 as a trend survey, the Nowitna River mouth. That's the  
14 river corridor and then periodically we'll do Deep  
15 Creek, and then we haven't done this area up by Tanana  
16 in a long time, or this upper part of the river area.  
17 But I'm going to present some data for these trend  
18 count surveys that's pretty recent and go back in time  
19 because one of the proposals you're going to consider  
20 is specifically about 21(B).

21

22                   This is data from 1992 to 2005, ratio  
23 data, bull/cows, calf/cows and yearling bull/cow  
24 ratios. And the bottom larger graph is just the  
25 population count within that trend count area over the  
26 long-term. These are the adult cows on the top on the  
27 purple line. It looks remarkably stable over time.  
28 Now, this is just a subportion of that large Nowitna  
29 Refuge. In 2001 we did an estimate of the whole  
30 Refuge, or a large portion of the Refuge, the  
31 population was 3,000, plus or minus a thousand moose,  
32 so somewhere between two and 4,000 moose back in 2001.  
33 And these two trend count areas, we're only counting  
34 300 or so moose, 350 moose, 250 of which are cows.  
35 That paints a picture of sort of long-term stability  
36 with a little bit of noise in that area.

37

38                   I do have to say in 2001 we switched  
39 our techniques a little bit and I'll back up. Instead  
40 of just flying the land contour lines along the  
41 corridor, the riparian habitat, we started covering  
42 that with this square grid, they're GSPE squares, which  
43 is a -- so we changed our technique slightly and the  
44 counts aren't absolutely perfectly comparable but in  
45 this area the extra habitat we covered with these  
46 squares outside of that is mostly upland and black  
47 spruce and it's real low density.

48

49                   So in particular on the Nowitna it  
50 added some area that we surveyed every year but it

1 didn't add very many moose to the surveys at all. And  
2 so anyway that basically gives you an idea.

3  
4 And then recent times we've seen a  
5 little bit of improvement in calf production of that  
6 area. The yellow line is raw calf numbers from those  
7 two trend count areas and you can see things have  
8 improved where we're getting as many as 100 calves in  
9 that trend count area the last couple years. This year  
10 it was a little bit lower in '05. And, again, you can  
11 see it in the ratios, the calves per 100 cows was real  
12 low back in 2000 and jumped up a little bit in '03, '04  
13 and '05 it was above, right around 30 or higher, which  
14 is reasonable production.

15  
16 This last year -- and of concern in  
17 this area and one of the reasons for restrictions that  
18 took place at the cycle two years ago was a low  
19 bull/cow ratio and the blue line is the bull/cow and  
20 what we saw is 2000 to 2002 or '03 this decline right  
21 here in the bull/cow ratio. Since the restrictions  
22 have been in place the bull/cow ratio is starting to  
23 recover. So between the restrictions and the improved  
24 calf numbers we've seen bull numbers start to recover  
25 right along that heavily hunted corridor.

26  
27 Now, much of the Refuge away from the  
28 river gets hunted, but it gets hunted much more lightly  
29 and the bull/cow ratio there is naturally higher.

30  
31 Overall, in '01 when we did the census  
32 it was 31 bulls per 100 cows. The river corridor this  
33 last year was 24 per 100 cows.

34  
35 A caution there is a number of those  
36 are young bulls. Out of 24 per 100, nine per 100 were  
37 yearlings, so there's a lot of young bulls there, and,  
38 again, that's a reflection of this increased calf  
39 productivity that are just getting recruited and  
40 they're becoming adults.

41  
42 So that's a little bit of sort of --  
43 and just as a difference to the Koyukuk population, the  
44 Nowitna is really overall a low density population,  
45 along the river corridor it's a little bit higher, but  
46 overall it's not the same type of habitat as the  
47 Koyukuk or other places in Alaska and it just exists at  
48 a lower density.

49  
50 Hunter and harvest numbers. This goes

1 all the way back to '88, the population data was from  
2 '92. But over the long-term a pretty stable hunter  
3 base. It kind of goes up and down, the regulations  
4 have changed several times in there. And harvest is  
5 kind of the same, you know, 35 to 55 bulls a year come  
6 through the check station off the river corridor pretty  
7 much every year. '03 we saw a spike in hunter numbers  
8 of, I think it was 208 that year that went through the  
9 check station, the next year there was significant  
10 restrictions in place and the hunter numbers were back  
11 down lower. Harvest was also low the next year and  
12 hunter numbers were back low. And then this year was  
13 kind of right about the long-term average again.  
14

15                   And so that's just the general picture  
16 of what's going on through the check station. There  
17 are other people who fly in and hunt and fly out and  
18 they don't come through the check station. As you know  
19 that area is all on drawing permits now for the antler  
20 retention permits so the numbers of hunters hunting  
21 away from the corridor and in the corridor is somewhat  
22 limited by that.  
23

24                   I'll carry on to the Koyukuk, and,  
25 again, the areas in the pink or whatever color that is  
26 inside the squares are the traditional trend count  
27 areas and we try to fly those every single year. For  
28 the purposes of the data that I'm going to display for  
29 the trend count areas, we combine these two into one  
30 big block around Huslia, Huslia Treat Island, we  
31 combine Three-Day Slough and Dulbi River, these two  
32 into one block for presentation of the data because  
33 these areas aren't huge, they're 80 to 110 or 20 square  
34 miles, by combining them we get a larger sample size.  
35 We eliminate some of the effects of movement in and  
36 out, changing the numbers annually just kind of makes  
37 it a little bit more robust and less likely to some  
38 anomaly, you know, some movement of 20 cows into the  
39 area can really dramatically change some of these  
40 individual trend counts.  
41

42                   Three areas between Galena and Koyukuk  
43 right here, Pilot Mountain, Squirrel Creek, and Koyukuk  
44 Mouth we combine. And then we have another trend count  
45 area in the Koyukuk, which is really different than  
46 everywhere else, this is a low density population, it's  
47 only one trend count area. And I'm going to present  
48 this data but you really need to take it with a grain  
49 of salt because movements in and out can really affect  
50 it year to year and you kind of really have to look at

1 a long-term trend and the ratio data is important,  
2 well, I'll cover that a little bit more.

3

4                   So up north around Huslia, this is the  
5 last four years we've done surveys. This is  
6 essentially since I've been here, where we do those GSP  
7 units, those square units that cover the entire trend  
8 count areas. And over the last four times we've flown  
9 it the adult cow numbers have been just right around  
10 890 and pretty stable it looks like there. Total moose  
11 numbers were going up a little because we'd had  
12 reasonable calf production. There's our calf/cow ratio  
13 that was real low in '01 like 14 or 12 or something  
14 like that, it climbed all the way up to 31. And then  
15 this year it was down a little lower, it was down  
16 around 20 overall. But improved calf numbers made this  
17 look like it was starting to increase the total number  
18 of moose in there. And the bull ratio has been right  
19 around 30, there's no significant change there really  
20 over time. And yearling bulls, I heard some concern  
21 about lots of yearling bulls getting shot and for the  
22 future, certainly that's a concern and in some ways as  
23 a biologist looking at populations, the fact that  
24 there's a lot of yearlings in the harvest, I view  
25 really as a good thing, because it means a lot of them  
26 were born and are surviving to hunting season. They're  
27 getting harvested and then in the fall in November,  
28 when we fly surveys, we're still seeing reasonable  
29 numbers of yearling bulls out there, so they're not all  
30 getting shot, there's still quite a number being  
31 recruited into the population. And if this continues,  
32 you know, we hope that bull/cow ratios will stay about  
33 30 where the management objective is for that area.

34

35                   So I guess I've covered all those  
36 numbers. And I'll entertain questions as I go, I don't  
37 want to just ramble and ramble.

38

39                   Ray.

40

41                   MR. COLLINS: On the yearling survival  
42 there, the fact that you're harvesting a lot, one thing  
43 that we became aware of in McGrath is that also means  
44 that their sisters are out there, and usually in equal  
45 numbers; is that right

46

47                   MR. SCOTTON: Absolutely.

48

49                   MR. COLLINS: So those are the ones  
50 that will be coming into the breeding stock so it's

1 actually healthy that you're seeing a lot of the young  
2 bulls out there.

3

4 MR. SCOTTON: Yeah, we use it as our  
5 indicator of recruitment. And by recruitment we mean  
6 the entering into the adult population of those animals  
7 so for from calves then they become yearlings and then  
8 once they survive their yearling year, they're an adult  
9 basically and the two year old cows will breed, some of  
10 them, and have their first calf on their third  
11 birthday.

12

13 So for every yearling bull that we see  
14 in the fall, there's more than likely a yearling female  
15 or cow that's right along side it, and actually there's  
16 probably a few more of them because we weren't hunting  
17 them as yearlings. So if we saw the numbers were, I  
18 think, 12 yearling bulls per 100 cows, that means we  
19 probably recruited at least 12 yearling females,  
20 probably more like 15, which is good, because they're  
21 compensating for the adult mortality. The adult cows  
22 that are getting killed by wolves and other things,  
23 they're being replaced by these younger cows.

24

25 Go ahead.

26

27 MR. REAKOFF: My question is, do you  
28 calculate the harvest of yearling bulls into your trend  
29 count area surveys to come up with a total yearling  
30 bull recruitment, I mean the harvested yearlings?

31

32 MR. SCOTTON: We don't add them back  
33 in. We kind of keep an eye on -- I'm not sure what the  
34 numbers would be, Glenn might be more familiar with  
35 them, but if Huslia harvested 90 bulls, some proportion  
36 of those are yearlings, probably in a good year, 10.  
37 15, maybe even 20 of those bulls are yearling bulls.  
38 And so we could, I guess, look at it a little bit that  
39 way and say, well, we saw 120 of them or whatever  
40 during the trend count survey, we could add 20 more in  
41 and say there are 140 and that's probably how many  
42 female calves there are, and occasionally we do that,  
43 but sometimes it's hard to get the age ratio of that  
44 harvested moose. With check stations, a lot of times  
45 we know how many yearlings, if people just reporting  
46 them on their harvest tickets, sometimes they'll report  
47 antler with and things like that and sometimes not.

48

49 But it's a good suggestion, we do it  
50 sometimes but don't really make a habit out of it, or I

1 don't, I guess.  
2  
3 Is there another one.  
4  
5 MR. WALKER: Yes.  
6  
7 MR. SCOTTON: Go ahead.  
8  
9 MR. WALKER: When do you do your  
10 surveys, fall time, winter time, spring time?  
11  
12 MR. SCOTTON: These are virtually all  
13 done in November. As soon as we have adequate snowfall  
14 to cover the undergrowth so we have a white background  
15 and, ideally, if there's snow, light fluffy snow  
16 clinging in the trees we'll fly them in the November  
17 when we've got good daylight and we usually stop by  
18 around the 5th of December as the large bulls start  
19 dropping their antlers right around then so then our  
20 bull/cow ratios get a little bit skewed.  
21  
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, just for your  
23 information, I talked quite a bit with our biologist  
24 and the reason they do that November survey is that  
25 they can tell the difference between a bull and a cow  
26 because they still have their horns.  
27  
28 MR. SCOTTON: Yeah, spring surveys,  
29 you're just counting moose and it's hard to tell what  
30 are bulls and what are cows. There's also some  
31 problems with sightability in the spring, in March you  
32 get bright, bright sunlight, a lot of times you don't  
33 have fluffy snow in the trees and it actually becomes  
34 harder to see moose with shadows and bright sunlight  
35 and old snow, so it tends to be that in spring surveys  
36 where -- sometimes you can only do them in the spring  
37 in some parts of the state because there's not adequate  
38 snow in  
39 November and they'll do them in March because that's  
40 the best that they can do but it's a little bit harder  
41 to interpret that data.  
42  
43 Jack.  
44  
45 MR. REAKOFF: One more question that I  
46 should have gotten earlier, what's the density of moose  
47 in the lower Nowitna per square mile?  
48  
49 MR. SCOTTON: I've got it here in my  
50 pile, it's right along the river corridor, it's on the

1 order of one moose per square mile, it's probably a  
2 little bit higher than that but I'll get that to you.

3

4 MR. REAKOFF: Okay.

5

6 MR. SCOTTON: If there aren't any more  
7 questions I'll continue on.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 MR. SCOTTON: This middle section of  
12 the river, I pointed out before on the map, Three-Day  
13 Slough and Dulbi River, this is actually Dulbi Slough  
14 here, I'm not talking about that, but Dulbi River, and  
15 Three-Day, we fly those, try to fly those every year.  
16 Some years we don't, like '02, because of inadequate  
17 snow. This is an area where, again, in the recent  
18 years we've seen an improvement in calf/cow ratios  
19 from, you know, a low of 14, up to 27 or so and then  
20 this past year it was, the calf/cow ration was 22.

21

22 We've also got a bull/cow ratio that's  
23 hovering around 20 which is below the management  
24 objective of 30 for the Koyukuk River Moose Hunter  
25 Working Group kind of management area. Yearling bulls,  
26 corresponding like with these years of improving calf  
27 production, we're seeing slight improvements and  
28 yearling bull recruitment, it was six per 100, that's  
29 not great, but it's a little bit better than it has  
30 been in the past. And these are the adult numbers.

31

32 And, again, the ratio data is really  
33 what we're after from these trend count areas but we do  
34 look at numbers and we combine these areas and this is  
35 an area, and certainly Three-Day Slough was much higher  
36 back in the '90s for adult cows and if you look at this  
37 over the long-term, the cow numbers have dropped off in  
38 these two areas pretty substantially and that's been  
39 one of the main reasons for concern and all the  
40 planning and the more restrictive regulations and what  
41 not.

42

43 And we still, actually, are maybe  
44 seeing a little bit of decline in cows in that central  
45 Koyukuk area.

46

47 MR. WALKER: I got a question.

48

49 MR. SCOTTON: Go ahead.

50

1 MR. WALKER: What is your predation in  
2 the November, do you have a trend on the moose decline,  
3 do you have a count on this, predation, wolf kills, et  
4 cetera?

5  
6 MR. SCOTTON: I'll cover wolves a  
7 little bit later and talk about what we do know.

8  
9 MR. WALKER: Okay.

10  
11 MR. SCOTTON: And then if you have  
12 questions I guess I'll try to address those then.

13  
14 I'm going to move down river to right  
15 here where we sit today at Koyukuk Mouth, Pilot  
16 Mountain, Squirrel Creek, and again the count numbers  
17 on the bottom, it looks like sort of stable cow numbers  
18 over the last few years. It was, really, as a  
19 biologist it's kind of hard to interpret this as any  
20 kind of a trend other than somewhere around stability,  
21 it could be increasing slightly, it could be decreasing  
22 slightly, it's really hard to say.

23  
24 But this area has had quite good calf  
25 production the last few years. Combined, we're above  
26 40 calves per 100 cows last year and just under 40 this  
27 year. These numbers have really picked up from some  
28 really bad years in '99/2000, and 2001. So reasons for  
29 optimism. Bull/cow ratios tend to be a little bit  
30 lower in this area because Pilot Mountain is right  
31 across from Galena, it gets hunted quite heavily by  
32 locals and a few non-locals. And yearling bull  
33 recruitment we're seeing it right around 10 which isn't  
34 too bad in recent years. And here again we shoot a lot  
35 of these yearlings because they're near Galena, so  
36 there's a fair number more female calves or female  
37 yearlings being recruited than that. So I've got some  
38 reasons for optimism in this area. In one particular  
39 trend count area, Pilot Mountain had 50 cows per 10 in  
40 it last fall, which is excellent and we're real happy  
41 to see that.

42  
43 So the reason I've kind of divided this  
44 out is there's sort of different things going on in  
45 different parts of the Refuge.

46  
47 Sometimes, depending on the meeting or  
48 how you're managing, and you can micro-manage down to  
49 small areas or you can manage generally over a large  
50 area and it's always hard to say which is the most

1 appropriate way, but sometimes geographically things  
2 are happening quite differently in different areas  
3 because of localized bear populations or a couple of  
4 different wolf packs or hunting by humans can impact a  
5 local area.

6  
7                   So I think I've covered that. I'm  
8 going to talk about Kaiyuh, and, again, in contrast to  
9 this area where you're talking about 1,000 or 1,200  
10 moose in these three trend count areas, the Kaiyuh  
11 trend count area only has 150 or 220 moose total in the  
12 whole count area, so you have to be a little bit  
13 careful about how you interpret numbers. But as far as  
14 ratios go, it consistently has a high bull cow ratio.  
15 We've seen improved calf/cow ratios the last few years  
16 from way down around 10 per 100, which is the dismal to  
17 above 50 last year and at 30 this year. Yearling  
18 bulls, 19 per 100 the last few years, which is really  
19 good, so we're seeing some recruitment there. But this  
20 is a small population, it's a low density population.  
21 The Kaiyuh, in general, is different than everywhere  
22 else on the Koyukuk, and it's, you know, moose per  
23 square mile kind of situation instead of, you know, two  
24 moose per square mile overall or three, four, five, six  
25 on the river corridor moose per square mile in places.

26  
27                   So that's the Kaiyuh. And I hope I'm  
28 not taking too much time, is there any questions so far  
29 at this point.

30  
31                   (No comments)

32  
33                   MR. SCOTTON: Okay, I'll just carry on.  
34 Long-term, there's some good twinning data that Fish  
35 and Game has collected for quite a few years up at  
36 Three-Day Slough, we saw a decline in twinning up until  
37 '98/99, this sort of corresponds with the time when  
38 adult cows were also declining. And in recent years  
39 it's turned around. The Three-Day Slough is in blue  
40 and it's actually been improving quite a bit so more  
41 productivity there. Again, we're still struggling to  
42 get those calves to survive until fall but that has  
43 improved a little bit.

44  
45                   And then recently we've started some  
46 twinning surveys other than -- in places other than  
47 Three-Day Slough because you have to be careful about  
48 only surveying one area because it could be quite  
49 different than everywhere else.

50

1                   But we are seeing a similar trend in  
2 recent years. Up around Huslia, Glenn does those  
3 surveys with Fish and Game. He's been seeing improved  
4 twinning rates around Huslia. We fly, the Fish and  
5 Wildlife Service flies these Pilot Mountain/Kaiyuh  
6 Flats area the last couple of years and we've seen  
7 twinning rates like 36 to 52 percent twinning, which is  
8 really good, we're happy to see that.

9  
10                   Incidental photo here but we also see  
11 this when we're flying twinning surveys, and this was  
12 about six miles from here, right north of Bishop Rock,  
13 and it's a black bear, he was actually eating a set of  
14 twins that were just born, and I watched him chase the  
15 adult cow, he chased that cow 200 yards away and she  
16 kept coming back and rushing in and it was a real  
17 spectacle to watch. And, you know, that's probably a  
18 daily occurrence out there and we don't witness it a  
19 lot. But Tim Osbourne did a study back in Three-Day  
20 Slough, you know, 15 years ago about calf mortality and  
21 it was primarily black bears and the same is probably  
22 true today, we can't afford to do these studies all the  
23 time but those types of things don't change overnight,  
24 so I think that's basically, you know, one of our  
25 issues with calf survival right there.

26  
27                   Now, as if I haven't already spoken  
28 enough I'm going to talk a little bit about moose  
29 censuses or population estimates, and, again, we do  
30 these periodically and they're expensive and they cover  
31 large areas typically. So you'll see a similarity.  
32 Here's the trend count areas, there's Huslia Flats,  
33 Treat Island, here's Three-Day and Dulbi, here's the  
34 area where we are now and Kaiyuh, we try to do those  
35 every year. And then periodically we'll come in and  
36 we'll lay a grid of all the squares over this entire  
37 green area which is 5,000 square miles, and then we  
38 sample it. So all the dark boxes we sampled in 2004.  
39 We did an extremely intensive survey that year, and we  
40 also did that area in 2001, although not as intensively  
41 to collect data. The numbers inside the boxes, which  
42 you can't read, are the actual raw counts of moose,  
43 it's the number of moose we saw in that unit, and these  
44 are about five and a half square miles each unit. We  
45 might see anywhere from zero moose in a low density  
46 unit to 105 in one unit, so that'd be 20 moose per  
47 square mile on that one unit, you know, more commonly  
48 in a high area we'd see 20. 30 moose in one of these  
49 units.

50

1                   So then we produce an estimate. In '04  
2 the estimate for the area was just under 8,000 moose  
3 for this whole area and that is the estimate of  
4 sightable moose, the ones that we can see with the  
5 technique that we the technique that we use flying in a  
6 supercub low level the same way in every unit and we do  
7 it the same in 2001 as we do in 2004, so that they're  
8 directly comparable estimates. We do know that we  
9 don't see 100 percent of the moose. And there's some  
10 ongoing research trying to figure out how many we miss  
11 and how consistent we are about that to produce a total  
12 estimate of moose, which is probably somewhat higher,  
13 and it may vary from this area to around Fairbanks, to  
14 out in Dillingham, different habitat types and we hope  
15 to do a little bit more work along those lines.

16  
17                   But this was the estimate 8,000, and  
18 then we have subareas. So the Kaiyuh subarea I talked  
19 about being different, it has a total estimate of moose  
20 of about just under 1,500, less than a moose per square  
21 mile.

22  
23                   This central area, and that includes  
24 this high density area right south of the river, south  
25 of Galena, and Squirrel Creek. So if you get down  
26 here, the density is quite a bit lower than .81 moose,  
27 it's probably more like .4 or .3 moose, there's not a  
28 lot of moose in the Kaiyuh Flats during the winter.

29  
30                   The west Galena subunit had about 3,300  
31 moose, overall density of two moose per square mile,  
32 but along the river corridor and in Three-Day Slough  
33 it's much higher than that, so it varies within these  
34 areas.

35  
36                   And then up at Huslia River, 3,200  
37 moose and overall about 1.7 moose pre square mile.

38  
39                   So this thing at the bottom just shows  
40 the difference between, we flew the same area in '01  
41 but we flew 291 of these squares. In '04 we were doing  
42 some research along with this, we flew 452 of them out  
43 of 978, so we actually flew half of the area, which is  
44 -- we don't intend to repeat that because it's so  
45 expensive, but we learned a lot from it. Normally it  
46 would take us roughly 200 hours of flying in a supercub  
47 to survey our trend count areas, last year we flew 350  
48 hours in this area.

49  
50                   So I'm going to show you this data two

1 ways because it looks different each way and as a  
2 biologist this is what we struggle with sometimes and  
3 interpret differently sometimes, but these are the raw  
4 counts of moose from that census, the 291 units that we  
5 flew in '01, we flew exactly the same 291 in '04 and  
6 then we did about another 200 as well, but if we  
7 compare the exact same ones from year to year, these  
8 are the raw counts. In the cows we saw like 3,160 cows  
9 in '01 and in '04 we saw 3,190, I think, or something  
10 like that, I mean it was within 30 cows. It kind of  
11 looks like it may have been stable over that time  
12 period and the overall number went up and this is  
13 primarily because we had more calves, '01 was a  
14 horrible year for calves and yearlings. We had more  
15 calves and yearlings in '04 so the total population  
16 estimate, the raw count was higher, so if you're  
17 following me so far.

18  
19 Now, these are the statistical  
20 estimates from those two estimates. And in '01 it was  
21 almost 9,000 moose, and in '04 it was 8,000 moose.

22  
23 This next number is an estimate of  
24 error around that population estimate. So it was 9,000  
25 plus or minus 13 percent. Because we flew so much in  
26 '04 our precision or the amount of error we think might  
27 be around that estimate is much lower, represented by  
28 these little segments, these little tails, it was 8,000  
29 plus or minus four percent. And this number falls  
30 within the confidence intervals, or this error estimate  
31 of the '01 estimate. So statistically we can't say  
32 that the population went down by a thousand moose. We  
33 don't know. It may have gone down slightly, it may be  
34 exactly the same, arguably -- I wouldn't argue this,  
35 but arguably somebody who's smarter than me could  
36 probably argue that it went up a little bit  
37 statistically. So there is some -- there's different  
38 ways to interpret the same data, these are raw counts  
39 for the same units. It looks like it's stable. These  
40 are estimates, it looks like it's gone down.

41  
42 I'm not here to say which one I think  
43 it is, I'm not sure I even know. But I will sort of  
44 reiterate some of the positives which is recently  
45 improved calf/cow ratios, recently improved yearling  
46 bull ratios, we still don't have bull/cow ratios  
47 anywhere because we're hunting it partly. And I think,  
48 you know, the goal for a lot of people is to fill the  
49 meat locker, so that bull/cow ratio is never going to  
50 climb dramatically until, you know, we really curtail



1 gives us, you know, information that our habitat is  
2 probably real good. We definitely have issues of  
3 predation. We had some deep snow last winter we were  
4 really concerned about but we still had decent yearling  
5 bull ratios this fall, meaning those calves last  
6 winter, a fair number of them survived, they did okay.  
7 We were pretty worried and I think they came through  
8 okay.

9  
10 We did see lower large bull numbers in  
11 all the trend count areas on the Koyukuk this year.  
12 There may have been some issues with distribution, we  
13 didn't have very much snow this fall when we started.  
14 It may be that we lost some of the larger, older age  
15 class bulls to a rough winter last year but that still  
16 of some concern to us. We saw fewer calves this fall  
17 than in '04, but '04 was a pretty good year for calves  
18 and sometimes you'll see a drop off a year after a  
19 really good year because some of those cows had twins  
20 and they nursed them all summer and they didn't get  
21 pregnant and you got lower calf/cow ratios the next  
22 year. We're just hoping this production stays decent.

23  
24 So kind of big conclusions, overall  
25 population on the Koyukuk Office of Subsistence  
26 Management Kaiyuh is probably stable but there's places  
27 where we're still very concerned, like Three-Day  
28 Slough, Dulbi River and Kaiyuh. These are reasons  
29 mainly for wanting to remain conservative in the  
30 management strategy and protect what we've got out  
31 there.

32  
33 So that kind of summarizes trend  
34 information.

35  
36 Very briefly, I think I might be losing  
37 some people here, but we did start a research project  
38 last fall in cooperation with UAF, the US Geological  
39 Survey who's kind of a research agency, Fish and Game  
40 on winter calf performance on winter range, or moose  
41 calf performance on winter range. And that that really  
42 means is a graduate student is interested in our  
43 habitat compared to habitat all over the state,  
44 Dillingham, Lake Clark, Fairbanks, Glennallen, all  
45 those areas, seeing where we're at relative to those.  
46 So what we're doing is we captured 30 female calves in  
47 the fall from Three-Day Slough down to Kaltag, placed  
48 radio collars on them and we weighed them. And what we  
49 found out -- and we're going to catch them again this  
50 spring and weigh them again to see if they lost weight

1 or gained weight on our winter range. She's doing that  
2 in other parts of the state as well to find out what  
3 our winter range is like and then she's also going to  
4 work with the willows and look at quality and quantity  
5 of willows and compare that to other parts of the  
6 state. And that helps us with another piece of  
7 management to know, you know, is this habitat capable  
8 of sustaining what we have, is it capable of sustaining  
9 more, there's really a lot of information here that  
10 comes from that.

11  
12 And we had calves, these were born in  
13 May and in October they weighed 436 pounds on the  
14 Koyukuk, which relative to other parts of the state is  
15 excellent. Those are healthy calves, they're kind of  
16 like McGrath calves. It's good habitat. They're  
17 growing fast. On the Kaiyuh they only weighed 414, I  
18 say only, that's within right around 20 pounds, it is a  
19 little bit less, it's not statistically significant but  
20 I think it lends to the thought that it's a little bit  
21 different habitat down there along the Yukon than up on  
22 the Koyukuk. So we're going to continue this work and  
23 anybody that's interested in that, I'm more than  
24 welcome to talk to or I'd love to hear your comments  
25 and thoughts on that study and I can give you more  
26 details.

27  
28 Real briefly, because of last year's  
29 severe winter, we actually started this before that,  
30 but we started putting these markers out in the woods,  
31 there's nine of them on the three Refuges to measure  
32 snow depth. We fly over with an airplane and count the  
33 bars sticking out so we have a better indication of how  
34 deep the snow is without actually going out and landing  
35 and measuring it in every spot, and we do this once a  
36 month, four months every winter, and that's going to  
37 give us an indication of winter severity that is  
38 repeatable, we'll do it every year. And this year  
39 we've got about half the snow we had last year so we're  
40 all pretty happy about that right now, except maybe the  
41 dog mushers.

42  
43 Wolf surveys. We try to do some every  
44 year and there's some technical, statistical methods we  
45 use called SUPE and there's another method we use which  
46 is basically going out after fresh snow fall and  
47 tracking them down and counting packs and trying to  
48 sort out where they all are and just getting a good  
49 idea every year and I could talk about this for an  
50 hour, but I promise I won't.

1                   In '01 -- or '99/2000 Fish and Game in  
2 cooperation with us did a bunch of surveys in the  
3 Koyukuk in a big area and they came up with about 220  
4 wolves with an average pack size of six wolves. This  
5 is from '03 on the Nowitna. If there's anybody in  
6 particularly interested they can talk to me about this  
7 later, but this is the statistical method where we  
8 track each pack down individually and follow them  
9 through these sample units and then we estimate the  
10 number of wolves in here, plus the areas we didn't  
11 survey, produce an estimate. We've done this before in  
12 the Nowitna, it was 68 plus or minus 10 wolves and it  
13 was 62 plus or minus 10 wolves in '04, pretty stable  
14 probably wolf population. The moose population is kind  
15 of in that same stable mode probably.

16  
17                   This is what I've been doing in recent  
18 years with wolves on the Koyukuk, and I've got some  
19 maps you can look at more closely but this is all the  
20 flying we do on moose surveys we keep our eyes open for  
21 wolves then in the spring we'll go out and try to find  
22 wolf packs or fill in gaps where we think there's a  
23 pack and find out how many's in it that we didn't see  
24 in the fall. And then I put them all on a wall map and  
25 in the spring I summarize all the observations into  
26 this and each grey circle represents a pack, with a  
27 number in it and then the name that I've given a pack.  
28 And by doing this in a similar manner every year it  
29 kind of gives us an index of the wolf's population.  
30 This is something we can do every year. We can't  
31 afford those statistical fancy things every year, they  
32 cost lots of money. This we can do a little more cost  
33 effectively and still learn a lot. And what we've seen  
34 since I've been here, the first year, first winter, an  
35 average pack size of about six and then we saw it drop  
36 down to 4.8 the next year, last winter it was 7.2,  
37 gives you maybe an idea of the pup survival for wolves  
38 was a little bit higher that year, and this year the  
39 jury's still out. I'm still collecting observations.  
40 Anybody that tells me they saw a pack of wolves, I  
41 wrote it down, a trapper, a hunter, a traveler, people  
42 call or they'll put them on the map. Glenn and I  
43 usually talk about this a little bit.

44  
45                   So this is not super scientific but it  
46 does provide us some information and just more or less  
47 telling you what we do know. These packs from last  
48 year totaled up to somewhere around 145 wolves. That's  
49 not every pack in there, no doubt about it. But I  
50 think we find most of them in the high density moose

1 areas, and hopefully over time if we keep doing this  
2 every year we'll learn even more from it and what's  
3 going on with wolves. They're dynamic they can  
4 increase or decrease dramatically in one year as Jack  
5 noted.

6  
7 So any questions on that I'll be happy  
8 to entertain them. And I think you're done with me. I  
9 appreciate everybody's patience. I was a lot longer  
10 than I wanted it to be, and Vince is probably cringing.

11  
12 Question.

13  
14 Benedict.

15  
16 MR. JONES: Yeah, this is Benedict. I  
17 got a question about your habitat and high density  
18 area. I noticed that moose, the bulls, their horns are  
19 getting smaller and even though they're same age and  
20 due to the habitat in the summertime and the regrowth  
21 of the willows on the river corridor area, the sand  
22 bars are getting shorter, there is no regrowth fast  
23 enough to keep the quality of the meat and the fat on  
24 the bulls. The fat was getting less fat on the bulls  
25 even though they're the same age, where five or 10  
26 years ago; the fat is going down.

27  
28 MR. SCOTTON: That's a real good  
29 question. Did everybody hear it in the audience, about  
30 habitat. It's a hard thing to get at. The study going  
31 on now is winter habitat, looking at the quality of  
32 that. Summer habitat you brought up also, may be  
33 possibly even more important and we know even less  
34 about summer habitat and quality. Because moose are  
35 very dynamic in the summer, they eat a lot of different  
36 things, they'll eat sedges, they'll go into the ponds  
37 and eat those water -- I call them water pineapples,  
38 I'm not sure what -- I'm not a very good scientist  
39 because I don't know their real name but they spread  
40 out and they eat a lot of different things in the  
41 summer. And in the winter they primarily eat willows,  
42 but they'll also eat birch and poplar and they'll dig  
43 down and eat sedges. But the habitat quality is  
44 something that we're kind of always constantly trying  
45 to look at or find an effective way to assess it and  
46 it's very difficult to do.

47  
48 But I think you're right, there's been  
49 some changes in antlered growth, which is probably a  
50 summer habitat issue and it's an area we probably need

1 to investigate, you know, even more. We're going to  
2 learn quite a bit about winter habitat from this  
3 ongoing study and how our calves do. We're also going  
4 to learn from those collared animals when they give  
5 birth to their first calf which is another critical  
6 component to how well a moose population is doing. If  
7 the first age of reproduction is two years old, we know  
8 they're healthy, they're doing really well. If they  
9 wait until they're three or four then there might be  
10 some habitat concerns.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

13

14 MR. REAKOFF: My question on that calf  
15 performance is, is your investigator overlying the hare  
16 population, at what point the hare population is and  
17 the browse competition with moose? That affects calf  
18 performance for the cows.

19

20 MR. SCOTTON: I haven't talked to her  
21 specifically about that but it's a good consideration.  
22 Because they will clip off those young willows and  
23 change things. She is measuring browse rates and the  
24 amount of willows available, so presumably it will be  
25 accounted for to some extent. If there are less  
26 willows available because they're clipped off by some  
27 other animal that would show up in the changes. But  
28 I'll talk to her about it.

29

30 Ray.

31

32 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, am I reading those  
33 wolf numbers right? Now, it looks like the pack's  
34 doubled in two years, did they from.....

35

36 MR. SCOTTON: Oh, I was going to  
37 explain that, excellent question.

38

39 MR. COLLINS: .....and the number is  
40 seven so there's more in the pack, so what's happening  
41 there, total population?

42

43 MR. SCOTTON: Good question. I failed  
44 in mentioning that. What that is we flew more in '04,  
45 because of that big moose census we flew in '05, we  
46 flew 350 hours, we covered the country pretty  
47 extensively. It's just a sample size issue. We  
48 covered this area in the northeast, northwest part of  
49 the Refuge better. I just found more packs that have  
50 been there the whole time and then I used those packs

1 to calculate the average pack size so I certainly can't  
2 say there's more wolves or less wolves but we know more  
3 about the packs that are there.

4

5 In that '99/2000 survey, they found  
6 most of these packs then as well so the wolf packs are  
7 fairly consistent in the same areas every year but  
8 their sizes do change, sometimes dramatically from year  
9 to year. Last year there was a pack right south of  
10 Koyukuk here that was 17 wolves right locally, this  
11 year I found it three times and there's only eight. So  
12 that pack lost some members and didn't replace them,  
13 which may very well be a good thing for the moose.

14

15 Ben.

16

17 MR. JONES: Yeah, the wolf population  
18 has decreased since last year because we've been  
19 tracking them and they got tired of being harassed so  
20 they moved out of the area. But up on -- I traveled to  
21 Huslia last week and I only saw three wolf track. But  
22 we had Western Arctic Caribou meeting in Anchorage a  
23 month ago and peoples were concerned that the wolves  
24 might have migrated from the Three-Day Slough up to the  
25 Kobuk River area and said the wolf really increased in  
26 the Kobuk River drainage this year. They're right  
27 around the villages. They have to walk the kids to  
28 school because of the wolf population, Ambler area.

29

30 MR. SCOTTON: Yeah, wolf populations are  
31 no doubt dynamic and I think in places where there's  
32 big caribou movements, I think there's been some  
33 documented cases of whole packs moving and following  
34 caribou and that can change things. From what I've  
35 seen since I've been here on the Koyukuk, which isn't  
36 that long, they're primarily eating moose, and the  
37 moose aren't -- they don't go anywhere, really, so the  
38 wolves tend to be sort of stable in this area in terms  
39 of where they live, but they do move around some.

40

41 And like you, Ben, I haven't seen as  
42 many wolves this winter as well flying around, both at  
43 work and on my own time. And I'll put a map over here  
44 on the wall of this year's information and if anybody  
45 has additional sightings or tracks, tell me about them  
46 and I'll put them on the map and at the end of the year  
47 I'll try to sort out, you know, if things did change a  
48 lot.

49

50 Three-Day Slough, I'm pretty sure

1 there's still three packs up there this year. I spend  
2 quite a bit of time up there and there's usually one  
3 lower Three-Day, one kind of in the middle and one more  
4 towards Roundabout, and they seem to still be there  
5 this year, different sizes but they're still there.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, I do have a  
12 comment. Maybe I've been watching TV too long but I  
13 watch the Outdoor Channel quite a bit and all these  
14 deer hunters and their floral gardens they raise for  
15 the deer, heck, they raise them for the antlers to  
16 increase the size of the antlers, not the size of the  
17 deer. So we're just a little different out there,  
18 maybe we should start some gardens out there, too, just  
19 for the antlers, uh?

20

21 (Laughter)

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Or just do away with  
24 that totally.

25

26 I'd like to thank you, you gave a  
27 pretty well rehearsed report, I'm glad you'll be  
28 sticking around for our proposal deliberations.

29

30 Thank you.

31

32 MR. SCOTTON: Thank you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Mike Spindler, Kanuti.  
35 I think getting this information before us, before we  
36 go into Council deliberations on proposals should speed  
37 it up pretty well.

38

39 Mike.

40

41 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Chair. Members of  
42 the Council. For the record, Mike Spindler, Refuge  
43 manager Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. Just by way  
44 of introduction, briefly, while Wennona is putting the  
45 map up Kanuti. I was the wildlife biologist in Brad's  
46 position there out at Galena for 11 years before I  
47 became the Refuge manager at Koyukuk. And in the last  
48 year I moved to Fairbanks and I'm now manager of Kanuti  
49 Refuge.

50

1                   This report will be specifically aimed  
2 at Proposal 34, and that's going to be the one for the  
3 season extension in the upper part of Koyukuk drainage.  
4 I would like to build upon what Brad just told you  
5 about in terms of the moose census and the moose trend  
6 count procedures. And I'd like to call your attention  
7 to Page 244 and 245 in your green book, that's the  
8 Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge report to the Western  
9 Council.

10  
11                   And for a reference there, we're  
12 talking about the Kanuti Refuge, and that's the map and  
13 Wennona and Salena are putting up right now.

14  
15                   We also do moose surveys in cooperation  
16 with Alaska Department of Fish and Game. In the last  
17 several years we've done the GSPE census, and so if you  
18 could look at Table 1 and Figure 1, that kind of, in a  
19 nutshell, summarizes what we've found with the moose  
20 numbers up in the upper Koyukuk drainage area, the  
21 Kanuti Refuge and the immediate surroundings of Kanuti.

22  
23                   The conclusions we can get from the  
24 data are overall the population's been stable,  
25 especially if you look from 1999 through 2005, those  
26 bars, the height of the bars in Figure 1 are fairly  
27 similar. And also that little wire type of bar on top  
28 is the size of the error surrounding the estimate and  
29 so if you incorporate the error, you can't conclude the  
30 population's gone up or down since 1999. But you can  
31 conclude it's gone down since 1993.

32  
33                   We've also done wolf surveys up in that  
34 area. Our report to the Council in your last book was  
35 a summary of our March 2005 wolf survey, and in that we  
36 concluded that wolf numbers had been pretty much stable  
37 in the Kanuti area for about the last five years.

38  
39                   Back to the moose data in front of you,  
40 Brad talked about productivity, that's derived as an  
41 index from the calf/cow ratio and I can conclude by the  
42 numbers in Table 1 for calves per 100 cows, that the  
43 last three surveys, the productivity has been good, so  
44 we're putting a lot of calves into the population.  
45 Likewise the yearling ratio has been really good in '05  
46 and pretty good in '04, and so that indicates, as an  
47 index that the number of young moose being recruited  
48 into the population is pretty good.

49  
50                   And then finally the bull/cow ratio in

1 Table 1 has been very good. So we can conclude the  
2 population is probably stable. Predation is probably  
3 stable. And the indicators of number of young moose  
4 we're putting into the population are good. And there  
5 seems to be plenty of bulls around.

6  
7 So looking at Proposal 34 which is  
8 talking about adding the one week extension on to the  
9 end of the moose season, going to October 1, we have  
10 the moose to do that, the bull numbers seem pretty good  
11 up there. I have some concerns about that proposal.

12  
13 We need to coordinate pretty closely  
14 with what the Board of Game is doing because there is a  
15 companion with the Board of Game and also as you  
16 mentioned earlier, the Middle Yukon AC has voted to add  
17 that extension on in August. If we're going to go out  
18 of alignment with the State we need to be careful  
19 because the area, the customers up there, I like to  
20 think of the subsistence users as the customers of  
21 Kanuti Refuge, our customers live in a landscape with  
22 checkerboard land ownership and so you have township of  
23 Native corporation land and then a township of Federal  
24 land and then a township of Native corporation land  
25 [sic], and the moose don't recognize these boundaries  
26 and the trails don't either, they pass through them.  
27 So my concern would be is if the State does not provide  
28 that extension at the end of September, but the Federal  
29 Subsistence Board does provide that extension, hunters  
30 could inadvertently get into trouble by thinking  
31 there's an open season but they're hunting on  
32 corporation land, tribal land or allotments and that's  
33 actually under State jurisdiction, which there might  
34 not be an open season.

35  
36 So I hope that when Glenn gets on the  
37 seat here that he can also elaborate what he  
38 anticipates the Game Board's actions on that proposal  
39 might be.

40  
41 And I hope that you would consider  
42 coordinating that somehow. As the Refuge manger of  
43 Kanuti, I will pledge that if we do go out of  
44 alignment, that I will work my very best to make sure  
45 that we have outreach information available to the  
46 hunters. I can work with Steven Bergman up there in  
47 Allakaket and I can work with the tribal councils in  
48 Alatna and Allakaket and also Evansville to make sure  
49 that the maps providing information, which areas would  
50 be open and which areas would be closed are available

1 to those hunters.

2

3

4 In a brief discussion I had with Glenn  
5 in terms of harvest reporting, if we do have this last  
6 of September season going to October 1 that we can  
7 still report that harvest on a State green harvest  
8 ticket. I think that would be the easiest for the  
9 hunters.

9

10

11 My bottom line and my recommendation to  
12 you as Council members is that we really need to think  
13 about ways to avoid harvesting cows because we have a  
14 low density population. As Ron and Jack are familiar  
15 with, I had to make the decision on this Federal Board  
16 delegation to the Refuge manager for a March antlerless  
17 moose season in the Kanuti, because it's low density, I  
18 did decide that it was best not to have a March  
19 antlerless hunt season there. And so anything that  
20 will provide a bull opportunity to help these hunters  
21 get their bull in September or in August I think is a  
22 great thing. And as long as we keep close tabs on the  
23 harvest and on the population levels and the  
24 production, I think we can manage it.

24

25

26 And, again, I'll emphasize that as  
27 manger of the Refuge up there I'll pledge to you that  
28 I'll provide whatever information I can to the hunters  
29 that will help facilitate this hunt.

29

30

31 And Kanuti will give a more detailed  
32 report on Kanuti's efforts at the end of the session  
33 when we do our Refuge reports, but this information  
34 here is directly pertinent to your consideration of  
35 Proposal 34.

35

36

Thank you.

37

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Mike, on  
40 that margin of error on that lower scale, what percent  
41 did you use for margin of error?

41

42

43 MR. SPINDLER: I don't have the  
44 percents handy but if you look at on Table 1, the third  
45 line, where it says the range of the estimate, you  
46 could see that the population estimate is, for example,  
47 in 2005, the population estimate was 1,025 moose but  
48 that number could be as low as 581 or as high as 1,470,  
49 and similarly for going back to 2004 and 1999.

49

50

What I can conclude graphically looking

1 at Figure 1 is that there has been no statistical  
2 change from 1999 through 2005.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: And what would be your  
5 ideal projection as far as a bull/cow ratio?

6

7 MR. SPINDLER: Looking at the third  
8 from last line on Table 1 where it has the bull/cow  
9 ratio, the last estimate we had of bull/cow ratio of 70  
10 bulls per 100 cows and for the last three surveys and  
11 actually all surveys that we have information for it  
12 shows a very good bull/cow ratio, anything over 50 is  
13 really good and up in the 70s is very good, so there's  
14 plenty of bulls up there.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, the reason I bring  
17 this up is because most of our moose are within the  
18 Kanuti Wildlife Refuge, Kanuti River and the Henshaw  
19 Creek area. These areas are consistently inaccessible,  
20 that's why there's so many bulls per cow and that's for  
21 the general public's information.

22

23 As far as subunit B, Unit 24, we will  
24 always have about 70 bulls per 100 cows because we  
25 can't get to them in the fall time when it's time to  
26 hunt them, and I would like to make this clear to the  
27 Council before we go into any deliberation on this.  
28 These big bull moose in our area, are in those two  
29 areas and they are inaccessible.

30

31 Do we have any questions for Mike  
32 Spindler.

33

34 Jack.

35

36 MR. REAKOFF: I just wanted to comment.  
37 I appreciate all the work that the Kanuti put into  
38 putting this information together for the deliberation  
39 of our proposal and for presenting it at this time.

40

41 I do think that these are very healthy  
42 bull/cow ratios. Pushing that season back to the 1st  
43 of October, those bulls start moving around, those  
44 young bulls are getting kicked out and moving around.  
45 So 30 bulls per 100 cows is what the planning effort  
46 would like to maintain in that area, 30 to 40 and so at  
47 70 bulls per 100 cows, I'm real encouraged by those  
48 numbers for our proposal.

49

50 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Mike. I'm  
2 glad you agree with us on that extending that season  
3 because that's when we're hunting in September, we know  
4 that we can't really harvest any more cows and I like  
5 those encouraging words you gave us, that maybe we will  
6 get that one extra week, at least for Unit 24(B).

7  
8 Any further questions for Mike.

9  
10 (No comments)

11  
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you.

13  
14 MR. SPINDLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
15 I'll be glad to discuss any questions you have  
16 regarding that map at a break.

17  
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you. Vince.

19  
20 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. We're  
21 putting together lunch which is being put together  
22 upstairs so we'll have to figure out logistics of  
23 getting it back downstairs but it was easier to put  
24 together upstairs. So I had to leave the room so I  
25 don't know if there are some other agency reports that  
26 needed to go now before you got into deliberations. So  
27 I didn't know of any, I think it was just Brad and  
28 Mike.

29  
30 So this may be a good time to take a  
31 break based on your agenda.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: That's what I intended  
34 to do. I don't see Randy Rogers. He was the only one  
35 that called me ahead of time to ask for early in, early  
36 out.

37  
38 Again, all you snowmachiners, or  
39 agencies that have to get out of here for conflicting  
40 schedules because of the State Board of Game, you're  
41 welcome to ask to be heard earlier from where you're  
42 scheduled on the agenda.

43  
44 (No comments)

45  
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, I think it would  
47 be a good time to take a lunch break. I think going  
48 through the last two reports and what I expect out of  
49 this Council I think we can easily finish by 5:00 our  
50 deliberation on proposals.

1                   Again, if you know of anyone that wants  
2 to testify on any one of these proposals, let them know  
3 that they're more than welcome. If they're local  
4 people I will recognize them with or without the green  
5 sign up sheet.

6  
7                   Vince.

8  
9                   MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. We just  
10 need to know when to get back on the record so those  
11 that are on the phone we can rehook up after lunch, so  
12 I don't know what time you want to come back on the  
13 record.

14  
15                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Let's shoot for 1:15, or  
16 between 1:15 and 1:30.

17  
18                   MR. MATHEWS: Okay. And then Mickey  
19 has an appointment at 1:30 and we'll reconnect him at  
20 2:30. Is that still okay, Mickey.

21  
22                   MR. STICKMAN: Yes, it is, Vince.

23  
24                   MR. MATHEWS: All right, thank you, Mr.  
25 Chair.

26  
27                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, lunch break.  
28 Percy.

29  
30                   MR. LONITZ: Yeah, I was just.....

31  
32                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Could you come up to the  
33 mic.

34  
35                   MR. LONITZ: No, I just had a question.  
36 I was just wondering when -- before you go into  
37 deliberations are you going to do the testimonies prior  
38 to the deliberations from the public or are you going  
39 to do the deliberations before?

40  
41                   CHAIRMAN SAM: No. We have to listen to  
42 all agencies, both Federal and State, locals, so we'll  
43 stop and let you have this, because the way we do this  
44 proposals. Vince introduces it, then we have agency  
45 comments, like Alaska Department of Fish and Game,  
46 Federal agencies, Native and village and tribal  
47 concerns, InterAgency Staff and then Advisory Groups,  
48 that's Middle Yukon and stuff, neighboring Advisory  
49 Groups, local Fish and Game Committee, National Park  
50 Service, summary of written comments and then public

1 testimony, so we listen to all of you before we go into  
2 actually deliberating on these proposals. We have to  
3 hear this, it's a standing rule, I guess with all  
4 Federal agencies, I mean the Federal Subsistence System  
5 and the State system. We have to listen to everybody  
6 before we go into deliberations.

7

8 MR. LONITZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you for your  
11 concern, Percy. That was Percy Lonitz, Chief of  
12 Koyukuk, and his question was what order, how we  
13 deliberate on these proposals.

14

15 Lunch break. Okay, we'll take a quick  
16 lunch break.

17

18 (Off record)

19

20 (On record)

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: It is now 1:21, at this  
23 time I would like to call the meeting back to order.

24

25 Vince.

26

27 MR. MATHEWS: I just need to get Don  
28 hooked up, and Pete, excuse me.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

31

32 (Pause)

33

34 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. To get us  
35 back on track here, we're now moving into the  
36 proposals. The first proposal is Proposal 1, which is  
37 to restrict the commercial sale and purchase of  
38 handicraft made from bear claws, and that's going to be  
39 found on Page 32 of your green books. And if someone  
40 doesn't have a green book, we can make sure you get  
41 one. Dan LaPlant will be presenting this proposal.

42

43 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, Vince.

46 Introduction of proposal.

47

48 MR. LAPLANT: Thank you. Mr. Chairman.  
49 My name is Dan LaPlant with the Office of Subsistence  
50 Management. Proposal 1, the proposal was submitted by

1 the Federal Subsistence Board and it's one that you're  
2 probably familiar with, it's very similar to what was  
3 discussed last year. I think last year it was Proposal  
4 1 as well, 05-01, but this one deals with the sale of  
5 handicrafts made from bear claws.

6  
7                   If you remember last year the Board  
8 addressed several elements of a bear handicraft  
9 regulation. They actually adopted most of the elements  
10 from that proposal. They changed the definition of  
11 handicraft, they changed the definition of skin, hide,  
12 pelt and fur. And they changed language that clarified  
13 that claws can be used in handicrafts that are for  
14 sale.

15  
16                   However, they deferred part of that  
17 proposal, the part that addresses commercial sales, and  
18 they deferred that to allow the Councils to review the  
19 Board's modified language. So the Board, in their  
20 discussions, last May, modified language that was in  
21 that last year's proposal and wanted the Councils to  
22 have another look at it before they address it this  
23 May.

24  
25                   If you remember handicrafts from black  
26 bears harvested on Federal lands statewide can be used  
27 in handicrafts, bear claws.

28  
29                   For brown bear, it only applies to  
30 bears that are harvested in Bristol Bay, Eastern  
31 Interior, and Southeast Alaska. So for purposes of  
32 Western Interior we're only talking black bear here.

33  
34                   The Board's considering regulations  
35 that limit commercial sales of bear claws handicrafts  
36 because they feel that an opportunity to sell large  
37 quantities of bear claws products may create an  
38 incentive for poaching so they're allowing the sale of  
39 handicrafts, but it's the commercial sale that this is  
40 addressing. So putting a limitation on how much can be  
41 sold.

42  
43                   State regulations allow the sale of  
44 handicrafts from both brown and black bear fur, but not  
45 the claws. So, therefore, handicrafts with claws can  
46 only be sold under Federal regulations.

47  
48                   The Board's proposal in this analysis,  
49 again, this analysis starts on Page 34, there's an  
50 executive summary of it on Page 32, but the analysis

1 itself is on Page 34 and the recommended language, what  
2 it does is it will prohibit subsistence users that have  
3 a business license, it will prohibit them from selling  
4 to other businesses, but it won't prohibit them from  
5 selling, even if they have a business license  
6 themselves, they can sell at handicraft or trade shows  
7 or craft shows, excuse me, to private individuals but  
8 they won't be able to sell to other businesses and  
9 other businesses will not be able to buy these  
10 handicrafts. So the sale would have to go from a  
11 subsistence to another individual without any sale to a  
12 business taking place.

13  
14 Now, gift shops, selling handicrafts  
15 under consignment would also be prohibited with this  
16 new language if the gift shop is generating any kind of  
17 a profit from the activity. And that's the solicitor's  
18 office's opinion, that even if it's done under a  
19 consignment, that would be prohibited, it would be  
20 considered a commercial transaction and it would be  
21 prohibited.

22  
23 So this regulation would remove  
24 incentives for harvesting bears thereby  
25 providing additional protection from  
26 overharvest of bear populations. The  
27 Board's intent in allowing the sale of  
28 bear handicrafts is to provide for  
29 customary and traditional making and  
30 selling of handicrafts from bears taken  
31 for subsistence but not to provide a  
32 commercial incentive to harvest bears.

33  
34 Now, this is different from the State  
35 regulations. The State has recently adopted, the Board  
36 of Game, in their January meeting, they adopted  
37 regulations that provides incentives for harvesting  
38 more bears and this is for their predator control  
39 program. The new State regulation will allow people in  
40 -- hunters in the predator control units in Unit 20(E)  
41 and in 12 to harvest brown bears for predator control  
42 through the use of a permit and sell these hides with  
43 claws attached on the market. So that's a regulation,  
44 it's not a handicraft regulation, but that's a  
45 regulation where the State is allowing the sale of bear  
46 hides and claws and, again, the intent is for predator  
47 control, to provide a commercial incentive.

48  
49 The Federal handicraft regulation is  
50 not to provide that commercial incentive, it's to allow

1 for customary and traditional sales of these  
2 handicrafts.

3  
4 So the Staff recommendation in the  
5 analysis here is to support the proposal that the  
6 Federal Board has put before you this year, with the  
7 exception of the Southeast exemption. There's an  
8 exemption in this regulation, this proposed regulation  
9 that allows commercial sales of handicrafts from bear  
10 claws in Southeast Alaska. And we feel that allowing  
11 commercial sales of handicrafts made from bear claws  
12 taken in any part of the state without a tracking  
13 system will have a significantly detrimental effect on  
14 the ability of enforcement officers to differentiate  
15 between legitimate sales and commercial sales of  
16 products from poached bears. So we're recommending  
17 support without that Southeast Alaska exemption.

18  
19 Mr. Chairman, thank you.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN SAM: When you say without the  
22 Southeast exemption, you mean to delete that taken in  
23 Units 1 through 5?

24  
25 MR. LAPLANT: That's correct, Mr.  
26 Chairman, yes.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further  
29 questions for Mr. LaPlant.

30  
31 (No comments)

32  
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, just go right  
34 down the line.

35  
36 MR. MATHEWS: Right.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Agency comments.  
39 Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

40  
41 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. I don't  
42 know if Glenn's ready to do that or knew he was  
43 possibly going to do that. Usually Terry's here but --  
44 Terry Haynes, but being so close to the Board of Game,  
45 I don't think he's going to make it.

46  
47 I can summarize it, it's on Page 46 of  
48 your book, the State's comment. And if I get it wrong  
49 I'm sure we'll get it right later.

50

1 But basically the Fish and Game  
2 Department does not support the  
3 proposal. The Department does not  
4 believe the Federal Subsistence Board  
5 has established a record demonstrating  
6 that the sale as opposed to the barter,  
7 sharing or use of bear claws, teeth and  
8 bones for use in making handicrafts for  
9 sale is a customary and traditional  
10 practice. Basically they don't see it  
11 as a customary and traditional  
12 practice.

13  
14 Even if the Board made a determination  
15 the record would only support limited  
16 non-commercial exchanges adhering to  
17 cultural practices in certain areas of  
18 the state.

19  
20 They go on to say that the provisions  
21 in the sections that are listed there,  
22 they exceed the authority of the  
23 Federal Board because they purport to  
24 authorize the sale and purchases by  
25 entities that are not Federally-  
26 qualified subsistence users in  
27 contravention of state law. Sale and  
28 purchase of bear claws, teeth, skulls  
29 and bones are prohibited by, and they  
30 list there the Alaska Statute and the  
31 Alaska Administrative Code.

32  
33 The Federal Board does not have the  
34 authority to alter such prohibitions  
35 with regard to non-Federally-qualified  
36 subsistence users. The State may take  
37 enforcement actions. This is what you  
38 talked about earlier on jurisdiction.  
39 This is in addition to that, land  
40 jurisdiction. The State may take  
41 enforcement actions against any non-  
42 Federally-qualified subsistence user  
43 who purchases or sells bear, teeth,  
44 claws, skulls or bones regardless of  
45 any Federal regulation that purports to  
46 authorize such sale or purchase.

47  
48 The State has raised several other  
49 issues relating to the sale of bear  
50 parts in their request for

1 reconsideration. And for Winchell,  
2 this is what we talked about last  
3 night, after the Board makes a  
4 decision, agencies, individuals,  
5 Councils can submit requests for  
6 reconsideration, that has been  
7 submitted and it is in the process with  
8 our program. And they filed that in  
9 August of 2005.

10  
11 This proposal fails to correct most of  
12 the underlying problems with current  
13 regulations identified with the request  
14 for reconsideration.

15  
16 So that's the State's position.

17  
18 And with the Chair's concurrence, I can  
19 go through all the other written comments that have  
20 been received.

21  
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Not right now. Federal  
23 agencies.

24  
25 (No comments)

26  
27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Native, tribal village  
28 comments.

29  
30 (No comments)

31  
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: InterAgency Staff  
33 Committee comments.

34  
35 MR. BOS: None at this time, Mr. Chair.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, that was Greg Bos,  
38 InterAgency, no comments. Advisory Group comments.

39  
40 (No comments)

41  
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Neighboring, I don't see  
43 anybody from Eastern Interior or YK-Delta. Vince.

44  
45 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I do  
46 have the recommendations from Yukon-Kuskokwim, North  
47 Slope and Seward Penn. I don't have Bristol Bay's, but  
48 someone here may know Bristol Bay's action on it but I  
49 do have the other Councils.

50

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go through them briefly  
2 on where they stand.

3  
4 MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

5  
6 For Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional  
7 Council, they support the Proposal 01.  
8 Their justification is we honor the  
9 beliefs and cultures of other parts of  
10 Alaska. Bear claws are used for  
11 handicrafts and skin sewing. There is  
12 a desire to maintain traditional sales,  
13 opportunity while preventing  
14 commercialization of sales. There is a  
15 desire to be able to display  
16 handicrafts in the village stores for  
17 sale by the person who produced the  
18 handicraft.

19  
20 The North Slope Regional Council took  
21 up this proposal, and they support with  
22 Staff modification. And that's the  
23 full length that I know.

24  
25 Seward Peninsula met on Proposal 01,  
26 they unanimously oppose the proposal.  
27 Their justification is the Council was  
28 uncomfortable supporting this proposal  
29 because they could see a connection  
30 between this proposal and the customary  
31 trade of fish regulations. The Council  
32 worried that if they supported this  
33 proposal, it may apply to other  
34 resources in the future, i.e., polar  
35 bears.

36  
37 Mr. Chairman, polar bears are not  
38 underneath this Federal Subsistence Program just to get  
39 that clear on the record. But, again, that was their  
40 justification for opposing.

41  
42 And I wasn't able to get the actions of  
43 Bristol Bay which did meet.

44  
45 I don't know if anybody went to the  
46 Bristol Bay meeting.

47  
48 Did you go?

49  
50 REPORTER: No.

1 MR. MATHEWS: No. Okay. It doesn't  
2 matter -- well, it does matter but we don't have it  
3 present here, Staff are all traveling to the 10  
4 meetings.

5  
6 And, then, Mr. Chairman, we do have  
7 written comments and Subsistence Resource Commission  
8 comments.

9  
10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Local Fish and Game  
11 Advisory Committees.

12  
13 (No comments)

14  
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: National Park Service,  
16 any comments.

17  
18 (No comments)

19  
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Summary of written  
21 comments.

22  
23 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This  
24 one did quite a few comments.

25  
26 The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park  
27 Subsistence Resource Commission met in  
28 Glennallen. They took up Proposal 01.  
29 They oppose this proposal as modified  
30 by Staff recommendation. They had a  
31 close vote, again, it's a positive  
32 motion, I believe, to support the Staff  
33 recommendation. There was four votes  
34 for it, five against. They wanted that  
35 noted in the record, that's why I'm  
36 sharing it. They also wanted it noted  
37 that the vote was taken on the proposal  
38 as modified by the Staff recommendation  
39 because there was general consensus  
40 that an exemption for one region would  
41 make the proposed regulation  
42 unenforceable. The prevailing opinion  
43 is that the proposal is really  
44 unnecessary. Commercialization is not  
45 felt to be common or to cause a  
46 conservation concern in the Wrangell-  
47 St. Elias area, thus the proposal would  
48 unnecessarily limit the opportunity for  
49 subsistence users to sell handicraft  
50 made from the claws of subsistence

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

harvest bears.

The minority, that would be the four votes that voted in favor of the proposal as modified support the proposal because the concerns about the potential for commercial sales to lead to overharvest and for cultural reasons. Bears are a great cultural significance to some people and commercialization of handicrafts made from their claws is disrespectful to the bear and its spirit.

Denali Subsistence Resource Commission took up this proposal when they met in Cantwell and their motion was to adopt the Staff analysis to support the proposal with modification to remove the Southeast exemption. That motion passed unanimously.

And their justification says, this regulation would remove commercial incentives for harvesting bears, thereby, providing additional protection from overharvest of bear populations.

The other written comments, Defenders of Wildlife submitted a written letter on this. They support with amendment of deleting Units 1 through 5 exemption. The sale of claws to business is defined in Alaska State Statute and should apply to all game management units without further justification -- there is no reason -- oh, I'm sorry, I miss-betrayed that, let me start over.

They support with amending deleting the 1 through 5 exemption. so Dan can straighten it out if I get it wrong, but they are not going with the Staff recommendation, correct, Dan, on Units 1 through 5. Their motion was to support with amendment deleting the Unit 1 through 5 exemption.

1                   While Dan's checking that I'll go on.  
2  
3                   But they're feeling this proposal  
4                   should apply to all game management  
5                   units. There's no reason to exempt  
6                   Unit 1 through 5. The sale of claws  
7                   has been closely restricted in State  
8                   regulation for obvious commercial  
9                   incentive involved and the relative  
10                  ease of procurement, handling and  
11                  transfer of these desired items in the  
12                  broad commercial market. Exceptions  
13                  for parts of the state are inconsistent  
14                  and raise serious monitoring and  
15                  enforcement problems for State and  
16                  Federal agencies.  
17  
18                  So maybe Dan can help make sure I get  
19 it clear on the record what they did.  
20  
21                  MR. LAPLANT: Yeah, that's correct,  
22 Vince. They were supporting the Staff recommendation,  
23 which is to remove the Southeast exemption. So they  
24 were supporting what the Staff recommended.  
25  
26                  MR. MATHEWS: Thank you. And the last  
27 written comment was from the AHTNA Subsistence  
28 Committee.  
29  
30                  They do not support WP06-01 as  
31                  proposed. However, they support small  
32                  sales by rural residents of handicrafts  
33                  made from claws of black and brown  
34                  bears taken under Federal subsistence  
35                  hunting regulations.  
36  
37                  Mr. Chairman. Those are all that I  
38 know of, and the Advisory Committees that I've been  
39 monitoring did not take up Federal proposals that I'm  
40 aware of.  
41  
42                  Thank you.  
43  
44                  CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Vince.  
45 Public testimony on Proposal 1.  
46  
47                  (No comments)  
48  
49                  CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, the Chair will  
50 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 01.

1 MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt  
2 Proposal 1 as submitted.  
3  
4 CHAIRMAN SAM: As submitted or.....  
5  
6 MR. COLLINS: Question, Jack, as  
7 modified, you mean?  
8  
9 MR. REAKOFF: As submitted to reiterate  
10 whether we support the Staff Committee.  
11  
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'm not clear on that  
13 either. Your motion is to adopt as submitted.  
14  
15 MR. REAKOFF: My motion is to adopt the  
16 Board's proposal, and then we can deliberate whether  
17 the Staff Committee's recommendation has merit.  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Is there a  
20 second.  
21  
22 MR. COLLINS: Second for discussion.  
23  
24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. If you remember,  
25 when we discussed this proposal earlier, maybe what a  
26 couple years ago, we all stated clearly that whenever  
27 we take stand on any proposal that we defer to the home  
28 units and that's why there are only three areas, three  
29 specific areas that supported and passed this proposal.  
30 We defer to the home regions because of our traditional  
31 beliefs and cultural differences.  
32  
33 At this time the Chair will -- any  
34 further Board deliberations, let's put it that way.  
35  
36 Ray.  
37  
38 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I  
39 personally prefer the modification there. I agree with  
40 the argument that if you allow it to enter into the  
41 commercial, that is they're selling to gift shops and  
42 so on, then that then commercialization it would be  
43 difficult to determine where those came from.  
44  
45 I'm not opposed to selling them  
46 directly to individuals, from the handicrafter to a  
47 purchaser, and that's what the Staff recommendation  
48 does, as I understand it. But I don't know if it's a  
49 good idea to get it into the commercial market so that  
50 you could buy them in a gift shop in Anchorage that

1 have bought them from you don't know who.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further  
4 deliberation.

5

6 Jack.

7

8 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman. I  
9 personally am not in favor of the sale of bear parts.  
10 My position is that I'm concerned about getting people  
11 used to harvesting bears for sale and if bear  
12 populations decline it's going to be hard to stop that.  
13 And so I wanted to get the Board's proposal on the  
14 table just as it is. I'm not going to vote for the  
15 Proposal 06-01 myself. I feel personally that it's not  
16 a good idea to start into the sale of bear parts and  
17 this Council has shown that in its history.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further  
20 deliberations.

21

22 Dan.

23

24 MR. LAPLANT: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. Mr.  
25 Reakoff, the sale of handicrafts from bear fur, which  
26 includes the claws, is currently legal, so this  
27 proposal isn't addressing that issue. What this  
28 proposal does is puts a limit on how much sales can  
29 occur. This allows commercial sales or large  
30 quantities of sales.

31

32 But currently the Board's decision last  
33 year does all the sale of handicraft made from bear,  
34 fur and claws, so that's not part of this decision,  
35 it's just the commercialization part. So it's whether  
36 or not the Board should put a limit on how much of that  
37 sales can take place.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further  
40 deliberation.

41

42 MR. WALKER: Ron.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Greg Bos.

45

46 MR. BOS: Greg Bos, Fish and Wildlife  
47 Service. Two points I'd like to make, Mr. Chair, if I  
48 understood you correctly. This proposal would apply to  
49 this region because it applies to the sale of black  
50 bear claws which are allowed -- the sale of handicrafts

1 made from black bear claws.

2

3

4 The other point is this is presented as  
5 a Board proposal, but it doesn't mean that the Board  
6 endorses this and is suggesting that this be adopted.  
7 It's the remnants of the proposal that was considered  
8 last year, and the Board, after much discussion, and  
9 amending the proposal that was before it last May,  
10 decided to go back out to the Councils, as Dan has  
11 mentioned, and the point I wished they had reached in  
12 their discussion, had this exemption for Southeast  
13 Alaska, and so they wanted to have the whole issue of  
14 commercial sales brought back before the Councils, but  
15 they left the wording for the exemption in the deferred  
16 part of the proposal.

16

17

18 So this was only brought back by the  
19 Board for consideration but it's not necessarily being  
20 proposed as the wording that it's seeking to adopt. Is  
21 that clear?

21

22

(Council nods)

23

24

MR. BOS: Thanks.

25

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, so my question to  
28 you then, Mr. Bos, is that if we pass this proposal  
29 that it affects our region and that we can sell from  
30 subsistence user to subsistence user or individually if  
31 we so choose?

31

32

33 MR. BOS: That's correct. If you  
34 recommend to support or adopt this proposal, it would  
35 allow sales by individuals, subsistence users to other  
36 individuals, but not to commercial businesses, for  
37 example.

37

38

CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

39

40

41 MR. REAKOFF: Excuse me for being  
42 unclear about that, that clarifies what this issue  
43 really is.

43

44

45 I would feel the most restrictive  
46 measures should be in place, so having -- I was un -- I  
47 had a misperception about what this proposal was  
48 objecting, and so I am in support of the most  
49 restrictive measures, so I understand the proposal now  
50 and I am supportive of this proposal, in that, this  
51 would be the most -- the amended language would be the

1 most restrictive and so I would support the Staff's  
2 recommendation for the most restrictive language. I'm  
3 very concerned about the sale of bear parts,  
4 personally.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack. I take that as an  
7 amendment to go with adopting -- as modified.

8  
9 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, I want to amend my  
10 -- the adoption to the Staff Committee's recommended  
11 language. I wanted to -- the reason I wanted to do  
12 that is I wanted to talk about what the Board's  
13 objective was, of why they proposed it, why it was  
14 published as a proposal, and so I modify my adoption to  
15 the Staff Committee's language, that clarified the  
16 issue for me. And so I want the most restrictive  
17 measures in place for the sale of bear parts.

18  
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: So your motion would  
20 then read to adopt Proposal 01 as modified by Staff?

21  
22 MR. REAKOFF: Yes.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN SAM: With the consent of.....

25  
26 MR. COLLINS: I'll second that.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further  
29 deliberation.

30  
31 MR. WALKER: Question.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called.  
34 All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying  
35 aye.

36  
37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

40  
41 (No opposing votes)

42  
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. At this  
44 time I'd like to introduce one of our famous guests,  
45 Federal Subsistence Board member, ladies and gentlemen,  
46 Judy Gottlieb.

47  
48 MS. GOTTLIEB: Thank you me for  
49 welcoming to your meeting, sorry, we're late, but we  
50 got here courtesy of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

1 Thank you, very much.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you for being  
4 here. Vince.

5

6 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. That  
7 brings us up to Proposal 02, which is found on Page 47  
8 and, again, we'll go through the same procedure as we  
9 did before.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Dan,  
14 introduction.

15

16 MR. LAPLANT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
17 Proposal 2, the executive summary as Vince said is on  
18 Page 47, the analysis part of it begins on Page 49.  
19 This proposal was submitted by the Office of  
20 Subsistence Management and it deals with the sale of  
21 handicrafts from non-edible byproducts of wildlife,  
22 other than bears. So we've dealt with the bear issue  
23 here in Proposal 1, so now we're talking about  
24 handicrafts from wildlife other than bears.

25

26 The current Federal regulation  
27 prohibits the sale of wildlife or wildlife byproducts,  
28 unless specifically permitted in Federal regulation.  
29 We have a regulation in Subpart A of our Federal  
30 subsistence regulations that says only handicrafts or  
31 wildlife parts can be sold if they're specifically  
32 identified in our Federal regulations. And in the  
33 Federal regulations right now, we have identified that  
34 the Board has specifically identified the sale of bear  
35 handicrafts that we just talked about, it allows the  
36 sale of fur from furbearers, they also allow the sale  
37 of fish from the customary trade regulation that was  
38 passed a few years ago, and you've always had the  
39 opportunity to barter wildlife products.

40

41 But other than those identified in  
42 current Federal regulations, all other sales of  
43 wildlife are prohibited.

44

45 Under State regulations handicrafts and  
46 parts of game can be sold or they can be purchased or  
47 bartered and they have a specific list of what cannot  
48 be sold. So the State regulations come at it from a  
49 different angle. They say you can do everything except  
50 these things, the Federal regulations you can't sell

1 anything except these that are specifically allowed.  
2 So that's a little bit of a twist there, but it's  
3 important to recognize that.

4  
5 Under the State regulations many  
6 handicrafts can be sold to individuals, they can sell  
7 individual antlers and horns under State regulations,  
8 you can sell capes of animals under State regulations.

9  
10 So the purpose of this proposal is to  
11 make the Federal regulations consistent with the State  
12 regulations with respect to handicrafts because under  
13 current Federal regulations many of the handicrafts  
14 cannot be sold. This action will not alter the  
15 existing harvest limits or seasons and, therefore, it  
16 shouldn't have any impact on any wildlife populations.  
17 The action will provide those subsistence users who  
18 make handicrafts with an opportunity to sell those made  
19 from wildlife that are harvested under the Federal  
20 subsistence regulations, again, right now it can only  
21 be done for those wildlife that are harvested under  
22 State regulations. This change will probably be  
23 minimal because the activity, again, is currently  
24 allowed under State regulations. The change will have  
25 no effect on other users.

26  
27 Because this proposed regulation uses  
28 the terms of big game and trophy we've modified the  
29 regulation to provide definitions for those two terms,  
30 so that's the amendment in this proposal.

31  
32 This proposed regulation also prohibits  
33 the sale from constituting a significant commercial  
34 enterprise so it puts a cap on how much of these  
35 handicrafts can be sold so long as they don't, again,  
36 consist of sales that reach what is called -- a level  
37 of what would be considered a significant commercial  
38 enterprise.

39  
40 Adoption of the new regulations will  
41 provide Federally-qualified subsistence hunters with  
42 the same opportunities that are currently available to  
43 those harvesting under State regulations and, again, it  
44 would accommodate existing practices.

45  
46 Now, one question that you may have is  
47 why doesn't the proposed regulation allow for the sale  
48 of capes and individual horns and antlers as the State  
49 regulation does, why don't we go that far with the  
50 recommendation. And the answer to that is the current

1 Federal regulations in their definition of subsistence  
2 uses only identifies handicrafts, resources for  
3 personal and family consumption, for customary trade  
4 and bartering, so these other wildlife products cannot  
5 be sold under the Federal regulations because they  
6 wouldn't be consistent with the definition of  
7 subsistence uses in ANILCA.

8

9 So we're just talking about sale of  
10 products as handicrafts.

11

12 So, Mr. Chairman, the Staff  
13 recommendation is to adopt this proposal with the  
14 modification to add these extra definitions into the  
15 Federal regulatory language, the definitions of big  
16 game and trophy that are used in the regulatory  
17 language.

18

19 Mr. Chairman, thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Dan. As Judy  
22 Gottlieb will back me up on this, we got into this same  
23 thing over fish byproducts but what came out of it  
24 after about 45 minutes of deliberations and questions  
25 and answers was that, what's edible to -- or non-edible  
26 doesn't apply to some other people because some of us  
27 may eat the whole animal and other people don't even  
28 know what it is, you know, so I hope we don't go 20 or  
29 30 minutes into this.

30

31 Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
32 comments.

33

34 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. Their  
35 written comments are found on Page 52 and if the  
36 Council needs full copies of all these comments I do  
37 have them. These are summaries in the book.

38

39 The Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
40 supports this proposal, they support a  
41 Federal regulation authorizing the sale  
42 of handicraft articles made from the  
43 non-edible parts of wildlife harvested  
44 for subsistence uses as consistent with  
45 State regulations governing the  
46 purchase, sale or barter of game parts.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Federal  
49 agencies.

50

1 (No comments)  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Native tribes, villages.  
4  
5 (No comments)  
6  
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: InterAgency Staff.  
8  
9 (No comments)  
10  
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Advisory groups. Vince.  
12  
13 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. I'll kind of  
14 combine these together.  
15  
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: I think just an up and  
17 down, which way they went, up or down.  
18  
19 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Wrangell-St.Elias  
20 Subsistence Resource Commission supports this proposal,  
21 let me see if I can capture real quickly, why, again,  
22 these commissions time these meetings for these Council  
23 meetings, so anyways they unanimously support it  
24 because the proposal does not cause a conservation  
25 concern and it would allow subsistence users to fully  
26 make use of the wildlife they harvest.  
27  
28 Yukon-Kuskokwim Regional Advisory  
29 Council supported the proposal. This would allow  
30 subsistence users to continue traditional practices.  
31  
32 Seward Peninsula, let's see what did  
33 Seward Penn do, they support the proposal. It would  
34 benefit subsistence users by allowing them to fully  
35 utilize the resource.  
36  
37 North Slope Regional Advisory Council  
38 supported Staff modification.  
39  
40 And then Denali Subsistence Resource  
41 Commission took up this proposal also. And they  
42 unanimously support the proposal as modified, and the  
43 reason for this is the adoption on this new regulation  
44 would provide Federally-qualified subsistence hunters  
45 the same opportunities that currently are available to  
46 those harvesting under State regulations.  
47  
48 Mr. Chairman. I think that's all of  
49 them.  
50

1                   Advisory Committees that I monitor did  
2 not take up this proposal.

3  
4                   Mr. Chairman, thank you.

5  
6                   CHAIRMAN SAM: So local advisory Fish  
7 and Game.

8  
9                   (No comments)

10  
11                  CHAIRMAN SAM: National Park Service.

12  
13                  (No comments)

14  
15                  CHAIRMAN SAM: Summary of written  
16 comments.

17  
18                  MR. MATHEWS: Yes, there's two more  
19 written comments.

20  
21                  One is from the AHTNA Subsistence  
22 Commission. They support 02 so that  
23 rural residents may sell handicrafts  
24 made from non-edible byproducts. This  
25 practice has been done under State  
26 regulations, but not under Federal  
27 regulations. So since there's no  
28 regulation in place under Federal so  
29 they're in support of the proposal.

30  
31                  The Mentasta Traditional Council, they  
32 support this proposal.

33  
34                  And that's all the written comments I'm  
35 aware of, Mr. Chair.

36  
37                  CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Vince.  
38 Public testimony.

39  
40                  (No comments)

41  
42                  CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, the Chair will  
43 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal WP06-02.

44  
45                  MR. TICKNOR: Mr. Chairman. For  
46 discussion I move to adopt this proposal.

47  
48                  CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

49  
50                  MR. WALKER: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: It's been moved to  
2 approve by Winchell, seconded by Robert. Any further  
3 deliberations.  
4  
5 MR. WALKER: Question.  
6  
7 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.  
8  
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: One more, go ahead,  
10 Jack.  
11  
12 MR. REAKOFF: A question for Dan. Does  
13 this proposal in any way affect the sale of capes?  
14 People in my area harvest an animal and they sell these  
15 capes from like caribou and stuff and I was wondering  
16 if this affects that in any way?  
17  
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Dan.  
19  
20 MR. LAPLANT: No, Mr. Chairman. Mr.  
21 Reakoff. The sale of capes is done under regulations.  
22 And like I said the Federal regulations can't be  
23 amended to allow that because it's not a subsistence  
24 use according to the definition. This regulation won't  
25 address that at all. It won't change that. Again,  
26 that's done under the State regulations.  
27  
28 MR. REAKOFF: Okay.  
29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. For my  
31 clarification, your motion to adopt, Winchell, was that  
32 as modified by Staff Committee.  
33  
34 MR. TICKNOR: (Nods affirmatively)  
35  
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is that understood?  
37  
38 (Council nods affirmatively)  
39  
40 MR. WALKER: Question.  
41  
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, question is  
43 called. All those in favor of adopting WP06-02 signify  
44 by saying aye.  
45  
46 IN UNISON: Aye.  
47  
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.  
49  
50 (No opposing votes)

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. Vince.

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. Just for  
4 the record then, the motion there was to adopt the  
5 proposal as modified. It wasn't picked up on the mic,  
6 just nodding, so that's cleared up.

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

9

10 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I  
11 failed to do this for the class that's present here so  
12 I apologize to the students that have been sitting  
13 patiently. But the senior students of this school are  
14 present in the room, if they are have questions, I  
15 encourage them to get your attention to come forward on  
16 that. I talked to one of them, I don't know if he's  
17 going to step up to the mic but he might, but he had  
18 some very good questions on moose management.

19

20 So, Mr. Chairman, that brings us up to  
21 Proposal, I think it's 69, which starts on Page 59, and  
22 I believe Dan is covering that.

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, introduction.

25

26 MR. LAPLANT: Mr. Chairman, Proposal  
27 69, the analysis begins on Page 60 of your book and it  
28 addresses sheep hunting regulations in Unit 24. This  
29 proposal was submitted by ADF&G.

30

31 The proposal makes some changes in Unit  
32 24 sheep hunting regulations to simply the regulations  
33 following the Board of Game's development of Unit 24  
34 subunits. And as this was talked about earlier in the  
35 meeting that the Board of Game made that decision at  
36 their January meeting and divided Unit 24 into four  
37 subunits. And if you look on the map on Page 62 of  
38 your book you see a map that displays where those new  
39 subunits are.

40

41 So in response to the Board of Game  
42 making that change, the Federal regulations have to be  
43 modified somewhat also. Regulations require that we  
44 use the State's unit descriptions in describing Federal  
45 regulations. So if you look in the proposal book on  
46 Page 60 at the bottom, it shows the existing Federal  
47 regulations displayed with the new Unit 24 subunits, so  
48 we would make that adjustment automatically. But now  
49 the Fish and Game Department is recommending in this  
50 proposal that would make some additional adjustments

1 for the purpose of simplifying the regulations and on  
2 Page 61 you'll see the strikeouts that they're  
3 recommending in Unit 24(A), specifically in Unit 24(A)  
4 is what would be affected by this.

5  
6           The action that they're recommending  
7 would, again, simplify the regulations, would result in  
8 two changes. In the area of 24(A) outside the Dalton  
9 Highway Corridor, the area east of the corridor and  
10 southwest of the corridor would experience a 10 day  
11 shift in the season from the beginning date of August  
12 10th to a beginning date of August 20th, and then a  
13 closing date of September 20th to September 30th. So  
14 that would make all of the area that you see in 24(A)  
15 except the Park, but all of the other land, all the  
16 other Federal land in Unit 24(A) would have the same  
17 hunting season, and, again that season would be from  
18 August 20th to September 30th.

19  
20           And then the other change in this area  
21 would be that hunters within Unit 24(A) outside the  
22 Dalton Highway Corridor would be required to have a  
23 Federal registration permit. Current regulations don't  
24 require the use of a Federal registration permit in  
25 the areas outside the corridor. So if you're going to  
26 make all the regulations the same within 24(A), that  
27 would require that everybody have a permit.

28  
29           So those are the significant -- well,  
30 those are the only changes that would result from this  
31 proposal. This change is determined to be  
32 inconsequential biologically, but it will simplify the  
33 regulations for hunters by providing uniform  
34 regulations for all Federal lands within Unit 24  
35 outside of the park. The use of Federal registration  
36 permit for those areas outside the corridor, it may be  
37 inconvenient for some hunters, so that's a thing to  
38 consider.

39  
40           Coordination by land managers will be  
41 needed to make these permits available to all eligible  
42 sheep hunters. The additional harvest data that would  
43 be obtained through this permit system will add in  
44 sheep management.

45  
46           The uniformed season throughout Unit  
47 24(A) is consistent with the preferred season requested  
48 in the year 2004 by local sheep hunters. So if you  
49 remember, the area inside the corridor, we made that  
50 adjustment to that later season and this would be

1 consistent with that, again, it would make all of Unit  
2 24(A) that same season that goes to September 30th.

3

4 So, Mr. Chairman, the Staff  
5 recommendation is to support this proposal.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: ADF&G.

10

11 MR. MATHEWS: The -- oh, Glenn's going  
12 to get it, thank you, because the one we have in the  
13 book, I think, is prior to going into effect, the  
14 subunits.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: All right. If I  
17 understand, the only reason this proposal is before us  
18 is that Anaktuvuk comes down and uses Unit 24 to hunt  
19 sheep, is that the reason, because that's all I can see  
20 there, right?

21

22 MR. LAPLANT: Well, Mr. Chairman, this  
23 is within your region, so all residents within 24(A)  
24 are eligible to hunt this area.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

27

28 MR. LAPLANT: Mr. Chairman. If I could  
29 just clarify that.

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead. Go ahead.

32

33 MR. LAPLANT: For Unit 24(A), the  
34 individuals who have C&T for this area are all rural  
35 residents of Unit 24 residing north of the Arctic  
36 Circle, Anaktuvuk Pass, Allakaket, Alatna, Hughes and  
37 Huslia, so these would be all the people affected by  
38 this proposal.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: You forgot Wiseman and  
43 Evansville.

44

45 MR. LAPLANT: They're north of the  
46 Arctic Circle.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Right, okay, Glenn  
49 Stout.

50

1 MR. WALKER: Vince, I can't read my  
2 book.  
3  
4 (Laughter)  
5  
6 REPORTER: Get him a flashlight.  
7  
8 MR. MATHEWS: Get a flashlight.  
9  
10 (Laughter)  
11  
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ready Glenn.  
13  
14 MR. STOUT: Yes.  
15  
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.  
17  
18 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My  
19 name is Glenn Stout. I'm with the Department of Fish  
20 and Game. I have a few comments on a few of the next  
21 proposals that you're going to be having and I'll start  
22 off with this, all of these -- there are some companion  
23 proposals that are going before the State Board of  
24 Game, in this case Proposal No. 43 that's going before  
25 the Board of Game will be considered which basically is  
26 an attempt to align the Federal and State seasons and  
27 to simplify the regulations.  
28  
29 The Department's recommendation is to  
30 adopt this proposal as it's submitted and it will help  
31 us align those seasons as they've talked about already.  
32  
33 Go ahead, Vince, shift it, down, I  
34 guess. The other direction there, there you go.  
35  
36 Some of the changes that are going to  
37 be affected, primarily on the State side, will just be  
38 to simplify the regulation in those in-holdings that  
39 are within the Gates of the Arctic Park. In the State  
40 season you won't see a sheep season in Units 24, what  
41 ends up being Units 24(C) and (D) because there aren't  
42 any sheep in those areas, so we just eliminated that  
43 portion of the regulation on the State side, so there's  
44 just a posted season in Unit 24(B) and (A).  
45  
46 The small changes that do occur end up  
47 being inconsequential because the Federal regulations  
48 allow for a continuation of the hunting opportunities.  
49  
50 Go ahead.

1                   And you already have the map in front  
2 of you there, but to just kind of describe some of  
3 those areas, 24(A) includes primarily that portion off  
4 to the east side of Unit 24, which includes all of the  
5 Dalton Highway Corridor, there is one little blip of  
6 land up there by Twelvemile Mountain that does actually  
7 skirt into just a few acres of land is really what it  
8 ends up being there in 24(A). That's actually Gates of  
9 the Arctic. And the rest of 24(B) is that central unit  
10 there, which is primarily all of the Gates of the  
11 Arctic Park and so as far as sheep are concerned, it's  
12 primarily just that Gates of the Arctic land that this  
13 regulation is going to be affected by.

14  
15                   So the one advisory committee that  
16 weighed in on this as far as the State side, was the  
17 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee and they recommended  
18 adoption of the proposal also for the State proposal.

19  
20                   And that's all I have for comments on  
21 this.

22  
23                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Lights.

24  
25                   MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

26  
27                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Federal  
28 agencies.

29  
30                   (No comments)

31  
32                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Native tribes.

33  
34                   (No comments)

35  
36                   CHAIRMAN SAM: InterAgency Staff.

37  
38                   (No comments)

39  
40                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Greg's shaking his head.  
41 Advisory Group comments. Vince.

42  
43                   MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. Glenn  
44 already covered the advisory group, the Koyukuk River  
45 Local Advisory Committee. And just to speed it up  
46 there are no other Regional Councils that have taken up  
47 this proposal.

48  
49                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Didn't North Slope meet.

50

1 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, but I  
2 don't have any record that they took up this proposal.  
3 It is on Unit 24, so I don't know if someone was at the  
4 North Slope meeting, but the notes I got from North  
5 Slope did not cover Proposal 69.  
6  
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Local Fish  
8 and Game Advisory Committees.  
9  
10 (No comments)  
11  
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: National Park.  
13  
14 (No comments)  
15  
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.  
17  
18 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, you're  
19 blessed, there was no written public comments to this  
20 proposal.  
21  
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you very much.  
23 Public testimony.  
24  
25 (No comments)  
26  
27 CHAIRMAN SAM: None. With that in  
28 mind, the Chair will entertain a motion to adopt  
29 Proposal WP06-69.  
30  
31 MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt  
32 Proposal WP06-69.  
33  
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.  
35  
36 MR. COLLINS: I'll second that, this is  
37 Ray.  
38  
39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Ray. Council  
40 deliberations.  
41  
42 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.  
43  
44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.  
45  
46 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, I live in this  
47 subunit 24(A) and this current season that the Federal  
48 Board has adopted has been very beneficial to the  
49 subsistence users. This past season we started  
50 utilizing that later portion of the season, we had

1 conflicts with moose hunting and having an areawide  
2 unitwide consistency would be beneficial to the  
3 subsistence user so I support this proposal.

4  
5 That'd be my comment.

6  
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any further  
8 comments.

9  
10 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair. I have a  
11 question for clarification.

12  
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray.

14  
15 MR. COLLINS: In the proposal it talks  
16 about 7/8ths curl and I thought that in the State one  
17 that was on the board up there it said full curl, is  
18 there a discrepancy there between the two.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Dan.

21  
22 MR. LAPLANT: No, Mr. Chairman. Mr.  
23 Collins. The Federal regulation, the Federal harvest  
24 limit is 7/8ths curl and the State is full curl. so  
25 there's a difference between State and Federal  
26 regulations, correct.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further comments.

29  
30 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. We did get  
31 clarification that the North Slope did take this up and  
32 they supported this proposal.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. I have one  
35 comment, too, I believe that this will be beneficiary  
36 and for clarification purposes we did some survey work  
37 up Alatna and Allakaket, part of Allakaket is within  
38 the Arctic Circle, Alatna is within the Arctic Circle,  
39 so that should be clarified, too.

40  
41 Any further comments.

42  
43 (No comments)

44  
45 MR. WALKER: Question.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called  
48 for. All those in favor of adopting WP06-69 signify by  
49 saying aye.

50

1 IN UNISON: Aye.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.  
4  
5 (No opposing votes)  
6  
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: WP06-69 is approved.  
8 Vince.  
9  
10 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just  
11 for the record, generally when you guys align with  
12 Staff recommendation we assume you align with the  
13 justification that's in the Staff recommendation  
14 because that will help Tom, when he's taking notes for  
15 this  
16  
17 (Council nods affirmatively)  
18  
19 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, let the record  
20 reflect they're nodding their heads, and that way you  
21 can keep moving. But I want it clear on the record  
22 that you're supporting the justification provided by  
23 Staff when they do align.  
24  
25 The next proposal is Proposal 33, which  
26 is found on Page 66 and this one is also by Dan.  
27  
28 Thank you.  
29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Dan.  
31  
32 MR. LAPLANT: Mr. Chairman. Proposal  
33 33 was submitted by the Innoko National Wildlife Refuge  
34 and it requests to revise the boundary and description  
35 of the Upper Koyukuk Controlled Use Area for moose in a  
36 portion of Unit 19(D) to align with State regulations.  
37 This analysis begins on Page 68 of your book, and on  
38 Page 70 you'll see a map that displays the upper  
39 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area.  
40  
41 The State modified the boundary of the  
42 upper Koyukuk Controlled Use Area in 2001, and they  
43 added that extra area to the west and this was done as  
44 part of the Unit 19(D) predator control plan that the  
45 Board adopted. That control plan was set to expire  
46 March 31st of 2006, so it was only a temporary or  
47 looked at at that time as only a temporary change in  
48 the area of the Controlled Use Area and it was being  
49 challenged at the time so we looked at it as being  
50 temporary so Federal regulations did not change to

1 maintain uniformity between the two.

2

3

4 At this time this Controlled Use Area  
5 under the State regulations is a part of a proposal  
6 that will be before the Board of Game here next week so  
7 it's a good likelihood that they're going to maintain  
8 their extended boundaries of that Controlled Use Area  
9 and under State proposals, it's Proposal 164.

9

10

11 So the Federal proposal here from the  
12 Innoko Wildlife Refuge is to expand the Federal  
13 Controlled Use area to be consistent with what it  
14 currently is, the size and area that it covers under  
15 the State regulations. Moose populations in Unit 19(D)  
16 remain at low densities. Unit 19(D) is composed of  
17 generally lower elevation areas, accessible by boats,  
18 Unit 19(D) hunters have been local residents from Unit  
19 19, 21 or Unit 18.

19

20

21 Harvest reports show that an average of  
22 about 106 moose have been harvested from Unit 19(D),  
23 all of Unit 19(D) during 2001 and 2002 and we have no  
24 additional information from the State any more recent  
25 than that.

25

26

27 But adopting this proposal, again,  
28 would allow alignment with State regulations for the  
29 upper Koyukuk Controlled Use boundary, this would  
30 expand the boundary to include all of the Takotna River  
31 drainage and the Kuskokwim drainage south of Big River  
32 and the Selatna River and the Black River drainages,  
33 but it would really only impact two parcels of BLM  
34 lands as you can see on the map. One parcel just north  
35 of the Selatna River and then there's another BLM  
36 parcel out farther to the west which is in the upper  
37 portions of the Takotna River drainages. So those  
38 would be the lands that would be affected by the  
39 expansion of the Controlled Use Area.

39

40

41 Mr. Chairman, our recommendation is to  
42 support this proposal.

42

43

44 Thank you.

44

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. So for my  
47 clarification this is just to -- pretty much just to  
48 align with the State?

48

49

49 MR. LAPLANT: Right. Just align with  
50 the State and reduce confusion and have that

1 consistency. And as I said before it appears that the  
2 State will extend this Controlled Use Area that they  
3 have that we previously viewed as just being temporary  
4 but it looks like it will long-term.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: So if we pass this  
7 before the State we will just be expanding our own  
8 Controlled Use Area, right?

9  
10 MR. LAPLANT: Well, Mr. Chairman, the  
11 State's action will actually take place before the  
12 Board of Game [sic] takes final action on this. So in  
13 the event that the Board of Game doesn't, the Federal  
14 Board would be informed of that and then they would be  
15 able to make their decision based on that information  
16 as well as your recommendation.

17  
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. ADF&G.

19  
20 MR. MATHEWS: I didn't know if Glenn  
21 was going to come charging down -- no.

22  
23 The Department's neutral on this.  
24 When the boundaries were expanded for  
25 purposes of predator management  
26 activities, the Board added a sunset  
27 clause, and you guys already talked  
28 about that, however, the Alaska  
29 Department of Fish and Game may ask the  
30 Board of Game in March, later this week  
31 to extend the sunset clause for an  
32 additional one to two year. If the  
33 Board does not extend the sunset date  
34 in the Controlled Use Area as  
35 described, then the proposed area will  
36 expire and this proposal is no longer  
37 necessary. If the Board does extend  
38 the sunset date then the proposed  
39 description would be in effect for some  
40 additional period.

41  
42 So that's basically they're neutral on  
43 it.

44  
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Vince.  
46 Federal agencies.

47  
48 (No comments)

49  
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Native tribes.

1 (No comments)  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN SAM: InterAgency.  
4  
5 (No comments)  
6  
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: None from Greg.  
8 Advisory Group.  
9  
10 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I don't  
11 think the Middle Kuskokwim have met. And I haven't  
12 monitored them so I don't know if they've taken this  
13 up, if someone knows if they did, I'm not aware of it.  
14  
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Local Fish  
16 and Game.  
17  
18 (No comments)  
19  
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Advisory Committees.  
21 Ray.  
22  
23 MR. COLLINS: The Upper Kuskokwim,  
24 McGrath Fish and Game Advisory is in favor of this. We  
25 want to keep the extension.  
26  
27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Ray. Where  
28 was I.  
29  
30 (Pause)  
31  
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: National Park Service.  
33  
34 (No comments)  
35  
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.  
37  
38 MR. MATHEWS: Again, another blessing,  
39 no written comments on this proposal.  
40  
41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Public  
42 testimony.  
43  
44 (No comments)  
45  
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, the Chair will  
47 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal WP06-33.  
48  
49 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman.  
50

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Carl.  
2  
3 MR. MORGAN: I make a motion to adopt  
4 WP06-33.  
5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.  
7  
8 MR. TICKNOR: I second, Mr. Chairman.  
9  
10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Winchell  
11 Ticknor. Council deliberations.  
12  
13 (No comments)  
14  
15 MR. WALKER: Question, Mr. Chairman.  
16  
17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called.  
18 All those in favor of adopting WP06-33 signify by  
19 saying aye.  
20  
21 IN UNISON: Aye.  
22  
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.  
24  
25 (No opposing votes)  
26  
27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. Vince.  
28  
29 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. If we  
30 could take just a little bit of a break here, I need to  
31 patch Mickey Stickman in, he said he'd be available at  
32 2:30 and it's 2:25 now, so if we could take a break.  
33 Proposal 34 is the next one up and I don't have a  
34 crystal ball but I got a faint feeling there's going to  
35 be quite a bit of discussion on 34 so if we could just  
36 take a five minute break it'd be great.  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN SAM: 10 minute break.  
39  
40 (Off record)  
41  
42 (On record)  
43  
44 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'll call the meeting  
45 back to order. Benedict asked to be excused for about  
46 20, 25 minutes or so so I excuse him.  
47  
48 Vince.  
49  
50 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. I need to

1 ask Glenn, you're going to provide a little  
2 presentation because I'm still connecting people on  
3 line so that would work.  
4  
5 MR. STOUT: Four slides.  
6  
7 MR. MATHEWS: Four slides before we go  
8 to 34?  
9  
10 MR. STOUT: No. Just when it's my  
11 turn.  
12  
13 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, Pete's doing 34 and  
14 that's who I'm trying to connect to. So what I'm  
15 getting at, can we do your -- do we still have Mickey.  
16  
17 MR. STICKMAN: I'm here.  
18  
19 MR. MATHEWS: Don.  
20  
21 MR. RIVARD: Yes, I'm here.  
22  
23 MR. MATHEWS: And Pete.  
24  
25 MR. RIVARD: And Clarence.  
26  
27 MR. STICKMAN: I'm here Vince.  
28  
29 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Pete, to get you  
30 up to speed, we're about to go into Proposal 34. The  
31 way it's been working out, if Glenn has some specific  
32 information to talk about proposals, he has a little  
33 PowerPoint presentation here. So I'll wait for  
34 direction from the Chair where we go next but Pete  
35 you'll be up here real quick.  
36  
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: So are we ready to  
38 begin?  
39  
40 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we  
41 have Pete who is going to present the proposal and then  
42 Mickey's back on line, and Clarence Summers with the  
43 National Park Service, and Don Rivard -- this is for  
44 the record.  
45  
46 So for the record, on the  
47 teleconference is Don Rivard, Pete DeMatteo, Office of  
48 Subsistence Management; Clarence Summers with National  
49 Park Service, and Mickey Stickman, Council member.  
50

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: So introduction of  
4 Proposal 34, Pete DeMatteo.

5

6 MR. DEMATTEO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
7 Mr. Chair. Members of the Council. The analysis of  
8 Proposal 34 can be found in your books, it begins on  
9 Page 74 of your Council books. And Proposal 34 was  
10 submitted by the Western Interior Regional Council.

11

12 This proposal would change the closing  
13 dates for the fall moose season in Units 21(A), 21(B),  
14 21(D), 21(E) and 24 from September 20 to the closing  
15 date of October 1. This proposal would also change the  
16 closing dates for the fall moose season in the Koyukuk  
17 Controlled Use Area in Units 21(D) and also 24 from  
18 September 20 to the closing date of October 1.

19

20 This proposal was submitted because the  
21 proponent feels that warmer than normal fall  
22 temperatures are delaying the normal moose movement,  
23 the bull moose during the fall season. The proponent  
24 has also made the claim that delay in fall moose  
25 movements has prevented subsistence hunters from  
26 harvesting moose.

27

28 Mr. Chair. The proposed regulatory  
29 changes can be found on Pages 77, 78 and 79 of your  
30 book under proposed Federal regulations. The season  
31 for the John River I would point out would remain the  
32 same, if you look under the proposed regulations,  
33 however, the adjacent hunt areas, fall seasons for  
34 those adjacent hunt areas would extend to October 1 for  
35 the fall seasons and the harvest limits would remain  
36 the same as well. There is some agreement that  
37 additional data is needed before a determination could  
38 be made concerning that the recent warmer than normal  
39 fall temperatures are part of a long-term climatic  
40 pattern.

41

42 Analysis of results from population  
43 surveys conducted in the proposal areas has revealed  
44 that moose populations could support additional but  
45 limited harvest during the proposed six day extension  
46 in certain areas, but not for all of these areas as  
47 requested in the proposal.

48

49 Mr. Chair. If this proposal is adopted  
50 by the Board it would have certain on both the moose

1 populations and also the users. For instance, the  
2 first affected, that this proposed action would have is  
3 that it would create a departure from existing  
4 management objectives with these moose populations.  
5 The existing management objectives are as a result of a  
6 cooperative management plan that some of the members of  
7 this Council have helped to achieve.

8  
9                   If these regulations are adopted, the  
10 result would be a departure from that management plan.  
11 And also another effect would be the State and Federal  
12 regulations would not be in alignment. This would  
13 produce mixed blocks of Federal and non-Federal lands  
14 with different season dates around villages. Some  
15 local residents would have difficulty discerning the  
16 boundaries between State and Federal lands, this could  
17 create some problems. An out of alignment of these  
18 regulations could create potential law enforcement  
19 issues.

20  
21                   Adoption of the proposed regulatory  
22 changes may result in the need to establish to Federal  
23 permit system for the Federal only fall seasons and  
24 this is because the current management objectives  
25 prescribe a close watch be kept on the harvest totals  
26 within management guidelines.

27  
28                   If this proposal is adopted, it will be  
29 necessary to do extensive outreach with hunters  
30 regarding the different land status boundaries in order  
31 to avoid the potential law enforcement situations and  
32 also the correct harvest information.

33  
34                   Mr. Chair. With that the preliminary  
35 conclusion is to support the proposal with the  
36 modification to provide the proposed season extensions  
37 for Unit 21(B) as in Baker, that portion of the Nowitna  
38 National Wildlife Refuge and also Unit 24 for the  
39 Federal lands north and east but not including the  
40 Koyukuk National Wildlife Refuge. Also if you turn to  
41 your books, Page 96 under preliminary conclusions,  
42 under preliminary conclusion on Page 96, also -- one  
43 modification that Staff would recommend is that -- the  
44 addition of a Federal registration permit be  
45 implemented for the March 1 through 5 season, for that  
46 portion of Unit 24, all drainages to the north of the  
47 Koyukuk River up stream and including the Alatna River,  
48 to and including the Northfork of the Koyukuk River,  
49 except that portion of the John River. That would be a  
50 recommended modification.

1                   And also, Mr. Chair, I'd like to point  
2 out at this time that on Page 97 of your books, Page  
3 97, halfway down, I'd just like to point out two  
4 typographical errors for Unit 24, that portion that  
5 includes the John River. The season there says August  
6 1 through December 1st, actually that should say  
7 December 31st. No one is suggesting that the season  
8 should be shortened for the John River.

9  
10                   And also the next paragraph, Unit 24,  
11 all drainages to the north of the Koyukuk River up  
12 stream from and including the Alatna River, that also  
13 is a typo that should read August 25 through October  
14 1st, not October 24th, it should read October 25 [sic].

15  
16                   And with that, Mr. Chair, I will stop  
17 there and answer any questions.

18  
19                   Thank you.

20  
21                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Do we have any questions  
22 for Pete while he's on line.

23  
24                   MR. WALKER: Yes.

25  
26                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

27  
28                   MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
29 Pete, this is Robert Walker from 21(E), you know, I  
30 don't know if you talked with Vince or Randy Rogers  
31 about our Yukon Innoko Moose Management meeting we had  
32 down in Unit 21(E), is this going to affect us here or  
33 should we just leave it in there or just strike it out?

34  
35                   Go ahead.

36  
37                   MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. The answer  
38 to his question is, yes, it would affect it because the  
39 Staff recommendation is to not support the extension  
40 for Unit 21(E), which covers his area.

41  
42                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions  
43 for Pete.

44  
45                   (No comments)

46  
47                   CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, did you have  
48 more Pete.

49  
50                   REPORTER: Pete, do you have anything

1 else.

2

3 MR. DEMATTEO: No, I don't, Mr. Chair.  
4 But just wanted to say that this was not an easy  
5 proposal to analyze, this involved the cooperative work  
6 of many field units (cutting in and out, phone line)  
7 comes to the conclusion based on results from surveys  
8 that there are some areas that just cannot support  
9 additional harvest of bulls in the fall season. Those  
10 areas where they could support an additional but a  
11 limited harvest of bulls, those are the areas that  
12 Staff is recommending that the Board adopt that  
13 request.

14

15 That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. ADF&G.

18

19 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My  
20 name is Glenn Stout with the Department of Fish and  
21 Game. First of all, just like Pete was saying this is  
22 a pretty complicated proposal. And at the same that  
23 the Federal proposal was submitted there was a  
24 companion proposal submitted to the State and that was  
25 Proposal No. 95. And I'll try and kind of dissect this  
26 a little bit because it did involve several different  
27 areas.

28

29 First of all the proposal for 21(A),  
30 (B), (D), (E) and 24, in the area of 21(A) and 21(E),  
31 as Member Walker pointed out there was discussion about  
32 the State proposal in that area and the GASH and the  
33 Yukon and Innoko Working Group were not in favor of the  
34 October 1st extension for the State proposal in those  
35 areas.

36

37 In addition, the Ruby Advisory  
38 Committee deliberated on this for 21(B) and they also  
39 were not in favor of it for that area.

40

41 The Middle Yukon Advisory Committee  
42 deliberated on the proposal for 21(D) and they chose to  
43 amend the proposal for an earlier season opening, and  
44 that ends up being Proposal 155 on the State side. And  
45 basically their amended version of this was to have an  
46 August 22nd to August 31st season instead. They were  
47 concerned about the October season going into the rut  
48 and then having that continuation of that hunting  
49 opportunity right after the regular season that right  
50 now stops on September 25th.

1                   So there are several different  
2 versions.

3  
4                   And then the final version is the  
5 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee. They deliberated on  
6 this and they recommended that it be adopted for 24(B)  
7 only, that area 24(B).

8  
9                   And none thing that I failed to mention  
10 earlier is that I put a few posters over there of the  
11 new game management areas that were adopted by the  
12 Board of Game and so when we talk about 21(B) I just  
13 want to make sure that we're aware that that includes  
14 all of the Nowitna River drainage now, not just that  
15 lower portion of it as it did before.

16  
17                   This proposal, as you recall, was  
18 generated as a result of some of the emergency  
19 petitions that have been submitted over the last couple  
20 years over concerns about hunting opportunity in the  
21 fall and it definitely dovetailed into some of our  
22 management processes where we're trying to improve our  
23 fall harvest rate success in order to reduce our  
24 dependency on the winter season. So there certainly is  
25 a logic to this that we've been working on.

26  
27                   The Department agrees with many of the  
28 points that were brought up by Pete and most  
29 importantly we feel like it's pretty important to  
30 maintain consistency and alignment of the State and  
31 Federal seasons where we can.

32  
33                   As a general practice, the Department  
34 does not support hunting during this late rut period  
35 and this is kind of a general rule that the Department  
36 tries to apply in all these proposals statewide. The  
37 Department's perspective is -- go down to the next  
38 slide if you can, there you go, basically research has  
39 demonstrated that the rut begins right about the 24th  
40 or 25th of September. If this season were to go to the  
41 1st, depending on how the variation is over any given  
42 year, potentially about half of the rutting activity,  
43 half of the actual breeding will have taken place  
44 during that last five days of September.

45  
46                   During the rut we know that bulls are  
47 particularly vulnerable, mature breeding bulls are  
48 particularly vulnerable during that period and we're  
49 concerned. There's been demonstrated in other ungulate  
50 species where when we disturb the rut that we have

1 essentially a cascade of events that could take place,  
2 particularly in areas where we have skewed ratios where  
3 we have a majority or a large proportion of young,  
4 yearling bulls, I think this particular set of events  
5 is more of a concern. But if we have a disruption in  
6 the rut we disturb our mature bulls from that breeding  
7 process, the potential of younger bulls breeding is  
8 higher. If younger bulls are breeding we know that  
9 physiology they aren't in a mature breeding state for  
10 about two to three weeks after the mature bulls are  
11 then that would essentially delay the gestation period  
12 of when those cows are bred. IF it's three weeks,  
13 those calves would be born then the following spring  
14 about three weeks late, they would go into the  
15 following winter with three weeks essentially that they  
16 weren't able to grow during that following summer  
17 season.

18  
19 We know and we do have good information  
20 that calves going into winter do succumb to higher  
21 rates of mortality depending on their calving weights  
22 or their weights going into that falling winter.

23  
24 So that kind of cascade of events is  
25 something that we haven't demonstrated in moose in  
26 Alaska but it has been demonstrated where it's been  
27 studied in other ungulate species in North America.

28  
29 Next slide please.

30  
31 Just like Pete was saying, there  
32 definitely is a different scenario in different areas.  
33 In 21(B) and I talked about the skewed bull/cow ratio  
34 where we have a large proportion of yearling bulls. If  
35 you look at the Novi mouth, the Novi, Selatna, you can  
36 see that we had relatively low bull/cow ratios down  
37 below where we want to be certainly right now in the 19  
38 to 23 you can see on that 2004. We brought them up a  
39 little bit in 2005 to 20 to 29. But anywhere from a  
40 half to two-thirds of the bulls ends up being yearling  
41 bulls so that's definitely something I would  
42 characterize as a skewed bull/cow ratio, skewed towards  
43 the young cohorts.

44  
45 As we come over here into 21(D) it's  
46 not quite as bad a situation where we've got about a  
47 third to a half of the bulls are yearling bull/cow  
48 ratios, and hopefully we're improving on those also  
49 here in 21(D).

50

1                   As was mentioned earlier, as we start  
2 going up river, and the first one the Huslia Flats  
3 trend count area, we have a much higher bull/cow ratio,  
4 that's the total bull/cow ratios of 41 bulls per 100  
5 cows, and right now we've got good recruitment with our  
6 bull/cow ratio coming up at 16. If you look down in  
7 2005, our adult bull count as Brad mentioned earlier  
8 has come down but we still got a pretty good cohort of  
9 good ones coming in right now.

10  
11                   Definitely the Middle Fork is a little  
12 bit different as far as upper Unit 24 and as Mike  
13 Spindler presented the data earlier, we've got very  
14 high bull/cow ratios up there in the Kanuti National  
15 Wildlife Refuge area, something on the order of 60 to  
16 65 bulls per 100 cows and 10 to 15 yearling bulls per  
17 100 cows. So I think that's a much different situation  
18 that I wouldn't characterize as skewed bull/cow ratio.

19  
20                   Now, one thing that we talked about  
21 several times, the object is, particularly as they  
22 pertain to the Koyukuk Moose Management Plan, and we  
23 talked about a couple different sets of objectives.  
24 One of the objectives was our biological objectives and  
25 areas of concern. On the lower Koyukuk in our high  
26 density moose area we talked about concerns  
27 biologically if a bull/cow got below 20 bulls per 100  
28 cows, we start to get pretty squeamish as biologists  
29 about the biological objective. Well, that's different  
30 from what our management objective was for the lower  
31 Koyukuk, where we said we want to maintain a management  
32 objective of 30 bulls per 100 cows, because we wanted  
33 purposely to provide for a couple different  
34 opportunities, not just subsistence, maximizing the  
35 number of moose shot but maintaining some large bulls  
36 in there and we know if we have higher bull/cow ratios  
37 we're going to have a higher proportions of larger  
38 bulls.

39  
40                   As we go up further up the river, in  
41 what was the low density moose area of upper Unit 24,  
42 we talked about having about 30 to 40 bulls per 100  
43 cows, and that had to do with a biological objective.  
44 Where we felt like we needed to maintain more breeding  
45 bulls out there in a population that was obviously more  
46 dispersed. Now, that higher bull/cow ratio was not  
47 necessarily our management objective. We intentionally  
48 tried to establish harvest rates that would allow for  
49 maintaining a higher bull/cow ratios up there and we  
50 felt like 30 to 40 bulls per 100 cows was more

1 appropriate up there and 40 or more was expected up in  
2 that area with those lower densities.

3

4 As far as the last concern, Vince, if  
5 you could switch the slide, just to address the issue  
6 of moose harvest. One of the concerns was that harvest  
7 was dropping off due to the weather over the last few  
8 years, and this is the harvest data for all those game  
9 management units, 21(A), (B), (D), (E) and 24, and then  
10 the top line there, the kind of purple line there is  
11 the total. And I put 2005 harvest data in there but  
12 remember we have some winter seasons and it's still  
13 preliminary data so I expect that that line is actually  
14 going to go up and the trend over time has been just a  
15 real consistent harvest in all five of these game  
16 management units. And it seems like, at least at this  
17 time, we're fitting well into what our harvest  
18 objectives are as far maintaining a fall harvest,  
19 because we have had some reductions in our winter  
20 harvest opportunity but it looks like overall our  
21 harvest is pretty good.

22

23 Particularly if you look at Unit 24,  
24 what's been reported for even 2005, it looks like we  
25 had a pretty good fall in 2005 even where we're up  
26 above what our average harvest has been and that's the  
27 red line, what ends up being the fourth from the bottom  
28 there. You can see 2005 even though it's preliminary  
29 data, is about our highest point there.

30

31 So anyway, that's the end of the  
32 information that I have on this proposal.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Glenn. Any  
35 questions for Glenn.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not we have Federal  
40 agencies.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Native tribes.

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: InterAgency Staff.

49

50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: None from Greg.  
2 Advisory Group comments. I think we covered that  
3 pretty much, right?

4  
5 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There  
6 are some. Glenn already covered the Advisory  
7 Committees. If you want I can cover the Regional  
8 Councils.

9  
10 CHAIRMAN SAM: You could see on Page  
11 94, Unit 21(A), Unit 21(B), could not support, that  
12 would be nothing more than a projection, right, that  
13 could not support, on Page 94.

14  
15 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. That would  
16 go to Pete DeMatteo. Ron is talking about Page 94 you  
17 have a little chart there in the middle.

18  
19 MR. DEMATTEO: Correct, Mr. Chair.  
20 That chart on Page 92 is basically a tally sheet which  
21 comes after the biology section in the analysis which  
22 shows that moose populations for each one of those  
23 units or subunits, whether they could support or could  
24 not support.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Where was I,  
27 Regional Councils, none?

28  
29 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, let me  
30 grab my notes on that.

31  
32 But Yukon-Kuskokwim Regional Advisory  
33 Council they took this proposal up and  
34 they oppose it. They oppose it because  
35 the Yukon Innoko Moose Management  
36 Working Group and the GASH Fish and  
37 Game Advisory Committee also did not  
38 support the proposal. So Yukon  
39 Kuskokwim opposes it.

40  
41 The North Slope Regional Advisory  
42 Council supports it with modification.  
43 And I'm not sure what that modification  
44 is at this point, but we could find out  
45 what that modification is, I believe  
46 it's the modification that as the Staff  
47 presented it.

48  
49 The other written comments we received  
50 is the Holy Cross Village Council had a

1 special meeting on this last week and  
2 they oppose the proposal.

3  
4 And Glenn has already covered that the  
5 two other Advisory Committees took up the parallel  
6 proposals and also opposed it.

7  
8 So those are all the comments that I  
9 know of for Proposal 34.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Public testimony.

12  
13 (No comments)

14  
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, the Chair will  
16 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal WP06-34.

17  
18 MR. STICKMAN: So moved, Mr. Chair.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Mickey  
21 Stickman. Is there a second.

22  
23 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

24  
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Jack  
26 Reakoff. Council deliberation.

27  
28 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chair.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

31  
32 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. On  
33 Page 81 there's a typo error here, the second Unit 24,  
34 east of the Dakli River drainage and east of the  
35 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, west of the Kanuti  
36 Controlled Use Area, the Tanana, Allakaket Winter Train  
37 and the Alatna River drainage, Winter Trail.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Trail.

40  
41 MR. WALKER: Trail?

42  
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Trail.

44  
45 MR. WALKER:? Okay.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further -- Jack.

48  
49 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman. We talked  
50 about this proposal when we were going to submit it,

1 some portions of Unit 21 were included for discussion  
2 and the Advisory Committees have taken certain  
3 positions on that and I feel that their concerns are  
4 valid.

5  
6 I do feel that, you know, because we  
7 were getting these requests for special actions that  
8 people, although they may be meeting their subsistence  
9 needs and getting moose, they're expending a lot more  
10 time and effort. We've cut their winter cow hunts off  
11 in a lot of places and we also have very high fuel  
12 costs, and I, as a subsistence user, the criteria for  
13 economy, time and effort, economy of time, effort and  
14 expense, and so causing people to hunt longer and  
15 harder to meet their subsistence needs, we've taken  
16 away winter hunts from people, I feel that if at all  
17 possible it behooves our Council to provide that where  
18 the populations can support that.

19  
20 I concur with the Staff Committee's  
21 modification that there are certain areas that can  
22 support with bull/cow ratio additional harvest. The  
23 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee reviewed this  
24 proposal, and the people down around Huslia were not in  
25 favor of additional -- that additional time down there  
26 on the State side. I do feel that the Staff  
27 Committee's modification has merit and I would support  
28 that preliminary conclusion of the Staff Committee.

29  
30 So I would like to modify the motion to  
31 adopt to be in support of the modified by the Staff  
32 Committee.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Who made that main  
35 motion, Tina.

36  
37 REPORTER: Mickey.

38  
39 MR. WALKER: Mickey.

40  
41 MR. REAKOFF: Mickey.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Mickey, are you still on  
44 line?

45  
46 MR. STICKMAN: Yes, I concur.

47  
48 MR. BENEDICT: Second.

49  
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, so we're clear on

1 our motion then. Tina, who seconded it?

2

3 REPORTER: Jack.

4

5 MR. REAKOFF: I did.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: So we're clear on our  
8 motion then, the motion is to adopt with the  
9 modification put forward by Staff; is that clear to  
10 everyone?

11

12 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

13

14 (Council nods affirmatively)

15

16 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. Just for  
17 my knowledge, does Pete or Glenn, does the description  
18 in that modification match the Subunit 24. I can see  
19 that when we discuss this in front of the Board, if the  
20 Board takes up the subunits, does that description  
21 match, I don't want to cause any trouble, I just want  
22 to make -- when we get down the road that everything  
23 kind of lines up if that's the desire of the Council.

24

25 MR. LAPLANT: Mr. Chairman.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

28

29 MR. LAPLANT: Just to respond to  
30 Vince's question, we're going to address that issue as  
31 part of Proposal 36 in that discussion, so right now  
32 we're dealing in Proposal 34 with the existing  
33 language. But that will be part of the next  
34 discussion.

35

36 MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, for the public's  
39 information, I think that Jack and I just get  
40 automatically faxed all these requests for special  
41 actions and that's why we came up with this proposal  
42 because we had proposals from all the units that are  
43 noted in this proposal, that they requested an  
44 additional week. And we felt compelled to provide for  
45 all the subsistence harvest opportunities that we could  
46 as we are charged with as serving on this Western  
47 Interior Subsistence Council, and that's where this  
48 proposal came from.

49

50 Any further deliberations.

1 Robert.

2

3 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
4 On 78, too, we have Unit 21(E), it says one moose,  
5 however, only bull may be taken August 20th, September  
6 25th and half mile up river for the Federal season and  
7 you've got from August 20th to October 1st here, I mean  
8 there is something that has to be cleared up inside  
9 this proposal here if we don't throw out -- is that  
10 what your modification is, Jack, to take out 21(E) from  
11 this, correct me here.

12

13 MR. REAKOFF: You have to go to Page 96  
14 and it's under preliminary conclusion of the Staff.

15

16 MR. WALKER: Okay. Thank you Jack for  
17 clearing that up.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further  
20 deliberations.

21

22 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Jack.

25

26 MR. REAKOFF: As Mike Spindler was  
27 discussing earlier in presentation, it is going to be  
28 -- I do recognize that it's going to be complex if the  
29 State, in Unit 24(B) does not adopt this, the State  
30 companion proposal, certain mapping and certain -- the  
31 users are going to have to know where the Federal  
32 boundaries are, but because of -- especially in Unit  
33 24(B), there's good bull/cow ratios, the way I look at  
34 this the harvest of this -- this extending this season  
35 into the early part of October, during hunting season a  
36 lot of those cows have gotten the bulls shot away from  
37 -- they move -- they get gun shy, they move away from  
38 the river corridors and the big bulls are with the --  
39 the rest of the big bulls are with those cows, mainly  
40 what you see in that 25th of August to October 1st is  
41 younger bulls, two year old bulls that are getting  
42 kicked out by other bulls and they're wandering around  
43 and that's what I encounter a lot in that time period,  
44 those are the good -- that's a good moose to kill, too,  
45 it's not bad meat.

46

47 And so I don't feel in these high  
48 bull/cow ratios, especially Unit 24(B), the Kanuti  
49 area, there's good bull/cow ratios, close to 70 bulls  
50 per 100 cows and I don't feel that this will interfere

1 with the breeding aggregates. You shoot a bull on the  
2 25th of September right in the middle of a yard of 10  
3 cows, you just screwed up that whole breeding regime  
4 right there so that does not really apply per se, you  
5 know, you can kill that bull on the 25th, he's got  
6 those cows almost close to estrus right then.

7  
8 So I feel that Unit 24(B) can support  
9 this. People in Allakaket are having a tough time,  
10 they hunt 15 days per moose. We've cut off the winter  
11 season and this is completely warranted.

12  
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. For my  
14 clarification under that preliminary conclusion,  
15 couldn't we just say Unit 24(B), would that clarify;  
16 who would that question go to, to Pete, if we just.....

17  
18 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. When Dan  
19 gets back I think he can cover that. I may have jumped  
20 a step ahead by talking about 24(B), he said that's  
21 going to come up in Proposal, I think, 36. So Dan just  
22 stepped out so I don't know how this description --  
23 well, he just stepped back in so maybe he can address  
24 your -- the Council is wondering if it would be best  
25 just to go with 24(B) with their motion.

26  
27 MR. LAPLANT: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, we're  
28 recommending that you deal with this issue using the  
29 existing, or if you will, the old regulatory language  
30 without breaking it down into the A, B, C and D,  
31 because this is the language you're probably most  
32 familiar with, so deal with the season extensions in  
33 those areas that you see fit and then we'll deal with  
34 converting that language into the A, B, C, subparts, in  
35 the next proposal.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Jack.

38  
39 MR. REAKOFF: The Staff's preliminary  
40 conclusion includes Unit 21(B), that population in  
41 21(B) as being able to support this additional Federal  
42 harvest, and so just including Unit 24 would not cover  
43 what the users in our western region could be  
44 accommodating with, so I would still like to stay with  
45 the Staff's modified language.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any further  
48 deliberations.

49  
50 Vince.

1 MR. MATHEWS: Mickey, did you  
2 understand what Jack was talking about since you were  
3 the mover of that motion, that the motion covers 21(B)  
4 as in Baker and covers the proportion described in 24,  
5 Mickey?  
6  
7 MR. STICKMAN: Yes.  
8  
9 MR. MATHEWS: Thank you.  
10  
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further  
12 deliberations.  
13  
14 (No comments)  
15  
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: How does our motion read  
17 right now, approve as recommended by Staff?  
18  
19 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and  
20 that's reflected on Page 96. That paragraph that  
21 starts with the word support in bold.  
22  
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.  
24  
25 MR. MATHEWS: I believe the covers all  
26 that Mr. Reakoff and Mr. Stickman would like, in that  
27 statement.  
28  
29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any further  
30 deliberations.  
31  
32 (No comments)  
33  
34 MR. WALKER: Question.  
35  
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called.  
37 All those in favor of adopting WP06-34 with the Staff  
38 modification signify by saying aye.  
39  
40 IN UNISON: Aye.  
41  
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.  
43  
44 (No opposing votes)  
45  
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. Thank  
47 you. Vince.  
48  
49 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. We're now  
50 going to go with Proposal 36, I don't know if you

1 caught that earlier, Pete, we're just switching the  
2 order just a little bit. So Dan will be taking up  
3 Proposal 36.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, introduction.

8

9 MR. LAPLANT: Mr. Chairman. Proposal  
10 36, the analysis is on Page 119 and this is a proposal  
11 that was submitted by the Department and it addresses  
12 some ways of simplifying the regulations in Unit 24  
13 because of the development of the subunits that the  
14 Board of Game adopted here in January.

15

16 So I know, Jack, your concern was --  
17 question before was 21(B), but we'll deal with that in  
18 Proposal 35. Right now in 36 we're just going to deal  
19 with the conversion of the regulations in Unit 24.

20

21 So if you look on Page 120, starting at  
22 the bottom of the page, it shows what your existing  
23 regulations would be. Now, this was done before you  
24 just made this decision to extend the seasons. So  
25 we're going to be doing two things here, basically at  
26 the same time. You already extended the seasons, it's  
27 not reflected in this language, but we'll rewrite this  
28 language to show that. But in addition, we're going to  
29 convert it to the Unit 24 A, B, C, D language, and this  
30 is what it would look like with the old seasons, you  
31 know, ending on September 25th.

32

33 So you've got Unit 24(A), that portion  
34 within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management and then  
35 you've got Unit 24, remainder; you got Unit 24(B), that  
36 portion within the John River; you got Unit 24(B) all  
37 drainages north of the Koyukuk River, except the John  
38 River, and then you've got Unit 24(B) that portion  
39 south of the Koyukuk River, and west of the Kanuti  
40 Controlled Use Area, and the Tanana, Allakaket Winter  
41 Trail. Now, that area, in particular, had to be carved  
42 out and described separately because under the old  
43 regulations, that was a piece of the area that was  
44 managed as the area north of the Koyukuk Controlled Use  
45 Area, and actually if you look on the map, you'll be  
46 using the map that was in Proposal 69, so it's on Page  
47 62.

48

49 There's a small area, mostly BLM land  
50 that's in that southwestern corner of 24(B). Okay,

1 under the old regulations that area was managed as part  
2 of that area north of the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area,  
3 but the way Unit 24(B) boundary is drawn now, the  
4 boundary between 24(C) and (B), that area ends up in  
5 Unit 24(B). And if you wanted to keep the same  
6 regulations in that area that you had before this  
7 change was made, you'd have to describe that area  
8 separately. So that's what that paragraph does on Page  
9 121, it's in that center paragraph, that's describing  
10 that area. And then the remainder of 24(B) is actually  
11 that part of 24, that south of the Koyukuk River. And  
12 then Unit 24(C) and (D), that portion is within the  
13 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area and then it's the  
14 remainder.

15

16 So that's basically on Page 121 and 122  
17 is what the language would look like if we were just  
18 converting it strictly into the subunits that were  
19 adopted by the Board of Game.

20

21 Now, what the Department is  
22 recommending is that we make a few changes in Federal  
23 regulations to simplify the regulations, and what  
24 they're suggesting, that description that's in the  
25 center of Page 123, that that be deleted. So that area  
26 would be managed then as part of Unit 24(B) remainder.  
27 Now, the effect of doing that is that it would change  
28 the harvest limit in that area from one moose to one  
29 bull. And also there would be no registration permit  
30 required for that area during the August 25th through  
31 the September 25th season. For right now in the fall  
32 season the registration permit is required, again,  
33 because it's managed as that part of the north Koyukuk  
34 Controlled Use Area, but if we bring it into Unit  
35 24(B), it would not require the use of a registration  
36 permit. So this action would get rid of the  
37 registration permit for that hunt and change the  
38 harvest limit from one moose to one bull.

39

40 Now, the other change that they're  
41 recommending is in Unit 24(A). It would combine all of  
42 Unit 24(A) into one management subdivision requiring  
43 the use of a Federal registration permit for this  
44 entire subunit. So, again, if you're looking at the  
45 map on Page 62, 24(A) would be that area along the  
46 Dalton Highway Corridor but more than just the  
47 Corridor, you see the area east of the Corridor and a  
48 portion of lands just west of the Corridor. But if you  
49 made all that one hunt area, currently permits are not  
50 required for the National Park Service lands and the

1 BLM lands and a small piece of the Kanuti National  
2 Wildlife Refuge within this area. So if you made the  
3 recommended change, the Dalton Highway Corridor would  
4 no longer be a separate management division and a  
5 registration permit would be required for all of that  
6 area. And, again, it would take an extra effort by the  
7 Federal managers in that area to make sure that hunters  
8 have those Federal registration permits available to  
9 them.

10

11 But these two actions would greatly  
12 simplify the regulations and it would remove those  
13 separate descriptions in the regulations and Mr.  
14 Chairman, that's basically what it would do.

15

16 So, now, in combination of that, with  
17 the changes that you just made in the season  
18 extensions, if you make these decisions I can show you  
19 on the screen what the new regulations would look like  
20 after both actions take place. But depending on what  
21 action you take on this one will determine that. So  
22 this recommendation again is to simplify the  
23 regulations in 24(A) by making it all one hunt  
24 description, would require a Federal registration  
25 permit for all of the area and then it would separate  
26 out that small piece in 24(B) which, in effect, that  
27 would be to change the harvest limit there to one bull  
28 instead of one moose and remove the need for a  
29 registration permit.

30

31 And those changes are probably  
32 inconsequential, they're small changes and the  
33 additional data from the registration permit in 24(A)  
34 would be beneficial for moose management.

35

36 So, Mr. Chairman, that concludes that  
37 proposal.

38

39 Our Staff recommendation is to adopt.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. On the  
42 bottom of the page, 123, when you look at that August  
43 25 to September 25, would that automatically change to  
44 October 1 then, that paragraph?

45

46 MR. LAPLANT: Yes, it would, Mr.  
47 Chairman.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

50

1 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Jack.

4

5 MR. REAKOFF: The existing regulations  
6 allows an antlerless moose season in Unit 24(B), south  
7 of the Koyukuk River into the Kanuti National Wildlife  
8 Refuge, this suggested proposed Federal regulation  
9 would eliminate that antlerless hunt south of the river  
10 is the way it looks to me and retain it to the north of  
11 the Koyukuk; is that the way -- it would appear to me  
12 that we're actually making a significant change in the  
13 winter hunt there.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Dan.

16

17 MR. LAPLANT: Actually, Mr. Chairman,  
18 Mr. Reakoff. There was an error in our description  
19 here when we converted the language to the 24 A, B, C.  
20 The antlerless season that you're talking about  
21 actually only exists on the Refuge, not on these BLM  
22 lands. So in this paragraph it talks about the  
23 antlerless season during the March season and also --  
24 well, the antlerless season during the March season,  
25 and that really wouldn't exist because when it was  
26 described as part of this area north of the Koyukuk  
27 Controlled Use Area, that phrase only pertained to  
28 Refuge lands and here we're separating out and just  
29 talking about the BLM lands, so that was a mistake in  
30 our description here.

31

32 So by making this change, you're not  
33 losing it on BLM lands, it didn't exist on the BLM  
34 lands to begin with.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: So adopt 36, we would  
37 then completely do away with winter antlerless moose  
38 hunt, even though it's -- we'd have to keep it in there  
39 somehow because as it stands right now, it's at the  
40 call of our Kanuti Wildlife Refuge manager.

41

42 MR. LAPLANT: Mr. Chairman. The  
43 antlerless moose hunt would continue to exist on --  
44 let's see where would it be here, all drainages north  
45 of the Koyukuk River, that part of 24(B), that's where  
46 it is now and that's where it would continue to take  
47 place. And then it would also continue to exist, if  
48 you look over on the next page, in Unit 24(C) and Unit  
49 24(D) and that's within the Koyukuk Controlled Use  
50 Area; and 24(C) and (D), remainder, that's the area

1 outside the Controlled Use Area and outside the Refuge.  
2 So it will continue in all those places that it is now,  
3 so there's no change in the antlerless season, I guess,  
4 is what I'm saying.

5  
6 It didn't exist on those BLM lands  
7 before and this doesn't change that.

8  
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions  
10 for Mr. LaPlant.

11  
12 (No comments)

13  
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, ADF&G.

15  
16 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm  
17 Glenn Stout with the Department of Fish and Game.

18  
19 This proposal, too, has a sister  
20 proposal going before the State Board of Game, and  
21 that's Proposal No. 103, and there are going to be a  
22 few changes, particularly in this 24(B) area, one of  
23 the larger changes has to do with the December season  
24 in that companion proposal.

25  
26 So when we were looking at these two  
27 proposals in combination, there was certain trade offs  
28 and there was certain lands that ended up being  
29 affected, and this one here, this deletion on this  
30 Federal portion had to do with a small portion of that  
31 24(B), south of that Kanuti Controlled Use Area, south  
32 of the river and basically it was up around Indian  
33 Mountain there, there's some BLM off to the kind of  
34 northeast side of Indian Mountain that was really not  
35 even being hunted, and so the change effectively on  
36 this Federal side is really kind of moot in my opinion,  
37 because it didn't provide much opportunity up on that  
38 hillside.

39  
40 On the State proposal, on Proposal 103,  
41 to do the same thing, to accomplish the same thing as  
42 far as simplification of the regulations, what we tried  
43 to do in that central portion of 21(B) is make that  
44 south side, all that existing December season that was  
45 in there for a small portion, we just went ahead and  
46 extended that all around that south side which includes  
47 some area south of the Kanuti that hadn't been allowed  
48 before, and that's pretty important, because now that  
49 allows that existing winter opportunity that was in the  
50 winter season there right around Allakaket and Alatna,

1 because now that December season on the south side of  
2 the river that you guys didn't have before, that State  
3 proposal, if it's adopted, would allow that opportunity  
4 right in that same area on the State lands, on the  
5 corporation lands, too.

6  
7                   So in combination, those two proposals,  
8 I think there's a real net gain as far as hunting  
9 opportunity that we're going to see with these two  
10 proposals coming together, the way I see them.

11  
12                   Let's see if you can switch the slide  
13 for me.

14  
15                   The Department's recommendation is to  
16 adopt this proposal. In addition to the State proposal  
17 and the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee did weigh in  
18 on aligning this moose seasons and bag limits and there  
19 were a few changes -- go ahead, Vince.

20  
21                   As you recall, and we've talked about  
22 this several times, this is just the State regulation  
23 areas. And it just kind of makes my head spin when I  
24 try and throw an overlay of the Federal regulations,  
25 the moose regulations, how they worked out. Just the  
26 State regulations, there was nine different regulatory  
27 areas basically in Unit 24 and it was really kind of  
28 mind boggling what we had to deal with on these  
29 proposals, and then you throw in that stuff on the  
30 Federal regulation on top of it. I think it was pretty  
31 tough for users. So I think these proposals are going  
32 to go a long way in simplifying the regulations for us  
33 in addition to the subdivisions, the way that we have  
34 it now. So I think that's going to be a real  
35 important improvement as far as these regulations go.

36  
37                   Next slide, please. We can go ahead  
38 and skip.

39  
40                   I think the area down there that we  
41 talked about in this regulation that changes is that  
42 area -- maybe go back one -- there's a sliver of land  
43 there southeast of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area,  
44 between that and that 24(B) boundary, that BLM land in  
45 there, that's basically what we're talking about as far  
46 as what's being deleted in that area right in there.

47  
48                   Okay. Now, on the State side there are  
49 six changes, and I think all of them are really pretty  
50 inconsequential except for that area, the south side of

1 the Koyukuk, the very bottom one there, that Unit  
2 24(B), and that's the one I'm talking about, as far as  
3 that December season opportunity because it already  
4 exists on the north side there, so that would just  
5 expand it basically all around Allakaket, Alatna for  
6 that December opportunity.

7  
8 But the other changes on the State  
9 side, 24(A) within the Gates of the Arctic, there's a  
10 small in-holdings up there and just where 24(A) happens  
11 to cut off a little small portion of it, you know, and  
12 -- and I don't know if these microphones will pick me  
13 up, I think I'm going to have to stand up and kind to  
14 point at it, where these occur.

15  
16 Maybe you can go up a slide.

17  
18 Basically where 24(A) comes in, this is  
19 a private in-holding there's just a small section of  
20 24(A) boundary that would now fall under that  
21 regulation. It's really inconsequential. I looked at  
22 the last six years of harvest data and there hasn't  
23 been any moose harvested on that little sliver of land.

24  
25  
26 Go ahead and go back down.

27  
28 The other area is between Kanuti  
29 Controlled Use Area and 24(C) -- go ahead and go back  
30 up.

31  
32 MR. MATHEWS: Back up?

33  
34 MR. STOUT: Yes. And this area right  
35 in here, this area in here will change, that's  
36 currently under that registration and drawing permit,  
37 and that will just go into the general harvest tickets,  
38 so all of 24(A) would be the general harvest ticket and  
39 that's another concern we have as far as simplification  
40 of regulations. We've had a lot of confusion,  
41 particularly down river here where those registration  
42 and drawing permits exist on which mechanism to use,  
43 and that will simplify that.

44  
45 Allakaket is here and so I think that  
46 would help things out as far as that simplification.

47  
48 Go back up.

49  
50 Once, again, the same like we had the

1 sheep drawing up there by Twelvemile Mountain -- and go  
2 back up one -- there's this little dimple of land where  
3 24(A) actually -- the Haul Road Corridor actually  
4 becomes a part of what's 24(B), it's insignificant. I  
5 looked at the last six years of data and no moose  
6 harvest in there.

7  
8                   The John River and Alatna River and  
9 Gates of Arctic portions of that, of course, those  
10 State regulations were in effect -- go ahead and go  
11 back up -- so it ends up being these in-holdings at the  
12 very tips of the Alatna River drainage and John River  
13 drainage, that changes and we've just basically  
14 redescrbed the regulations to allow for the  
15 continuation of those seasons in the private land  
16 portions of it. So we still have the same opportunity,  
17 we just don't describe all this Federal land in the  
18 regulation.

19  
20                   So, Mr. Chairman, I guess that's the  
21 end of my presentation, but I basically feel like this  
22 is going to be a good improvement for us as far as  
23 simplifying the regulations. Getting rid of some of  
24 these descriptions that have caused a lot of confusion,  
25 I think, particularly like up around Allakaket and  
26 Alatna. I think there was a lot of confusion when the  
27 December season was announced that you had to be up  
28 stream of the Henshaw Creek and hunt the south side, I  
29 think this will improve that.

30  
31                   Thank you.

32  
33                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any  
34 questions for Glenn.

35  
36                   (No comments)

37  
38                   CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, Federal  
39 agencies.

40  
41                   (No comments)

42  
43                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Native tribes.

44  
45                   (No comments)

46  
47                   CHAIRMAN SAM: InterAgency.

48  
49                   (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: None. Advisory Group  
2 comments.  
3  
4 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. To my  
5 knowledge, I don't have any on that. If Glenn has some  
6 from the other Advisory Committees that he attended,  
7 I'm not aware of any.  
8  
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: I think he covered them  
10 all on there.  
11  
12 MR. STOUT: (Nods affirmatively)  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. National Park  
15 Service.  
16  
17 (No comments)  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.  
20  
21 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. I've been  
22 working -- there are no written comments, but I've been  
23 working with other Staff to get what the North Slope  
24 Regional Council did. They did support this proposal  
25 with the Staff modification.  
26  
27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Public testimony.  
28  
29 (No comments)  
30  
31 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, the Chair will  
32 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal WP06-36.  
33  
34 MR. WALKER: I'll move, Mr. Chairman.  
35  
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.  
37  
38 MR. REAKOFF: Second.  
39  
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Robert Walker,  
41 seconded by Jack Reakoff. Council deliberations.  
42  
43 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.  
44  
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.  
46  
47 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman. This  
48 Council was in support of this division of Unit 24 and  
49 it makes simplification of regulations. And as Larry  
50 Edwards said on our Koyukuk River Advisory Committee

1 meeting, this is a long time coming, so I'm happy to  
2 see these simplification of these regulatory  
3 boundaries.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further  
6 deliberations. Go ahead.

7  
8 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. We're not  
9 clear on the motion, is the motion to support the  
10 proposal as written or was it to support as modified by  
11 Staff.

12  
13 MR. LAPLANT: Mr. Chairman.

14  
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

16  
17 MR. LAPLANT: If I could clarify that,  
18 the Staff recommendation here that you see on the  
19 bottom of Page 127 is to support with modification, and  
20 that modification was to include language that required  
21 a Federal registration permit for the March season in  
22 that area described as the drainages north of the  
23 Koyukuk River, however, you just did that in Proposal  
24 34, so you don't need to do that again. So right now  
25 our Staff recommendation here would change and it would  
26 be just to support is our Staff recommendation.

27  
28 What happened was both Pete and I were  
29 working on these analysis, and we both recommended the  
30 same thing to address this need for permit up north of  
31 the Koyukuk River, so you've already taken action on  
32 that, so right now our Staff recommendation is just to  
33 support.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN SAM: That was our motion,  
36 too, right?

37  
38 (Council nods affirmatively)

39  
40 MR. REAKOFF: Right.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further  
43 deliberations.

44  
45 (No comments)

46  
47 MR. WALKER: Question.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called.  
50 All those in favor of adopting WP06-36 signify by

1 saying aye.  
2  
3 IN UNISON: Aye.  
4  
5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.  
6  
7 (No opposing votes)  
8  
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. Now,  
10 we'll go back to 35.  
11  
12 MR. LAPLANT: Mr. Chairman.  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.  
15  
16 MR. LAPLANT: Now, that you've passed  
17 both proposals 34 and 36, I can show you what the Unit  
18 24 regulations would look like with the season  
19 extensions that you adopted in Proposal 34 and the  
20 conversion of the language into the A, B, C, D subparts  
21 as well as the recommendations that the Department made  
22 that you just adopted. So I've got a handout here that  
23 would look like and I can flash it up on the screen if  
24 you would like me to do that.  
25  
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Put it on the screen  
27 because the public might be interested in this, too.  
28  
29 (Pause)  
30  
31 MR. MATHEWS: Hello.  
32  
33 MR. STICKMAN: Yes, Vince.  
34  
35 MR. MATHEWS: Did someone else join us.  
36  
37 MR. RIVARD: Well, Pete got cut off so  
38 I had to reconnect him in, so we're all set now.  
39  
40 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, with  
41 this proposal, as he's putting it together and laying  
42 it out and that, I don't expect us to revisit this  
43 during this meeting but if so be, we'll contact you  
44 throughout the meeting because I've been getting a lot  
45 of questions on this so there may be some other things  
46 that come up, I doubt it but if there are, we may need  
47 to go through a reconsideration, so just a little bit  
48 of a warning that may not be needed, but just so you  
49 know.  
50

1 MR. LAPLANT: Okay, Mr. Chairman, as  
2 you just passed those two proposals, this is what the  
3 regulations will look like with those changes.

4  
5 In Unit 24(A) you'd have one antlered  
6 bull by Federal registration permit and in regulation  
7 it would be the same throughout all of 24(A), and the  
8 season extension to October 1 is displayed as you just  
9 passed in Proposal 34.

10  
11 Unit 24(B), that portion within the  
12 John River drainage, you've made no changes to that,  
13 that was August 1 to December 31 before and it remains  
14 the same.

15  
16 In Unit 24(B) drainages north of the  
17 Koyukuk River except the John River, you see the  
18 October 1 extension there, the March 1 through 5 season  
19 remains as you had before and all the rest of the  
20 language remains the same.

21  
22 In Unit 24(B) remainder and this is  
23 essentially the area south of the Koyukuk River in  
24 24(B), the Kanuti Controlled Use Area and other  
25 adjacent areas, that shows the October 1 extension that  
26 you passed, and the harvest limit there remains one  
27 antlered bull. And included in that is that area that  
28 we talked about that's just to the east of Indian  
29 Mountain that Glenn was describing as well that falls  
30 within that area.

31  
32 And then Unit 24(C) and (D), that  
33 portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area and the  
34 Koyukuk National Wildlife Refuge, that's the area that  
35 shows no extension, you decided not to provide an  
36 extension for that area but the March 1 through 5  
37 season remains.

38  
39 And the area of 24(C) remainder, there  
40 we're talking about -- excuse me, 24(C) remainder and  
41 24(D) remainder we're talking about those areas that  
42 are not part of the Controlled Use Area and not within  
43 the Refuge so it's that area northwest of the Refuge  
44 and north of the Refuge, that area shows the October 1  
45 extension that you approved in Proposal 34.

46  
47 Mr. Chairman, that's what the  
48 regulations will look like with those two decisions.

49  
50 (Applause)

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Greg.

2

3 MR. BOS: Thanks, Mr. Chair, I wouldn't  
4 applaud too soon, there's always another twist.

5

6 (Laughter)

7

8 MR. BOS: I know that you don't like  
9 surprises, you or the Council at the Board meeting and  
10 the Staff Committee will be taking a look at what the  
11 State Board of Game does in proposals before it  
12 regarding this area.

13

14 The Department of Fish and Game in  
15 Proposal 103 to the State Board is going to be  
16 recommending a December 1 to 10 season in a portion of  
17 Unit 24(B), that is drainages into the Koyukuk, down  
18 stream from and including the Henshaw Creek drainage.  
19 And the reason I bring this to your attention is that  
20 this may create a jurisdictional problem south of the  
21 Koyukuk River and the Kanuti Controlled Use Area on the  
22 Refuge. The reason is that under Federal regulations,  
23 if that area south of the Koyukuk and the Kanuti  
24 Controlled Use Area on the Refuge, only Federally-  
25 eligible subsistence hunters can hunt there for moose  
26 under Federal regulations. If the State adopts a  
27 December 1 to 10 season for that portion of 24(B),  
28 local subsistence hunters won't be able to hunt on the  
29 Federal lands in that area under that State season,  
30 only on their -- only on the private or Native owned  
31 lands within that Refuge. So we have that  
32 jurisdictional problem, you know, in the boundaries,  
33 knowing where those borders are between Federal and  
34 State lands.

35

36 So after the Board of Game takes action  
37 on these proposals, if they have adopted a December 1  
38 to 10 season, I think the Staff Committee is going to  
39 look at the possibility of recommending to the Board,  
40 the Federal Board, that we adopt a similar regulation  
41 that would enable local subsistence users in that area  
42 to hunt on the Federal lands December 1 to 10 along  
43 with hunting on the State jurisdiction lands so we  
44 don't have that enforcement problem and the different  
45 -- you know, putting Federal subsistence users at risk  
46 of violating Federal regulations within the Kanuti  
47 Refuge.

48

49 It's kind of complicated, but I just  
50 wanted to let you know that that's something that may

1 come up afterwards after this meeting and after the  
2 State Board of Game meeting, that the Federal Board  
3 would like to take a look at.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Did I hear  
6 you right when you said that we can hunt on corporation  
7 lands?

8  
9 MR. BOS: That's correct, under State  
10 regulations.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thanks, had to get  
13 that clarified. Thank you, Greg.

14  
15 Vince.

16  
17 MR. MATHEWS: If you wanted to work on  
18 that at all, what we would do is ask Glenn to help with  
19 Proposal 103, to present that and then you would, if  
20 you wanted to, support that, and we'd get that to the  
21 Board of Game and then share that with the Federal  
22 Board if that's your desire. So I think that would  
23 help the Federal Subsistence Board if that's what you  
24 wanted to do, to know where you stand on it. I do  
25 realize that the December 1 through 10 season is one  
26 that you've debated quite a bit. So I'm just saying  
27 that that's an avenue if you want to seize upon this  
28 opportunity or not.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: I don't know if I want  
31 to at this time. For the first time in history that  
32 December 1 through 10th hunt came into play. I mean  
33 really began to appreciate that. And I just don't want  
34 to revisit it at this time because if we got that  
35 extension to October 1 that may make that December 1  
36 through 10th moot, too, so I don't want to delve into  
37 it right now. Let's see what happens under the October  
38 extension. Let's just leave it at that, I think.

39  
40 MR. REAKOFF: Right.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is that fine with you  
43 Jack?

44  
45 MR. REAKOFF: Yes.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, thank you. Is Pete  
48 still on line?

49  
50 MR. MATHEWS: Pete, are you still

1 there.

2

3

MR. DEMATTEO: Yes, I am here.

4

5

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, I think we're ready

6

7

8

CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Pete.

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

there.

MR. DEMATTEO: Yes, I am here.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, I think we're ready to go into Proposal 35, thanks.

CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Pete.

MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. The analysis of Proposal 35 begins in your Council books on Page 112. Proposal 35 was submitted by the Department of Fish and Game and this proposal would establish a December 1 through 10 moose season in Unit 21(B) with a harvest limit of one antlered bull.

Residents of Unit 21(B) and the communities of Tanana, Galena and Ruby have a positive C&T moose determination for moose in Unit 21(B).

The Department of Fish and Game submitted Proposal 35 to the Federal Board and a similar proposal to the Alaska Board of Game for consideration at its March 2006 meeting.

The point of the proposals is to provide users the opportunity to harvest bull moose in a remote area not easily accessed during the fall moose season.

Adoption of Proposal 35 would align Federal and State regulations if the proposed regulations are adopted by both Boards.

The proponent, however, requested the withdrawal of Proposal 35 should the Board of Game decide not to adopt the State's companion proposal.

Mr. Chair. The proposed Federal regulations can be seen on Page 112 under the heading of proposed Federal regulations displayed with 21(A) and (B) boundary changes.

The Alaska Board of Game adopted the proposed boundary changes at its recent meeting. There's all of this -- essentially for here is the entire Nowitna River drainage is now in Unit 21(B) where before, the existing regulations, it was divided into 21(B) and 21(A). This means that the November season for the upper part of the river that was 21(A)

1 is now Unit 21(B). And qualified residents have lost  
2 the November 1 through 30 season but have gained the  
3 proposed December 1 through (phone cuts out) in this  
4 proposal.

5  
6 The lower Nowitna River that remains in  
7 Unit 21(B) as it was before would gain the proposed  
8 December 1 through 10 with the one antlered bull  
9 harvest limit.

10  
11 These regulatory -- or the hunt area  
12 descriptions that I'm mentioning on Page 112, these are  
13 essentially temporary for the purposes of discussion  
14 and for this analysis. If you look under the heading,  
15 again, on Page 112, the proposed Federal regulations  
16 displayed with proposed State Units 21(A) and (B)  
17 boundary changes, it says Unit 21(B) that portion of  
18 the Nowitna drainage formerly in 21(A), which is the  
19 upper Nowitna River, of course, if this was passed by  
20 the Board, the regulations that would read in the  
21 regulations book would be more appropriate language.  
22 But we felt that when we wrote this, this would be the  
23 easiest way to explain the existing and also the  
24 changed, and then under that you would see Unit 21(B),  
25 that portion that is existing in Unit 21(B), one  
26 antlered bull. And, of course, that's the lower part  
27 of the river from the Little Mud River (ph) (phone cuts  
28 out) on down to the mouth.

29  
30 The lower Nowitna River that remains in  
31 Unit 21(B) as it was before would gain the proposed  
32 December 1 through 10th season as I mentioned before,  
33 so what this essentially means is that the folks in the  
34 lower part of the river would also gain a December  
35 season and this is where we (phone cuts out) predicated  
36 the bulk of the harvest would occur because that's the  
37 area that's closest to the communities of Telida, Ruby  
38 and Tanana.

39  
40 If this proposal is adopted by the  
41 Board, the proposed season would provide an increased  
42 opportunity to harvest moose in areas of 21(B) where  
43 the population can support the harvest of bulls that  
44 are not easily accessed during the fall season.  
45 Adoption of the Federal and State proposals would  
46 simplify regulatory complexity and should help to avoid  
47 confusion for the users. Federal lands are not closed  
48 to any communities but would align State and Federal  
49 regulations and provide opportunities for harvest while  
50 traveling land also during trapping (ph) (phone cuts

1 out).

2

3

4 The proposed December 1 through 10  
5 season will also simplify hunting activity on the Ruby-  
6 Poorman Road where hunters are currently permitted to  
7 hunt and to harvest moose only on the west side of the  
8 road during the Unit 21(D) December season. Total  
9 annual harvest for the affected area is not anticipated  
10 to change as a result of adoption of this proposal.

11

12

13 If hunter is shifted to include more  
14 bull moose and fewer cows, the population decline will  
15 likely decreased (ph) (phone cuts out) by the retaining  
16 of more cow moose. Because cows are limiting  
17 reproductive component of this population at this time,  
18 any increase in the productive capacity in the  
19 population will potentially result in the population  
20 growth and also more moose available for harvest.  
21 Because Federal lands in the upper Nowitna River  
22 drainage are very remote and costly to access no  
23 adverse impacts to the area moose populations are  
24 anticipated should Proposal 35 become adopted by the  
25 Federal Board.

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

The proposed December 1 through 10

season will also simplify hunting activity on the Ruby-  
Poorman Road where hunters are currently permitted to  
hunt and to harvest moose only on the west side of the  
road during the Unit 21(D) December season. Total  
annual harvest for the affected area is not anticipated  
to change as a result of adoption of this proposal.

If hunter is shifted to include more  
bull moose and fewer cows, the population decline will  
likely decreased (ph) (phone cuts out) by the retaining  
of more cow moose. Because cows are limiting  
reproductive component of this population at this time,  
any increase in the productive capacity in the  
population will potentially result in the population  
growth and also more moose available for harvest.  
Because Federal lands in the upper Nowitna River  
drainage are very remote and costly to access no  
adverse impacts to the area moose populations are  
anticipated should Proposal 35 become adopted by the  
Federal Board.

The Department of Fish and Game  
anticipates that with the additional opportunity for  
bull harvest the lower Nowitna and Yukon River portion  
of 21(B) during the time of year when bulls still  
possess their antlers, unreported harvest of cow moose  
during the remainder of the winter should be reduced.

Because of the vast remoteness of the  
upper Nowitna River drainage area in conjunction with  
the high cost of travel, the majority of the moose  
harvest is expected to occur in areas closer to the  
communities of Ruby and Tanana.

Mr. Chair, with that, the Staff  
conclusion is to support the proposal. I'll stop  
there.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Pete. ADF&G.

MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This  
is a proposal that I think is going to take a little  
bit more consideration and explaining on this because  
things have kind of been in a state of flux on this as  
the Department first submitted this proposal. And I

1 really haven't even had a chance as a result of some of  
2 these changes that have been going on to talk very  
3 closely with the Fish and Wildlife Service,  
4 Subsistence, about some of the changes.  
5

6                   But the effect of this proposal was  
7 originally designed to simplify regulations in 21(B)  
8 when we made those subunit boundaries. And we added  
9 the December season on there because there was always  
10 confusion on Ruby. Hunting up Poorman Road in the  
11 winter, that was where most of the road hunting took  
12 place during that December season, it was just the west  
13 side of the road that they could hunt during that  
14 winter season, whether it was December or March,  
15 whatever we had, because 21(B) was west of that Poorman  
16 Road. And that always created some confusion.  
17

18                   When we changed the regulations  
19 recently and went to that drawing and registration  
20 permit, we had the same situation. Left side of the  
21 road you had to use the green harvest ticket, the right  
22 side of the road you had to use either drawing or  
23 registration permit. And to kind of give you an idea,  
24 in 2004, 45 percent of the harvest reporting was  
25 reported in error. 81 of the 260 reports that were  
26 sent in for 21(B) were reported on a green harvest  
27 ticket in 21(B), well, the green harvest ticket wasn't  
28 even a valid mechanism in that unit anymore. It's a  
29 big problem that we have on this reporting. One of  
30 these considerations that we'll have, like the proposal  
31 that was adopted in 34 would be an October season where  
32 there won't be a season now and that will be another  
33 mechanism that we've just added in there.  
34

35                   We're trying to get away from that. I  
36 think it's really important on this one to align these  
37 regulations and get these simplified to reduce the  
38 number of mechanisms, get this reporting kind of lined  
39 up so we can kind of organize what's going on here and  
40 reduce all this confusion. I know there was just a  
41 huge amount of confusion on those reporting, on those  
42 permits the last two years.  
43

44                   The Department, when it met with Middle  
45 Yukon Advisory Committee and basically the proposal to  
46 extend the October season they wanted to go to that  
47 August season, and the Department felt like that was a  
48 good alternative, but if we went to the August season  
49 in 21(D), we felt like, okay, once again, we had to  
50 change our mind on 21(B), make sure, provide

1 opportunity, simplify the regulations, and we said okay  
2 that's fine, what do you think about just making that  
3 August season in 21(B) also so we don't have that same  
4 problem east and west of Poorman Road. And that was  
5 adopted and approved by the Ruby Advisory Committee.  
6 They felt like that was a good solution to the problems  
7 there.

8

9                   And so what the Department is going to  
10 do on the State's proposal, on the Department side, is  
11 what we've done is submitted or will be submitting  
12 Proposal 96A and instead of having that December season  
13 it will be an August 22nd to 31st season is what we're  
14 going to have in 96a.

15

16                   There's also the companion proposal in  
17 this, also it's attached to Proposal 155 and that's to  
18 close that December moose season in 21(D), and so  
19 that's what we kind of -- kind of the tie in to all of  
20 these proposals, how it's going to work out.

21

22                   So the Department's preferred  
23 alternatives, and also in the Federal regulation and  
24 the State regulation we had that November season, that  
25 was for that upper part of the Nowitna drainage, which  
26 is now 21(B), there was almost no harvest. I looked at  
27 it and it was like two moose in the last 10 years or  
28 something like that, it was very seldom utilized,  
29 there's hardly anybody living on that upper Nowitna now  
30 and it's just not utilized very often. So trying to  
31 provide for that opportunity in the old 21(A) portion  
32 of the Nowitna drainage wasn't really as much of a  
33 concern as trying to line up the road east and west of  
34 Poorman Road, that's where we were really trying to  
35 improve things.

36

37                   And we are trying in this process to  
38 eliminate the three mechanisms for reporting because we  
39 want to get rid of basically that general harvest  
40 ticket on the middle Yukon. We just won't have to  
41 worry about that and there won't be any more confusion  
42 and people sending in the wrong report and getting  
43 tickets and stuff like that.

44

45                   So that's kind of where we're going  
46 with this.

47

48                   I guess I'll go down and just kind of  
49 fly through these slides real quick. A lot of this is  
50 stuff we've already talked about.

1                   Again, this is the 21(B) area and  
2 that's the line, yeah, where he's pointing there,  
3 that's the old boundary for 21(B), now it's all of the  
4 Nowitna drainage, which includes the Federal land  
5 there, the Nowitna Refuge that's shaded there in light  
6 blue.

7  
8                   Next slide. This is the old  
9 regulation, the old area, we had that drawing  
10 registration permit, we had three drawing permit areas  
11 and the idea that we implemented this is we were  
12 concerned about our bull/cow ratios. Brad showed you  
13 the date earlier, that the first year of this, we cut  
14 our harvest down to about half and our bull/cow ratios  
15 are starting to come up and I think he's right, it's a  
16 combination of the more restrictive regulations as well  
17 as our yearling bulls being recruited into the  
18 population. So we've got a couple things going on  
19 there that I think are positive.

20  
21                   Next one. Pretty static harvest in  
22 21(B), right around 75/80 moose and this is all  
23 reported moose in 21(B), the former 21(B).

24  
25                   Next slide. A few things we noticed  
26 going on in there and this is Fish and Wildlife  
27 Service's guiding and transporting activities going on.  
28 You'll recall we implemented those drawing and  
29 registration permits up on the Koyukuk in 2000 and you  
30 can see what happened, we started deflecting a lot of  
31 hunters over on to Nowitna, and that was one of our  
32 concerns, and I think it's a pretty tell-tale sign of  
33 what happened and where those hunters went.

34  
35                   Next slide. Just as far as 21(A), (B),  
36 and I split that up, what is the old portion, the upper  
37 portion is what I'm calling 21(A) of the Nowitna River  
38 drainage, obviously the bulk of the harvest on the  
39 Nowitna River drainage is in the lower portion there.

40  
41                   Next slide. Just looked at the last  
42 few years and I can tell you my intent here on this was  
43 to try and identify what happened in 2004 and 2005 with  
44 that drawing registration hunt that was implemented the  
45 last two years. Numbers are so small there on the  
46 upper river drainage I didn't see this big jump that I  
47 guess, hopefully, was trying to demonstrate. But the  
48 numbers are small and it's hard to identify really any  
49 kind of trend of what's going on. 2004 data has a big  
50 star by it because just what I told you earlier about

1 45 percent of the reporting was in error so there's a  
2 lot of problems that we're still trying to sort out in  
3 our reporting data base.

4  
5 Next slide. I'll probably go through  
6 these real quick, Brad already told you all about the  
7 moose surveys that we're doing there.

8  
9 Next slide. Our population estimates  
10 that we have.

11  
12 Next slide. We have trend count  
13 surveys done on the mouth, the Nowitna mouth.

14  
15 Next slide. Our bull/cow ratios were  
16 low 2001, 2004, this is Deep Creek.

17  
18 Next slide. You can see 2001, 2003,  
19 those were our real low years, we implementing the  
20 drawing and registration permits. The first year in  
21 2004 and 2005 and hopefully that trend will continue,  
22 that we start to build our bulls back up.

23  
24 Next slide. Same thing. A little bit  
25 further up river. Brad had these two combined, he had  
26 the two trend count areas combined as one bulk unit,  
27 these are just the same thing split apart. But I think  
28 the same thing, 2004/2005 our bull/cow ratios is going  
29 up the way we want it.

30  
31 Next slide. There is just a little bit  
32 of information on what's the old 21(A) there and Fish  
33 and Wildlife Service had a trend count area there.  
34 This is just the total number of moose counted. I'm  
35 not trying to describe any trend, it's really kind of  
36 tough. It was a small trend area in 1980, and I guess  
37 really the point I'm trying to make here is there's  
38 just not as many moose up in that upper 21(B), what is  
39 the upper Nowitna drainage. That's the only point I'm  
40 trying to make on this slide.

41  
42 Next slide. The new State regulations  
43 then, the way it would turn out would be to have the  
44 lower Nowitna basically stay the same, but we would  
45 continue that Haul Road Corridor, or not the Haul Road  
46 -- the corridor, the Tenmile Corridor going on up the  
47 Nowitna River. And then the blue area, you see that  
48 would just stay a general harvest ticket, very little  
49 use in those areas and no need to add additional  
50 restrictions.

1                   Our concerns about up river traffic  
2 just aren't up there so we're not worried about some of  
3 the other concerns we seen in the other areas where we  
4 had talked about bootlegging and reporting problems.  
5 You really can't access those drainages very well  
6 anyway. They get real low on water that time of year.

7  
8                   Next slide.

9  
10                  And that's it.

11  
12                  So the proposal that you see here, as  
13 far as the State proposal, our perspective has changed  
14 a little bit after talking with Middle Yukon Advisory  
15 Committee. And just so you know where the State  
16 proposal is going, that's the direction that the  
17 Department would like the Board of Game to adopt and,  
18 hopefully that maybe we could convince you to go ahead  
19 and go in that direction to keep our seasons aligned.

20  
21                  That's all I have, thank you.

22  
23                  CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Glenn.  
24 Federal agencies.

25  
26                  (No comments)

27  
28                  CHAIRMAN SAM: InterAgency Staff.

29  
30                  (No comments)

31  
32                  CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Advisory  
33 group comments, you have anything.

34  
35                  MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The  
36 written comments that we have are a little confusing  
37 here. I'll try to make it clear to you.

38  
39                  It's from Alaska Defender's of  
40 Wildlife. They oppose this proposal as  
41 well as Proposal 38 and 68. They urge  
42 caution and recommend more conservative  
43 action, late season winter moose hunts  
44 invite driving, herding and harassing  
45 moose with snowmachines and activities  
46 currently prohibited under Federal  
47 Subsistence law. Enforcement is  
48 extremely difficult in remote areas  
49 during this time and abuse is connected  
50 with this method of hunting can

1                   diminish healthy populations of moose.

2

3                   So in light of the changes with the  
4 State this doesn't seem to apply anymore.

5

6                   And, Mr. Chairman, I have to caution  
7 the Council here, because this proposal was to put in a  
8 December 1 to 10th season, if I understand now it's a  
9 completely different proposal but I may be wrong.

10

11                   When the Board has had this, I've seen  
12 it difficult when there's a fairly substantial change  
13 in the proposal to take action on it. So maybe one of  
14 the Staff Committee can help out on this. But if I  
15 understand the State they no longer December 1 through  
16 10, they want to go with an August season. I don't  
17 know how to handle that, I suppose.

18

19                   CHAIRMAN SAM: That brings us up to  
20 what, that was summary of written comments?

21

22                   MR. MATHEWS: Yes. That's the only  
23 ones that were submitted, yes.

24

25                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Public testimony.

26

27                   (No comments)

28

29                   CHAIRMAN SAM: The Chair will entertain  
30 a motion to adopt Proposal WP06-35.

31

32                   (No comments)

33

34                   CHAIRMAN SAM: The Chair will entertain  
35 a motion to adopt Proposal WP06-35.

36

37                   MR. REAKOFF: Brad's got a comment, I  
38 think.

39

40                   MR. STICKMAN: So moved, Mr. Chair.

41

42                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Brad Scotton.

43

44                   MR. MATHEWS: If you could just wait,  
45 Mickey, on that.

46

47                   MR. SCOTTON: Mr. Chairman. Members of  
48 the Council. My name is Brad Scotton. Again, we  
49 weren't really prepared to comment on this because the  
50 original proposal was for this December season and with

1 the amendments that the State is making or potentially  
2 to this proposal that are going to go before the Board  
3 of Game and that you're about to consider, I guess,  
4 unless I'm really confused, to consider this August  
5 20th to 30th season, then there'd be a five day space  
6 and then on 21(B) we've already got a September 5th to  
7 October season now.

8

9                   And our comments, previously,  
10 biologically, were for the Federal season in 21(B), the  
11 extension to October 1st probably could be sustained  
12 for Federal users only because it's not a lot of  
13 additional harvest along the river corridor on Federal  
14 lands.

15

16                   With this additional season we could  
17 potentially have this 10 day August season and then a  
18 30 day September season essentially, and if the State  
19 also passes the State -- the season for August 20th,  
20 then that's not just Federal users but all users.  
21 Potentially we could have a higher level of harvest  
22 than we might be comfortable seeing from that area  
23 because more users would be qualified, longer season.  
24 A lot of people probably aren't going to come out to  
25 hunt in August because it's hot and it's harder to take  
26 care of meat, things like that. Locals may take  
27 advantage of it, I'm not sure.

28

29                   But because of the bull/cow ratio in  
30 21(B) along the corridor on Federal land is only 24  
31 bulls per 100 and it's just recovering, the more  
32 harvest we take out of there and the more users that  
33 are eligible and what not, we start getting a little  
34 more uncomfortable about whether or not it's  
35 sustainable biologically. So I'm just kind of throwing  
36 that out as a note of caution as a biologist. And then  
37 administratively I think my manager and the individual  
38 subsistence biologist who often runs the check station  
39 is also somewhat concerned about operating a check  
40 station from August 20th until October 1st and some of  
41 the administrative things that come along with that.

42

43                   So I'm just putting that out there and  
44 if there's any questions I can offer some more  
45 comments, and maybe Glenn wants to say something else  
46 as well or our new Refuge manager, but I was kind of  
47 urged to say a few things.

48

49                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Brad. The  
50 Chair will entertain a motion to adopt..... WP06-35.

1 MR. STICKMAN: So moved, Mr. Chair.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN SAM: I knew I shouldn't have  
4 said that.  
5  
6 (Laughter)  
7  
8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second to the  
9 motion.  
10  
11 (No comments)  
12  
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion died for a lack  
14 of a second. No action taken on WP06-35.  
15  
16 Did you catch that Mickey?  
17  
18 MR. STICKMAN: Yes, Mr. Chair.  
19  
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. That takes care  
21 of WP06-35. Will somebody find out what time dinner  
22 is.  
23  
24 MR. JONES: 6:30.  
25  
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Uh?  
27  
28 MR. BENEDICT: 6:30.  
29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: 6:30. So we'll take a  
31 10 minute break and go on with the rest of the  
32 proposals, thank you for bearing with us.  
33  
34 (Off record)  
35  
36 (On record)  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN SAM: The sooner we get started  
39 the sooner we'll be done.  
40  
41 (Pause)  
42  
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'd like to call the  
44 meeting back to order. Vince, where are we?  
45  
46 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. To my  
47 understanding we now move into crossover -- oh, Dan has  
48 something else, but we will, after Dan move into  
49 crossover proposals.  
50

1 MR. LAPLANT: I'm doing them.  
2  
3 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, you're doing  
4 crossover, I'm sorry, I'm on a different sheet of  
5 music, sorry. Okay, the next set of proposals that we  
6 talked about during the work session is it is a group  
7 of proposals, 42 through 52 to determine customary and  
8 traditional use determinations for all those species in  
9 Unit 22. And with that, Dan is going to be presenting  
10 that.  
11  
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Vince, before we begin,  
13 ha YK-Delta met?  
14  
15 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, YK has met.  
16  
17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you.  
18  
19 MR. MATHEWS: And we have their  
20 recommendations, I believe, on these. Yes, we do. We  
21 do.  
22  
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, Proposal 42  
24 through 52, introduction.  
25  
26 MR. LAPLANT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
27 Again, this is Dan LaPlant with OSM. Proposals 42  
28 through 52 were submitted by Kawarek Incorporation of  
29 Nome, and the analysis of this proposal, we've combined  
30 these all into one analysis and that begins on Page 132  
31 of your book. There's an executive summary on the  
32 preceding page, 131, but the analysis starts on.....  
33  
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Who is Kawarek?  
35  
36 MR. LAPLANT: Kawarek is a non-profit  
37 corporation out of Nome.  
38  
39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you.  
40  
41 MR. LAPLANT: Kawarek submitted this  
42 request for customary and traditional use of beaver,  
43 Arctic Fox, red fox, hare, lynx, marten, wolverine,  
44 spruce grouse, ptarmigan, including both willow and  
45 rock ptarmigan, ground squirrel and porcupine.  
46  
47 Again, Proposals 51 and 52 that were  
48 also submitted and what they're requesting in those  
49 proposals were to provide year-round seasons and no  
50 harvest limits for ground squirrel and porcupine.

1                   So you'll see that there's a whole  
2 bunch of proposals here that they've submitted dealing  
3 with these small animals within Unit 22.

4  
5                   The Federal Subsistence Board has never  
6 made a C&T determination in Unit 22 for these species.  
7 Beaver Arctic Fox, red fox, hare, lynx, marten,  
8 wolverine, they're all open to all rural residents and  
9 that's because there's been no C&T determination made,  
10 thus, all rural residents are eligible to take the  
11 resources under the existing subsistence regulations.

12  
13                   Grouse and ptarmigan have been  
14 determined by the State, a C&T determination was made  
15 by the State and that was adopted by the Federal  
16 program back in 1990, so we do have a C&T on the  
17 records for grouse and ptarmigan, and that includes  
18 rural residents of Unit 11, 13, 15, 16, 20(D), ,22, 23,  
19 and the village of Chickaloon. So that's what we have  
20 in regulations right now for grouse and ptarmigan in  
21 Unit 22. Again, that was adopted from the State.

22  
23                   Very little specific data are available  
24 for these species and that's why we combined all these  
25 proposals into one analysis. Proposals 51 and 52  
26 requested this unlimited harvest and the year-round  
27 season for ground squirrel and porcupines as I  
28 mentioned. Ground squirrels and porcupine and are  
29 considered unclassified wildlife in our regulations,  
30 and as such they're not listed in the Federal  
31 regulation book. So any wildlife that is listed in  
32 Federal regulations -- that's not listed in the book is  
33 considered unclassified and unclassified wildlife are  
34 automatically -- they automatically have an unlimited  
35 harvest limits and seasons that go year-round.

36  
37                   So because of that, what they've asked  
38 for they already have so we haven't done anything more  
39 with that request which was their Proposal 51 and 52.  
40 So that's as far as we went with that analysis was to  
41 inform them that what they're asking for they already  
42 have because it's unclassified wildlife.

43  
44                   So the analysis for the rest of the  
45 species, the eight factors, this is a C&T determination  
46 or C&T analysis as to process. I won't go through all  
47 eight factors here in this presentation, just focus on  
48 what the harvest has been and where it's been and the  
49 analysis provides the other remaining eight factors  
50 that you can look through.

1                   The information on some of the  
2 resources, as I said earlier, is very sparse,  
3 particularly on porcupine, ptarmigan and squirrel.

4  
5                   The long-term pattern of use that the  
6 analyst found is that beaver have only -- they've only  
7 recently colonized the western portion of the Seward  
8 Peninsula in Unit 22(E) and they're likely not  
9 harvested in much of that area. They're believed to be  
10 increasing in Unit 22(E) in the Serpentine River area  
11 and they're not found at all on St. Lawrence Island,  
12 that portion of Unit 22.

13  
14                   All of the furs have been traditionally  
15 used from these species. From beaver, have been  
16 traditionally used in clothing and incorporated into  
17 Native art as symbols, drawings, etchings, figurines  
18 and masks. Some of the furbearers are occasionally  
19 harvested on St. Lawrence Island, Little Diomed  
20 Island when they've traveled to those areas. So other  
21 furbearers besides beaver that occur in those areas  
22 have been harvested on those islands.

23  
24                   The lynx populations, they grow and  
25 decline according to the size of the hare populations,  
26 which is their major food source. And we have little  
27 information on the use of those species, other than  
28 knowing that there has been use increase in times of  
29 more abundance.

30  
31                   In Unit 22(A) lynx are common and  
32 increasing at this time.

33  
34                   In Unit 22(B) lynx are increasing  
35 although they are still somewhat scarce.

36  
37                   Marten are not found throughout all of  
38 Unit 22 and occur most frequently in the forested areas  
39 of the Seward Peninsula and Eastern Norton Sound.

40  
41                   And wolverine has been used for  
42 trimming around faces and garment making throughout the  
43 Seward Peninsula so there's a record of use of that  
44 species.

45  
46                   The other information on the use of  
47 these species are found on the table on Page 136 in the  
48 analysis and I won't go through anymore than that.

49  
50                   As far as areas of use go, there are no

1 maps of use areas for these resources, however, the  
2 resources are taken in the proximity of the villages,  
3 so that's kind of the extent of our knowledge about  
4 where they're used.

5  
6                   There's some anecdotal information  
7 regarding subsistence users from outside of Unit 22  
8 coming into Unit 22 to harvest these resources, but  
9 there's little information regarding these uses in the  
10 literature or in harvest data bases, so we know only  
11 from anecdotal information that people from outside of  
12 Unit 22 use these resources.

13  
14                   So the effect of this proposal, if it  
15 was to be adopted, would be that all rural residents in  
16 Unit 22 would be eligible to harvest the resources in  
17 these proposals because they're either -- there's  
18 either no determinations or very broad determinations,  
19 thus, there would be no change in the harvest  
20 opportunity for Unit 22 residents if these proposals  
21 were adopted.

22  
23                   But adopting the proposals would have  
24 effect on users outside of Unit 22. Now, they have the  
25 opportunity to harvest because the C&T determination  
26 says all rural residents so if it was adopted for just  
27 Unit 22 residents, those people who harvest from  
28 outside the unit would not be able to utilize the  
29 resources.

30  
31                   Some communities from the surrounding  
32 units have C&T in Unit 22 for other species and likely  
33 to be traveling into Unit 22 and may take these small  
34 animals in association with those activities. For  
35 example, residents of 21(D), west of the Koyukuk and  
36 Yukon Rivers have C&T for caribou in parts of Unit 22  
37 so they may be traveling in there and using these other  
38 species opportunistically. And residents of 21(D) north  
39 and west of the Yukon River have C&T for wolves in  
40 Unit 22, so if they're traveling in Unit 22 to harvest  
41 wolves or trap wolves they wouldn't be able to harvest  
42 these small animals if the C&T determination was made.

43  
44                   So some people from the adjacent units  
45 may be affected by this decision if this determination  
46 is adopted.

47  
48                   So our Staff recommendation at this  
49 time -- our preliminary conclusion is to defer the  
50 proposals for all these proposals, and the reason being

1 is that these proposals should be deferred to give  
2 adjacent Regional Advisory Councils and the public the  
3 opportunity to provide information regarding the use of  
4 beaver Arctic Fox, red fox, hare, lynx, marten,  
5 wolverine, spruce grouse, ptarmigan, including both  
6 willow and rock ptarmigan, ground squirrel and  
7 porcupine by residents from the surrounding units of  
8 Unit 22.

9  
10 So what we'd like to find out from  
11 anyone in these surrounding units, including residents  
12 of this region as to what their use has been of these  
13 resources. So by deferring the proposal we'd allow  
14 Staff to gather more information about these uses and  
15 talk to more people and be able to provide a better  
16 recommendation to the Board.

17  
18 So I've got a note here from the author  
19 to please ask the Council if they have any information  
20 on the uses of anyone, by anyone from the western  
21 region of taking any of these resources in Unit 22.

22  
23 Mr. Chairman, that is all I have.

24  
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. ADF&G.

26  
27 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. Glenn  
28 handed that wand over to me to give their comments.

29  
30 So they're found on Page 140, and they  
31 support with modification these  
32 proposals. They support a customary  
33 and traditional use finding be made for  
34 these species but believe the analysis  
35 should be expanded to include rural  
36 residents outside the unit who may have  
37 a history of harvesting within the  
38 unit. One step in this process is to  
39 have the Regional Advisory Councils in  
40 adjoining units review these proposals  
41 at their winter 2006. This is an early  
42 comment from the State. Additional  
43 information may be available through  
44 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game,  
45 Division of Subsistence technical  
46 papers. The Department does not object  
47 to this proposal being deferred to  
48 2007.

49  
50 So that's the State's comments.

1                   And I do have the actions of the two  
2 Councils that have reviewed this so far.

3  
4                   CHAIRMAN SAM: And they were.

5  
6                   MR. MATHEWS: Both of them are to  
7 defer. Yukon-Kuskokwim deferred and they said hunters  
8 from their area do utilize these species in the Seward  
9 Peninsula area, there is a need to gather more  
10 information on this issue before a decision is made.  
11 We'll just leave it at that.

12  
13                   Seward Penn took it up and they said  
14 that more information needs to be gathered and that  
15 Fish and Wildlife Service will work with Kawarek on  
16 these proposals.

17  
18                   And those are the two Councils that  
19 have reviewed this.

20  
21                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.

22  
23                   MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. There were  
24 no written comments.

25  
26                   CHAIRMAN SAM: It has always been  
27 Western Interior's stand that when it's area specific  
28 we would rather defer to the home region. So.....

29  
30                   MR. WALKER: Do you need a motion.

31  
32                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

33  
34                   MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
35 I'd like to make a motion to defer it back to the home  
36 region.

37  
38                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

39  
40                   MR. JONES: Second the motion.

41  
42                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Benedict  
43 Jones. All those in favor of the motion signify.....

44  
45                   MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

46  
47                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

48  
49                   MR. REAKOFF: I want to comment, I'm  
50 sure we've got people from Kaltag hunting over in Unit

1 22 for wolves and stuff and I feel that OSM should do a  
2 little more work on trying to find out who is, in our  
3 region, that's hunting over there. We don't want to  
4 close the door on our users.

5  
6 So at this time we can defer it, but I  
7 do feel that -- to the home region, but I do feel that  
8 we should -- our anthropologist should investigate  
9 looking at customary use of those animals, especially  
10 wolverine and fox when people go over there following  
11 that trail over to the coast.

12  
13 So that would be my comment.

14  
15 Thank you.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further comments.

18  
19 MR. STICKMAN: This is Mickey in  
20 Nulato.

21  
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Mickey.

23  
24 MR. STICKMAN: Yeah, I concur with Jack  
25 because, well, I know there's some guys down in Kaltag  
26 that they use the Kaltag Unalakleet trail, they do have  
27 some marten trap lines over there too so -- and they go  
28 over there and they hunt caribou and, yeah, they do get  
29 wolves and I think they do some -- they also do some  
30 bear hunting over on the Kaltag Unalakleet trail in the  
31 springtime.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Mickey. Judy  
34 Gottlieb.

35  
36 MS. GOTTLIEB: Thank you, Mr. Chair and  
37 members of the Council. I'm Judy Gottlieb from  
38 National Park Service.

39  
40 I just wanted to mention that I was at  
41 the Seward Peninsula meeting when they discussed this.  
42 And so just for some background the intent was not to  
43 exclude adjacent areas or Councils or regions, that was  
44 not the intent. And so their Chair, Grace Cross,  
45 encouraged the Council to defer so they could get input  
46 from the adjacent regions because they don't want to  
47 exclude anybody.

48  
49 So appreciate what you're saying here  
50 and if there's way that people can provide information

1 to OSM during the next few months that would be really  
2 helpful for the analysis.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Judy. Again,  
7 we always defer to home region but we do have crossover  
8 uses especially with that Kaltag Unalakleet Trail,  
9 Northwest Arctic through Allakaket, Alatna, Huslia and  
10 Hughes, so we do have crossovers.

11

12 But when we defer to the home region  
13 it's just that we're not throwing it away, it just  
14 becomes clear that even the home region wants more  
15 information, and we, as adjacent Council, we need more  
16 information and it becomes clear from both the ADF&G  
17 Staff and Staff recommendation that we don't have  
18 enough information to even act on this.

19

20 So as Chair, I'm trying to say that  
21 deferring the motion is not throwing it away all we're  
22 doing is putting it off until another time.

23

24 Any further comments.

25

26 Ray.

27

28 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. Could we  
29 pick -- make sure that we put in our comments there  
30 that we would like the subsistence Staff to  
31 particularly visit Kaltag contact Kaltag so they could  
32 get their input. Because if they're not aware of it,  
33 we don't have somebody sitting here from there, we need  
34 somebody to contact them so we could get their input  
35 into it.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, we have Bob  
38 Nicholas with us, he's been with us all day, I gave him  
39 a handbook so he's going to take that home, and I'm  
40 glad to welcome him here.

41

42 Any further comments.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, all those in  
47 favor of deferring Proposals 42 through 52 signify by  
48 saying aye.

49

50 IN UNISON: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.  
2  
3 (No opposing votes)  
4  
5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. Go  
6 ahead, Dan.  
7  
8 MR. LAPLANT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
9 Yes, I'll pass this information on to our analyst Helen  
10 Armstrong who's working on this and we'll make sure we  
11 contact the folks in Kaltag and, again, just repeating  
12 the request that if you know of any other users from  
13 the Western Interior that travel to that area we'd like  
14 to know about it and you could contact Helen Armstrong  
15 or myself and anybody else at OSM and we can make those  
16 contacts and gather that information so we can update  
17 the analysis and bring it back to you for  
18 consideration.  
19  
20 Thank you.  
21  
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Vince.  
23  
24 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. That  
25 brings us up to a series of proposals in Unit 18  
26 starting off with Proposal 27, and I gather Pete's  
27 going to present that then.  
28  
29 So Pete, are you on line still?  
30  
31 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes, I am.  
32  
33 MR. MATHEWS: Okay.  
34  
35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Pete,  
36 introduction.  
37  
38 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. The analysis  
39 of Proposal 27 you can find in your book on Page 142,  
40 Page 142 of your book. Proposal 27 was submitted by  
41 the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Council and the  
42 Council requests that the establishment of a Federal  
43 Controlled Use Area for all moose seasons in the lower  
44 Yukon River drainage within Unit 18.  
45  
46 Mr. Chair, this proposal is being  
47 presented to you because it affects the residents of  
48 Aniak and the residents of Upper Kalskag. This  
49 proposal was originally deferred by the Board as  
50 Proposal 11 last year at the 2005 meeting. The Board's

1 decision to defer Proposal 11 was based on its limited  
2 jurisdiction to implement an effective controlled use  
3 areas because of the mixed land jurisdictions within  
4 the affected area.

5  
6                   The Council also submitted a companion  
7 proposal to the Alaska Board of Game, which is State  
8 Proposal 9 at its October 2005 meeting. The Alaska  
9 Board of Game rejected Proposal 9 in November of 2005  
10 based on their conclusion that the current level of  
11 impacts from fly in hunters, impacts on the resource  
12 and on the affected users are insignificant.

13  
14                   Proposals 11 and Proposal 27 and the  
15 State Proposal 9 were submitted because of local  
16 concerns of aerial moose spotting by lower Unit 18  
17 moose hunters who fly from areas south of the Yukon  
18 River drainage to a lower portion of the Yukon River to  
19 hunt moose. Local residents have reported seeing non-  
20 local fly in hunters spotting moose from privately  
21 owned aircraft during the Federal seasons in lower  
22 Yukon River drainage.

23  
24                   Mr. Chair. The proposed regulations  
25 can be seen on Page 143 of your Council books under the  
26 heading of proposed Federal regulations, and at the  
27 bottom of the page, that lower paragraph would be the  
28 proposed language which would describe the proposed  
29 closed area for the controlled use area in Unit 18.

30  
31                   A reported total of one moose was taken  
32 in the affected area by fly in hunters from south of  
33 the Yukon River drainage in Unit 18 during the period  
34 of 1998, '99 through the regulatory year of 2003/2004.  
35 If this proposal is adopted by the Federal Board,  
36 Federally-qualified subsistence users would be  
37 restricted from accessing traditional hunt areas in the  
38 lower Yukon drainage with privately owned aircraft to  
39 hunt moose.

40  
41                   If this proposal is adopted by the  
42 Board it would fail to address the concerns because of  
43 the complex land ownership within the affected area.

44  
45                   The Federal Board's jurisdiction does  
46 not include flight rules for pilots and their  
47 passengers who spot moose over Federal lands and those  
48 who spot moose and access State jurisdiction by  
49 privately owned aircraft. It is important to mention,  
50 Mr. Chair, that the Board has not established any

1 Federal only controlled use areas in Alaska.  
2 Controlled use areas are established by the State of  
3 Alaska in state access restrictions within the  
4 controlled use area are mirrored in the Federal  
5 subsistence regulations (ph) (phone cuts out).  
6

7 Local concerns about aerial moose  
8 spotting should be directed toward the local State and  
9 Federal land managers who can address these issues  
10 through proper law enforcement channels.  
11

12 With that, Mr. Chair, the Staff  
13 conclusion is to support the proposal.  
14

15 Thank you.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Pete. Vince.  
18

19 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. That  
20 brings us up to the Department of Fish and Game comment  
21 on it, they do not support the proposal. The  
22 Department is unaware of any information that supports  
23 the need for a creation of the proposed controlled use  
24 area on Federal public lands. The Board of Game  
25 considered but did not adopt a similar proposal at its  
26 November 2005 meeting. Department records indicate  
27 that only two hunters have reported using aircraft in  
28 the area since 2000 and only one of those hunters  
29 successfully harvested a moose. The proposed  
30 controlled use area would only apply to Federal public  
31 lands and would complicate the regulations.  
32

33 Because the moose population in this  
34 area is healthy and growing establishing a controlled  
35 use area would be an unnecessarily restrict  
36 opportunity. So they're in opposition, the Department.  
37

38 And, Mr. Chairman, the YK Council did  
39 meet on this if you'd like their action.  
40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.  
42

43 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman.  
44

45 The Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional  
46 Council took up Proposal 27, they voted  
47 to support without modification.  
48

49 Their reasoning is, is there are local  
50 concerns about aerial moose spotting in

1 lower Unit 18. Residents within the  
2 proposed area feel that spotting moose  
3 from an aircraft creates an unfair  
4 advantage over rural users who do not  
5 practice this method for locating moose  
6 during the winter season. Subsistence  
7 users in this area travel by land and  
8 by water. Spotting by aircraft is not  
9 fair for those harvesting by land and  
10 water.

11  
12 The Council feels the need to maintain  
13 the abundance of moose in this area by  
14 restricting access.

15  
16 So they are in support of this  
17 proposal.

18  
19 There was no written public comments  
20 that I'm aware of.

21  
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. So what this  
23 proposal is trying to do then is trying to address the  
24 issue of aerial spotting rather than establishing a  
25 controlled use area; is that the biggest conflict?

26  
27 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. I could  
28 answer that question.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

31  
32 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, go ahead, Pete.

33  
34 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. The biggest  
35 problem is that because of the mixed land jurisdiction  
36 between Federal and State private land, that if the  
37 Federal Board would adopt this proposal would create a  
38 mixed block of land jurisdictions that would be closed  
39 and some would be open. So it would not fully address  
40 the proponent's concern.

41  
42 And also it would make it difficult for  
43 people to try to determine where Federal lands stop and  
44  
45 where State lands start and vice versa. It'd be  
46 difficult for people to make that determination in  
47 certain areas in the lower river.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. We'll move  
50 on to Regional Council recommendation. The Chair will

1 entertain a motion, or whatever, the Council member  
2 want. Action, no action.  
3  
4 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman,  
5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.  
7  
8 MR. REAKOFF: Make a motion to adopt  
9 WP06-27 for discussion.  
10  
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.  
12  
13 (No comments)  
14  
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion died for lack of  
16 a second. Any further discussion.  
17  
18 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.  
19  
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.  
21  
22 MR. REAKOFF: My main discussion would  
23 revolve around people from Aniak and down in the --  
24 knew that -- are there people that fly down there into  
25 Unit 18 to harvest moose from our region. discussion  
26  
27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further comments.  
28  
29 (No comments)  
30  
31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Where does that put us  
32 in parliamentary rules, no action.  
33  
34 Vince.  
35  
36 MR. MATHEWS: Well, Mr. Chairman, you  
37 did that earlier and so the Council takes no action on  
38 this proposal.  
39  
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Consensus.  
41  
42 (Council nods affirmatively)  
43  
44 CHAIRMAN SAM: No action on 27. Pete,  
45 28 and 29.  
46  
47 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. The analysis  
48 of Proposal 28 and 29 you can find in your books on  
49 Page 150. The Proposals 28 and 29 were submitted by  
50 the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge.

1                    Proposal 28 would request a change in  
2 existing 10 day to be announced winter moose season,  
3 December 20th, January 10th for the remainder of Unit  
4 (phone cuts out), the intent of Proposal 28 is to  
5 provide Federally-qualified users for a 22 winter  
6 season for the remainder of Unit 18, that portion north  
7 and the west of the line of Cape Romanzof to the  
8 Kusilvak Mountains to Mountain Village and excluding  
9 all Yukon River villages up river from Mountain  
10 Village. That's for Proposal 28.

11  
12                    For Proposal 29, the request is to  
13 provide Federally-qualified users with the opportunity  
14 to harvest either one antlered bull or one calf that  
15 portion north and the west of a line from Cape Romanzof  
16 to Kusilvak Mountain to Mountain Village and excluding  
17 all Yukon River drainages up stream from Mountain  
18 Village.

19  
20                    Mr. Chair. This proposal is being  
21 presented to you because both Proposals 28, 29 affect  
22 the residents of upper Kalskag.

23  
24                    The proposed 22 day winter moose season  
25 and the proposed calf harvest were put into State and  
26 Federal regulations for the 2005/2006 regulatory year  
27 by State emergency order and also by Federal special  
28 action. At its November 2005 meeting the Alaska Board  
29 of Game adopted a 22 day winter season and expanded  
30 harvest limit for calves that are also proposed in  
31 these proposals.

32  
33                    Mr. Chair, the proposed regulations  
34 could be found on Page 151 of your Council books with  
35 the proposed Federal regulations on Page 151.

36  
37                    The moose population along the Yukon  
38 River down to the coast has grown substantially in  
39 recent years and this population continues to grow  
40 rapidly with high production and survival rates of  
41 calves. If Proposal 28 and 29 are adopted by the  
42 Board, any additional harvest of moose population that  
43 would occur from a proposed action would hold the rate  
44 of population growth down somewhat. However, no  
45 detrimental impacts to the population are anticipated  
46 because in the lower river the population is  
47 essentially bounding.

48  
49                    Adoption of the proposed actions would  
50 also provide Federally-qualified users additional

1 opportunity to harvest moose and it would align the  
2 Federal and State winter seasons and harvest limits for  
3 the affected areas.

4  
5 Adverse impacts to the adult moose and  
6 adult -- I'm sorry, adverse impacts to the adult moose  
7 and abundant calf population are not anticipated as a  
8 result of adoption of Proposals 28 and 29.

9  
10 Mr. Chair. With that the preliminary  
11 conclusion are the following, would be to support  
12 Proposal 28 and support Proposal 29 with the  
13 modification to delegate the authority to the Refuge  
14 manager to close the calf season should it be necessary  
15 and to adopt the State's definition of calf as  
16 currently the Federal definitions lack a definition for  
17 the term calf. And what the Staff recommendation is so  
18 far is that the regulatory definition that we talk  
19 about as a modification to adopt the State's definition  
20 of calf, which follows and the term is calf, and the  
21 definition is a moose, caribou, elk, muskox, or bison  
22 less than 12 months old.

23  
24 And, with that, Mr. Chair, I'll stop  
25 and answer any questions you may have.

26  
27 Thank you.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Pete. For  
30 clarification purposes, if I remember right upper  
31 Kalskag was deleted from Western Interior to be united  
32 with lower Kalskag, I'm pretty sure it was passed by  
33 the Federal Subsistence Board also. I know we did that  
34 to unify upper Kalskag with lower Kalskag, do you  
35 remember that Carl?

36  
37 MR. MORGAN: I'm trying to think but I  
38 think we did that because the representative from that  
39 part of the country is from upper Kalskag and he does  
40 belong to the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Vince.

43  
44 MR. MATHEWS: Hopefully I can shed some  
45 light on this. I think what we did is upper Kalskag is  
46 part of the domination process for the Yukon-Kuskokwim  
47 Delta Regional Council. I don't think we've moved any  
48 unit boundary.

49  
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'm positive that we did

1 so let's leave it at that.

2

3

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

4

5

CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further  
6 questions for Pete while we're on line.

7

8

(No comments)

9

10

CHAIRMAN SAM: ADF&G.

11

12

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. I hope I  
13 can do this justice because this is kind of confusing  
14 to me, but there are comments from the Alaska  
15 Department of Fish and Game on Proposal 28 and 29.

16

17

For 28 they support with modification.  
18 Basically adoption of this proposal  
19 would align with the Federal and State  
20 winter moose season dates in the  
21 remainder of Unit 18. In order to be  
22 consistent with the Board of Game  
23 actions in November 2005 the harvest  
24 limit should be changed from one bull  
25 to one antlered bull. The Board of  
26 Game also excluded part of the  
27 remainder of Unit 18 from the scope of  
28 the proposal it adopted.

29

30

In Unit 18, that portion north and west  
31 of the line of Cape Romanzof to  
32 Kusilvak Mountain to Mountain Village  
33 excluding all the Yukon River drainages  
34 up river from Mountain Village. The  
35 Board authorized the Department to  
36 close portions of this area to the  
37 taking of calves by emergency order.  
38 Therefore, the Department recommends  
39 that the same provisions be included in  
40 Federal regulations so that Federal and  
41 State regulations are consistent.

42

43

So 28 they want with modification.

44

45

With 29 they support with modification.  
46 Adoption as the proposal as written  
47 would establish a set winter season and  
48 part of the remainder of Unit 18. In  
49 order to match the actions of the Board  
50 of Game in November 2005, the Board the

1 proposed winter season and harvest  
2 limit should apply only to Unit 18,  
3 that portion north and west, which I  
4 already read earlier.  
5  
6 So they're basically wanting on both 28  
7 and 29 to align with actions of the Board of Game at  
8 November 2005.  
9  
10 So that's the Department's comments.  
11  
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: InterAgency.  
13  
14 (No comments)  
15  
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: None. Regional  
17 Councils.  
18  
19 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the  
20 Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Council took up both  
21 proposals, and if there's any questions there are Staff  
22 here that participated in that meeting.  
23  
24 On 28 the Regional Council supports the  
25 proposal. On 29 they support the  
26 proposal with the modification to add  
27 with its mother after the word calf.  
28 They felt that calf is described as an  
29 ungulate still with its mother. The  
30 regulatory language should add with its  
31 mother after the word, calf.  
32  
33 Justification. Calf harvest is not  
34 customary and traditional. There are  
35 concerns about the definition of a  
36 calf. It would be good to provide  
37 additional opportunity for the lower  
38 Yukon subsistence hunters to feed their  
39 families.  
40  
41 So, again, if there's questions on it,  
42 I understand there was fairly lengthy discussion on  
43 this description or definition of calf.  
44  
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.  
46  
47 MR. MATHEWS: No written comments on  
48 these proposals.  
49  
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: None. Thank you. At

1 this time to speed things up the Chair will entertain a  
2 motion to support YK-Delta's action, the home region.

3

4 MR. REAKOFF: So moved.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Jack, is there  
7 a second to support the home region's action.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: That didn't speed up,  
12 did it.

13

14 (Laughter)

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Died for lack of second.  
17 The Chair will entertain a motion to adopt Proposals  
18 WP06-28 and 29.

19

20 MR. REAKOFF: So moved.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Jack. Is there  
23 a second.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Died for lack of a  
28 second. No action by Western Interior.

29

30 Proposal 30. Go ahead, Pete.

31

32 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. The analysis  
33 for Proposal 30 you can find in your book on Page 157  
34 and Proposal -- this proposal was submitted by Henry S.  
35 Powers, III, of Bethel. The proponent requests the  
36 Board to eliminate the Federal regulatory closure  
37 restriction for the September 1 through 30 moose season  
38 in the remainder of Unit 18.

39

40 And, again, Mr. Chair, this proposal is  
41 being presented to you because it affects the residents  
42 of upper Kalskag.

43

44 The proponent feels that the Federal  
45 closure regulations for this area should be changed to  
46 allow for sport and recreational hunters from outside  
47 Unit 18 the opportunity to utilize Federal lands to  
48 hunt moose. The proposed regulations you see on Page  
49 157 under the heading of proposed Federal regulations.

50

1                   The non-resident closure was originally  
2 established by the Board in 1991 to ensure the  
3 subsistence needs and rights received first priority.  
4 This was important because of the low moose numbers at  
5 that time. I mentioned in the previous analysis that  
6 the moose population of Unit 18 remainder is  
7 essentially bounding and can sustain additional harvest  
8 than what is presently taken. This is the result of a  
9 five year moratorium on moose hunting and was a huge  
10 success in expanding the moose population to what it is  
11 today.

12  
13                   Harvest records reflect that harvest of  
14 moose by local users has increased the Yukon River  
15 portion of Unit 18 but harvest since 2002 appears to be  
16 stable by just over 200 bulls taken per year (ph)  
17 (phone cuts out).

18  
19                   If this proposal were adopted by the  
20 Federal Board, the proposed action is expected to have  
21 little biological effect on the lower Yukon River  
22 moose population and minimal effect on the (phone cuts  
23 out). Any increased harvest is expected to be  
24 initially minor. But the sociological and political  
25 effect of immediately removing this restriction could  
26 be detrimental to the success of future management  
27 actions and cooperative efforts with the Yukon River  
28 communities.

29  
30                   Mr. Chair, this is not an easy issue to  
31 analyze. It is very complex. It involves much more  
32 than just looking at the biology of the moose  
33 population. It looks at much more -- it involves much  
34 more than just looking at the harvest. The deferral of  
35 this proposal is recommended for continuing the ongoing  
36 cooperative management necessary to effectively manage  
37 the resources of Unit 18. The history of public  
38 cooperation that established three moose hunting  
39 moratoria and also the success of the Delta Goose  
40 Management Plan in Unit 18, these were achieved through  
41 broad public involvement of local residents, not to  
42 mention the sacrifices that were made by local  
43 residents during the moratorium on moose hunting.

44  
45                   A deferral of the proposed action would  
46 allow for additional public involvement and discussions  
47 between diverse user groups such as subsistence hunters  
48 and air taxi operators and transporters. It is  
49 unlikely that the lower Yukon River moose population  
50 would even exist if it were not for the voluntary

1 actions taken by lower Yukon residents.

2

3

4 Mr. Chair, again, if we look at just  
5 the status of the moose population and the harvest,  
6 it's hard to justify the continuation of the closure.  
7 But because there's the much larger picture of social  
8 and also political issues that can't be analyzed in a  
9 biological analysis, the Staff conclusion is to defer  
10 action on this proposal.

10

11

Thank you.

12

13

CHAIRMAN SAM: ADF&G.

14

15

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

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

Consequently, we recommend this  
proposal be resubmitted for  
reconsideration for the 2007/08 Federal  
regulatory year.

CHAIRMAN SAM: InterAgency.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Regional  
Council actions.

1 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The  
2 Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Council took this up and  
3 they opposed it.

4  
5 They oppose it because they want to  
6 listen to their elders. Many of the  
7 people from the YK-Delta, Yukon area  
8 have expressed concerns about this  
9 proposal.

10  
11 There is a concern that the needs of  
12 the lower Yukon villages are not being  
13 met.

14  
15 There are concerns about changing  
16 environment and the stability of the  
17 moose population. There are concerns  
18 about the people of the lower Yukon  
19 being able to get enough moose to feed  
20 their families for future generations.

21  
22 YK Council then, obviously, opposes the  
23 proposal.

24  
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Summary of written  
26 public comments.

27  
28 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, they're  
29 quite lengthy on Page 162 and 163 so I'll just capture  
30 the key points.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: I see there are quite a  
33 few.

34  
35 MR. MATHEWS: Ted Hamilton of the  
36 Emmonak Tribal Council opposes the proposal.

37  
38 He feels that right now there are not  
39 enough moose in Unit 18 to even fill  
40 half the freezers in the village. If  
41 there should happen to be a big flood  
42 in the lower Yukon Delta, they stand a  
43 chance of losing up to half of the  
44 moose population because they are  
45 basically in a flood plain.

46  
47 So basically he opposes the proposal.

48  
49 Glenn Fredricks, the president of  
50 Georgetown Tribal Council also opposes

1 it. I don't have a copy of the  
2 resolution but anyways following the  
3 letter they are going to -- the Board,  
4 I assume is going to receive a  
5 resolution from the Native Village of  
6 Georgetown requesting the Federal  
7 Subsistence Board reject this proposal.  
8

9 The self-imposed moratorium on moose  
10 hunting has meant that some of our  
11 members have had to go without moose  
12 meat to feed their families and as the  
13 high cost of gas prices has made it  
14 impossible to travel far enough to  
15 hunt. Our members understand that this  
16 sacrifice is necessary to provide for a  
17 sustainable moose population in the  
18 future.  
19

20 We do not support any sporthunting  
21 activity which may further jeopardize  
22 the goal of this sacrifice.  
23

24 There was 18 individuals and  
25 organizations located in the Yukon  
26 Delta Region that opposes the proposal  
27 for several reasons with the main one  
28 to protect the subsistence lifestyle,  
29 and they're listed on Page 163.  
30 They're individuals from Quinhagak to  
31 people from Emmonak Tribal Council and  
32 the village of lower Kalskag, but  
33 they're all listed on Page 163.  
34

35 Those are all the written comments that  
36 I'm aware of, Mr. Chair.  
37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Vince. At  
39 this time the Chair will entertain a motion to adopt  
40 WP06-30.  
41

42 (No comments)  
43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: No action by Western  
45 Interior.  
46

47 Dinner at 6:30. What is the pleasure  
48 of the Board, do you want to stop now, or we got a few  
49 more proposals.  
50

1 MR. WALKER: Let's do them.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN SAM: What's that?  
4  
5 MR. WALKER: Do the next one.  
6  
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: You want to keep going  
8 or do you want to give people time to set up, we got  
9 about one hour.  
10  
11 MR. WALKER: How many more do we have,  
12 we have 61?  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah. Keep going.  
15  
16 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.  
17  
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray.  
19  
20 MR. COLLINS: I think we should.....  
21  
22 REPORTER: Ray. Ray.  
23  
24 MR. COLLINS: Excuse me. We should  
25 keep this letter in hand there from the Emmonak Tribal  
26 Council because I notice that last sentence it says,  
27 another thing to mention is that the up river moose  
28 population is going down, this means that up river  
29 subsistence hunters may come down to GMU 18 to hunt in  
30 an already overcrowded area. We could use that when  
31 they come in with a new proposal to be able to come up  
32 river and hunt in our already crowded area.  
33  
34 (Laughter)  
35  
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you for that  
37 notification. Well said. You want to keep going then.  
38  
39 (Council nods affirmatively)  
40  
41 MR. WALKER: I suppose.  
42  
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Proposal 61.  
44  
45 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman,  
46 Proposal 61 is to close the moose season within a  
47 portion of Denali National Park and Preserve in Unit  
48 20(C) as in Charlie, and Dan LaPlant is going to be  
49 presenting that.  
50

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Introduction.

2

3 MR. LAPLANT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
4 Proposal 61, the analysis begins on Page 164, actually  
5 the executive summary and 165 is where the analysis  
6 begins and Page 166 is a map that illustrates the area  
7 we'll be discussing.

8

9 This proposal was submitted by a Jeff  
10 Barney of Fairbanks. He requests that the moose  
11 hunting season in the Kantishna area Denali National  
12 Park in Unit 20(C) be closed due to concerns about low  
13 moose population in that area. The proponent wants  
14 hunting stopped so that the moose population can  
15 rebuild.

16

17 The proposed closed area is marked on  
18 the map on Page 166, it's that cross-hatched area that  
19 would be east of Bear Creek and west of the Toklat  
20 River in the Kantishna area of the Park.

21

22 And based on survey counts by the  
23 National Park Service moose numbers and densities have  
24 declined in the Kantishna area and if you look on Page  
25 168, Table 1 there illustrates that the densities have  
26 declined. Park biologists are unsure of what might be  
27 causing the decline in the population. During 2003 and  
28 2004 surveys, bull comprised about half of the  
29 estimated population of the Kantishna area, the high  
30 bull/cow ratios representative of the vicinity is over  
31 the ADF&G's management objective, so we have a high  
32 bull/cow ratio but a declining density.

33

34 During the September moose season,  
35 subsistence users typically obtain a road permit from  
36 the Park and they drive to Kantishna and the  
37 surrounding vicinity to access hunting areas. Based on  
38 past records kept by the Park Service Staff there are  
39 low numbers of hunters and harvested bulls reported  
40 from the Kantishna area and that's displayed on Table 2  
41 there, on Page 168 there. The last several years  
42 there's been five, seven, and I guess in 2004 one  
43 hunter got a permit, received a permit and hunted the  
44 area but the harvest has been five moose in 2001, four  
45 in 2002 and three in 2003 and then no reported harvest  
46 in the last two years.

47

48 So since there is no season for cows  
49 under either the Federal or State regulations in all of  
50 Unit 20(C) the one bull harvest limit has little effect

1 on the reproductive potential of the moose population  
2 in the Kantishna area, so, again, the bull/cow ratios  
3 are high, there are excess number of bulls for  
4 maintaining the population or providing the  
5 reproductive potential of the population.

6  
7 So the Staff recommendation here is to  
8 oppose the proposal. And it's based on the fact that  
9 there are few users harvesting the small number of  
10 bulls and the impact on the moose population in the  
11 Kantishna vicinity appears to be minimal. So, again,  
12 Mr. Chairman, the Staff recommendation -- preliminary  
13 recommendation is to oppose the proposal.

14  
15 Thank you.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN SAM: ADF&G.

18  
19 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

20  
21 The Department does not support this  
22 proposal. There is no biological  
23 evidence to support a closure within  
24 the Park and Preserve lands west of the  
25 Toklat. Only a small amount of the  
26 hunting effort in this part of 20(C)  
27 occurs within the Park and Preserve.  
28 Eliminating the harvest of bulls would  
29 not have much positive impact on the  
30 moose population.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: InterAgency.

33  
34 (No comments)

35  
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Councils.

37  
38 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. Eastern  
39 Interior, we had to reschedule their meeting and  
40 they're not meeting until March 21st and 22nd, so  
41 they've not taken this up.

42  
43 Southcentral meets around those dates,  
44 I didn't memorize their dates, but Southcentral has not  
45 met yet.

46  
47 So no other Council has met that has  
48 jurisdiction in this area.

49  
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: At this time the Chair

1 will entertain a motion to adopt WP06-61.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Do we need to make a  
4 positive motion, I want to oppose it but I guess I move  
5 to adopt.

6

7 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Jack  
10 Reakoff. There's a motion on the floor to adopt WP06-  
11 61.

12

13 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

16

17 MR. COLLINS: The Denali SRC took this  
18 up and we opposed it obviously.

19

20 As stated there, very clearly, the  
21 harvest is very low and really this an effort to stop  
22 hunting, it's not to build the moose population because  
23 stopping the harvest of the bulls will do nothing to  
24 bring the population up. 148 bulls per 100 cows,  
25 although there aren't that many in the area, so there's  
26 almost twice as many bulls as you need. So the SRC  
27 which meant recently opposed this.

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

30

31 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman. I'll  
32 concur with Ray there. These statistical data reflects  
33 that even the population can sustain a five percent  
34 harvest rate, and they're far below that five percent  
35 so this is strictly an anti-subsistence proposal, and  
36 so I'm completely opposed to this one.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further comments.  
39 Vince.

40

41 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. Just so  
42 it's on the record that you did get written comments on  
43 them, and they're on Page 170. You can look at them,  
44 they're from the Alaska Regional Office of National  
45 Parks Conservation Association and then the AHTNA  
46 Subsistence Committee.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further comments.

49

50 (No comments)

1 MR. WALKER: Question.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called.  
4 All those in favor of adopting WP06-61 signify by  
5 saying aye.  
6  
7 (No aye votes)  
8  
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: All those opposed, same  
10 sign.  
11  
12 IN UNISON: Aye.  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: WP06-61 failed. Next  
15 proposal.  
16  
17 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the  
18 next proposal, Tom Kron will be leading. This one will  
19 take a little bit of time, but this is Proposal 63  
20 which is to allow the baiting for wolves in the Eastern  
21 Interior region, it starts on Page 171.  
22  
23 Thank you.  
24  
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Tom.  
26  
27 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. Members of  
28 the Council. This proposal is before you, it's a  
29 crossover proposal because Western Interior does have  
30 C&T in the Eastern Interior.  
31  
32 Proposal 63 was submitted by the  
33 Eastern Interior Regional Council and requests that  
34 wolf baiting be allowed during the hunting season in  
35 the Eastern Interior region in Units 12, 20 and 25.  
36 The proponent wants to provide additional opportunity  
37 for subsistence hunters to harvest wolves in the  
38 Eastern Interior Region. Under Federal Subsistence  
39 Management regulations, using bait to take wolves is  
40 specifically prohibited except with a trapping license  
41 during the trapping season. During the trapping season  
42 there is no requirement concerning the placement of  
43 bait in a trap, near a trap or whether a trap must be  
44 used with bait. During the trapping season with a  
45 trapping license, wolf baiting is already allowed under  
46 BLM, Fish and Wildlife Service and on National Park  
47 Service lands, but on National Park Service lands you  
48 cannot shoot a free-ranging wolf with a trapping  
49 license.  
50



1 bear baiting. Federal regulations specify that an  
2 ADF&G permit is required to bait black bears. The  
3 State and Federal governments have a number of safety  
4 and resource conservation requirements for hunters who  
5 wish to bait black bears. The Alaska Board of Game  
6 will be addressing a parallel proposal for wolf baiting  
7 in Units 12, 20 and 25 at their March 10th through 20th  
8 2006 meeting in Fairbanks. That's next week's Board  
9 meeting. It will be important to see what actions are  
10 taken by the Alaska Board of Game on this issue. It  
11 will be important to hear from the Regional Councils  
12 about how bait is currently used to harvest wolves. If  
13 the Eastern Interior, Western Interior and Southcentral  
14 Regional Councils recommend support for this proposal  
15 at their winter meetings and the Alaska Board of Game  
16 supports wolf baiting there will still be time for the  
17 Federal Subsistence Board to address this issue at the  
18 May 2006 meeting.

19

20 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: ADF&G.

23

24 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. The  
25 comments they submitted, they are neutral on this  
26 proposal.

27

28 Whether or not baiting of wolves should  
29 be authorized under hunting regulations  
30 on Federal public lands in Units 12, 20  
31 and 25 is unlikely to result in much  
32 increase in harvest and is not expected  
33 to create a conservation concern but  
34 their position is to remain neutral on  
35 this proposal.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: InterAgency.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: None. No other Regional  
42 Councils have met.

43

44 MR. MATHEWS: No, Mr. Chairman, they  
45 have not met, but two Subsistence Resource Commissions  
46 have taken up this proposal.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.

49

50 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman,

1 they're found on Page 179 and 180.

2

3

The AHTNA Subsistence Committee supports this proposal. The population of wolves is overabundant and allowing bait would increase the chance of harvesting more wolves.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

The National Parks Conservation Association opposes this proposal. They're saying that if there's a parallel proposal to the Board of Game as the writing in the proposal on the Federal side suggests, it becomes questionable whether the true intent of this proposed regulation can be considered subsistence. The Conservation Association is concerned that the use of bait to increase wolf kills in Units 12, 20 and 25, which includes portions of Wrangell-St. Elias and Denali National Park and Preserve and all of the Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve, by providing additional opportunity for its hunters is nothing more than predator control in disguise and it should be considered that.

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

The Conservation Association does not feel the intent is to provide for subsistence opportunity but it is rather to make killing wolves easier. The opportunity to kill wolves exists under current regulations. Killing wolves for the sake of reducing wolf populations is not consistent with the Congressional intent that units of the National Park Service should be providing for natural and healthy wildlife population, therefore, this proposal should not be adopted.

44

45

46

47

The Alaska Defenders of Wildlife submitted a letter also. They oppose the proposal.

48

49

50

1. Liberal seasons and no bag limits in all three units at present allow sufficient opportunity for subsistence

1 uses of wolves. Baiting is not  
2 justified.  
3  
4 2. Even if justification was offered  
5 for baiting, the proposal offers no  
6 system to administrate or limit baiting  
7 practices such as provided in State  
8 regulations.  
9  
10 3. There's a serious question about  
11 whether baiting as it is commonly  
12 practiced is customary and traditional  
13 subsistence activity under Title VIII  
14 of ANILCA.  
15  
16 4. Again, this type of proposal is  
17 primarily a predator control measure  
18 for which there is no authorization in  
19 Federal subsistence law except as a  
20 responsibility as the individual land  
21 managing agency with additional review  
22 and procedures.  
23  
24 So, again, the National Parks  
25 Conservation Association, Alaska Defenders of Wildlife  
26 oppose this proposal.  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Vince. At  
29 this time the Chair will entertain a motion to adopt  
30 WP06-63.  
31  
32 MR. COLLINS: I'll make that motion for  
33 purposes of opposing.  
34  
35 MR. WALKER: I'll second.  
36  
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Ray Collins and  
38 seconded by, Tina?  
39  
40 REPORTER: Robert.  
41  
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert Walker. Council  
43 deliberation, comments.  
44  
45 Ray.  
46  
47 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, the  
48 Denali SRC took this up and we opposed it because the  
49 harvest is already allowed by trappers during the  
50 season. In the spring when they're proposing, as some

1 of them argue, the hides are not necessarily prime late  
2 in the season then and it will just provide more  
3 ammunition for those who are opposed to any kind of  
4 wolf harvest and use if we were actually using bait out  
5 there in the spring when we weren't going to be selling  
6 the hides.

7  
8                   So we opposed it. And I personally  
9 couldn't see any reason for this.

10  
11                   The other thing we said is who would  
12 want to sit out there over bait for hours waiting for a  
13 wolf to come as leery as they are, it doesn't seem like  
14 a very smart move.

15  
16                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Vince.

17  
18                   MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. Just  
19 because this is a sensitive proposal, this is the only  
20 reason I'm doing this. Because Ray serves on that  
21 Commission, but the letter that I got from the  
22 Commission which is signed by the Chair, on Proposal  
23 63, is that a motion in support of deferring the  
24 proposal was passed unanimously.

25  
26                   MR. COLLINS: Deferring okay.

27  
28                   MR. MATHEWS: So baiting of wolves is  
29 not a traditional subsistence activity in Denali Park  
30 area, therefore, this proposal would have little  
31 effect, so that mirrors what Ray is saying, but the  
32 action according to the letter submitted to the Federal  
33 Subsistence Board is to defer.

34  
35                   MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I stand corrected.

36  
37                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any further  
38 comments. Go ahead, Vince.

39  
40                   MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, Wrangell-St. Elias  
41 supports this, I think I already covered that,  
42 increased opportunity so the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC  
43 supports it. Denali deferred it with the cautionary  
44 statements as shared.

45  
46                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further comments.

47  
48                   MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

49  
50                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

1 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman. Eastern  
2 Interior, I think, has more bear baiters over there and  
3 they might see wolves when they're baiting bears. I  
4 don't know of many people baiting bears in our region  
5 myself, and so I would prefer to defer this back to  
6 Eastern Interior, and they can just do what they want  
7 over there. This is their baby so I wouldn't want to  
8 oppose their proposal, I would rather prefer to defer  
9 it.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: We do have a motion on  
12 the floor. We will act on it one way or another.

13  
14 Any further comments, it has been  
15 seconded.

16  
17 (No comments)

18  
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: All those in favor of  
20 adopting WP06-63 signify by saying aye.

21  
22 (No aye votes)

23  
24 CHAIRMAN SAM: All those opposed, same  
25 sign.

26  
27 IN UNISON: Aye.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN SAM: WP06-63 fails. Where  
30 does that put is, Vince.

31  
32 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, that brings us up  
33 to an Eastern Interior proposal that was to extend the  
34 wolf hunting season in Eastern Interior Region.

35  
36 Again, for Winchell, I think I covered  
37 this last night, the reason you're looking at Eastern  
38 Interior proposals and looking at Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta  
39 proposals is because there's a positive C&T  
40 determination. You don't just look at proposals  
41 because they are interesting.

42  
43 (Laughter)

44  
45 MR. MATHEWS: You know, so with that  
46 Pete DeMatteo will be covering Proposal 64.

47  
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Pete. How are  
49 you doing, are you tired out yet?

50

1 (Pause)

2

3

REPORTER: Pete, go ahead.

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

MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. The analysis of Proposal 64 can be found in your book on Page 182 and Proposal 64 was submitted by the Eastern Interior Region Council. The Council requests that the closing dates of the wolf hunting season for Units 12, 20 and 25 be changed from April 30 to a new closing date of May 31st.

The proposed regulatory change would provide an additional 31 days of opportunity for Federally-qualified users to harvest wolves in the affected areas. This proposal analysis is being presented to you today because the residents of Units 19, 21 and 24 have a positive customary and traditional use determination for wolves in Units 12, 20, except 20(F), and also Units 25(A), 25(B) and 25(C).

The proponent of this proposal would like to see additional opportunity for qualified residents to harvest wolves in the Eastern Interior Region. The proposed regulations can be seen on Page 182 of your book under the heading of proposed Federal regulations on Page 182. A parallel proposal was submitted to the Alaska Board of Game to allow wolf hunting in Units 12, 20 and 25 during the proposed 31 day season extension. That proposal to the State will be considered at the Alaska Board of Game's meeting this month, actually next week.

Because wolves are generally harvested by incidental take during the hunting season, the affected wolf populations can support the additional harvest that may occur during the proposed season extensions in Proposal 64. But if this proposal is adopted by the Board, adoption of the proposed season extension could cause inadvertent harvest of adult wolves with pups (ph) (phone cuts out) resulting in the abandonment of the young at the den site and subsequent additional mortality of wolf pups.

Although the harvest of wolves by firearms generally is through incidental take, the proposal would allow for taking wolves during a period when wolf pup survival could be impacted from the harvest of the respective parent wolves and other members of the pack that provide protection of the pups

1 at the den site.

2

3

4 Mr. Chair. The preliminary conclusion  
5 is to oppose the proposal based on the fact that the  
6 proposed season could have adverse impacts on the wolf  
7 pups and also wolf hides during the month of May are  
8 considered to be of less monetary value due to their  
9 sub-prime condition due to shedding. Harvest of wolves  
10 during the proposed season extensions would not provide  
11 Federally-qualified users with additional opportunity  
12 to harvest wolves with prime pelts for the making of  
13 clothing and handcrafts. However, unless, I must add,  
14 Mr. Chair, at the fall 2005 meeting of the Eastern  
15 Interior Council, the Council offered testimony saying  
16 that fur clothing sewers do use the shorter fur wolf  
17 pelts for making hats and also the Western Interior  
18 Council, you offered at your fall 2005 meeting that the  
19 pelts from yearling wolves are highly prized and sought  
20 after in the fall time for providing winter clothing.

20

21 Mr. Chair, with that, I'll stop there.

22

23 Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: ADF&G.

26

27 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman,  
28 similar to the last proposal, the Department is neutral  
29 on this proposal.

30

31 Extending the closing date of the wolf  
32 season on Federal public lands in this  
33 proposal from April to May 31st is not  
34 likely to result in much of an increase  
35 in harvest and is not expected to  
36 increase conservation concern.

37

38 Pelt quality may be an issue with  
39 wolves harvested late in the season.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.

42

43 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There  
44 were three written comments submitted.

45

46 The AHTNA Subsistence Committee support  
47 the proposal. The wolf population is  
48 abundant and can sustain a longer  
49 hunting season.

50

1 The Alaska Defenders of Wildlife  
2 submitted a letter. They oppose it.  
3 The harvest of wolves in May  
4 constitutes wasteful taking under  
5 Section .802 and .804 Title VIII of  
6 ANILCA.

7  
8 At this time of the year the pelt is  
9 poor quality. The taking of wolves in  
10 May during the critical denning time is  
11 inconsistent with sound management  
12 principles and is a threat to the  
13 conservation of healthy populations of  
14 wildlife and, therefore, is prohibited  
15 under Section .802.

16  
17 This is primarily a predator control  
18 measure for which there is no specific  
19 authorization in Federal subsistence  
20 law. Such activity is the  
21 responsibility of the individual  
22 agencies and must go through an  
23 intensive review.

24  
25 In State regulations all Interior Game  
26 Management Units are closed to the  
27 taking of wolves on April 30th. To add  
28 another month in these three units in  
29 Federal regulation would create serious  
30 enforcement problems.

31  
32 The National Parks and Conservation  
33 Association, the Alaska Regional Office  
34 also oppose it. They understand the  
35 existing season date of April 30th in  
36 those units includes parts of the  
37 Wrangell-St. Elias, Denali National  
38 Park and all the Yukon-Charley  
39 Preserve. That April season is set  
40 because the pelts lose most of their  
41 useful value as the winter turns into  
42 summer, as such, an extension of the  
43 season cannot be considered to benefit  
44 subsistence purposes and is another  
45 ill-conceived attempt to kill more  
46 wolves to benefit wolves in caribou  
47 populations.

48  
49 Intensively managing wildlife such as  
50 wolves to the benefit of moose, caribou

1 populations is contrary to the National  
2 Park Service policy. The Conservation  
3 Association does not feel the intent is  
4 to provide for a subsistence  
5 opportunity but rather it is just  
6 making killing of wolves easier. The  
7 opportunity to kill wolves exists under  
8 current regulations. Killing wolves  
9 for the sake of reducing wolf  
10 population is not consistent with  
11 Congressional intent for these units of  
12 the National Park System because they  
13 were established to provide for natural  
14 and healthy wildlife populations.

15  
16 Again, they oppose this proposal, it's  
17 the National Parks Conservation  
18 Association.

19  
20 Those are all the written comments  
21 submitted.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Vince. WP06-  
24 64, the Chair will entertain a motion to adopt WP06-64.

25  
26 MR. REAKOFF: So moved.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Jack Reakoff.  
29 Is there a second.

30  
31 MR. WALKER: Second.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Robert  
34 Walker. Board comments. Go ahead, Jack.

35  
36 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman. Actually  
37 these comments are correct. We have to stay within  
38 non-wasteful consumptive use and so extending the wolf  
39 season into May, when I've watched wads of hair coming  
40 out of them and they've got pups and stuff, I would  
41 consider a wasteful time of year to kill wolves, the  
42 fall time is a little bit different story.

43  
44 So I'm opposed to this proposal.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further comments.

47  
48 MR. WALKER: Question.

49  
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called

1 for. All those in favor of adopting WP06-64 signify by  
2 saying aye.

3  
4 (No aye votes)

5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

7  
8 IN UNISON: Aye.

9  
10 CHAIRMAN SAM: WP06-64 failed. Two  
11 more, 65.

12  
13 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Pete, will be  
14 covering Proposal 65 which deals with 26(A) caribou,  
15 and it starts on Page 189.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Pete.

18  
19 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, the analysis  
20 itself begins on Page 190 of your books. And this  
21 proposal was submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish  
22 and Game. The Department requests a regulatory change  
23 to remove the closed area for caribou in Unit 26(A).

24  
25 A review of this closure by the Office  
26 of Subsistence Management concluded that relative to a  
27 high abundance of caribou along with the high harvest  
28 of local hunters may warrant a more thorough review of  
29 this Federal closure. Most of the Federal public lands  
30 in the closure area lie within Gates of the Arctic  
31 National Park, which is already closed to non-  
32 subsistence hunting. Other Federal lands affected  
33 include a portion of Gates of the Arctic National  
34 Preserve, which is open to non-subsistence hunting  
35 accept for caribou harvest under this closure.

36  
37 Mr. Chair. There is a map that I will  
38 refer you to on Page 192. 192, at the bottom of the  
39 map, as you can see, the Federal closure area overlaps  
40 with some of the National Preserve which is also  
41 affected by the State Controlled Use area.

42  
43 Currently there are two Federal land  
44 closure areas (ph - telephone connection), lands north  
45 of Anaktuvuk Pass, formerly managed by the BLM that  
46 neither have been selected or conveyed, Native  
47 corporations or the State of Alaska are no longer  
48 Federal public land. Initially a closure was  
49 established at the Council's recommendation to lessen  
50 the impact on caribou migration by reducing competition

1 to non-subsistence hunting. Local subsistence users  
2 were concerned that non-subsistence hunters take the  
3 first caribou of the migration causing the migration to  
4 move away from the area subsistence users hunt in Unit  
5 26(A).

6  
7 In November of 2005, the Alaska Board  
8 of Game adopted a Controlled Use Area for the Anaktuvuk  
9 River drainage, which you can see on Page 192, and this  
10 went into effect beginning July 1st, 2006. The use of  
11 aircraft for caribou hunting is prohibited from August  
12 15th through October 15th. It was the intent of the  
13 Board of Game that this hunter transportation  
14 restriction effectively limit access for non-local  
15 hunters in the Anaktuvuk vicinity. As a result this  
16 would reduce the occurrence of user conflicts and  
17 lessen the impact on caribou migration in the Anaktuvuk  
18 Pass area.

19  
20 The populations of these three caribou  
21 herds whose ranges traverse Unit 26(A) are not  
22 currently a management concern. The harvestable  
23 surplus of these caribou populations is sufficient to  
24 provide for both subsistence and non-subsistence.

25  
26 There are fewer Federal public lands  
27 than when the closure was originally established. Only  
28 Gates of the Arctic National Preserve lands to the east  
29 of Anaktuvuk Pass would be affected by the continued  
30 closure. The Controlled Use Area for the Anaktuvuk  
31 River drainages -- establishes restrictions which  
32 should limit user conflicts and impacts on caribou  
33 migration.

34  
35 Mr. Chair. This analysis, of course,  
36 is being presented to you because it affects the  
37 residents of Anaktuvuk Pass and the preliminary  
38 conclusion is to support the proposal.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Pete. ADF&G.

41  
42 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The  
43 Department supports this proposal. Well, it's their  
44 proposal, so they support it, but they support lifting  
45 this restriction because it's unnecessary due to the  
46 small amount of Federal public land in this subunit and  
47 the abundant caribou populations that migrate through  
48 the area.

49  
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.

1 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It  
2 was kind of hard to interpret the written comment from  
3 the Alaska Regional Office of National Park  
4 Conservation Association.

5  
6 But when I attempted to summarize their  
7 letter, it basically came down to that  
8 the Federal Regional Advisory Councils  
9 need to identify where they are lacking  
10 data for making sound wildlife  
11 management decisions and whether they  
12 are considering a new closure or  
13 lifting an old closure or adjusting  
14 harvest levels or changing the length  
15 of a season, where data is lacking  
16 attention should be focused on  
17 approving the quality of the harvest  
18 data population data, et cetera.

19  
20 Only when the National Park Service is  
21 aware of incidences in which the data  
22 is lacking can it begin to direct  
23 necessary funds to improve scientific  
24 research and gathering.

25  
26 So the way I took this is basically  
27 they're saying you need to have good data to make  
28 decisions and if you know of areas that need data that  
29 you should develop a list and it appears to be to  
30 provide that to the National Park Service so to provide  
31 guidance to them on their use of their research money.

32  
33 Furthermore, there needs to be an  
34 analysis of potential impact on the  
35 future ability of the area to provide  
36 for moose and caribou for local  
37 subsistence users assuming harvest  
38 levels will increase as a result of the  
39 proposed lifting of hunting  
40 restrictions. That information needs  
41 to be developed and considered with  
42 these proposals.

43  
44 So basically they're giving you  
45 cautionary statements.

46  
47 There are no other written comments.  
48 And the North Slope Regional Council did meet on this  
49 proposal.

50

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, just for my  
2 information, what did North Slope do.  
3  
4 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. As they  
5 provided to me, supported the proposal as written, and  
6 so they support lifting this closure.  
7  
8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. At this time  
9 the Chair will entertain a motion to adopt WP06-65.  
10  
11 MR. REAKOFF: So moved.  
12  
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Jack. Is there  
14 a second.  
15  
16 MR. WALKER: Second.  
17  
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Robert  
19 Walker. Any further comments.  
20  
21 (No comments)  
22  
23 MR. WALKER: Question.  
24  
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called  
26 for. All those in favor of adopting WP06-65 signify by  
27 saying aye.  
28  
29 IN UNISON: Aye.  
30  
31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.  
32  
33 (No opposing votes)  
34  
35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. WP.....  
36  
37 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.  
38  
39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, Jack.  
40  
41 MR. REAKOFF: I would like to get on  
42 the record as commenting on my justification for this.  
43 I feel that the Board action -- the Game Board action  
44 in November addressed the issues that the people in  
45 Anaktuvuk had with interfering with caribou migrations  
46 to the north of the village, and so I feel that  
47 rescinding the rest of the Federal land to closures is  
48 warranted.  
49  
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. WP06-

1 66.

2

3

4 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, before  
5 we go to 66, you did have a letter submitted to the  
6 Federal Subsistence Board as well as copied to the  
7 Commissioner of Fish and Game concerning some kind of  
8 outreach educational program on non-harassment of lead  
9 caribou. So that is pending, there is going to be a  
10 response to that. We've not received anything from the  
11 Commissioner. Jack has met with Staff to get further  
12 clarification on that letter, but that is still pending  
13 out there, that you're requesting some type of  
14 educational process that would have hunters, most  
15 likely non-local hunters, understand the importance of  
16 not harvesting or harassing those lead caribou.

16

17

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair.

18

19

CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, Jack.

20

21

22 MR. REAKOFF: When I talked to Staff  
23 the other day I was unaware that the Board had actually  
24 made this Controlled Use Area on the Anaktuvuk River in  
25 November, and so I was not apprised of that. And so  
26 the Commissioner should make the general public aware  
27 of what, you know, why these are necessary. I don't  
28 think people quite understand that interfering with any  
29 caribou migration across the Dalton Highway of the lead  
30 cows can impede their movements. And so I think the  
31 public, in general, should be aware that when the  
32 Central Arctic Herd is coming from northeast heading  
33 southwest that harassment of those lead caribou is  
34 impeding their movement.

34

35

36 And so I still feel that the letter is  
37 necessary but in regards to the area of Anaktuvuk, it's  
38 kind of a moot subject.

38

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. I  
41 think that we've been talking about this issue for  
42 quite some time. We brought it up time and time again,  
43 but nobody quite understands us. We haven't seen, even  
44 this year, Anaktuvuk Pass has had problems harvesting  
45 caribou, and we haven't seen any in Jack's area,  
46 Wiseman, and none in the Allakaket/Alatna area, whereas  
47 in the past they migrate right through the villages  
48 when the lead caribous go by, so that has to be  
49 addressed.

49

50

Thank you, Jack.

1 WP06-66.

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chair. Pete.

4

5 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. The analysis  
6 for Proposal 66 begins in your book on Page 198. And  
7 Federal lands in the portion of the Colville River  
8 drainage down stream from and including the Chandler  
9 River within Unit 26(A) are currently open to moose  
10 harvest only by Federally-qualified users. And there's  
11 a map on Page 200 of your book. If you look on the map  
12 on Page 200 of your book, at the bottom of the page,  
13 it's the Anaktuvuk Pass, which this proposal affects,  
14 and to the right of Anaktuvuk Pass you can see where  
15 the closure area involves the western portion of Gates  
16 of the Arctic National Preserve.

17

18 This proposal was submitted by the  
19 Office of Subsistence Management to open these Federal  
20 public lands to moose harvest by all Federal [sic]  
21 residents. This proposal was developed in response to  
22 a substantial increase in Unit 26(A) moose population.  
23 A relatively small amount of Federal public lands would  
24 be affected by adoption of this proposal, and that  
25 would be lands within Gates of the Arctic National  
26 Preserve and some lands within the National Petroleum  
27 Reserve.

28

29 During the 1990s Unit 26(A) moose  
30 hunting was restricted under both Federal and State  
31 regulations due to a continued decline in moose. In  
32 1994 the Federal Subsistence Board closed Unit 26(A)  
33 Federal public lands to the use of aircraft of moose  
34 hunting. In subsequent years, the Federal Subsistence  
35 Board closed Federal public lands in portions of Unit  
36 26(A) so only Federally-qualified subsistence hunters  
37 were allowed to harvest moose. In 2005, the Office of  
38 Subsistence Management conducted a review of closed  
39 areas and initially recommended continuing the existing  
40 closure to non-Federally-qualified subsistence hunters.  
41 Later in 2005, in response to new information on  
42 improved moose population status, the Office of  
43 Subsistence Management developed the current proposal  
44 which would eliminate the closure.

45

46 In November 2005, the Alaska Board of  
47 Game expanded opportunities for residents to harvest  
48 moose in portions of Unit 26(A), including aircraft use  
49 allowed on the Colville River up stream from, but not  
50 including the Anaktuvuk River. The Alaska Department

1 of Fish and Game moose data from annual spring aerial  
2 surveys for the Colville, Chandler and Anaktuvuk Rivers  
3 indicate the population has been increasing since 1997.  
4 The Alaska Department of Fish and Game annual winter  
5 aerial census surveys shows similar trends.

6  
7 Mr. Chair. If this proposal is adopted  
8 the proposed regulatory change is expected to have  
9 minimal effect upon either the moose population or  
10 Federally-qualified users. If this proposal were  
11 adopted the ability of Federally-qualified subsistence  
12 users to harvest moose should not be greatly affected.

13  
14 You have to forgive me, Mr. Chair, the  
15 lights just went out here and I'm trying to adjust to  
16 the dark.

17  
18 (Laughter)

19  
20 MR. DEMATTEO: Existing Federal public  
21 lands subject to current regulation are limited in  
22 extent. Headwaters of the Nanushuk River within the  
23 Gates of the Arctic National Preserve and portions of  
24 lower Colville River and associated tributaries within  
25 the National Petroleum Reserve.

26  
27 The Unit 26(A) moose population has  
28 substantially increased and should be able to support  
29 some additional harvest of bulls.

30  
31 Mr. Chair. With that the preliminary  
32 conclusion is to support the proposal.

33  
34 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Pete. ADF&G.

37  
38 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. They  
39 do support the proposal. The growth of the moose  
40 population in the area and the small amount of Federal  
41 lands in that portion of the Colville River drainage  
42 down stream from and including the Chandler River make  
43 closure to non-Federally-qualified subsistence users in  
44 this area unnecessary.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.

47  
48 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. I won't  
49 repeat it. It's the same one that came from the  
50 National Parks and Conservation Association about if

1 you know of data lacking to note that and to make sound  
2 decisions and things like that.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. The Chair  
5 will entertain a motion to adopt WP06-66.

6

7 MR. REAKOFF: So moved.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Jack Reakoff.  
10 Is there a second.

11

12 MR. WALKER: Second.

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Second by Robert Walker,  
15 thank you. I support this proposal, too. It's well  
16 out of our area and so little moose are taken up in  
17 that area that I do not see any conservation concern.

18

19 Jack.

20

21 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman. I'm on the  
22 Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission,  
23 and we have Commission members that have expressed want  
24 to be able to hunt moose again after this long closure.  
25 Moose are not -- caribou are a primary animal taken by  
26 people in Anaktuvuk, but there's also a few families  
27 that take moose periodically, especially on a year like  
28 this when the caribou haven't shown up and so it's an  
29 alternate species, but nearly as sought after as would  
30 be the general knowledge within our region. And so  
31 it's not going to be that many moose being harvested by  
32 the village of Anaktuvuk, so I'm in full support of  
33 this proposal.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. I  
36 suspect also that the sheep population may take a  
37 bigger hit than usual if possible, so I ask for support  
38 for this proposal.

39

40 Any further comments.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 MR. WALKER: Question.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called.  
47 All those in favor of adopting WP06-66 signify by  
48 saying aye.

49

50 IN UNISON: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Mickey.  
2 Opposed, same sign.  
3  
4 (No opposing votes)  
5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. Thank  
7 you, Pete, for bearing with us. I know you've been  
8 having a tough time but it's good to hear your voice.  
9 I know we've been trying to connect all this time to  
10 cover our proposals. Thank you, Pete.  
11  
12 MR. DEMATTEO: You're welcome, Mr.  
13 Chair. I'll try to find that winter train that goes up  
14 to Allakaket.  
15  
16 (Laughter)  
17  
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: It should be big enough  
19 to carry you there.  
20  
21 (Laughter)  
22  
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Pete. Vince.  
24  
25 MR. MATHEWS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I  
26 don't know if Glenn wants to present it.....  
27  
28 MR. STOUT: No.  
29  
30 MR. MATHEWS: No, okay. I'll get  
31 copies of it, your discussion about the caribou  
32 concerns of migration. The Board did draft -- the  
33 Board of Game did draft a letter on that. Glenn has  
34 it, I'll try to get copies for you to see what the  
35 Board of Game did on that issue in their January  
36 meeting.  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN SAM: We got about 27 minutes  
39 to set up for our dinner so at this time the Chair will  
40 declare a recess until, what, 8:30 in the morning.  
41  
42 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, 8:30.  
43  
44 MR. WALKER: 8:30.  
45  
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, we'll start by  
47 9:00.  
48  
49 MR. MATHEWS: 8:46.  
50

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

MR. WALKER: Okay, 9:00.

CHAIRMAN SAM: Recess.

(Off record)

(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 170 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 7th day of March 2006, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at Koyukuk, 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 26th day of March 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph P. Kolasinski  
Notary Public in and for Alaska  
My Commission Expires: 03/12/08