

00136

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE  
REGIONAL COUNCIL MEETING

8

9

10

VOLUME II

11

12

Huslia, Alaska

13

March 10, 2004

14

8:30 o'clock a.m.

15

16

17 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

18

19 Ronald Sam, Chair

20 Ray Collins

21 Benedict Jones

22 Tom Kriska

23 Carl Morgan

24 Jack Reakoff

25 George Siavelis

26 Michael Stickman

27 Robert Walker

28

29 Regional Council Coordinator; Vince Mathews

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, Alaska 99517

49 907-243-0668

50 jpk@gci.net

00137

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

(Huslia, Alaska - 3/10/2004)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN SAM: Vince, take a roll call.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Let me find the list real quick.

(Pause)

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. George Siavelis.

MR. SIAVELIS: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Carl Morgan.

MR. MORGAN: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Benedict Jones.

MR. JONES: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Jack Reakoff.

MR. REAKOFF: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Ray Collins.

MR. MORGAN: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Ron Sam.

CHAIRMAN SAM: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Mickey Stickman.

MR. STICKMAN: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Tom Kriska.

MR. KRISKA: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Robert Walker.

MR. WALKER: Yeah.

(Laughter)

00138

1 MR. MATHEWS: And we already mentioned  
2 that Emmitt has a family illness that kept him away. So  
3 you have the same quorum you had yesterday -- I mean  
4 you've increased by one with Carl's arrival, so you have  
5 nine out of the 10 members.

6  
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thanks, Vince. To  
8 begin with, I don't think we can get a hold of Pete and  
9 Jerry, I think you got an explanation of how we're  
10 dealing with this.

11  
12 MR. BERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
13 Yeah, we're not able to get a hold of Pete at this time,  
14 although we'll keep trying but we have a back up plan, we  
15 have various Staff that are ready to present the analysis  
16 for your Council, so however you'd like to proceed we're  
17 ready to handle those proposals.

18  
19 Thank you.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. If I think I heard  
22 it right I think we'll just go right down the line as  
23 presented on the agenda.

24  
25 MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. I've got a quick  
28 overview procedure that we go through.

- 29  
30 1. We have proposal introduction by  
31 Vince.  
32  
33 2. Bio-analysis, Pete DeMatteo or  
34 whoever is coming the proposal  
35 from the Staff who is present.  
36  
37 3. Public comments -- I mean agency  
38 comments, will be ADF&G, that's  
39 the third one.  
40  
41 4. Public comments.  
42  
43 5. Staff Committee input, OSM.  
44  
45 6. Written comments.  
46  
47 7. Regional Council deliberation.

48  
49 This is not the first time we've gone  
50 through this but I just wanted to put it on the record

00139

1 that we will follow this.

2

3

Proposal introduction, Proposal 77.

4

5

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, Proposal 77 is the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. It's kind of a comprehensive proposal to simplify regulations, seasons, and et cetera for brown bear in Units 19 through 21, 24, 25 and portions of 26. And it looks like Warren's going to be presenting that and obviously Randy or Glenn Stout will be here for questions for the State on this proposal. And as I mentioned yesterday, you were exposed to this proposal, or the first generation of this back in Wasilla by Roy Nowlin.

15

16

CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Vince. At this time the Chair will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 77.

19

20

MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

21

22

CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

23

24

MR. SIAVELIS: Second.

25

26

CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by George Siavelis for the record. And your name, again.

28

29

MR. EASTLAND: Mr. Chair. Members of the Council. My name is Warren Eastland. And I'm the Staff Committee member for the BIA.

32

33

WP04-77 starts in your book on Page 39 and it was submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and simplifies brown bear regulations for Units 19 through 21, 24, 25 and 26(C). The proposed regulatory changes treat Unit 26(C) as a separate unit.

38

39

The biological data for the population of brown bears is actually a little bit on the sparse side but the Department of Fish and Game does feel that the numbers are high enough to support additional harvest opportunities. This proposal -- I will not be going through each and every unit mentioned in here simply because most of the write ups are the same. For example, Unit 19 starts out very little biological information is available.

48

49

The guess is is that these proposed regulation changes should not cause declines in bear

50

00140

1 populations. Harvests have been below the rate at which  
2 as far as can be told that it causes populations to  
3 decline. This proposal will provide increased  
4 opportunity for subsistence users and would change many  
5 of the one bear per four year regulations into a one bear  
6 per year that would not count against the harvest limit  
7 of one bear per four years in other parts of the state.

8

9 In Units 19(A), (B) and (D), the season  
10 for these units would be extended by 52 days. In 19(C),  
11 now, this is -- I'm reading from Page 47 here on effects  
12 of the proposal -- 19(C) is actually a problem here in  
13 this proposal because 19(C) has a negative determination  
14 of customary and traditional use. It is not a no  
15 determination, it is a negative determination. So were  
16 you to adopt this proposal, it would mean that a second  
17 C&T analysis of Unit 19(C) would need to be done and  
18 found positive, in other words, contrary to the current  
19 finding, before the Board could act on 19(C). I'll come  
20 back to that problem in a minute.

21

22 Unit 20(A) would have one bear limit,  
23 September 1st through May 31st.

24

25 Unit 20 remainder, one bear, the same  
26 season.

27

28 Unit 21(D), the season would be extended  
29 by 37 days.

30

31 Unit 21 remainder, an extension of 52  
32 days.

33

34 Unit 24, an extension of 32 days.

35

36 Unit 25(A) and (B), an extension of 37  
37 days.

38

39 And it would set up Unit 26(C) with a  
40 separate season running August 10 through  
41 June 30th. In the past Unit 26(C) has  
42 always been combined with Unit 26(B).

43

44 The proposed changes for these units  
45 would align with current changes adopted by the Board of  
46 Game in November of 2004. Now.....

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: 2003.

49

50 MR. EASTLAND: That's exactly what I was

00141

1 going to say, that's what the book says but since  
2 November 2004 hasn't rolled around yet, I wonder whether  
3 that's quite accurate, either that or they have a lot  
4 better crystal ball than I do.

5  
6 To go back to Unit 19(C), the Eastern  
7 Interior Regional Council excluded that, excluded 19(C)  
8 from -- they amended the proposal to exclude 19(C) and  
9 then supported this proposal for all units that were  
10 within the Eastern Interior region and deferred all else  
11 to the home region.

12  
13 The North Slope Regional Council did not  
14 notice that the 19(C) proposal would cause problems  
15 because of a negative C&T determination so they approved  
16 it en mass.

17  
18 If you look, again, on Page 39 at the  
19 executive summary, you'll notice that Unit 25(C) is  
20 included there, that's merely for clarity because that  
21 season, as is presented in the executive summary is  
22 already in the Federal regulations. So that doesn't  
23 appear on Page 42 with a description of the proposed  
24 Federal regulation, nor does it appear in the preliminary  
25 conclusion.

26  
27 And with that are there any questions.

28  
29 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Ray.

32  
33 MR. COLLINS: What is the difficulty in  
34 -- I'm thinking about 19(C), I know there is traditional  
35 use out in that area, it's not very heavy but it is --  
36 the State has been treating that as a guiding area, and  
37 that's true there's more guiding in that area than  
38 anywhere else but it's also used by people from Nikolai,  
39 they have traplines that run out there. And they  
40 probably don't harvest many bears or haven't for awhile,  
41 but there was traditional use in the area.

42  
43 What I'm wondering is, if we adopt this  
44 now we're saying that they didn't have that and that's  
45 why Eastern was excluding it, I guess. Is that the way  
46 to go so that there's no determination and then you don't  
47 have to fight to change a negative one?

48  
49 I don't know how hard it is to change a  
50 negative one is what I'm saying. I'd rather have it no

00142

1 determination right now and then letting them go through  
2 the regular process of hearing and gathering data and so  
3 on.

4

5 MR. EASTLAND: Mr. Chair. Ray.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

8

9 MR. EASTLAND: To change it would require  
10 quite a bit of analysis. And the clearest way to go  
11 would probably be to exclude -- to amend this proposal to  
12 exclude 19(C) and then see about changing it with a  
13 proposal in the future, and then bring it into the fold  
14 that way.

15

16 Because when you approve a -- or support  
17 a proposal that has problems in it, that opens the door  
18 for changes and when the door is opened, sometimes more  
19 than just the nose of the camel comes in.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Vince, and then Polly.

22

23 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just to  
24 get it clear, Warren's got it right, but what Eastern did  
25 is only speak on their units, period. We didn't talk to  
26 them about 19 or whatever, and they felt to maintain  
27 clarity that they wanted clear that they weren't talking  
28 about your area, they were just saying that they support  
29 the proposal just for units in Eastern Interior.

30

31 And I think what might help out here and  
32 I apologize for not being up to speed on it, but the  
33 State could inform us if this passed at the Board of  
34 Game. If it passed at the Board of Game, the opportunity  
35 would still be in 19(C) because your concern about  
36 subsistence opportunity, if that did pass, then the  
37 people of Nikolai would still have that opportunity. So  
38 we need clarification if that did pass on that.

39

40 And then if you do go forward with a C&T  
41 proposal, looking at a map here at a minimum, we'd want  
42 to run that through the Denali Subsistence Resource  
43 Commission. There's a little piece of Lake Clark so I'll  
44 leave that up to the Park Service if we need to run it by  
45 Lake Clark.

46

47 And then, obviously, Ray, you're local  
48 advisory committee may want to. And Polly would have an  
49 update on the C&T part. But from what I see at this  
50 point, we would want to make sure those three entities,

00143

1 at a minimum, were aware that you guys are trying to --  
2 if you agree to change a negative determination to a  
3 positive determination so that they can log in on it.

4

5 And then I'm sure we would investigate  
6 why it was negative and Polly may know why it was  
7 negative in the past, I don't know, because we usually  
8 don't -- we don't have too many negatives so, anyways, I  
9 may be speaking too much for Polly so I'll stop.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Polly.

12

13 MS. WHEELER: I'd let you know.

14

15 (Laughter)

16

17 MS. WHEELER: Ray's absolutely -- Mr.  
18 Collins is absolutely correct. The Federal government,  
19 as I said yesterday in my short summary of C&T  
20 determinations, when the Federal government assumed  
21 management authority over subsistence uses on Federal  
22 lands we adopted all of the State C&T determinations,  
23 good, bad or indifferent. And 19(C) has historically  
24 been treated as sort of a guiding area in spite of its  
25 proximity of other areas or communities that are in  
26 19(D), so there's no one that resides in 19(C), but.....

27

28 (Coughing)

29

30 MS. WHEELER: Bless You.

31

32 MR. JONES: Thank you.

33

34 MS. WHEELER: And so that's why there's a  
35 negative determination for that resource in that area.  
36 But Warren's correct, in that, if you were to pass this  
37 and exclude that you could come back with a proposal for  
38 a positive C&T determination and then subsequently amend  
39 that regulation so it's a step by step process, but  
40 that's the history of it.

41

42 But I don't know what they did at the  
43 Board of Game, I don't know if Randy or Glenn would want  
44 to come up and speak to that, if they even did anything  
45 yet.

46

47 MR. ROGERS: Whenever you're ready.

48

49 MS. WHEELER: I'll relinquish my seat,

50 Mr. Chair.

00144

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: ADF&G.

2

3 MR. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
4 Members of the Council. I wanted to start off by Roy  
5 Nowlin wanted to convey his apologies for not being here  
6 personally to talk about this. He's wrapping up things  
7 at the Board of Game. I also wanted to point out that  
8 Glenn and I will comment on a few proposals here, but the  
9 other proposals, the Department's comments on the  
10 original proposal are in the book and are unchanged  
11 except for in a few instances.

12

13 As far as Board of Game action on this,  
14 the Board did adopt this entire proposal without  
15 modification. So it has gone through. And I'd like to  
16 remind you that this proposal is, you know, strictly  
17 related to increasing opportunity and no way is intended  
18 to reduce bear predation on moose calves, it's not an  
19 intensive management or predator control proposal. In  
20 fact, in areas where we have liberalized the bear  
21 regulations with the hope of having some effect on bear  
22 predation, we've seen little to no effect.

23

24 There's a few areas involved in this  
25 proposal, 19(B) is one of those where we did not  
26 recommend liberalizing the regulations extending the  
27 seasons quite as much because there are areas where there  
28 is a significant bear harvest and we didn't want to get  
29 in a situation where there might be conservation  
30 concerns.

31

32 As far as a few updates on the proposal  
33 before you, and I don't know if this came up in the  
34 Eastern Interior meeting or not but part of this proposal  
35 on the State side involves Unit 12. And it should have  
36 the same season extension of August 10 to June 30th with  
37 one bear per year.

38

39 Also we agree with the situation in Unit  
40 19(C), that this proposal is really not applicable in  
41 that area because of the negative C&T finding. So we  
42 would concur with the idea of modifying the proposal  
43 before you to eliminate 19(C) right now. You may or may  
44 not want to deal with the Unit 12 issue since that's  
45 really an Eastern Interior side of the proposal.

46

47 That's all I have for now.

48

49 Thank you.

50

00145

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Randy. Public  
2 comments.

3

4 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we've  
5 already covered Eastern Interior, and that's it. I'm  
6 sorry, I was trying to see what Eastern did on Unit 12.

7

8 But there are no written public comments  
9 that were submitted on Proposal 77.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Staff Committee. Thank  
12 you, Randy, we'll call you if we need to.

13

14 MR. EASTLAND: The Staff Committee has no  
15 comments on this proposal.

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments, Vince.

18

19 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, I'm sorry, I already  
20 jumped out of step there. There are no written comments  
21 on Proposal 77, and you were already briefed on Eastern.

22

23 I don't know if -- oh, Warren already did  
24 North Slope so North Slope's actions were briefed. They  
25 approved it. Eastern approved it, only for its regions,  
26 it didn't want to tell you guys what to do, to paraphrase  
27 what they were -- their concerns. They didn't want to  
28 cause any more confusion. If you guys were going to  
29 amend your proposal or do any kind of action, they just  
30 wanted it specific to theirs. And we don't need to  
31 address Unit 12 since you don't have a positive C&T for  
32 that area.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. We have a proposal  
35 before us. There's a motion to adopt as presented, it's  
36 already been seconded. Do we have any friendly  
37 amendments or anything.

38

39 Ray.

40

41 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I would move  
42 to amend by excluding 19(C) and request that the Federal  
43 Office of Subsistence Management initiate a study of the  
44 C&T for brown bear in that unit.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

47

48 MR. SIAVELIS: Second.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by George

00146

1 Siavelis. Further discussion on the amendment.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5

CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

6

7

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

8

9

CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

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. REAKOFF: My comment is in the upper part of Unit 24, up in the mountains there's lots of bears up there and I've been seeing -- there was concern about bears in the Dalton Highway Corridor and a proposal to go to a drawing, we opposed that, because there's lots of bears up there and I see multiple age classes and females with cubs and younger females and so I don't feel that this increased harvest length period is going to dramatically affect the grizzly bear population which is at a very high number right now.

CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any further comments on the amendment.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On 21(E) here, we were kind of -- I was not surprised when Roy told me last fall that we were going to go from four bears to one per regulatory year, but I was kind of surprised on the extension that they did for this because the last three years we watched the guides come through Anvik with two and three year old bears. I mean this is telling us that the majority of the big breeding bears are already killed off and to further it, to get one bear per year and extend the days to 37, this is 37 more days to what there is prior to hunting, and our GASH Board didn't have a problem with that because -- but I had a problem with it. And I will still have a problem with it, because I don't think this is justification for our area without more input or a public hearing in 21(E).

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SAM: So if I understand you correctly, you are not in opposition at this time?

MR. WALKER: Yes.

00147

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Robert, this regulation is  
4 only the Federal regulation and it only applies to  
5 subsistence users, so what we're doing is extending the  
6 opportunities with this to subsistence users, we're not  
7 dealing with the State season.

8

9 MR. WALKER: Okay, I misunderstood that.  
10 Because when I talked with Roy last fall, he was going to  
11 -- correct me here, Randy, maybe could you come up and  
12 clarify this, please, for what we talked about last fall,  
13 going from four bears -- one bear every four regulatory  
14 years to one bear?

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Randy.

17

18 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, I don't know exactly  
19 what Roy said to the GASH Advisory Committee, but in  
20 general he's been trying to inform all the Councils and  
21 Advisory Committees of this proposal that affects all of  
22 Interior. And the general idea behind it is to extend  
23 the opportunity to take bears, and also make it  
24 consistent of allowing one bear per year bag limit across  
25 Interior except in areas where we have an identified  
26 conservation concern. I'm not aware that we have any  
27 significant concern there in 21(E) or exactly what input  
28 the GASH Advisory Committee might have given Roy on that.

29

30 But the general intent is to just try to  
31 make this consistent across the boards. As I said, it's  
32 not intended to reduce the bear populations, and,  
33 certainly if there is now or there became a conservation  
34 concern related to bear populations, we would look to  
35 reduce some of the season to keep that under control.

36

37 I guess the preferred approach is that we  
38 would want to stick with the one bear per year because  
39 that gets very confusing between different units as to  
40 where that's allowed and whether that counts against the  
41 one bear per four years requirement in some areas.  
42 There's much higher concern about bear populations down  
43 in Southeast and Southcentral Alaska where there's, you  
44 know, trophy hunting for large coastal brown bears that's  
45 separate from the Interior situation. But I think the  
46 Department, in seeking to pass this proposal, carries  
47 with it a commitment that, you know, if there is concerns  
48 and that would come from the Advisory Committee and  
49 consultation with the area biologist, et cetera, we would  
50 reduce opportunity to take care of that.

00148

1 I hope that answers your question.

2

3 MR. WALKER: Yes, it does, Randy, thank  
4 you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: We do have an amendment  
7 before us at this time, the Chair will call for action on  
8 the amendment to exclude 19(C), that's the one we've been  
9 trying to get at, to exclude 19(C) from our deliberation;  
10 is that what you wanted Ray?

11

12 MR. COLLINS: Right. And also ask the  
13 Office of Subsistence Management to initiate a C&T study  
14 of that area.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: So is that on the record,  
17 Tina?

18

19 REPORTER: (Nods affirmatively)

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: And that will be directed  
22 -- that question will be directed to the proper agency.

23

24 MR. MATHEWS: (Nods affirmatively)

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further  
27 comments on the amendment.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 MR. STICKMAN: I call for the question.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called  
34 for. All those in favor of excluding 19(C) amendment  
35 from this Proposal 77 signify by saying aye.

36

37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

40

41 (No opposing votes)

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Amendment carried. Any  
44 further discussion on the whole Proposal 77.

45

46 MR. SIAVELIS: Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: George.

49

50 MR. SIAVELIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

00149

1 Yeah, I intend to support this proposal. It increases  
2 opportunity for subsistence users and it doesn't look  
3 like it's going to increase the harvest by a lot or  
4 endanger bears, it just increases opportunities for  
5 people to -- local people to take bears.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further comments on  
10 Proposal 77.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Questions.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: And what's the pleasure of  
19 the Council, do you want to vote only on our proposals or  
20 just go en mass on this for the time being, because I  
21 don't think it will hurt anything.

22

23 MR. STICKMAN: We have amended it.

24

25 REPORTER: Mickey.

26

27 MR. STICKMAN: Just vote on it as  
28 amended.

29

30 REPORTER: Mickey.

31

32 MR. STICKMAN: Yes, just vote on it as  
33 amended.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Just one vote on the whole  
36 proposal as amended.

37

38 (Council nods affirmatively)

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further.....

41

42 MR. STICKMAN: Question.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called  
45 for.

46

47 MR. JONES: Second.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, it's already been  
50 moved and seconded. All those in favor of the motion of

00150

1 adopting Proposal 77 signify by 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. Thank

10 you.

11

12 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, that brings  
13 us up to the next proposal, and we're going to be  
14 somewhat shifting around here in a few minutes but not at  
15 this point. This brings up Proposal 50, which is dealing  
16 with caribou seasons and area descriptions in Unit 18,  
17 and Tom Kron will walk us through this proposal and I  
18 think Jerry has what Yukon Kuskokwim Delta did with  
19 Proposal 50, 51 and 52.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Just to simplify matters  
24 right now I would just like to go through one proposal  
25 number at a time, I think it will be simpler and faster.

26

27 MR. STICKMAN: Okay, I make a motion to  
28 adopt Proposal 50.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

31

32 MR. SIAVELIS: Second.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by George  
35 Siavelis.

36

37 Tom.

38

39 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. Members of the  
40 Regional Council. The analysis on Proposal 50 is found  
41 on Page 52 in your Council books. This is a Unit 18  
42 caribou proposal. It was submitted by the Yukon  
43 Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council.

44

45 The reason this proposal is before is due  
46 to a C&T determination which includes Upper Kalskag. And  
47 I think before we go any further, it might be good if we  
48 could have some discussion on that. You probably  
49 remember a couple of years ago there was discussion of  
50 the Regional Council responsibilities and handle Upper

00151

1 Kalskag and Lower Kalskag, so maybe if Mr. Mathews could  
2 brief us on that issue.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: If I remember correctly we  
5 did drop Upper Kalskag from Western Interior per the  
6 request of Upper and Lower Kalskag; is that correct,  
7 Vince?

8

9 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, that is correct. And  
10 I'm the one that kept this one in the book because it  
11 wasn't clear to me if that change in regional boundary  
12 also affected the C&T portion. So I consulted with Tom  
13 on this, too, and we consulted with your Council member  
14 for the area and we thought, well, we'll just bring it up  
15 so you know of it and then we need to sort our procedures  
16 out on what effect that change had, if any on the C&T  
17 determinations.

18

19 So you are correct, Upper Kalskag is now  
20 part of the -- or nominations and membership part of  
21 there, it's not clear at this point if it addresses the  
22 C&T.

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Carl.

25

26 MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
27 do concur that since Upper and Lower Kalskag went with  
28 the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Region that I think we should  
29 defer decision and defer this recommendation to the Yukon  
30 Kuskokwim.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Did you have something.

33

34 MR. KRON: Yeah, just one comment and  
35 Jerry, please correct me if I'm incorrect. But at the  
36 meeting in St. Mary's for the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta  
37 Regional Advisory, there was no opposition to this  
38 proposal. And again it was submitted by their Council  
39 for your information.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: What was that again.

44

45 MR. KRON: The YK Delta Regional Council  
46 supported their own proposal, they supported this  
47 proposal for your information.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: All right. So Carl you  
50 just wanted to defer.

00152

1 MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
2 Well, just support whatever the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta  
3 Region has recommended since it is Upper and Lower  
4 Kalskag are in their district and they have elected to  
5 switch.

6  
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, we have two options  
8 here. We have a motion before us so we could withdraw  
9 the motion or we can just go ahead and support -- go on  
10 record as supporting YK Delta on this. We do have a  
11 motion to adopt this proposal. Any further discussion.

12  
13 MR. COLLINS: Is the analysis complete on  
14 this.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Oh, no, not yet.

17  
18 MR. COLLINS: Okay.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: I just wanted to clarify  
21 whether we wanted to defer or to just work on the main  
22 motion and keep going.

23  
24 MR. COLLINS: I didn't hear any comments  
25 in the presentation about the other modifications to  
26 remove that restriction on leaving meat on the bone, you  
27 know, we've favored that before and this strikes it out,  
28 and so I'm wondering -- I'd like some discussion on that,  
29 why that was done.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, I see where you're  
32 coming from. We did get ahead of ourselves. So we've  
33 had the proposal introduction. Bio-analysis, is that you  
34 Tom?

35  
36 MR. KRON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, again, I'd  
37 raised that other issue earlier because I wasn't sure how  
38 far you wanted to go with this particular proposal. So  
39 I'll go through in a little more detail.

40  
41 Wildlife Proposal 04-50 was submitted by  
42 the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Regional Council to combine the  
43 regulatory hunt area descriptions for Unit 18 caribou to  
44 add 15 days to the existing regulatory season and to  
45 extend the meat on the bone requirement for that portion  
46 of Unit 18 north of the Yukon River. The proposed change  
47 would also remove the meat on the bone regulation  
48 language for Unit 18 caribou from Subpart D.

49  
50 At the fall 2003 meeting the Alaska Board

00153

1 of Game extended the caribou season for Unit 18 by two  
2 weeks, changed the harvest limit to bulls only and  
3 adopted unit-wide meat on the bone salvage requirements.  
4 If the Federal Subsistence Board adopts the provision  
5 specified in Proposal 42, that would limit the fall  
6 harvest to one bull. Adoption of this proposal would  
7 align State and Federal regulations for Unit 18 and would  
8 nullify the component of Wildlife Proposal 04-52.

9

10 MR. STICKMAN: Tom, before you go on, I  
11 was going to -- well, I was the maker of the motion so I  
12 was going to withdraw my motion because that Unit isn't  
13 even in the Western Interior regional area.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Consent of the second to  
16 withdraw the motion to adopt or support Proposal 50.

17

18 MR. STICKMAN: I'm withdrawing my motion.

19

20 MR. SIAVELIS: Second.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, withdraw the second.  
23 So next move then would be to.....

24

25 MR. STICKMAN: To go with Carl's  
26 suggestion to defer it.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Do we need a motion on  
29 that.

30

31 MR. MATHEWS: It would just help if we  
32 just make a motion to defer to the home region because I  
33 think we need a -- I'm reading this quickly, but I  
34 believe the meat on the bone remains so we need to get  
35 that clear with Ray, that the meat on the bone did not  
36 remove. But anyway a motion would help.

37

38 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman.

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Carl.

41

42 MR. MORGAN: Yes, for simplification and  
43 so the process can move a little faster on some of these  
44 regulations, I make a motion that we defer action for the  
45 home region.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

48

49 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

50

00154

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further discussion.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 MR. WALKER: Question.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called.

8 All those in favor of deferring action on Proposal 50

9 signify by saying aye.

10

11 IN UNISON: Aye.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

14

15 (No opposing votes)

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion to defer carries.

18 Vince.

19

20 MR. MATHEWS: So Ray did we get that

21 cleared up with you that the meat on the bone is still in

22 effect in Unit 18, because you read the proposal that

23 this was removing it. I don't want to move ahead unless

24 we get clear that the meat on the bone remains. It just

25 -- Tom, correct me, just went to a different part of the

26 regulations instead of being a subpart of the unit, so

27 meat on the bone remains in Unit 18.

28

29 MR. COLLINS: (Nods affirmatively)

30

31 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, thank you. That

32 brings us up to Proposal 51, which was submitted by the

33 Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council, and it

34 extends the season in an area and closes another one and

35 simplifies area descriptions in Unit 18, and Tom Kron

36 will be presenting that proposal. It's for moose.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. The Chair will

39 entertain a motion.

40

41 MR. STICKMAN: I make a motion to defer

42 this back to their home area also.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

45

46 MR. MORGAN: I'll second the motion.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further discussion.

49

50 (No comments)

00155

1 MR. SIAVELIS: Question.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called on  
4 Proposal 51, there's a motion to defer. All those in  
5 favor of deferring Proposal 51 to the home region signify  
6 by saying aye.

7

8 IN UNISON: Aye.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

11

12 (No opposing votes)

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. Proposal  
15 51 deferred to the home region.

16

17 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, that brings us up to  
18 Proposal 52, which again was submitted by the Kuskokwim  
19 Delta Regional Advisory Council, and it extends the meat  
20 on the bone restriction for caribou and moose to all of  
21 Unit 18, and Tom will be presenting that proposal.

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: The Chair will entertain a  
24 motion to adopt Proposal 52. A motion. You had a  
25 question on this Ray and I was just wondering if.....

26

27 MR. COLLINS: Well, I'll move to adopt  
28 because in principle I like that concept, we've moved to  
29 put that in place of conserving -- I guess I would have a  
30 question though about traditional use down there. Do  
31 traditional hunters do that anyhow in the field, we do  
32 that in our area, the quarters are cut up and the meat's  
33 left on the bone and we don't bone them out.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: There's a motion to adopt  
36 Proposal 52, for clarification purposes if I understand  
37 right.

38

39 MR. COLLINS: Uh-huh.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

42

43 MR. STICKMAN: I'll second the motion  
44 because the proposal, there's also 19(B) which is within  
45 our area.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Bio-analysis.

48

49 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. Members of the  
50 Regional Council. The analysis on this proposal is found

00156

1 on Page 76 in your book. This proposal was submitted by  
2 the Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council, and  
3 requests that the Federal Subsistence Board simplify the  
4 meat on the bone regulations for caribou and moose in  
5 Unit 18. The proposal requests the deletion of the words  
6 south of the Yukon River from the Federal Subsistence  
7 Regs.

8

9 This proposal would simplify the hunting  
10 regulations in Unit 18 by extending the meat on the bone  
11 salvage requirements unit-wide. Historically, again,  
12 it's only been south of the Yukon River where it's been  
13 required, by removing that phrase, it would apply in all  
14 of Unit 18.

15

16 It's before you, again, it's a Unit 18  
17 issue in this case but it's before you because of C&T  
18 determinations for Aniak and Chuathbaluk. Unit-wide  
19 salvage requirements for moose and caribou would favor a  
20 reduction in meat spoilage during transport from the  
21 harvest site and would comply with local harvest and  
22 transport methods that refrain from deboning harvested  
23 meat.

24

25 The preliminary conclusion from Staff is  
26 to support this proposal. My understanding is that there  
27 was no opposition to this proposal at the YK meeting at  
28 St. Mary's and similarly, no opposition from Bristol Bay.

29

30 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Any questions.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: George, then Jack.

33

34 MR. SIAVELIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
35 support this proposal. But I'd like to just clarify that  
36 I believe, if I'm not mistaken, that this proposal is  
37 only for Unit 18, you know, there's discussion, it shows  
38 the existing law including these other units, but the  
39 proposal is simply the issue of Unit 18 for the  
40 Federally-qualified users on Federal lands in Unit 18.

41

42 MR. KRON: Yes.

43

44 MR. SIAVELIS: Thank you.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

47

48 MR. REAKOFF: I support this proposal.  
49 The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee supported this line  
50 of salvage and we've heard testimony about the concerns

00157

1 from down in that area of the high numbers of people  
2 moving into Bethel and they have to be aware of customary  
3 uses and so this makes it regulatory to those new members  
4 of the community of Bethel and I am in support of this,  
5 Region 5's position.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Tom  
8 Kron.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, ADF&G.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any comment.

17

18 MR. ROGERS: (Shakes head negatively)

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Comments.

21

22 MR. MATHEWS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll  
23 just get it on the record because I know Randy's working  
24 on other things. Basically they support the proposal and  
25 that's pretty much it. Just so it's clear on the record  
26 that Fish and Game's comments were incorporated.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Staff Committee.

29

30 MR. BRELSFORD: We did not have  
31 additional comments on this proposal.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Taylor. For  
34 the record, Staff Committee didn't have any further  
35 comments.

36

37 Written comments, Vince.

38

39 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, there were no  
40 written comments and Tom's already summarized what the  
41 neighboring Regional Councils did for Yukon Kuskokwim  
42 Delta and Bristol Bay.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Regional Council  
45 deliberation. We do have a motion to adopt Proposal 52.  
46 any further discussion.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Comments.

00158

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not all those in favor  
4 of supporting Proposal 52 signify by saying aye.

5

6 IN UNISON: Aye.

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

9

10 (No opposing votes)

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried.

13

14 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, that brings  
15 us up, because you took up the customary and traditional  
16 use determinations before, yesterday, I should say, this  
17 brings you up to Proposal 84 which was submitted by  
18 Harold Schetzle and his proposal reduce the Unit 26(C)  
19 sheep harvest limit.

20

21 I have Eastern Interior's actions, and I  
22 believe other Staff here will have North Slope's actions.

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: The Chair will adopt a  
25 motion to adopt Proposal 84.

26

27 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

30

31 MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt  
32 Proposal 84 for discussion.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

35

36 MR. SIAVELIS: Second.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by George  
39 Siavelis. Bio. Go ahead.

40

41 MR. EASTLAND: Mr. Chair. Members of the  
42 Council. This is Warren Eastland with the BIA again.  
43 Proposal 84 was submitted by Harold Schetzle of Chugiak  
44 and would divide Unit 26(C) into two units, that would be  
45 the Hulahula River Drainage and Unit 26(C) remainder.  
46 The proposal seeks to change the harvest limit for the  
47 Hulahula River Drainage from three sheep to one sheep.

48

49 The table on Page 10 -- oh, excuse me,  
50 this starts on Page 99, the executive summary is found on

00159

1 Page 99. Table 1 on Page 103 does show a decline in the  
2 sheep population in the Hulahula area, which has been --  
3 it looks like it's actually declined at least twice, it's  
4 a fluctuating population. Depends on weather severity.  
5 High and low harvest were 117 in 1987, low harvest was 40  
6 in 1999. Kaktovik residents who are primarily the ones  
7 who take the sheep in the Hulahula River Drainage and  
8 they shoot just a very few in some years to as many as 50  
9 in other years.

10

11 The sheep population may, in the future,  
12 need some form of protection, but this proposal will not  
13 do it at all because the State regulation mirrors this.  
14 There is the same December season -- pardon me, October 1  
15 to April 30 season, that the State has that allows three  
16 sheep and so any reduction in the Federal limit would  
17 simply be -- people would hunt under the State limit and  
18 this proposal would have no effect whatsoever.

19

20 So the Staff recommendation is to oppose  
21 this proposal.

22

23 The Eastern Interior agreed, opposed it  
24 unanimously as did the North Slope region.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Vince, yes, I got a  
29 question for you first, why is this proposal on our books  
30 and it's so darn far out of the region?

31

32 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, that's what I was  
33 researching and I'll take some responsibility for that.

34

35 The current C&T for 26(C), which correct  
36 me, Warren, that's the issue at hand is 26(C), correct?

37

38 MR. EASTLAND: Correct.

39

40 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. 26(C), the current  
41 C&T is residents of the Unit, Anaktuvuk Pass, Arctic  
42 Village, Chalkyitsik, Fort Yukon, Point Hope and Venetie.  
43 So you really don't have standing in the area.

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: No.

46

47 MR. MATHEWS: I might have been the one  
48 that pushed this through because for 26(B) Wiseman is.  
49 So I'm struggling here, why, with all the reviews, this  
50 still survived. But I think I started the ball rolling

00160

1 and no one stopped it.

2

3

(Laughter)

4

5 MR. MATHEWS: But maybe Jack has another  
6 insight on this but I don't see why you need to bring it  
7 up but maybe Jack could give another shot at this.

8

9

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

10

11

CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, it's on the floor,  
12 go ahead, Jack.

13

14

MR. REAKOFF: Because I'm on the Gates of  
15 the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission I'm in contact  
16 with Anaktuvuk Pass people and we deal with sheep harvest  
17 in the Park and harvest for Anaktuvuk Pass, and so I feel  
18 comfortable with making a position on this proposal as I  
19 feel that I must represent them from this Council. They  
20 don't have a representative to the south side of Region  
21 6, and so I feel that I have to represent them.

22

23

I look at dall sheep in the Atigun River  
24 in the North Slope, which is sort of a linear population  
25 across the north side of the Brooks Range, and I see high  
26 production off of the -- right at the mountain front edge  
27 of the populations. And so I feel that the populations  
28 are staying within sustained yield, these harvests of  
29 dall sheep by these people from Kaktovik and a few from  
30 Anaktuvuk, they would go to Kaktovik and hunt with their  
31 relatives over there in Kaktovik is how they would do  
32 that. And I don't think that this is an unreasonable  
33 amount of harvest.

34

35

These trend counts are very erratic  
36 because that's the weather-related issues of observing  
37 sheep. And so I don't feel that these harvests are out  
38 of line with what the population is there. I observed  
39 recruitments in the Atigun River this year of 45 percent  
40 yearling recruitment. Those are pretty high recruitments  
41 for sheep.

42

43

And so I don't support this proposal, I  
44 support the subsistence users harvest of three sheep per  
45 year.

46

47

Thank you.

48

49

CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. I've got  
50 a question for you, too. On one of these proposals, I

00161

1 think you said that we do have C&T use for some of that  
2 26 area resources?

3

4 MR. REAKOFF: The people from Anaktuvuk  
5 Pass have C&T in 26(C) and that's how kind of this  
6 proposal gets into our region a little bit. Because that  
7 village is actually in Unit 24. And their village is on  
8 the head of the John River, they're right on the divide,  
9 but they're on our side, in our region, so we have a  
10 village in our region that has a C&T in 26(C) for dall  
11 sheep.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Right, thanks for that  
14 clarification. ADF&G, I know you were Kanuti, right,  
15 Gates of the Arctic -- go ahead.

16

17 MS. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
18 Wennona Brown, Fish and Wildlife Service. In addition to  
19 representing Kanuti Refuge, I also represent Arctic  
20 Refuge. And just a couple points from the Arctic Refuge  
21 Staff about the sheep populations.

22

23 Their biologists feel that the  
24 populations in the drainage in 26(C) is stable. And the  
25 level of harvest that has been occurring in that area has  
26 not detrimentally affected the population. In addition,  
27 the couple of high years of population that you see in  
28 the table, that the high years are the anomaly and not  
29 the low years. And their comments was that the  
30 population is stable and the level of harvest is not  
31 detrimental to the population of sheep in the Hulahula  
32 Drainage.

33

34 Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. I'll take that  
37 as bio-analysis, extension. Thank you. ADF&G.

38

39 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, on Page 106  
40 is their comments, and I believe they haven't changed.  
41 They oppose the proposal, and you can see it on there, I  
42 won't paraphrase it, but I think it would match that the  
43 population is doing okay.

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Vince. Public  
46 comments.

47

48 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. You  
49 already got the comment of Eastern and North Slope.  
50 Eastern opposed it. And I believe North Slope opposed

00162

1 it, correct, this proposal?

2

3 MR. EASTLAND: (Nods affirmatively)

4

5 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, okay. The written  
6 public comments came in from city of Kaktovik. Fenton  
7 Rexford of Kaktovik and Native Village of Kaktovik, and  
8 they all oppose the proposal. They just want to leave it  
9 as a subsistence hunt as you already discussed. So three  
10 in opposition, and they're found on Page 106.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Vince. Staff  
13 Committee.

14

15 MR. EASTLAND: Staff Committee has no  
16 comments.

17

18 Thank you.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Written  
21 comments.

22

23 MR. MATHEWS: I just did those.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, I went out of line  
26 again, it was my fault.

27

28 (Laughter)

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments are  
31 already covered. Regional Council deliberation. We do  
32 have a motion to adopt Proposal 84, and just for the  
33 record, everybody else is opposing this because no real  
34 concern.

35

36 Anything else to add.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further Council  
41 deliberation.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 MR. STICKMAN: Call for the question.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called  
48 for. All those in favor of adopting Proposal 84, signify  
49 by saying aye.

50

00163

1 MR. STICKMAN: Aye.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Aye -- oh, no, not aye.

4

5 MR. STICKMAN: No.

6

7 (Laughter)

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you. You got  
10 that clear. All those in favor of opposing 84 signify by  
11 saying aye.

12

13 IN UNISON: Aye.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion fails. I mean  
16 Proposal 84 fails for the record.

17

18 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, that brings  
19 up overlap proposals with Bristol Bay and that's Proposal  
20 42, which is -- I know it's a bit out of your region but,  
21 again, it's the positive C&T determinations. And that's  
22 to revise the caribou harvest limits for Units 9(B) and  
23 17, and Tom Kron will be presenting that.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: At this time the Chair  
26 will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 42.

27

28 MR. STICKMAN: It's not even in our area.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Do you want some time.

31

32 (Pause)

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any motions, any kind of  
35 motion to go up or down.

36

37 (Pause)

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Carl.

40

41 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, thank you, Mr.  
42 Chairman. I move to adopt Proposal No. 42 because it  
43 does mention Lime Village and Stony River, that they do  
44 have customary and traditional so I think we should  
45 either adopt or oppose.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Carl.

48

49 MR. COLLINS: I'll second that.

50

00164

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you for that  
2 clarification, too. Seconded by Ray Collins. Go ahead,  
3 Tom Kron, bio-analysis.

4  
5 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. Members of the  
6 Council. The analysis for Proposal 42 is found on Page  
7 109 in your Council books. Wildlife Proposal 04-42 was  
8 submitted by the Bristol Bay Federal Subsistence Regional  
9 Advisory Council and would reduce the bull caribou  
10 harvest limit and extend the season in Units 9(B), Unit  
11 17 and Unit 18.

12  
13 Over the last six to seven years the  
14 Mulchatna Caribou Herd has declined from about 200,000  
15 caribou in 1996 to a current post-calving estimate of  
16 147,000 animals. The estimated annual harvest has been  
17 high, in the 12,000 animal range, of which, approximately  
18 two-thirds of the harvest is estimated to be bulls with a  
19 higher proportion of bulls harvested during the fall.  
20 Reducing the bull harvest will help to increase the bull  
21 to cow ratio which should help the population stabilize  
22 or increase.

23  
24 Again, as Council member Morgan has  
25 pointed out, this is before you because of the C&T  
26 determinations for Lime Village and Stony River, which,  
27 again, are described on the top of Page 112.

28  
29 ADF&G's population management objectives  
30 for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd are to maintain a minimum  
31 population of 100 to 150,000 caribou with the minimum  
32 bull to cow ratio of 35 to 100. There's some biological  
33 information included there on the second paragraph on  
34 Page 113. But I guess, in summary, there at the bottom  
35 of that paragraph, based on the survey in 2002 both Unit  
36 17 and Unit 18 there was an overall bull to cow ratio of  
37 25.7 to 100 bulls to a hundred cows [sic]. Based on the  
38 preliminary data collected during the October 2003 survey  
39 there was a bull to cow ratio of only 17.4 bulls to 100  
40 cows.

41  
42 On Page 116 of your Council books, you  
43 will find the preliminary conclusion of the Staff. And  
44 again, basically the Staff conclusion, their assessment  
45 for our consideration is to support with modification to  
46 extend the Federal season to July 1st in Unit 9(B) to  
47 April 15th in Unit 18 and to combine the north and south  
48 parts of Unit 18 as Unit 18.

49  
50 It's my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that

00165

1 the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council at their  
2 meeting supported the Staff conclusion that's included in  
3 the book on Page 116, and I'll just look to Polly for  
4 confirmation on that.

5

6 MS. WHEELER: (Nods affirmatively)

7

8 MR. KRON: That concludes the information  
9 I have. I'd be happy to try to answer any questions.

10

11 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Questions for Tom.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: So about all this proposal  
18 does is address the bull to cow ratio and what else does  
19 it address again?

20

21 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman, it extends the  
22 season in some of these areas. It gives people more  
23 opportunity in terms of time but it restrict the bull  
24 harvest to try to address the bull to cow ratio concern.

25

26 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Tom. Any  
29 further questions for Tom.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, agency comments,  
34 ADF&G.

35

36 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, they're found  
37 on Page 121, and they support with modification. With  
38 Tom's concurrence, I believe, they agree with the same  
39 modification. I didn't analyze it.

40

41 Okay, heads are shaking in the positive  
42 direction that it does.

43

44 So anyway they're on Page 121 with no  
45 change, so they support with modification.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Just for my  
48 clarification then and for the record, too, so we do have  
49 a motion to adopt Proposal 42, do we have to amend that  
50 motion to say as modified or just with that friendly

00166

1 understanding.

2

3

4 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, in the past you've  
5 done it by friendly amendment, to ask the mover of the  
6 motion and the second if they would modify their motion  
7 to adopt the Staff recommendation, which is to modify.

7

8

CHAIRMAN SAM: Who made the motion?

9

10

MR. STICKMAN: Carl.

11

12

CHAIRMAN SAM: Carl.

13

14

15 MR. MORGAN: Yes, as the motion maker I  
16 do concur.

16

17

18 Ray.

CHAIRMAN SAM: Consent of the second,

19

20

MR. COLLINS: Yes.

21

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Okay, that's for my  
24 clarification purposes. Public comments, Vince -- or did  
25 ADF&G have any comments?

25

26

MR. MATHEWS: They didn't have any.

27

28

CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

29

30

31 MR. MATHEWS: There were no written  
32 public comments and I believe there's no one here from  
33 Bristol Bay in the crowd that needs to speak either. So,  
34 no, there's no written public comments that I'm aware of.

34

35

CHAIRMAN SAM: Staff Committee.

36

37

38 MR. BRELSFORD: The Staff Committee had  
39 no additional comments on this proposal.

39

40

Thank you.

41

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, did you get that  
44 Tina, the Staff Committee comment.

44

45

REPORTER: (Nods affirmatively)

46

47

CHAIRMAN SAM: Jerry Berg.

48

49

50 MR. BERG: Just to let the Council know  
that the Yukon Kuskokwim Council did take this up in St.

00167

1 Mary's and they supported Proposal 42 with the  
2 modifications outlined in the Staff analysis. And they  
3 also opposed any restrictions on the Unit 18 caribou  
4 harvest at this time. And that motion passed by a vote  
5 of eight to one.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thanks, Jerry. We already  
10 covered written comments.

11

12 MR. MATHEWS: (Nods affirmatively)

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Regional Council  
15 deliberation. We do have a motion before us to adopt  
16 Proposal 42 with the Staff Committee modification.

17

18 MR. STICKMAN: Jack.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

21

22 MR. REAKOFF: I support this proposal.  
23 The bull cow ratio declining like that is a bad  
24 indicator, so I support the use expansion period but, you  
25 know, they need to get a handle on this harvest a little  
26 bit. So even though it's not in our region, I still  
27 would support. If that population was to decline further  
28 and people were cut off from using that resource, that  
29 would be an effect on our subsistence users.

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. Any  
32 more.

33

34 MR. SIAVELIS: Mr. Chairman.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: George.

37

38 MR. SIAVELIS: Yes, I support the  
39 proposal also. The caribou herd in question does come  
40 into our region.

41

42 Thank you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, George. Any  
45 further comments.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 MR. REAKOFF: Question.

50

00168

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called  
2 for. All those in favor of adopting Proposal 42 as  
3 modified signify by saying aye.

4  
5 MR. COLLINS: Aye.

6  
7 MR. STICKMAN: Aye.

8  
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

10  
11 (Laughter)

12  
13 IN UNISON: Aye.

14  
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: All those in opposition,  
16 same sign.

17  
18 (No opposing votes)

19  
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion 42 has been  
21 adopted.

22  
23 (Laughter)

24  
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: I mean Proposal 42 has  
26 been adopted as modified for the record.

27  
28 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, that brings  
29 us up to Proposal 43, again, it's the positive C&T that  
30 you just dealt with is why it's before you.

31  
32 It was submitted by the Bristol Bay  
33 Regional Advisory Council and it would allow same day  
34 airborne hunting for caribou in Unit 9 and 17. And Tom  
35 Kron will be presenting that.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, 17, is that in our  
38 region, too?

39  
40 MR. STICKMAN: No.

41  
42 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, it's the  
43 Stony River and Lime Village is the reason why it's  
44 before you.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. The Chair will  
47 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 43, I think ADF&G  
48 and Staff Committee recommends to support this  
49 modification, so I would like the motion to reflect that.

50

00169

1 MR. COLLINS: I'll move to support with  
2 modification.

3  
4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

5  
6 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Mickey. Okay,  
9 Tom.

10  
11 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman, again, the  
12 analysis for Proposal 43 is found on Page 124 in your  
13 book. As Vince mentioned this was originally submitted  
14 by the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council.

15  
16 I should note, however, at their recent  
17 meeting, that same Regional Advisory Council chose not to  
18 support this proposal, so again the Bristol Bay Regional  
19 Advisory Council did not support this proposal.

20  
21 The Bristol Bay Native Association whose  
22 members include representatives from 30 villages in  
23 Bristol Bay have expressed the position that airplane use  
24 should not be considered a customary and traditional mode  
25 of transportation for subsistence harvest.

26  
27 The modifications would allow same day  
28 airborne hunting on BLM lands in Unit 9(B), 17(B) and  
29 17(C) and a very small portion of the Togiak National  
30 Wildlife Refuge in the western portion of 17(B).

31  
32 I think I'll stop there and see if there  
33 are any questions.

34  
35 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, just for my  
38 clarification. You said Bristol Bay opposed this and one  
39 of the main reasons is that airplane hunting is not  
40 considered C&T, is that one of the reasons?

41  
42 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman, again, the  
43 Bristol Bay, BBNA had opposed it but it's my  
44 understanding that some of the key Council members that  
45 had knowledge of this issue were not present at the  
46 meeting so that was part of the reason as well, but,  
47 again, I do not know all of their reasons for their  
48 opposition but they did oppose this proposal.

49  
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further.....

00170

1 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, question.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

4

5 MR. COLLINS: In the analysis, this is to  
6 line up with the State -- the State already allows this,  
7 do they, in State regs? I guess the question would be,  
8 are we denying a subsistence opportunity if we oppose  
9 this that is already available for other State users?

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jerry.

12

13 MR. BERG: I don't know if there's any  
14 State Staff that could clarify but the analysis does say  
15 that it would be consistent with State regulations, the  
16 support with modification would be consistent with State  
17 regulations.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Glenn.

20

21 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The  
22 Department's recommendation is similar to the Staff's  
23 recommendation that there is currently some airborne  
24 hunting allowed in portions of 9(B), 17(B) and 17(C), but  
25 they just want to make sure that it aligns with what the  
26 current regulations, and the proposed regulation would go  
27 beyond that. And so the modification is basically the  
28 same as the Federal Staff's recommendation.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Glenn.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: You had something Jack?

35

36 MR. REAKOFF: (Shakes head negatively)

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Public comments.

39

40 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, there were no  
41 written public comments submitted. And then Jerry would  
42 have the actions of the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta.

43

44 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Yukon  
45 Kuskokwim Regional Council opposed this proposal with a  
46 vote of eight to one.

47

48 Thank you.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Staff

00171

1 Committee.

2

3

4 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
5 Taylor Brelsford from the BLM for the Staff Committee.  
6 At the time that the Staff Committee met several weeks  
7 ago prior to the Bristol Bay Council meeting, we did not  
8 have any additional comments, we supported the  
9 preliminary conclusion that's before you.

9

10

11 The action taken by the Bristol Bay  
12 Council does shift the landscape a little bit here. And  
13 I think it's important to sort of look at the heart of  
14 the issue here. The questions in my mind that are before  
15 us are really two things. The Bristol Bay Council  
16 initiated this proposal, several members suggesting that  
17 use of aircraft was a legitimate subsistence methods and  
18 means of transportation and that the State already  
19 permits it in certain areas. I think the Staff Committee  
20 discussion and the Staff analysis and the detail that Tom  
21 kind of skimmed over says something about the history and  
22 the pattern of use of aircraft in the Bristol Bay region,  
23 and we find out that there's divided opinion in the  
24 Bristol Bay region about whether aircraft is a widespread  
25 subsistence methods and means of transportation.

25

26

27 It's certainly important to us that the  
28 Bristol Bay Native Association, the regional tribal  
29 association with all member villages participating takes  
30 a pretty strong position on this question. That's  
31 important as we look at the region.

31

32

33 Now, in light of recent events, we're  
34 faced with the fact that the Regional Council, by a vote  
35 has opposed its own proposal and I think the Board is  
36 going to have to really struggle with what basis there  
37 would be to reverse or challenge a recommendation of the  
38 Bristol Bay Council.

38

39

40 So one big area is this whole thing of  
41 what does the region want in regard to aircraft as a  
42 method of transportation.

42

43

44 The second problem before us is that the  
45 State already permits it in certain areas of Unit 17 and  
46 Unit 9(B), so the effect of Federal action would not be  
47 very significant, the State action would already govern  
48 hunting opportunities for State qualified users.

48

49

50 So I think to conclude, that the Board is  
going to have to look at what the Staff recommendation

00172

1 says and stack that up side by side with the Bristol Bay  
2 Regional Council recommendation. I think you're going to  
3 have to think out loud about this whole question of  
4 regional practices and what regional users consider  
5 subsistence methods and means, while at the same time the  
6 State already authorizes the use of aircraft in this  
7 fashion in certain parts of the region. So you're going  
8 to have to choose, basically, between the recommendation  
9 adopted by the Bristol Bay Council or the preliminary  
10 conclusion in the Staff analysis and offer us your  
11 reasons, your judgment about why you would make the  
12 recommendation you do adopt.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Taylor. Just  
17 sit there for a second, I'm trying to figure this thing  
18 out.

19

20 So either way we go it wouldn't mean much  
21 without final say from Bristol Bay Regional Council  
22 before the Federal Subsistence Board, right, Tom?

23

24 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman, again, the  
25 Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council has opposed this as  
26 has the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council,  
27 they have both already opposed this proposal.

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Even though we have one  
30 village in that area, I don't think our vote will count  
31 very much.

32

33 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

36

37 MR. REAKOFF: I would support those other  
38 Councils. I'm looking at these data, this very low  
39 bull/cow ratio in the Mulchatna, I would be concerned  
40 with that and they were trying to expand the harvest when  
41 they allowed same day airborne, but now that those  
42 bull/cow ratios are starting to fall off, I think it's  
43 time not to allow that, it's time to step back a little  
44 bit, so I would be in support of the other Councils in  
45 not adopting this proposal.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions for  
48 Staff Committee.

49

50 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman.

00173

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Carl.

2

3 MR. MORGAN: I do support the other two  
4 Council's recommendations. But did I hear you say, Tom,  
5 that BBNA also opposed this?

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

8

9 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. Council member  
10 Morgan, again, on Page 133 there under the justification  
11 section, the Bristol Bay Native Association has expressed  
12 a position that airplanes should not be considered a  
13 customary and traditional mode of transportation for  
14 subsistence harvest. That is their position.

15

16 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17

18 MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Tom. And for  
19 that reason, too, I strongly oppose that recommendation.

20

21 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

24

25 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
26 The wording in there, airborne, same day hunting, it  
27 doesn't go over good with me because this is something  
28 that could be used somewhere along the line here, some  
29 other proposal where if you give one you might as well  
30 give all.

31

32 I oppose this.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further  
35 questions for Staff Committee while he's still there.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 MR. WALKER: Question.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question has been called  
42 for. We've already gone into Regional Council  
43 deliberation.

44

45 Okay, we've heard both sides of the  
46 argument, all those in favor of adopting Proposal 43 as  
47 modified signify by saying aye.

48

49 (No aye votes)

50

00174

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: All those opposed adopting  
2 Proposal 43 signify by saying aye.

3  
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 43 failed in  
7 support of the two other Regional Councils.

8  
9 We're done with that section of proposals  
10 that we were supposed to do yesterday.

11  
12 (Laughter)

13  
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: At this time do you want a  
15 short break, grab some coffee.

16  
17 (Council nods affirmatively)

18  
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, coffee break, smoke  
20 break.

21  
22 (Off record)

23  
24 (On record)

25  
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: I would like to call the  
27 meeting back to order, we are back in session.

28  
29 Before we begin, on Thursday morning,  
30 Terry Chapin of University of Alaska asked for some time  
31 under other agencies and groups so we'll go ahead and  
32 grant University of Alaska-Fairbanks some time under Item  
33 F.

34  
35 The next proposal before us is Proposal  
36 1. If you don't have it in your book we have a hand out,  
37 it's on this hand out.

38  
39 MR. MATHEWS: Some of you may have it in  
40 your book.

41  
42 MR. KRON: It's not in the book.

43  
44 MR. MATHEWS: I have it in my book, so  
45 that's what I'm wondering, if we have a pattern, it would  
46 be on Page 35. If it's in your book, just let us know,  
47 it would be interesting to see why this was in some and  
48 not in others. It looks like most of you don't have it.

49  
50 You do have the hand out. It's a

00175

1 statewide proposal. It was submitted by Sue Entsminger  
2 of Mentasta Pass. It's allowing the sale of handicrafts  
3 from brown bear fur, and, we, as Staff will collect all  
4 the Regional Council recommendations that we know of when  
5 we get to that section.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 And you should all have copies. For the  
10 public and Staff there's copies at the desk, the public  
11 desk saying Proposal 1.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: The Chair will entertain a  
16 motion to adopt Proposal WP04-01.

17

18 MR. WALKER: So moved.

19

20 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved and seconded. Moved  
23 by Robert Walker, seconded by Mickey Stickman to adopt  
24 Proposal WP04-01. Bio-analysis.

25

26 MR. UBERUAGA: Good morning, Mr.  
27 Chairman, Council members. My name is Richard Uberuaga  
28 and I work for the Office of Subsistence Management in  
29 Anchorage. I'm a fish and wildlife biologist. I  
30 represent the Northwest Arctic, Yukon Delta, Western  
31 Interior and Kodiak/Aleutian areas. I worked with Pete  
32 DeMatteo a little bit on this proposal, helped him with  
33 some of the background and since he's not here I'll go  
34 ahead and present it for him.

35

36 The proposal was submitted by Sue  
37 Entsminger of Tok, and it requests that handicraft items  
38 be allowed to be made from the fur of brown/grizzly bear.  
39 And I want to clarify one thing that Sue pointed out at  
40 the Eastern Interior meeting. She later clarified that  
41 she wanted this proposal just for Interior grizzly bear,  
42 okay, and we had looked at it initially as brown/grizzly  
43 bear since genetically they're the same species and  
44 they're pretty much indistinguishable genetically but  
45 they are treated differently depending on whether you're  
46 near the coast hunting brown bear or in the Interior  
47 hunting the smaller grizzly bear. But she was pretty --  
48 she wanted to make sure that you understood that it was  
49 just for the Interior grizzly bear.

50

00176

1                   There are a couple other related  
2 proposals. Craig Fleener submitted a proposal for using  
3 handicraft items from bear, hide sales and claws, skull  
4 sales for Unit 25, and then the Anvik Tribal Council  
5 submitted a proposal to allow the sale of bear hides,  
6 grizzly bear, brown bear hides in Unit 21(E).

7  
8                   This proposal would allow the sale of  
9 handicraft items made from the fur of brown/grizzly bear  
10 to provide additional cash flow from parts that are not  
11 normally utilized.

12  
13                   The proponent noted that the use of brown  
14 bear hides is not available except for personal use. And  
15 this would benefit the subsistence user by allowing them  
16 to more fully utilize the bear hide.

17  
18                   So right now the regulations, both State  
19 and Federal regulations are that you can sell handicraft  
20 items from the fur of black bear, black bear only and  
21 this proposal would allow sale of handicraft items from  
22 black bear and grizzly bear.

23  
24                   I'm just going to touch on a few of the  
25 points of the past regulatory history. I think all of  
26 you are pretty much familiar with some of the past, how  
27 bear have been managed over the year and then I'll move  
28 on to the analysis. Before statehood, sale of  
29 brown/grizzly bear hides was legal in some form or  
30 another. But in the early '70s it was prohibited. In  
31 '71 and then also in '85 another law was passed in the  
32 state prohibiting another phase -- phases of parts of  
33 black bear, like the blue bear, or the glacier bear being  
34 sold. So in 1998, the Board of Game entertained a  
35 proposal to legalize the sale of handicraft items from  
36 black bear and in '98 they made it legal to sell black  
37 bear handicraft items. And then subsequently the Federal  
38 Subsistence Board in 2002 adopted that regulation and  
39 also made it legal under their regulations to make  
40 handicraft from black bear only -- black bear fur only.

41  
42                   So that brings us to how are the bears  
43 doing in Alaska. Well, the black bears in general are  
44 healthy populations and stable to increasing statewide  
45 for the most part and also grizzly bears can be  
46 considered to be, in most parts, most units, stable to  
47 increasing. From a biological point of view I would like  
48 to point out that the two species are quite a bit  
49 different in terms of how they're managed, black bear in  
50 most cases are not required to be sealed in rural areas,

00177

1 urban areas they're required to be sealed. All  
2 brown/grizzly bears are required to be sealed if  
3 transported from the state except for in the Brown Bear  
4 Management Areas, Western Alaska Brown Bear Management  
5 Area, they do not be required to be sealed if they are  
6 not removed from the management areas, and I'm sure a lot  
7 of you know that.

8

9 In terms of the harvest history, bear  
10 hides are legally sold in some states and countries.  
11 Sixteen states have laws prohibiting the sale of certain  
12 bear parts, and as I said, we've got lots of requirements  
13 in Alaska in terms of transporting bear hides out of  
14 state so there are several permit requirements for  
15 transportation of bears out of state.

16

17 By adopting this proposal, legalizing the  
18 sale of handicraft for grizzly and brown bear, you would  
19 increase the economic opportunities available to  
20 subsistence users, rural residents, principally in  
21 creating handicrafts.

22

23 This commercialization of handicrafts  
24 from brown/grizzly bear could lead to increase and demand  
25 and overharvest of population of some bears. Interior  
26 brown/grizzly bears have lower densities than some of  
27 your coastal brown bears, have lower reproductive rates  
28 and are susceptible to overharvest. This proposed  
29 regulation could threaten those some populations of  
30 Interior bears.

31

32 Their sustainable yield is low. And  
33 normally brown/grizzly bears are managed at very low  
34 exploitation rates, in other words, we harvest a very  
35 small portion of their numbers every year.

36

37 There's a large economic incentive out  
38 there for illegal sale of bear parts and we hear about it  
39 all the time throughout the United States and Europe.

40

41 Switching away from that I want to get  
42 into the cultural, mention the cultural taboos for many  
43 rural people in Alaska, they find it culturally taboo to  
44 sell bear parts because bears are revered and respected.  
45 This proposal, you know, could offend a lot of people in  
46 certain parts of rural Alaska.

47

48 I need to mention the background about  
49 some of the laws. On lands in Alaska that are under the  
50 National Park Service jurisdiction, making and selling of

00178

1 handicraft articles from the non-edible fish and wildlife  
2 by-products, in this case, brown bear, is a permitted  
3 subsistence use within National Park lands. This fact is  
4 really not well known or understood but it is the case.  
5 Use of black bear handicraft has been allowed for five  
6 years now but there's very little data been collected on  
7 what have been the effects of allowing black bear fur to  
8 be made into handicrafts, so there's really not a lot of  
9 information on what has occurred in the last five years  
10 in terms of selling handicraft -- black bear handicraft  
11 items.

12

13                   There's no tracking or monitoring  
14 mechanism available in the state to follow the sale of  
15 handicraft items made from black bear as of yet. So, you  
16 know, there's little or no information on the customary  
17 trade of handicraft from the lands under Park  
18 jurisdiction.

19

20                   So the preliminary conclusion of this  
21 Staff analysis was to oppose this proposal.

22

23                   The justification for that is first the  
24 regulatory law enforcement framework to control illegal  
25 harvest and trade for brown bear is not in place, and at  
26 first glance does not appear to be practical to have a  
27 good law enforcement framework to control this kind of  
28 trade.

29

30                   Secondly, as I mentioned, the practice  
31 could be found by many people to be culturally  
32 objectionable.

33

34                   Allowing the sale of handicraft items  
35 from brown bear could increase the potential for legal  
36 overharvest and illegal overharvest, and not just of  
37 brown bear populations in Alaska but of brown bear or  
38 grizzly bear populations in the Lower 48, in Canada and  
39 elsewhere.

40

41                   You know, it's been shown throughout  
42 history that once you start selling animals and bringing  
43 them into the cash economy it can be detrimental to most  
44 populations.

45

46                   Brown bear populations are basically  
47 small in number, have low growth rate, low yield and they  
48 have a high commercial value and can be easily  
49 overharvested in some areas. This proposal could changes  
50 some hunters patterns whereas before they didn't hunt for

00179

1 bear, because they didn't have an economic reason to do  
2 so may start hunting for bear because the economic  
3 incentives are so attractive. And, of course, as I  
4 mentioned it could lead to illegal trade throughout the  
5 United States and elsewhere and Europe.

6

7 So that ends my presentation and with the  
8 help of Tom Kron and others, we'd be glad to entertain  
9 any questions.

10

11 MR. SIAVELIS: Mr. Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: George.

14

15 MR. SIAVELIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16 Thank you for that presentation.

17

18 What is the actual legal definition of --  
19 or is there one for handicraft articles?

20

21 MR. UBERUAGA: Yeah, I've got it in here.

22 Let's see where it's at, it deals with substantially  
23 altering -- here it is.

24

25 Handicraft means a finished product in  
26 which the shape and appearance of the  
27 natural material has been substantially  
28 changed by the skillful use of hands such  
29 as sewing, carving, etching,  
30 scrimshawing, painting or other means,  
31 and which has substantially greater  
32 monetary value and aesthetic value than  
33 the unaltered natural material.

34

35 That's the legal definition. We've had  
36 the question posed several times, well, how about if I  
37 grab a fore leg of a black bear and have the claws  
38 attached and I somehow substantially alter that claws and  
39 fur into a handicraft item, can I sell it with the claws  
40 and I don't have an answer of whether or not that's legal  
41 but to me it sounds like it would be legal but I just  
42 don't know.

43

44 But there's a fairly strict definition.

45

46 In 2002, there was a proposal before the  
47 Federal Subsistence Board to reclassify bears as  
48 furbearers with, I think, the hopes that once it was  
49 classified as a furbearer then it could be legally sold.

50

00180

1 So that's it.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not we'll go into bio-  
8 socio-analysis -- I mean, no, agency comments. Randy  
9 Rogers. I talked with you just a little while ago and I  
10 think that because of the next few proposals, you wanted  
11 to cover the Board of Game actions and something else?

12

13 MR. ROGERS: Yes, thank you, Mr.  
14 Chairman. For this particular proposal and it applies to  
15 53 also, Terry Haynes asked me to give you a little bit  
16 of update on what action the Board of Game took. When we  
17 get to the proposals relating to the Central Kuskokwim  
18 Moose Management Plan, the first one of those proposals,  
19 No. 58, I'll give a little background on the final  
20 recommendations of the planning committee and Board of  
21 Game action there.

22

23 For the purpose of Proposal No. 1 and it  
24 also applies to Proposal 53, Terry asked that I pass on  
25 to you that the Board of Game did adopt a proposal to  
26 legalize the sale of handicrafts made from grizzly bear  
27 fur. The Board of Game's authorization did not include  
28 claws. And if you look at the definition, the Federal  
29 definition, the definition of fur it includes claws.  
30 Basically in the Federal definitions it has skin, hide,  
31 pelt, fur, and this is potentially a conflict with the  
32 State action that was taken.

33

34 The Board was considering a myriad of  
35 different proposals related to sale of both grizzly and  
36 black bear fur hides. The Board adopted a statewide bear  
37 conservation policy and was going to consider some of  
38 these other proposals in the context of that policy. But  
39 as of the time when I had left the meeting, the only  
40 action they had taken to further allow sale of bear  
41 parts, fur, in any way, was this provision for legalizing  
42 sale of handicrafts from grizzly bear fur alone.

43

44 Thank you.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Go ahead.

47

48 MR. UBERUAGA: I would just further that  
49 definition that Randy gave in terms of skin. The skin,  
50 hide, pelt or fur means the skin, hide, fur or pelt of a

00181

1 bear shall mean the entire external covering with claws  
2 attached. So he's correct in that there's a conflict  
3 between -- there could be a conflict.

4

CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Randy.

6

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

8

CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Ray.

10

11 MR. COLLINS: Well, I don't know if this  
12 is a question -- well, I guess it is. I guess the  
13 concern is to block the sale of claws but that seems  
14 strange to me because that's the easiest item to make  
15 into necklace or some handicraft item and it would be the  
16 highest demand. And what, you have to throw the claws  
17 away then and then just use the fur, I guess, that  
18 doesn't make sense to me if you're going to have sale,  
19 that you would exclude the part that was the most  
20 valuable.

21

CHAIRMAN SAM: Randy.

23

24 MR. ROGERS: Through the Chair. Member  
25 Collins, not necessarily a question and I wasn't able to  
26 be present for the full discussion of what actually took  
27 place at the Board of Game.

28

29 I guess it's my impression that the Board  
30 had wanted to set this overall bear conservation policy  
31 and look at also expanding our current regulations that  
32 relate to wolf predation control to include bear  
33 predation control, and then within the context of these  
34 overall policies and in consideration of the State  
35 intensive management law and intensive management areas,  
36 make decisions about where it might be appropriate to  
37 make, you know, specific approaches in different areas.

38

39 I'm under the impression that at this  
40 time they weren't ready to go to a more widespread  
41 legalization of sale of bear hides and claws, but I think  
42 that the issue is certainly going to remain on the table  
43 and that once, you know, it could be considered in the  
44 overall context of this policy it wouldn't surprise me to  
45 see things like, particularly, maybe sale of black bear  
46 hides be adopted at some point. And in fact, it could  
47 have happened at the end of the meeting, you know, which  
48 run through today. So I apologize that I can't give you  
49 more conclusive information, but, you know, that's kind  
50 of the consequence of having these overlapping meetings.

00182

1 MR. COLLINS: But I guess the question in  
2 that was, you know, you may have kind of buried it, was  
3 why are they concerned about claws? Is there a concern  
4 about claws is that why they're being so careful in that  
5 wording and do you have any information on that?

6  
7 MR. ROGERS: I really don't. I wasn't  
8 present during the discussion on that so I think it  
9 probably would end up relating to, you know, increase  
10 demand for harvest and maybe getting into the arena of  
11 conservation concerns.

12  
13 I believe that Sue Entsminger was present  
14 at the Board, you know, after the Eastern Interior RAC  
15 meeting and I think she may have emphasized that what she  
16 was particularly looking for was using the fur. I'm not  
17 sure that that was the case but that's the impression  
18 that I have.

19  
20 And, you know, I think also the Board  
21 recognized that, you know, this proposal in itself will  
22 do very little to change harvest of bears, that there's  
23 not that many people out there that really have any  
24 significant interest in using grizzly bear fur for  
25 handicrafts.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

28  
29 MR. UBERUAGA: I would just add that one  
30 of the concerns with the sale of claws is that the  
31 inability to track a set of claws and the ease which  
32 those claws could move throughout illegal commerce.  
33 Claws are very -- you know, once they're detached from  
34 that hide, they're virtually impossible to follow and  
35 track, whereas a hide with claws attached can be sealed,  
36 permitted, followed, et cetera. With claws, I think  
37 that's one of the big concerns.

38  
39 Thank you.

40  
41 MR. KRISKA: Mr. Chairman.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Tommy and then Tom Kron.  
44 Tommy Kriska.

45  
46 MR. KRISKA: Then you're saying if you're  
47 going to have sale of the fur then what happens -- I mean  
48 you're talking about the claws, what happens with the  
49 teeth and one of the main things I'm concerned about, my  
50 concern about is out of all this, everything in this bear

00183

1 the gall bladder is worth the most. So I mean, you know,  
2 people will go after the fur, not even worried about what  
3 they're going to do with the fur, anybody can have it as  
4 far as I know, that's going to be a problem, because most  
5 of the guys around -- all over, is going to go after the  
6 gall bladder because it's worth -- I wouldn't say what  
7 it's worth but for me -- you know, they're not going to  
8 get too much for that skin but I know their main thing  
9 going after them bears is going to be that gall bladder.

10

11 MR. UBERUAGA: Yeah, you're very correct.  
12 Tom, would you like to add to this, please.

13

14 MR. KRON; Mr. Chairman. Mr. Kriska.  
15 And I also I think to respond to Mr. Collins' question.  
16 Mr. Kriska is right, the gall bladder is economically a  
17 very important part of the bear in terms of value, next  
18 to that, the claws also. And I think to -- and, again, I  
19 don't know all of the implications, but I do know from an  
20 enforcement standpoint, you know, in other areas along  
21 the range, that one of the problems they've had is they  
22 find a bear basically with its claws cut off. A dead  
23 bear, it's claws have been cut off, maybe its gall  
24 bladder is removed and the bear is laying there. And I  
25 think it's that sort of issue that is a concern, you  
26 know, in this whole context.

27

28 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Tom. Any  
31 further questions.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Comments.

36

37 MR. SIAVELIS: Mr. Chair.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: George.

40

41 MR. SIAVELIS: Did I hear that the  
42 definition of fur includes claws and stuff, is that what  
43 you said?

44

45 MR. UBERUAGA: Yeah, there's a legal  
46 definition of the skin. Skin, hide, pelt or fur, okay,  
47 they're all the same under this definition, and that is:

48

49 The entire external covering with the  
50 claws attached.



00185

1 this proposal, that's the Native corporation in the  
2 Glennallen area. But I received correspondence just  
3 before getting here that they've reversed their support  
4 and they now oppose the proposal. So AHTNA opposes the  
5 proposal.

6

7                               The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park  
8 Subsistence Resource Commission supports the proposal as  
9 written.

10

11                               And then on the Regional Council  
12 recommendations. The Seward Penn Regional Advisory  
13 Council on February 19th took this up and they opposed  
14 the proposal. They felt that the proposal may have more  
15 appropriate -- may be more appropriate for specific areas  
16 but not statewide. This change would not be culturally  
17 acceptable in the Seward Penn region. Adopting this  
18 proposal may also result in increased illegal harvest and  
19 could also provide economic incentives associated with  
20 bear hunting, thus changing the incentive of the bear  
21 hunters.

22

23                               Eastern Interior took up this proposal  
24 and had a lengthy discussion on Proposal 1. And they  
25 support the proposal with a vote of seven in favor and  
26 one in opposition. The Regional Council wants to be able  
27 to use brown bears taken for subsistence uses to their  
28 fullest extent. They did not feel that the selling of  
29 brown bear fur would be detrimental to the brown bear  
30 populations or that it would be a law enforcement  
31 problem. The Council stated that other wildlife furs are  
32 currently sold from furbearers and other big game  
33 animals. They also stated that hunting guides are  
34 allowed to make thousands of dollars for taking someone  
35 out to shoot a brown bear and they would like to allow  
36 subsistence users to be able to fully utilize the bear  
37 that's harvested.

38

39                               And Jerry probably has Yukon Kuskokwim  
40 and maybe someone has Bristol Bay's actions on Proposal  
41 1.

42

43                               CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Jerry.

44

45                               MR. BERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do  
46 have the recommendation from the Yukon Kuskokwim Regional  
47 Council. They opposed this proposal on a vote of eight  
48 to one and they felt that it should be a regulation  
49 that's considered region by region rather than a  
50 statewide regulation. And they also stated that the

00186

1 local people don't hunt brown bear that much in their  
2 region, especially along the coast because there aren't  
3 that many brown bears in that area.

4

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

6

CHAIRMAN SAM: Staff Committee.

8

MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman.

10

CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Tom.

12

13 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman, I understand  
14 that the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council supported  
15 the proposal, just to conclude the comments from the  
16 Councils.

17

Thank you.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thanks for those  
21 last public comments. Any further public comments,  
22 Vince, or was that it?

23

MR. MATHEWS: (Nods affirmatively)

25

CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Staff Committee.

27

28 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
29 The Staff Committee had no additional comments on this  
30 proposal.

31

32 I would like to mention as we move into  
33 the Western Interior region, that the Staff Committee  
34 will have some supplementary comments on a couple of  
35 items coming up.

36

37 And just to underscore for the new  
38 members, we sometimes use the word Staff and Staff  
39 Committee almost like they're the same thing, but I do  
40 want to distinguish a little bit and repeat something  
41 that you heard in the training yesterday. The Office of  
42 Subsistence Management, the biologists, the  
43 anthropologists, the coordinators are the core technical  
44 Staff to the Federal Subsistence Board. They write the  
45 proposals. So a Staff analysis has come from the Office  
46 of Subsistence Management.

47

48 We use the term Staff Committee to talk  
49 about Warren or Sandy or me, we have a different job. A  
50 different role. So we're actually -- I think we're going

00187

1 to try and start using the words Inter-Agency Staff  
2 Committee to keep it separate for everybody, the Office  
3 of Subsistence Management Staff on the one hand and then  
4 the Staff Committee or Inter-Agency Staff Committee is a  
5 slightly separate role or separate set of players.

6  
7 So the point I want to underscore is that  
8 after some conversations with Regional Council Chairs and  
9 the Board last year, the Board asked the Inter-Agency  
10 Staff Committee to be sure and participate a little more  
11 fully in the Regional Council meetings, and if there are  
12 key concerns about proposals, we want to make sure you  
13 guys hear it now and not way later on when your Chairman  
14 goes to a Board meeting and suddenly there's a  
15 controversy. So the idea is to try and alert you to key  
16 concerns early during the Council meetings.

17  
18 So later on we will have a couple of  
19 proposals with some comments and I just wanted to mention  
20 kind of how those fit into the picture before we get into  
21 the middle of them.

22  
23 Thank you.

24  
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. So that took  
26 care of Inter-Agency Staff.

27  
28 MR. BRELSFORD: (Nods affirmatively)

29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Right.

31  
32 (Laughter)

33  
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Vince.

35  
36 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I apologize  
37 for getting out of step here but I did consult with other  
38 Staff because there's other Councils that met. So we do  
39 have Staff here that were at the Northwest Arctic and  
40 Staff that were at North Slope and they can give you what  
41 they understood that happened and it might be good for  
42 you to understand what those two Councils did.

43  
44 So if you like, Sandy can come up with  
45 Northwest and then Wennona could cover North Slope.

46  
47 And see this shows the strength of the  
48 integration of the program, just to put in a pitch here,  
49 but we're really pitch-hitting here but it really helps  
50 when you have people like this that cover areas. So if

00188

1 you'd like to have Sandy come up on Northwest and then  
2 Wennona on North Slope, then you'll get an understanding  
3 of the way they looked at it.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is it okay with the  
6 Council.

7

8 (Council nods affirmatively)

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Sandy. Wennona.

11

12 MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch with  
13 the Staff Committee. I'll speak for Northwest Arctic --  
14 or I'll share with Northwest Arctic Council did. They  
15 did not like the statewide aspect of this proposal and  
16 they voted to oppose it. They, however, are interested  
17 in the proposal and asked that the Staff write up a  
18 region specific version of this and bring it back to  
19 their Council next year so they could consider it for  
20 their region.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Sandy.  
23 Wennona.

24

25 MS. BROWN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.  
26 Again, the North Slope was essentially following the same  
27 line, they opposed the proposal as a statewide measure  
28 but entertained the opportunity of introducing a proposal  
29 specific to their region.

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Wennona. Is  
32 that all you had, too?

33

34 MS. BROWN: (Nods affirmatively)

35

36 MR. RABINOWITCH: (Nods affirmatively)

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you. We're  
39 under written comments.

40

41 MR. MATHEWS: I already covered those  
42 earlier. And I don't know if Koyukuk River took up this  
43 proposal or McGrath Advisory Committee or Central  
44 Kuskokwim took up this proposal.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

47

48 MR. REAKOFF: We had a Koyukuk River  
49 Advisory Committee meeting -- we didn't take up this  
50 proposal in particular. There was a proposal to allow

00189

1 the sale of black bear parts and the Koyukuk River  
2 Advisory Committee people felt that that was not  
3 culturally acceptable to sell bear parts and they  
4 excluded that part from what they would endorse under  
5 that broad-based proposal that was before us for same day  
6 airborne and various taking sows with cubs and various  
7 aspects.

8

9 The only thing that the Advisory  
10 Committee would adopt is the trapping of bears with foot  
11 snares and traps and the use of lights in the den for  
12 denning. And that's the only portion of that proposal  
13 they would accept. The majority of the Committee members  
14 didn't feel that it was culturally acceptable to sell  
15 bear parts.

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. Ray.

18

19 MR. COLLINS: Denali SRC spoke to this  
20 just this last week. There was a vote of four in favor  
21 and one opposed to the sale so they did support it.

22

23 McGrath Fish and Game Advisory Committee  
24 also supported it and I'll speak to that a little bit  
25 later.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you.

28

29 MR. STICKMAN: Ben.

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, Ben.

32

33 MR. JONES: Yeah, the Middle Yukon  
34 Advisory Committee opposed the sale of black bear parts  
35 for sale but they accepted brown bear parts for sale.  
36 And as for trapping we accepted foothold snare, we  
37 adopted that.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Benedict. Any  
42 further comments.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: I guess that was under the  
47 Regional Council deliberations. I think you had some  
48 more, Ray.

49

50 MR. COLLINS: Well, I guess it's more --

00190

1 are you ready for member comments on the proposal right  
2 now.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

5

6 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, on our area as you  
7 know we've been trying to deal with the moose population  
8 and to build it up, and grizzly bear were found to be one  
9 significant factor in some areas. Just a few animals can  
10 take a lot of calves in the spring when they get good at  
11 it. So we wanted to increase harvest. So we've gone to  
12 one bear every year and we also asked them to waive the  
13 tag fee because we found out that very few local people  
14 were even harvesting grizzly because when they were out  
15 there hunting moose in the fall is when they would see  
16 them and they didn't have a tag and they weren't going to  
17 buy a tag ahead of time on the chance that they might see  
18 a bear. So they asked for a waiver of that.

19

20 It was in place, it had to be renewed at  
21 the last meeting and I don't know what happened.

22

23 They wouldn't mind having a fee for it if  
24 you could purchase it after you took a bear. But they  
25 didn't want to say I'm going to hunt a grizzly bear so  
26 you buy a tag ahead of time and do that, they would  
27 rather see what happened in the fall if they took one  
28 then they'd go ahead and do it.

29

30 But with that one bear a year and the fee  
31 waiver, the harvest went from like two bears to five  
32 bears so it was not excessive.

33

34 And one of the things that people are  
35 concerned about in our area all along, even the elders,  
36 they don't want to kill something for nothing, so they're  
37 not wanting the hide and so if they're not going to eat  
38 the bear why should I kill that bear, or if they have  
39 killed a bear for food, it's used a little bit in  
40 potlatch, even grizzly, but very limited, just some of  
41 the elder men would eat it. One fellow liked to pickle  
42 the paws, I know, picked bear paws, but it was very  
43 limited use during my time, the 30 years or so I've been  
44 in the area, it's been only limited use at potlatch.

45

46 But they did take them occasionally when  
47 they were causing problems around the village, and then  
48 the hide just laid there, often was wasted. And I feel  
49 that there -- there is a feeling that they should be able  
50 to use the animal for something if it's useful.

00191

1 I know there's a concern if you start  
2 selling it's going to get out of hand and so on. But it  
3 seems to me that if you have to seal those before you can  
4 turn it into handicraft or sell even the claws, anybody  
5 that starts selling has to show that they have a sealed  
6 bear, that they took a bear. And what you would want to  
7 monitor would be the harvest in the area. So if you're  
8 trying to increase harvest to allow the people that have  
9 harvested to sell it, I don't think should cause a  
10 problem for the bear population as long as you're  
11 monitoring that harvest and it's within -- and then it's  
12 up to the individual whether they want to sell it or not.

13

14 I mean some people might not want to get  
15 into that. It should be regional. I guess I can't see  
16 all the concern about it.

17

18 Right now it goes on illegally and they  
19 can't control it and they're not sealing it or anything,  
20 they're just out there illegally harvesting it. Why  
21 should not people that can legitimately take it and have  
22 them sealed be able to use that whatever way they feel  
23 appropriate. That's kind of my feelings.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack Reakoff.

26

27 MR. REAKOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
28 don't think that this would even apply regionally. I  
29 think it would be unit-specific at best. I would be very  
30 concerned about allowing the sale of bear parts where I  
31 live in the Dalton Highway Corridor.

32

33 I sell wolf teeth jewelry, I sell wolf  
34 skins and stuff. I have people come into my house all  
35 the time, even though I have a sign on the front of my  
36 house that says no bear parts, no bear claws, or in tact  
37 moose antlers, they beg me to sell them bear claws. I  
38 can see this thing could be -- there's very high demand.  
39 I have people all the time, all summer long wanting to  
40 buy bear parts. I got a bear on my wall and they see  
41 that bear, they want to buy those bear parts. I would be  
42 very reluctant to allow that because we have bow hunters,  
43 we're around our sustained yield in that Dalton Highway  
44 Corridor. I would not want to encourage the sale of bear  
45 parts by the subsistence users there.

46

47 We eat bear meat there. We kill those  
48 grizzlies for meat. They're good bears up there, there's  
49 hardly no salmon there so they're good meat. But I  
50 wouldn't want to start a market that would start to

00192

1 suppress those bears up in that country. And so we're at  
2 sustainability in that Dalton Highway Corridor, I would  
3 be opposed to the sale of grizzly bear parts in that  
4 area.

5  
6 There may be other areas in this region  
7 around McGrath or somewhere where those people might want  
8 to be able to do that, but where I'm at, I don't want to  
9 see that there for conservation measure.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: George Siavelis.

12  
13 MR. SIAVELIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
14 Yes, I would be opposed to this proposal. The seal comes  
15 off once it's tanned and we have a few tanneries now in  
16 Alaska. I think it would be -- and taking that into  
17 consideration it would be impossible to enforce if it  
18 wasn't legal statewide. If you just started doing it  
19 region to region, it'd be difficult for the enforcement  
20 people to know where the bear came from once the tanning  
21 process started.

22  
23 There's a big difference when you switch  
24 from black bears to brown bears. We feel that there are  
25 many -- if you did make it statewide, there are many  
26 people that are sensitive to even talking about bear  
27 harvest and selling those parts would be even worse.

28  
29 We have a big concern, I have a big  
30 concern about making bear hunters out of people who don't  
31 have any real use for it. Right now they don't hunt bear  
32 but they'll become bear hunters if there's a big  
33 incentive for it.

34  
35 And another problem I see is the abuse.  
36 If you legalize certain parts of grizzly bears, grizzly  
37 bears is the big scare. If you legalize sale of the  
38 hide, parts of the hide, the claws or even the whole bear  
39 hide, there's a real potential for guys going over to --  
40 I know I could just take a bear hide and go over to the  
41 orient and sell the bear hide -- we could flood the  
42 market and the bear hide value may go down to say, a few  
43 hundred dollars or so, but I could easily make a deal to  
44 sell the bear hide for 10,000 knowing the bear hide's  
45 only worth a couple hundred, but the cooler with the gall  
46 bladders, I'll give you those, and it's perfectly legal  
47 right now to give all the gall bladders away you want and  
48 I could just simply -- I mean you develop relationships  
49 with people and you just know that you're selling bear  
50 hides but you're giving away gall bladders and it goes

00193

1 along with it.

2

3

4 And I think it will change the world,  
5 European, Lower 48 people's opinion on subsistence  
6 hunting. This is a proposal for subsistence hunting of  
7 bears, change their opinion completely.

7

8

9 And I do think it violates, at the very  
10 minimum, the spirit of ANILCA.

10

11

12 Thank you.

12

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, George. Any  
15 further Council deliberations. Jeff, go ahead, Jeff, one  
16 more.

16

17

18 MR. DENTON: Jeff Denton, I'm with the  
19 BLM Anchorage Field Office. Just in the last two weeks I  
20 was at an International Bear Conference in San Diego and  
21 there's actually quite significant changes in the  
22 marketing of bear parts worldwide. Actually the gall  
23 bladder trade is actually declining rather drastically,  
24 however, paws and, in fact, many American black bear  
25 parts are right now currently in the Black Markets in  
26 China, Korea. There's surprising numbers of them that  
27 are located there.

27

28

29 We have people actually over there and  
30 they're doing genetic work and so on, on some of these  
31 parts that they buy and actually there's a very brisk  
32 trade right now in North American bear parts in the  
33 Orient. And even though the gall bladder trade is  
34 somewhat declining because of the Viagra's and this sort  
35 of thing in the world, actually, Viagra's probably one of  
36 the greatest things for bear conservation that ever  
37 happened, surprisingly.

37

38

39 (Laughter)

39

40

41 MR. DENTON: But right now in Russia they  
42 have, I think -- the Russian government has 4,000 gall  
43 bladders sitting there they can't sell. So the gall  
44 bladder trade is actually somewhat depressed, however,  
45 other bear parts, claws and so on are greatly increasing  
46 right now.

46

47

48 So there's a very brisk market. There's  
49 a lot of opportunities for legal and illegal trade. So  
50 just as a kind of an update on what's going on world  
51 wide.

00194

1 MR. UBERUAGA: I'd like to point out that  
2 many of you may have heard that Fish and Wildlife  
3 Protection made a case in Bethel here recently. I just  
4 read about it last week in an Anchorage newspaper. It's  
5 weekly, Fish and Wildlife Protection did a sting on some  
6 people in Bethel, they offered some gall bladders to a  
7 resident of Bethel who traded them liquor, two bottles of  
8 Crown Royal for a bear gall bladder and they were  
9 successfully arrested and hopefully will be prosecuted.  
10 But it's happening right now in this area.

11

12 Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: We've gone through some  
15 lengthy discussions. I think everybody knows which way  
16 they're leaning. So anything further.

17

18 MR. COLLINS: I think I'm persuaded, I'll  
19 probably vote against it.

20

21 (Laughter)

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further deliberations.

24

25 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chair.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

28

29 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You  
30 know, all this that goes on in the world here, a lot of  
31 this part of the state doesn't really know what goes on,  
32 only if there's CNN news then they know what's going on.

33

34 And to make handicrafts out of bear parts  
35 has been, you know, something maybe introduced newly, but  
36 I think I'm not going to oppose it, I'm going to vote yes  
37 for it. Because I think that, you know, we're talking  
38 subsistence here, you know. I mean there are laws, but,  
39 sure, there's going to be laws no matter what, but in a  
40 subsistence point of view here, a person who can make  
41 \$50, \$100, it doesn't really enter their mind that some  
42 of these things are illegal until it is brought up by  
43 some Fish and Feather's Cop here jumps up, hey, you're  
44 going to be arrested here because you are illegal selling  
45 parts, you know, this is a rude awakening for a lot of  
46 people.

47

48 But I'm going to vote yes on it.

49

50 Thank you.

00195

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further.

2

3 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, Carl.

6

7 MR. MORGAN: I am wrestling with this  
8 concept. But I would oppose a statewide, but I think I  
9 would, you know, generally leave it up to the regional  
10 concept, I think like GASH can do it. I think if GASH  
11 wants it then I think they should be able to do that. If  
12 Central Kuskokwim wants it, I think they should be able  
13 to make that decision. I think the decision should be  
14 made locally rather than statewide.

15

16 And I generally oppose this, but I think  
17 it should be left up to the region, which I think is more  
18 appropriate, it will be more or less a local decision.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Carl. I intend  
21 to vote against it and the main reason will be -- one of  
22 the reason is that it shouldn't be a statewide proposal.  
23 The other one is that if you're going to address sale of  
24 any parts, you've got address the whole animals. Because  
25 if you're selling just one part of an animal, you're  
26 wasting it conceptually if you know what I mean because  
27 all that would do is create more wanton waste out there.

28

29 And at this time I intend to vote against  
30 it because you're just looking at total wanton waste for  
31 a few bucks is what this amounts to, and this proposal  
32 only addresses the skin so that's why I'm voting totally  
33 against this proposal at this time.

34

35 Any further deliberations.

36

37 MR. WALKER: I got one more question.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

40

41 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, we're talking  
42 about Proposal 1, right, allowing the sale of  
43 handicraft.....

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

46

47 MR. WALKER: .....brown bear parts?

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, this is Proposal

50 1.....

00196

1 MR. WALKER: Okay.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: .....as introduced by Sue  
4 Entsminger of Tok. Any further deliberations.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, all those in favor  
9 of adopting Proposal 1 statewide sale of bear parts  
10 signify by saying aye.

11

12 MR. WALKER: Aye. I'll vote yes.

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, the record notes  
15 that Robert voted yes. All those opposed signify by  
16 saying same sign.

17

18 IN UNISON: Aye.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion fails. Proposal  
21 53. Vince.

22

23 MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 53.

26

27 MR. MATHEWS: I'm searching for it.

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, go ahead. Proposal  
30 53 was discussed a little bit in your last discussion and  
31 it was submitted by Anvik Tribal Council which allows the  
32 sale of Unit 21(E) black bear and brown bear parts.

33

34 MR. STICKMAN: I make a motion to adopt  
35 Proposal 53.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

38

39 MR. WALKER: Second.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Robert.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Bio-cultural analysis.

44

45 MR. UBERUAGA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
46 Members of the Council. Richard Uberuaga again.

47

48 Proposal 53 was submitted by the Anvik  
49 Tribal Council as Vince stated. It asks for the legal  
50 sale of bear parts from black and brown bear harvested in

00197

1 Unit 21(E). And it also requests an increase in the  
2 harvest limit in 21(E) from one brown bear every four  
3 years to four brown bear every year.

4

5 As I mentioned there are other bear  
6 proposals, 78 as Craig Fleener submitted and was acted  
7 on. The one I just presented. And you know the results  
8 of the Board of Game on this issue of bear hides, parts.

9

10 So the proponent, the Anvik Tribal  
11 Council requested that the Board address this provision  
12 for Unit 21(E) and while the bear would be harvested in  
13 Unit 21(E), it could be sold anywhere in the state and  
14 that's similar to Craig Fleener's proposal in Unit 25.  
15 It would be harvested in 25, sold -- it'd be a legal sale  
16 anywhere in the state. The reasoning behind his proposal  
17 was he stated the legal sale of bear parts would provide  
18 a subsidy for the lack of commercial fishing in District  
19 Y4.

20

21 And as you know both Federal and State  
22 laws prohibit the sale of bear parts except handicraft.

23

24 There's a lengthy regulatory history I've  
25 mentioned to you in the previous proposal. I won't go  
26 through that again. Suffices to say that it was legal at  
27 one point in Alaska, Alaska became a state and through  
28 the following years became illegal for both brown and  
29 black bear hides and parts to be sold commercially at all  
30 or bartered.

31

32 We know some of the history about how  
33 we've tried to, under Federal proposals, classify the  
34 bear as a furbearer and approach it from that angle and  
35 that didn't work.

36

37 Some of the other history is that the  
38 Board has reviewed proposals to legalize sale of gall  
39 bladders before, it's not that they haven't ever taken it  
40 up. In 1995 they addressed the sale of gall bladders and  
41 did not adopt that proposal.

42

43 I need to mention something about the  
44 status of the bears in 21(E) and what I have before me  
45 says that black bear are relatively abundant in 21(E),  
46 however, the brown bear population in 21(E) is at a low  
47 density but is considered to be stable.

48

49 Again, we know about the history of sale  
50 throughout the state and the Lower 48 and the world and

00198

1 the problems, conservation problems that are out there  
2 right now.

3

4 Harvest of black bear in 21(E) is  
5 believed to be well below the harvestable surplus as it  
6 is in many areas of the state. As we see we've got a  
7 liberal season for black bears in most areas of three  
8 black bear.

9

10 The brown bear harvest in 21(E) is  
11 thought or estimated to be at near the sustainable yield  
12 levels.

13

14 The annual harvest in 21(E) is around  
15 five bears a year or the sustainable harvest level is  
16 around five bears a year based out of a population of 100  
17 -- an estimate of 108 animals. So there's not a lot of  
18 brown bear in Unit 21(E). Harvest levels -- sustainable  
19 harvest levels are low and the actual harvest levels are  
20 near that level now.

21

22 I've mentioned the cultural sensitivity  
23 that brown bear plays in many of your cultures in this  
24 area and how it could be very culturally offensive to  
25 many people.

26

27 We've gone through why selling bear parts  
28 is a bad idea in terms of conservation of small  
29 populations of animals, how they can be easily  
30 overharvested. How these economics -- big, large  
31 economic incentives can change people's behavioral  
32 patterns. All of a sudden people want to become bear  
33 hunters to get some money.

34

35 We've got lots of examples of illegal  
36 activity throughout the state but we don't need to go  
37 over that.

38

39 Let's talk about the black bear for a  
40 moment in contrast to the brown bear.

41

42 The black bear are more numerous and more  
43 productive than the brown bears and they're less  
44 susceptible to over-exploitation or overharvest. Under  
45 the existing regulations for both subsistence and non-  
46 subsistence, the liberal seasons that are out there right  
47 now and the bag limits, the three bear black bear bag  
48 limit gives that opportunity to engage in illegal harvest  
49 in the Black Market. I mean the opportunity is there if  
50 you want to go into illegal harvesting of black bears.

00199

1                   A strictly regulated sale of their hides  
2 and parts modeled after like the program that trappers  
3 use for following sealed furs, you know, could provide a  
4 mechanism for black bear hides and that mechanism could  
5 be a suitable mechanism to control and follow and try to  
6 help prevent, you know, some of the illegal activities  
7 and control it.

8  
9                   By adopting this proposal could allow  
10 individuals who desire to make handicrafts from black  
11 bear fur, the legal access to buy a hide. Right now they  
12 can't go out and buy a hide and cut it up and use that  
13 fur to make a part, they have to get that hide either  
14 themselves or have it given to them.

15  
16                   So I'm kind of presenting this analysis  
17 in that it's looking at black bear in a more positive  
18 light, the sale of black bear hides in a lot more  
19 positive light than brown bear hides.

20  
21                   However, the conclusion, the preliminary  
22 Staff conclusion was to oppose the proposal for many of  
23 the same legal and biological concerns. We don't have  
24 the mechanism in place to follow black bear hides. We  
25 know that brown bear populations are more susceptible,  
26 however, the black bear might be a more suitable species  
27 to allow this to occur if there were mechanisms in place  
28 to prevent abuses.

29  
30                   So allowing the sale of bear hides and  
31 parts from Federal lands in 21(E) would currently be  
32 unenforceable because it would be difficult to prove  
33 where the bear was harvested and could lead to increased  
34 harvest throughout Alaska and elsewhere.

35  
36                   It was the feeling of this analysis that  
37 the statewide regulation would be much more enforceable  
38 than a unit-specific regulation.

39  
40                   As I said black bear may be able to  
41 sustain this increased exploitation rates because of  
42 their current abundance and population health. But  
43 without that regulatory enforcement framework, our  
44 conclusion was to oppose this proposal.

45  
46                   Again, brown bear populations are much  
47 smaller in number, much slower growth rates, much lower  
48 sustainable yields, have a much higher value, are more  
49 easily overharvested and would likely be detrimentally  
50 exploited if they were allowed to enter that commercial

00200

1 market.

2

3 That's all I've got.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any questions.

8 Robert.

9

10 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 Rich, how much of a shake up was this proposal here when

12 it was written up by the OSM here and the State here, did

13 it kind of throw a wrench in their planning or anything?

14

15 MR. UBERUAGA: Well, I'll give you a

16 little background on what I went through. You know, in

17 2002 Tom Kron did the major part of this proposal when he

18 addressed black and brown bear to be classified as

19 furbearers so he provided a really good history of

20 everything that we went through. And as I was looking at

21 his past analysis and trying to fit it to 2004 and what

22 was being asked for, we realized that, you know, under

23 certain laws and regulations, like under the National

24 Parks, under handicraft items made from brown bears are

25 legal, okay, can be sold if you're within a Park and you

26 have the Subsistence Resource Commission has given you

27 resident zone community status, you know, you can

28 actually go out into a Park and harvest a brown bear and

29 make a handicraft item from parts of that bear, the non-

30 edible parts of that bear and engage in some commerce.

31

32 And to me that was a complete surprise.

33 I think that several of us, it was a complete surprise,

34 and it took us awhile, working with Sandy Rabinowitch

35 from the Park Service to really clarify what laws say and

36 how some of the regulations have been made to address the

37 law.

38

39 So, you know, of course, we knew all

40 along that these proposals were going to go before the

41 Board of Game about the same time that we were going to

42 address them here and at first we thought, well, let's

43 just wait until the Board of Game weighs in on what they

44 think and what they're going to adopt and I think that

45 the OSM felt that, no, we need to provide an analysis,

46 our best analysis and made a recommendation and not just

47 follow exactly in lock step with the Board of Game's

48 actions.

49

50 So that's kind of some of the stuff we

00201

1 went through, the turmoil, if you will, in addressing  
2 this proposal.

3

4 I think, well, you know, it's just a very  
5 difficult issue to deal with for subsistence users  
6 because, you know, we hear things like a big game guide  
7 can go out and make a lot of money guiding hunters on  
8 this animal, yet the subsistence user is out in the  
9 village, has that animal, has killed that animal and  
10 can't do anything with it and profit by it, so is there  
11 an inequity there, well, you know, those kind of things  
12 play into all of this and, you know, those are sometimes  
13 value judgments, sometimes moral judgments and, you know,  
14 we try to keep a good objective as possible analysis and  
15 let this process, the Regional Council process work like  
16 it's supposed to and hear from you.

17

18 So that's all, thank you.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Hearing none, ADF&G.

25

26 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, their  
27 comments are on Page 150 which are quite lengthy. I  
28 would encourage you to look at them because it does bring  
29 in some other laws that apply and et cetera.

30

31 So basically Alaska Department of Fish  
32 and Game opposes Proposal 53, and I would just encourage  
33 you to look at them.

34

35 (Pause)

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions on ADF&G  
38 comments. Public comments.

39

40 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I have one  
41 question. They make a statement in there that brown  
42 bears are CITES Appendix 1 species and black bear are  
43 CITES Appendix 2, I don't know what that means and it  
44 doesn't add anything to their statement. Can somebody  
45 clarify that?

46

47 Second paragraph.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

50

00202

1 MR. UBERUAGA: CITES is a classification.  
2 I think it was established by the North American  
3 Commission on Wildlife Trade, it's a classification that  
4 you have to have a CITES permit before you can export an  
5 animal out of the state through Canada or to Europe.

6  
7 It's a classification that deals with  
8 that population's health and status.

9  
10 MR. EASTLAND: You're getting a lot of  
11 things confused.

12  
13 MR. UBERUAGA: Okay.

14  
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

16  
17 MR. EASTLAND: CITES is, as Rich says,  
18 it's a classification from the International Union on the  
19 Conservation of Nature based in Switzerland. CITES  
20 stands for the Convention in International Trade in  
21 Endangered Species. And the United States is a signatory  
22 of this international treaty.

23  
24 Animals on Appendix 1 are counted as  
25 endangered and trade in those animals is highly  
26 restricted. Animals on Appendix 2 are potentially  
27 threatened if trade is not monitored. So animals on  
28 Appendix 1 require one heck of a lot of paperwork to  
29 trade in any piece or part of them. Animals on Appendix  
30 2 are routinely traded but the host country, the  
31 originating country provides a permit. And the United  
32 States through the Endangered Species Act enforces the  
33 CITES Treaty.

34  
35 Thank you.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

38  
39 (No comments)

40  
41 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, public comments.

42  
43 MR. MATHEWS: I didn't know if Bob  
44 Shultz, Refuge manager had any other comments since he  
45 came up to the mike.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Did you Bob.

48  
49 MR. SHULTZ: I dealt with CITES for 10  
50 years when I was down at Tok. And I think the Appendix 1

00203

1 -- the definition for Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 clarified  
2 for some of the misunderstanding. If you've got an  
3 Appendix 1 species you've got to get a CITES permit to  
4 import or export that species from one country to  
5 another. And there's an application fee and permit fee  
6 for that. On Appendix 2 species, such as the black bear,  
7 you do not need a CITES permit and there is no fee but it  
8 is tracked through a CITES form. You have to have it  
9 filled out before you transport it from one country to  
10 the next.

11

12 And that leads to a lot of confusion for  
13 people coming up the Alaska Highway. For people  
14 traveling with it in their position. A lot of that stuff  
15 ends up being seized. Down in Tok we confiscated a lot  
16 of Eskimo dolls and that, the heads were carved out of  
17 cottonwood but the eyes were baleen and the baleen made  
18 it an endangered species or a CITES 1 and they could not  
19 import or export those species. So it ends up with a lot  
20 of hassle for people who buy parts. These bear skins, if  
21 they were sewn into a part of a muk-luk, put into part of  
22 a fur ruff or something like that, would lead to a lot of  
23 problems in getting them out of the state of Alaska.

24

25 Thanks.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thanks, Bob. Any further  
28 questions.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Public comments.

33

34 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, you do  
35 have them on Page 151.

36

37 The Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk, Holy Cross  
38 Local Advisory Committee, when they first took up this  
39 proposal supported it. Their meeting in January they  
40 opposed it. And I did talk to the Chair on that to get  
41 that confirmed, Ken Chase, so what is on Page 151 is  
42 correct, that they oppose it unanimously. To increase  
43 the harvest limit of brown bears to four bears and to  
44 allow the sale of black and brown bear parts harvested in  
45 Unit 20(E) [sic]. It appears they oppose Anvik's Tribal  
46 Council to close Federal lands in 21(E) to black bear,  
47 brown bear and moose because statements in their minutes,  
48 no change to the State season or take.

49

50 We received a letter from Audubon Alaska.

00204

1 They oppose this proposal. The sale of bear parts,  
2 because it could result in serious conservation problems  
3 for black and brown bears throughout Alaska. The illegal  
4 traffic in bear parts is a serious world wide  
5 conservation concern. Providing a legal market in Alaska  
6 could increase the demand for gall bladders in Asia.

7

8 The Alaska Professional Hunters  
9 Association, they oppose Proposal 53 and similar  
10 proposals regarding the sale of handicraft from bears.  
11 And, again, as they said before they didn't see that  
12 complying with the requirements of ANILCA.

13

14 And I don't know if Yukon Kuskokwim took  
15 up this one, it has a no determination, which means it's  
16 a statewide, all rural Alaskans apply, but I don't know  
17 if any other Councils took this up.

18

19 MR. BERG: (Shakes head negatively)

20

21 MR. MATHEWS: It appears not. And I  
22 don't see any other Staff saying any other Councils took  
23 this up so it is before you.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Inter-Agency Staff.

28

29 MR. BRELSFORD: We'll all try to get the  
30 lingo right. The Inter-Agency Staff Committee had no  
31 additional comments on this proposal.

32

33 Thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Taylor.  
36 Regional Council deliberations. We do have a motion to  
37 adopt Proposal 53. Regional Council deliberations.

38

39 MR. WALKER: I'll go first.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

42

43 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
44 did discuss this with the tribe in Holy Cross, I am from  
45 Anvik.

46

47 One of the issues they brought up was a  
48 lot of bears are being harvested up in 21 and we know  
49 because we have a guide there that flies in there and  
50 takes a lot of bears just within five miles of our

00205

1 community, grizzly bears, you know, and we're sitting  
2 there, you know, we asked, hey, do you need drivers, you  
3 need helpers, no, we don't, we don't want to spend any  
4 money on you guys because we can just fly in there and  
5 shoot a bear and fly out.

6  
7                   So this has been going on for about 20  
8 years here. And I did talk to a Captain Fleet (ph) at a  
9 Fish and Game meeting in Anchorage before he retired, he  
10 said that the average of between 30 and 50 bears a year,  
11 somewhere in the region of 21 but it also goes up into  
12 Unalakleet and Kaltag area. And all these bears are  
13 being taken out by big game guides. And you know when  
14 you go to these lodges and everything and you see these  
15 bear hides hanging up and everything, you know, there's  
16 no taboo about that. I mean Jesus Christ look at -- I  
17 mean, what do you think, a bear part you use it and  
18 everything, I mean times have changed but, sure, there is  
19 still some taboo, but when you go to a White guy's lodge  
20 there's no taboo there.

21  
22                   And we felt that we should just draft up  
23 a letter and just send it out to the OSM and see what  
24 their reaction would be, and, you know, I could see  
25 there's a lot of reaction here reading back in here,  
26 ADF&G, that's the first time I've ever seen them put a  
27 full page into opposing it, they never ever did a full  
28 page before. You know, this is really a rude awakening  
29 for some of these organizations here, which I'm glad  
30 they're all here to read this and take a really hard look  
31 at it. It is frustration for us. Not only for 21, but I  
32 know there's some other units here that, you know, maybe  
33 wanted to do the same thing we did.

34  
35                   But going back to this allowing the sale  
36 of bear parts, we did a research also and we came up with  
37 all the same analysis that Rich came up with and we went  
38 even further, we wanted to see how the GASH Board would  
39 work on this, because the GASH does not talk to the  
40 tribal, there is some conflict there, and when I talked  
41 to the chief, he said they had a secret meeting, I wasn't  
42 aware of it, it wasn't posted, so Vince called the so-  
43 called Chairman here and get his input on this, which is  
44 fine, I am glad that there is communication here. You  
45 know, I would have liked to go over and have said a few  
46 words, so did other people who would have liked to go  
47 over there and say a few other words and let them know  
48 that we know this is not going to pass, we know right off  
49 the bat that this is not going to go nowhere. But it  
50 just showed us that the Advisory Board didn't want to

00206

1 communicate with the tribal governments and sit down and  
2 talk it over.

3

4 The GASH Board went out on a limb and had  
5 a secret meeting here and that kind of let us know where  
6 we stand.

7

8 But I'm going to oppose this, too,  
9 because I really thought this was going to be some kind  
10 of an awakening for even our own Board here. Look at it,  
11 all our lives we grew up here and all you ever see is big  
12 game hunters coming and shooting bears and the  
13 subsistence livers here could do this but they can't do  
14 that.

15

16 So we're just kind of like sending a  
17 direct signal to the State and to the OSM, Park Service,  
18 even the Audubon back here they said, Audubon, the Alaska  
19 Professional Hunter's Association, that, you know, we are  
20 living out here, we'd like to utilize some of this stuff  
21 but there has to be some regulations made for us. The  
22 subsistence user, as Mr. Bifelt brought up yesterday, we  
23 only make between eight to \$20,000 a year and that's a  
24 good year. Somewhere along the line everybody's going to  
25 have to work together for some kind of conclusion where  
26 bear parts, we're not interested in the gall, we're not  
27 interested in -- all we want is the hide, teeth, skull,  
28 claws, some people want to make jewelry out of the claws,  
29 which is illegal, they can't do that. Some people would  
30 like to clean up the skull and paint it and sell it. I  
31 mean just a few dollars here, it's not a lot of money.

32

33 But I'm just really glad that we got some  
34 attention here. It seems like there's some lengthy pages  
35 here and I thank Vince for that.

36

37 (Laughter)

38

39 MR. WALKER: I'm not making fun of you,  
40 Vince.

41

42 (Laughter)

43

44 MR. WALKER: But in all due respect to  
45 everybody, all this work that has been done, this has  
46 really showed a lot of attention -- I'm going to bring it  
47 back to the tribe and I'm going to explain it to them and  
48 we're going to talk this over, and I'm going to say, you  
49 know, blah, blah, the Western Interior, you know, how  
50 they take their vote, it's up to them, you know, I'm not

00207

1 saying we're subsistence you got to go with us, you know,  
2 it's up to the individual person.

3

4 But like I said, I'm going to probably  
5 vote no myself, too, but I'm just glad I brought this to  
6 the attention to everybody, not me, but the tribal  
7 government with my help here and those are my  
8 deliberations.

9

10 Thank you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further Council  
13 deliberations.

14

15 MR. COLLINS: Robert, there's a couple  
16 points I'd like to make here. One would be I would have  
17 to vote against this, too.

18

19 The first one would be the fact that  
20 we're getting -- we have a tribal council proposing it  
21 and then we have a Fish and Game Advisory against it, so  
22 just like the Federal Board when those conflicts come up  
23 I would have to send it back to the region and ask them  
24 to come to agreement on a proposal, I think before I  
25 could support it, even if I wanted to do it for a local  
26 area.

27

28 But the other one would be, I think the  
29 jump from one bear every four years to four a year would  
30 be excessive because it would promote almost market  
31 hunting of those bears. So if there was going to be sale  
32 of parts, for somebody who had taken one legally I might  
33 be able to support that, but I don't think I could  
34 support four a year because it looked like it would be  
35 aimed at really reducing the bear population  
36 dramatically.

37

38 Thank you.

39

40 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

43

44 MR. COLLINS: Yes, Ray there is a  
45 conflict. We just put four bears to get the attention of  
46 the State because we know the State is going to go to one  
47 bear every regulatory -- every year rather than one every  
48 four regulatory year.

49

50 Randy, could I ask you to come up here

00208

1 and talk and tell us a little something about this  
2 planning the State is doing here for 21, at this time,  
3 Mr. Chairman, is that okay with you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: What was that question  
6 again, Robert, or who was that directed to?

7

8 MR. WALKER: Randy.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, Randy.

11

12 MR. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
13 Member Walker. Yeah, I think it's a good time to bring  
14 this up. We have, for a long time have been working to  
15 try and organize a cooperative planning effort to address  
16 moose management in Unit 21(E). Just recently we  
17 received word that we will be getting some funding from  
18 Office of Subsistence Management to help support that  
19 project.

20

21 So basically our intent is to go ahead  
22 and get a project initiated. You know, some of the  
23 discussion here highlights some of the challenges that  
24 we'll have. Do we work through the Advisory Committee,  
25 do we work through the village councils, do we need to  
26 involve Tanana Chiefs, AVCP, I mean with all the issues  
27 before you, the C&T determinations, you know, while we  
28 would be focusing on bear management, predation on -- I  
29 mean focusing on moose management, predation on moose  
30 from bears and wolves will inevitably come into the  
31 discussion, and, you know, we will address those issues  
32 as it relates to moose management.

33

34 Also I want to acknowledge the fact that  
35 we're going to have some real difficult staffing issues  
36 in terms of getting started on that project immediately.  
37 The assistant area biologist in McGrath recently left the  
38 Department to go back to the University of Alaska to  
39 complete a Ph.d. project, but I guess we would intend to,  
40 one way or another, find a means to follow through with  
41 that project and complete it in time for bringing  
42 recommendations to the Board of Game in their next cycle  
43 which will be in spring 2006. And, of course, as we've  
44 always done we want to coordinate that through this  
45 Council. This would, you know, inevitably involve the  
46 YK-Delta Council and also up through the Federal  
47 Subsistence Board.

48

49 So in general that's what we have in  
50 mind.

00209

1 MR. WALKER: Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

4

5 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

8

9 MR. REAKOFF: I don't have a question, I  
10 just wanted to state that the old-timers in the area  
11 where I live there talk about bears increasing in  
12 population and then declining and I've seen that. I've  
13 seen bears increase in population and in the 1974/75  
14 winters the bears crashed and then they had to go to a  
15 drawing hunt in the Upper Unit 24. And so these bears go  
16 through cycles and they're not like wolves, wolves have  
17 mean litters of six pups per year, bears real low  
18 reproductive. I'm reluctant to encourage the sale of  
19 bear parts for cultural reasons, and for conservation  
20 reasons. We have high number of bears, but just like the  
21 Mulchatna Caribou, that can all turnaround real quick and  
22 we can be scrambling to try to catch up and once that use  
23 is established, trying to get people to not sell that  
24 again is going to be hard to do.

25

26 I think that this animal, big animal, is  
27 a very -- it wobbles back and forth and so I don't think  
28 that selling the bear parts is a good thing to do and I  
29 think we can encourage harvest through liberalization  
30 through seasons and bag limits and that's as far as I  
31 would like to go on that bear harvest issue.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further comments.

34

35 MR. BIFELT: Can the public make any  
36 comments at this time.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Public testimony, we do  
39 have a section for public testimony. Go ahead, the Chair  
40 will accept your testimony.

41

42 MR. BIFELT: You know, I understand where  
43 the Anvik Tribal Council is coming from here.

44

45 I think they probably knew that this  
46 thing wasn't going to pass, but I think they wanted to  
47 put it on the table and shed some light on this.

48

49 We have a philosophical difference here.  
50 On the one hand it's okay for the commercial operation

00210

1 like myself to go out and make money on grizzly or brown  
2 bear, our subsistence people are excluded from that  
3 simply because we're under some kind of a definition of  
4 customary and traditional use that maybe we're just  
5 supposed to just hang on to our bow and arrow and  
6 snowshoes and slowly fade away while some kind of  
7 commercial activity is left to thrive.

8

9                   It doesn't make any sense here. We talk  
10 about creating an economy out there in rural Alaska and  
11 we all know it's difficult. We have high priced  
12 corporations who are struggling to do that. We look at  
13 ways to help our people out here in the villages. Native  
14 and non-Native. And we have to provide opportunity for  
15 them.

16

17                   A long time ago in this area, the reason  
18 that we don't have much big animals is because our people  
19 used to go out there and hunt them and they get on that  
20 track until they get them, because that's all we had to  
21 eat amongst rabbits and stuff like that and what little  
22 fish we had. That's why we didn't have much big animals  
23 a long time ago. Our people are practical people, they  
24 used it.

25

26                   I think we could still maintain that same  
27 philosophy today.

28

29                   It's not fair for me or George or Virgil  
30 Umphenour or whoever to benefit from these natural  
31 resources we have and yet our people are excluded from it  
32 because they don't have a license and they don't have  
33 whatever.

34

35                   There's philosophical differences here.  
36 Just because we're subsistence people we shouldn't be put  
37 on some kind of pedestal and say you guys have to live  
38 like this, we're just like a body of water, our people  
39 were always that way, we move and live with the times.  
40 That's how we survived.

41

42                   We never did think that we're just one  
43 way and that's the way it is forever and it's etched in  
44 stone. If we thought like that we would have died a long  
45 time ago. We were adaptable and we were resilient.

46

47                   I think maybe this is not the time to  
48 shed light on this proposal that's been presented by  
49 Anvik Council but some day I think it will see it's  
50 proper light. There's no difference in selling salmon

00211

1 strips under customary and traditional use, there's no  
2 difference there. I don't see why that's allowed and  
3 then thinking about bear parts, whatever, is not allowed.  
4 Our people are not going to sell bear gall bladders and  
5 stuff like that, that's not for us, but maybe the claws  
6 and the use of the hide in some way.

7

8                   These kind of things are going to come to  
9 light, I think it's only a matter of time. This is the  
10 way we can address predation. Nobody's going to out  
11 there and work really hard to go after a big animal when  
12 we have nothing, no financial reward at the end. We  
13 can't afford to spend all that time and all that gas  
14 money and tear up our machines for that.

15

16                   So that's what I have to say about it.

17

18                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Fred. I agree  
19 with you. It's just a matter of time until the  
20 subsistence sale of black or brown bear harvest will be  
21 recognized and utilized. I think it's just a matter of  
22 time.

23

24                   1.           Simply because of predation  
25                   problems.

26

27                   2.           The uncertain economy, I think  
28                   people will begin to utilize more  
29                   and more natural resources and I  
30                   think there are some people  
31                   already thinking about it. It  
32                   just takes time to develop and to  
33                   be socially or culturally  
34                   acceptable.

35

36                   I think that our slow movement on  
37 anything such as this is just more -- a lot of it is out  
38 of respect for our elders, especially on the Koyukuk that  
39 don't want to see any black bear parts for sale and/or  
40 brown bear parts for sale. It's just a matter of a whole  
41 culture changing over a matter of time.

42

43                   And if this was intended to open up a few  
44 eyes, it has and it will be considered some more down the  
45 line

46

47                   Any further deliberations.

48

49                   (No comments)

50

00212

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, we have a motion  
2 on the floor to adopt Proposal WP04-53. All those in  
3 support of Proposal 53 signify by saying aye.

4  
5 (No aye votes)

6  
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Those opposed, same sign.

8  
9 IN UNISON: Aye.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 53 fails. Thank  
12 you. It is now five to 12:00, do you want to take a  
13 lunch break, I don't think we could finish another  
14 proposal in that time. Lunch break, I want to start by  
15 1:00 o'clock.

16  
17 (Off record)

18  
19 (On record)

20  
21 CHAIRMAN SAM: We've got some  
22 housekeeping. Again, we have a \$5 donation for lunch,  
23 the box is still back there. At this time I'd like to  
24 extend my thanks to Staff, we all know that we can't get  
25 Pete DeMatteo on the line and I'd like to thank the Staff  
26 for filling in on each one of these different proposals  
27 by coming up to the hot seat and providing all the  
28 information.

29  
30 What are we doing for dinner tonight,  
31 Vince.

32  
33 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I talked to  
34 the Tribal Council and there'll be a covered-dish dinner  
35 here in the community hall. I saw the poster also in the  
36 Tribal Council. And that will be at 5:30 here. So we  
37 were just talking as I came in the room on travel, but  
38 looking at the agenda and that you guys may want to  
39 consider at the next break if you want to work this  
40 evening to keep on track, because I just called the air  
41 carrier on all the flights for tomorrow so we're all set  
42 for tomorrow afternoon to leave on the flights, but I  
43 think you'll want to look in a little bit, you know, at  
44 your next break about maybe working a little bit into the  
45 evening.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, if we have to we  
48 will. Are we ready to begin then?

49  
50 MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

00213

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any more housekeeping.

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: No. Later on we'll go over  
4 the flight materials. But the main thing to get across  
5 is I confirmed that everyone's on an afternoon flight  
6 tomorrow, which one is, you know, you got to find out  
7 from me, but everyone's on an afternoon flight.

8

9 (Laughter)

10

11 MR. MATHEWS: So this is with Warbelow's,  
12 so that works out great.

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, the reason I wanted  
15 to take care of housekeeping is that a few of the Staff  
16 have indicated to me that some of them may be leaving  
17 early or either that or late morning.

18

19 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack, you had something.

22

23 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, a  
24 housekeeping issue, from that letter we wrote last night  
25 regarding the Huslia concerns. Because of the expansion  
26 of the drawing hunt up into the Hog River country, I feel  
27 that that letter should go to the Kanuti wildlife staff  
28 also for education of people at Allakaket because people  
29 from there are going to be going into the Hog River and  
30 should be aware of the antler registration hunt -- the  
31 antler hunting, and then a carbon copy should go to Lt.  
32 Gary Foldger at the Alaska State Trooper, Bureau of  
33 Wildlife Enforcement.

34

35 I just wanted to ask if that would be  
36 okay with the Council.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Are you in the process of  
39 drafting one or what?

40

41 MR. REAKOFF: No, that was that letter I  
42 read last night, that I drafted during our issues hearing  
43 we had here.

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. And you just wanted  
46 to copy it to all the -- to the Koyukuk River or what?

47

48 MR. REAKOFF: I would like to see that  
49 primarily the letter was to go to the Koyukuk Refuge and  
50 I would like to see it also go to the Kanuti Wildlife

00214

1 Refuge and a carbon copy to Gary Foldger so that he  
2 understands our concerns with how that was enforced here.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you, Jack.  
5 There's no action needed right now, okay, it's just  
6 housekeeping.

7

8 MR. REAKOFF: Yes.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Got that Vince.

11

12 MR. MATHEWS: (Nods affirmatively)

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: So we're back onto  
15 proposals, Proposal, what 55?

16

17 MR. MATHEWS: 54.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: 54. Proposal 54. Vince.

20

21 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, Proposal 54  
22 is, again, submitted by Anvik Tribal Council. It is  
23 requesting to close Federal lands in 21(E) to non-  
24 subsistence uses for the taking of black bear, brown bear  
25 and moose.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: The Chair will entertain a  
28 motion to adopt Proposal 54.

29

30 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

33

34 MR. WALKER: Second, Mr. Chairman.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Mickey, seconded  
37 by Robert to adopt Proposal 54. Bio-analysis.

38

39 MR. DENTON: Yeah, I'm Jeff Denton with  
40 the Bureau of Land Management out of the Anchorage Field  
41 Office. I was asked to present this so, thank you, Mr.  
42 Chair, Council members.

43

44 As Vince said this particular proposal  
45 submitted by the Anvik Tribal Council, it requests the  
46 Federal Subsistence Board restrict access to the Federal  
47 public lands in Unit 21(E) for the taking of black bear,  
48 brown bear and moose, except for Federally-qualified  
49 subsistence users.

50

00215

1                   The local concerns are that hunting  
2 pressure from non-subsistence hunters and the harvest of  
3 brown bear, black bear and moose is getting to the degree  
4 where they feel restrictions to access for everybody but  
5 non-Federally-qualifying subsistence users is favored by  
6 those folks.

7  
8                   Current regulations. There are some  
9 current restrictions already in place. One is the  
10 Paradise Controlled Use Area, which prevents aircraft  
11 access during the moose hunting season in 21(E). And  
12 what the proponent of this particular proposal is  
13 requesting additional restriction, basically protect for  
14 Anvik subsistence lifestyles and ensure rural priority.

15  
16                   This particular proposal actually affects  
17 -- in the regulation booklets black bear regs, brown bear  
18 regulations as well as moose for 21(E) and it just adds  
19 the statement to the existing regs:

20  
21                   Federal public lands in Unit 22(E) are  
22 closed to the taking of black bear, brown  
23 bear and moose in the appropriate  
24 sections except by Federally-qualified  
25 subsistence users.

26  
27                   Federal public lands in 21(E) account for  
28 about 55.4 percent of all the lands in 21(E), 44 percent  
29 of those are BLM, 11.4 Fish and Wildlife Service and  
30 probably in terms of access and where subsistence users  
31 actually use the Federal public lands in the Innoko Yukon  
32 bottoms, which include parts of the Yukon Delta Refuge,  
33 the Innoko Refuge and then scattered tracts of BLM are  
34 the primary targets where most subsistence are. Probably  
35 30 percent of the Federal public lands in 21(E) are non-  
36 accessible by river, even aircraft are very difficult to  
37 get to, heads of drainages that receive very little  
38 subsistence activity for the taking of moose or bear.

39  
40                   The regulatory history is in your book on  
41 Page 157. It's reasonably complicated because we're  
42 dealing with three species of critters. If there's some  
43 questions on that we can go into that, otherwise I'll  
44 just kind of move on with that, it's fairly complex.

45  
46                   Biological background. Black bear  
47 considered relatively abundant in Unit 21(E) according to  
48 the Fish and Game biologist, Toby Boudreau. In speaking  
49 with Robert earlier, yesterday, he mentioned that  
50 actually black bears in this particular area in the last

00216

1 year actually experienced a fairly significant decline so  
2 he may want to speak to that later.

3

4                   Brown bear population, we've talked  
5 before in 21(E) just this morning relative to a couple of  
6 past proposals. They are right now at about the maximum  
7 sustainable yield that they can handle right now at this  
8 point in time. This is not a dense population of brown  
9 bears, they seasonably concentrate in areas but making  
10 what few bears there are pretty vulnerable.

11

12                   And, again, we've already talked about  
13 harvest in the past two proposals on black bear and brown  
14 bear in this area, and the moose harvest situation there  
15 we've gone over in past meetings in copious details so --  
16 and we'll be addressing those later today as well.  
17 There's a lot of conflicts with moose harvest there but  
18 it's still a relatively healthy moose population. And so  
19 I'll leave that at that unless folks have some specific  
20 questions. I don't have all the data at my fingertips  
21 that Pete would have.

22

23                   The preliminary conclusion of the Staff  
24 is to oppose the proposal.

25

26                   The justification is, although Anvik  
27 residents are concerned with competition with non-local  
28 hunters in 21(E), black bear, brown bear and moose  
29 population numbers still appear generally healthy while  
30 local hunter success rates for moose remain high. Area  
31 wildlife managers believe bear and moose populations are  
32 able to sustain current levels of harvest. And the  
33 proposed closure of Federal lands in the affected areas  
34 to non-Federally-qualified users may not resolve local  
35 resident concerns with non-local hunting effort. The  
36 proposed closure of Federal lands to non-qualified users  
37 would have the undesirable affect of increasing hunter  
38 congestion and user conflicts within adjacent areas and  
39 also lands that are administered under State regulations.  
40 And the concentration of users in adjacent areas, other  
41 local residents that hunt bear and moose numbers,  
42 actually in those other areas are lower bear and moose  
43 numbers than the area in 21(E).

44

45                   Because of this adoption of the proposal  
46 would result in redistribution of non-Federally-qualified  
47 hunters within 21(E) and would cause subsequent adverse  
48 impacts to local users of adjacent areas.

49

50                   Also for these same reasons, the

00217

1 proponent's request does not meet the criteria of Section  
2 .815 of ANILCA which allows restriction of non-  
3 subsistence users where wildlife populations are of  
4 concern or there's a conservation issue involved.

5  
6 Adoption of the proposed regulatory  
7 change would also circumvent the efforts of the GASH Area  
8 Moose Management Planning Committee, which Randy has  
9 spoke about just before lunch. User group concerns and  
10 other GASH subsistence issues, hopefully should be  
11 channelled through this committee and this planning  
12 effort is basically what the thoughts are.

13  
14 Alaska Fish and Game Department opposed  
15 this proposal. The Grayling -- the GASH Area Fish and  
16 Game Advisory Committee also opposes it. And there was  
17 one individual on behalf of the Alaska Professional  
18 Hunter's Association also opposed this. And on Page 163  
19 there is an articulation of what those folks' reasons  
20 were.

21  
22 That concludes what I can throw at you  
23 right now.

24  
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Jeff  
26 Denton.

27  
28 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

31  
32 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
33 Again, this was drawn up by the Anvik Tribal Council here  
34 to get the attention of the State here. We go back to  
35 the public comments here, you know, you're talking of  
36 opposing two different proposals here when you see the  
37 GASH and you see the other one. There's no bear parts or  
38 anything to be sold in this proposal. I don't know why  
39 this was put in there, but this does not make any sense  
40 to me.

41  
42 Again, like I said earlier, the GASH had  
43 a meeting there where the public was not invited, so,  
44 again, this was more documentary just for private,  
45 whatever, and I will contest this later when they do have  
46 it at the GASH meeting. I will say this was not open to  
47 the public.

48  
49 This one I will support. I think  
50 actually the intention was, Jeff, track vehicles to be

00218

1 used to hunt -- no track or, you know, on BLM land,  
2 whether it's a four-wheeler or a track vehicle,  
3 snowmachine, et cetera. I think this is what the  
4 intention was here.

5  
6 I know we had an incident down in Holy  
7 Cross where an individual was driving a track vehicle  
8 over BLM land and tore the land all up real bad, I'm  
9 surprised that BLM didn't send him a bill to repair this  
10 land.

11  
12 I will comment later on on this, Mr.  
13 Chairman.

14  
15 Thank you.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Robert. Any  
18 further questions or questions direct to Mr. Denton.

19  
20 (No comments)

21  
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, anyone from ADF&G.  
23 Randy.

24  
25 MR. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
26 I'm Randy Rogers again.

27  
28 I don't really have anything to add to  
29 what Jeff said. It's reasonably straightforward. I did  
30 want to just take the chance to suggest that as we look  
31 forward to initiating the 21(E) moose planning process,  
32 at some point here the Council may want to identify one  
33 or two participants for that process.

34  
35 But I have nothing more other than what  
36 Jeff already summarized.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Randy. Any  
39 questions for Randy Rogers.

40  
41 (No comments)

42  
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, public comments.

44  
45 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, Jeff already  
46 covered those but I was double-checking in response to  
47 Robert's concern why these are listed here.

48  
49 In the letter from the Alaska  
50 Professional Hunter's Association, it does show that it

00219

1 opposes Proposal 54.

2

3

4 And then the GASH Advisory Committee, I  
5 took it based on that one language there but it's  
6 confusing on the GASH Committee because their December  
7 meeting said they supported Proposal 54, so I'm going to  
8 have to work on that, but basically I did not ask the  
9 Chair, Ken Chase, about Proposal 54 when I talked to him  
10 because it didn't seem to be an issue.

11

12

13 But anyways, that clears up the  
14 Professional Hunter's Association. We still got to do  
15 some more work on where the Committee stands on Proposal  
16 54.

17

18

19 Thank you.

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

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

CHAIRMAN SAM: That was the extent of  
public comments.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, that was it. Because  
Jeff already covered them. So, I mean the Professional  
Hunter's opposed it. Again, I can only take the language  
they put in the letter and the letter was addressing the  
sale of parts, so that's as far as I can go with it.

And then the minutes of the Advisory  
Committee, there was a little bit of confusion over that  
so I think we'll just leave that that it's not clear  
where the Advisory Committee stands on Proposal 54.

CHAIRMAN SAM: Jerry Berg.

MR. BERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The  
Yukon Kuskokwim Regional Council did review this proposal  
and they opposed this proposal by a vote of nine to zero.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jerry. Any  
questions -- Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I'm a little  
confused on YK there, but also the residents in Unit 23  
have a positive C&T so I have no information if Northwest  
Arctic took this up, but maybe Sandy Rabinowitch who was  
at the Kotzebue meeting, or am I on the wrong proposal,  
but I'm fairly certain that you guys, a couple of years  
ago addressed with black bear up in the upper portions  
and then worked it out with Northwest Arctic to say that

00220

1 they could use, there's some hot springs up there, I  
2 don't remember all the details. So I don't know if 23 is  
3 part of the -- did Northwest take it up, I suppose is the  
4 question before us.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any other questions.

7  
8 (No comments)

9  
10 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, Inter-Agency  
11 Staff.

12  
13 MR. RABINOWITCH: Thank you, Mr.  
14 Chairman. Sandy Rabinowitch. The Staff Committee has no  
15 comments on No. 54.

16  
17 And in terms of Vince's question about  
18 Northwest Arctic, I'm kind of drawing a blank in my  
19 memory and I would turn and wonder, Warren, do you have  
20 any recollection if they took it up -- okay, Warren maybe  
21 can shed some light on that one.

22  
23 MR. EASTLAND: This is Warren Eastland  
24 with the BIA. The Northwest Arctic opposed this proposal  
25 unanimously. They felt that the black, brown bear and  
26 moose populations were not low enough to support an .815  
27 closure.

28  
29 Thank you.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Vince.

32  
33 MR. MATHEWS: Then I'll dispel any doubt,  
34 I now understand why YK, Yukon Kuskokwim took it up, it's  
35 because of the moose C&T is the reason why. Again, when  
36 there's three species down there that's where it gets a  
37 little complex. And the positive C&T for that is Russian  
38 Mission is the reason why it was reviewed.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Polly.

41  
42 MS. WHEELER: Mr. Chair, I was just going  
43 to clarify the C&T and Vince just did it. If they have  
44 the C&T for moose, or Russian Mission does in 21 and then  
45 Unit 23 has a positive C&T for brown bear, so it's not  
46 all species, it's just because it involves the three  
47 species and there's different C&T determinations  
48 depending on the species in the area, if that maybe  
49 helped or hurt.

50

00221

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'm not sure, but, thank  
2 you.

3  
4 (Laughter)

5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Anything more from Inter-  
7 Agency.

8  
9 (No comments)

10  
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions from the  
12 Council.

13  
14 (No comments)

15  
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, Regional Council  
17 deliberations. We do have a motion to adopt Proposal 54.

18  
19 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

22  
23 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
24 Again, this was written to wake up the State a little bit  
25 here, which I know they would already comment and say  
26 that they oppose, and I can understand why the Lower  
27 Yukon opposed, too, because when you look at their C&T in  
28 the portion of Lower 21, it's 50 percent of it is Federal  
29 land.

30  
31 When we compete with guides in our area,  
32 they have a tendency of using track vehicles, four-  
33 wheelers and everything to get into Federal lands where  
34 the subsistence user does not do this. We hunt and walk  
35 to where we're going or whatever we're going to get or  
36 whatever we have to pack out. A lot of people don't have  
37 this kind of money to buy vehicles to go out and use them  
38 once a year.

39  
40 I mean this is competing with the  
41 subsistence hunter in 21. I could imagine this goes on in  
42 other units, too, if I'm not mistaken. I would like to  
43 see this passed here. I know it's not going to pass  
44 because already we have enough opposition here to  
45 convince the Board members here, well, you know, I guess  
46 we're not really subsistence hunters anymore, we just got  
47 to go to the store and buy things other than what we  
48 really want to get in our freezers for the winter.

49  
50 I'm not going to sit here and plead to

00222

1 you, it is your call. And we don't want to have to  
2 compete with any other people for this, just what we want  
3 to get.

4

Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further Council  
8 deliberations. George.

9

10 MR. SIAVELIS: Yes, thank you, Mr.  
11 Chairman. I will oppose this proposal. I think it's  
12 pretty clear and compelling, all the Advisory Committees  
13 and in order for the Board to do something like this it  
14 would have to be consistent with the management of fish  
15 and wildlife in accordance with recognized scientific  
16 principles and requiring substantial evidence. And  
17 there's just clearly no conservation concerns here.

18

Thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further Board  
22 deliberations.

23

(No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, we have a motion  
27 to approve Proposal 54. All those in favor of adopting  
28 Proposal 54 signify by saying aye.

29

MR. WALKER: Aye.

31

MR. STICKMAN: Aye.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: All those opposed, same  
35 sign.

36

IN UNISON: Aye.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion fails. Proposal 54  
40 failed.

41

42 MR. MATHEWS: So, Mr. Chairman, the  
43 record reflects that two were in favor of the adoption.

44

CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, for the record, yes.

46

47 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, two were in favor and  
48 then seven opposed.

49

CHAIRMAN SAM: Six?

50

00223

1 REPORTER: Six.

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, six. You got that  
6 straightened out for the record?

7

8 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we  
9 counted our fingers and got it straight, but it is hard  
10 when you do that, we can't tell who's voting so that's  
11 why we want to get it clear on the record.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

14

15 MR. MATHEWS: This brings us back to  
16 customary and traditional use determinations. This was  
17 submitted by Andy Bratrud and it's misspelled in the  
18 book there. And he's requesting to revise the customary  
19 and traditional use determination for brown bear in Unit  
20 24.

21

22 Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: The Chair will entertain a  
25 motion to adopt Proposal 55.

26

27 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I make a  
28 motion to adopt this Proposal 55.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

31

32 MR. SIAVELIS: Second.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by George  
35 Siavelis. Bio-analysis.

36

37 MS. WHEELER: Mr. Chair, thank you. It's  
38 Polly Wheeler with Office of Subsistence Management.  
39 This proposal is somewhat similar to the proposal that  
40 you dealt with yesterday, that proposal dealt with  
41 caribou but some of the rationale's the same or you'll see  
42 that it's familiar. The analysis for this Proposal 55 is  
43 on Pages 165 to 177 in your Board book.

44

45 I'm not going to belabor a lot of the  
46 same material that, again, I talked about yesterday in  
47 reference to Proposals 56, 82 and 83, but I would  
48 reference them and the analysis because the analysis is  
49 fairly similar.

50

00224

1                   This proposal requests that the existing  
2 customary and traditional use determinations for brown  
3 bear in 24 be expanded to include all residents of the  
4 Dalton Highway Corridor north of the Yukon River.

5  
6                   The eight factors are covered in the  
7 analysis and the up shot is that the proposal is -- the  
8 preliminary Staff recommendation is to support the  
9 proposal so that the proposed regulation would be, it  
10 would read:

11  
12                   For Unit 24, that portion south of  
13 Caribou Mountain and on public lands  
14 within and adjacent to the Dalton Highway  
15 Corridor Management Area. Residents of  
16 Unit 24. Steven's Village. Wiseman.  
17 And residents of the Dalton Highway  
18 Corridor Management Area.

19  
20                   And I would say that the North Slope  
21 Regional Advisory Council qualified that recommendation  
22 so that they said it was and residents of the Dalton  
23 Highway Corridor Management Area in Unit 24 rather than  
24 north of the Dalton Highway, and Member Reakoff may want  
25 to speak to that a little bit more.

26  
27                   But in any event, the justification for  
28 supporting the proposal is, again, there's somewhat  
29 limited information available on these uses in this area,  
30 but certainly the Koyukon and the Nunamuit uses of brown  
31 bear well fulfilled the eight factors. There's not a lot  
32 of data but it's assumed that the long-term permanent  
33 residents of this area would adopt many of the uses  
34 similar to those people in the region.

35  
36                   So, Mr. Chair, again, the Staff  
37 recommendation is to support the proposal and there may  
38 be some discussion about modifying the proposal as I said  
39 the North Slope Regional Advisory Council did at their  
40 meeting last week.

41  
42                   Mr. Chair.

43  
44                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Polly. Any  
45 questions for Polly.

46  
47                   (No comments)

48  
49                   CHAIRMAN SAM: ADF&G.

50

00225

1 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, they're  
2 neutral on this proposal as they were with the other C&T  
3 proposals, and that's reflected on Page 176.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Public comment.

6

7 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, to save some  
8 time, the same letter was submitted by Susan Henderson  
9 and you had her feelings of prejudice and discrimination  
10 and the feeling of meeting nutritional needs and et  
11 cetera, and so I won't go through that at length. You do  
12 have it on Page 176, the same comments.

13

14 Eastern Interior did take up this  
15 proposal, I talked a little bit about it earlier. This  
16 is one that they spent quite a bit of time on and they  
17 decided to defer to the home region because Council  
18 members had concerns about the fluctuations in the  
19 population, the human population in the past 100 years  
20 there and then, of course, the negative impacts on the  
21 indigenous people, where others on that Council thought  
22 that this might be a way of lessening the tension between  
23 the residents, among the residents of the Dalton Highway  
24 Corridor. So with that discussion they decided to defer  
25 to the home region.

26

27 So Eastern Interior deferred.

28

29 North Slope had the qualification that  
30 Polly already pointed out.

31

32 And that's the only Regional Councils  
33 that would be addressing this.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Vince.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, Inter-Agency  
40 Staff.

41

42 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
43 The Inter-Agency Staff Committee had no additional  
44 comments on this proposal.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Regional  
47 Council deliberations. Jack.

48

49 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I  
50 participated on the teleconference with Region 10, the

00226

1 North Slope Council. And as I stated about the caribou,  
2 I was opposed to inclusion of 20(F) residents of the  
3 corridor into this brown bear customary and traditional  
4 use in Unit 24. So my suggestion, the Council amended  
5 the proposal to allow Unit 24 residents within the Dalton  
6 Highway Corridor to have C&T for brown bear. I'm not  
7 opposed to that. Like I stated yesterday, there's  
8 certain individuals who are starting to live in Coldfoot  
9 on a year-round basis that would like to harvest  
10 subsistence resources and some of those people, one  
11 person in particular, and another person that lives down  
12 by Kanuti River, they used to live at Wiseman.

13

14 So I do have a problem with 20(F) C&T  
15 because like I say there's no one that lives there on a  
16 year-round basis. There's been no customary and  
17 traditional use by that area up in Unit 24 and we kind of  
18 addressed that previously in our C&T deliberations about  
19 black bear.

20

21 And so at this time I would like to -- I  
22 made the mistake again and made a motion to adopt the  
23 proposal as written, I would like to amend my motion to  
24 reflect that it's only for Unit 24, C&T for Dalton  
25 Highway Corridor residents.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: And then it does not  
28 address 20(F), it has no permanent residents?

29

30 MR. REAKOFF: Right.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Is there a second  
33 to the amendment.

34

35 MR. SIAVELIS: Second.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by George  
38 Siavelis. We have this amendment before us to just make  
39 it clear that we're just addressing Unit 24 with this  
40 amendment and within the whole proposal itself, right?

41

42 MR. REAKOFF: Yes.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Polly.

45

46 MS. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. Again, the  
47 proposed language is in the executive summary in 165 and  
48 the change to this proposed language would be:

49

50 Unit 24, that portion south of Caribou

00227

1 Mountain and on public lands within and  
2 adjacent to the Dalton Highway Corridor  
3 Management Area. Residents of Unit 24.  
4 Steven's Village. Wiseman. And  
5 residents of the Dalton Highway Corridor  
6 Management Area in Unit 24.

7  
8 So you would get rid of the north of the  
9 Yukon River and that would address the concerns raised by  
10 Member Reakoff. And then the other -- the Unit 24  
11 remainder would read:

12  
13 Rural residents of Unit 24. Residents of  
14 Wiseman and residents of the Dalton  
15 Highway Corridor Management Area in Unit  
16 24.

17  
18 So then you've got that real clear that  
19 it's just Unit 24.

20  
21 Mr. Chair.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. So rural residents  
24 of Unit 24, Wiseman and the residents of the Dalton  
25 Highway, is that how it would read?

26  
27 MS. WHEELER: In Unit 24.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Oh, residents of Dalton  
30 Highway Corridor in Unit 24.

31  
32 MS. WHEELER: (Nods affirmatively)

33  
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is that how the amendment  
35 would read, Jack?

36  
37 MR. REAKOFF: Yes. Polly's correct.  
38 There's a delineation of where the boundary of customary  
39 and traditional use of Steven's Village in that lower  
40 part of Unit 24 and this would maintain that line of  
41 delineation of customary use by Steven's Village and so  
42 we'd just be striking north of the Yukon River and  
43 inserting Unit 24 in both of those definitions.

44  
45 Thank you.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: So on that first Unit 24,  
48 that portion south, residents of Steven's Village and  
49 residents of Unit 24, that's how it would remain, right  
50 on top?

00228

1 MR. REAKOFF: (Nods affirmatively)

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

4

5 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, I'm jumping in here  
6 because I'm lost. On Page 166, I think is what Jack's  
7 reading from and that does have Steven's Village in there  
8 so we have to be very cautious that Steven's Village  
9 remains in Unit 24 because that's not on the table.

10

11 MR. REAKOFF: Right.

12

13 MR. MATHEWS: So I'll try to get this  
14 straight here -- well, I'll wait until someone else --  
15 but anyways what's written in the executive summary I  
16 think we should avoid and look at Page 166 and modify  
17 from there.

18

19 MR. REAKOFF: But Page 165.....

20

21 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, but what I'm worried  
22 about, that portion south of Caribou Mountain does not  
23 have Steven's -- oh, it does have it up there.

24

25 MS. WHEELER: It does actually, Vince.

26

27 MR. MATHEWS: I'm sorry.

28

29 MS. WHEELER: Yeah.

30

31 MR. MATHEWS: I'm just -- okay, thank  
32 you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: So we're looking at the  
35 proposed Federal regulation as written on the bottom of  
36 Page 166.

37

38 MS. WHEELER: But take out, instead of  
39 north of the Yukon River it would read in Unit 24, so the  
40 last line on Page 166 and I apologize if I've contributed  
41 to the confusion here, Mr. Chair, the last line on Page  
42 166 cross out north of the Yukon River which is in bold,  
43 and insert in Unit 24.

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. That's what I  
46 wanted to clarify. And on the top of Page 167, cross  
47 out.....

48

49 MS. WHEELER: No, again, it would be  
50 crossing out north of the Yukon River and inserting Unit

00229

1 24.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Is this clear?

4

5 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, it.....

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: It's clear enough to me.

8

9 MR. MATHEWS: .....always gets clear with

10 more data.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Because I know that

13 Steven's Village get C&T.

14

15 MR. MATHEWS: Right we got that covered.

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Uh-huh.

18

19 MR. MATHEWS: The issue is, just so that

20 whoever goes to the Board meeting does not get confused,

21 Wiseman is in Unit 24, all the residents of the Corridor

22 are in Unit 24, so to save on ink it might be wise to say

23 all the residents of Unit 24, but I'm not the regulations

24 specialist, but I think that's where it's going to end up

25 down the road.

26

27 Again, I was trying to see if Jack had a

28 concern because some communities do still want to be

29 listed in the C&T, this is not for the remainder now,

30 this is for that other portion, and I was trying to see

31 if Jack wanted to maintain that because Wiseman is in

32 Unit 24. So I'm hopefully not muddying up the water but

33 basically the net result is -- I am muddying up the

34 water, but, that I think the end regulations will be Unit

35 24 residents, period.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

38

39 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, yes, I would

40 like to alleviate that reference to Wiseman it seems to

41 infuriate certain individuals in Coldfoot, and so this

42 would accommodate their C&T and it will also alleviate

43 this reference to Wiseman.

44

45 Wiseman has been there since 1905, 1907

46 and Coldfoot, has had, you know, comings and goings of

47 people there, so that's why there's reference to Wiseman,

48 that comes from the Game Board customary and traditional

49 use determinations before Coldfoot was really even

50 established.

00230

1                                   And so at this time we should delete the  
2 Wiseman reference to alleviate tensions among the local  
3 people there.

4  
5                                   CHAIRMAN SAM: So am I hearing you  
6 correct by saying we should go ahead and delete Wiseman  
7 from the.....

8  
9                                   MR. REAKOFF: No. From the language, it  
10 will just be the residents of Unit 24 in the Dalton  
11 Highway Corridor and that way we're in there we're just  
12 not stated as there, specifically.

13  
14                                  CHAIRMAN SAM: Now, what was our  
15 amendment anyway now.

16  
17                                  (Laughter)

18  
19                                  MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, if you'd like  
20 me to read, I can read the entirety of the amendment. It  
21 would be:

22  
23                                  Unit 24, that portion south of Caribou  
24 Mountain within the public lands  
25 comprised of or immediately adjacent of  
26 the Dalton Highway Corridor Management  
27 Area.

28  
29                                  And the C&T would read the residents of  
30 Steven's Village and residents of the of  
31 the Dalton Highway Corridor and other  
32 residents of Unit 24.

33  
34                                  Something to that effect. And then it  
35 would be remainder of Unit 24, it would be:

36  
37                                  The residents of Unit 24 and residents of  
38 the Dalton Highway Corridor within Unit  
39 24.

40  
41                                  MR. COLLINS: You don't even need the  
42 Dalton Highway Corridor.

43  
44                                  MR. REAKOFF: I guess you don't even need  
45 the Dalton Highway there anymore, so it's just:

46  
47                                  Residents of Unit 24 and the remainder.

48  
49                                  So we don't even talk about the Dalton  
50 Highway anymore or Wiseman.

00231

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Everybody's getting more  
2 and more confused.

3  
4 (Laughter)

5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: What was our motion  
7 addressing -- or amendment. We trying to clarify it and  
8 right now we're getting worse and worse.

9  
10 (Laughter)

11  
12 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, could we  
13 include Anvik in this also?

14  
15 (Laughter)

16  
17 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, the reason  
18 this got this way is because of the tension in the area  
19 so I don't want to downplay that. And when we're dealing  
20 with these there is a history of people wanting to be  
21 listed. But as we work through it now we're seeing that  
22 it should just be the residents of Unit 24.

23  
24 So one way out of this is the mover of  
25 the amendment -- who is it Tina?

26  
27 REPORTER: Jack.

28  
29 MR. MATHEWS: The mover would be Jack,  
30 and the second, would they agree, based on Staff  
31 cognitive thought that it would be best just to go with  
32 the amendment to be all the residents of Unit 24, and  
33 that would be cleaner than voting it down and then  
34 bringing it back up.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Jack.

37  
38 MR. REAKOFF: That would be Unit 24, the  
39 remainder, would be residents of Unit 24. We have to --  
40 in this portion south of Caribou Mountain, we have to  
41 include Steven's Village.....

42  
43 MR. COLLINS: Right.

44  
45 MR. REAKOFF: .....and the residents of  
46 Unit 24.

47  
48 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, that was my  
49 oversight, the Steven's Village would still stay in  
50 there, correct.

00232

1 MR. REAKOFF: So we would be deleting all  
2 reference to the Dalton Highway Corridor and with south  
3 of Caribou Mountain, we have to include Steven's Village  
4 because they have a positive C&T in there.

5  
6 So it's real short and sweet:

7  
8 South of Caribou Mountain, residents of  
9 Unit 24 and Steven's, the remainder of  
10 Unit 24, residents of Unit 24.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: So delete all references  
13 to the Dalton Highway then.

14  
15 MR. REAKOFF: (Nods affirmatively)

16  
17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. And heck, I want to  
18 delete Wiseman from there, let.....

19  
20 (Laughter)

21  
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: .....them know that we're  
23 watching them.

24  
25 (Laughter)

26  
27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Does everyone  
28 understand, that was just clarification of language, no  
29 amendment, right.

30  
31 MR. REAKOFF: No, Mr. Chairman, that is  
32 an amendment.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

35  
36 MR. REAKOFF: Because the proposal is to  
37 include everything north of the Yukon River.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

40  
41 MR. REAKOFF: This is the amended  
42 language.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Was there a second  
45 to that amendment.

46  
47 MR. SIAVELIS: Yes.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, any further  
50 discussion.

00233

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. All those in favor  
4 of the motion, the amendment signify by saying aye.

5

6 MR. REAKOFF: The amendment or the  
7 motion.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: In favor of the amendment.

10

11 IN UNISON: Aye.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: All those opposed.

14

15 MR. SIAVELIS: Aye.

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. The amendment,  
18 yeah, one opposed. Amendment passed clarifying the  
19 language.

20

21 Now, we have Proposal 55 in front of us,  
22 there's a motion to -- the motion will reflect that --  
23 the motion is to approve 55 as amended, right, Proposal  
24 55, right?

25

26 MR. REAKOFF: (Nods affirmatively)

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further discussion.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: We're getting hung up in a  
33 lot of small stuff.

34

35 MR. WALKER: Question.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called  
38 for. All those in favor of the motion to adopt Proposal  
39 55 as amended signify by saying aye.

40

41 IN UNISON: Aye.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

44

45 (No opposing votes)

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carries. Man,  
48 we're finally out of the first page. Proposal 57.

49

50 MR. MATHEWS: Proposal 57 is on Page 177

00234

1 and it was submitted by Jack Reakoff. It extends the  
2 sheep season in part of Unit 24.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: The Chair will entertain a  
5 motion to adopt Proposal 57.

6

7 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

10

11 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Jack Reakoff.  
14 Analysis.

15

16 MR. EASTLAND: I'm Warren Eastland from  
17 the BIA, Inter-Agency Staff Committee.

18

19 And as stated Wildlife Proposal 57 was  
20 submitted by Jack Reakoff of Wiseman and would extend the  
21 harvest season for sheep in that part of Unit 24 that is  
22 within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area,  
23 excluding Gates of the Arctic National Park from August  
24 10th to September 20th -- or pardon me, it would extend  
25 it from the current closing date of September 20 to a  
26 closing date of September 30, so the total season would  
27 be from August 10th to September 30th. This would  
28 include rams with seven-eight curl or larger by Federal  
29 registration permit only.

30

31 The dall sheep in this area have  
32 apparently declined by about 30 percent across -- at  
33 least 30 percent across all age classes and the goals for  
34 sheep in the Eastern Brooks Range, which include this  
35 area, are to protect maintain and enhance the sheep  
36 population, provide for continued subsistence use of  
37 sheep as well as provide an opportunity to hunt sheep  
38 under aesthetically pleasing conditions and an  
39 opportunity to view and photograph sheep.

40

41 Because of the biological data available,  
42 the sheep population are declining so that the primary  
43 goal of protecting and maintaining and enhancing the  
44 sheep population does not appear to be met.

45

46 The effects of this proposal, adding the  
47 extra 10 days from September 10 to September 30th would  
48 provide increased flexibility for Federal qualified  
49 subsistence users to schedule their moose and sheep  
50 harvest, however, the additional 10 days to the sheep

00235

1 season is designed to make it easier to harvest sheep and  
2 would be expected to increase the total harvest of sheep  
3 on the population which has undergone already a 30  
4 percent reduction in all age classes, including a 32  
5 percent reduction for legal rams and a 46 percent  
6 reduction in those rams that are sublegal, in other  
7 words, in those rams that are aging and will be available  
8 for hunting in future years.

9

10 The OSM Staff conclusion was to oppose  
11 the proposal because sheep populations in the Central  
12 Brooks Range appear to be declining. Recent sheep  
13 surveys indicate that the sheep population has declined  
14 across all age classes and increasing the length of time  
15 available to harvest sheep would probably increase the  
16 harvest which would further exacerbate a declining  
17 population.

18

19 And with that, any questions.

20

21 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Jack.

24

25 MR. REAKOFF: You don't have the harvest  
26 data for the Dalton Highway Corridor Federal permit  
27 holders?

28

29 MR. EASTLAND: Those data appear to be in  
30 Table 3 on Page 183 of your book showing that the sheep  
31 harvested under the current regulations are down in the  
32 two and three sheep range.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, ADF&G.

39

40 MR. ROGERS: No comments.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: None, okay. Public  
43 comments.

44

45 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, there were no  
46 written public comments and the record reflects that the  
47 Alaska Department of Fish and Game opposes the proposal  
48 due to declining -- it'd be declining -- the population  
49 appears to be declining due to poor recruitment.

50

00236

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Are we doing this over  
2 again when I keep saying Inter-Agency Staff?

3

4 MR. MATHEWS: No, you're not doing it  
5 over again. They met and reviewed all the draft  
6 analysis.....

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

9

10 MR. MATHEWS: .....and so they wanted to  
11 make it clear based on stuff we'll be discussing later in  
12 the agenda what they learned with that review and wanted  
13 to share their talking points, is what they're calling  
14 it, so you understood what they wanted more clarification  
15 on or additional information they wanted to share from  
16 their recent meeting.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thanks. Go ahead  
19 Taylor -- oh, go ahead.

20

21 MR. EASTLAND: Mr. Chairman, this Warren  
22 Eastland. I'm speaking here on behalf of OSM, not in my  
23 capacity as Inter-Agency Staff Committee member. I'm  
24 afraid that may have caused some confusion there.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you.

29

30 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'm going to use that a  
33 little later on, too.

34

35 (Laughter)

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Taylor.

38

39 MR. BRELSFORD: Well, I think, just think  
40 pinch-hitter, Warren's pinch-hitting for Pete.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you.

43

44 MR. BRELSFORD: I do have some comments  
45 to bring to you from the Inter-Agency Staff Committee.  
46 This was one of the proposals on which the Inter-Agency  
47 Staff Committee talked for quite a long time.

48

49 I think the severity of the conservation  
50 concern, the documented decline and the composition of

00237

1 the sheep population in the Eastern Brooks Range was  
2 really a central consideration in the Staff Committee's  
3 discussion. So we believe that that's really the primary  
4 fact before the Regional Council that has to be taken  
5 into consideration.

6  
7 Warren's outlined and the Staff analysis  
8 lays out the details of this 30 percent reduction and  
9 potentially greater reduction in the number of sublegal  
10 rams that would become the huntable population in the  
11 next year or two. The proposal is intended to expand  
12 subsistence opportunity but we don't know how much growth  
13 or change in the subsistence hunting pattern might occur.

14  
15 We recognize and understand that the  
16 subsistence effort is currently low at seven to eight  
17 hunters per year and at a low and stable level of  
18 harvest, two to three sheep per year. It could be argued  
19 that the change in season would just mean the same number  
20 of hunters have a longer period of time to hunt but there  
21 would be no increase in harvest.

22  
23 Under a lot of circumstances the Board  
24 has adopted expansions in subsistence opportunity like  
25 that, but I think where the Staff Committee came out in  
26 the end of the discussion, is that, in the face of a very  
27 significant decline in the sheep population, this was not  
28 the time to expand the subsistence hunting opportunity.

29  
30 And so we invite the Council to talk with  
31 us about or to talk among yourselves and to lay out your  
32 thinking in your motion about how to address this serious  
33 conservation issue and if the subsistence harvest can be  
34 spread out a little bit across a longer season without  
35 growing, how would we manage that? How would we ensure  
36 that there's no increase in harvest or no large growth in  
37 harvest at a time when the sheep population is really in  
38 a -- we think a 30 percent reduction is a pretty serious  
39 situation.

40  
41 So we welcome your conversation and we  
42 want to see what your thinking is about how to pay  
43 attention to the conservation and provide an appropriate  
44 level of subsistence opportunity.

45  
46 Thank you.

47  
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Taylor. If you  
49 really do look at Table 3, this is under a Federal  
50 registration permit hunt, right, and these permits are

00238

1 limited, are they not?

2

3

4 MR. BRELSFORD: Actually, Mr. Chairman,  
5 my understanding is a registration permit hunt means that  
6 the eligible resident can come and sign up for a permit,  
7 but there's no quota, no cap on the number of permits at  
8 the present time.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further  
10 questions for Taylor.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Because I thought we had  
15 an answer there for a second.

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

20

21 MR. BRELSFORD: I rarely have an answer  
22 to the question that hasn't been asked.

23

24 (Laughter)

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: We've already covered the  
27 written comments.

28

29 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman.....

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, I think we did.

32

33 MR. MATHEWS: .....yeah, you did. There  
34 was no written comments.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Council deliberations.

37

38 Jack, I know you're waiting for something  
39 to say.

40

41 (Laughter)

42

43 MR. REAKOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
44 I'm the proponent of this proposal. I live within the  
45 Dalton Highway Corridor. I am one of those subsistence  
46 sheep hunters.

47

48 There's some misunderstandings by the OSM  
49 Staff as to regarding sheep harvest timeframes, it was  
50 stated in the analysis that the sheep hunting is

00239

1 primarily done in August and September. The Dalton  
2 Highway Corridor is adjacent to the Gates of the Arctic  
3 Park, which has a season of August 1 to April 30th, three  
4 sheep, no horn restriction, it's any sheep. Those  
5 harvest dates reflect the traditional harvest timeframes  
6 for sheep hunting by local residents, which is, we  
7 reviewed the proposal for Unit 26(C), which also has a  
8 very similar harvest timing. The Dalton Highway Corridor  
9 has a one ram, seven-eighths horn requirement. That is  
10 intended to restrict harvest to protect a breeding  
11 component.

12

13 Now, the other aspect of this dall sheep  
14 in that area and Anaktuvuk and the mountainous region,  
15 sheep is a secondary subsistence animal for Anaktuvuk  
16 Pass. They put that caribou as a primary and dall sheep  
17 as a secondary. At Wiseman sheep is secondary in that  
18 moose is first because they live close to us, and dall  
19 sheep is also a resident animal and we rely to a great  
20 degree on that for subsistence. Caribou come and go and  
21 we can't count on those and bears are -- we use those as  
22 an alternate.

23

24 The success rate is 28 to 42 percent,  
25 those are primarily the same subsistence hunters that  
26 utilize that fall hunting season. There's certain  
27 members of our community that utilize the winter hunt to  
28 a greater degree. The likelihood that this is going to  
29 increase harvest is very unlikely because there's very  
30 few people who are eligible. You have to be a resident  
31 of the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area to use a  
32 firearm so it's very unlikely that you're going to  
33 harvest sheep under a Federal permit with a bow. And so  
34 there is a very limited pool of eligible users and so  
35 that pool is very limited.

36

37 And so Coldfoot has an eligibility and  
38 they get the registration permits, but dall sheep hunting  
39 is quite a bit of work and you got to know what you're  
40 doing to get those, they're a fairly wary animal and  
41 they're hard to pack out and forth so. And so there's  
42 people who customary and traditionally use that animal  
43 for meat.

44

45 I proposed this because as our moose  
46 population falls, we spend longer and longer days afield  
47 trying to get a moose, our primary meat animal. And so I  
48 have to start weighing out a moose, which is a big animal  
49 and more meat than dall sheep, which is an animal that we  
50 really enjoy getting, they're very good eating, and are

00240

1 integral to our subsistence use. And so I thought it's  
2 reasonable, since I feel -- I find that it's very  
3 interesting that the State is opposed to this proposal  
4 when they have a guiding pressure to the east of the  
5 Dalton Highway Corridor, a declining sheep population and  
6 just went through a Board process and made no adjustment  
7 in season or bag limit or non-resident hunter use or any  
8 kind of adjusted season yet they're opposed to the  
9 subsistence as a possible, and I say very unlikely,  
10 expansion in the subsistence use in the Dalton Highway  
11 Corridor by the subsistence users there.

12

13 All this proposal would do is what my  
14 intention is, it's going to be the same subsistence users  
15 that are harvesting dall sheep. Since we have to hunt  
16 longer for moose we'll be able to utilize the moose  
17 season and then have a few extra days past the end of --  
18 really in reality it only comes out to be five extra days  
19 from -- the moose season ends the 25th of September and  
20 then we'd have five more days to hunt sheep after moose  
21 season was over. If we didn't get a moose, we're  
22 pressured to try and get a sheep.

23

24 We're subsistence hunters, we're trying  
25 to get meat. This isn't the -- the quality hunt issue  
26 should not have entered into this deliberation, this is  
27 not a sport hunt. This is a subsistence. And dall  
28 sheep, contrary to popular public opinion in urban areas,  
29 dall sheep is considered a sport animal, in rural areas  
30 in mountainous regions dall sheep are a subsistence  
31 animal, that's why I supported that Unit 26(C) sheep hunt  
32 over there because I know those people in Kaktovik are  
33 hunting those for meat.

34

35 And so that's my position on this  
36 proposal. I do not feel that it's going to expand the  
37 number of take. It will be the same amount of hunters  
38 that will be ordinarily taking those. There's been  
39 eligibility by other people. They have limited degree in  
40 success. The horn restriction and the bag limit of one,  
41 according to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is  
42 the cure all for sheep management. So we have this horn  
43 restriction, we have a limit of one dall sheep.

44

45 So I still endorse this proposal and will  
46 vote in favor of it.

47

48 That's my position, thank you.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further Council

00241

1 deliberation.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: I got a question, when we  
6 didn't grant or we didn't address that C&T for Coldfoot  
7 did we, it doesn't take this into consideration, right,  
8 Coldfoot?

9

10

MR. REAKOFF: No.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: No, okay, that's the one I  
13 was worried about because we just gave them some leeway  
14 awhile ago.

15

16

Any further deliberations.

17

18

(No comments)

19

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not we have Proposal 57  
22 in front of us. All those in favor of adopting Proposal  
23 57 signify by saying aye.

23

24

IN UNISON: Aye.

25

26

CHAIRMAN SAM: All those opposed.

27

28

(No opposing votes)

29

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 57 passes  
32 unanimously. I still think we're not granting any more.  
33 Again, one of our mandates as a Subsistence Council is to  
34 provide for subsistence harvest.

34

35

Proposal 58.

36

37

38 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, Randy Rogers  
39 talked to me about doing these kind of as a block in Unit  
40 19, but before we would get into dealing with Unit 19  
41 proposals, he would like to kind of go over the planning  
42 effort there and some recent outcome so you get an idea  
43 of what's there and then walk through each proposal  
44 individually, if that's okay with you. I believe he also  
45 approached you on that.

45

46

47 But it might help create a better picture  
48 instead of doing it piecemeal as each proposal comes up.

48

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, I'm kind of confused  
51 here. I see we've got 58 and then 59, which one are we

00242

1 dealing with, what page?

2

3

4 MR. MATHEWS: Well, Mr. Chairman, you  
5 would take up 59, I think Randy just wants to go over the  
6 planning effort that's out there that may assist you to  
7 get through Proposal 58 and 59 and whatever else is on  
8 Unit 19. Because there is that planning effort that's  
9 going on in Unit 19.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: So then if I call for a  
11 motion, it would be WP04-58/59?

12

13 MR. MATHEWS: That would work. That's  
14 fine. I just wanted, based on Randy's conversation, kind  
15 of get you guys to get an overview of the planning  
16 process, so, yes, it would probably be wise to bring up  
17 58 and 59, but realize he's going to cover the whole  
18 planning process for that area.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Just looking at 58,  
21 it just crosses out everything.

22

23 (Laughter)

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: So the Chair will  
26 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal WP04-58/59, would  
27 that work?

28

29 MR. MATHEWS: (Nods affirmatively)

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Is there a motion.

32

33 MR. COLLINS: I so move.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: There's a motion by Ray,  
36 is there a second.

37

38 MR. MORGAN: I'll second it.

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Carl. Bio-  
41 analysis and I think you wanted some time to go over that  
42 moose planing effort down in that area?

43

44 MR. ROGERS: Yes, I wanted to give a  
45 little background but whatever timing is best for you  
46 guys is fine with me. I can do this either as State Fish  
47 and Game comments or I can do this up front and then  
48 follow with the analysis of each one.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Randy.

00243

1 MR. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My  
2 name is Randy Rogers. I'm wildlife planner for  
3 Department of Fish and Game. And what I'd like to do is  
4 give you a brief overview of the most recent developments  
5 in the Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning  
6 Process. I gave the Council an update on this at the  
7 joint meeting in Wasilla and your previous meeting to  
8 that and so hopefully you all have a fairly good idea of  
9 what's taken place out there.

10

11 I'd like to start by just thanking Office  
12 of Subsistence Management for helping with the funding  
13 for this project, it's made a big difference in our  
14 ability to publish newsletters and reach out to the local  
15 communities that we need to work with closely.

16

17 I'd like to start off by just reviewing a  
18 couple of the basic resident hunt management  
19 recommendations that were circulated for public review  
20 and comment through this fall.

21

22 Really, the primary recommendation for  
23 resident hunt management that came out of our planning  
24 committee was to go to for jointly in both Units 19(A)  
25 and (B), a dual system, where there would be registration  
26 permits available for any bull, and those permits would  
27 be available only in the local communities and we would  
28 stop issuing them five days before the season opening  
29 begins to try to steer use to the local residents as much  
30 as possible within the constraints of State law. We  
31 would also include an option for residents using harvest  
32 tickets that apply antler restrictions of spike-fork 50-  
33 inch or four brown tine, and that was intended more for  
34 folks that don't live in the local area, might fly in  
35 from the rail belt and so they would have an opportunity  
36 to hunt and not have to go into the local communities,  
37 but they're also more familiar in dealing with spike-fork  
38 50-inch regulations so that would provide opportunities  
39 for both.

40

41 And I'd also like to point out, too, that  
42 members of your Council, Carl Morgan has stopped into a  
43 couple of our planning committee meetings in Aniak and  
44 George Siavelis has attended just about every single  
45 meeting that we had, so they've got some insights into  
46 what's happened out there also.

47

48 This fall we sent the Draft Management  
49 Plan out for review. I think several Council members  
50 should have received these. We also sent out a

00244

1 newsletter to everybody to ask for public comment and we  
2 looked at two alternative approaches for managing harvest  
3 there. One, which was designed to maintain as many  
4 opportunities as possible within the constraints of a  
5 declining moose population and keeping in mind the  
6 overall purpose of the plan is to try to increase the  
7 moose population out there. But the second alternative  
8 designed to have further reductions in non-resident  
9 hunting opportunity, which, also involves, you know, a  
10 little bit greater preference for the subsistence users.

11

12                   With that background, the Central  
13 Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning Committee held a  
14 meeting in early February to review the public comment  
15 and additional information. Since the project got  
16 started we've radio-collared 38 moose out in the  
17 Kuskokwim area trying to get a better idea of the  
18 movement of moose, what's going on with calf survival, et  
19 cetera.

20

21                   At that meeting we discussed the  
22 different options for harvest management and ended up  
23 that we have a split opinion, the planning committee did  
24 not reach consensus on one way to recommend moose harvest  
25 to the Board of Game. The majority of the committee  
26 recommended closing Unit 19(A) to non-resident hunting  
27 and a shortening of the season for non-residents in 19(B)  
28 which was kind of between the two alternatives that were  
29 laid out in the newsletter and the Draft Plan.

30

31                   So a couple of the other provisions that  
32 came out of that was the planning committee recommended  
33 that in Unit 19(A), which is the area right along the  
34 Central Kuskokwim River where most of the local  
35 subsistence users live, in that particular area, not  
36 providing the option for the harvest tickets. There's  
37 not that many people that would come in from other fly in  
38 areas that would want that option, plus one of the goals  
39 in going to registration permits in the area is to try to  
40 improve our harvest reporting. And if you had both  
41 options out there, then it wouldn't give us quite as good  
42 of a handle on what's going on with the harvest. Also, I  
43 think, most folks in the area, whether they would come up  
44 river from Unit 18 or residents of Unit 19(A) itself  
45 really don't want to deal with spike-fork 50 regulations  
46 anyhow.

47

48                   Following that planning committee  
49 meeting, the Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee met,  
50 for the most part endorsed all the recommendations that

00245

1 came out of the majority view from the planning  
2 committee. The one issue that was left hanging out there  
3 was how to deal with the Lime Village harvest, an area  
4 where moose are very few and far between up there. The  
5 goal of the planning committee has been to completely  
6 eliminate all cow moose harvest, but there was a  
7 reluctance to move forward in the planning committee  
8 meeting, we didn't have representatives of Lime Village  
9 present, our main representative ended up getting a job  
10 at the Donlan Creek Mine down there. At any rate, at the  
11 Advisory Committee a few folks did come in from Lime  
12 Village, we talked over the situation of the need to  
13 reduce and eliminate cow moose harvest there, they also  
14 informed the Advisory Committee of the difficulty of  
15 obtaining moose at all in the region and the fact that  
16 they hadn't seen bulls for several years around their  
17 village, any, at all, and the Advisory Committee came up  
18 with the recommendation to allow a harvest of four cow  
19 moose.

20

21 Under the existing State regs you're  
22 allowed to take up to 28 moose and the Federal regs have  
23 a quota of 40 moose.

24

25 So, you know, there's potentially that  
26 many cows that can be taken. The actual harvest because  
27 of the scarcity of moose is way lower than that.

28

29 At any rate, following that up, the  
30 Department, in approaching the Board of Game meeting, we  
31 submitted amended proposals to the Board of Game that  
32 reflected the majority opinion from the planning  
33 committee and the final recommendations from the Advisory  
34 Committee. At the Board of Game meeting there was a  
35 great deal of controversy concerning the level of non-  
36 resident hunting that could be allowed in Units 19(A) and  
37 (B), and the basic difference between the two  
38 alternatives;

39

40 Alternative A was going to include a  
41 registration permit hunt to allow 15 moose to be  
42 harvested by non-residents; whereas

43

44 Alternative B, which was the majority  
45 opinion of the planning committee, was to completely  
46 close 19(A) to non-resident hunting.

47

48 There was intense lobbying going on  
49 throughout the Board of Game meeting over this issue. A  
50 couple Board members said it was probably one of the most

00246

1 difficult decisions of the entire Board of Game meeting  
2 that they faced.

3

4                   At any rate, the Board ended up  
5 establishing a committee to try to work up a compromise  
6 and included a couple of Board of Game members, myself,  
7 and Toby Boudreau from Fish and Game, the Department of  
8 Law, Division of Subsistence, a couple of guide  
9 representatives, Greg Roczicka from the Bethel area and  
10 Mark Modder, the Chairman of the Central Kuskokwim  
11 Advisory Committee.

12

13                   In that committee we still were not able  
14 to work out any agreement on a full consensus approach to  
15 moose management hunting there. And what we did  
16 accomplish, though, in that meeting, was we really gave a  
17 close examination of the amounts necessary for  
18 subsistence and where we stand in relationship to the  
19 State subsistence law and requirements for Tier I  
20 subsistence protection, which eliminates non-residents  
21 and also the potential for Tier II to have to allocate  
22 among subsistence users.

23

24                   After this close examination of amounts  
25 necessary and subsistence law, comments from the public,  
26 et cetera, the Board of Game went ahead and endorsed  
27 pretty much all the essential elements of the planning  
28 committee majority recommendation. This included closing  
29 Unit 19(A) to non-resident hunting and reducing the non-  
30 resident season in 19(B) by 10 days, whereas, there was  
31 also a five day reduction in the resident season in  
32 19(B). The Board did endorse closing the winter seasons  
33 for residents in 19(A). The Board of Game accepted the  
34 planning committee recommendation to have only  
35 registration permits apply in 19(A).

36

37                   The Board did not accept the  
38 recommendation of the Central Kuskokwim Advisory  
39 Committee to allow the harvest of four cows in Lime  
40 Village. The Board, after discussion, you know, felt  
41 that considering what a severe conservation situation  
42 exists down there that they really couldn't justify  
43 allowing any harvest of cows whatsoever.

44

45                   As a final summary point, while not an  
46 issue involving the Federal Subsistence Proposals before  
47 you folks, the Board of Game did adopt the planning  
48 committee proposal to establish a wolf predation control  
49 plan for Units 19(A) and (B). They were working on  
50 finalizing some of their findings on that related to

00247

1 aerial and land and shoot taking of wolves before I left  
2 the meeting.

3

4 So that's the context of this. I'd be  
5 happy to go into more detail on any questions that you  
6 might have.

7

8 In actuality, the three Federal  
9 proposals, what I had done, all of this moose stuff was  
10 combined in one proposal for the Board of Game, but I  
11 broke it into three components for your purposes because  
12 I didn't want to see if one part of this wasn't accepted  
13 it would take the entire package down. You know, as it  
14 is with all the results that came out from the Board of  
15 Game, to achieve consistency with that and to maintain  
16 the majority view from our planning committee, there's  
17 only one minor modification required of the proposals  
18 that have been in your packet and I'll point that out  
19 when we get to that specific proposal.

20

21 So with that, I'll call that at least my  
22 initial summary and be happy to answer any questions.

23

24 Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Randy  
27 Rogers.

28

29 George.

30

31 MR. SIAVELIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
32 As it regards to Proposal 58 here, this part of the plan  
33 was endorsed by -- this part of it was almost a  
34 consensus, wasn't it, if I'm not right, wasn't it one  
35 dissenting vote on this part of it?

36

37 MR. ROGERS: Through the Chair. Yes, Mr.  
38 Siavelis. There was really no disagreement from the  
39 planning committee on the resident hunting provisions.  
40 This was fully supported by all the committee members.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions for  
43 Randy.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: No. ADF&G, is that -- go  
48 ahead.

49

50 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, I guess the other key

00248

1 point I should make is the recommendations in your  
2 booklet for these proposals from ADF&G was neutral and  
3 that was based primarily on the fact that we were still  
4 in the public review process and knew that we might need  
5 to make changes.

6  
7 At this point we would recommend adoption  
8 of all three of these with one amendment to one of the  
9 proposals.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: You're confusing me,  
12 again, when you said all three, our motion read to adopt  
13 58 and 59, right, that's what our motion read. So what  
14 other proposal are you talking about?

15  
16 MR. ROGERS: Yes, I'm sorry, Mr.  
17 Chairman. Proposal No. 60 is also part of the overall  
18 package that came out of this and it relates to the Lime  
19 Village harvest quota.

20  
21 To be clear, on Proposal No. 58, we would  
22 recommend adopting as is currently in the book.

23  
24 For Proposal 59 -- now, 58 involves the  
25 elimination of the winter seasons in 19(A). The State  
26 Board of Game has already removed the seasons under State  
27 law. In Proposal 59, this is where we recommend -- this  
28 involves the dual system for Units 19(A) and (B) of  
29 registration permits for any bull or harvest tickets for  
30 spoke-fork 50-inch or four brow tine bulls.

31  
32 To be consistent with the State action  
33 and recommendation from the majority of the planning  
34 committee, we recommend eliminating the provision for  
35 harvest tickets with spike-fork 50-inch in Unit 19(A).

36  
37 And I will hold off on Proposal 60 until  
38 you guys get to there.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Vince, public comments. I  
41 think we got this.....

42  
43 MR. MATHEWS: We're just a little bit out  
44 of sequence but.....

45  
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

47  
48 MR. MATHEWS: .....just to keep it  
49 rolling there's no public comments on Proposal 58 or 59.

50

00249

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Inter-Agency.

2

3

4 MR. BRELSFORD: Well, actually, Mr.  
5 Chairman, in Pete DeMatteo's absence I was going to try  
6 and highlight a couple of key points in the Staff  
7 analysis, be the pinch-hitter. So with your permission  
8 I'd like to emphasize five points and then move quickly  
9 on to the action item before you.

9

10 We have the Staff analysis in your book  
11 starting on Page 189. And much of this is information  
12 that you all have reviewed years and years on end so I  
13 really want to boil it down to a couple of central  
14 points.

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

1. First of all, there is the serious downturn in the moose population in Unit 19(A) and (B). These were the villages where I first lived in Western Alaska in the 1980s. That was a time when winter hunting seasons were being reauthorized after shortages in the 1970s and in particularly the last five to seven years, people from throughout the Central Kuskokwim have been talking again and again about they don't see moose, all the survey results suggest the downturn in that population so this is a serious biological and conservation crises.

2. The second point is that the planning process has been intensive and comprehensive. Many of the members on this Council have participated and as I look at the roster of people who worked on the Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning exercise, these are some of the best leaders, some of the most thoughtful people in the region, so people have really risen up to this conservation crises to look carefully at it.

3. So the third point is what's

1 really before you are pretty  
2 drastic conservation measures.  
3 And they are particularly focused  
4 on conserving cow moose. So  
5 ending the winter hunts in Unit  
6 19(A) is a terrific hardship for  
7 those communities. This is a  
8 time of year when people rely  
9 very heavily on that food  
10 resource. So the self-sacrifice  
11 involved in this planning  
12 committee saying that because of  
13 the crises, we're going to forego  
14 winter hunts, this is a very  
15 major investment in conserving  
16 moose for the future by the  
17 communities. And from that  
18 standpoint, I think the fact that  
19 all of the players, the Board of  
20 Game, everybody is saying, it's  
21 hard but it's necessary and we're  
22 going to want to line up with  
23 that.

24  
25 4. The fourth point is that there is  
26 a moose population sufficient to  
27 provide a bull harvest in the  
28 fall time and we're managing that  
29 under this plan in a new way.  
30 These registration tickets are  
31 going to be a little bit of a  
32 nuisance for folks, it's not a  
33 familiar way of managing the fall  
34 hunt but it's necessary as part  
35 of this overall package.

36  
37 5. And the final point is that the  
38 action that I would urge you to  
39 adopt is to support the plan,  
40 taking into account the one  
41 change that the Board of Game  
42 recently adopted.

43  
44 So that would mean adopting the winter  
45 closures as they're proposed without change, and adopting  
46 the change in the fall season, Proposal 59, if you want  
47 to look with me on Page 188, this is the executive  
48 summary of Proposal No. 59, what Randy has said, the  
49 Board of Game adopted, and I think we would want to do  
50 the same thing on the Federal side that we line up:

00251

1 In that portion 19(A), the remainder, the  
2 harvest limit would now read; one bull by  
3 State registration permit.

4  
5 There would no longer be a spike-fork 50  
6 hunt in Unit 19(A).

7  
8 And again, what that's trying to do is  
9 trying to ensure that the available bull moose harvest is  
10 saved for the local communities, that's the change. The  
11 Board of Game went a little further than the language  
12 that we see here on the Central Kuskokwim Advisory  
13 Committee made some recommendations, this is a better  
14 action before you.

15  
16 So I'll stop there and simply say that I  
17 think we're on the verge of doing a very important thing  
18 to conserve moose populations in the Central Kuskokwim.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, Carl.

21  
22 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I commend the Central  
23 Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning Committee. If you  
24 look at the roster, they were not only from the Kuskokwim  
25 area, there were people from Anchorage AC, there were  
26 people from Mat-Su Valley, there were people from the  
27 Chugiak big game guides, so we also had Steve Hill and  
28 he's big game transporter. I think that's one of the  
29 reasons the Alaska Game Board looked at this real  
30 seriously because with the recommendations of these folks  
31 that they put in, they were not only subsistence users,  
32 these were guides, these were transporters, these were  
33 conservationists, and comment them.

34  
35 And I would also like to make a  
36 recommendation so we don't go through the incident that's  
37 going on up here unfortunately and that we educate,  
38 educate, educate, educate, educate.

39  
40 Thank you.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Carl. How the  
43 heck did you get transporters out there?

44  
45 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

48  
49 MR. WALKER: They transport themselves.

50

00252

1 (Laughter)

2

3

4 MR. WALKER: Now, that you are successful  
5 moose breeders, how long before you can get the moose  
6 population up when you can have a winter hunt here, is it  
7 going to be five, 10, 12, 15 years? You know, you guys  
8 got experts now, so he says, you got all these top people  
9 here working and you are on the spot.

9

10 MR. ROGERS: Yes, Member Walker, that's a  
11 very difficult question. I'm not a biologist and even  
12 our biologists couldn't make a definitive prediction on  
13 when we can get to that point.

14

15 You know one of the biggest problems we  
16 had in the entire planning effort was lack of good data,  
17 had we had better data we might have achieved consensus.  
18 That's one of the big differences between this process  
19 and the Koyukuk one. There's no comparison in the level  
20 of data and that includes both the moose survey data and  
21 also harvest reporting.

22

23 I mean as I mentioned yesterday, we have  
24 outstanding harvest records from the Koyukuk region which  
25 have also been benefited by our Division of Subsistence  
26 household surveys. I mentioned that we did go ahead and  
27 deploy radio collars on some moose to improve our  
28 information base. We also have received funding from OSM  
29 to do household subsistence surveys to better document  
30 that.

31

32 You know, there's a provision in the  
33 plan, there's a couple statements in here that the  
34 committee agreed that knowing that we were going to have  
35 to face reductions in harvest, there's goals and  
36 strategies in place that say as soon as we can -- the  
37 harvestable surplus of the moose increases that we want  
38 to restore these lost opportunities. And I think some of  
39 the first that we're going to need to look at is, you  
40 know, maintaining what's essential for subsistence needs.

41

42

43 You know, one of the dilemmas that we get  
44 in, you know, is the winter subsistence opportunity which  
45 is so important normally correlates to cow harvest, which  
46 has a much more detrimental effect on the population. So,  
47 you know, that's going to be something that we're going  
48 to have to wrestle with in years to come. The Board of  
49 Game is going to want us to report back, out of cycle,  
50 next March at their Anchorage meeting, they want to know

00253

1 what's happening, you know, with the moose population,  
2 with these new harvest management programs and with the  
3 predation control program to decide if, in one year from  
4 now, we need to modify this or, you know, we'll do the  
5 same thing in two years from now.

6

7 So this is going to have to be something  
8 that's going to have to be an ongoing effort that will  
9 work with the different users to look at, you know, when  
10 we can get to the point of restoring some of these  
11 opportunities such as the winter hunt.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: So that was just a long  
14 way of saying we don't know, right.

15

16 (Laughter)

17

18 MR. ROGERS: Okay, you got me there, Ron.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

21

22 (Laughter)

23

24 MR. ROGERS: No, I think it is a.....

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: But I believe you when you  
27 say that ADF&G, even the Federals don't know because from  
28 what I keep hearing about moose in this area, it's just  
29 that there are none, right, close to none; isn't that  
30 right?

31

32 MR. ROGERS: There are very few and  
33 declining. You know, we looked at every range of options  
34 including Tier II and a complete moratorium, you know,  
35 has been in place, that's recently been put in place in  
36 Unit 18, and it's not the view, as Taylor pointed out,  
37 that we have to go so drastic as to completely eliminate  
38 all moose harvest, but we need to manage that as  
39 conservatively as possible.

40

41 But I really think that it's important,  
42 you know, even though I didn't directly, you know, tell  
43 you how many years it would be until we restore the  
44 winter harvest, but it's important to know that we're  
45 going to keep working with the users involved in this,  
46 and manage it, you know, watch it very closely, try to  
47 improve our information on which we can base these  
48 decisions and look to restoring those opportunities at  
49 the earliest opportunity.

50

00254

1                   You know, realistically it could take  
2 awhile to get this turned around. You know as many  
3 people testified at the Board of Game, one of the  
4 problems we have in predator management right now is we  
5 wait until we get into an extreme crises situation and it  
6 is much more difficult to turn the population around at  
7 that level.

8  
9                   So, you know, we're at a pretty low level  
10 right now, some of this also will also depend on how we  
11 can effect bear predation. And we haven't really pushed  
12 a lot of regs to put, you know, extreme measures in place  
13 to increase the bear harvest and we may have to look at  
14 that to make this program more effective, do more, to  
15 effect bear populations.

16  
17                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any more  
18 questions -- go ahead, George and then Ray.

19  
20                   MR. SIAVELIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
21 Randy, on Page 188, the executive summary for Proposal  
22 59, you know the first paragraph there's lines all  
23 through it, does that mean that if you drew line through  
24 those seasons on the right that don't have line through  
25 it, that it would be the same thing? I could draw --  
26 does that imply that or do I misunderstand?

27  
28                   MR. ROGERS: The lines being drawn means  
29 those will be crossed out?

30  
31                   MR. SIAVELIS: Right.

32  
33                   MR. ROGERS: Oh.

34  
35                   MR. SIAVELIS: Right.

36  
37                   MR. ROGERS: Up above there?

38  
39                   CHAIRMAN SAM: On the top.

40  
41                   MR. SIAVELIS: What do those seasons  
42 apply to and/or if I -- I mean I'm assuming that if I  
43 drew lines through those it would mean the same thing  
44 because all the whole left line has a line through it; am  
45 I correct?

46  
47                   MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, with your  
48 permission, Taylor Brelsford. That is a drafting error  
49 in the book. The intention here is to reflect the same  
50 closure in the winter seasons that you saw on the page

00255

1 before in Proposal 58 and that you see in the second  
2 paragraph down. So the first paragraph, left and right  
3 columns both.....

4

MR. SIAVELIS: So I could draw a line?

6

7 MR. BRELSFORD: .....should be barred  
8 out.

9

MR. SIAVELIS: Yeah.

10

11

MR. BRELSFORD: Yes.

12

13

MR. SIAVELIS: Okay, thank you.

14

15

CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray.

16

17

18 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, they were  
19 suggesting a modification of this, would you speak to  
20 that again because we have to modify our proposal, amend  
21 our motion.

22

23 MR. ROGERS: Yes. In looking at the  
24 proposed regulation, Proposal there on Page 188 under  
25 19(A), it would be:

26

One bull by State registration permit  
only.

28

29

30 It would line out with spike-fork or 50-  
31 inch antlers or antlers with four or more brow tines on  
32 one side, which would be, you know, the hunt that was  
33 originally proposed under a regular harvest ticket.  
34 That's the only modification that's needed.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: So 19(B) would remain as  
37 presented?

38

39

40 MR. ROGERS: That's correct. There would  
41 be both options maintained in 19(B) and, you know, it was  
42 the intent of the planning committee and Board of Game  
43 that non-resident hunting opportunity be maintained there  
44 in 19(B). There's, you know, extensive discussion of the  
45 -- you know, the original reason that 19(A) and (B) were  
46 separated out was to separate the non-resident fly-in  
47 hunting from the local subsistence use that takes place  
48 along the rivers.

48

49

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: So do we have to amend our  
50 motion to.....

00256

1 MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd make  
2 that amendment to strike the wording with spike-fork or  
3 50-inch antlers, and four or more brow tines.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

6  
7 MR. COLLINS: So it would read:  
8  
9 One bull by State registration permit for  
10 the 19(A) portion.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

13  
14 MR. SIAVELIS: I second.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further discussion on  
17 the amendment.

18  
19 (No comments)

20  
21 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, all those in favor  
22 of the amendment signify by saying aye.

23  
24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

27  
28 (No opposing votes)

29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Amendment has been passed,  
31 Proposal 59 has been amended.

32  
33 Where are we now, under Regional Council  
34 deliberations, is that where we're at?

35  
36 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, you just  
37 amended 59, you took up 58 and 59 as a block so you would  
38 have 58 as it's presented and 59 as amended needs to be  
39 acted on.

40  
41 I just need clarification for my own  
42 record keeping, so 19(B) would still be as written, one  
43 bull with spike-fork 50-inch, correct?

44  
45 MR. COLLINS: Or one bull by State  
46 registration permit.

47  
48 MR. MATHEWS: Or one bull, okay, thank  
49 you.

50

00257

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, they got that, both  
2 opportunities.

3  
4 MR. MATHEWS: Thank you.  
5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further Council  
7 deliberations. Benedict.

8  
9 MR. JONES: Yeah, I'd like to ask the BLM  
10 Staff for habitat in 19(A) and (B), what's the habitat in  
11 that area?

12  
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jeff Denton.  
14

15 MR. DENTON: Mr. Chair, Jeff Denton,  
16 Anchorage Field Office BLM. Benedict in response to  
17 that, actually moose are very much under carrying  
18 capacity in 19(A) and (B), at least on BLM lands. In the  
19 last 15 years we've had several very large scale wild  
20 fires in that country and actually my flights that I've  
21 done here in the last six years, a lot of that country  
22 have areas of moderate to good habitat that essentially  
23 have no moose in them at all. And these are these burns.

24  
25 The Inowok Fire, some of you are familiar  
26 with that, it was a very large fire, it was a half  
27 million acres. The areas that did respond there in terms  
28 of moose habitat are virtually unoccupied by moose in any  
29 numbers at all, this is six years now, that was in '98.

30  
31 There are several burns from the early  
32 '90s that are also virtually unoccupied by any  
33 significant numbers of moose and have excellent habitat,  
34 some of these areas have four and five years of leader  
35 growth on the willows in some of these areas with  
36 virtually no browsing on them at all. So overall in  
37 19(A) and (B) habitats are actually far above the numbers  
38 of moose that they could be supporting at the present  
39 time.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

42  
43 (No comments)

44  
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further Council  
46 deliberations.

47  
48 (No comments)

49  
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not -- oh, Mickey.

00258

1 MR. STICKMAN: You know, we're  
2 eliminating a winter moose season and we are a  
3 Subsistence Council, but I can see the reason for doing  
4 that, with, you know, under conservation issues, but, you  
5 know, I would like to see, you know, we're just managing  
6 people and eliminating moose hunts. But I'd like to know  
7 what's being done as far as predator control. You know,  
8 there's that component of moose reduction that's not  
9 being addressed there.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Mickey. Does  
12 anyone have an answer, I know that you're trying to  
13 expand that predator control out of McGrath to 21 -- 2000  
14 or something, or does this include this or is that too  
15 small yet?

16  
17 MR. ROGERS: Yes, I kind of went over  
18 that point perhaps too briefly, but the Board of Game did  
19 adopt its Proposal No. 234 which established a wolf  
20 predation control area for all of Units 19(A) and (B),  
21 over 10 times the size of the area in McGrath, and, you  
22 know it was I don't know it was somewhat amazing that in  
23 all the controversy we have over predation control  
24 issues, which you guys are familiar with, we had one  
25 comment in opposition at the Board of Game and that wolf  
26 control proposal went through without hardly a concern.

27  
28 The Board itself did go through multiple  
29 versions of trying to look at whether it should be  
30 authorized in 19(A) or 19(B) and how it should be done.  
31 But in the end they adopted the regulation that included  
32 the wolf control plan for the entire area.

33  
34 What their intent was, that under the new  
35  
36 same day airborne Legislation that passed last year is  
37 they're going to issue findings of the Board of Game to  
38 authorize the Department to issue permits for aerial and  
39 land and shoot taking of wolves in Unit 19(A) alone. And  
40 the planning committee had consistently said, you know,  
41 understanding that you don't always get everything you  
42 want, if you get anything at all when you're dealing with  
43 predator control, that the first priority for predation  
44 control efforts needed to be the areas most important for  
45 subsistence use of moose, and so that's what they did.

46  
47 When we go back to them next year there's  
48 a fair chance that they may want to expand the  
49 authorization to 19(B) if it looks like that's what needs  
50 to be done to be effective. But, you know, this plan we

00259

1 really did deal with intensive management and the  
2 predation side of this, you know, more than any plans  
3 I've been involved with before.

4

5                   You know, the other thing we discussed  
6 was an emergency regulation to initiate that immediately  
7 after the conclusion after the Board of Game meeting, to  
8 do that we would have to have an emergency finding of the  
9 Board and we'd be on a little bit more shaky legal  
10 grounds, so the decision was to go ahead and get the  
11 regular regulation in place so that we can issue permits  
12 to begin that program as soon as possible next year and,  
13 you know, hopefully in the fall, if the weather  
14 conditions apply.

15

16                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. We have  
17 Proposal 58 and 59 as amended before us in a motion form.  
18 Any further deliberation.

19

20                   MR. STICKMAN: One last one.

21

22                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

23

24                   MR. STICKMAN: Randy, you talked about  
25 the wolf, the control there, I was wondering if there was  
26 anything as far as black bears or grizzly bears because,  
27 you know, that the bears they consume about two-thirds of  
28 the moose calves in the spring time.

29

30                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Randy. I think  
31 this was blanketed by the State's effort to make more  
32 bears available for harvest and I think this was more or  
33 less covered earlier, wasn't it?

34

35                   MR. ROGERS: Yes, you're correct, Mr.  
36 Chairman. The planning committee considered a whole  
37 range of options for dealing with both black bear and  
38 brown bears and a whole range of opinions on those.  
39 There was folks that were concerned with conservation of  
40 brown bears, in particular, and didn't want to loosen  
41 things up too much. The committee felt that the existing  
42 bag limit of three black bears and year-round season was  
43 sufficient. So what they did endorse was the  
44 Department's recommendation to liberalize the seasons  
45 throughout Interior and that was the only step that's  
46 been taken, and as I mentioned before, we may find a need  
47 to be more aggressive in dealing with bears to make the  
48 program work.

49

50                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Randy, again.

00260

1 George.

2

3

4 MR. SIAVELIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
5 I'd just like to go on record and say, just bring up the  
6 point that early in the planning process of the moose  
7 planning committee, it was very early recognized that if  
8 there was going to be a question on where predator  
9 management -- intensive predator management would focus,  
10 if we had to choose between A and B or anywhere, that it  
11 would, in fact, be in 19(A) and specifically along the  
12 river corridors there and the guiding industry, and the  
13 guide representative on that committee was the first one  
14 to step up and say, we need it, too, but we want it for  
15 the local hunters there first, and we only get it if they  
16 -- if we can bring their population way up so that they  
17 can get what they need first.

17

18

Thank you.

19

20

CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, George. Any  
21 further deliberations.

22

23

(No comments)

24

25

CHAIRMAN SAM: We do have Proposals 58  
26 and 59 as amended before us in the form of a motion.

27

28

All those in favor of adopting Proposals  
29 58 and 59 as amended signify by saying aye.

30

31

IN UNISON: Aye.

32

33

CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

34

35

(No opposing votes)

36

37

CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 58 and 59 as  
38 amended has been adopted.

39

40

Proposal 60 and this.....

41

42

MR. BIFELT: Mr. Chairman.

43

44

CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

45

46

MR. BIFELT: I'd like to offer a friendly  
47 suggestion. We have elders here that want to testify and  
48 they're getting tired and plus they got to go home and  
49 prepare dinner for the public, but the elders want to  
50 participate on Proposal 65, so I was wondering if it

00261

1 would be possible to amend your agenda now to bump 65 up  
2 so our elders could testify and then they could go home  
3 and prepare food for the public.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: I think that that is more  
6 than appropriate and I think it would also be timely.  
7 Again, we would like to thank the village of Huslia for  
8 hosting the Western Interior Council meeting.

9

10 So at this time I would like to direct  
11 Vince and all Staff concerned with to get ready to take  
12 up Proposal 65 and we'll take a quick five minutes break  
13 for a smoke break. By that time we should be all set up  
14 for Proposal 65.

15

16 (Off record)

17

18 (On record)

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Could we find our way back  
21 to our seats.

22

23 (Pause)

24

25 MR. MATHEWS: As I collect my thoughts  
26 here, I haven't had a chance to talk to the Refuge on  
27 procedure on this, so I think I will defer to them. They  
28 did approach me on an approach on this proposal, so it  
29 might be best to refer this to Geoff to see how to  
30 approach this Proposal 65.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, the Chair will  
33 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 65.

34

35 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

38

39 MR. WALKER: Second.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Robert Walker.  
42 Proposal 65 is on the floor to be deliberated. Geoff.

43

44 MR. BEYERSDORF: Mr. Chair. Members of  
45 the Council. My name is Geoff Beyersdorf. I'm a  
46 subsistence coordinator for the Koyukuk/Nowitna Wildlife  
47 Refuge. And what I was going to do here is I'm  
48 presenting the OSM Staff analysis for this proposal. And  
49 following that, what I will do, when you're ready for  
50 that I will also give the Refuge's position on this

00262

1 proposal and give a presentation on that. And Jenny  
2 Bryant and also Glenn Stout will follow-up with the  
3 biological information for this proposal, so whenever  
4 you're ready to start.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. I'd like to, at  
7 this time, some thank you's from the Council, on behalf  
8 of the Council. First off, I'd like to thank Benedict  
9 Jones for bringing out some fish strips for lunch.  
10 Franklin Lillian Simon for the tea and the moose meat,  
11 and lastly, I'd like to thank the whole community of  
12 Huslia for hosting Western Interior's Council meeting for  
13 deliberations on game proposals.

14  
15 A brief history on our appearance here,  
16 short notice. We've been trying to meet at Ruby for  
17 quite some time because we're finally getting them  
18 involved even though they're in our unit and we've been  
19 trying for a couple of meetings to have a meeting there  
20 but we just got a call about a week and a half ago that  
21 the Iditarod is going through and they're just full blast  
22 involved in the Iditarod procession.

23  
24 So on behalf of the Western Interior  
25 Council I would like to express my deepest and heartfelt  
26 thank you to the community of Huslia for hosting us, even  
27 with this short notice, we just picked up a phone and  
28 called Bill Derendof and got the okay. So we are here  
29 before the residents of Huslia and for the residents of  
30 Huslia to express their concerns and their feelings on  
31 any one of these proposals. At their request we will  
32 move up Proposal 65 to accommodate our elders and  
33 residents of Huslia.

34  
35 It is quite lengthy and I expect a lot of  
36 discussion on this proposal, so at this time, without  
37 further adieu I'll go ahead and turn it over to Geoff.

38  
39 MR. BEYERSDORF: Mr. Chair. Members of  
40 the Council. Proposal No. 65 can be found on Page 253 of  
41 your booklets. Proposal No. 65 is somewhat complex. I  
42 will try and break it down as best I can and simplify it.

43  
44 The intent is two-fold in this proposal,  
45 one is to give the Refuge manager of the Koyukuk/Nowitna  
46 the authority to close the fall antlerless moose season  
47 in 21(D) and 24.

48  
49 The other portion of this, the original  
50 intent was to eliminate the February season in 21(D) and

00263

1 the March season in 24. And our original intent on this  
2 proposal was for all of 21(D) and Unit 24 outside of the  
3 Gates of the Arctic National Park.

4

5 We attempted to amend this proposal and  
6 we had talked to BLM and to the Innoko and Kanuti Refuges  
7 and also to Gates of the Arctic Park Staff and we had  
8 gotten their support on this proposal to move the winter  
9 seasons that were in place in the regulations to December  
10 and make it a bulls only hunt. Unfortunately that  
11 original intent was rejected and so all we're going to  
12 deal with this on this proposal right now as it stands is  
13 within 21(D) and 24 within the Koyukuk Controlled Use  
14 Area.

15

16 Because Unit 21(D) and 24 moose numbers  
17 are potentially declining more conservative management is  
18 required. In the spring of 2000 the Alaska Department of  
19 Fish and Game and the Koyukuk River Moose Hunting Work  
20 Group developed a five year management plan that  
21 established guidelines for managing harvest when  
22 conservative measures are necessary. The Federal  
23 agencies participated and supported this process along  
24 with the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council and  
25 the Federal Subsistence Board endorsing the Koyukuk River  
26 Moose Management Plan. Action 1.3.1 of the plan outlines  
27 the approach for reducing antlerless moose hunting  
28 opportunities is being followed.

29

30 The recommendation to implement this  
31 action include when restrictions in cow harvest are  
32 needed, they should first be applied to the general hunt,  
33 then to the fall subsistence hunt and last to the winter  
34 hunt. Antlerless moose harvest in the affected area can  
35 be supported by present moose populations on a limited  
36 basis only. Special action closures of the fall  
37 antlerless moose seasons were implemented in 2001, 2002  
38 and 2003, and I would add that those were mirrored on the  
39 State side by emergency order.

40

41 With poor recruitment and potentially  
42 declining populations additional measures to conserve  
43 cows must be taken. Substantial efforts to reduce the  
44 total adult and total cow moose harvested in user group  
45 conflicts in the Lower Koyukuk River Drainage have been  
46 made by the State during the last five regulatory years.  
47 The number of State registration and drawing permits for  
48 the affected area have been decreased over recent years  
49 and ADF&G, again, reduced the number of permits in the  
50 fall 2004 season.

00264

1                   Analysis of results from cooperative Fish  
2 and Game, Fish and Wildlife Service moose surveys in  
3 Units 21(D) and 24 indicated three successive years,  
4 1999, 2000, 2001 of poor calf survival and recruitment  
5 less than 20 calves per 100 cows and less than eight  
6 yearling bulls per 100 cows. Analysis of results from  
7 population estimates conducted in the 5,526 mile square  
8 area in November 2001 indicated that the calves per 100  
9 cows and yearling bulls per 100 cows, the ratios were  
10 estimated at 18 calves per 100 cows and seven yearling  
11 bulls per 100 cows respectively. Poor recruitment has  
12 resulted in a maximum estimated decline of 15 percent in  
13 Unit 21(D) and 25 percent in Unit 24 during the last  
14 three years -- during the three years from 1999 to 2001.

15

16

17                   Calf/cow and yearling bull cow ratios  
18 indicate that recruitment rates are declining and more  
19 conservative harvest of the reproductive component of the  
20 population is needed throughout the affected area.

21

22                   Results from the large scale moose  
23 population estimate surveys in '87, '97 and 2001 and the  
24 annual trend count areas on the Koyukuk National Wildlife  
25 Refuge indicate a stable adult moose population, however,  
26 declining recruitment parameters were evident in all  
27 trend count areas since 1998 and in the 2001 population  
28 estimation surveys.

29

30                   Peak densities of moose were reached  
31 between 1993 and '97 and have exhibited declines observed  
32 in the more recent surveys. The 2001 population estimate  
33 survey bull/cow ratios were well above the minimum needed  
34 for breeding while the calf/cow ratios were lower than  
35 the minimum needed to maintain a stable population.  
36 Aerial moose trend surveys were conducted on the  
37 Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge in November and  
38 December of 2003, the overall results indicated stable  
39 cow numbers, good calf production and good recruitment on  
40 all the TCAs, however, there were low bull cow ratios  
41 observed in seven of the 10 TCAs.

42

43                   Three-Day Slough specifically showed  
44 significant signs of not only decreases in bulls but also  
45 in the number of cows.

46

47                   The effects of the proposal. Analysis of  
48 results from the population surveys conducted in Unit  
49 21(D) and portions of Unit 24 between 1985 and 2003  
50 reveal significant declines in productivity in yearling

00265

1 bull recruitment. These declines continue and have been  
2 documented through results from surveys conducted during  
3 2000 through 2003. Declining trends derive from analysis  
4 of surveys conducted during the last four years support  
5 action 1.3.1 of the management plan that describes a  
6 reduction in cow moose harvest, however, the proposed  
7 changes in the winter season are not likely favored by  
8 local user preferences.

9

10                   Depending on the dates set for a winter  
11 season, some subsistence hunters may find the timing of  
12 the proposed winter season less desirable and fruitful  
13 than the existing seasons.

14

15                   While increased cow harvest levels have  
16 provided additional opportunity, prolonged harvest at the  
17 current levels will likely contribute to declines in  
18 productivity and recruitment. A review of survey results  
19 suggest that additional declines are imminent, therefore,  
20 it would be necessary to place the proposed restrictions  
21 before the overall users need in order to protect these  
22 moose populations from further declines.

23

24                   The preliminary Staff conclusion is to  
25 support the proposal contingent upon the Board of Game  
26 actions.

27

28                   And that concludes the OSM analysis. And  
29 I'm ready for the Refuge presentation whenever you are.

30

31                   CHAIRMAN SAM: So you are prepared  
32 to.....

33

34                   REPORTER: Ron.

35

36                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. So you are prepared  
37 to give your Refuge report, which is different than the  
38 analysis you just presented; is that correct?

39

40                   MR. BEYERSDORF: I was going to give our  
41 Refuge recommendation on this. We have an amendment to  
42 this and Jenny Bryant and Glenn Stout will present the  
43 biological data justifying our position on this proposal.

44

45                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, go ahead. We need  
46 some data on this.

47

48                   MR. BEYERSDORF: Proposal 65, I know this  
49 is a rather long-winded explanation but I think it kind  
50 of leads to some misinterpretations in the booklet that

00266

1 it was just to close the fall antlerless season, that  
2 wasn't our intent.

3

4 What we wanted to do with this proposal  
5 was give the authority to declare the opening of the  
6 antlerless and the winter season in Unit 21(D) and 24  
7 within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area to the Refuge  
8 manager. And I started this because the Refuge manager  
9 would not be allowed to make this decision on their own,  
10 the Refuge manager would need to consult with the area  
11 biologist with the Chairs of the Western Interior  
12 Regional Advisory Council and also with the Chair of the  
13 Middle Yukon Advisory Council.

14

15 The Refuge recommendation is to amend and  
16 adopt, to include the remainder of Unit 21(D) and  
17 establish a December 1st to 10th bulls only hunt. The  
18 Board of Game, at this last week's meeting passed State  
19 Proposals 188 and 189 to reauthorize the antlerless hunts  
20 in 21(D) and 24, and the Board of Game also passed State  
21 Proposal 201-A, changing the winter hunts in Unit 21(D)  
22 and 24 to a bulls only December 1st to 10th hunt.

23

24 Special action closures of the fall  
25 antlerless moose season were implemented in 2001/2002 and  
26 2003, and with the special action closures, what I wanted  
27 to point out there is that we've been having to go  
28 through the Office of Subsistence Management to submit  
29 that to them and then it goes through Staff Committee,  
30 there's several layers of bureaucracy there and what OSM  
31 had recommended is that if we could put in a proposal  
32 giving the Refuge manager after consulting with the YRAC  
33 [sic] Chair, the Middle Yukon Chair and the area  
34 biologist, that authority, we don't need to go to that  
35 level every single time. So basically as far as the fall  
36 antlerless portion it's cutting back on several layers of  
37 bureaucracy there.

38

39 Adoption of this proposal would provide  
40 alignment with the current State regulations. As I said  
41 State 201-A was changed at this latest Board of Game  
42 meeting.

43

44 And lastly, I would point out on there  
45 that there's differing land status in the region,  
46 especially in the area of Kaiyuh Flats, for example, and  
47 there could be significant confusion of the Federal and  
48 State regulations are not aligned.

49

50 This proposal does comply with action

00267

1 1.3.1 of the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan. That  
2 action outlines the approach for reducing the antlerless  
3 moose hunting opportunities is -- will be followed. This  
4 Council and the Federal Subsistence Board endorsed the  
5 Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan. If this proposal is  
6 rejected, the ongoing harvest of cows will continue to  
7 negatively impact the moose population.

8

9 I would point out that we've experienced  
10 very poor calf survival in 1999, 2000 and 2001. There  
11 has been recent improvements in the numbers and we're  
12 going to talk about that, but we need to keep in mind  
13 that these calves are not yet recruited in the  
14 population. It's not money in the bank yet. We can't  
15 afford to lose any more cows unless the population is  
16 growing, and this population, based upon the surveys that  
17 we've done, is not growing at this point.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, go ahead.

20

21 MS. BRYANT: Hi, my name is Jenny Bryant,  
22 and I work at the Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife  
23 Refuge and I'll give you an overview of the Koyukuk moose  
24 trend area surveys that we conducted this year.

25

26 In 2003 we did five trend areas on the  
27 Koyukuk, Huslia River Flats, Treat Island, Dulbi River  
28 mouth, Three-Day Slough and Koyukuk River mouth. Those  
29 are the ones that you see on the top up in the middle of  
30 the Koyukuk National Wildlife Refuge and Koyukuk River  
31 mouth is down on the bottom just above the Kaiyuh.

32

33 Just a brief overview of what we found  
34 this year. While the trends, we had three years of poor  
35 calf and yearling numbers. Like Geoff said, '99, 2000,  
36 2001, but we have seen improved calf numbers in the last  
37 two years, '02 and '03 and improved recruitment this  
38 year. I say improved but they're not necessarily great.

39

40 Taking the trend count areas and compiled  
41 them into one graph, so I grouped them all together and  
42 you can see in the blue are the bull/cow ratios and  
43 they've declined slightly. One important note for that  
44 is in the Koyukuk River Management Plan, it calls for a  
45 bull/cow ratio, a sustained bull/cow ratio of 30 and you  
46 can see it's below that.

47

48 You can see the calves have improved a  
49 little, up some, and yearling bulls have improved  
50 slightly.

00268

1 Here's individual TCAs where I've broken  
2 them down. That last graph was the grouped TCAs, these  
3 are the individuals, this is the Huslia River TCA, and  
4 you can see in 2000 and 2001 in the red, shows low calf  
5 numbers per 100 cows and you can see the slight  
6 improvement in 2003 and also in the yellow are the  
7 yearling bulls and improvement there also.

8

9 Treat Island which is up to north of  
10 here, which is east of Huslia River Flats, same thing  
11 2000 -- actually in '99 it shows up, 2000/2001 you can  
12 see in the red the lower calf numbers. Also the really  
13 low yearling bull numbers and a slight improvement in  
14 '03.

15

16 Dulbi River mouth, this is down -- Dulbi  
17 River and Three-Day Slough are probably the most hunted  
18 areas on the Refuge -- well, they are the most hunted  
19 areas on the Refuge and this shows what our main concern  
20 here, this depicts exactly what we're looking at here.  
21 In the red you can see the calves, the declining calf/cow  
22 ratios and in 2003, let's see, yeah, 2003 still -- it's  
23 okay but not great. Bulls, you can see the declining  
24 bull/cow ratio there really well in the blue. And  
25 yearling bulls, really pitiful '99/2002 and a little bit  
26 up in 2003 but not a whole lot.

27

28 Three-Day Slough, same thing. In the  
29 blue you can see the bull/cow ratios declining and in the  
30 red are the calf/cow ratios, also declining and the  
31 yearling bulls down and still up a little in '03, but  
32 still below average and the calves are still below  
33 average also.

34

35 And this is a little bit different graph,  
36 instead of looking at the ratio, these are the actual  
37 observations, and you can see the peak that Geoff  
38 mentioned earlier in about '93 and it's been declining  
39 since then and bulls and cows and that's the important --  
40 one of the important thing that jumps out at me as a  
41 biologist, is the cows are declining also.

42

43 Koyukuk River mouth, in the blue, you can  
44 also see the lower bull/cow ratios. Calves did pretty  
45 well in '02 and '03, and yearling bulls slightly better  
46 in '03.

47

48 And Glenn is going to -- these next  
49 couple of graphs are ones that Glenn made for his  
50 presentation so I'll have him explain them because he



00270

1 drawing permit and we effected the new changes on the  
2 antler destruction, where we required people to saw  
3 through the palm. And beginning in 2000 you can see we  
4 had a pretty substantial reduction in the number of  
5 hunters, which is in the yellow bar. We also saw a  
6 similar decline in the absolute number of moose that were  
7 harvested, and, that, ultimately is what we're trying to  
8 achieve in the reduction of number of moose that are  
9 actually being shot.

10

11 What we've done is with the use of the  
12 drawing permit we've been very effective at establishing  
13 exactly what we wanted to do in reducing that harvest.  
14 And I'll just qualify the year 2001, you're all familiar  
15 how warm it was that year and that's why that number of  
16 harvest dropped off there and you can see success rate  
17 essentially was real poor that fall just because of the  
18 warm year that we had there and then there was also the  
19 problem with the events of 911 that affected that for  
20 non-resident harvest, too.

21

22 So the way I look at that, the last four  
23 years, 2000 through 2003 was we've been able to stabilize  
24 that harvest. We've been able to control it. Compared  
25 to all the years before that since '83 it was basically  
26 an unregulated, uncontrolled increase in the number of  
27 hunters and the harvest of moose that was going on there  
28 so I think those regulations were pretty effective.

29

30 When I look at this data it all feeds  
31 back into kind of an overall picture on why some of the  
32 proposals that were submitted, the rationale behind them.  
33 When we saw an increasing number of non-locals coming  
34 into the area, what we saw at the same time was a  
35 decrease in the success rate amongst locals and that has  
36 kind of a fall out, it's a domino effect. If locals have  
37 decreasing success rates, what ends up happening is they  
38 have to choose two things, they can move to a different  
39 area or they can hunt a different time of year. If we  
40 see decreasing success rates in the fall, the option for  
41 local hunters was to start hunting in winter. And we  
42 know that when the locals have that option in the winter,  
43 that about 60 to 70 percent of the moose that are  
44 harvested during the winter season aren't fat cows.

45

46 So with the declining parameters that  
47 we've been looking at there, if we add onto that and the  
48 increasing dependency on cows as a proportion of the  
49 harvest, that kind of accelerates that decline that we're  
50 concerned about.

00271

1                   And here you can see exactly what we're  
2 talking about on the controlled use area. The local  
3 hunters is in the green bar, and I shortened the frame of  
4 picture here but you can see exactly what happened coming  
5 into the '90s, is that, we had an increasing number of  
6 non-locals coming into the area and that was just almost  
7 perfectly offset by the number of local hunters that  
8 ended up having to leave the area because they were being  
9 displaced. Once we got that registration and limited  
10 drawing permit in place in the year 2000 you can see we  
11 reversed that trend almost exactly the way it had been  
12 happening before that.

13

14                   So I think that the success of that  
15 drawing -- limited drawing permit has been really well  
16 received because it accomplished exactly what we wanted  
17 to try and do.

18

19                   And since that, since we've looked at  
20 this data and we've had the opportunity to talk with  
21 several of the people around the Galena Management Area,  
22 one thing that kept coming up, you know, is how else can  
23 we do this in other areas where we see the concern.

24

25                   As you all know, there's been several  
26 proposals submitted in the past to expand the controlled  
27 use area boundary on the Dakli River, on the Huslia  
28 River. We've seen several of these proposals. And what  
29 I did, talking with some of the people that were  
30 interested in accomplishing that was try and develop a  
31 strategy that maybe was more favorable to the Board of  
32 Game, because the Board of Game is not really favorable  
33 to introducing new controlled use areas. So as an  
34 alternative, I felt like a good alternative would be to  
35 have drawing and registration permits in a larger area to  
36 help accomplish this same thing, where we could decrease  
37 the non-local hunting pressure and get our fall success  
38 rates from locals back up to where we need them to be so  
39 they aren't as dependant on that winter season.

40

41                   And so that's when I had a chance to --  
42 Fred Bifelt called me up and he says, you know, how can  
43 we address this situation and I was able to work with him  
44 and we put together Proposal 193 and the Board of Game at  
45 the last meeting, this last Sunday, adopted an amended  
46 version of 193 that basically establishes the drawing and  
47 registration permit around the entire perimeter of the  
48 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, so basically we've  
49 established a large block now that we can have this kind  
50 of control on and I think that's a real good move

00272

1 forward.

2

3

4 And we'll get into the additional  
5 proposals for 21(B) but as a part of that amended  
6 proposal of Fred Lee's was that they also included all of  
7 Game Management Unit 21(B), which is over on the Novi,  
8 the Lower Nowitna River Drainage portion.

8

9

10 One thing that I tried to express at the  
11 Board of Game and tried to show them is this decreasing  
12 fall success and increasing winter success. And  
13 unfortunately this was -- I went out on a little bit of  
14 thin ice, actually, with the Board of Game and tried to  
15 express to them exactly what's going on and to show that.  
16 And I would have liked to have been able to pull up a  
17 slide like this and said, okay, here's exactly that split  
18 for local harvest, where decreasing numbers of fall just  
19 like we've been describing and then we would have liked  
20 to have seen a nice perfect graph here of an increasing  
21 number of moose that are harvested during the winter.  
22 Unfortunately the data isn't that clear and that's for a  
23 couple reasons.

23

24

25 First of all we'll look at this slide  
26 here and this is a comparison between the harvest ticket  
27 reporting, which is that statewide harvest ticket  
28 reporting and that's either the subsistence harvest  
29 permits that you get that are kind of white, and then all  
30 the green harvest ticket data. And that's in the orange  
31 bars there that are numbered there, 66, 63, that's the  
32 total harvest, and this is just for Galena, just using  
33 them for an example. But I think it's -- well, I know,  
34 looking at all the other data, it's very representative  
35 of the whole area.

35

36

37 Well, what happens here is if you compare  
38 our green harvest ticket data there, those dark orange  
39 bars, you can see that they're typically about half of  
40 the harvest that is being reported when we do our door to  
41 door survey. Now, one thing that we know is that much of  
42 the unreported harvest, and that basically that's the  
43 length of the bar above the orange portion there, that's  
44 unreported harvest essentially as far as the harvest  
45 tickets go.

45

46

47 Much of that harvest is taking place  
48 during the winter time, that's when we see most of the  
49 unreported harvest activities. And so it's kind of  
50 hidden within there that we're seeing an increase in that  
51 harvest right in there. And I explained that to the

00273

1 Board of Game, and they accepted that as an explanation  
2 for that and as much of the reason why they supported  
3 passage of 193.

4

5                   At the same time we recognize that with  
6 this increasing harvest and the dependency on the winter  
7 seasons that, even though we're making grounds and we're  
8 making a move in the direction to help locals increase  
9 their fall harvest success, we still have to address the  
10 harvest of cows in the winter. And at this point in  
11 time, that's why we submitted the other proposal,  
12 Proposal 201, which was to close the February and the  
13 March seasons in 24, that was a State proposal, and that  
14 proposal was passed. So for the State regulations, we  
15 don't have the February and the March seasons now.

16

17                   Now, I know one of the concerns, and,  
18 believe me, I really, really understand how decisive an  
19 issue this is and how this is causing a lot of concerns  
20 amongst the local communities, and I know one aspect of  
21 it was the concern that we would never get that winter  
22 season back again. And I guess I just want to allay some  
23 of that fear and reassure people that it's certainly my  
24 intent, if we can get to the point, that we can get back  
25 and we see that harvest of cows is available, that I'm  
26 going to be willing to get that back on the books.

27

28                   So this isn't a permanent way to get rid  
29 of that season. We're not opposed to the harvest of cows  
30 as long as the population can support it.

31

32                   But it's my position at this point, as a  
33 biologist, trying to give the best objective data that I  
34 can to you for making decisions, is that, the population  
35 right now cannot support this cow harvest.

36

37                   MS. BRYANT: Okay. That wraps up the  
38 Koyukuk, and we'll move on down to the Kaiyuh.

39

40                   And this year in November/December 2003  
41 we were able to do three trend count areas on the Kaiyuh,  
42 and that's the southern portion, the lower part of this  
43 map the three pink trend count areas, Kaiyuh Slough,  
44 Pilot Mountain and Squirrel Creek. And once again we saw  
45 pretty much the same thing, lower bull/cow ratios. In  
46 the blue, calves were up a little bit and yearling bulls  
47 were up slightly. The summary of the trend surveys for  
48 both 21(D) and southern 24 were lower bull/cow ratios on  
49 seven of the 10 TCAs. We believe this is because a  
50 combination of poor recruitment over a three year period,

00274

1 '99, 2000 and 2001 and a consistent level of harvest.

2

3

4 We did have two years of decent calf  
5 numbers in '02 and '03, and one year of decent  
6 recruitment, this year in 2003 and this should improve  
7 the smaller size bulls in the next year but medium and  
8 large bulls will have more of a time lag for recovery.  
9 And I've heard a lot that -- a lot of people are saying  
10 that you just don't see the big bulls anymore, they're  
11 mined out and, well, yeah, they are. There are still a  
12 few out there but they're really hard to find.

12

13

14 Although, we're encouraged by these  
15 recent improvements in the calf numbers conservative  
16 management of these populations is required until those  
17 calf and yearling cohorts from '02 and '03 have a chance  
18 to enter the adult population. They're not recruited  
19 yet. Although it's good and we're encouraged, they're  
20 not recruited yet. And not only do they have to deal  
21 with predators but in addition to predators they have  
22 winter stress to deal with and if you noticed this  
23 morning it's snowing and we haven't had a really tough  
24 winter since probably '92 with a lot of snow. And so  
25 we're going to keep our fingers crossed and see how the  
26 rest of this winter plays out.

26

27

28 Three areas of particular concern, Three-  
29 Day Slough, Dulbi River and the Kaiyuh. Bulls and cows  
30 have declined and calf numbers are still below average in  
31 those areas. This population is at best, at best stable,  
32 but it's extremely susceptible to future decline if we  
33 don't manage it conservatively.

33

34

35 Our management recommendations are based  
36 on, because in these hunted areas the population is  
37 declining. In the areas that are lightly hunted, mostly  
38 in the outskirts that are really hard to get to, maybe  
39 temporarily acting to moderate a unit-wide decline, but  
40 if we're not careful those areas will become affected,  
41 too. We need to implement conservative strategies now. I  
42 was told yesterday that we need to start being -- stop  
43 being reactive and start being proactive.

43

44

45 So we're saying now, let's do nothing to  
46 increase harvest. We can't afford to harvest cows from  
47 this population right now.

47

48

49 As I see it we're literally teetering on  
50 the edge of a population decline. We can either keep  
51 doing what we've been doing and step off into that

00275

1 serious decline or we can stop and back up and tighten  
2 our belts and take the sacrifice. And, you know, I'll  
3 say it one more time we can't afford to keep harvesting  
4 cows.

5  
6 And I think, yeah, that's it.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN SAM: So was that your ADF&G  
9 analysis?

10  
11 MS. BRYANT: No, that was Fish and  
12 Wildlife Service, Koyukuk/Nowitna.

13  
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Glenn. Glenn,  
15 yours?

16  
17 MR. STOUT: Yes, Mr. Chair, that would be  
18 what I have to offer our recommendation is in the book,  
19 too, as far as support of the amended version that the  
20 Refuge is submitting, that that be established for all of  
21 21(D) and 24, which would mimic the State regulations  
22 that were just adopted by the Board of Game.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Glenn.

25  
26 Benedict.

27  
28 MR. JONES: Yeah, Glenn, I noticed the  
29 last five years, the habitat area for Kaiyuh Slough is  
30 really poor in the Kaiyuh Flats area even south of  
31 Koyukuk, so those moose densities in that area is kind of  
32 unstable because of the habitat.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions for  
35 Glenn or Geoff or Jenny.

36  
37 (No comments)

38  
39 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, Inter-Agency, I  
40 think.

41  
42 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Public comment.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, we have public  
45 comment coming up, will you wait for that -- okay.  
46 Inter-Agency Staff.

47  
48 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
49 Taylor Brelsford for the Inter-Agency Staff Committee.

50



00277

1 winter season in December 1 to 10, March 1 to 10. And I  
2 think, if I understand right, you're for December, is it,  
3 on that proposal -- December, and none March -- okay.

4

5 In the past, like I said yesterday I live  
6 here all my life. And from the time we started to deal  
7 with moose there was not too many. And I was still on  
8 the Fish and Game Advisory Committee when we ask for  
9 December 1st to 10 because of the potlatch, some years we  
10 have during that holiday for that moose head, especially.  
11 That's what my people, my ancestors had carry on, you  
12 know, my grandparents they're gone a long time ago and  
13 all the people and that's the most delicacy, just like in  
14 your own cover dish or birthday or something, you always  
15 like to have something special, and seemed like we have  
16 to have that moose meat -- I mean moose head.

17

18 We save our moose head in the fall if  
19 there's something coming up. And like right now there's  
20 so many things that change. They have potlatch any day  
21 they want to. We never used to in the past.

22

23 And now another thing about having moose  
24 season in 1st of March to 10, that's the right time for  
25 us. We still can use fall moose meat because as you know  
26 there's Foodsaver, freezer, we always finish our dry  
27 meat, what we -- what little we put away in the fall  
28 because we share it. And sometimes we share it all the  
29 way to California, John Sackett from here is living in  
30 California, so last year or I forgot what time, one of  
31 the people from here, Hudson Sam was going down to -- I  
32 forgot where they went, Las Vegas, I guess, so here's my  
33 chance to send -- because I send it by mail once and  
34 didn't work, wasted. And so I sent him dry meat so it  
35 goes all the way that far even.

36

37 If we get moose in March, that will be  
38 for all summer and dry meat. Before the freezer we used  
39 to get our moose, like around March for dry meat, and  
40 back in '40, early '50s through '60, we used to save dry  
41 moose ribs and then soak it and make soup for the kids,  
42 anything, that's before the freezer. And so that I would  
43 go -- I know most of them, my husband, too, he can't hear  
44 good, I know he'll go for March because like I say the  
45 December, we still got last fall's moose head because  
46 there's no kind of activity in the fall so we save it for  
47 holiday.

48

49 And that's that about moose. And seeing  
50 all these up and down population of animal, us human is

00278

1 not only one taking those up and down -- making those up  
2 and down. Pretty much wolves in the winter, like right  
3 now they're having picnic with moose. Moose can't move.  
4 It's above their belly the way the snow is. That's when  
5 it's really hard. And those are the things should be  
6 worked with, get rid of the moose [sic] or try to get it  
7 down. And then the spring come, all the moose -- one  
8 time about three years ago, we always travel on the  
9 river, and we made a trip from here to Hughes or  
10 Allakaket, one of the places they were having potlatch  
11 and our relatives. From the time we went into Cut Off  
12 Slough, because it's narrow and not like the big river,  
13 the main river, a lot off Cut Off on this end, I didn't  
14 count them all but we saw a whole bunch of cow moose with  
15 calf healthy animal. We stayed up there about a week or  
16 so and then we started to come back down, through that  
17 same Cut Off from upper end to lower end, we seen some  
18 calf [sic], they look pretty sad, no calf, there's bears,  
19 I don't know if we saw wolf but I know we saw -- and Bear  
20 Mountain, where we call, about half way between here and  
21 Hughes, he was steering and I went to sleep on my chair  
22 and he pushed me, we got little dog and he was really  
23 looking but he didn't see ahead, so he woke me up and  
24 point out the dog, she was standing by the window in  
25 front and soon as I look I saw black bear, not very big  
26 really running after cow moose with calf behind. And so  
27 right away I got his gun down and give it to him, I'll  
28 take the wheel, you just shoot over them, he's not going  
29 to kill them, we don't need it, and that's out of season,  
30 and we didn't need the meat anyway. So he didn't know  
31 what to do, I said get out there and shoot over it, by  
32 that time we were coming closer, we didn't close enough  
33 and the cow had jumped over the little ditch and the calf  
34 fell in, couldn't make the jump, it wasn't that big  
35 either, but it just trip, the black bear just grabbed it  
36 and into the brush.

37

38 I cried. My husband saw me. I felt so  
39 bad for it.

40

41 Out Huslia in the spring when we go  
42 fishing, same thing happen, this one cow moose we had  
43 hard time with, we started check our fish net and this  
44 corner of that little slough, he tried to -- that cow  
45 tried to charge us and he keep looking over there, that  
46 moose where the bear got the calf, really sad. And we  
47 try to look over there, try to come closer and it just go  
48 in the water after us.

49

50 So you probably know that it's not only

00279

1 human but it's pretty much -- the hunters take a few but  
2 not all over the place. I don't like them, I don't like  
3 sport hunters. Some of them are our good friends, but,  
4 yet we don't like what they're doing.

5  
6                   But really, I believe the really answer  
7 is pretty much the big bear and the black bear and the  
8 wolf. And I know if somebody fly around right now  
9 they're just having a feast because that happened one  
10 winter. Some moose starve because they were stuck in the  
11 snow. I was down in Koyukuk and there was one calf over  
12 there last -- last spring's calf, pretty big, it's just  
13 stuck but they were feeding it. I think it survived  
14 because I see a lot of brush in front of it. It couldn't  
15 move so they just feed it.

16  
17                   And anyway, I'm really for March season  
18 because that's the time we need meat to last us all  
19 spring and summer. I don't like to go back to where we  
20 used to soak dry muskrat, dry beaver, dry -- dry beaver  
21 is good, dry muskrat and dry moose meat, 1937 my  
22 grandmother make dry meat out of moose head, last fall  
23 one, and they had one favorite daughter, her name was  
24 Celia, but she had Indian name, and she say, that's her  
25 -- that's for her, you see what people used to do. I  
26 seen Steven's mom used to -- that's where I learn it,  
27 nice fat moose ribs, she soak it and she make soup out of  
28 it.

29  
30                   And then I understand if they do have  
31 December season only bull, and we've been eating meat  
32 for, you know, the rest of our life as we're living and I  
33 remember in 1938, somewhere around there grandpa -- first  
34 time I saw grandpa shot moose, but before that they were  
35 hunting. For the winter they were hunting down Dulbi in  
36 September and that's how long we have moose, it was  
37 pretty scarce at the time, there was not that much. And  
38 you ever know how poor the bull moose get. If you get it  
39 in December you just as well try to cook leather and try  
40 to eat it, that's how tough it is. It never eat for how  
41 long, no fat, just tough meat, that's what it is. And we  
42 probably, if we have to eat we could use it, you know,  
43 like our people did.

44  
45                   And that's another thing about December,  
46 maybe by March they might get a little better than that  
47 time because there's December January, February, March.  
48 So might be different, I wouldn't know. But reason why  
49 we take when we were able to they let us take cow in  
50 December or March, reason why we take it, we know it's

00280

1 bad because it's going to have calves some of them, but  
2 it's the best nutrition for your childrens and  
3 grandchildren, that's the way I see it.

4

5 So with that, that's my comments about  
6 moose.

7

8 Thank you, Chairman.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Katherine.  
11 Let's see if there's any questions. Any questions for  
12 Katherine Attla.

13

14 MR. COLLINS: Ron.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray.

17

18 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Katherine, I have one  
19 question.

20

21 MS. ATTLA: Yes.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: They've said that they want  
24 to protect cow moose and they're suggesting maybe  
25 reducing or eliminating the winter hunt, if there was a  
26 bull only hunt in March, would that cause any problem for  
27 the hunters here? Are they knowledgeable enough they can  
28 tell a bull from a cow even though they don't have  
29 antlers if we did the March season that was bull only?

30

31 MS. ATTLA: I don't know. I'd rather  
32 have -- like I say cow is the best nutrition for your  
33 family and for the community.

34

35 MR. COLLINS: Uh-huh.

36

37 MS. ATTLA: And, really, all this, there  
38 must be a way to get away from losing our moose is get  
39 rid of the animal.

40

41 It was even tough when I was on the  
42 Advisory Committee, Fish and Game Advisory Committee,  
43 there was 12 of us and I was only lady. And being lady  
44 I'm not supposed to talk about big animal, which is  
45 grizzly and brown, but I was forced to it, I was  
46 cornered. The boys wouldn't say nothing. There was two  
47 older guys, they wouldn't say nothing on account of that  
48 \$25 permit. And in our belief, in our tradition, person  
49 is not supposed to talk about that animal. It's the same  
50 way with whalers and I found out later, they never --

00281

1 that one teacher that was here, he say he start to go  
2 with them and he ask the captain, you know, what we do if  
3 we see the animal, boy, he got mad and he just really lay  
4 the law on him, he said, and we're the same way with that  
5 animal. But I was forced to talk. So we got rid of that  
6 \$25 permit before, you know, so you have it when you're  
7 in camp so you don't have to go back and, you know, if  
8 there's animal around.

9

10 But animal is doing really a lot to moose  
11 population. And I bet you anything this winter is going  
12 to be worse, this spring. And there's so many calves we  
13 lose.

14

Okay.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions for  
17 Katherine.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you again,  
22 Katherine.

23

24 MS. ATTLA: Uh-huh.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: I think I got your  
27 message. That if we do establish a winter hunt, you  
28 would prefer the March one, right?

29

30 MS. ATTLA: Yes.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you.

33

34 MS. ATTLA: Yeah.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: I just wanted to make  
37 sure.

38

39 MS. ATTLA: Okay, thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, too. Thank you  
42 very much. Any more public testimony, Fred Bifelt.

43

44 MR. BIFELT: First of all I'll start by  
45 saying the people here in Huslia, were unaware of these  
46 proposals that were presented to the Game Board in  
47 Fairbanks. We didn't know that our winter hunts were in  
48 the process of being eliminated and focusing primarily on  
49 December 1 to 10, bull only.  
50

00282

1 I'm sure if we knew that this was going  
2 to be up for discussion, we would probably try to be at  
3 the table and give our input. It was just by chance that  
4 we were able to find out about this this morning. And it  
5 goes to show that maybe there should be more  
6 communication.

7  
8 We knew since probably about '95, mid-  
9 90s, maybe even earlier, that our moose were in danger.  
10 We were saying this, too. We were trying to tell people  
11 that, look, we got a problem here, we should try to  
12 address it, but all we hear is these studies, oh, this  
13 population is thriving, this and that's going on here and  
14 all that, and far as I was concerned it was hog wash  
15 because I knew it was going down, and I told Virgil that  
16 a number of times. We have to limit our bull harvest  
17 around here, we're going to kill off these moose, no, no,  
18 no, that ain't going to happen.

19  
20 Traditional knowledge, our people knew  
21 these kind of things was happening, but data and  
22 everything didn't jive with the way we were looking at  
23 it, so if there's no scientific data then that means that  
24 there's nothing wrong, nobody really looks at traditional  
25 knowledge like they should. We live here, we knew that  
26 the moose was going down. That's what I said yesterday  
27 about we got to quit reacting to things and we got to  
28 start being proactive.

29  
30 It's too late now. Moose population is  
31 going down, and now we're talking about killing -- I mean  
32 not killing cows. It's like Katherine said, any one of  
33 you folks here when you go to the grocery store and you  
34 want to go shopping for your children, you're going to  
35 get the best that's on the shelf, you're not going to buy  
36 wieners or whatever, we look at it the same way. When I  
37 go out hunting, caribou or moose or whatever, I'm going  
38 to look for the best, healthiest animal out there so when  
39 I come home, I feel good in my heart that I'm going to  
40 give my kids something good to eat.

41  
42 That's what it's about right now. We  
43 always are like that. When we go trapping beaver we want  
44 the best beaver, we know where they're at. Stuff like  
45 that. We want to give our kids something good and  
46 nutrition to eat. We don't want to feed them bull moose  
47 meat if we have to when they're all run down in December.

48  
49 Right now if we were to walk around town  
50 and all our -- in any one of our villages, our freezers

00283

1 are almost empty. We don't have no choice but to go out  
2 and hunt. We couldn't go to the grocery store and live  
3 off chicken and beef and pork or whatever, even if we had  
4 the opportunity, if we had all the money to do that we  
5 probably wouldn't want to anyway because we grew up on  
6 Mother Earth and the resources she provides.

7  
8                   We have to have this March hunt, we have  
9 no choice. We don't need that December hunt. Our  
10 freezers are full in December but right now we're getting  
11 down to the bottom and we got to have something to bring  
12 us through the summer and up into our fall hunt. One  
13 moose is not enough for us to survive for one year. So  
14 we got to have this March hunt.

15  
16                   It's really unfortunate that we even come  
17 to the table and discuss whether it should be a bull or a  
18 cow. A lot of people here, we could distinguish between  
19 a bull and a cow, that's not hard, but we don't want to  
20 shoot a bull. He's not that healthy. We want to bring  
21 something nutritious home for our kids, we like to eat  
22 fat. That's the way we were since we were young and  
23 that's how our people grew up, because they don't like to  
24 eat too much rabbits and chicken because there's no fat  
25 on it. If you live on something like that for long time  
26 you'll know how much you crave that fat meat, beaver or  
27 whatever, moose the same way. So we want to hunt cow  
28 because that's the best one.

29  
30                   I know we're in a dilemma now where we're  
31 backed into the corner now if we start shooting cows --  
32 we're shooting moose, we'll just get one or maybe we  
33 shoot three, twin calves or whatever, but we should have  
34 never got to this point. We have to try to look to work  
35 together. If people would have listened to us in '95 or  
36 '94 when we knew that things were starting to go down  
37 just because we start seeing how much moose was being  
38 harvested, 30 bulls on Long Channel or whatever, up the  
39 Huslia River and down below here, we knew that something  
40 was going to happen like this. And we were trying to  
41 say, we were pleading but nothing was done about it.  
42 That's how I quit working with Virgil, because I knew I  
43 didn't agree with what he was doing and I told him, too,  
44 and he wouldn't listen to me.

45  
46                   Now, there ain't no more big bulls around  
47 here. If you get a 60-inch bull, that's outstanding.

48  
49                   These studies that we seen here, it's  
50 true, I knew -- I mean I told Mike the last couple of

00284

1 years, I know that the calves are coming back because we  
2 seen them. Last fall I hunted in Hog River, and I seen  
3 -- year before I didn't see any cows and I didn't see any  
4 calves, last fall I was surprised, we seen cows and we  
5 seen some of them were twin calves, I don't know where  
6 the heck they came from, but there's more of them for  
7 some reason. And I noticed that, in my travels all  
8 winter, I noticed that there was -- sometimes I see a  
9 couple calves so they're coming back but there's a  
10 problem with predators, we have to work on that.

11

12 We're willing to work with whatever we  
13 have to do to try to bring our moose back.

14

15 But it's unfortunate that we have to be  
16 in this situation like this anyway. And I recommend -- I  
17 wouldn't want to tell you to bring to the table for your  
18 kids, and I have a problem with having to bring lean meat  
19 to the supper table for my kids. I want to go out there  
20 and get the best there is, just like we always done,  
21 that's what I have to say about it.

22

23 And that means I would want to hunt a cow  
24 in March instead of a bull.

25

26 We should have been working on this thing  
27 five, six, seven years ago instead of having to do it now  
28 when we're behind the curve. Let this be a lesson for us  
29 and in other areas, that's going to face problems like  
30 this, that we got to be in front of it instead of behind  
31 it. I hope that Unit 23 and further on down the Yukon  
32 and other areas will pick up on this because that's where  
33 the pressure is going to go next winter. We start  
34 closing it up around here, it's just going to go in other  
35 areas.

36

37 With that, I thank you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Fred. Was  
40 there any questions for Fred.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, more public  
45 testimony.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there any one else who  
50 wants to testify. Okay, Jack Wholecheese.

00285

1 MR. WHOLECHEESE: Mr. Chairman. Board  
2 members. Thank you Fred and Katherine for really making  
3 a good testimony. I mean they just about said everything  
4 that the whole village is concerned about and that's the  
5 kind of representation we need.

6  
7 But, you know, Fred was saying, well, it  
8 is traditionally true that we stock our freezers in the  
9 fall to last us all winter. And this March hunt would be  
10 just right to stock our freezers for the summer until the  
11 fall. You know, it's a two-cycle deal.

12  
13 And traditionally, people don't want to put no  
14 stringy meat or any kind of that meat in their freezers,  
15 there's no nutrition in there, there's nothing. You  
16 can't make artificial fat. And when you buy your chicken  
17 or something here in town, it's twice as much than it is  
18 in Fairbanks. So what are our people going to live on?

19  
20 We have to have that moose to survive for  
21 the summer. A lot of people live on fish but that gets  
22 pretty tiring after awhile and we don't hardly get any  
23 fish to live on anyway. So you know there's two  
24 different boats here.

25  
26 But I really want to thank Fred and  
27 Katherine for everything that they said. With that I'd  
28 like to thank you.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. Is there  
31 any questions for Jack Wholecheese.

32  
33 (No comments)

34  
35 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, thank you again.  
36 Thank you, Fred and Katherine, and also for being here  
37 last night. Any further public testimony. Okay, Steven  
38 Attla.

39  
40 MR. ATTILA: I agree with what people are  
41 saying, but you people got to see the other side, too.  
42 This has been going on, these sports hunters, they hunt  
43 up the Huslia River, do they have a right to have a camp  
44 where they're not supposed to hunt -- hunt out of there.

45  
46 Another thing, they have a camp way up  
47 the North Fork, there's some big boats went up there last  
48 fall and our boys hunt moose up the Huslia River and then  
49 these boats come down in morning and they go down this  
50 way all day, at night they go back up. Do they have a

00286

1 right to do that. They're not supposed to kill moose on  
2 this side of North Fork, but there's something going on.  
3 I think we need more control on that area there, really.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, very much  
8 Steven. We have Hudson Sam.

9

10 MR. H. SAM: Mr. Chairman. Board  
11 members. I'd like to make a little comment on this, like  
12 the fall hunt, how we survive on the fall hunt. Maybe we  
13 get one or two moose to a family, maybe one. And with  
14 that put away or somebody or someone is going to have a  
15 potlatch during that winter, well, maybe late November,  
16 they expect a potlatch so that automatically goes -- some  
17 of it goes to that potlatch, it's put away for that  
18 potlatch. Okay, now, we go all the way through New  
19 Year's -- Christmas, New Years, we have all this big  
20 celebration here, people from the outlying villages all  
21 comes here and we depend on that fall harvest for that,  
22 so we put a lot away for that.

23

24 Now, you take moose strips, dry moose  
25 strips and all that moose head, and brisket, and put all  
26 that, it's put away for that special reason, this is our  
27 fall hunt, it's our traditional way.

28

29 Now, we need another one. So one of our  
30 family members would go out, he didn't get no moose that  
31 fall so we saved his harvest ticket or get another  
32 harvest ticket after New Year's to put us through the  
33 summer, and some of that has to be put away in case  
34 there's another funeral or potlatch or whatever, that's  
35 got to be expected, and that's us, that's our traditional  
36 way regardless of what anybody say.

37

38 And if you cut us off on this March hunt,  
39 like me, you can't cut me off, I'm going to go out and  
40 get it regardless of what who say, no matter what. You  
41 can put me in jail, I wouldn't care, I don't mind. While  
42 I'm in jail you guys got to support my family anyway, you  
43 got to send them some kind of welfare so why cut us off.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you.

48

49 MR. COLLINS: Ron, I had a question in  
50 general.

00287

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Ray.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Aren't they getting permits  
4 for funerals and memorial potlatches because we are in  
5 our area, we usually go out and get a fresh moose and  
6 even though we've got shortages, they can still get those  
7 permits for a moose for a potlatch.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, we had one, I don't  
10 know what the status of it is now. I'd like to bring  
11 Glenn Stout up here, for funeral and memorial potlatches.

12

13 MR. H. SAM: Yeah, they do. They do.  
14 And that's funeral or potlatch, but then you don't have  
15 time to put that stuff away or you don't have time to dry  
16 that stuff.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

19

20 MR. H. SAM: You don't have time to do all  
21 this, like you only got three or four days, I'm talking  
22 months.

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. A quick update on  
25 that hunt.

26

27 MR. STOUT: Yeah, Mr. Chair, that's  
28 correct. We still allow for that potlatch take. That's  
29 still in the regulations to allow for that, you know,  
30 whenever that comes up that that's necessary.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: I got one more question,  
33 too. Those questions that our elders Steven Attla asked,  
34 that Proposal 193 under the State, would that cover that  
35 area at all, as a registration permit hunt only, too,  
36 now?

37

38 MR. STOUT: Yes, Mr. Chair, that's  
39 exactly right. We have all that Huslia River and the  
40 Dakli River Drainage will now be under a limited drawing  
41 permit and we'll be able to exert the control on that  
42 just like we do in the Controlled Use Area. And what we  
43 did this year, just to update everybody on that and make  
44 sure everybody's clear, this year we only issued 50 of  
45 those drawing permits for the Controlled Use Area  
46 portion, and based on past harvest and participation by  
47 people that drew those permits, we anticipate that only  
48 16 people will take a moose under that permit.

49

50 So you can see where we've made a drastic

00288

1 reduction in the number of non-locals and that's the only  
2 option available for residents and, in fact, it's an  
3 80/20 split. So we would expect probably something on  
4 the order of four or less moose will be even harvested by  
5 non-residents so we made just a dramatic decline on the  
6 control that we can exert on those hunters that were --  
7 you know, exactly right, like he pointed out, were  
8 creating problems for locals and their success dropping.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Fred.

11

12 MR. BIFELT: Pertaining to the upper  
13 Huslia area where Steven just mentioned, our tribal  
14 council allocated money over the past month to initiate  
15 control on the periphery on our corporation land. So  
16 next fall we're going to have a camp up there on the  
17 Huslia River which individuals just staying there to make  
18 sure that nobody comes down into our corporate lands for  
19 where we know that's happening. So we put up money and  
20 we're going to do it on our own, not be confrontational  
21 or nothing but we're just going to have people there  
22 camping and they're going to monitor it for us. And if  
23 we see any airplanes flying around, we're going to try to  
24 document that however we can and we're going to forward  
25 that to the proper authorities.

26

27 So we're trying to do as much as we can  
28 here with what little we have.

29

30 Thank you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Fred. I know  
33 that I'm jumping around, but sometimes we'll have to do  
34 that. That little update from Glenn will make some  
35 differences on some other proposals that we will be  
36 deliberating on. So I just wanted that before us and  
37 before the Huslia residents that did testify.

38

39 It was for information only.

40

41 Now, we're into Proposal 65. I see a  
42 whole bunch in here, it's kind of vague. It leaves it up  
43 to me and Roys Purington (ph), the way it's written -- if  
44 that was true, why open everything -- you know -- but I  
45 would like to.....

46

47 MR. STICKMAN: There's one written  
48 comment.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. I've got one

00289

1 written comment but that's just updating again. Do you  
2 have anything more?

3

4 MR. MATHEWS: No, I had no other written  
5 comment.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: I just got one that was  
8 just handed to me. So just for the record I will read  
9 it.

10

11 Dear Chairperson: My name is Annie Vent.  
12 I wanted this letter written to tell you  
13 that this proposing of only having a  
14 hunting season open during September is  
15 not right. Look at all the moose that  
16 are getting killed by wolves, you should  
17 do something about this. My son, David  
18 Vent, saw four wolf kills since this  
19 fall. He brought home a calf that was  
20 killed in a wolf kill to salvage the  
21 meat. The meat was thawed out, there was  
22 hardly any meat on the moose, even the  
23 head. All we live on here is meat. If  
24 you want to, you should stop the hunting  
25 of sport hunters instead of us. We  
26 depend on meat. There are no rabbits or  
27 ptarmigan, just moose, that's all. I  
28 would suggest you keep the fall and  
29 spring hunting open for the community of  
30 Huslia. Sincerely, Annie Vent, Huslia  
31 Elder.

32

33 I'd like to have this submitted into the  
34 record.

35

36 If there are no written comments, we'll  
37 go into Regional Council deliberation. If this was  
38 submitted by Koyukuk/Nowitna I would like to bring Geoff  
39 back up, because I don't understand the whole proposal as  
40 I see it on Page 251.

41

42 Okay, just for your information, I guess  
43 we're having covered dish at 5:00 and I do not see an  
44 alternative, we'll have to go into an evening session if  
45 we want to complete this meeting. These proposals are  
46 taking way too long for some reason.

47

48 (Laughter)

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: There's some mix up some

00290

1 place, we're not getting the right information right out  
2 front, I think.

3

4 Okay, now, what does this proposal do  
5 now, Geoff?

6

7 MR. BEYERSDORF: What the proposal would  
8 do would be to eliminate the February season in that  
9 portion of 21(D) and in 24 within the Koyukuk Controlled  
10 Use Area. And it would also give the Refuge manager to  
11 close the antlerless season, if necessary, after  
12 consulting with Glenn, the area biologist, with yourself  
13 the Chair of the Western Interior Regional Advisory  
14 Council, and the Chair of the Middle Yukon Advisory  
15 Council.

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Geoff.

18

19 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Ray.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: You mentioned that it would  
24 close the winter season if advisable, but it doesn't list  
25 a winter season at all or does it, does it have the March  
26 season in there?

27

28 MR. BEYERSDORF: Well, what we did was,  
29 originally when we put it in it just says winter season  
30 to be announced, because we knew that on the State side  
31 they had a proposal in and we didn't know what the dates  
32 were going to be for that at the time. But the State,  
33 with the passage of 201-A now has a December 1st to 10th  
34 season.

35

36 And the other thing that I would point,  
37 Ron, is that just the way that we have it written right  
38 now it just applies to 21(D) and 24 within the Koyukuk  
39 Controlled Use Area. We were looking for that to be  
40 amended to all of 21(D).

41

42 MR. SIAVELIS: Mr. Chairman.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: George.

45

46 MR. SIAVELIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The  
47 door was closing. I didn't hear the part about what did  
48 201 exactly do?

49

50 MR. BEYERSDORF: 201-A, the State Board

00291

1 of Game amended proposal that was passed takes the  
2 seasons for Unit 21(D) and 24, it eliminates the February  
3 season in 21(D) and the March season in Unit 24 and moves  
4 them to December -- December 1st through 10th and makes  
5 them a bulls only hunt.

6

7 So it took the former winter seasons of  
8 February and March to December and made them a bulls only  
9 hunt.

10

11 And what we were looking to do in our  
12 area is be in alignment with those actions on that  
13 proposal.

14

CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

15

16 MR. STICKMAN: Are we on Regional Council  
17 members.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Benedict first.

20

21 MR. JONES: Yeah, I have a question for  
22 Glenn. On your seven points human harvest, at Middle  
23 Yukon we requested four percent human harvest, the Game  
24 Board accepted the seven percent?

25

26 MR. STOUT: Mr. Chair. Member Jones.  
27 That seven percent is a number that we established in the  
28 Koyukuk Plan, that's a number that we've taken out of  
29 that plan for our harvest rates and it was for the area  
30 of Zone 1, which is the higher moose density areas below  
31 Hughes down to the mouth of the Koyukuk, that portion of  
32 the Koyukuk Drainage, that, we recommended was seven  
33 percent, plus or minus one percent, and up stream from  
34 Hughes, that portion of the Koyukuk Drainage is five  
35 percent. And those were established within the plan.

36

37 For the remainder of 21(D), what we did  
38 is when I submit management reports, I adopted the  
39 similar objectives that we establish in the plan, I  
40 adopted those for the management area for the remainder  
41 of 21(D) as well outside the Koyukuk Drainage, so both  
42 those areas are established by the Department and then  
43 through the working group, you know, we work and manage  
44 by those as objectives.

45

46 MR. STICKMAN: Ron.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Mickey.

49

50

00292

1 MR. STICKMAN: Tom [sic], you know, when  
2 we had our Middle Yukon Advisory Committee meeting on  
3 Nulato, we didn't want these, you know, we didn't want  
4 these seasons to be off the books but apparently from  
5 what Jeff is saying those are taken off the books now and  
6 they have been changed from February and March through  
7 December 1st through the 10th.

8

9 MR. BEYERSDORF: That's on the State  
10 side.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Mickey.

13

14 MR. STICKMAN: Okay, because you know  
15 just like the testimony from the elders and Fred's  
16 testimony and Jack's testimony, you know, it's the same  
17 way in Nulato and, you know, I don't think it's any  
18 different than Koyukuk, you know, we don't have no  
19 sustainable economy so everybody they have to eat moose  
20 meat, you know, year-round. In Nulato we're kind of  
21 lucky because we live right on the Yukon there where  
22 harvest in king salmon and silvers and chum salmon is,  
23 you know, it's relatively -- not that hard for us not  
24 like up here. So the Middle Yukon Advisory Committee  
25 agreed with the concept of having the hunt closures but  
26 they didn't agree with a change in the seasons.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Tommy.

29

30 MR. KRISKA: Yeah, Glenn, you remember  
31 that we didn't want the hunts to be taken off the books  
32 because in the future it would be harder for us to try to  
33 get it back from you guys or whoever's cutting these  
34 hunts off so we didn't want it to be taken off the books  
35 at all.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Tommy. Any  
38 further questions or comments.

39

40 MR. COLLINS: Ron.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, Ray.

43

44 MR. COLLINS: It sounds like the action  
45 that the Board took at the recent meeting went against  
46 the original plan because I thought I heard in the plan  
47 very clearly that if there's to be a restriction on the  
48 winter hunt -- or on the cow hunt, that it would  
49 disappear first in the fall and then in December and  
50 March would be the last to go and instead they came up

00293

1 with this bull only December 15, I'm wondering why they  
2 didn't make it -- if they were going to do that, just a  
3 bull only March, although I think they would prefer, from  
4 the testimony, that it remain cow.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Glenn.

7

8 MR. STOUT: Mr. Chairman. Member Collins  
9 and Mr. Kriska. There's a couple of things that kind of,  
10 as far as the sequence of events, as far as why it was  
11 taken off the book, when I presented the proposal to the  
12 Middle Yukon Advisory Committee, I had that language that  
13 would essentially take it off the books. And I took your  
14 recommendations from the Middle Yukon Advisory Committee  
15 and when I talked to the Board of Game I told them what  
16 your recommendations were. It was basically up to them  
17 at that point to take that under advisement and accept it  
18 or take the language that was written in the proposal.

19

20 I also brought forward to them what the  
21 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee had presented and they  
22 had presented as an alternative, a reduction in the  
23 number of days in that March season in favor of adding  
24 additional days in the fall season, and they chose not to  
25 accept that alterative either.

26

27 As far as addressing Mr. Collins'  
28 concerns, the way we've gone through this is although the  
29 fall season is still on the books, we've allowed that to  
30 remain on the books to address this concern in the past  
31 that if we did take it off the book it would never come  
32 back on, and so for the last three years we've had  
33 emergency closures during that fall season. So  
34 effectively we have gone through that step process but  
35 what we did was we were able to tell the Board, when we  
36 have to get our annual reauthorization of the cow  
37 seasons, that there was concern about taking it off the  
38 books but they agreed with that understanding that they  
39 knew we were going to close them by emergency order. So  
40 effectively we have gone through that process, although,  
41 in the specific case in the fall season it doesn't look  
42 like it on the books.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Tommy.

45

46 MR. KRISKA: Mr. Chairman. Glenn, and  
47 Mickey, when we said not to take it off the books and  
48 then you wanted to close the season then we said, if it  
49 was to be closed like that we'd settle for a bull in  
50 March instead of -- not in December. And we said we'd

00294

1 keep it open in March and settle for a bull; is that  
2 right Mickey?

3

4 MR. STICKMAN: (Nods affirmatively)

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: He's nodding yes. Go  
7 ahead.

8

9 MR. STICKMAN: You know, in the  
10 management plan, you know, at one point 3.1, it says that  
11 the restrictions in the cow harvest are needed, you know,  
12 they should be applied to the general hunt, then to the  
13 fall subsistence hunt and last to the winter hunt, you  
14 know, so you're not even following the management plan if  
15 you're going to eliminate the winter hunt right off the  
16 bat.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Mickey. Any  
19 questions or comments -- Jack -- Jack and then Benedict.

20

21 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman. I've been  
22 discussing this proposal all winter with National Park  
23 Service. We had the meeting down in Hughes regarding  
24 that December 1 to December 10th all winter long. I was  
25 at the Game meeting representing the Koyukuk River  
26 Advisory Committee, all winter long I've been saying this  
27 December 1 to December 10th, bull only season is not  
28 palatable, that means you can't eat it, and we don't want  
29 that, we didn't want that to start with and the Game  
30 Board didn't listen to us.

31

32 So they didn't address that.

33

34 This is supposed to be a subsistence hunt  
35 and so if you can't eat a tough bull that's all run down  
36 and the hams are all narrow like that and they're all  
37 beat up and bruised up and skinny, that's not a  
38 subsistence palatable hunt. So the Koyukuk River  
39 Advisory Committee, when we met in Hughes had proposed an  
40 alternate and that alternate was to take five days off  
41 the March season, still allow antlerless harvest for five  
42 days in spring time and put that five days on the end of  
43 September to encourage bull harvest, more bull harvest in  
44 the fall time but still give some opportunity for cow  
45 harvest in spring time, but less days. We felt that that  
46 was addressing the harvest issue by reducing the number  
47 of days but still giving some opportunity to harvest cow  
48 moose in spring time.

49

50 The Board didn't listen at all. They

00295

1 weren't even paying a lick of attention to what we were  
2 talking about. They adopted the one bull. That's not a  
3 subsistence moose. I don't think that the Board of Game  
4 even cared if that was subsistence moose.

5  
6                   But we never did hear about the Middle  
7 Yukon's alternate proposal, I guess they had an alternate  
8 proposal for a bull in March. A bull in March is still  
9 better than nothing. It's better than a bull in  
10 December. A bull in March, I can tell a bull in March,  
11 the sun is back, it's light out, you can see that white  
12 pedestal, a cow's got a white spot on her butt and  
13 there's no -- I got no problem spotting a bull at 200  
14 yards, no problem. And so bull in March is a heck of a  
15 lot better than a December bull.

16  
17                   And I've been saying this stuff all  
18 winter to all these management people and it's all been  
19 going right over their head. I'm glad to hear that, I'm  
20 finding down here in real subsistence country where  
21 people are going to tell you you cannot eat a bull in  
22 December, no one wants one of those moose and that is not  
23 palatable for this Council. We're a Subsistence Council,  
24 we're supposed to look out for the subsistence users.

25  
26                   We have two options here, these Federal  
27 Refuge lands, we can amend the proposal to have a March 1  
28 to March 5th antlerless season, put the five days on the  
29 end of the fall hunt or we can go for a March 1 to March  
30 10th, one bull in March. But I don't want to take that  
31 December 1 to December 10 bull, that's not a good moose.  
32 I feel it's a wanton waste of moose.

33  
34                   CHAIRMAN SAM: So Glenn or Geoff, if we  
35 put that into an amendment into Proposal 65, would that  
36 go into the books as a winter subsistence hunt?

37  
38                   MR. BEYERSDORF: Our main concern here is  
39 the conservation of cows, I mean we're at that point with  
40 this population and I think Boomer and Glenn have really  
41 tried to point that out, that what we're seeing out there  
42 shows us that we really need to be conserving our cows.

43  
44                   We would prefer that it's a December  
45 season because then as far as we would still have bulls  
46 out there that would be retaining their antlers. One of  
47 our reasonings for that is that what we would see is with  
48 the December season in place it would not be a law  
49 enforcement issue. And I think like what we saw here  
50 with testimony last night if there were people that

00296

1 weren't able to discern cows and bulls as easily as some  
2 of the other people, I would like to avoid that  
3 situation.

4

5 The Council has that option to amend it  
6 to the March season. If they did amend it, what we would  
7 also request is if they could amend it to all of 21(D).

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Benedict, you had  
10 something.

11

12 MR. JONES: Yeah, thank you, Mr.  
13 Chairman. I just wanted to comment to the Koyukuk River.  
14 We do predation control in that area for the last 10  
15 years, that's why the increase of calf survival and moose  
16 population increased.

17

18 And as for black bear, for the last five  
19 years we haven't seen too many black bears in that area  
20 and for the brown bears, there's very few in that area,  
21 only from Gisasa on up is the brown bears and black  
22 bears. So the bear population are real low in that area,  
23 that's why the moose increased in that area and I think  
24 some of the upper Koyukuk moose population migrate down  
25 to that area due to the wolves and other predation.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Benedict.

28

29 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray.

32

33 MR. COLLINS: Before we make an amendment  
34 to that, I would like to alter what Jack proposed. I  
35 would like to see us -- if we're going to go down to five  
36 days in March, I'd leave it just at an antlerless hunt.  
37 It seems to me that we could afford to do this in steps  
38 rather than eliminate any cow harvest at all or take all  
39 those off the books. If you're going to reduce it, why  
40 not do it in a step and then monitor it next fall but I  
41 don't think there's -- people are going to take what they  
42 need and, at least there would be a five day opportunity.

43

44 I would like to see us grant that for  
45 another year and then monitor and see what the situation  
46 is next year.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: We don't have an  
49 alternative. Tommy.

50

00297

1 MR. KRISKA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Geoff,  
2 so as of now the March hunt is going to be off the books?

3  
4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Under the State land.

5  
6 MR. KRISKA: Under the State land.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN SAM: The State proposal, it  
9 will be, but then what we're working on is the Federal  
10 side of this.

11  
12 MR. KRISKA: Okay, thanks.

13  
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Jack.

15  
16 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman. So right  
17 now, currently there's no cow hunting on the Native  
18 corporation lands around Huslia or any of the white areas  
19 we see on our maps here. The Federal proposal that we're  
20 talking about right now is only going to apply to the  
21 Refuge lands here and the Refuge and BLM lands, if we  
22 include 21(D). So still, people are going to have to  
23 travel a long ways away if we still retain some March  
24 hunt. That's gone around the villages.

25  
26 Some of the concern on the State side was  
27 that there's too easy of access close to Galena and  
28 there's harvest there, that hunt's gone. We can't do  
29 nothing about that State one bull in December thing.  
30 All's we're talking about here is the Federal lands and  
31 that's quite some distance from Huslia, it looks like  
32 quite a ways away from here on the Federal lands, and the  
33 local people would have to realize that it would have to  
34 be on the Federal lands and that's a little bit hard to  
35 describe and look at. But basically there's some general  
36 rules on the river from certain points you would be able  
37 to know where you were at and you could harvest a moose,  
38 but it's still going to be a lot of traveling, still not  
39 as good as hunting close to home, economy of time, effort  
40 and expense.

41  
42 But I still feel that it's my position  
43 that the local people down in this country have harvested  
44 a lot of wolves over the last few years and the way I  
45 calculate that that's accounted for savings of thousands  
46 of moose in the last few years with all of the harvest  
47 that's occurred. And so I feel that these people have to  
48 realize that there's a subsistence need, and there is  
49 subsistence harvest of wolves and I feel that a  
50 conservation reduction in time for hunting moose in

00298

1 spring may be a little bit, but I don't want to see a  
2 total elimination and I don't want to see one bull in  
3 December.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. Like I  
6 said we don't have an alternative.

7

8 There was another issue and another  
9 concern introduced at the Koyukuk River Moose Working  
10 Group meeting, and that was concern of the bull/cow ratio  
11 in Unit 21(D) and Unit 24, that portion within the  
12 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area. The concern there was the  
13 bulls per 100 cows and the ideal is somewhere around 20-  
14 some to about 30 -- 25 to 30, right around 30 and all the  
15 graphs that we saw recently, they're showing 16, 17 bulls  
16 per 100 cows, and if those graphs are right we are not  
17 addressing the bull to cow ratio.

18

19 So there has to be some -- you would  
20 figure that to harvest a few more cows -- or harvest a  
21 few cows in March 1 through March 5, I don't think it  
22 would hurt the population. If there's no bulls there  
23 won't be much moose anyway, big breeding bulls,  
24 especially the big breeding bulls, so we're not  
25 addressing that issue yet. And I think that one way that  
26 we can partially address that issue is to instigate or  
27 put into operation a five day Federal Subsistence hunt  
28 for Federally-qualified subsistence users within 21(D)  
29 and Unit 24, that portion within the Koyukuk Controlled  
30 Use Area.

31

32 I think that would also -- for the most  
33 part this would be mostly on Federal lands, and I think  
34 that's the only way that we can address this issue.

35

36 Any further deliberations from the  
37 Council.

38

39 MR. STICKMAN: One last one.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

42

43 MR. STICKMAN: You know, I always think  
44 about when we do any kind of reductions, subsistence  
45 harvest of moose, you know, Ben, he knows about the past  
46 a lot better than I do but, you know, when we sit around  
47 with the elders back home and they talk about way back in  
48 the 50s before Alaska even became a state when there were  
49 no moose in the Kaiyuh Flats or no more moose anywhere  
50 around, and, you know, when they were traveling by dog

00299

1 team or they were walking and they would come across a  
2 moose track and the whole village would have a meeting  
3 and they would go run that one moose down even if it was  
4 the last moose in the country, they would go run it down  
5 and harvest it because it was that important to the  
6 village, you know.

7

8                   So, you know, when I think about that  
9 concept and I think about this -- you know, doing away  
10 with this subsistence harvest of cows, you know,  
11 sometimes it's just hard for me to swallow because in the  
12 past my ancestors used to shoot every single moose they  
13 see right off the bat as soon as they see it, regardless  
14 if it was the first one or the last one.

15

16                   CHAIRMAN SAM: And you still have moose.

17

18                   MR. STICKMAN: And you still have moose.

19

20                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack, and then I think  
21 George, because we've been on this issue, this proposal  
22 for an hour and 50 minutes and it's almost time for  
23 dinner, so we've got to move one way or the other.

24

25                   Jack.

26

27                   MR. REAKOFF: I'm always of the opinion  
28 that we don't want to kill cows accompanied by calves in  
29 the winter hunt. I think that if you kill a cow in the  
30 winter, you might as well shoot the calf, too. I think  
31 for conservation measures I think that we should  
32 incorporate only dry cows.

33

34                   Another aspect of this cow hunting thing  
35 is there's old cows that are unproductive that are not a  
36 breeding component. I know a lot of elders that can pick  
37 those out, I can pick them out, my dad was trained by  
38 Jimmy Huntington how to do that and there's certain  
39 things about killing these older cows, it's not going to  
40 be -- it's not all breeding component. So that's another  
41 aspect of this thing, is there's -- you can target  
42 unproductive component of the population that's not  
43 really going to do anything to the moose. But I don't  
44 want to see a harvest of cows accompanied by calves,  
45 that's my personal thing.

46

47                   CHAIRMAN SAM: George.

48

49                   MR. SIAVELIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm  
50 really torn on this one, I'll probably support an

00300

1 amendment and because of all the compelling testimony. I  
2 really appreciate it and it seems that there's a real  
3 need.

4

5 I also think that it was probably real  
6 hard for OSM Staff and those people to, you know, they're  
7 bound by managing by certain scientific principles and  
8 they see a big concern, and I just appreciate that, and  
9 it emphasizes to me, along with a lot of the testimony  
10 we've heard here the last two days about what happens  
11 when the predator/prey balance gets out of balance.

12

13 But I'm probably going to go along with  
14 -- I mean, really the testimony's been compelling.

15

16 Thank you.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, George.  
19 Further deliberations.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, the Chair will  
24 entertain an amendment to Proposal 65. Jack.

25

26 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I make a  
27 motion to amend and adopt the proposal. The amendment  
28 would read:

29

30 To step down this cow harvest by having  
31 an antlerless moose season to be March 1  
32 to March 5th and cows accompanied by  
33 calves are not legal to be harvested.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Was that clear to  
36 everyone, cows with calves are not to be harvested?

37

38 (Council nods affirmatively)

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

41

42 MR. KRISKA: Second.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Tommy. Any  
45 further deliberation.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 MR. STICKMAN: I call for the question.

50

00301

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: The question on the  
2 amendment has been called, all those in favor of the  
3 amendment signify by saying aye.

4  
5 IN UNISON: Aye.

6  
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.  
8  
9 (No opposing votes)

10  
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. Now,  
12 we're into the main motion, to adopt WP04-65.....

13  
14 MR. STICKMAN: As amended.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: .....as amended. Again,  
17 for the Staff, I know you deliberated and you sweated  
18 some stuff on this stuff but we, as a Subsistence  
19 Council, are mandated to provide for subsistence  
20 activities for the rural residents, Federally-qualified  
21 Federal subsistence residents and I, as Chair, will not  
22 deviate from that language, I will provide for Federally-  
23 qualified subsistence users to the best of my ability.

24  
25 And then with that, I let the Staff know  
26 of our mandate, not only mandated, but it is under Title  
27 VIII of ANILCA.

28  
29 MR. WALKER: Do you need a motion?

30  
31 MR. STICKMAN: No.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: We have a main motion.

34  
35 MR. STICKMAN: We have a main motion  
36 already.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN SAM: We just took care of the  
39 amendment. Just briefly, Mike.

40  
41 MR. SPINDLER: I just want to remind the  
42 Council that you will be going out of alignment with the  
43 State actions and so there's going to have to be a very  
44 strong educational component that this will be an  
45 opportunity available only on Federal lands.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: The State has been  
48 alignment with us for a good many years.

49  
50 (Laughter)

00302

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: But they do agree that we  
2 do take some subsistence harvest, so I think that they'll  
3 go over it anyway.

4  
5 Any further deliberation -- Vince.

6  
7 MR. MATHEWS: Yes Mr. Chairman, just to  
8 make it clear for the record. I'm a little lost if we're  
9 looking at all of 21(D) and where else is this going to  
10 apply. So it would be easier if we could just get it  
11 clear on the record of where you're applying this because  
12 there was a suggestion to amend the proposal so I want to  
13 make that clear to all the Council members where this is  
14 going to apply, your motion, if it does pass.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: This proposal for us was  
17 requested to be put on the floor by Huslia residents and  
18 the way I look at this proposal it is Unit 21(D), Koyukuk  
19 Controlled Use Area.....

20  
21 MR. STICKMAN: And 24.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: .....and Unit 24, that  
24 portion within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area. I think  
25 that clearly defines it, right?

26  
27 MR. MATHEWS: I'm asking Staff, does that  
28 work, because a component of this proposal, they wanted  
29 it amended it to be all in 21(D), so I'm sorry to  
30 interrupt the Chair there, but if this were to pass by  
31 the Board, is this functional within the Refuge to have  
32 the Controlled Use Area in there?

33  
34 MR. SPINDLER: I think you need to look  
35 at the map and if you want to provide this opportunity  
36 for the Kaiyuh Flats, you need to be real specific about  
37 that, 21(D). And then Huslia itself here is in 24, I'll  
38 remind the Council, too.

39  
40 So if you could have specific language,  
41 either the Controlled Use Area or the Koyukuk Refuge.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Mickey.

44  
45 MR. STICKMAN: I think before we vote on  
46 it, you know, I'm getting a little confused here, you  
47 know, because the proposal says 21(D) and all parts of  
48 Unit 24 outside the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, so we  
49 need a little clarification here because I thought the  
50 Kaiyuh Flats was 21.

00303

1 (Pause)

2

3 MR. SPINDLER: The original wording that  
4 I recall the Council deliberating on was 21(D) and then  
5 that portion of 24, including the Controlled Use Area.  
6 Is that what you offered, Jack, as I recall?

7

8 MR. REAKOFF: I was referring to the  
9 Refuge lands in 24 and then in 21(D).

10

11 MR. STICKMAN: Okay.

12

13 MR. REAKOFF: And so I was making it  
14 clear that these were Federal lands and that these  
15 delineations of where these lands are because people are  
16 going to have to be aware of where these lands are, these  
17 Federal lands, that's where the hunt is going to occur.  
18 There is no hunt on the State land.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is that clear enough  
21 Vince?

22

23 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that  
24 makes it clear where it applies.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Fred Bifelt.

27

28 MR. BIFELT: The only concern that I have  
29 is I respectfully request that our tribal councils in  
30 these areas that are going to be affected by this new  
31 Federal law, that we be -- that we work in conjunction  
32 with the Staff of whoever's going to implement this act,  
33 that we do an educational process to our people that they  
34 know where this hunting season is going to take place.

35

36 We have to do an intensive communication  
37 here, I think, and our tribal council is willing to take  
38 this one, to help our people here in Huslia. But we have  
39 to work with, I don't know, maybe -- I don't know who.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: The Koyukuk/Nowitna  
42 Refuge.

43

44 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Carl.

47

48 MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
49 want to reiterate to the Council that this is a  
50 recommendation that's going to the Federal Subsistence

00304

1 Board. This has got to go through another hurdle, this  
2 is not done yet. We still got to make that argument to  
3 our Chair and perhaps Vince and some of the Staff will  
4 help to make that argument when the Federal Subsistence  
5 Board meets.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thanks for that  
8 clarification. That's very important, because whoever  
9 goes down there and testifies before the Federal  
10 Subsistence Board, it doesn't always work, it is also not  
11 a guarantee that we get it or get it implemented, but if  
12 we don't we'll just keep introducing it again.

13

14 Any further deliberation.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 MR. STICKMAN: I call for the question.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called.  
21 All those in favor of adopting WP04-65 as amended signify  
22 by saying aye.

23

24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Those opposed, same sign.

27

28 (No opposing votes)

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carries. It is two  
31 minutes after 5:00, and I think the cover dish starts  
32 shortly.

33

34 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I've  
35 already been approached that the women want to start  
36 setting up at 5:00.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

39

40 MR. MATHEWS: So we need to help start  
41 moving things around.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: All right, we'll start  
44 moving some stuff. What time do we want to reconvene  
45 tonight, we haven't even gotten done with proposals.  
46 We've got three or four more that concerns the local  
47 area, too.

48

49 (Laughter)

50

00305

1 MR. STICKMAN: I don't mean to laugh.

2

3 (Laughter)

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, let's shoot for 7:00  
6 o'clock to reconvene for more proposal deliberations.

7

8 (Off record)

9

10 (On record)

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'll call the meeting back  
13 to order.

14

15 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, these are  
16 kind of housekeeping issues that we need to address and  
17 one is to make it clear on the record that your action on  
18 Proposal 65, your amendment was that it would be any  
19 moose except those accompanied by a calf during March 1  
20 through the 5th; does that match everybody on that?

21

22 (Council nods affirmatively)

23

24 MR. MATHEWS: Because the other language  
25 you were using was confusing, to put it mildly -- I  
26 shouldn't say put it mildly, it was, we were concerned  
27 about what it would be and this makes it clearer for us  
28 -- me, was confused.

29

30 (Laughter)

31

32 MR. MATHEWS: The other thing.....

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: No, what we did was what  
35 we really wanted to say that time.

36

37 MR. MATHEWS: Right.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

40

41 MR. MATHEWS: I should have been a  
42 lobbyist.

43

44 (Laughter)

45

46 MR. MATHEWS: The other issue is because  
47 of the intensity of the subject, one of the reasons for  
48 the proposal was to grant in-season -- I'm mixing fish  
49 terms, but we'll get through it, in-season authority to  
50 the Refuge manager to deal with that season instead of

00306

1 going through the long process of a Special Action  
2 Request, reviewed by OSM and reviewed by the Board and et  
3 cetera. So I think the Council wants to address that  
4 issue in light of that. Those are the only two  
5 housekeeping.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: So we do we have to amend  
8 or just a friendly clarification on what the language  
9 should read.

10

11 MR. MATHEWS: I think it would be good to  
12 just go through a motion in addition to your action on  
13 Proposal 65, and is that -- and I think Jack may have the  
14 wording here, grant the authority to the Refuge manager.  
15 The language is in the book, I don't have the page, so it  
16 may not be in-season authority. Mike has it.

17

18 MR. SPINDLER: It mainly does relative to  
19 the decision as to whether the fall season should include  
20 cow season harvest or not.

21

22 MR. MATHEWS: Right. It's relating to  
23 the fall season for the cow portion of that. And you  
24 discussed that earlier, that it's mainly now been handled  
25 by emergency orders on the State side and Special Actions  
26 on the Federal side, it just takes a little bit too long  
27 to do it on the Federal side to make it expedient for the  
28 users, so the proposal was to delegate that to the Refuge  
29 manager.

30

31 And Jack has it there, there's the bit  
32 about consulting with the Chair, and et cetera, and I  
33 don't want to gloss over that.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: So the correct procedure  
36 would be then to revisit -- a motion would be in order to  
37 revisit Proposal 65, do we have to go through all that?

38

39 MR. MATHEWS: I don't think so. I don't  
40 think we have to get that technical about it. I think  
41 you would pass a motion that your action on 65 -- well,  
42 if you agree to the motion that your action on Proposal  
43 65 would also include delegation of authority to the  
44 Refuge manager after consultation -- it's all written out  
45 there -- consultation with the Western Interior Regional  
46 Council Chair, Fish and Game area biologist -- I'm just  
47 going by memory here.

48

49 Okay, I think I'll just get the right  
50 language and get it going here. What is it Jack.

00307

1 MR. COLLINS: Well, it's just talking  
2 about.....

3  
4 REPORTER: Ray.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Use your mike Ray.

7  
8 MR. COLLINS: There's more wording than  
9 that, though, because there's the portion of the  
10 Controlled Use Area, one moose, however antlered moose  
11 may only be taken August 27 to 31st, if authorized by  
12 announcement of the Koyukuk/Nowitna Refuge manager.  
13 Announcements for the antlerless season says it will be --  
14 oh, no, that's for the winter -- for the antlerless  
15 season will be conducted after consultation with Alaska  
16 Fish and Game biologists and so on; you want all of that  
17 in there?

18  
19 MR. MATHEWS: I think that's the  
20 direction, we'll have to ask the Refuge manager on that.  
21 But they want to be able to have the authority, if need  
22 be, to address that antlerless portion in the fall.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Geoff.

25  
26 MR. BEYERSDORF: Chairman Sam. That is  
27 what we are looking at, just to give the Refuge manager  
28 the authority, after consulting with the area biologist  
29 on the fall antlerless season. The winter season you  
30 guys have already said is March 1st through 5th, so we  
31 don't need to determine that. But it's just the fall  
32 season.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: You got that Jack?

35  
36 MR. REAKOFF: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think  
37 I got the language figured out.

38  
39 The announcements for the fall antlerless  
40 moose season will be conducted after  
41 consultation with the Alaska Department  
42 of Fish and Game area biologists, the  
43 Chairs of the Western Interior Regional  
44 Advisory Council and the State Fish and  
45 Game Advisory Committees.

46  
47 MR. SPINDLER: That's good but with one  
48 clarification.

49  
50 REPORTER: Wait. Wait.

00308

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Microphone.

2

3 MR. SPINDLER: Yeah, with consultation  
4 with the Fish and Game area biologists, the other Federal  
5 land managers in the area, Kanuti Refuge manager and the  
6 Park Service managers, tribal councils and Western  
7 Regional Council Chair and the AC Chairs. So I'll be on  
8 the phone a long time.

9

10 (Laughter)

11

12 MR. SPINDLER: The other point of  
13 clarification that I wanted to remind the Council of is  
14 we really need to say, does this include all Federal  
15 lands within Unit 21(D) or Federal Refuge lands within  
16 21(D) or Koyukuk Refuge lands. Now, my understanding was  
17 that it included all Federal lands within 21(D) plus the  
18 Koyukuk Refuge portion of 24. That's what I recall Jack  
19 saying.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: So are we prepared to put  
22 a motion on the floor to address that delegation of  
23 authority.

24

25 MR. MATHEWS: We're close. The language  
26 further in the analysis doesn't have that level of  
27 consultation in it so I think Jack's working out some  
28 language here on that, but most of it's on Page 251 other  
29 than the Kanuti Refuge is not listed on 251.

30

31 MR. REAKOFF: The language that Mike  
32 suggested.....

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Use your mike.

35

36 MR. REAKOFF: The language that Mike  
37 suggested now would read something like, announcements  
38 for the fall antlerless moose season will be conducted  
39 after consultation with the Alaska Department of Fish and  
40 Game area biologist, with other Federal land managers,  
41 the Chairs of the Western Interior Advisory Council and  
42 the State Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Was that a motion to  
45 clarify the language needed.

46

47 MR. REAKOFF: Okay, I'll make that a  
48 motion to read:

49

50 Announcements for the fall antlerless

00309

1 moose season will be conducted after  
2 consultation with the Alaska Department  
3 of Fish and Game biologist, with other  
4 Federal land managers, the Chairs of the  
5 Western Interior Regional Advisory  
6 Council and State Fish and Game Advisory  
7 Committees.

8  
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: There is a motion on the  
10 floor, is there a second.

11  
12 MR. STICKMAN: I second.

13  
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Second by Mickey. So that  
15 should clarify all your problems with it, you, too,  
16 Geoff.

17  
18 MR. BEYERSDORF: (Nods affirmatively)

19  
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Anything further.

21  
22 (No comments)

23  
24 MR. WALKER: Question.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called.  
27 All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.  
28 IN UNISON: Aye.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Those opposed, same sign.

31  
32 (No opposing votes)

33  
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried.

35  
36 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I approached  
37 you during break, to keep your Council members up to  
38 speed, the two proposals that are forthcoming, 66 and 67,  
39 it was decided that it would be best to take up 67 first,  
40 and then whatever outcome of 67 then would relate to 66.  
41 So Sandy Rabinowitch is going to present Proposal 67 and  
42 then we'll see what happens from there for 66, so it's a  
43 little bit out of order, but if that's all right with  
44 you.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: We've been out of order  
47 since we started.

48  
49 (Laughter)

50

00310

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Fine with me.

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, Proposal 67 is found  
4 on Page 295. It was submitted by Gates of the Arctic  
5 National Park. It revises the hunt area description,  
6 seasons and harvest limits for moose in Unit 24.

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: The Chair will entertain a  
9 motion to adopt Proposal WP04-67.

10

11 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Mickey, is there  
14 a second.

15

16 MR. WALKER: Second.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Robert Walker.  
19 Analysis. Sandy.

20

21 MR. RABINOWITCH: Thank you, Mr.  
22 Chairman. If I lose my voice just tell me to get louder,  
23 I'm getting a little hoarse here.

24

25 I'll make one quick comment and then I'll  
26 put on my Pete DeMatteo hat and then like others before  
27 me pretend I'm Pete DeMatteo. The Park Service put a  
28 draft copy of this Council in its October meeting in  
29 Wasilla, and I'll come back to that point later, but I  
30 just wanted to mention that we had done a draft version  
31 of this and presented it to you and talked with you a  
32 little bit about it at that time.

33

34 And now I'll try and fill in for Pete  
35 DeMatteo. I am going to be very brief. I think that  
36 much of what you discussed in the last proposal relates  
37 to this proposal. This is the area farther to the north,  
38 it's up river, it is primarily -- if you have this book  
39 handy here, the Federal regulations book, there's a map  
40 on Page 143 that could be useful to get out. Most of the  
41 land involved in this proposal is in Gates of the Arctic  
42 Park up in the headwater area. But there are some other  
43 relatively small pieces of Federal lands and BLM land in  
44 particular that are potentially affected.

45

46 So with that, I'll start on Page 297 and  
47 I'll just try to touch on the things that I think are  
48 most significant. This proposal would shorten the  
49 antlerless season in the John River Drainage, that's the  
50 one nearest Anaktuvuk Pass, it would reduce the fall and

00311

1 winter season and eliminate the March season in the  
2 Alatna Drainage. It would replace the March antlerless  
3 season with a December season, that's similar to what you  
4 were hearing about in the last proposal, in the North  
5 Fork of the Koyukuk and on other BLM lands north of the  
6 Koyukuk. It would also make regulations for the NPS  
7 lands in the Dalton Highway Corridor consistent with the  
8 regulations in that Corridor for the other lands. That's  
9 kind of a small issue.

10

11 I think I'll stop there.

12

13 I think you've heard, and I know you're  
14 aware that the Federal Subsistence Board and the Board of  
15 Game have made closures similar to but not exactly like  
16 those presented here in the last couple of years in the  
17 fall, and so the concern here is to try to not have so  
18 many emergency actions, as this was presented and to try  
19 to get something more firmly in place given the  
20 situation.

21

22 I'm going to now flip several pages. I  
23 think was mentioned about the last proposal and I would  
24 agree about this proposal, this is a complicated  
25 proposal, and part of the reason it's complicated is  
26 because the existing regulations are lengthy. On the  
27 Federal side they're in six different groupings, if you  
28 look on the State side I think they're in seven different  
29 groupings, so there's an awful lot of language to kind of  
30 wade through.

31

32 And I'm going to flip up to Page 302, the  
33 regulatory history.

34

35 Most of these regulations have been in  
36 place since 1994, again, on the Federal side, however, in  
37 1996, the regulations in the Upper Alatna Drainage,  
38 that's the part that's in the Gates of the Arctic Park  
39 were changed and so the more lengthy season in the Alatna  
40 Drainage has only been there since 1996 on the Federal  
41 side of things.

42

43 On to the population status and here I'm  
44 just going to touch on a couple of things, again, briefly  
45 because you heard an awful lot about this already.

46

47 The moose surveys conducted in Unit 24  
48 were generally not in Gates of the Arctic Park, they were  
49 in other areas to the south so all of the information is  
50 kind of inferred northward to here. It's important for

00312

1 you to know that. The results in Unit 24, however, were  
2 similar to the results in Units 21, and again, so there's  
3 that inference that what's happening to the moose in the  
4 rest of the drainages and down river is probably  
5 happening to the moose further up the drainages, okay,  
6 it's not perfect, it would be nice to have data but there  
7 really isn't anything concrete in the Gates of the Arctic  
8 Park area.

9

10 And I'm really going to try to skip over  
11 this very lightly because of the time. There's a table  
12 on Page 305 which is an attempt to speak to harvest  
13 history. I wish that that table had some information  
14 about Anaktuvuk Pass, I don't know why it doesn't. And  
15 when you look at the two communities that are most  
16 affected, Alatna and Allakaket, it kind of gives you  
17 mixed information that there's some increase in hunting  
18 effort and there's some where there's not an increase in  
19 hunting effort to get moose. So it kind of presents kind  
20 of a little bit of a mixed picture.

21

22 When I flip over to Page 306 in your  
23 book, there's a small but notable error that I want to  
24 point out to you on the map, there's a black and white  
25 map there, and if you look up at the top of the dark  
26 area, the John River Drainage, that's where Anaktuvuk  
27 Pass community is. There's quite a big piece of private  
28 land, it's village corporation land and it shows on this  
29 other map here in the hunting book, but I just want to  
30 point out that the State regulations that you just heard  
31 about today will be in effect -- or when they become  
32 effective, they will be in effect for that land around  
33 Anaktuvuk Pass as this map here shows you. So the one in  
34 your Board book is a little bit off. The one in the  
35 hunting regulation book is more correct.

36

37 Let me see, on effects of the proposal,  
38 let's see if I can summarize this, there's a lot of words  
39 written down here.

40

41 On Page 307 there's a series of bullets  
42 and I'll just touch on a few things here. One of the  
43 things the Park Service was trying to do if there was a  
44 way to redescribe the hunt areas and we found that a real  
45 hard challenge. We talked to a lot of people, many of  
46 them in this room here, State Staff, Federal Staff and  
47 kind of tried and tried to see if there was a way to  
48 simplify this and kind of every way we turned there was a  
49 challenge or a problem. So we gave it our best shot,  
50 but, admittedly it's probably far from a great

00313

1 improvement in terms of simplification. The OSM Staff  
2 has some recommendations about that and I'll touch on  
3 that in a minute.

4

5                   The next thing, I think, on the second  
6 bullet that I'll touch on is in the John River Drainage  
7 within the Park and that's the part that affects  
8 Anaktuvuk Pass the most, what the Park Service proposed  
9 here would shorten the antlerless season by 51 days, it  
10 would retain a five day antlerless season in September,  
11 and then the bull harvest opportunity would remain -- you  
12 know, I'm not sure if I'm actually reading this quite  
13 right here -- but retain the harvest opportunity for the  
14 five month season.

15

16                   I'm sorry, I don't mean to confuse you,  
17 but I did read that right here, I'm just getting a little  
18 tired.

19

20                   So I know that issue right there,  
21 reducing that season for Anaktuvuk Pass is something that  
22 people would be concerned about and I would just  
23 encourage you to look at that and think about whether you  
24 think it's a good idea or not.

25

26                   In the Alatna River Drainage, what  
27 fundamentally we're proposing to do is return the  
28 regulation back to the way it was in 1996. That's just  
29 kind of the real short version of what's being proposed  
30 in the Upper Alatna part of the drainage. It's our  
31 understanding, and this is a place where you could  
32 certainly help inform all of us, it's our general  
33 understanding that people from Alatna and Allakaket tend  
34 not to get as far up the Alatna Drainage as the Gates of  
35 the Arctic Park lands when they're hunting for moose. I  
36 believe for sheep they do, and possibly wolf hunting they  
37 do. The information that we've been able to dig up shows  
38 that they generally don't go past that Park boundary  
39 further up river for moose. I'm not saying never, I'm  
40 saying generally. So if you have information about that,  
41 you know, either the same or different, it would be good  
42 for you to put that on the record, and you could help  
43 clarify that.

44

45                   And then I'll try to wrap this up, on  
46 Page 308 is the preliminary conclusion that OSM came up  
47 with and I think I can boil this down fairly shortly.  
48 Looking on Page 309 the first paragraph there's no change  
49 in so there's nothing to tell you about there. The  
50 second paragraph which starts out Unit 24, that portion

00314

1 within the John River, that's a little bit of a  
2 redescription and then the proposed season that OSM  
3 recommends. The third paragraph deals with the Alatna  
4 River, again, is a little bit of a redescription, and you  
5 can see with strikeouts what's being added and deleted.  
6 The fourth paragraph is the Koyukuk River area up stream  
7 from the Alatna and there, again, you see some deletions  
8 of language in an attempt to try to simplify by just  
9 talking about Federal public land. And then the fifth,  
10 which is the second from the bottom bullet is a  
11 relatively small item about the Dalton River Corridor.  
12 The sixth and last paragraph there's no change in that  
13 one.

14

15 I've skimmed over a lot of detail. I  
16 understand this is complex and has a lot of things being  
17 proposed here.

18

19 I would mention -- it's already been  
20 touched on, but we've been talking with Jack Reakoff on  
21 and off for months and months trying to get feedback from  
22 Jack and ideas and thoughts and concerns and he's been  
23 very gracious with his time and expressed his concerns  
24 about things we have in here and so on and so forth.

25

26 I think I'll leave it at that. If there  
27 are questions about biology, I may well ask Glenn Stout  
28 if he can help. I am not a biologist. And possibly some  
29 Fish and Wildlife people might be able to help also that  
30 have knowledge about any biological questions if you've  
31 got them. So I'll stop for a moment there.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'm sure there are a lot  
34 of questions and corrections on this proposed regulation  
35 on 309, so you're just trying to get us to adopt language  
36 that is written on Page 309.

37

38 MR. RABINOWITCH: On Page 309 is what the  
39 Office of Subsistence Management recommended. It is a  
40 little bit different than what the Park Service  
41 originally proposed, and that's fine, I mean that's what  
42 we're all here to do, is to lay ideas out and get  
43 everybody's different views on what's the best thing to  
44 do.

45

46 So it's up to you what you want to --  
47 that's what OSM recommends, is what's on Page 309.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Again, this is  
50 unacceptable, similar to Proposal 65 and I'm sure that

00315

1 we'll change a whole bunch of language from the first  
2 paragraph on down to, what, the fifth, yeah.

3

4 At this time do we have any questions for  
5 Sandy. Jack.

6

7 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, the Dalton  
8 Highway Federal Corridor permit would be given to all  
9 eligible users in the Dalton Highway Corridor but,  
10 unfortunately, only Wiseman is the resident zone  
11 community that is eligible to hunt in the Park, and would  
12 the permittees be notified that -- in other areas that  
13 they are not eligible to hunt under Park Service  
14 regulations since they are not a resident zone community?

15

16 MR. RABINOWITCH: Because I don't work --  
17 I'm going to try and give you a simple and clear answer,  
18 but I'm trying to figure out how to do that. But I guess  
19 the most direct thing I can say is I don't know if they  
20 would be informed. Your question strikes me is it would  
21 be a good thing to do and a logical thing to do.

22

23 Do you want me to keep going or do you  
24 want me to stop there?

25

26 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

29

30 MR. REAKOFF: There's people in the  
31 community that were concerned that there would be  
32 confusion if they read this proposal, they commented to  
33 me that they would have preferred to see the except for  
34 the Gates of the Arctic Park language retained in that  
35 Corridor permit, because although they have a C&T use,  
36 they do not have a resident zone status. A resident zone  
37 status is a long standing customary use of a Park  
38 resource of significant amount of people that have a  
39 customary use of a Park resource from Pre-ANILCA, so  
40 that, Coldfoot does not have that resident zone status.

41

42 MR. RABINOWITCH: Right.

43

44 MR. REAKOFF: And could never obtain that  
45 resident status. And therefore their concern was that  
46 they would be issued a permit and then would feel that  
47 they're eligible to hunt in the Park, and that's not the  
48 case. That's not Park Service regulations. And they  
49 felt that that would lead to confusion if that, except  
50 for the Gates of the Arctic Park language was omitted.

00316

1 MR. RABINOWITCH: Okay. If I may, you  
2 know, that's certainly a good comment. The Park  
3 Service's intent was to see if there was a way to just  
4 simplify, as I said, to simplify these a little bit and  
5 that seemed like there was a place where there might be a  
6 small opportunity. It's nothing that the Park Service is  
7 particularly driven about. If the idea had merit we  
8 figured it would survive, if it didn't we figured it  
9 would not.

10

11 So your comments are well taken.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: George.

14

15 MR. SIAVELIS: Just sort of a thought,  
16 Jack, what if, like in other cases in other regulations  
17 in other areas when there's a Controlled Use Area or a  
18 certain, like a restriction that pertains to it but is  
19 not needed in the language, like above it, they'll say,  
20 you know, like a reminder, you know, it will say you  
21 can't hunt in the Park, that type of thing.

22

23 MR. REAKOFF: That would be another way  
24 to address that to issue this permit under this status  
25 but leave a reminder in the regulation book that only  
26 eligible resident zone communities are able to hunt in  
27 the Park.

28

29 Some way the users, the other users are  
30 going to have to be able to understand that this does not  
31 begin to give them a resident zone status to hunt in the  
32 Park, that would be a huge process with the Park Service  
33 and the Subsistence Resource Commissions.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Sandy.

36

37 MR. RABINOWITCH: Mr. Chairman, if I may,  
38 there is a generic explanation of what you both were just  
39 talking about in the current Federal book. I could, if  
40 you like I could show it to you a little later, it would  
41 just take me a minute to find where it is. So there is a  
42 generic one for all the hunts around the state in here  
43 already.

44

45 Again, I think the kind of, sort of  
46 footnote, you know, that you're suggesting, that kind of  
47 thing can be crafted and added also.

48

49 MR. SIAVELIS: I was specifically  
50 suggesting put the footnote in the spot where it is

00317

1 because you don't want to have to add it -- him to  
2 remember he read it on the third page of the beginning of  
3 the book, you know, to connect it.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Jack.

6

7 MR. REAKOFF: It's going to have to be  
8 very apparent. You're going to lose people by having  
9 that in the beginning of the book, it's going to have to  
10 be stated in this Corridor permit, the Dalton Highway  
11 Corridor permit description, if you go in that direction.

12

13 The Park Service has an aversion to  
14 mentioning the Gates of the Arctic Park, that's where the  
15 primary drive of this proposal. And so if they want to  
16 alleviate the Gates of the Arctic reference, then they're  
17 going to have to put that eligibility language in there  
18 also. So it's a Catch-22, it's six to one and half a  
19 dozen of another.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions for  
22 Sandy at this time. We'll take up a whole bunch of  
23 discrepancies at our deliberation.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Agencies, ADF&G.

28

29 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The  
30 Department's recommendation on this proposal is do not  
31 adopt.

32

33 There's several issues here with the  
34 existing regulations that we're concerned with and as far  
35 as the intent to change some of the seasons to December,  
36 we weren't able to address those and we feel like this  
37 draft that's currently on Page 309 is still a pretty  
38 rough draft that we need to do some work on in order to  
39 get us to where we need to be.

40

41 With the current regulations we've  
42 identified several different errors in it that we'd like  
43 to point out to you as far as what things that we think  
44 would need to be addressed at the minimum. But we want  
45 to make sure that it's clear, too, that besides just  
46 changes in season dates, many of these changes represent  
47 changes in the current boundaries of where hunting  
48 activities occur. And it changes some of these area  
49 descriptions and the hunting seasons for new areas that  
50 really need to be made apparent.

00318

1 I tried to go through this when I first  
2 got this proposal and draw out a map of the new areas and  
3 there's several problems and just roughing it out here on  
4 the map -- I don't have an overhead to make it very  
5 apparent, but I'll go through a few of the different ones  
6 that we have.

7  
8 First of all, in the third paragraph, the  
9 language that refers to the March 1 to March 10 season.  
10 That was excluded as an antlerless season so that means  
11 that would be a bulls only March hunt. And this is  
12 something that we're not in favor of because what we have  
13 identified in the past is when we have a bulls only  
14 season after the bulls have dropped their antlers, that  
15 often mistakes happen and it would create an enforcement  
16 issue if we had a season set like that in March.

17  
18 Also in that section there, what happens  
19 when we describe the Federal lands is we have a new block  
20 of area here on the Upper Alatna and the John and Wild  
21 River Drainages. It creates this exclusion zone that's  
22 similar to all the other -- the remainder portion of the  
23 area. What you end up having is there's a little section  
24 over there, because it is within the John River Drainage  
25 -- or the Alatna River Drainage up on the upper Sir Creek  
26 (ph), that overlaps Federal lands and it's a fairly  
27 discreet land mass there that I don't think would be  
28 immediately apparent if you went through the regulations  
29 and identified that.

30  
31 In addition there's a section in  
32 paragraph four where we have a separation from the  
33 Henshaw Creek Drainages up to the North Fork. And that  
34 area would be similar to a block of land over on the  
35 Upper North Fork portions of the river, including that  
36 portion of Gates of the Arctic. And so we kind of have a  
37 separation that never seemed to exist, that block of land  
38 there and certainly don't coincide with the original  
39 intent on how that regulatory areas were first  
40 established.

41  
42 The second thing that's not shown in that  
43 language there is the Anaktuvuk Pass area. In the  
44 original language Anaktuvuk Pass is written in section --  
45 is written in the sixth paragraph as one of the qualified  
46 communities for that and what you don't see in the  
47 language, is inadvertently, Anaktuvuk Pass has been  
48 written out of the current regulations, and Anaktuvuk  
49 Pass is not listed as far as C&T communities in the main  
50 section there. So inadvertently we've written out

00319

1 Anaktuvuk Pass as Federally-qualified for these areas  
2 here.

3

4 I think we had one other season. And  
5 then also in paragraph four we had the similar thing, as  
6 far as the March season, where we described an antlerless  
7 moose season during March and we would recommend against  
8 that.

9

10 Overall, basically we feel like this at a  
11 point that there's enough changes that these changes need  
12 to be addressed as far as how they will affect hunting  
13 patterns that have long been established with the current  
14 regulations and the Department is concerned in its  
15 current state that there would be substantial confusion  
16 on where these areas are and we haven't met the original  
17 intent to simplify regulations in this case.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: So what do we have on the  
20 books right now as far as Federally-qualified subsistence  
21 user regulations?

22

23 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Jack.

26

27 MR. REAKOFF: Your question was what do  
28 we have on the books?

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes. And how long does it  
31 remain on the books until we change it, because this is  
32 creating just more mass confusion, it's hardly worth  
33 considering.

34

35 MR. REAKOFF: There's only limited  
36 eligibility to hunt in the Park. My concern with the  
37 proposal is the elimination of the winter hunts are not  
38 necessary.

39

40 Here in the lower Koyukuk, we're at  
41 sustainability, we're playing on the edge of harvestable  
42 surplus. The Gates of the Arctic Park, in zone two, and  
43 especially within the Gates of the Arctic Park boundary,  
44 we're far below the sustained yield -- the harvests are  
45 far below the sustained yield. Moose are harvested  
46 occasionally by people from Anaktuvuk Pass. People from  
47 Wiseman, I've cautioned them, as the moose population is  
48 full, we're on personal restraint from harvesting moose  
49 in winter time, so the harvest in the Gates of the Arctic  
50 Park are currently less than one percent, we're not even

00320

1 near the sustainability, there's no need for restrictions  
2 on winter hunts.

3

4 I feel if I was in a bind for meat and  
5 there was no caribou, I should be able to go over to the  
6 Park and come up with a moose to eat and there's very  
7 little harvest in the Park, and if Ron needs a moose bad  
8 and he needs to go up to the Park to get a moose, the  
9 harvests are so low within the Park boundaries, that  
10 there's not a problem with the moose population.

11

12 And so the reduction of the antlerless  
13 moose season in winter, I don't feel that that's  
14 necessary at this time. They're not even close to  
15 utilizing that sustainability.

16

17 The people of the Park area look at the  
18 moose population there as a reserve, as a back up, if we  
19 get in tight spot, we got that as our back up. That's  
20 been basically the Subsistence Resource Commission's  
21 position on moose utilization. We hunt sheep up there in  
22 the Park. We can walk in there and get sheep -- and  
23 people from Anaktuvuk -- or correction, from Alatna and  
24 Allakaket go up there.

25

26 So I don't really think that all of these  
27 boundary descriptions -- it actually makes it more  
28 confusing. The Park Service has a problem with the Park  
29 itself being utilized as mentioned in the regulations. I  
30 suggested that to alleviate that fear or that concern,  
31 that they just describe it as the Federal public lands of  
32 the John River -- Alatna River, John River, Wild River  
33 and North Fork of the Koyukuk; and call it that, and then  
34 you don't get into all this convoluted boundary  
35 descriptions. And of course, then if you're going to  
36 hunt up there you still have to find out where the Park  
37 boundary is but that's your job to look at the map then.

38

39 To describe the lands in language, I  
40 don't feel is necessary. We can just go for the Federal  
41 public lands in those drainages, that addresses that  
42 concern. And I don't want to see the winter hunt --  
43 there's really no need to change these seasons. These  
44 seasons are in effect for various reasons. The harvest  
45 is still far below sustainability and I don't really feel  
46 that there's a need to change any seasons because we're  
47 not at that sustainability level. And that's where the  
48 Moose Working Group Plan comes into effect, is in that  
49 harvest, when we're utilizing at sustained yield harvest  
50 ranges, and if the population is falling then maybe we

00321

1 might trim five days off the spring hunt or something,  
2 but we're not even close to sustainability in that Park  
3 resource for moose, not even close, and so I don't feel  
4 that there is a need for the winter hunt reductions.

5  
6 And so that's my position.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Tom Kron.

9  
10 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. I wanted to  
11 talk a little bit about the wording, Federal public  
12 lands, and I think what Council member Reakoff was just  
13 saying it would go a long ways to addressing some of the  
14 concerns that we had had there at OSM.

15  
16 The one thing we'd noticed, for example,  
17 in the fisheries regulations, you know, we don't have the  
18 detail relating to specific conservation system units,  
19 such as Gates of the Arctic, and that was why we were  
20 suggesting, just go ahead and make the transition to  
21 Federal public lands as Mr. Reakoff had just suggested.  
22 Leave the seasons alone at this point, if that's your  
23 will and concerns.

24  
25 But that would be a step, I think, in an  
26 appropriate direction that you might consider.

27  
28 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Just for my clarification,  
31 if you look at Alatna, we're all within State lands,  
32 right, and the only conservation move in that area to  
33 protect Alatna is the Kanuti Controlled Use Area, is that  
34 right?

35  
36 MR. RABINOWITCH: I'm not sure I  
37 understood your question, I'm sorry.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN SAM: The only thing giving us  
40 any kind of protection right now is the Kanuti Controlled  
41 Use Area, right, or Kanuti No Fly Zone?

42  
43 (Phone ringing)

44  
45 (Laughing)

46  
47 MR. RABINOWITCH: I believe that's  
48 correct, Mr. Chairman, that the Kanuti is a No Fly Zone.  
49 The Gates of the Arctic Park, though, I would mention, is  
50 essentially also a No Fly Zone because of Park Service

00322

1 Legislation. I don't know if I'm answering your  
2 question, I'm trying, though.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: No. Can we get Pete  
5 DeMatteo on line.

6

7 (Laughter)

8

9 MR. RABINOWITCH: I'm sorry.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Really.

12

13 (Laughter)

14

15 MR. RABINOWITCH: I just don't understand  
16 the question.

17

18 MR. SHULTZ: This is Bob Shultz, Refuge  
19 manager for Kanuti Refuge, could you please restate your  
20 question, Ron?

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes. If I read this map  
23 right, the Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge doesn't cover  
24 north of the Koyukuk River around the Alatna area, does  
25 it?

26

27 MR. SHULTZ: No, there's no land --  
28 there's no Refuge land that adjoins the Alatna River,  
29 you're correct.

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: So the only conservation  
32 effort north of the Koyukuk River around that area is the  
33 Kanuti Controlled Use Area then?

34

35 MR. SHULTZ: On the Alatna, yes, that's  
36 right.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further  
39 questions on this.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, Bob.

44

45 MR. SHULTZ: Mr. Chairman, I kind of feel  
46 like John Kerry here because I supported this change and  
47 now I'm flipping back to say that I have some problems  
48 with the way it's been rewritten on 309.

49

50 Current regulations here allow people

00323

1 from Anaktuvuk Pass, Koyukuk, and Galena, it gives them  
2 positive C&T determinations for the remainder of Unit 24,  
3 which would be basically the southern end of the Kanuti  
4 National Wildlife Refuge, and the way that it's presented  
5 on Page 309, that wording there would exclude the people  
6 from Koyukuk and Galena from ever going up there and  
7 hunting. It would reduce their C&T or change their C&T  
8 determinations. The way it's written right now it would  
9 only be open to residents of Unit 24 is the way I read  
10 it.

11

12 It's confusing the way the thing has been  
13 written and I don't know how we go about straightening  
14 this out. There's so many changes on it, I'm almost  
15 saying, you know, hey, let's take another stab at it the  
16 next go around or something. Because the way the  
17 regulations have been written they're so darn confusing  
18 and then this here is just adding on an additional layer.  
19 And maybe we ought to regroup and hash this thing out so  
20 we understand so we aren't -- I don't want to drop  
21 anybody out, you know, I don't want to change the C&T  
22 determinations.

23

24 If we could get better descriptions on  
25 the zones, but at the same time I don't want to see the  
26 Federal regulations describing one set of zones and the  
27 State hunting season having a different set of  
28 descriptions for the same area. It's too darn confusing  
29 right now.

30

31 One of the things I talked with Vince  
32 earlier this year, is I want to get a map and outline  
33 these areas and color them in so I could figure out where  
34 -- which areas were being described and apparently Pete  
35 DeMatteo or somebody had started working on that very  
36 thing there and for one reason or another we never got it  
37 completed. But I would sure like to get a map. It's my  
38 goal to be able to sit down with the people from  
39 Allakaket and Alatna, from Bettles and Evansville and  
40 say, okay, from this date to this date you are allowed  
41 this type of moose in this area; orange area, green area  
42 or whatever color we come up with, but I want to come up  
43 with some kind of a color scheme so that people  
44 understand where they can and they can't hunt so that we  
45 don't have this thing about, you know, somebody going out  
46 and thinking they're perfectly legal and then they're not  
47 or through these changes we exclude somebody that wasn't  
48 intentionally excluded.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. And that was

00324

1 the direction where my question was supposed to take, as  
2 to why don't we just go back to the old existing  
3 regulations, and now -- Jack, you had something.

4

5 MR. REAKOFF: Yes, but.....

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Sandy.

8

9 MR. RABINOWITCH: Mr. Chairman, just one  
10 small clarification, I agree with what was just said here  
11 but I would point out that the existing regulations,  
12 State and Federal do not currently match. I'm not trying  
13 to argue for any particular changes but.....

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Well, with what we did on  
16 Proposal 65 they surely don't match there either so what  
17 difference does it make if we -- all we're trying to do  
18 is provide for subsistence activities.

19

20 Jack.

21

22 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I move to  
23 table this proposal until the language is clarified and  
24 the mapping is worked out.

25

26 I personally feel as Vice Chair of the  
27 Gates of the Arctic Park Subsistence Resource Commission  
28 that there's not a conservation problem within the Gates  
29 of the Arctic Park for moose and so that's my position.  
30 And I can't speak for the Subsistence Resource Commission  
31 because we failed to meet a quorum but that's my personal  
32 position. I do not feel that there's any way, shape or  
33 form a conservation concern with the moose population  
34 within the Park.

35

36 MR. MATHEWS: Well, you had a motion to  
37 adopt.

38

39 MR. REAKOFF: So it has precedence.

40

41 MR. MATHEWS: Well, you had a motion to  
42 adopt.

43

44 MR. STICKMAN: Okay, so who made the  
45 motion.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack, didn't you just make  
48 a motion to table?

49

50 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, I'm making a motion

00325

1 to table this until the language is clarified and some  
2 other issues are addressed.

3

4 MR. WALKER: I second that, Mr. Chairman.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Robert.  
7 What's parliamentary procedure on tabling motions, it  
8 just goes or it just goes to a vote.

9

10 MR. MATHEWS: I would have to look it  
11 up.....

12

13 MR. COLLINS: Just vote on it.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Just vote on it.

16

17 MR. MATHEWS: I'd have to look that up  
18 but you had a motion before to adopt the proposal.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: But the motion to table  
21 would override -- it overrides everything, right.

22

23 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, it does.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: It overrides that, period.

26

27 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

28

29 MR. MATHEWS: Sandy might know, I'd have  
30 to take it out of the book, but I don't think tabling is  
31 debatable but I'll have to look.

32

33 MR. RABINOWITCH: I actually couldn't  
34 answer that one but what I was going to say is that I  
35 believe if you vote to table a proposal, then it takes a  
36 motion of your Council to bring it back to your table at  
37 some point in the future.

38

39 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

40

41 MR. STICKMAN: Call for the question.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Question's been  
44 called, but I just wanted to clarify that we will bring  
45 this back or it will be presented to us in one way, shape  
46 or form or other, in another way, shape or form, I just  
47 don't know when. But I think we've been happy with the  
48 latest regulations.

49

50 Again, question's been called on a

00326

1 tabling motion. All those in favor of the motion to  
2 table signify by saying aye.

3

4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Those opposed, same sign.  
7 Action on Proposal 67 has been tabled.

8

9 Proposal 66.

10

11 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, point of  
12 order question, I guess. There were three parts of that  
13 last one that we were dealing with before we broke and we  
14 only dealt with two, we didn't look at the third one, is  
15 there a reason why we haven't gone back to that? What  
16 were the numbers on that, 57, 58 -- yeah, 58 and 59 and  
17 there was a 60 related to that same issue.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. We just threw that  
20 whole bunch, like we said, we are way the heck out of  
21 order ever since we -- we tried to accommodate the Huslia  
22 local residents and all these proposals that we are  
23 discussing right now are addressing the local issues on  
24 the Koyukuk River and the adjacent boundaries and that's  
25 why we're going in this order because we still have some  
26 Huslia residents present.

27

28 MR. COLLINS: Okay.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, Proposal 66, again,  
31 deals with the Koyukuk River. Again, we go to Unit 21(D)  
32 and 24. At this time the Chair will entertain a motion  
33 to adopt Proposal 66.

34

35 MR. WALKER: So moved.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Robert is there a  
38 second.

39

40 MR. KRISKA: Second.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Tom Kriska.  
43 Analysis.

44

45 MR. BEYERSDORF: Mr. Chair. Members of  
46 the Council. Again, Geoff Beyersdorf with the  
47 Koyukuk/Nowitna Refuge and I'll be giving the OSM Staff  
48 analysis on this and I intend on being brief.

49

50 Proposal 66 is found on Page 283 of your

00327

1 booklet and Proposal 66 was submitted by George Yaska of  
2 Huslia requesting the fall harvest season for moose in  
3 Unit 21(E) the remainder and all parts of the Unit 24  
4 outside the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area be reduced to end  
5 on September 20th as they currently do within the  
6 Controlled Use Area.

7

8                   The proponent states that the September  
9 20th closures is needed because the bull moose are weak  
10 and run down by the 20th of September. He also states  
11 that the change is needed before the situation requires  
12 emergency action to save the moose population for the  
13 future.

14

15                   So in effect, what he's doing is outside  
16 Controlled Use Area in 21(D) and then outside the  
17 Controlled Use Area in 24, he's just shortening the  
18 season to September 20th.

19

20                   The preliminary conclusion from Staff is  
21 to oppose the proposal. Justification for this is  
22 closing the last five days of the fall season in Unit  
23 21(D) would not affect the bull harvest opportunity as  
24 requested by the proponent. Existing State regulations  
25 would continue to allow bull harvest during the five day  
26 period from September 21st to 25th. Furthermore, the  
27 declining populations are a result of poor recruitment  
28 and not a result of high bull harvest.

29

30                   And I would also point out that the  
31 recent Board of actions on Proposals 193-A, which created  
32 the drawing and registration permits around the  
33 Controlled Use Area and Proposal 201-A, which for 21(D)  
34 and 24, move the winter hunt to December 1st to December  
35 10th and made it a bulls only address, should address the  
36 proponent's concerns.

37

38                   And lastly I would point out that  
39 adopting this proposal would bring it out of alignment  
40 with the current State regulations, and that's it.

41

42                   CHAIRMAN SAM: So what would our action  
43 be taken, just quickly for my clarification -- I mean  
44 where would our action take us or where does it show?

45

46                   MR. BEYERSDORF: If you oppose the  
47 proposal you would just keep the season dates the same,  
48 the way they are in the regulations currently.

49

50                   So in other words, in the rest of Unit

00328

1 21(D) it would be September 5th to the 25th, in those  
2 portions of Unit 24, it would go August 1st to December  
3 31st, if you look on Page 285 of your booklet, on that  
4 first paragraph where it's struck out, it's August 1st to  
5 December 31st, the proponent wanted to change to  
6 September 20th, in the second paragraph, again, it was to  
7 go to December 31st and the proponent would like it taken  
8 back to September 20th. And then in the third, fourth  
9 and fifth paragraph where it goes August 25th to  
10 September 25th, the proponent's advocating it go to  
11 September 20th.

12

13 So if you oppose it you will just keep  
14 those season dates that you see struck out there.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any questions  
17 for Geoff.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Agencies, ADF&G. Glenn, I  
22 would recommend that you just stay up there and handle  
23 all the ADF&G's that are being called.

24

25 MR. STOUT: Mr. Chair, thank you. The  
26 Department's recommendation at this time is oppose. And  
27 there's several reasons.

28

29 First of all we're concerned -- first of  
30 all to say that the hunting having an affect on the  
31 decline in the population at this time in this area is  
32 not exactly how we see it. One of our main concerns in  
33 the way to recover the bull population, we believe, has  
34 to do with addressing the issues of poor recruitment and  
35 poor calving rates.

36

37 One thing that we see in this particular  
38 regulation, too, is that we still have the existing State  
39 seasons that would not be changed and so what that would  
40 result in is that the State seasons are more liberal than  
41 the Federal season that would be adopted.

42

43 Finally on this, I think there is some  
44 confusion, too, as far as the length of the season in the  
45 discussions here, and it may not be clear that in the  
46 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area portion of this, that the  
47 season begins on the 27th of August, and so I just wanted  
48 to make sure that it's clear in there and it's recognized  
49 that the State season, actually we shifted that season is  
50 why we have it ending on the 20th. It starts earlier now

00329

1 and that's all from the Koyukuk planning process that we  
2 did and we just wanted to make sure that that's clear.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Questions for Glenn.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'm getting more confused  
9 is about all. I realize the intention. One of the  
10 reasons we've always opposed proposals such as this is it  
11 shortens our subsistence opportunities while the seasons  
12 are still open under the State regulations. Is this  
13 clearly understood.

14

15 (Council nods affirmatively)

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: And we do not want to  
18 place any more restrictions upon our subsistence users or  
19 place any restrictions on our subsistence harvest.

20

21 Any more questions for Glenn.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, Taylor, Inter-  
26 Agency.

27

28 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
29 Taylor Brelsford for the Inter-Agency Staff Committee.  
30 And you actually just made the point that the Staff  
31 Committee was concerned about. Since Federal lands  
32 remain open to State qualified users, this change in  
33 season on the Federal side would not limit activity and  
34 therefore would not achieve the conservation goals that  
35 Mr. Yaska had in mind.

36

37 We think the primary regulation changes  
38 to address moose conservation were better handled in  
39 Proposal 65 or 67. You've already taken action on  
40 Proposal 65, so we don't think this one adds any value in  
41 light of the action you took on 65.

42

43 So from that standpoint, we thought the  
44 particular approach put forward by the proponent was not  
45 going to achieve the conservation purposes that he had in  
46 mind.

47

48 Thank you.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Taylor.

00330

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seeing none, public  
4 comments.

5

6 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, there was no  
7 written public comments. There was a comment from the  
8 Koyukuk/Nowitna Refuge but I think Geoff probably already  
9 covered that, so that's the only real written comment we  
10 got was from the Refuge itself.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: So there are no public  
13 comments or written comments.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Regional Council  
18 deliberation.

19

20 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

23

24 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'm opposed  
25 to this proposal. It goes against what our objective is,  
26 is to promote bull harvest in the fall time and try to  
27 accommodate subsistence needs so that we don't have to  
28 take so many cows in the winter hunt, or antlerless  
29 moose. And so I'm opposed to this proposal because it  
30 has a subsistence restriction.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: So do you feel that what  
33 we are attempting to do with our action on Proposal 65  
34 should take care of the problem?

35

36 MR. REAKOFF: Our action on 65 is reduce  
37 the antlerless moose hunt in winter accommodating  
38 subsistence need to a certain degree and we still need to  
39 try to obtain more harvest in the fall time, so I would  
40 actually prefer to see a lengthening of the fall season  
41 as the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee recommended a  
42 five day extension to the fall season, instead to allow --  
43 to accommodate more bull harvest and try to reduce a  
44 little more cow harvest.

45

46 And so this goes against what our line of  
47 thinking is on how this management strategy should  
48 proceed.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further Council

00331

1 deliberations.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 MR. WALKER: Question.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called.

8 You've heard the arguments, all those in favor of

9 adopting WP04-66 signify by saying aye.

10

11 (No aye votes)

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Those opposed, same sign.

14

15 IN UNISON: Aye.

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 66 fails.

18

19 What's the wishes of the Council, do you

20 want to go back to 60 and work our way down or just keep

21 working on local one by one?

22

23 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

26

27 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I

28 think we should submit a letter to Mr. George Yaska, Sr.,

29 and give him a letter saying why we did this and I think

30 it would be a good explanation to do that to him.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, I believe we've had a

33 couple of letters of this sort mailed out and I think

34 that another follow up wouldn't hurt. Did you get that,

35 Vince?

36

37 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I got

38 that you want a letter to Mr. Yaska explaining why you

39 ended up in opposition to his proposal and encourage him

40 to either call the Chair or myself or others for

41 clarification.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, that's on record so

44 we'll leave it at that.

45

46 Okay. Let's see, one, two, three, all

47 right, we've got six more proposals. And if I read

48 fisheries topics and number 8 and number 10, those are

49 informational, just for my information?

50

00332

1 MR. MATHEWS: Well, the fishery ones I'm  
2 sure we'll be spending some time on the fishery ones.

3  
4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

5  
6 MR. MATHEWS: The ones that are under  
7 Office of Subsistence Management reports are generally  
8 information. There are going to be a few briefings on  
9 it, those won't take a lot of time.

10  
11 I don't see any of the -- unless -- well,  
12 yes, that's true there is that one, whatever the wishes  
13 of the Council are. I mean we just go through the  
14 proposals and see where we end up, but I think we have  
15 enough time tomorrow to cover, if you don't even get to  
16 the management reports from OSM, I think we could cover  
17 those very quickly tomorrow morning.

18  
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: All right, let's keep on  
20 going for awhile.

21  
22 MR. MATHEWS: Maybe you ought to just go  
23 with Proposal -- hopefully it's an easy one, Proposal 68.

24  
25 MR. MATHEWS: It might. Hopefully it's a  
26 fast one, let's try it.

27  
28 MR. STICKMAN: Motion to adopt.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Mickey Stickman moved to  
31 adopt Proposal 68 is there a second.

32  
33 MR. JONES: Second.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Benedict  
36 Jones. Proposal 68 on what page?

37  
38 MR. MATHEWS: 316.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, Page 316.

41  
42 MR. BERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll  
43 be presenting the analysis on this proposal, as you said  
44 the analysis starts on Page 316.

45  
46 Proposal 68 was submitted by Jay Sears of  
47 Galena and requests the addition of an earlier trapping  
48 season for beavers for food in Unit 21. That season  
49 would be from September 26th to October 31st with a 30  
50 beaver limit. The existing regulation would remain in

00333

1 place and that current regulation allows for unlimited  
2 trapping of beaver in Unit 21 from November 1st to June  
3 10th.

4

5 The proponent suggested that the  
6 additional five weeks of beaver trapping would give  
7 subsistence users more opportunity to harvest beavers  
8 after moose season to allow for a few easy meals before  
9 the ice gets thick.

10

11 In 1990 Unit 21 had a 50 beaver harvest  
12 limit for trapping and a season of November 1st to April  
13 15th, and then in 1992 it was modified and it was split  
14 apart, Unit 21 and Unit 21(E) had different seasons and  
15 then both State and Federal regulations were aligned in  
16 1997 and the unit had the same regulation for the entire  
17 unit and the season was set at November 1st to June 10th,  
18 and that's the current regulations. And so the current  
19 regulations have been in place since 1997.

20

21 Based on a 1998 Fish and Game, ADF&G  
22 report, the beaver harvest and the beaver population in  
23 Unit 21 is high and increasing. The Koyukuk/Nowitna  
24 National Wildlife Refuge Staff do conduct beaver count  
25 surveys when possible and based on the latest surveys,  
26 there has been an increase in beaver densities from  
27 previous surveys consistent with local village  
28 observations.

29

30 If adopted, the earlier beaver trapping  
31 season in Unit 21 would likely only increase current  
32 harvest levels minimally, if at all, however, adopting a  
33 harvest limit of 30 beavers could lead to some waste of  
34 animals without a requirement to salvage the meat prior  
35 to the traditional season when pelts are in their prime  
36 condition.

37

38 And earlier beaver trapping season would  
39 be an additional opportunity for subsistence users in  
40 Unit 21.

41

42 The proposed expanded season dates of  
43 September 26 to October 31st in conjunction with the  
44 harvest limit during this earlier season would not likely  
45 impact the overall population of beaver in Unit 21.  
46 However, if adopted, the proposed change would create a  
47 difference between State and Federal trapping regulations  
48 in Unit 21.

49

50 And with that, Mr. Chair, the preliminary

00334

1 conclusion is to support the proposal with the  
2 modification to limit -- to have a harvest limit of six  
3 beavers and there be a requirement that the meat from the  
4 beavers be harvested during the early season and be  
5 salvaged for human consumption. And you can see the  
6 proposed language on Page 319 about the middle of the  
7 page.

8

9 That's all I have, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

10

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Do we have beaver trapping  
13 season open until June 10th at this time, do you have any  
14 idea Glenn?

15

16 MR. BERG: Go ahead, Glenn.

17

18 MR. STOUT: Yeah, that's what we have  
19 right now.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Until June 10th?

22

23 MR. STOUT: (Nods affirmatively)

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further  
26 questions for Jerry or Glenn.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, I'll turn it over  
31 to Glenn, ADF&G.

32

33 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We  
34 just wanted to inform in the written comments here,  
35 support with modification and based on Board action on  
36 Proposal 184, the Board of Game had a similar proposal  
37 before it and they failed that proposal. So the  
38 Department's recommendation would now be to oppose to  
39 maintain alignment with the State and Federal  
40 regulations.

41

42 Just so you're aware, the Middle Yukon  
43 Advisory Committee, the Ruby Advisory Committee, the  
44 Tanana Advisory Committee and the Koyukuk River Advisory  
45 Committee were all in opposition to this proposal.

46

47 The Department is concerned if a season  
48 like this is instituted, that non-target species such as  
49 otter or mink may be captured during that period when the  
50 fur quality is poor for those species. When we talked to

00335

1 the proponent of the proposal about the option of having  
2 salvage requirements attached to this. The proponent was  
3 not in favor of that and felt like the season wouldn't  
4 meet his needs at that point because he was interested in  
5 having beaver carcasses for trapping purposes, and so we  
6 feel like at this time that we wouldn't address the  
7 concerns that he had, and the Department would not  
8 support this change.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions for  
11 Glenn. Go ahead Benedict.

12

13 MR. JONES: Yeah, I would oppose this  
14 proposal because the beaver meat condition at that time  
15 of the year is really poor. There's no fat on them at  
16 all on them during the summer. So I would oppose this.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Glenn or  
19 Jerry Berg.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, Inter-Agency  
24 Staff.

25

26 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
27 The Inter-Agency Staff Committee was concerned that the  
28 purpose of this proposed change was to provide for food,  
29 beaver to be taken in that early season for food, and we  
30 thought the modification offered in the Staff analysis  
31 addressed that. It said six beaver during that early  
32 part of the season with the salvage for human food.

33

34 So we thought the original proposal  
35 raised some questions and some controversy about why  
36 beaver were being harvested and the potential to bring  
37 controversy on the subsistence use. We thought the Staff  
38 proposal preliminary conclusion addressed that concern.  
39 But I do have to say that the information that Glenn has  
40 just provided about the local Advisory Committees is  
41 important new information. I think those actions by the  
42 Advisory Committee's affected here would be very  
43 persuasive to the Staff Committee and to the Board when  
44 this is taken up.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Taylor. Any  
49 questions for Taylor. George.

50

00336

1 MR. SIAVELIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
2 Actually I have a question for the Inter-Agency Staff and  
3 ADF&G if that's acceptable.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

6  
7 MR. SIAVELIS: Would any of the agencies  
8 recommendations change at all if there was a requirement  
9 for it to be -- it can be taken under a trapping license  
10 but if it had to be shot and, therefore, target species  
11 would be eliminated?

12  
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Glenn.

14  
15 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
16 Yeah, we do have concerns.

17  
18 First of all, typically when we give  
19 hunter safety courses through the Department of Fish and  
20 Game we don't support shooting across water surfaces.  
21 That's certainly a concern that we have for certain  
22 safety purposes.

23  
24 The second thing is, where we have had  
25 seasons where shooting is an option, we've seen a high  
26 loss ratio where animals are shot and some of those  
27 beaver just end up sinking and they can't be salvaged and  
28 so we're concerned about being able to salvage. And I've  
29 heard figures upwards of 50 percent and we're pretty  
30 concerned about that loss in resource if we had an open  
31 season with shooting.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any further --  
34 did you have something Taylor.

35  
36 MR. BRELSFORD: Yes, just a brief point.  
37 There are other regions in which the Federal Subsistence  
38 Program provides for beaver seasons in which firearms are  
39 used. I think the Federal program has recognized that  
40 that is a subsistence harvest practice in some parts of  
41 the state under some circumstances. So I think it's  
42 conceivable that that would be a valid modification here.

43  
44 But, again, I have to say that the  
45 positions of the local Advisory Committees seem to be  
46 pretty strong and pretty categoric about this question.

47  
48 Thank you.

49  
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes. It is well known

00337

1 that the Upper Tanana River Drainage use is extensively  
2 both in the spring and I think in late fall. But then  
3 the only safety practices I would see is that Unit 24 is  
4 well above Unit 21 and we still don't have any ice to  
5 trap beaver on and that's a traditional practice, through  
6 the ice, so I think that would present a safety hazard at  
7 any time, that early.

8

9 Public comments.

10

11 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, the Refuge  
12 did submit a comment on it. They're present here, they  
13 may want to cover their comment, but they basically  
14 opposed the proposal. This would be the Koyukuk/Nowitna  
15 Refuge.

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Public comments, go ahead  
18 Geoff.

19

20 MR. BEYERSDORF: Our comments are found  
21 on Page 320. Basically we're opposed for some of the  
22 same reasons that you heard here today and then also  
23 based upon the Board of Game actions on 184, which  
24 failed.

25

26 That's all I wanted to pass along.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Written  
29 comments.

30

31 MR. MATHEWS: That was the only written  
32 comment.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you. Regional  
35 Council deliberations.

36

37 Again, my main reason for opposing this  
38 is it's not general practice in our area plus the safety  
39 factor of thin ice if you do even have ice at this time  
40 of the year.

41

42 Any further Council deliberation. Jack.

43

44 MR. REAKOFF: Well, the Koyukuk River  
45 Advisory is against this proposal primarily because as we  
46 had the nice fat beaver meat and so they felt that it was  
47 a waste of a good beaver to kill it when it was skinny.  
48 They were opposed to that use and too early in the  
49 season.

50

00338

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

2

3 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4 Directed to you, has anybody been cited for shooting  
5 beaver at any time, in the past or whatever?

6

7 MR. STOUT: Mr. Chair, I guess I'm not  
8 aware of that. I'm not part of the enforcement so I  
9 don't necessarily track that. But I guess I haven't  
10 heard of that around here since I've been here. I  
11 haven't heard of anybody getting a citation for shooting  
12 beaver.

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Robert.

15

16 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So  
17 what you're saying is that it never happened in the past  
18 so there's no use to start now is what you're telling us  
19 now, right?

20

21 MR. STOUT: I guess when I was addressing  
22 the original question, that that was an alternative  
23 solution potentially to having this early trapping season  
24 and in order to avoid non-target species like river  
25 otter. In that context, just using the shooting season I  
26 didn't feel like, and as far as our description of it, it  
27 didn't seem like a fair or an acceptable alternative.

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

30

31 MR. STICKMAN: Ron.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Mickey.

34

35 MR. STICKMAN: No question, but, you  
36 know, it's not a traditional practice, you know, the  
37 proposal says 21(D), and that's where I'm from and, you  
38 know, we do a lot of riding around in the fall time and  
39 we see all this beaver out there but just because we see  
40 them we don't shoot them. I mean like Ben said, you  
41 know, they're not fat at that time, you know, they just  
42 spent the whole summer.....

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Gathering.

45

46 MR. STICKMAN: .....gathering food so  
47 they're not fat.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Benedict.

50

00339

1 MR. JONES: Yeah, the reason for this  
2 early season, I oppose it, they're really busy until  
3 wherever they have open water in September, they're still  
4 putting their winter food away.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further Council  
7 deliberation.

8  
9 (No comments)

10  
11 MR. WALKER: Question.

12  
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called  
14 for. All those in favor of adopting Proposal 68 signify  
15 by saying aye.

16  
17 (No aye votes)

18  
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

20  
21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 68 fails. We'll  
24 take a five minute smoke break and get the last five,  
25 okay.

26  
27 MR. STICKMAN: All right.

28  
29 (Off record)

30  
31 (On record)

32  
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

34  
35 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, this brings  
36 us back to Unit 19, and I know that out of respect to the  
37 locals here we did not get to Proposal 60 when we took up  
38 other Unit 19. But anyway, this is found on Page 199, it  
39 was submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
40 and it reduces the harvest limit for moose in Unit 19 for  
41 Lime Village.

42  
43 With that, I think Jeff Denton is  
44 presenting this proposal.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Jeff.

47  
48 MR. DENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

49  
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: No, just a second though,

00340

1 Tina, a motion?

2

3 REPORTER: (Shakes head negatively)

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

6

7 MR. WALKER: I make a motion that we  
8 adopt Proposal 60.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Was there a second.

11

12 MR. STICKMAN: I second.

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, Robert move and  
15 Mickey Stickman seconded to.....

16

17 MR. STICKMAN: We don't table this.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: .....approve Proposal 60.  
20 Go ahead, Jeff, thanks.

21

22 MR. DENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
23 Members of the Council. Jeff Denton, BLM, Anchorage  
24 Field Office.

25

26 As Vince noted, this particular proposal  
27 submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. It  
28 reduces the harvest limit for moose in the Lime Village  
29 area from their village quota of 40 down to 28, it also  
30 establishes a bull season rather than an either sex  
31 season.

32

33 As a point of clarification, I believe in  
34 the proposal, the way it's written, I don't think we have  
35 either sex bulls, I think we just have bulls in there, I  
36 think either sex should be crossed out on the executive  
37 summary as well as they're written. I think there's an  
38 error there. Is that correct or do you intend to have  
39 either sex bulls?

40

41 (Laughter)

42

43 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I.....

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: If we stay any later we  
46 will be.

47

48 MR. DENTON: Maybe that's why we don't  
49 have many moose in that part of the country.

50

00341

1 (Laughter)

2

3 MR. SIAVELIS: And this is 2004.

4

5 (Laughter)

6

7 MR. DENTON: Okay, and what's involved  
8 there, most of the folks have been involved either with  
9 the Central Kuskokwim Committee to some degree and Lime  
10 Village has been around, the situation in Lime Village  
11 ever since we've been in business here in '92 basically.

12

13 And the Federal regulatory history, in  
14 '91, the regulatory year, the village quota was  
15 established at 30. In 1992 that was raised to 40. And  
16 these were either sex harvests, and again it was a  
17 village quota.

18

19 The State regulatory history, I might  
20 have Randy run that down more than me, I think, if he  
21 wants to comment on this.

22

23 Biological background. To kind of  
24 establish a little bit of a comparative base, in 1992,  
25 when Jack Whitman was still a biologist out of McGrath we  
26 did do a gasaway census in that area around Lime Village,  
27 an area about five times larger than the intensive use  
28 area that Lime Village uses today. And as comparative if  
29 you look on Page 202, just as a comparison, let's see,  
30 well, yeah, on Page 203, the second paragraph at the top  
31 of the page where the more recent work in the Aniak  
32 River, that Toby's done, .7 moose per square mile there  
33 in Lime Village in 1992 was about .74 moose per square  
34 mile, fairly similar to what Toby had in Aniak, I  
35 believe, two years, and then also the Holitna area where  
36 he had 1.25 moose per square mile, just as a range of  
37 where we were in Lime Village 12 years ago.

38

39 The harvest data, we have a lot better  
40 data than what's done here. We've had a fairly intensive  
41 harvest reporting program there for the last nine and a  
42 half years. There's been, and depending on how many  
43 they've killed in the last month or two, 204 moose have  
44 been taken. Of those 193 we know the sex of. And over  
45 that period of time, the average, every year, 30 percent  
46 of the harvest has been cows. And the recent, last three  
47 years, we notice as population and the harvest drops down  
48 the proportion of cows in the harvest has gone up  
49 dramatically. Right now, for this regulatory year, 75  
50 percent of the harvest has been cows. There's only been

00342

1 four moose harvested this year since July. And the cows  
2 that are being harvested, of interest, are basically  
3 young cows that are either transient looking for home  
4 ranges, they're dispersal young cows.

5  
6 The adult cow breeding population in that  
7 area is basically depleted and every cow that's moving in  
8 there to establish is basically being harvested. I would  
9 consider this a depleted population. I think we're far  
10 beyond the crises mode, we're at a -- we're starting from  
11 scratch. We're dealing with transient moose are the only  
12 harvest of moose that are occurring in that area right  
13 now.

14  
15 Their harvest has gone from -- in the  
16 beginning in 1994 when we started the harvest reporting  
17 system, they had a quota of 40, they've never met that  
18 quota, it's been 34 and it's been steadily declined with  
19 a few little bumps in it to down to 14 last year, and  
20 this year, in the first six months of the year we've only  
21 gotten four. You know, we're looking at a very dramatic  
22 decrease in harvest, and I think that will probably  
23 correlate when I fly out here next week in a  
24 stratification level type flight it will probably  
25 correlate -- my stratification from 1992, will look at a  
26 very significant reduction in numbers of moose.

27  
28 So the effect of the proposal. We've  
29 actually communicated with Lime Village folks for several  
30 years, when they turn in their harvest reports, to  
31 encourage them not to be harvesting cows if they can  
32 possibly do that, but we still have a very significant  
33 cow harvest over there. So I guess we've got to start  
34 some place by reducing the kill on the moose factory over  
35 there and reestablish some productive capability in that  
36 area for moose.

37  
38 So with that, I'll stop and I'll have  
39 Randy kind of -- he summarized a little bit before what  
40 the Board action's been. This particularly proposal, how  
41 it would line up with the Board action that took place as  
42 well.

43  
44 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Council.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, Jeff, I have one  
47 question before we go on. Is there any other site or  
48 place within the state that has this system or operates  
49 under this system?

50

00343

1 MR. DENTON: Not to my knowledge. This  
2 is a pretty unique situation that came out of basically  
3 litigation in the courts, so it's a fairly special  
4 situation.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any other questions for  
7 Jeff.

8  
9 MR. WALKER: No questions.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, Randy.

12  
13 MR. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To  
14 follow up a little bit on the State regulatory side. The  
15 State hunt there in the Lime Village Management Area is  
16 managed under Tier II and it's a fairly unique system  
17 also. The bag limit has been two moose under each Tier  
18 II permit with 14 permits being issued. So essentially  
19 the State harvest limit is 28 moose, has been up to this  
20 time.

21  
22 As I mentioned, the Board of Game adopted  
23 this as part of their action in dealing with the moose  
24 harvest regulations in the Central Kuskokwim region, so  
25 at this point our recommendation would be to go ahead and  
26 adopt this as it's currently proposed.

27  
28 And, you know, as Jeff pointed out, I  
29 don't think that the reduction in the overall number of  
30 moose included in this proposal is likely to have a  
31 significant effect on harvest in Lime Village because,  
32 you know, they haven't been able to get up to that 40  
33 moose or even the 28 moose under the State system in  
34 recent years. So the main effect really would be to put  
35 the requirement to bulls instead of cows.

36  
37 And as you see they have essentially a  
38 year-round season under Federal regulations, and they've  
39 got a very long season under State regulations also.

40  
41 You know, I guess a factor that's  
42 important to consider is -- in terms of availability of  
43 meat for Lime Village is caribou in the area. And  
44 recently there has been some and hopefully, you know,  
45 there might be some in the area to help carry them  
46 through. And with any luck with the predation control  
47 effort that would include this area along with reductions  
48 in harvest, that the moose population will be built up  
49 and, you know, this could be relaxed in the not too  
50 distant future.

00344

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Randy. Any  
4 questions for Randy. Go ahead, Robert.

5

6 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
7 Randy, when you get back to your ADF&G comments here,  
8 it's emphasized here that Federal moose, the Central  
9 Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning Committee has  
10 submitted a companion proposal to the Alaska -- the Board  
11 of Game, so this is a pretty much cut and dried deal  
12 here, I don't think we even have to go into any more  
13 testimony. Tell me I'm right.

14

15 (Laughter)

16

17 MR. ROGERS: You're right.

18

19 (Laughter)

20

21 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Randy. At this  
22 time, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to call the question on  
23 this.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question has been called.  
26 I think I agree with Robert, I think we've discussed this  
27 area moose extensively under 58 and 59. There are no  
28 written public comments anyway at this time.

29

30 So all those in favor of adopting  
31 Proposal 60 signify by saying aye.

32

33 IN UNISON: Aye.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

36

37 (No opposing votes)

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 60 has been  
40 adopted.

41

42 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, this brings  
43 us up to the customary and traditional use determination  
44 proposal that has been before you several times before.  
45 This is dealing with the C&T determination for moose in  
46 Unit 21(E). This proposal was submitted by the  
47 Association of Village Council Presidents.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: The Chair will entertain a  
50 motion to adopt Proposal 61.

00345

1 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

2

3 MR. WALKER: Second.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Robert. Go  
6 ahead, Polly.

7

8 MS. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For  
9 the record it's Polly Wheeler with the Office of  
10 Subsistence Management. For your information and for  
11 record purposes the draft Staff analysis on Proposal 04-  
12 61 is in your books on Pages 207 to 225.

13

14 As Vince just said -- actually Vince said  
15 this proposal has been before you and that's not entirely  
16 true, the issue has been before you a number of times as  
17 you well know. This is not the same proposal, nor the  
18 same proponent as has been before you previously, but  
19 this proposal, like others, asks that the C&T  
20 determination for moose in 21(E) be extended to include  
21 all residents of Unit 18. It was submitted by the  
22 Association of Village Council Presidents.

23

24 Again, we recognize that the Councils  
25 considered this issue for the past several cycles. But  
26 this is a new proposal and when we get new proposals we  
27 analyze them and bring them before you. Most of the  
28 analysis material that's in your Board book is material  
29 that you have seen before, it's sort of been reorganized  
30 and retooled but it's not providing a lot of new  
31 information.

32

33 I guess the one exception to that is that  
34 there is a section that includes the results of several  
35 meetings that were held in 2003 on this issue. And just  
36 to recap a little bit to you, in January of 2003 there  
37 was a moose management planning effort for 21(E), which  
38 Randy Rogers may or may not want to speak to. In May of  
39 2003, just last May, the Federal Board had their meeting  
40 and they deferred action on last years's proposal and  
41 directed that the two Councils meet to discuss this  
42 issue, and as you probably remember, because it wasn't  
43 that long ago, in October of 2003 you had joint Council  
44 meetings between the Western Interior and YK-Delta  
45 Councils and at that meeting the Regional Advisory  
46 Councils requested that the proponent withdraw the  
47 proposal, which he did. But then Association of Village  
48 Council Presidents submitted a proposal to include all  
49 residents of Unit 18 and a positive C&T for moose in Unit  
50 21.

00346

1                   A preliminary conclusion, you'll probably  
2 notice if you skip right to the conclusion there is no  
3 recommendation from Staff, but there is some harvest  
4 ticket information in there and there's the analysis.

5  
6                   So with that, Mr. Chair, I turn it back  
7 over to you. I will remind you of the discussion that we  
8 had yesterday on the parameters of customary and  
9 traditional use determinations and the importance of  
10 Board input to these determinations, particularly when  
11 it's considered by the Federal Board later on down the  
12 line.

13  
14                   Mr. Chair.

15  
16                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Polly. Any  
17 questions for Polly.

18  
19                   (No comments)

20  
21                   CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, ADF&G.

22  
23                   MR. ROGERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I don't  
24 have any extra comments for you on this, but I did want  
25 to come up to be available if there's any questions  
26 involving the moose management meeting we had last  
27 January, or January a year ago or our plans for the  
28 future.

29  
30                   CHAIRMAN SAM: I do have a question, when  
31 is your next meeting then?

32  
33                   MR. ROGERS: We don't have a next meeting  
34 scheduled. As I said, before, we plan to -- you know,  
35 the meeting that we had in January 2003, that was kind of  
36 an interim measure because we weren't able to get moving  
37 on the 21(E) planning right away because of the Central  
38 Kuskokwim one.

39  
40                   You know, we basically made a commitment  
41 to folks from the Unit 21 area to begin working more  
42 closely with them on moose issues, which is what that  
43 first meeting was. It wasn't intended, in and of itself,  
44 as the start of a planning process.

45  
46                   Now, we, you know, as I mentioned, we  
47 have funding from OSM to work on that and it's our intent  
48 to get a process going in order to bring recommendations  
49 to the Board of Game in the next cycle, which will be in  
50 March 2006.

00347

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any other questions for  
2 Randy at this time.

3

4 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

7

8 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
9 Getting back to the comments here, ADF&G comment, they  
10 oppose. At the last WP03-33, I think it was, the State  
11 opposed that also; am I correct here when they did put  
12 this back there or did ADF&G oppose that one?

13

14 MR. ROGERS: To be quit honest, I haven't  
15 paid that close of attention to our position on this.  
16 You know, up until the point we formally launch a  
17 planning process, you know, I have been hopeful that this  
18 Council and the YK-Delta Council could work out  
19 something. And as of the meeting we had last January it  
20 looked like that might happen.

21

22 So, you know, I guess I can't answer your  
23 question very good. All I can say is that if this issue  
24 is still hanging out, which it appears it very well might  
25 be, we'll do the best we can to work with the Federal  
26 Staff to help address it.

27

28 MR. WALKER: Okay.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions for  
31 Randy.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Inter-Agency Staff.

36

37 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
38 This proposal is unusual in that the preliminary  
39 conclusion takes no position and most of the time the OSM  
40 Staff would try to come up with a best judgment about the  
41 data in front of you.

42

43 The reason there's no conclusion here is  
44 because the Staff Committee was of very different  
45 opinions about what this data says, what these data say  
46 and what should be done. Some Staff Committee members  
47 believed that the demonstration of harvest tickets and  
48 some use patterns by many communities was sufficient, and  
49 some Staff Committee members felt very strongly that the  
50 harvest tickets were talking about very recent history

00348

1 and not longer term history of use, and that these low  
2 levels of use were very difficult to justify as  
3 representing a community pattern of historic customary  
4 and traditional use.

5  
6 So couldn't come to agreement in the  
7 Staff Committee, and, instead, felt like what we needed  
8 to do was really ask the Councils to give us their  
9 perspective, the details, give us your thoughts on this,  
10 not just your conclusion, but some of the testimony, some  
11 of the information that you have about use practices,  
12 historic patterns of use in the Unit 21(E).

13  
14 So that's my main point, is to say that  
15 we believe the data is very limited here. Much of it is  
16 very recent in history rather than a generation of use  
17 patterns. And we believe that the testimony, the kind of  
18 knowledge that Council members have would be very  
19 important information for the Board to have on the record  
20 in order to access this.

21  
22 So that's where the Staff Committee came  
23 out on this and we really invite your comments, in  
24 detail, on the use patterns as you know them.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Taylor. And I  
27 expect a lot of testimony under testimony or expressions  
28 of concerns under our Council deliberations, so I would  
29 like to leave that until then.

30  
31 Public comments, I think there's a few,  
32 Vince.

33  
34 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. And in  
35 response to Robert's question, the Proposal 33 was a  
36 different type last year, it was dealing with a portion  
37 of the unit, but if he is interested in the position Fish  
38 and Game has, I do have it here from last year. But it's  
39 kind of a different proposal last year.

40  
41 I don't think we have any public  
42 comments. I do have the preliminary actions -- actually  
43 we do have public comments on this. There are two  
44 submitted.

45  
46 The GASH Local Advisory Committee passed  
47 recommendation in opposition to Proposal 61. Committee  
48 members do not want to see Unit 18 residents hunting in  
49 Unit 21(E). There are currently too many outside hunters  
50 in the area that are not customary and traditional users.

00349

1                   We received a letter from Ross Boring of  
2 Bethel who supports Proposal 61 because he has hunted in  
3 Unit 21(E) for 10 years during the winter season. The  
4 group he hunts with split the moose they harvest between  
5 several families.

6  
7                   The Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Regional  
8 Advisory Committee took up this proposal at their meeting  
9 in St. Mary's on March 3rd and 4th, and Jerry shared his  
10 notes with me, but basically they took this up in two  
11 motions and I think that's important to point that out.  
12 There was a motion to oppose the proposal and that  
13 failed. But it failed by a vote of three to five. Then  
14 they brought up a motion to support the proposal which  
15 passed nine to one. But there was efforts by Council  
16 members to see if they could follow the -- what would you  
17 call that, the withdrawal effort that was done by Mr.  
18 Peterson. But anyway, so their action is to support  
19 Proposal 61 is the Yukon Kuskokwim.

20  
21                   No other Council -- no other Council --  
22 no, they don't, Stebbins and -- I'm thinking fish, no,  
23 there were no other Councils that took it up.

24  
25                   So that's the full extent of the public  
26 comments and Regional Council actions.

27  
28                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thanks, Vince. If you  
29 remember just recently, inside of a month, I believe,  
30 that we got a call from Harry Wilde, Chairman of YK Delta  
31 and then the call was to have me call him. At that time  
32 we discussed it intensively or as far as we could at that  
33 time because we knew that we were going to be in  
34 opposition of each other again and at that time he said  
35 that he would attempt to have the whole Council oppose it  
36 but then it's quite apparent that that wasn't going to  
37 happen anyway.

38  
39                   And, again, this is just Proposal 33, new  
40 language under a new proponent.

41  
42                   And when Harry called me -- or when I got  
43 a hold of him, he said that he didn't want -- he'd had  
44 enough of this proposal, too, and that he just doesn't  
45 know what to do now. But it seems quite apparent that  
46 YK-Delta Subsistence Council had no choice but to support  
47 it because of their region, their area.

48  
49                   And at this time I don't think that we  
50 could support it, too. That was just to bring you up to

00350

1 date on public comments and that was from YK-Delta.

2

3 Regional Council deliberation. Robert.

4

5 MR. WALKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we had a  
6 lengthy battle with them in Wasilla and we finally got  
7 them to pull their Proposal 33 and at that time, the  
8 Western Interior RAC Board voted unanimously to vote it  
9 out, and so I would recommend that the Board do this  
10 again here and we'll try to be done with it because Harry  
11 Wilde is tired of dealing with it.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: For the record, I would  
16 like all Council members to put in some sort of comments  
17 on why we would oppose it. It's not a matter of fact, I  
18 want it on record why we oppose this proposal.

19

20 One of the things that came out of the  
21 Aniak meeting and this came out of Aniak residents, that  
22 if we allow this to happen on the Yukon, they would do  
23 exactly the same thing on the Kuskokwim. So that's what  
24 the Aniak residents were afraid of, and it's always been  
25 the Western Interior's stand that, while one or two  
26 residents from two or three villages could possibly  
27 qualified as C&T users, it's always been our stand that  
28 we cannot grant C&T to the whole village just because one  
29 or two village residents qualify. That will be my stand,  
30 again, on this issue.

31

32 The other issue is and was brought up at  
33 Wasilla, that the coastal residents, the one or two that  
34 did qualify came up and utilized 21(E) moose only after  
35 commercial fisheries was introduced and where everyone  
36 could afford a fast boat and a big motor and all the gas  
37 they could buy.

38

39 Such comments as those would be more than  
40 welcome at this time under Council deliberation.

41

42 Mickey.

43

44 MR. STICKMAN: You know, the last time it  
45 came up I voted against this, you know, this C&T  
46 determination. My main reason for voting against this  
47 C&T determination was because last summer I went to Holy  
48 Cross and I stayed in Luke Demientieff's Bed and  
49 Breakfast down there, and, you know, he's an elder so  
50 whenever I travel around I always try to make the best

00351

1 use of my time and I figured it was a good opportunity to  
2 pick his brain about this problem.

3

4 I told him that it's a proposal that's  
5 been before us for a few years. Through our conversation  
6 he said that he didn't believe that they had the right to  
7 have a customary and traditional use of that area.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Carl.

10

11 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, thank you, Mr.  
12 Chairman. I, too, oppose this proposition. As you know  
13 I'm from Aniak and Aniak's got a lot of history going to  
14 21(E). They used to do it -- there's a lake that we  
15 called Pike Lake and we used to go over there with dog  
16 teams, and we did that, you know, as far as I can  
17 remember. In fact, if I walked up the hill, I can walk  
18 from 19 to 21(E) because all waters, when you go up that  
19 hill -- I'll walk up -- everything going down draining  
20 north you're in 21(E). The waters draining south, you're  
21 in 19(A). So it's close to proximity, I think we've been  
22 doing it -- and I think we can prove it, but due to  
23 respect we haven't claimed it.

24

25 But we do use it. You know, we pick  
26 berries, like they say. We go up, we can walk. I've  
27 caughten [sic] a moose on the State side because 21(E) in  
28 the State regs don't close to September 25th and in 19 it  
29 closes on the 20th, and we went up there and I caught a  
30 moose, you know, just and it's so close, but this was not  
31 on -- this was on the State opening. So, you know,  
32 Chuathbaluk can claim, upper and lower Kalskag, they go  
33 to Paimuit. They go to Paimuit ever winter. They've got  
34 relatives that's buried in Paimuit, so does Aniak. So  
35 you know if anybody should be claiming it, it should be  
36 the people on the Kuskokwim side that's real close, even  
37 closer than Russian Mission that we support their C&T  
38 claim.

39

40 So at this time I oppose 61.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Carl. Jack.

43

44 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman. I also  
45 oppose this proposal. We opposed Proposal 33. Primarily  
46 when I review that data, I see a family here, a family  
47 there in those coastal villages that go up every two or  
48 three years and harvest a moose and to give all of those  
49 villages C&T into that unit, even the lower part of the  
50 unit, I have a problem with it and this proposal goes

00352

1 further. This proposal goes the entirety of Unit 21(E).

2

3

4 And so until Region 5 comes up with a  
5 proposal that has a reasonable few people and close to  
6 the boundary, a concentric that's close to the boundary I  
7 won't even think about it. And so this proposal's way  
8 too far -- it's way beyond what's warranted. They can  
9 still hunt under State regulations. But to give a grant  
10 of C&T, this is a pretty serious subject.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: George.

12

13 MR. SIAVELIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I,  
14 too, oppose this proposal for all the good reasons  
15 already stated.

16

17 In addition, the agencies clearly show,  
18 you know, they lack supporting data for this and the GASH  
19 Advisory Committee's position.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, George. Again,  
24 one of the strongest opposition points that I had was  
25 that granting C&T to whole villages just because of one  
26 or two people who might qualify and I don't see how a  
27 whole unit qualifies under this.

28

29 Any further deliberations.

30

31 MR. WALKER: Tommy.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Tommy.

34

35 MR. KRISKA: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I  
36 oppose it for all the same reasons, all the good reasons  
37 and for the GASH and all of these other people, I'm just  
38 going to have to oppose it.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Tommy. Any  
43 further deliberations.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 MR. STICKMAN: Call for the question.

48

49 MR. WALKER: Question.

50

00353

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called  
2 for. All those in favor of supporting or adopting  
3 Proposal 61 signify by saying aye.

4  
5 (No aye votes)

6  
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: All those opposed, same  
8 sign.

9  
10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried unanimously  
13 to oppose 61. And I hope we have enough data to justify  
14 our reasons for opposing 61.

15  
16 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, that brings  
17 us up to Proposal 62 which is found on Page 227. This  
18 was submitted by the Tanana Tribal Council. And it opens  
19 the moose season earlier in 21(E) by nine days.

20  
21 The Refuge Staff has a presentation on  
22 that and then we do have the actions of the Eastern  
23 Interior on this proposal.

24  
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: At this time the Chair  
26 will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 62.

27  
28 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

29  
30 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Jack Reakoff.

33  
34 (Pause)

35  
36 MR. BEYERSDORF: Mr. Chair. Members of  
37 the Council. Again, for the record I'm Geoff Beyersdorf  
38 with the Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge. And  
39 Proposal WP04-62 is found on Page 228 of your booklets  
40 and it was proposed by the Tanana Tribal Council.

41  
42 Basically what this proposal would do is  
43 add nine additional days of hunting opportunity in the  
44 Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge by changing the dates in  
45 21(B), that portion within the Refuge from September 5th  
46 to August 27th. The proponent requests that the Federal  
47 fall moose season in Unit 21(B) open nine days before the  
48 corresponding State season opens for State managed lands  
49 within the Nowitna River Drainage. The proponent claims  
50 that by opening the Federal season in Unit 21(B) on

00354

1 August 27th instead of September 5th, it would reduce  
2 the impact on local subsistence users who must compete  
3 with non-Federally-qualified users.

4

5 So basically the regulation change would  
6 be:

7

8 That within Unit 21(B), that portion  
9 that's within the Nowitna National  
10 Wildlife Refuge, instead of the current  
11 September 5th to 25th opening that's now  
12 in place, it would be August 27th to  
13 September 25th

14

15 The Refuge conducted moose surveys there  
16 in fall 2003 on two of the trend count areas there, and  
17 those trend count areas revealed that there were declines  
18 in not only the adult bulls along the River Corridor but  
19 also in adult cows. And most of the hunting pressure  
20 that takes place in that area takes place right along the  
21 river corridor. The bull/cow ratios there in 2001 were  
22 16 bulls per 100 cows and based upon our surveys this  
23 year they're down to 12 bulls per 100 cows. Of course  
24 that's below our objective there. 20 bulls per 100 cows  
25 is considered poor. And our goal for that area would be  
26 30 bulls per 100 cows.

27

28 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to  
29 oppose the proposal. Adoption of this proposal would  
30 have additional adverse impacts on the already depressed  
31 bull population in the Refuge area there. The proposed  
32 nine day extension to the Federal season would likely  
33 cause additional harvest of adult bulls and results from  
34 the last three years of surveys revealed a decline in the  
35 adult bull population in the river corridor there. And  
36 additional harvest of bulls could have detrimental  
37 impacts on future productivity and recruitment and  
38 ultimately may reduce the moose numbers available to the  
39 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

40

41 And that's the end as far as my OSM  
42 presentation. I do have separate comments from the  
43 Refuge whenever you're ready.

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

46

47 MR. BEYERSDORF: Again, changing moose  
48 season from August 27th to September 5th, our Refuge  
49 recommendation is to not adopt it.

50

00355

1                   Our main concern here is that in our 2003  
2 trend surveys we had low numbers of both bulls and cows  
3 along the Nowitna River Corridor and if there's  
4 additional hunting time added, that would actually worsen  
5 the problem that we're seeing there right now.

6  
7                   The other thing that I would point out is  
8 that the Board of Game at their March 2004 meeting, just  
9 this last week, passed Proposal 193(A), which creates  
10 within 21(B) a drawing and registration permit area very  
11 similar to what you see on the Koyukuk, and Proposal 193,  
12 I would also point out was supported by the Ruby, the  
13 Middle Yukon and the Koyukuk River ACs.

14  
15                   The Proposal 193 amendment there for the  
16 Nowitna Refuge would require a drawing permit and a  
17 registration permit and those similar to hunting under  
18 the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, those hunting under the  
19 subsistence registration permit would be required to saw  
20 through one palm and then forfeit that palm at the check  
21 station. Those that would want to retain the antlers  
22 would be required to have a drawing permit, just like on  
23 the Koyukuk.

24  
25                   So there's three drawing permit areas.  
26 The main one of concern that we have is in the yellow  
27 there, number 1, that's where we have the really low  
28 bull/cow ratios and we've seen declining bull numbers and  
29 cow numbers this past year. The second one would just be  
30 to the west there, number 2, and then the third one is to  
31 the east in Unit 3. So that drawing permit area right  
32 along the river corridor would be a five mile corridor on  
33 either side of the Novi, from the -- as you can see it  
34 would be from the mouth of the river to the unit boundary  
35 there. And drawing permits would be issued upon  
36 sustained yield and subsistence harvest, the Federal and  
37 State biologists would get together to determine the  
38 number of drawing permits that could be issued for that  
39 area.

40  
41                   I think what you saw with Glenn's  
42 presentation earlier, that with these recent Board of  
43 Game actions on the Koyukuk, they had a reduction in the  
44 number of non-local hunters and subsequent to that an  
45 increase in non -- excuse me, there was an increase --  
46 we've been seeing an increase in non-local users to the  
47 Novi Drainage and a decrease in the local users, but with  
48 the drawing permit system that was issued on the Koyukuk  
49 Controlled Use Area, we could reverse this trend and  
50 provide more opportunities for locals and have a decrease

00356

1 in the non-local use, much of what you saw presented  
2 earlier for the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area.

3

4 So the Refuge feels that establishing  
5 this drawing permit area along the river corridor where  
6 most of the hunting pressure is occurring right now  
7 should address the proponent's concerns.

8

9 If adopted, this proposal would cause  
10 Federal regulations to not be aligned with the State  
11 regulations, but more importantly adoption of this  
12 proposal would have adverse impacts on the bull moose  
13 populations in the river corridor where we're already  
14 seeing low bull/cow ratios. And adoption of the season  
15 would extend the Federal season and likely cause  
16 additional harvest of adult bulls in an area where we  
17 already have conservation concerns.

18

19 That concludes my portion of the  
20 presentation.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: So with the passage of  
23 State Proposal 193(A) do you think that would address the  
24 local concerns and the issuance of these permits would  
25 probably handle everything?

26

27 MR. BEYERSDORF: Yes, we do.

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further.....

30

31 MR. BEYERSDORF: And I think that -- I  
32 mean that's exactly what you've seen on the Koyukuk, that  
33 they had this problem before they started the drawing and  
34 the registration permit and subsequently reduced the  
35 problem.

36

37 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

40

41 MR. REAKOFF: What's your harvest  
42 percentage that you're going to calculate on for your  
43 sustained yield, are you going to use five or seven  
44 percent?

45

46 MR. BEYERSDORF: I don't know the actual  
47 percentage yet. We're going to be meeting with Glenn  
48 later on in the week to determine the number of drawing  
49 permits. Right now in a previous conversation that we  
50 had I think the maximum number of permits that we talked

00357

1 about being issued was potentially 10.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, ADF&G.

8

9 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10 Basically what the Refuge just presented there is exactly

11 what our position is. With the adoption of Proposal 193

12 this addresses the concerns that we have about

13 displacement of local hunters.

14

15 And for all we look at throughout the  
16 area, it's really an important factor for me in the  
17 consideration as far as these declining success rates and  
18 the domino effect that that has when local hunter success  
19 rates in the fall declines. And the effect of Proposal  
20 193 will help distribute hunters away from the river. If  
21 we look at all of 21(B) data that we have rather than  
22 just the Novi data, we can see that going through the  
23 late '80s and '90s, we used to have about 20 hunters  
24 reporting harvesting moose in 21(B). Now you look at the  
25 data the last few years and we're averaging about four or  
26 five.

27

28 What I contend is happening, for  
29 instance, like residents of Ruby that traditionally would  
30 hunt that area, those people are being displaced and  
31 they're having to hunt moose either in other areas or  
32 they were probably hunting moose during the winter  
33 season. So that kind of downward effect is really what  
34 we're concerned about.

35

36 I think with this proposal, we're kind of  
37 going in the opposite direction that we want to with this  
38 population right now. We need to address some pretty  
39 specific biological concerns that we have there, and  
40 liberalizing the season at this time is not the direction  
41 that we want to go.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Glenn.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, Inter-Agency --

48 oh, Robert.

49

50 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

00358

1 Glenn, you know WP04-62, their general description, it  
2 says Unit 21(E), I mean am I -- is this the way it's  
3 drawn up in your book also here?

4

5 MR. BEYERSDORF: Yeah, it says 21(E), it  
6 should be 21(B).

7

8 MR. WALKER: Okay. My question here, Mr.  
9 Chairman, is that a typo error here, I would just  
10 recommend we just send it right back to them and let them  
11 redo it.

12

(Laughter)

13

CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

14

(No comments)

15

CHAIRMAN SAM: Further questions.

16

17

(No comments)

18

CHAIRMAN SAM: Inter-Agency.

19

20

MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21

22 The Inter-Agency Staff Committee supports the  
23 recommendation that's being offered by the Refuge and by  
24 ADF&G. That is to say that strong action by the Board of  
25 Game is the best solution to this situation.

26

27 The Staff Committee recognized the  
28 conservation concern and the displacement, the growth of  
29 non-local effort in the Nowitna River Drainage and so the  
30 whole focus was on how to find an effective solution.  
31 When the State Board of Game has acted on Proposal 193,  
32 that creates the limitations on non-local use in the most  
33 effective way. An early opening under Proposal 62 would  
34 have not helped in the conservation issues and closing  
35 Federal public lands, another possible solution, if the  
36 State Board of Game had not acted, closing Federal lands  
37 would have been a problem because State-qualified hunters  
38 could continue to hunt the river corridor below the  
39 ordinary high water mark. But it could actually have  
40 increased competition in the river corridor.

41

42 So, again, we believe the most effective  
43 solution was a unified solution by the Board of Game and  
44 the Board's adopting Proposal 193 is the best way to  
45 address the conservation and the increased pressure  
46 problem on the Nowitna Drainage.

47

00359

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Taylor. Public  
4 comments. I asked you to strike -- oh, no, go ahead,  
5 we'll have to enter it in the record.

6

7 MR. MATHEWS: We'll correct the errors.  
8 We've had a fair errors in the book and we understand  
9 that this is dealing with 21(B) and not 21(E) as in  
10 Evansville.

11

12 Mr. Chairman, this one generated a lot of  
13 discussion at Eastern Interior so that's why I have a lot  
14 of grey hair, because I have to go between these two  
15 Councils.

16

17 The Ruby Advisory Committee on Page 234  
18 originally supported the proposal, but then they reversed  
19 their position in January. I did talk to the Chair and  
20 Vice Chair on that because the minutes didn't reflect  
21 that, but both the Chair and the Vice Chair and I believe  
22 Glenn has already said that they oppose this proposal,  
23 that's the Ruby Advisory Committee. The Refuge has  
24 already expressed that they oppose this proposal. The  
25 Eastern Interior, when they took this up generated quite  
26 a bit of discussion. The support the proposal.

27

28 The Regional Council supports this  
29 proposal because it allows local subsistence users an  
30 earlier opportunity to meet their subsistence needs  
31 before the highly competitive State general hunt.  
32 Passage of this proposal would allow local subsistence  
33 users to beat the competition from non-local hunters  
34 displaced from other areas. Several Regional Council  
35 members commented on the increase of hunting camps  
36 throughout the Refuge. The transcript would reflect  
37 around every bend in the river there was another camp.

38

39 Regional Council members commented on the  
40 increase of hunting camps throughout the Refuge. Several  
41 Council members stressed that they do not believe  
42 there'll be an increase in the harvest that will threaten  
43 the sustainability of the moose population.

44

45 Again, a lengthy discussion went on about  
46 the fact that it's not the human harvest that's causing  
47 this moose population to decline it is the predators and  
48 that they feel that they need this additional season.

49

50 Anyways, they went on to believe that the

00360

1 concentration of hunting pressure, concentration meaning  
2 the time period, threatens the moose population more and  
3 does not allow for the hunting pressure to be spread out  
4 and reduce competition between the various hunters.

5  
6 They went on because of their concern  
7 about the preliminary conclusion. The Regional Council  
8 does not -- in general does not support waiting until the  
9 Board of Game takes action. That was in reference to the  
10 preliminary conclusion to wait to see what the Board of  
11 Game was going to do. The Regional Council feels they  
12 and the Federal Subsistence Program were developed to  
13 take action and not defer to others. So I assume when  
14 the new Chair for Eastern Interior will be on line, that  
15 this will be a -- they will be stressing their concerns  
16 that they do not agree with the increased harvest and  
17 that the competition demands that there be an additional  
18 nine days to address that competition.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Was State  
21 Proposal 193 discussed at all at that Eastern Interior  
22 meeting?

23  
24 MR. MATHEWS: No, Mr. Chairman, it wasn't  
25 because they met on February 27th or 28th and the Board  
26 wasn't -- we had no idea what the Board was doing at that  
27 time. And, again, their position was, that this is the  
28 Federal Subsistence Program, they shouldn't be waiting  
29 for the Board of Game to take action, that if there's an  
30 action item in front of them that the program as well as  
31 the Council should act upon it.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: I would just like to go on  
34 record and thank John Sam, Fred Bifelt and I think Glenn  
35 Stout who drew up that Proposal 193, I would like that to  
36 go on record.

37  
38 Any further public comments.

39  
40 (No comments)

41  
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.

43  
44 (No comments)

45  
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Regional Council  
47 deliberation, Carl.

48  
49 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, just for -- there's  
50 another typo on the Ruby Fish and Game Advisory Committee

00361

1 it should be Proposal 62, not Proposal 61.

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: Thank you, Carl. That one  
4 I can claim because that one I wrote.

5

6 (Laughter)

7

8 MR. MATHEWS: We will correct that. I  
9 can give you the history of that. It first was listed as  
10 Proposal 61, but anyways we'll get that corrected.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further Council  
13 deliberations.

14

15 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

18

19 MR. REAKOFF: The Koyukuk River Advisory  
20 Committee endorsed the State remedy of the drawing hunt  
21 and so that we're happy that the State Board adopted that  
22 remedy and so there's -- as Monday Morning Quarterbacks,  
23 this Western Interior is comfortable with -- I, as a  
24 Council member, am comfortable with the State's remedy to  
25 the situation, and so I oppose this Proposal 62.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. Further  
28 deliberation.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Because I, too, believe  
33 that State Proposal 193 takes care of the problem -- or  
34 is addressing the problem directly, trying to benefit the  
35 locals.

36

37 Any further deliberations.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, all those in favor  
42 of adopting Proposal 63 [sic] signify by saying aye.

43

44 (No aye votes)

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Those opposed, same sign.

47

48 IN UNISON: Aye.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 62 fails. Mr.

00362

1 Chairman, that brings us up to Proposal 63, which is your  
2 proposal, and maybe to speed this along this is -- I'm  
3 fairly certain this is considered a housekeeping  
4 proposal, which was to remove the half-mile restriction  
5 along the Yukon River in Unit 21(D) for the moose season.  
6 It's found on Page 235.

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Didn't we take care of  
9 this before?

10

11 MR. MATHEWS: No, Mr. Chairman, we did  
12 not. It was one that slipped through the cracks, so we  
13 have not. In Federal regulations we still have this  
14 half-mile restriction, it was removed under -- I'm taking  
15 Jerry's job over. In State regulations it was removed.  
16 You requested Staff, myself, draft this proposal up, we  
17 did but your agenda's do get quite crowded and it didn't  
18 come up at the last round so we need to -- well, we don't  
19 need to address it. You felt that it would be better to  
20 have the regulations aligned.

21

22 MR. STICKMAN: Ron.

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Mickey.

25

26 MR. STICKMAN: Okay, at this time I make  
27 a motion to adopt Proposal 63.

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second to the  
30 motion to adopt 63.

31

32 MR. MORGAN: Second.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Carl. If this  
35 is housekeeping and alignment issue, do we need all the  
36 testimony?

37

38 MR. BERG: Mr. Chairman.

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Just briefly.

41

42 (Laughter)

43

44 MR. BERG: Mr. Chairman, I will be brief  
45 on this. I would recommend that you go through the  
46 public process since it is a proposal that you're making  
47 a recommendation on to the Federal Board. I think it  
48 will be fairly short and painless.

49

50 As Vince did mention, this proposal was

00363

1 before you in 2001 and the Federal Board rejected the  
2 proposal at that time based on the recommendation from  
3 your council, from the Western Interior Council. At that  
4 time the Council said that they opposed the proposal due  
5 to the limited amount of Federal lands that were impacted  
6 and you asked at that time that the proposal be submitted  
7 to the Alaska Board of Game, which it was the following  
8 year and the Board of Game has now acted on it and the  
9 half mile restriction has been removed in State  
10 regulation.

11

12 So this proposal, 63, submitted on your  
13 behalf, would remove the restriction -- would request the  
14 removal of the restriction to be at least one-half mile  
15 from the mainstem of the Yukon River to harvest moose  
16 during the winter season in 21(D). This change would  
17 align with existing State regulations.

18

19 My understanding is that this half-mile  
20 restriction was first put in place to help protect the  
21 cow moose population.

22

23 I'm not going to go through the  
24 biological information because you've heard quite  
25 detailed information from the Refuge already.

26

27 If this proposal were adopted it would  
28 provide Federally-qualified users additional opportunity  
29 to harvest moose within a half mile of the mainstem of  
30 the Yukon River, and this change would more closely align  
31 with the current State regulations for the winter moose  
32 season in Unit 21(D) under which subsistence users can  
33 harvest one bull moose along the Yukon River without the  
34 half mile restriction.

35

36 So with that, Mr. Chair, the conclusion  
37 is to support the proposal.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Jerry.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: ADF&G.

46

47 MR. STICKMAN: Vince has his hand up over  
48 there.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Vince.

00364

1 MR. MATHEWS: I don't know if the State  
2 will cover the concern or not so I'll just wait to see if  
3 they'll bring up a concern.

4  
5 MR. STOUT: What concern?  
6

7 MR. MATHEWS: The concern is your action  
8 taken on an earlier proposal is what I'm alluding to  
9 so.....

10  
11 (Laughter)

12  
13 MR. WALKER: Jump on it there.

14  
15 (Laughter)

16  
17 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The  
18 Department recommends adoption of that. There would be,  
19 I think, this would apply for a December season as it was  
20 adopted, so it would apply for that December season, I  
21 guess -- well, actually it's not in the State regulation  
22 at all, so we don't -- when we changed it to the December  
23 season, we don't have that either so I guess as far as  
24 the status of this February season be maintained is the  
25 same, but as far as removal of it, at the time we  
26 supported the recommendations to eliminate that and that  
27 hasn't changed.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Glenn.

30  
31 If I remember back when we had that half  
32 mile restriction, I think it was there to protect the  
33 local residents and protect the local resources because  
34 of the wide openness of the Yukon River and all the non-  
35 locals traveling through there with snowmachines, too,  
36 and that was addressing only the winter hunt if I  
37 remember right.

38  
39 Inter-agency.

40  
41 MR. BRELSFORD: We have no comments.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: No comments, thank you,  
44 sit there.

45  
46 (Laughter)

47  
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Public comments.

49  
50 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The

00365

1 Ruby Local Advisory Committee supports Proposal 63.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: I think we discussed that  
4 they met -- I think you're the one that stated that they  
5 met in December, before 193 was passed and then they  
6 changed their mind sometime in January, because I saw  
7 that same thing. And I believe that if they knew of --  
8 if they know of the passage of 193 they would be more  
9 than happy to oppose this.

10

11 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

14

15 MR. WALKER: I think we're getting kind  
16 of goofy here. I'll just call the question here so we  
17 can move on please.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Proposal 63. All  
20 those in favor of adopting Proposal 63 signify by saying  
21 aye.

22

23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Those opposed, same sign.

26

27 (No opposing votes)

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 63 passes.

30 Vince.

31

32 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, for the record, your  
33 motion just passed, just to make it clear so everyone  
34 understands is just the removal of that half mile  
35 restriction, it does not address anything about the  
36 winter hunt that's listed in the proposed regulation,  
37 it's just to delete the half mile restriction.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Right.

40

41 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, correct, that was the  
42 concern.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: If I remember Glenn's  
45 comments, I don't think we have any winter hunts at this  
46 time, do we?

47

48 MR. STOUT: (Shakes head negatively)

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: We don't have any winter

00366

1 hunts, right?

2

3

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

4

5

CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

6

7

MR. REAKOFF: Proposal 65 may continue a winter hunt and that would apply to those Federal lands down there near the Yukon River, so there's some little areas where this would apply if our proposal passes.

11

12

CHAIRMAN SAM: Still fine as is, all we did was remove that restriction even without a hunt, I guess.

15

16

(Laughter)

17

18

CHAIRMAN SAM: I must be getting tired. So we're okay with that then.

20

21

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, it's clear. We understand now, it's just to remove the half mile restriction, it does not endorse anything else that's listed in the analysis relating to the winter seasons.

25

26

CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Proposal 64, last one.

28

29

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this was submitted by your Council. This one we will need the Refuge up on. This would revise the boundaries of the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area for moose in Unit 21 and 24.

33

34

CHAIRMAN SAM: The Chair will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 64.

36

37

MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

38

39

CHAIRMAN SAM: Second.

40

41

MR. REAKOFF: Second.

42

43

CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Jack Reakoff.

44

45

Jerry.

46

47

MR. BERG: Mr. Chairman, Proposal 64 was submitted on behalf of your Council and requested a revision to the boundary description for the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area for moose in portions of Units 21 and

00367

1 24 to align with the State description.

2

3

4 The primary modification to the boundary  
5 description was to add longitude and latitude coordinates  
6 to all the physical location descriptions, which was  
7 added to the State regulations in 2002, I believe, I  
8 think I skipped that part. Yes, in 2002.

8

9

10 The intent of this proposal is to align  
11 with the State area description. This change is not  
12 expected to have any impact on the moose populations in  
13 Unit 21(B) and 24. It would benefit moose hunters by  
14 providing them an additional way of knowing exactly where  
15 the boundary is if they choose to use modern GPS devices  
16 available. There was also an addition of the  
17 Hochandochtla Mountain.

17

18

MR. SPINDLER: Hochandochtla.

19

20

21 MR. BERG: Mike can say it much better  
22 than I. But anyway, there was an addition of a point on  
23 the boundary description and basically that's just  
24 another point along the line drawn from Little Indian  
25 River to Cottonwood Creek. And so it just helps better  
26 define that line from what I can tell. I drew that  
27 description on the map and I think it just made the  
28 description a little bit better.

28

29

30 And with that the preliminary conclusion  
31 is to support the proposal.

31

32

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

33

34

CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Jerry.

35

36

(No comments)

37

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: So this was -- do you have  
40 a question back there -- okay, no. This proposal is just  
41 then alignment procedure, with a slight addition if I  
42 understand it correctly; is that right?

42

43

44 MR. BERG: That's correct, Mr. Chair.  
45 That's my understanding, is that, it would basically  
46 align with the current description in State regulation so  
47 this would make State and Federal regulation descriptions  
48 of that boundary the same, is my understanding.

48

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions for  
Jerry.

00368

1 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

4

5 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
6 Jerry, is this longitude and latitude here, has been  
7 determined by who, the State, Federal government?

8

9 MR. BERG: I would have to defer that  
10 question to Glenn, might know better how those points  
11 were determined.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: If I remember right this  
14 expansion and stuff, I think it came out of one of the  
15 proposals out of a local resident from here in Huslia to  
16 redefine and possibly expand it and that that was again  
17 just to simplify finding all these coordinates on the  
18 map. And that's what I thought it was intended to do.

19

20 Glenn.

21

22 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
23 There's kind of been a little bit of history on this on  
24 how this evolved.

25

26 We wanted to clarify with those GPS  
27 coordinates that we have verified that those GPS  
28 coordinates match the point of deflection of each one of  
29 those points around the Controlled Use Area. And those  
30 came about as a proposal through the State system and  
31 some misread or some misunderstandings on where exactly  
32 those points were, in particular, it had to do with the  
33 forks on the Dakli River portion of it. And so we wanted  
34 to clarify that and we corrected that in the State  
35 language to make sure that those points were defined real  
36 well and defensible, I guess, in that regard.

37

38 I will say this, I think this is a pretty  
39 important issue other than just a simple housekeeping to  
40 say and to address the issue that you're concerned enough  
41 about this Controlled Use Area and the importance it has  
42 for management of hunters in the area. And I say that  
43 because there were several proposals submitted on the  
44 State side to either reduce or eliminate the Koyukuk  
45 Controlled Use Area as several others, and we came real  
46 close on the State side to having a substantial change in  
47 that based on one of the recommended proposals. And so I  
48 would certainly encourage this Council to make a strong  
49 statement that this is an issue of importance.

50

00369

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Glenn.

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: I, too, believe in your  
8 statement, but I've got a question for you. With the  
9 passage of State Proposal 193, doesn't that strengthen  
10 the Controlled Use Area or its boundaries, Proposal 193?

11

12 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It was  
13 suggested during the Board of Game deliberations when  
14 they were reviewing a single proposal that suggested that  
15 they shrink the Controlled Use Area down to a two mile  
16 corridor to follow the Controlled Use Area. Because we  
17 have limited hunters now, we have effectively limited  
18 them, that the drawing permit system is working for us  
19 now and we didn't need the Controlled Use Area anymore.

20

21 What I talked about at the Board is that  
22 if we wanted to -- first of all, if we wanted to make a  
23 change, it was brought out by David James at the meeting,  
24 that that would be an important issue to take before like  
25 a Koyukuk Moose Planning Meeting to make sure those  
26 weren't changed. I believe what would happen is what we  
27 see in many other areas, that even if we open up a large  
28 expanse of land and we eliminate that from the protection  
29 of the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, that a two mile  
30 corridor would essentially, you know, it's nice to think  
31 that with all that open land that an airborne hunter  
32 would go out into the middle of those unused areas right  
33 now, but what we know from looking at data on the Nowitna  
34 is just because all that country is available they won't  
35 go out into the areas where it's .3, .4 or .5 moose per  
36 square mile, those airborne hunters just as well like to  
37 hunt in the high density areas. And for instance areas  
38 like Three-Day Slough would have been available at the  
39 upper end to land on and that's one of the problems we're  
40 facing right now is concentration of hunters in these  
41 high density areas and it displaces our local hunters.

42

43 And so I don't think we have, at this  
44 point, the protection just in this drawing system to do  
45 that and I think what it would do is it would shift the  
46 priority that we talked about in the Moose Management  
47 Plan, where one of the things that we always wanted to  
48 try and achieve was maintaining the opportunity for some  
49 of that drawing permit hunt opportunity. You remember  
50 like the trophy-type hunt, and we went to great lengths

00370

1 to try and maintain for those people that opportunity,  
2 but during the planning process what we never talked  
3 about or what never became a priority amongst those  
4 discussions was that we would try and achieve or regain  
5 airborne opportunities in there. So I think that's a  
6 matter of priorities that we have already established and  
7 that we kind of need to follow through, and certainly if  
8 we moved away from there we would have to start thinking  
9 about going back to the plan, and how that affects the  
10 plan.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions for  
13 Glenn.

14

(No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Inter-Agency.

17

18 MR. BRELSFORD: We don't have any  
19 additional comments.

20

(Laughter)

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Sorry about that, thank  
23 you Taylor.

24

25 MR. BRELSFORD: I did it before you  
26 scolded me.

27

(Laughter)

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: I wasn't intending to.....

30

(Laughter)

31

32 MR. WALKER: Vince, you got to edit that  
33 out of there.

34

CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

35

(Laughter)

36

CHAIRMAN SAM: Public comments.

37

38 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, it was just  
39 the Local Advisory Committee Ruby, unanimously supported  
40 this proposal.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Regional Council  
43 deliberations.

44

00371

1 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

4

5 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I would like  
6 to endorse what Glenn was saying there. The Office of  
7 Subsistence Management and the Federal Board should  
8 understand that this Controlled Use Area has been in  
9 place for many, many years, it's a key note of the  
10 Koyukuk Plan on maintaining sustained yield parameters.  
11 I was very distressed at the Board meeting to see that  
12 they were trying to eliminate that and the success rates  
13 will go up with aircraft they could fly around, see the  
14 moose, they can land in places where those moose are off  
15 the river, especially if those warm falls when people are  
16 having a hard time getting moose locally, those airplanes  
17 are going to beat the tar out of them out there on the  
18 outer edge of the flats.

19

20 So I think that the Federal Board should  
21 know that we endorse this boundary description and that  
22 we also endorse the principle of the Controlled Use Area,  
23 that it stays within the current customary and  
24 traditional allocation for moose for ground base harvest  
25 by river boat.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, for your  
28 statement and clarification. I was wondering how to deal  
29 with Glenn's request on how to, not only maintain the  
30 Controlled Use Area but if we go ahead and adopt this  
31 latitude and longitude description.

32

33 I think that we should also go on record  
34 to keep it in place, is that what you were shooting at?

35

36 MR. REAKOFF: Right. Mr.  
37 Chairman, I would like to adopt this language and then  
38 have a cover letter submitted with this proposal to  
39 reiterate to the Federal Board that this is a very  
40 important management tool to maintain sustained yield  
41 harvest parameters and provide for subsistence users in  
42 the affected area.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is this clear and fine  
45 with the goal with the Council.

46

47 (Councils nods affirmatively)

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seeing no objections,  
50 would you see to that, Vince, that letter.

00372

1 MR. MATHEWS: (Nods affirmatively)

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further deliberations.

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'm glad that we got that  
8 on record in support of Glenn's request, and thank you,  
9 Jack. Because we've been using that Controlled Use Area  
10 as a management tool and I guess everyone's aware of  
11 that. So I'd like to thank all of you for bearing with  
12 us on that particular usage.

13

14 Any further deliberations.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, all those in favor  
19 of adopting Proposal 64 signify by saying aye.

20

21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

24

25 (No opposing votes)

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 64 passes. Do we  
28 have any more updates.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Alaska Board of Game  
33 proposals.

34

35 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I think  
36 that's been covered throughout the meeting. When we  
37 developed this agenda, quite some time ago we just wanted  
38 to have a slot in there unless Glenn and Randy have some  
39 other updates that they want to provide you. My  
40 understanding is, is we've covered all the ones that  
41 relate to issues that are before you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Glenn, I would  
44 like to see what else they're coming out with.

45

46 MR. STOUT: Thanks, Mr. Chair. It's  
47 really late and I had a list of like 20 proposals that  
48 were passed and if you want me to go through them real  
49 quick, I can read them real quick and just let you know  
50 as far as what happened to the Galena Management Area

00373

1 proposals, is that what you wanted to do? I could  
2 probably do it pretty quick.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: I think I would like to  
5 know, too, because I know they did take some actions on  
6 quite a few of those.

7

8 (Pause)

9

10 MR. STOUT: Okay. First of all I wanted  
11 to let you know we had a request from that last Moose  
12 Management Meeting that we go to the Board and request  
13 from the Board that they direct the Department to develop  
14 a predator control implementation plan for the Koyukuk  
15 River Drainage. We did go to the Board with that  
16 request, they reviewed it and they declined to direct the  
17 Department to do that predator control implementation  
18 plan.

19

20 We talked about 193, everybody knows that  
21 that was adopted.

22

23 There was a proposal to lengthen moose  
24 seasons in Unit 21(A) and 21(B), that proposal failed.

25

26 There was a proposal to implement antler  
27 restrictions in 21(B) and this is basically, it was an  
28 alternative based on Proposal 193 so they failed to  
29 implement those antler regulations, which was a concern  
30 from a lot of people.

31

32 They failed the Proposal 191 to close  
33 non-resident moose seasons in Nowitna River Drainage  
34 portion of 21(B).

35

36 There was the proposal to modify the  
37 brow-tine restrictions here in Unit 24, that proposal was  
38 also failed.

39

40 Proposal 194 to shorten and implement  
41 antler restrictions on 21(C) passed, but it was amended.  
42 They didn't shorten the seasons for that non-resident  
43 season but they did implement antler restrictions for  
44 non-residents.

45

46 Proposal 197, they took no action on to  
47 shorten the seasons based on the previous proposal.

48

49 Proposal 201, to modify the winter moose  
50 hunts in 21(D) and 24, we've talked about this quite a

00374

1 bit, this was the one to shift to the February and March  
2 seasons to December and they adopted that proposal.

3

4 They reauthorized the cow moose hunts  
5 that we still have on the books for the fall seasons with  
6 the understanding that we will be closing those by  
7 emergency order like we've done in the past.

8

9 196 was a proposal to allocate drawing  
10 permits within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area and what  
11 the Board did was they amended and adopted that proposal.  
12 It is just for the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area but what  
13 that will do is it will allocate 50 percent of the  
14 drawing permits to guides in those areas. Because this  
15 wouldn't affect this coming season, the Department has a  
16 little bit of time to work on some of the language, but  
17 the directed the Department to come to them at the next  
18 Board of Game meeting next year, and, out of cycle, they  
19 would adopt any additional language that needed to clear  
20 that up to make that a workable proposal.

21

22 There's a proposal to limit Koyukuk moose  
23 drawing permit applicants to one year, that failed.

24

25 A proposal to prohibit proxy hunting on  
26 the drawing permit, and they failed that proposal.

27

28 There was a Proposal 174 to eliminate the  
29 Haul Road drawing permit, that failed, we still have that  
30 drawing permit on the Haul Road.

31

32 Proposal 185, to establish a brown bear  
33 drawing permit on the Haul Road, that also failed, so we  
34 don't have that drawing permit.

35

36 There was a Department proposal to close  
37 the Galena Mountain Herd caribou seasons, the fall  
38 seasons in 21, and they adopted that proposal. The only  
39 thing we have now, for instance, in that area north of  
40 Galena and south of the Koyukuk River is winter season to  
41 be announced only if the Western Arctic Herd shows up  
42 there in substantial numbers.

43

44 They reviewed Proposal 199 to eliminate  
45 brown bear tag fees for 21(B), (C) and (D), they adopted  
46 that proposal. So in those areas we no longer have  
47 resident brown bear tag fees.

48

49 They deferred three proposals and I  
50 haven't heard yet, but it was all these bear proposals

00375

1 and how they tied into that Brown Bear Management Policy  
2 that the Department was working on, and I haven't heard  
3 on those three at last time I talked to them.

4

5                   There was a proposal in Unit 24 to  
6 lengthen the wolf hunting season, that proposal failed.

7

8                   There was the proposals that we talked  
9 about already, to extend the beaver and muskrat seasons,  
10 both those proposals failed.

11

12                   There was a proposal to eliminate the  
13 meat on the bone regulation in Unit 21(C) and that  
14 proposal failed, we still have that in there and we were  
15 glad to see that.

16

17                   And that's all the proposals that we  
18 talked about for the Galena area.

19

20                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Thanks for that update,  
21 Glenn. And, again, I would like to thank all the Staff  
22 here, too, for bearing with us, I know that we're  
23 compressing our time and some of your comments, too.  
24 It's not really what we want to do but we do want to get  
25 through our agenda. And if I read the agenda right, we  
26 are looking at a 2:00 p.m., adjournment tomorrow. I  
27 think that we should be able to get through what we've  
28 got there if just call a lot of our agenda items  
29 information, then we should be able to get through it  
30 tomorrow.

31

32                   We'll start up at 8:00 o'clock, 8:30 in  
33 the morning. And, again, before we go, I'd like to  
34 express my thanks to John Sam, Fred Bifelt and who was  
35 the other one that worked on this Proposal 193, that took  
36 a lot of work under our.....

37

38                   MR. STICKMAN: Tom Huntington.

39

40                   CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, Tom Huntington --  
41 out of our agenda work session here.

42

43                   Thank you all for participating, the  
44 local people here and we'll recess until 8:30.

45

46

(PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

00376

1

C E R T I F I C A T E

2

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )

4 )ss.

5 STATE OF ALASKA )

6

7 I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for  
8 the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix  
9 Court Reporters, LLC do hereby certify:

10

11 THAT the foregoing pages numbered 137 through 375  
12 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the  
13 WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY  
14 COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II taken electronically by Salena  
15 Hile on the 10th day of March 2004, beginning at the hour  
16 of 8:30 o'clock a.m. at Huslia, Alaska;

17

18 THAT the transcript is a true and correct  
19 transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter  
20 transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to  
21 the best of our knowledge and ability;

22

23 THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party  
24 interested in any way in this action.

25

26 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 28th day of  
27 March 2004.

28

29

30

31

32

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph P. Kolasinski  
Notary Public in and for Alaska  
My Commission Expires: 03/12/2008 \_

33

34