

WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL
ADVISORY COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING
ANIAK COMMUNITY HALL
ANIAK, ALASKA

October 10, 1995, 7:00 P.M.
Pages 1 - 50, Inclusive

BOARD MEMBERS

RAYMOND COLLINS
HENRY DEACON
POLLOCK SIMON, SR.
HERMAN MORGAN
JACK REAKOFF
ANGELA DEMIENTIEFF

REPORTED BY: Joy S. Brauer, RMR-CRR
Registered Merit-Certified Realtime Reporter

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. COLLINS: Call the meeting to order at 6:58 is the time I've got. Make it 7, round it off to 7 p.m., and I'll ask Vince to call the role.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Collins is the vice chair, and let me find my roster here real quick. Okay, Harold Huntington is absent, Ray Collins.

MR. COLLINS: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Angela Demientieff.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Pollock Simon, Sr.

MR. SIMON: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Henry Deacon.

MR. DEACON: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Herman Morgan.

MR. MORGAN: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Jack Reakoff.

MR. REAKOFF: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Phillip Graham is absent, and I need to explain why Gail Vanderpool is here. Real quickly, Phillip Graham was the other representative. He resigned due to a conflict with his job, so the slot was vacant. During the nomination process, we had a list of alternatives -- alternates, excuse me, and Gail is one of those alternates, so we brought her in as a volunteer. She cannot vote tonight but just in case she does get appointed, she gets an idea of how the meeting is, because at this meeting you guys discuss issues that you're going to take recommendations and actions on at the next meeting. So I kind of worked to get her here. So she will possibly be appointed. She'll be up to speed for the next meeting. So Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.

MR. COLLINS: We have six members present. The first thing on the agenda is work session and again I'll turn to Vince to explain this.

MR. MATHEWS: I'm a little nervous. There's two things going on. One is that the public, I don't want to -- the council doesn't want to leave you out, I don't want to leave you out, but my back is to you and that doesn't mean anything.

The other thing I need to tell the council, some of the council members know this, this past summer, I had neck surgery.

As the evening progresses, my neck will get stiffer. I'm not getting "stiff-necked" to you, my neck is. I'm not being rude, but it could be perceived that I'm being rude and that's not my point and I want to make that clear to everybody on that. So we may move you around.

The other thing which I will accept responsibility for on the agenda, there's no place in there that says "public testimony". Unless Ray feels different, which I kind of doubt, the standard has been to allow public testimony any time that it's appropriate, and the Chair just has to recognize it and let it happen. So I apologize there's no set time here that if we want to target your time to come and testify, that's not on here and if you want to stay throughout, you can stay at any time. So you need to -- I know I talked to some of you today. You need to get Ray's attention, not my attention, to get recognized on that.

Mr. Chairman, I know we were going to go to wildlife management, but there's another thing that has come up that I need to

address, if that's okay with you. The reason we're stumbling a little bit tonight is we have some people that didn't arrive, we have staff that was supposed to attend and due to illnesses in their family, did not. So I'll be getting these little sheets of paper that I'll have to pick up on, and I apologize for that, but if we all communicate your concerns, I think we can handle it.

I'll just bring this up to get it out of the way.

MR. COLLINS: We had the roll call but I don't think we introduced the staff here. Maybe we should do that, for the record.

MR. MATHEWS: May I recommend that the council members introduce themselves and then we'll go to staff, if that's okay. And where the council members are from, because the public here may not know where different people are from.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. I'll start. We can go around this way and keep going right around that way.

Ray Collins, I'm representative from the McGrath area and I'm the vice chairman on the council.

MR. DEACON: Henry Deacon from Grayling.

MR. SIMON: Pollock Simon, Sr. I'm representative from Allakaket.

MR. MORGAN: Herman Morgan from Aniak.

MR. REAKOFF: Jack Reakoff from Wiseman.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Angela Demientieff from Holy Cross and St. Mary and I'm happy to see some here from Holy Cross here this evening.

MS. VANDERPOOL: I'm Gail Vanderpool from Red Devil.

PETE DeMATTEO: I'm Pete DeMatteo with the Fish & Wildlife Service, Koyukuk Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge, based out of Galena.

PERRY GRISSOM: I'm Perry Grissom, U.S. Fish & Wildlife, Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge, representing the community of Fairbanks.

ED MALLEK: I'm Ed Mallek from Fish & Wildlife Service out of McGrath, Innoko.

JEFF DENTON: Jeff Denton with the Anchorage District Bureau of Land Management.

DAVE YOKEL: Dave Yokel with the BLM Fairbanks.

CONRAD GUENTHER: I'm Conrad Guenther. I'm with Fish & Wildlife Service I'm a subsistence biologist for the Western Interior, this region.

MR. MATHEWS: I'm Vince Mathews, the regional coordinator for Western Interior and Eastern Interior, and there's other staff here, too, that may want to identify themselves.

STEVE ULVI: Steve Ulvi with Gates of the Arctic National Park out of Fairbanks.

PAUL HUNTER: I'm Paul Hunter with the National Park Service support office in Anchorage.

MR. MATHEWS: Maybe the public would like to introduce themselves?

MR. COLLINS: Would the public like to identify themselves? Go ahead, Frank, start with you.

FRANK TURNER: Thanks, Ray. Frank Turner. I'm Holy Cross Traditional Council and a member of the Tanana Chief board for the Lower Yukon subregion.

MARY TURNER: Mary Jo Turner, Holy Cross.

ANGIE MORGAN: Angie Morgan, KNH National Resources.

CARL MORGAN: Carl Morgan, chairman of the KNH subsistence committee.

GREG ROCZICKA: I'm Greg Roczicka. I work for the Association of Unit Council Presence.

DEBBIE LEE: Debbie Lee and I'm with Natural Resource for OMC in Bethel.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: Robert Hoffman with native council.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, the one thing I failed to mention is Katherine has a sign-in, Katherine didn't introduce herself.

MS. BURSE: Katherine Burse, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

MR. MATHEWS: There'll be a sign-in sheet. Please sign in when it's convenient for you there.

The one with the other one, this is the Federal Subsistence Board, Chairman Mitch Demientieff has some introductory comments for the council, and I'll just read them to start off this cycle. This is his comments.

I'd like to welcome you to the fall 1995 Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meetings. These fall meetings mark the beginning of a new cycle of decision making for the next set of annual subsistence regulations. These meetings are symbolic of the roll of regional councils and the federal subsistence management.

They are a starting point from which the next year's subsistence regulations are produced and are intended to ensure that subsistence users' needs are well accommodated in subsistence regulations. This is the fall set of regional council meetings. It's meant to serve as a kick-off of the annual regulatory process. The regional councils, themselves, are meant to serve as a foundation for subsistence users' involvement in subsistence management.

The regional councils are the critical link between subsistence users and federal subsistence boards. The members of the council all have direct, firsthand experience with subsistence and they are leaders in their communities. Collectively, they provide the board with unparalleled insight into the needs of subsistence users statewide, and by statute, their recommendations carry a great deal of weight in the subsistence decision making.

This begins the third full year the regional councils have been in operation. During the evolution of subsistence management during these three years, we've made great strides in structuring subsistence management to accommodate subsistence users' customary and traditional practices in a manner consistent with maintaining healthy wildlife and fish populations. We could not have made such progress without the involvement of the regional councils.

Without a doubt, such progress has not been without its share of frustration, in both federal and the regional council arenas. However, change is sometimes difficult, particularly when it involves such a complex issue with so many players.

I believe it is the credit -- to the credit of all involved that the program that we now have has so many new and often quite substantial innovations to accommodate subsistence users. For example, largely as a result of the regional council initiative and willingness to work cooperatively with federal staff, subsistence users now have available to them designated hunter harvest permitting, community harvest limits and seasons, harvest limits, methods and means that accommodate customary and traditional

practices, to name a few.

That is not to say that we are content to rest on our laurels. We are still faced with issues to be resolved and more issues will undoubtedly arise in the future. In fact, some of these issues are on your agenda for this meeting. The federal subsistence management program is on the leading edge of resource management that is cooperative and responsive, and with the continued high quality of the involvement of the regional councils, will continue to do so.

I wish you the best of luck at this meeting and I and the other board members look forward to seeing your proposals and recommendations.

From Mitch Demientieff, earlier in September.

MR. COLLINS: And Mitch is Chair of the --

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Demientieff was appointed by the Secretary of Interior to serve as the chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board and he has completed one year in that capacity. And as long as there's a pause here, the other members of the board are from Fish & Wildlife Service, Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service and U.S. Fish & Wildlife. Generally, those are the directors of those various agencies that serve on the board. So there's six members on the board.

Periodically, I'll do this, because Gail will possibly be a new member, and for the public, so it's clear who is on the board and how the process works.

MR. COLLINS: Now, what do you want to do in the work session?

MR. MATHEWS: On the work session, what we're trying to do on this is that as you realize, there are two meetings. You have what's called the fall meeting, the one we're in now, then you have a late winter meeting. The late winter meeting are the deals where you have exact proposals in front of you, you vote them up or down or take some kind of action. The fall meeting is to take issues, hear concerns, generate proposals, and go back with it. The fall meeting, we're trying to make it, with your concurrence, to make it more of a management planning meeting where we would have a round table like this, a discussion about issues and an understanding of what's -- I don't know how many biologists we have here, five or six, what do they use to understand the issues that you bring up and then what do you use to understand and to provide information to them, what are the issues and that.

So we're trying to make this a bridging point and a planning time, and this is step one, a very preliminary step where Conrad and other biologists may assist to go through some of the basic terminology. So I'll turn it over to Conrad. It's very preliminary. We'll be going further with this down the road if the council agrees with it.

CONRAD GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, what we'd like to do at a session like this, since the meeting has already started, just suspend Roberts Rules of Order so we can open discussion from anybody from the audience, council members, whatever, regarding this, and from any other biologists or management people here.

Like Vince was saying, we've talked about this for a couple of years now. There are a lot of terms that are used in the biological analysis and also in the social scientific analysis. I'm primarily concerned, of course, with the biology. There are a lot of terms that may not be familiar with people or that people have

misunderstanding on, so that when the analyses show up and we present the information we have on the biology, so that everybody has a common understanding of what we're talking about, we would like to start having about half hour sessions and it would really be nice if we could do it every time we meet, where we go over different aspects and talk about different areas of biology.

This time what I have is just a real short list, actually, of some of the common terms that we use, and there's blue sheets over there that have -- are the same terms, if the people from the audience would like to get those. These are some of the terms that all of the biologists in the regional office that are doing analysis sat down and we came up with this list and these are terms we use frequently that show up in our analyses and we thought they were important ones that everybody should have a common understanding of.

What I'd like to do, go down through the list of terms and just go over the definitions. If you have questions, jump in and ask the questions at any time. And we're figuring this will take about a half hour.

Now, if you have the blue sheets, there are a couple of spelling errors on the blue sheets, and I'll mention those as we get to them, so you might want to make the change when we get there.

MR. COLLINS: As Conrad mentioned, if you have questions, just direct them to him. Don't have to go through the Chair now. This will just be discussion.

CONRAD GUENTHER: The first three particularly dealing with moose and caribou are bull:cow ratios. Basically what this is is number of adult bulls per 100 cows. And you know, if you've got questions about the significance of some of these, we can get into that, but at this point, what I'd kind of like to do is if there's certain things that particularly are of interest to you, ask them, but we're hoping that in the next session we have at the next meeting we'll start talking about particular species, and for this region, probably the first that we'll be talking about, moose will be the first and caribou will be the second, and then we'll talk about some of the other species, maybe grizzlies or black bear, and I'd like some input from you as to which species you feel are most important, then we'll go over biology of each one, talk about the specific -- specifically for example the bull:cow ratios, why they're important and what is really a good bull:cow ratio for a particular specie.

With calf:cow ratios, this is an indication of the number of calves per hundred cows and what it does, it gives us, if done in the spring, gives us idea of birth rate. If it's done in the fall, it gives us an idea of summer survival rates of calves. If we do spring and fall, we've got an idea of how many calves we're losing over the summer.

Carrying capacity, basically carrying capacity is the number of animals that any particular area can carry. In other words, how many can it support. You can only have a certain number of moose, because you've only got so much grounds. So when you look at carrying capacity, we're looking at what's the most animals that we could put into that area.

A census, it's evaluation of the number of individuals, and for it to be of any true value, it has to be done several times, hopefully at the same time of year under the same conditions, so we get an idea of changes in populations and

populations of growing or decreasing.

Estrous is the period of sexual heat in female animals. It's the time she's receptive. She's ovulating, the time in which she gets pregnant.

Fecundity, this was spelled wrong. F-E-C-U-N-D-I-T-Y.

Think it was a Freudian slip putting "fun" into it. Technically, it's actually the reproductive capacity of a particular female. And it actually refers to the time that fertilization occurs, even though commonly biologists are usually talking about management relative to the production of offspring in the spring, we're talking about a deferred function, but in real technical terms, it's actually animals becoming pregnant at the time they ovulate.

Fecundity rate is the frequency of births in particular populations.

Furbearers, the reason we put that term in is sometimes there's some confusion since the state has fur animals and furbearers. Furbearers are things like beaver, coyote, arctic fox, red fox, lynx, marten, and you can read through the list yourself, and basically, these are animals that are trapped specifically for their pelt. Under state regulations, it's a classification of animals taken when they're trapped.

Again, if you have any questions at all, please ask.

Gestation period is the length of time from the point at which conception occurs to the time of birth, and generally, it's a fixed period of time, within a couple of days. When we talk about caribou, we see caribou are some of the animals that can have a fair variation of gestation period, how long it is to when a cow actually is fertilized, becomes pregnant, and when she has her calves is related to the quality and the amount of food she gets during the winter. So we can actually see shifts in birth dates relative to what the quality of winter has been at that time. So it's a good indication when we start seeing what the changes in winter have been at that time.

The next term, habitat -- something happened when this ran through the computer, put the definition on a separate page by itself. Basically it's just the area the animal lives in. Habitat management refers to a strategy to control wildlife populations indirectly by changing the habitat, itself.

Herbivores are animals that rely on plants for the primary source of food.

Herd composition is the makeup of a population of ungulates and ungulates are hoofed animals and the composition is based on the percentages or ratios of bulls to cows and calves to cows that make up the population. If we had money so that we could do really in-depth surveys, in some cases had the technology, we would look at herd composition as age classes of animals. If we knew whether we had one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten year old cows and bulls in the population, we'd even have a better idea of what the population was like and we'd know how various changes that occur in a bad winter, hunting pressure, and number of other things, we could have a better idea exactly how we could affect that population.

Limiting factors -- a limiting factor is really any environmental factor at all that controls the maximum number of animals in a population or in a particular area. For example, if some animal can't deal with extremely cold weather, then cold weather

would be a limiting factor and when it got below a certain point, the animals couldn't exist in that area.

Other limiting factors could be the certain types of stress. If there's nothing for moose to eat, they certainly can't be there. Becomes a more subtle thing where we have certain preferences for certain types of things, you know, amount of those available may be a limiting factor, but it's the particular item in the environment that stops the population from growing.

Management is strategy to regulate and control populations. It could be a lot of different ways we could manipulate populations. Even human harvest could be a management strategy to change the population.

Mortality rates relates to the frequency of deaths in the population, or death rate.

Parasites, parasites is an organism that relies on another organism for its life, one species that relies on another species. Generally, we don't refer to things like wolves as parasites. We refer to things that actually live on or inside of the animal as parasites. Worms or certain insects that live on the hides of animals, there are a number of things that could be parasites on animals that way. Generally, parasites don't kill animals, but they may weaken them so they would be more vulnerable to other things that would damage them.

A population is a group of organisms. Population density refers to the number of animals found in a particular area, and frequently here in Alaska we talk about the number of animals per square mile or the number of animals per square kilometer. For example, we have in some areas an extremely high moose density, maybe six or seven moose per square mile. Have other areas where we have low densities, on the Yukon Flats, for example, in Unit 25, I believe it is, we have moose densities as low as .1 moose per square mile. In other words, there's only on average one moose every ten square miles. So that would be a low density population for moose.

Population modeling, it's a way that biologists can take as many factors as we understand, and using those factors, we can come up with a mathematical model of what will happen with a population. For example, real simple model might be if you've got a bull moose and a cow moose and we assume that because of good conditions that cow is going to produce two calves. She hasn't produced the calves yet, but we can make the assumption by this simple model that one cow and one bull, if they're both healthy animals and the environment's in good condition, that they'll produce two calves. So our model in that case would say that next spring, we would have four moose in that population, a bull, a cow, and two calves.

Modeling becomes much more complex than that. Give you an idea, the caribou model that the state has uses over 30 different factors in that model. A really good model can predict using weather patterns, changes in habitat that are also predictable, hunting pressure and a number of other factors, they can predict how big a population will be in five years, ten years or some models have even been projected as far as a hundred years, assuming things don't change. The best thing about a model is now we can say, okay, what if we get a really bad winter, how is that going to affect this. We can run our model with a bad winter and say this is what the moose population is going to be like if we go through one really bad

winter. If we go through a good winter, here's what it's going to be like. If we go through a high harvest or low harvest, all of those things can be focused in the models, and we start to have a little bit of insight into what the future's going to be and it helps us to look at if a population is such and such and other conditions are a certain way, we look at possibly how many animals can we harvest out of this population without it having a negative impact on the population next year or in five years from now. So we try to second-guess the future with as much knowledge as we have, and just try to do a better job of managing the population, managing hunting seasons, managing a number of other things.

Population size, that's pretty obvious. It's just the number of animals, the total number in a population.

Predation, it's an interaction between two species and sometimes it's very obvious like wolves eating moose. Sometimes it's not quite as obvious as that. It may be a very indirect predation. Basically talking about a predator is an animal that actually goes out, catches an animal, kills it and consumes it. We're not talking about an animal such as a fox feeding on a moose that some other animal has killed or the moose has died from something else.

The range of an animal refers to the area that an animal can exist in. In other words, if all of the factors are right, the environment is right, the food is there, the weather is appropriate for that particular animal, the animal will fill up that area that has the right conditions for it and that becomes the range of the animal.

The term rut, and again there's a correction that you need to make on the blue sheet, the rut refers to the period of sexual heat in the male ungulates, in male hoofed animals. In other types of animals, we don't refer to the period that the male is in breeding condition as the rut.

Species management specifically is a strategy to manage a particular kind of animal. A species is a particular animal, a particular group of animals. Basically, from a technical aspect, the species is defined by what animals that can breed with another animal, talking about wild populations.

A stable population, you'll notice in our analysis lots of times we'll talk about a stable population as opposed to an increase or a declining population. Basically it's a population that over some period of time -- hopefully we're looking at periods of time three, five or ten year periods, the longer the period actually the better -- in which the rate of deaths and the rate of birth are equal so that we have a population that doesn't get larger or smaller, pretty much stays the same. It's at an equilibrium.

Surveys are an activity which we go out and look for trends, subtle changes in the population. We also in cases, some cases we count the number of animals specifically, other times we just take sample areas and sample certain areas to give us an idea of what's happening in that population, the population going up or down or what sort of changes are taking place.

Sustaining yield, this is a state standard for management, it's the level at which you can continue to harvest a population without causing the population to go down.

Trend surveys are a type of survey, again, that indicate whether a population -- it's a specific type of survey that indicates, that's looking for increases or decrease in the

populations and over a longer period of time. In other words, is the population growing, is it getting smaller, is it staying the same, and then hopefully we can adjust management relative to that.

The unfortunate part about trend surveys and all surveys and censuses is that they're relatively expensive. We're depending on weather condition, timing and also our technology, and so even though they're good tools, they're not absolutes, so they just give us indications of what's happening in the populations.

And again, ungulates, like I mentioned before, is any hoofed animal.

This is a really abbreviated list. We have a list now that we've continued to think about since we developed this list, and we have a list that's about almost four times as long, of things that we use fairly frequently and some of the most frequent terms we use we missed when we put this first list together.

What I hope to do is whether we have another session at the next meeting or not, I hope to be able to give you updated lists on the common terms that we use to look at our analysis. You can look through the list and get a better idea of what we're talking about.

If any of the biologists have any comments they want to make relative to any of the terms, they feel there may be a correction or adjustment to be made on these, I look forward to that.

Any of the council members have any comments or any questions, I'd be happy to answer those.

MR. COLLINS: I had a question. On the census, population trends, all of that, it's usually based on sampling, it's very seldom you actually go count all the animals in an area?

CONRAD GUENTHER: Right.

MR. COLLINS: And then you project that? You want to explain a little bit? When somebody reads that, they say there's so many moose, so many caribou, it's not an actual census.

CONRAD GUENTHER: No, census basically give us an index. There are some censuses we actually count every animal, try to count every animal. Some of the caribou surveys we do, they go out, actually fly the herds and photograph the animals so they get a relatively accurate count of actual numbers, but even in those we have caribou that are off in a side valley or just don't happen to be where they fly, and so they're even -- they have a thing they can count to 20,000 animals in a particular caribou herd. That count is actually plus or minus. It could be several thousand animals. It depends on the terrain. If it's very open country, it's flat country, you can see, there's a lot of factors.

Frequently when people do census, they have a pretty good idea of what percentage of the population they may have hit, particularly if they've been in an area a long time and they've worked the area a lot and so they've got a pretty good idea, plus or minus, how many animals are in that group.

Things like moose that tend to be in more difficult areas to count because they're usually in trees, areas that have trees, with the exception of some of the high valleys where you just have high willows, generally in situations like that, there's a few different strategies that are used. In some cases -- let me back off on the moose and in situations where you have large areas or areas where you can't necessarily see every animal, there's a number of different strategies that are used. In some of them, they're

transects where they actually draw lines on a map and they fly those lines and they count the number of animals they see along those lines. Then they come up with a number that they multiply that by to get an idea for the whole area. Some cases it's very difficult to do that, so they don't even try to come up with a total number for the area, it's just like fly the same lines every year, hopefully with the same snow conditions and the same light conditions, and get the count every year and they count a hundred moose in a series of transects and the next year they may count a hundred again, the next year they may count 85, the next year they count a hundred and five, the next a hundred and ten, then they may count a hundred. In a situation like that, you would probably assume that since the population stayed around a hundred, that it was a relatively stable population. If one year they counted a hundred and next year a hundred and then they counted 85 and then they counted 80 and then 75 and then they counted 85, it would give them an indication that something was happening to that population. It was probably declining. The opposite would be true if the numbers got higher.

So the best we can do is really just come up with an idea of changes in populations. With caribou calf count, lots of times, particularly the smaller caribou herds, caribou are calving generally relatively in open areas. You can fly the areas, and if you're familiar with the herd, you've done fall surveys and survey maybe during the winter, you have a pretty good idea of the total population, and about how many cows should be in that population. So flying in the calving grounds and counting the number of calves and also the number of cows and come up with a ratio of calves to cows, now the biologist can look at it and say, well, we saw 4,000 cows out there that are counted. We think that there are probably about 8,000 cows in the herd or 12,000 cows in the herd. We saw so many calves.

Let's say they saw about half of the cows in the herd. Now the number of calves that they counted in that herd with those cows, say you have -- it was right in the peak of calving and you have about 60 calves per hundred cows. Now they can say that the expansion of that, what that would tell them about that number of calves, because there should be about twice that many cows.

So it gives you an idea of how many calves should be going into that summer and then what the productivity of the herd would be and whether the herd can increase with that number of calves or whether it will stay the same. Starts giving us ideas of what happens in that herd.

Another strategy for counting is to have specific small areas designated on the map. Then you start doing intensive flying back and forth over those areas and count every moose in that area. There's a number of different strategies that you do that, where you rate areas of high densities and low densities and populations get very highly complicated in some of the strategies, but by doing this, gives us a very good idea of what the total moose population might be in an area.

When we talk about moose at a future meeting, I'll give you the detail on exactly how they do this, but kind of gives you an idea of where they go.

MR. MORGAN: Conrad, since you're defining terms, can you define the term intensive management?

CONRAD GUENTHER: It's a state term and really I can't define it exactly the way it's written in the law. I need it

in front of me to look at it. Basically, intensive management is you're talking about the state's laws that they just passed where they're saying that you have to provide the absolute maximum number of animals possible for hunters to take. And under the worst case scenario with intensive management -- and that's my personal opinion, worst case scenario -- the management level for harvest by hundreds would be so high that it would not even allow for natural losses, natural mortality of animals. In that case, you could not have any predators at all, you could not have any eagles -- for example with fish, you could not have any eagles, you cannot have any wolves, you could not have any wolverine. They take a caribou calf once in a while. You could not have any predators taking any caribou calves because you would not have enough caribou calves allowed for hunters to harvest at the rate they're supposed to harvest, as I understand one of the laws that was in the process. But it's management of a maximum harvest by hunters, period.

MR. MATHEWS: Conrad, on that and Herman, tomorrow, unless he walked in and I didn't see him, the area biologist, Jack Whitman, will be here. We talked in your office, and hopefully he'll be prepared more on the intensive management. As your coordinator, I need to advise you that intensive management law only applies to state lands. You can still comment in that area but the jurisdiction is on federal regulations.

MR. MORGAN: I thought one definition was controlling the multiple predators that are preditoring on moose, like I thought that was one aspect of it.

CONRAD GUENTHER: That is one aspect of it, would absolutely say, sure, you would have to limit the number of predators on any animals and of course in the situation like that, that could be very damaging to the rest of the ecosystem because a predator is an important part of the ecosystem.

MR. MORGAN: If you get too many, you got to have some kind of balance.

CONRAD GUENTHER: Yeah, of course. But as Vince was saying, intensive management under federal law is absolutely cannot do what would be considered intensive management because our mandates do not allow us to do that sort of management, and it's totally outside the purview of the Federal Subsistence Board and the Federal Subsistence Board has made a statement on the record at the April 1993 board meeting that management of any species, specifically for the benefit of another species, was not within their jurisdiction, and that was not considered subsistence under federal law. You cannot specifically reduce any particular species for the benefit of any other species, whether it's beaver to increase white fish or wolves to increase some other population. That was a ruling by the Federal Subsistence Board, and that's pretty close to a quote.

MR. MATHEWS: Both Herman and Conrad on that, I know we're into an issue that's later on the agenda. May be better at that time to discuss it, if that's okay with Herman and Conrad, and the other thing is that Conrad's not intending, by going through this, the definitions, that you guys are going to become biologists. What we're trying to do now is show the terminology that he's following, that does not mean if he brings up or any of the other biologists brings up carrying capacity, looking over his shoulder or whatever, you are charged to stop and ask them what do they mean by that. We're not asking you to become biologists.

What we need now, not at this meeting but if it's available, fine, we need the dialogue in the other direction. The other direction is what is the customary, traditional use for the different areas. What in the past or present type of customary, traditional management that's going on. We need to go in two directions.

As he pointed out with the surveys, they give you an indication, you on this council, the public that's present here and the subsistence users in general, spend I'm pretty sure on this, a lot more time than the biologists do on the ground. So we need the dialogue in two directions. I realize the problem has been in front of you, has been proposals. We're trying in the fall meetings, and sounds like also in the other meetings, to make it where you don't have to have a proposal in front of you where you have to say no to him and yes to them on the proposal, where you can discuss the issue that both of them are interested in, short of saying, yes, no. And then maybe when we have these discussions between two interest groups, we can find out that there's an alternative way.

When we go to a proposal, which is good to go to, we are now pitting them against them and then the board has to step in.

So we're going to try other tools and these are terms that are being used loosely, and loosely by myself. We can define it as a council.

There's cooperative agreements, there's cooperative management, there's co-management. There's other avenues that could be pursued.

What does that mean for you? If we follow this dialogue, that means when you meet, you're only going to have really when you meet for the spring meeting those proposals that could not be resolved by other manners. Now, this is going to take five or six years to do this. I understand that, but what I'm saying is that we need to use your time to the maximum and your time to the maximum would be planning and for these issues that cannot be resolved short of proposals, so we don't end up dealing with proposals that could be resolved by the refuge manager or resolved by the park superintendent or by some other means, and that will save everybody's time.

So that's kind of where we're going with this. We need to get the dialogue back from the council. Each of you represent an area. We need your assistance and that could mean that you would say you need to contact so and so or you need to work through such and such an organization, or we need to explore -- I mean, I have a bunch of ideas that I got today and other months. I mentioned to you an earlier meeting about a friendship program, et cetera. We need to explore that. We realize there's only one of you per area that's many, many, many square miles. Challenge me, challenge your team, challenge all the others to help you get that information in. The worst case is to have a decision go through that makes people living out there angry at you and at everyone else, and then we have to go back again and correct it. And that to me is a real waste of your time and a lot of resources.

So we're going to try through the fall meetings, and other ways, to do that and we have to take the time to set that up, but with your leadership and your input, we can now have -- we do have present the different entities, different organizations, but we could all be sitting together and discussing, well, bring up a topic that's later on the agenda, moose on the Nowitna River, and we could be dialoguing instead of up or down on the issue. Or we could be discussing the issues between Upper River, Lower River on the

Kuskokwim and we could have representatives here from the other regional council or other entities. I know we have people here from Bethel, but I think if we could use this forum to do that, there still will be proposals, there'll still be disagreements, but maybe we can get those that can be resolved also.

I'll get off the soap box, but that's what I hope we can do with this, and I think the resources are there. I think you have the power to go in that direction. It's your decision in the next few meetings. Decide if you want to go that way or if you just want to go with the way that you just get proposals in front of you and then you decide yea or nay on them. But what I hear from you individually is, is that you guys want to work things out in your areas and to the best benefit of your area, but also for the resource themselves. And we'll try that and the other biologists, and I know Tanana Chiefs has been talking about cooperative management. I have not talked with AVCP. I believe they have pursued -- I know they have pursued it in different areas, so I'm not just talking on the federal government, and it's obvious at most of the meetings you have usually the area biologists and other Fish & Game people attending. So the players are present. We just have to make it, make the difference.

GEORGE YASKA: Conrad, who's acting chairman here today?

MR. MATHEWS: We have the vice Chair. Harold is not here.

GEORGE YASKA: I'm George Yaska, Tanana Chiefs Conference. I ran into Tim Osborne at the airport, asked me to give this to Jack Whitman. I didn't hear what you said about Jack Whitman. Is he coming in or not?

CONRAD GUENTHER: He should be here tomorrow.

GEORGE YASKA: And also the other report on the jurisdiction later on in the meeting, the navigable waters by this board or the Federal Subsistence Board --

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, I have a very preliminary thing on the -- he's talking about a later agenda item, whether it is, brief update on navigable waters and fishing management and the petition, and on some of those, if Gordon's here, Gordon's with Tanana Chiefs, he maybe closer on some of the issues than I am.

We'll be sharing information on that, but that is on the agenda later as the jurisdiction of this program, as far as waters and beyond federal public lands, and that's something you'll hear us stumble on for public and staff. You'll hear us say public lands, then federal public lands. When we're talking public lands, we're talking only federal lands. If we fail to make that clear to you, remind us.

Essentially, the conservation units and BLM lands, Bureau of Land Management lands are covered under this program. The native corporation lands are under the state program. Viable lands under the state program and state lands are under the state program.

A lot of you know that, but just confusing the way those boundaries are at times.

GREG ROCZICKA: I had actually a question for Guenther but what you just mentioned, the federal jurisdiction does apply if the lands are not yet conveyed fairly well, but anyway, that's for later discussion.

You were talking about bull:cow ratios when you first

started out and I wondered, is there a commonly accepted number or generally used number for your maximum yield in the, say, moose and caribou population, since they're kind of the main interest?

CONRAD GUENTHER: It's different with both moose and caribou populations and they're sort of a general range that's the accepted of how low a bull ratio can get before it starts impacting the number of cows that are bred. In other words, you have to have at least a minimum number of bulls for the number of cows in order to assure the cows are bred and there could be a higher number and could even have a higher success rate. Does that answer your question?

GREG ROCZICKA: No.

CONRAD GUENTHER: Specifically what? Are you looking for a number?

GREG ROCZICKA: You mentioned a range, 25 bulls per hundred cows or 30 bulls for the maximum yield. You want to get as many as you can.

JEFF DENTON: It's a lot more complicated than that, for several reasons. One, it's dependent on your management objective for that herd. If you're wanting, one, for example, maximum reproduction, maximum harvest, and you don't care about age structure in bulls, there's a different range that you would management for. If you're management is for genetic to maintain genetics in your composition, health, so on of a herd, that's a different one. So it varies on your objective for that herd, and so there's ranges for each of these objectives and managers have that flexibility when they go to the public for herd management plan. Depending on what the objectives that come out of that meeting, that gives you a targeted range where you want to have for bull:cow ratios.

You may want a certain number of mature bulls per hundred cows, a certain number of middle aged bulls per hundred cows.

You may be looking at a number of yearlings for hundred cows for your recruitment of the bull population. So it's not as simple as this. This is real simple, but it depends on your management objectives for a given herd.

Under a natural circumstance, say in very wilderness area, that's probably what your natural bull ratios would be. Under managed herds, that are harvested or for other purposes, that range may be far different than a totally wilderness herd of moose that doesn't have any harvest.

GREG ROCZICKA: So for example, take that as I said, the maximum yield for the greatest possible harvest, what would be a ballpark figure?

JEFF DENTON: Okay, would depend on what you're trying to harvest for maximum harvest. If you're trying to maximum harvest just moose in general, okay, if you're targeting certain age structure of your harvest, then that also dictates what your bull ratio has to be. I'm being kind of evasive because finite management requires a lot more finer tuning to where you sit on that. It's not as simple as if you want to manage for this, maximum number of moose.

It may be if you want to manage for maximum number of moose harvested. Is it maximum number of males you want harvested, maximum number of males and females harvested, maximum number of all age classes harvested, and suddenly you have to direct your management much more discretely to what kind of bull ratios you want. And so it's not simple; okay?

What I'm trying to say is you have the flexibility from A to Z, and depending on all your specific objectives for a population, then you have to pick the ranges within that that are -- that you're trying to target to meet a given objective.

GREG ROCZICKA: And I've been in discussions where, you know, it was brought up on bull:cow ratios, you're the first one that went to all the different parameters.

JEFF DENTON: There's goods and bads about you may be able to produce maximum harvest of a moose for a short period of time before you start affecting genetics. For example, if you -- all you do is harvest bulls that are very large, over a period of time, that's such a selective pressure that pretty soon you'll have five and six and seven year old moose that are very small and actually not very competitive for cows, and actually, you've really impacted your moose herd in terms of productivity, what it can produce for hunters.

So there's all those -- there's a lot of goods and bads to all these parts of the range. It's not something you just, you know, here's where we are, this is the range of bulls we want to manage for. Very evasive, but it's not simple. It's a lot more complex. .

CARL MORGAN: On the bull:cow ratio, all the scenarios you been pointing out, in other words, that's just the best guess estimate on your part, it's not something you can go and -- it's not fact. You take all these factors and it's just a best guess estimate.

JEFF DENTON: We've actually measured those ratios in herds that are managed various ways. There's a lot of data that indicates a herd that's been experiencing a certain kind of harvest for the long term, this is the kind of bull ratios that we consistently count in those. Same with, say, Denali park herds which are relatively unharvested. They'll have a different age structure and a different bull composition.

So there is -- they're based on things that are on the ground out there that we have -- we've counted moose till heck freezes over in this country, and there's characteristics of those populations based on how they're harvested, what their historic harvest and so on has been and the kind of ratios that are being experienced by those, by those populations. So it's not a best guess. It's based on things we've seen repeatedly in a lot of different areas.

CARL MORGAN: For that area, specifically for that area, though. That area don't applies to this area. It's just for that area that you go there every fall, every spring and count.

JEFF DENTON: That's right, that's right.

CARL MORGAN: And all the rest is not --

JEFF DENTON: And even the conditions there change. If you have two or three bad winters, certain age class of animals, winter kills, and others don't. So it affects the ratios, but it's based on these kinds of things. We know those kind of things influence bull:cow ratios and you have to look at a range of different factors, not just one or two factors. Range of winters, past harvest, past reproductive rates and recruitment. All these things affect bull:cow ratios, so you have to take all those into account when you make these management objectives and what a bull:cow ratio means in a given population.

MR. MATHEWS: And then on that, if there was a concern

about the management objectives or the bull:cow ratio, et cetera, this would be the forum to, either through a council member in your area, saying I'm hearing this in the analysis or whatever, I don't think it holds water, I think that's kind of what you're indicating, that you could bring up that issue but then we would almost challenge you back and say, based on what, and then you could say, your years of experience there, talk, et cetera, et cetera. So that's where the dialogue has to go both ways. The biologists are -- need to hear that.

Some may interpret it that they're not hearing it, but they have their information that they've been somewhat, you know, ground truthing in different areas. So it's compelled upon the users to show, and what they lean on is harvest data and service -- surveys. Harvest data compliance is not very high in many areas of the state. So we're missing a key component there. So we're hoping through this process and others to maybe bring that back up, or at least provide some additional information that supports or rejects what the biologists are seeing there in these goals.

So where the council kicks in, that's what I was looking here, I couldn't find it, that they can review not only regulations which are proposals but they can look at policies, management plans, and other matters relating to subsistence. So I don't know what area you're talking about, but if there's a management plan there and you feel it should get higher profile or just profile in general, one, here it is, this council.

It's also the local advisory committee for the state.

Each agency may have its own planning process review, but don't leave out your advisory committee and don't leave out the council. Neither -- both of them may not take it up, but it's possible that they may. So don't leave them out. That's another way of bringing it up.

CARL MORGAN: I'd like to comment on that, too. Vice-versa, don't leave the local people, don't leave the people -- you know, each one, there's one council member here or so many council members and they got a great responsibility of covering so much area. I wish if they're going to cover that area, they do go out and talk to these people, you know. They're -- they got a lot of area to cover. So therefore, don't leave the vice-versa out. It works both ways.

MR. MATHEWS: Right, and if you have any suggestions on that, either on record or off record, please tell me and how I can assist them to cover their areas or additional ways of going directly to those users, because the worst thing, as I mentioned earlier, is to go through, make a decision and have to go back again, either the next year or the next five years and correct it because of whatever. And so it would be best if we can get dialogue.

I'm also realistic. We're talking huge areas and that, but if we keep the dialogue open, work through the councils, give us suggestions, we'll try our best. I also realize it's not all going to be hunky-dorey, either. There will be times when there's disagreements. As long as there's dialogue, I think we can work things out. It's when either party or parties to that issue drop off that things don't go well, in my opinion, and I've seen that with issues when I work with the state with fisheries. Once one party drops out, it gets real interesting.

CONRAD GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, I'd like to thank you.

The session is about a half hour; I'm ready to close. We've already gone over that time. Just one closing comment, again, this is just something to try this time and we'd like to continue it, but again, it's up to the council whether we continue to do this. This is your meeting. And if we do continue to do this, I could give you some suggestions on what I thought might be good in the future, but I also need feedback from you on what you'd specifically like to cover.

As far as I see, education is a two-way street. I can present you things like this, but I'm a biologist and there's a whole list in the computer, everything in Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge to the committee of the whole Yukon drainage. So I need a tremendous amount of help from the council members and from other people, and so I need your input into this to make this a two-way street if we're going to do this.

The information will help you understand your local situations better, and I'll also try to do that, get things back to you. We have state surveys, harvest data, other things, so that you understand how I make decisions and how I make my recommendations in the different categories, and this is just -- this is the start so that we're all having a mutual understanding.

MR. COLLINS: You have any comments about that?

MR. MATHEWS: We were thinking the next -- not putting words in your mouth, tell us if we're wrong -- the next step would be, as we mentioned early on, would be the next fall meeting that we would go over a few species or maybe even more than a few species.

CONRAD GUENTHER: It would be better to do one species a meeting, because I mean, we could literally spend weeks and weeks on each species, because they're very, very complex.

MR. MATHEWS: The council would take moose at the next fall meeting, we could cover moose from the whole region, we would invite --

CONRAD GUENTHER: Fall and spring.

MR. MATHEWS: -- all the different groups involved, try to encourage them to come and just go over what we know about the population of moose and the use, and people would say, like he did, I don't think that's right or this is right or you're right on here and all, and then from that, then we could start seeing where areas are needed and that could be a proposal, could be -- but it could get also very boring from the northern part to the southern part of this region on moose to go over all the biological data.

CONRAD GUENTHER: That would be one approach. Another approach would be not to talk about specific areas of data, issues and areas, but to talk about how we -- how biologists look at moose management, how we look at bull:cow ratios, how we look at cow:calf ratios, how they apply to habitat, what is true habitat, what's required within the habitat, what are little things that make a difference to populations. That could be applied to a lot of different areas. So one possibility is something a little more general about moose management, just moose management, and then also we could get into what data is available, survey data, harvest data, local information on particular areas.

So there's a number of ways to approach this. It's not just one way, and we need your input on it. We don't necessarily need it right now but I certainly would like to see it sometime during the meeting, possibly the new business.

MR. COLLINS: I think if we look at this at the end,

we may have identified issues that will be pointing in some direction. If it doesn't happen at this meeting, in the spring when we deal with proposals if there are issues coming on proposals where we see there's an issue, then we could target it for the fall. Maybe we could use that.

GEORGE YASKA: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I'm lost on the agenda here. Where are we on the agenda?

MR. COLLINS: We're up to the block at the top, actually, which is work session on wildlife management. We went down through introduction of council members and then, well, we had opening comments from Mitch. So we're down to V, actually, when we come back into the meeting, but then we stopped for the work session.

GEORGE YASKA: Okay, and if a member of the public were to bring a proposal forward, where on this agenda would they be able to do that? Is that under A in new business?

MR. COLLINS: Well, I think it's down -- probably tomorrow it would be on there. We've got other old business, new business -- let's see.

MR. MATHEWS: Right, it's about proposals and that. That's under A of the new business. So what we need to go through is what the board did since the last meeting, correspondence, need to walk through the C&T priority.

Now again, it's -- I misspoke there. The council has not adopted this final draft agenda. So the agenda is not adopted, so this is just a template that they could go by or they could change it. So anyways, the way it's laid out here is, as you see in front of you, new business would cover the proposal.

GEORGE YASKA: I guess that answered my question. Again, if a member of the public were to bring forth a proposal, they'd do it under new business, letter A?

MR. COLLINS: New business, A, right.

MR. MATHEWS: Right, and they can do that either through public testimony or give the proposal to staff or to the council. If it's given to the staff, Conrad or I, then we'll take it as being submitted to the process to be actually put in the proposal book. If it's mentioned to the council, it needs to be clear to them that's the way it's going or are they to just look at it to kind of give guidance on it, okay, but if you give it to me, I'm going to ask you, is this what you want the proposal book to circulate. If you say yes, it's in the book. This will make it clear to everybody.

MR. COLLINS: I think, George, since we won't actually be dealing with proposals, they can turn them in between now and the spring meeting, too. I assume there's a deadline.

MR. MATHEWS: Deadline, October 27th.

MR. COLLINS: Can bring them in and spring meeting will be set up to deal with proposals, take positions on them. Okay, is that all you had in mind covering with the work session, just general?

CONRAD GUENTHER: That's it. Thank you very much.

MR. COLLINS: Then we're down to Item Number V on your agenda, which has to do with council members' concerns or topics that you want to bring up. So we'll just run around, any of you have any concerns now that you want to bring to our attention, from your area, something that would not be on the agenda?

MR. DEACON: We had a meeting in Grayling September 26th about our annual meeting of the separate issues and of most

concern was impact of hunters on the private land, corporation land, and it's in the process of how we will work it. It's the local corporation land and regional corporation land that people go on and hunt. There's no sign for trespassers or any of those. There's a concern there for our area, Healy area, and they have a pretty big land region up there that's got to be looked into. So it's in the work plan now, I think, see how would we go about this.

MR. COLLINS: These are lands that are in many cases adjacent to or inside federal lands.

MR. DEACON: Local corporation land and regional corporation land.

MR. COLLINS: And you want to know what your options are, you mean, or you are making your own plan?

MR. DEACON: I don't know, I think it's kind of -- is it sort of like trespassing on corporation land, local corporation.

GEORGE YASKA: Mr. Chairman, I did speak with Doyon about this issue and they have posted lands before. We have new posting regulations and the new rules state that each sign must be visible within each other. So if you have a sign at the bend of a creek, you have to be able to see the next sign before they go around the bend, and so in certain areas, to legally post a slough or twisted little river becomes unmanageable and quite expensive. Plasticized orange legal signs are quite expensive, and it is quite expensive to close lands, but --

MR. COLLINS: Whose rules were those, George? Is that state or federal rules?

GEORGE YASKA: Those are state and, Dave, I believe the federal government has posting rules.

DAVE YOKEL: I'm not aware of any.

MR. COLLINS: I think some of the corporations have been experimenting with this. The river here has a closed area or some restrictions on their land, I believe. I think Holy Cross, didn't you deal with this, Frank, on some of your lands, too?

FRANK TURNER: Yes, a few years back we posted the lands for no trespassing and hunting to local residents on corporation lands or lands that we tried to have posting on.

MR. COLLINS: I'm not sure what our jurisdiction would be here, unless it's a matter of having a work session to discuss the issue or -- go ahead, Jeff.

JEFF DENTON: Yeah, again, it's one of the things that's not very simple. You folks with corporation lands, those become, in all intents and purposes, private lands. A lot of those lands are encumbered by what are called 17-b easements. When the lands were conveyed, there were easements that were attached to those that allowed access to public lands through them and that is a complicating issue because there are, and not available to the public, because all the of them haven't been conveyed, and so on, where those are. They're not marked on the ground, unless they're a real established type trail, road, this sort of thing that people know about.

That's one of the conflicts is people know there's a public easement across some of those but they have no idea where it's at. I know our agency in some cases has worked with various corporations to mark some of those. So it's something that'll warrant discussion down the road, because those aren't federal lands except for access across those to, whether it be state public lands

or other federal public lands across those lands. So it's not a cut and dry, you can close it to hunting, but you still can't close it to somebody walking across a 17-b easement.

So it's a management problem that's going to be more intensified as time goes on, there's no question. It's just I guess one of the problems with private land ownership. It's going to have to be dealt with.

MR. COLLINS: Did you have other comments?

MR. DEACON: That's all I have. One of the problems is sport fishing that's going on on land, if it's the state or the federal. We have some -- few that's sport fishing, but we also have hunters on the federally owned management, the wildlife, that hunt. I know, because I been -- I stayed up the river and I watched that stuff. So there's some sports fishing should be checked into. If fishermen could stop the fishing, subsistence fishing or something, that's their land. I don't know if we have control over it as federal subsistence, but that's a local concern, too.

ANGIE MORGAN: I just wanted to say, I had my hand up earlier when you were talking about corporation lands and stuff, but the way the Kuskokwim Corporation do their -- their permit program, they do have a permit program, they do have signs on corporation lands saying that it is corporation land and they do have a land office here in Aniak and they have maps of where the corporation land is located, and also the federal and state lands, where they -- where other people can go hunting, and they direct these people that do come around, you know, that this is corporation land and around here is the state and federal lands and they tell them how far, you know, they -- it's marked. They have people that show them where to go, and that's how the corporation does it.

MR. COLLINS: Would you identify yourself, please? I think the secretary will need that.

ANGIE MORGAN: Angie Morgan, but that's how they identify their lands.

MR. COLLINS: That's how you're handling it locally. They have to actually go into the office to physically look at the maps then.

ANGIE MORGAN: They have to come to the office. There are people that go -- they have a patrol service every summer and they carry maps and they hand them out to people that come around hunting in this area. And they know where to go for the maps here in Aniak.

MS. VANDERPOOL: I have a concern here, maybe we should -- the way I'm going to tell you this is maybe we should have a workshop for like the people who live up river. They are in the Kuskokwim Corporation but there is a lot of talk about them wanting to try to develop some kind of program where it could be local resident hunting only for the next few years because the moose population has just diminished terribly. Every year we get a big swarm of boats that come up river, and of course they check the corporation lands, but I know the corporation lands are all along the river and they can just go a few miles back, you know, if they have access with a small airplane, and they can hunt, which we have a lot of big guides in the whole area. We see a lot of moose kills that are just left there. We see rafters come down with just horns, and they say our raft tipped over and we lost our meat. Well, why do you still have your horns, then?

This is a big problem we're having up river now because our moose population is just -- it's just diminished just terribly. And like along the corporation, you have your lands, but I know every so often there's some state land or federal open lands that they can go ahead and set up their camps and whatnot, or they camp below the water level and stuff like that, but is there some way we can try to assist up river in trying to develop some type of program to close the area for so many years till we bring our moose population back up? Because they don't want to lose -- we don't want to lose our subsistence. Just to local residents only or do they have to go through the corporation or --

MR. MATHEWS: Well, first off, the area that you're talking about -- and again, it is a concern I'm hearing from others, so I'm not surprised by that, but again, it goes back to the land ownership of that area. That is corporation; that's considered private. Well, this council is very limited in that area, but the closure that you're talking about, let's say it was federal land, it's in the area you're talking about.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Is it all state land even back from --

MR. MATHEWS: I'd have to look.

JEFF DENTON: It varies.

MR. COLLINS: Should have maps available here at some point.

MR. MATHEWS: We do, but we'd -- the discussion item you're bringing up we have to look at the jurisdictional. Okay, then let's say there is jurisdiction for this area -- but I'm pretty sure it's not, but let's say there is. Then we have to go through the test of before closure, it has to be based on a conservation concern and is there a conservation concern. So that's why kind of all the terminologies and the surveys and that all has to be tested, because if it's not biologically, meaning if that population up there can withstand and meet the needs of that area with both local use and non-local use, then local -- non-local use will continue. We have to look at that.

You have to give some indication of -- not us, but the process. When I say us, I mean the process. What is the status of the moose population there, what have you noticed and then what have we seen as the agencies in the area with that population. So that has to be borne out.

One way of doing that is to submit a proposal to say close down the area, if there was federal land there, to non-subsistence use, but it's got to go through the tests. You're going to hear -- you'll hear that, because I believe, I'm not sure, good chance there's going to be a couple proposals asking that very thing, and so you're going to hear some questions, and then from there, you're going to hear more answers as if that proposal ever goes out. Others are going to comment and say, well, I'm not sure it's that way or et cetera, and that whole process, staff will be analyzing it, the analysis comes back here saying this is what we have in the biology, this is what we know of the uses, what do you guys want to do with this proposal.

So we will try along the way to plug in people in the area into that process, but that's -- that's the cycle. Say the proposal comes up to shut down the river to non-local use or what we call non-subsistence use. It will be brought before the council. At

this time, they will not take official recommendation. They will maybe ask questions about it, get educated on it and et cetera. Then it goes into the proposal book which I don't know -- Catherine knows when it comes out, but it'll be coming out in November or December -- December I believe, and that'll go to everybody on the mailing list.

They'll look at it. Others will say, no, that river shouldn't be closed, or yes, it should be closed, and they can send in their comments.

All that's compiled, put together along with the analysis for what he's calling the spring meeting, which is in January and February. At that time, this council has the option of saying that proposal should be adopted, should be rejected, tabled, deferred, whatever else, but that's the main thing, adopted and rejected, and then from there it goes back into the system. The biologists and others involved with the analysis take the additional data from that meeting. That is all given to the interagency staff meeting. They pass their recommendation, which goes parallel to the board. The board meets in April; the board takes all this information in front of them. They go up or down on the proposal.

If it goes against what the submitter or others wanted, then they can go for what's called a Request for Reconsideration saying, no, you forgot something here or I think you didn't look right at this information. Then we go for Request for Reconsideration, and after that, that issue is pretty much done in this cycle.

And that's the full cycle all the way through, and then we start over again in the fall. So we're under an annual approach. Everything in this region is up, not like in the state system where only certain species are up, and that's changing. We'll talk about that later, but that's the whole gist of it. To close an area, it's got to go through that test, and what I understand in the area you're talking about, we don't have much jurisdiction.

MR. COLLINS: I think maybe at this point we should hear from each member a list of comments and then we can see whether we can put them on the agenda, not try to get into a complete discussion of every one. But your main concern, Gail, is the hunting pressure up there and whether through proposal some land could be closed to non-resident hunting.

MS. VANDERPOOL: After meeting with all the other villages and the councils and the people who live there.

MR. COLLINS: We have to look and see whether you're under state or federal land.

MS. VANDERPOOL: With all the people and the wolves, it's getting pretty bad.

MR. COLLINS: I know what you mean. I hear you. We're further up river. Same thing. Other concerns by members?

MR. SIMON: I don't have concerns, but I have a few comments I'd like to make. I'm excited about coming to Aniak. First time I ever been here, but we as a board here, we represent most of the areas around Aniak. Been going to meetings for many years, and always like to hear the concerns of the peoples that I represent. I also like to talk with the peoples that I represent. For that I'm very happy to be in Aniak and Mr. Chair, if the people from Aniak do have time for the input, to hear the concerns, that's the only comments I have.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you.

MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I have the same concern as Gail. There's a wolf problem. We having a lot of wolves around and getting a lot of moose, but in talking to -- Vince sent some other people saying even though it's pretty hard to get it, but if there's other ways we can protect the moose population, we glad to hear it.

There's also a problem, there's a lot of outfitters come around here and drop people off and they're not covered in the same rules as guides. They should be covered in the same rules as guides, you know. What Gail was saying, lot of time, all they have is the horns and no meat, and they got the waste. If it were us, we waste meet, we would be in trouble, but they can get away with it. That's my problem.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you. Jack, you have concerns?

MR. REAKOFF: The only concern that I have or think that I have from our area where I live is that the grizzly bears are getting pretty thick and we still have, in the area that I live, we have one bear every four years, and I'm considering making a proposal to allow one bear every year, brown bear. In the area that I live, those bears up there, people should have opportunity to kill one of those bears every year. Also, this regulation book is unclear, federal subsistence regulation book is unclear about the sealing of brown bears. It doesn't -- there was a -- I personally had a conflict between the state and the federal regulation book about the state book says you have to seal it 30 days within the kill. This federal book doesn't state that, and I had a conflict with the state over that particular aspect. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife head enforcement told me that this book says that but in a not clear fashion, and I think that that should be clarified in this book.

I think that also that it's a hardship for rural residents to seal brown bears by going to Fairbanks, and the state book says that you have to go to Fairbanks to seal these brown bears.

I feel that rural residents who kill brown bears for subsistence or in any unit that requires sealing of bears should be able to go to their local -- there's licensed vendors that are enabled by the state biologists to seal fur animals, wolves, wolverines, and those types of animals that have to be sealed. Then they should also be eligible to seal brown bears for the state so that the rural residents don't have to travel all the way to Fairbanks to get those sealed. That's one thing that's been kind of coming up in our area.

MR. COLLINS: I think people are taking note of those. Anything else?

MR. REAKOFF: No.

MR. COLLINS: Angie?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Mine's the same as Gail's and Henry's, except the other thing we're having problems with is a person in our area who's killing a lot of black bear for bladders and feet and we tried to report him and they close the eyes to reporting, just look the other way, and it's wrong. In our culture, when you kill something, you have respect toward the animal. It would be like if you had passed on and someone took your hands and your feet off you, and your gallbladder. People don't do that to their own people, and showing disrespect for our way by doing that to the bears that are not harming no one --, we as people can see a black bear and go on, keep on going, leave it alone. We're not there to kill it to make money, and there's some people there in Holy Cross who are doing it frequently, nightly, and transporting those parts of animals out.

MR. COLLINS: It's an unfortunate problem. I'm surprised it's not being followed up on.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Then our moose, we're having a lot of hunters come in to our country and we try and report them and that doesn't work either for the person bringing them in. You're not supposed to be able to fly into our area. It's a closed area by plane to hunter. It's a closed area, yet we see float planes coming in. Float plane went down in the Innoko River about two weeks ago. Some of them were carrying moose. We'd have never known the plane was carrying moose meat except it went down and they had to take the boat, simple boat or something, and that's not allowed and they're landing in our lakes and it's illegal to land in the lakes and they're camping there. They say they're fishing, but they're hunting, too. We don't see them taking no fish home. They're coming in off the beach and coming in and going back by the beach and not bringing boxes and boxes of meat, just bringing horns. Where's all the meat?

People go out in the woods and all they find is carcasses, no horns. Big, nice, fat bull, just wasting. Nothing is being done in our area and people are getting frustrated over it and who to tell or what to say, that's our concern for our area. And the wolves, again. The wolves are still bothering us from last year.

GEORGE YASKA: Mr. Chairman, if I might briefly, have you entertained inviting Fish & Wildlife protection to these meetings and has that been a topic of discussion in the past?

MR. COLLINS: To my knowledge, it has not and I don't think we have.

GEORGE YASKA: I say that because I -- we had a case in Tanacross a couple years ago, person was roughly less than a hundred feet across the boundary. He shot a moose that was outside the area that he was supposed to shoot. He was prosecuted. He was a subsistence hunter. And we had a case last year, a clear identification of a plane, airline transporter, number of hunters, guns, et cetera, exactly where it was inside a closed area, 15 miles inside a closed area. Fish & Wildlife protection says, "Well, honest mistake. He's a nice guy, I know those guys."

Some inconsistencies there. I think it might be valuable to invite those people into the meeting now. Again, have you entertained that, the invitation?

MR. COLLINS: As I said, I don't think we have, have ever before, reporting to us. I know at the state meeting there's usually somebody there and they ask for reports, and our local meeting we have reports on our advisory committee from what issues are coming up in -- yes, Vince?

MR. MATHEWS: They are sent a draft agenda, but it doesn't -- I'm not going to mislead you. That it doesn't actually invite them, but they're aware of the meeting, items on the agenda, then it's a question of somewhat jurisdiction, I think.

GEORGE YASKA: Just an example of a transporter's plane fast and loose with the regulations and they're largely ignored. That should change, of course.

MR. MORGAN: I mentioned to the wildlife officer here we're having a meeting. I don't know if he was busy or not, but I mentioned to him.

GREG ROCZICKA: Just a couple comments to what some of the guys, Jack I believe your name is, you mentioned about as far as sealing the brown bear hides. About three years ago, we got a

regulation passed through the state to eliminate the need for the sealing requirements. So long as the hides were not taken out of the region, so that may be one way you want to look into that.

MR. REAKOFF: Well, that's one other possibility, to expand West, Northwest brown bear area to include our area. Our area falls outside of that. That's where we get into this -- this problem. That was one consideration.

GREG ROCZICKA: And Mr. Chairman, if I could, what Gail was mentioning on the float hunters and the fly-in and the commercial hunter, I don't know if you recall, but that was exactly the proposal that Sleetmute put in and the board of game virtually tied themselves in a knot to come up and avoid that. It came up to be the 40 horsepower restriction.

MS. VANDERPOOL: It also went to the courts, though, which Sleetmute can't afford.

GREG ROCZICKA: Where we're at right now is Katie John case and potentially the federal will take over navigable waters, and that's up in the air. If that shakes up in the favor of the federal side, this council will have a lot of say-so on that.

MS. VANDERPOOL: That's just -- from what I understand now from the Sleetmute case, it's all in court now and it's just going -- they're just -- there's a group of people that afford to take them to court and that's what they're doing. They're just fighting that.

GREG ROCZICKA: Consistently go on appeal.

MS. VANDERPOOL: It's all legal on paper, and also to deal with what George, what you said, is the way, you know, when you was talking about the guy, the subsistence guy who was prosecuted and things like that for going in a hundred feet and then the big game hunters and stuff not being prosecuted, is it a matter with the federal -- with the Fish & Wildlife, the protection officers in the state, is it a matter of they make more money off the big game hunters and everything instead of versus the subsistence? That's the way I would look at it, as a protection deal. I mean, they're making megabucks off of this, you know, these big game hunters to come into the areas, and the subsistence people, they don't make a dime, and to me, you know, that's something that we should try to help and support in whatever way we can.

CARL MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to comment on that, too. I support that. Also, I like to comment on the requirement for hunting license, which I've got to get in order to go hunting, and when I buy that hunting license, it does not say subsistence hunter, it says a hunter in the State of Alaska, and whoever's collecting that money for that user, there's a sports fishing license lobby money against me as a subsistence hunter, and I don't see why the federal government or the federal board should require a resident or a -- anybody hunting in federal land with a license, because all it does, it support a federal sports fishing guide to fight me as a subsistence hunter. And I'm the only one that's going to lose because there's no money coming in my way.

They always try to shut down the subsistence offices and don't try to fund them. And the same regard, we're having a heck of a time getting the state to come here. They don't want to recognize the federal government's jurisdiction. They want to manage the whole thing.

MR. COLLINS: I don't know whether that issue's ever

been brought to the federal board about licenses on federal land; has it?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, it has, and you took action on it at the last meeting.

MR. COLLINS: Better go back and read the minutes of the last meeting.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, I think you better -- no, remember when we talked last time about federal requirements and you were dealing with changing the months for that and you decided to leave the months of residency required and insert the rule. It's in the minutes, but we did address that and that was the issue of residency requirements that was brought up by the Joint Board of Fisheries and Game and Bureau of Land Management. So you have -- it's not on tonight's agenda, I don't believe, because you took action on it.

MR. COLLINS: We were just clarifying, though, at what point one becomes a resident so that they're qualified for subsistence rights in a certain area. We didn't deal with the issue of whether or not there should be a separate license or cost of federal license.

MR. MATHEWS: No, we didn't. We had one option of having no license. But again, we'll decide if you want to revisit that.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, I think we've been around. In terms of concern in my area, unfortunately right immediately around McGrath we have very little federal land and we have the same concerns you have with increased number of hunters and the declining population, the growing hunt boat populations, but it's not something that could be fixed by proposal here.

Okay, moving on, then, the next --

FRANK TURNER: Mr. Chairman, may I add something, please? I think something positive no one mentioned, in our area, the last hunting season opened on August 20th for hunting on federal lands, and we really like that for the local people. They had a chance to hunt before the influx of the hunters. The normal, the regular season opened September the 5th. However, as Jeff mentioned, the federal lands are, you know, we had a map on an 8 by 12 -- 8 by 11 piece of paper which was really fragmented, and I think that would work well for us.

Traditionally, before, before the land became a state, when we were a territory, that's when it used to open, August 20th, and it works well for our people over there. But I would be glad to work with whoever to identify that land on the ground, so you know, we won't be law breakers all the time, because we get close, try to get close to it, but we don't know exactly where it's at, and I wanted to mention that.

MR. COLLINS: Did I miss somebody else? Okay, coming back to our agenda, then, we're down to Item Number VI, which has to do with additions or corrections to the agenda and approval.

Do you have anything that needs to be added or deleted? Does the agency have anything that --

MR. MATHEWS: There's only two items and they're informational and they can wait. One would be an update on the migratory bird treaty and the other one would be kind of an update and understanding of compacting under the Indian Self Governance Act.

There's not a lot to discuss in those areas, but can add them or wait to the next meeting.

MR. COLLINS: Anybody want to see them on the agenda? I guess we'll leave them on. Maybe you can do something in the informational in the report.

MR. MATHEWS: Leave them off the agenda and put them on for a later meeting?

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I didn't see anyone responding, so okay.

MR. MATHEWS: I may -- if any of you allow and time allows, I'm going to have a newsletter and I can incorporate some of the stuff in there, but you will have to let me know if it meets your needs on understanding the variety of issues in the newsletter. I'm going to cross them off of mine. I don't know about other agencies that are present here, which includes, you know, public, if they have anything they felt should be on the agenda.

MR. COLLINS: I think the members here that brought up issues, if some of those could be covered by proposals, you've got time to think about it and under new business we have a place for generation of proposals. So we could visit it then. Was there any topics coming out of those comments that should be on here?

MR. MORGAN: Only thing, the comments would be public enforcement, sport hunters are getting into lands they're not supposed to, and we need more enforcement. Do we have federal wildlife protection officers in this area?

MR. MATHEWS: If I understand correctly, you're talking about enforcement, that we may need more information on enforcement and what level of -- what involvement the federal agencies have. I'm going to turn over to the refuges on that. As discussed, I believe they have deputized.

PETE DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, I'll address that. There's two aspects to the federal resource enforcement and that is, one, for instance, I work for refuges, okay. The refuges have what we commonly call refuge officers and these are people that work in the refuge offices that assist special agents. Special agents are the second part, and these are people that are stationed in Fairbanks and also Anchorage, and they come out in hunting seasons and do the work.

The refuge officers are the first people I described. They assist. They come and assist the refuge -- I'm sorry, assist the special agents. Does that answer your question?

MR. MORGAN: How many do you have? Doesn't seem like you've got enough. This is going on, seems it's not enough for enforcement.

PETE DeMATTEO: We've heard this before in different parts of the state, that there's not enough presence out there.

PERRY GRISSOM: May I say something? Another problem is finding out. Not very many and it's a big area to cover, so if there is some way to get information from the people quickly and in as much good information as possible so we can catch people in the field or when they're coming back into town, that would help, if there's some way to identify that.

MR. MORGAN: We're giving you information right now. What we're telling you right now is happening around here and a lot of other places, too.

PERRY GRISSOM: And one, if we can't catch them, that specific person and then say, okay, now this river, these people are people who commonly come down this river this time every year, and we could try to set something up or even have local people as, like,

guides or go with refuge people or something, because just kind of wandering around, we may find people, but if we find them when they're legal or have the stuff hidden, we can't catch them. So it's real hard to catch people when you can actually get them for a crime and tie them to that dead moose with all the meat left on it.

So the more information that they could get as quickly as possible, or even general information, and use it next year, would help a lot. Generally, the more cooperation the better.

MR. MORGAN: Do you think it would help if you post notices in post offices and stores and give a number to call?

PERRY GRISSOM: That helps. I also work for Yukon Flats and Arctic also, and we have a 1-800 number that people can call, special agents that are also stationed and they're big -- refuge officers work on refuges and special agents can cover any federal law, like selling animal parts. They're big into that no matter where that occurs. They'd like to hear about that. So if Fish & Wildlife protection can't deal with that or don't want to or whatever, then you might try special agents.

MR. MORGAN: Do they give rewards like the state does for catching the people that buy it?

PERRY GRISSOM: I think they do for big money things. I think they have, but it would be like up to the U.S. attorney. They can end up seizing all kinds of stuff from people, boats, planes, whatever is used. The judge would have to do that and the judge also can, you know, U.S. attorney can hand out money.

MR. COLLINS: Could I assume then that somebody would contact the members that had specific concerns here to get more information on that? You heard it's on the record, if somebody could follow up on those.

MR. MATHEWS: On the enforcement?

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, what they raised and what Angela mentioned. The other thing would be some kind of informational packet to the local communities about what we were looking for. They say I saw this; you need more than that. What should they be reporting to you, what -- in order to make a case, what would you have to have?

I think that's why they turn it in and nothing happens and maybe you can't follow it up because something's missing, but if the local people don't know that, then it looks like you're not doing anything.

PERRY GRISSOM: Yes, that's true.

JEFF DENTON: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, it would be probably to the advantage of all the agencies and their enforcement personnel to either get together and put such a packet together, but also the reports, even if they're not acted on immediately, we have an idea of frequency of a problem area, we can focus on an area maybe the next year or something like that.

Enforcement out here is extremely expensive. No agency has the kind of money it takes to cover Alaska lands. Even combined we don't have the money. And so we have to take a look at and focus on priority areas that are really a problem area and go in and take care of it and next year go to the next one and so on. We don't really know, unless you folks are turning in reports at some frequency, how serious a problem that it is. And so that's how -- I mean, we all are sitting here working on fixed budgets, and so we have to target certain areas with enforcement moneys just like any

other kind of money. And so it is very important that we know where the problem is, how serious that problem is in terms of frequency of the problem, and then we can set our priorities to get to those areas.

We can't even hope to cover every problem out there. It's impossible, logistically, and everything else. So bear in mind, we're encumbered, too, and so we have to act. It's like the squeaky wheel gets the grease, so the area that has the biggest problem or the perceived problem is the one that's going to get the act.

GEORGE YASKA: Mr. Chairman, are we going to get some heat in here tomorrow perhaps?

MR. MATHEWS: Wasn't in the bill; I forgot to ask for that.

GEORGE YASKA: And secondly, Vince, did you get a copy from Fred Nicolai, the tribal council proposal, the Nowitna closure?

MR. MATHEWS: From Tanana? I have a copy of that and I submitted it to be published, but we need to probably make copies for this group also. So we'll work something out.

GEORGE YASKA: I have a copy here.

MR. COLLINS: We're on the agenda right now. If we can get back, Pollock, you have comments?

MR. SIMON: Yes, I have comments on this. I like moose meat, part of our main diet, and if we don't get a moose, we'll be out of meat and we have a hard time, and for this reason, you can't compete with sports hunters or other hunters just looking for the trophies like the antlers. This is a problem in a lot of villages and some urban hunters come around, whether they're fishing or just fishing and then hunting season opens and they start hunting, it should be more enforcements that you can have, or if that certain area is low in moose, then it should be closed to sport hunting or urban hunters. We can't get a moose, then we will be out of meat. It's that critical.

MR. COLLINS: Is there anything on this discussion that should be on the agenda, added to? If not, then do I have a motion to adopt the agenda?

MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt it.

MR. COLLINS: Moved by Jack. Is there second to that?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I second it.

MR. COLLINS: Seconded by Angie. Comments? All those in favor signify by raising your right hand. Yes votes for all members, correct? Motion carried.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I just need clarification. I don't want to mislead anybody, but you said is someone going to follow through on what's needed for enforcement concerns.

MR. COLLINS: Well, that was just a suggestion I threw out. I don't think that's part of our action here.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, I just wondered.

MR. COLLINS: But it sounds like a good idea. I'm hoping somebody will follow up on that.

MR. MATHEWS: Is the council feeling that someone will follow up on it? I don't want to end up doing things --

MR. COLLINS: We adopted the agenda. It was an action item. I didn't feel it was appropriate.

MR. MATHEWS: Let me know if that's --

MR. COLLINS: Maybe when we get down towards the end on topics and issues and subjects for instance on that future, there

will be some directions.

MR. MATHEWS: All right.

MR. COLLINS: I want to kind of keep us within the framework of the agenda. Then the agenda's been adopted. Welcoming and orientation of new council members, welcoming Gail, who is sitting here for informational purposes, I guess.

MR. MATHEWS: I just need to inform the council as to who the new member -- members are. Let me grab my notes real quick on that. You had three seats that were up for your region and that was Mr. Collins' seat, Pollock Simon's seat and -- wait a minute, not --

MR. COLLINS: Not my seat.

MR. MATHEWS: Wasn't your seat, sorry. It was Henry Deacon's seat, Seat Number 4, Seat Number 5 which was held by Phillip Graham, and then the other seat was -- who didn't reapply? It's Seat 6. I'm just drawing a blank. Those are the three seats.

Out of those three seats that were up, Henry Deacon reapplied and was reappointed by the Secretary of Interior. The seat that Phillip Graham had, he was reappointed by the Secretary of the Interior and resigned. So we're in the process of filling that vacancy, and we have one of the alternates here as informational.

The other seat, which was Seat 6, I just can't remember who that was.

MR. COLLINS: Sharon.

MR. MATHEWS: Sharon, sorry. I apologize to Sharon also because she served very well. She did not reapply. That seat went to William Derendoff, Huslia, and due to the timing of his appointment and just communications, I wasn't able to reach him to get him to come to this meeting.

So the truly new member for sure is William Derendoff, and there was two other assignments which was Henry Deacon and Phillip Graham, but Phillip has resigned since then.

And then on that next round of seats would be Harold Huntington's seat -- no, would be Ray Collins' seat, Pollock Simon's and Jack Reakoff's are the next round of seats that are out. That's under Tab 1, if you want to know of that, and we'll talk about nominations later.

MR. COLLINS: By next round, when are we up? At this meeting, spring meeting?

MR. MATHEWS: You're on until we get a replacement, so you would be serving the spring meeting. The appointments don't go into effect -- we hope to get them approved in August, but the movement in Washington has been that they happen in September, which doesn't make it easy for anybody. So you would serve the next meeting and then you need to reapply, but we'll talk about that later.

MR. COLLINS: Reading and approval of the minutes of February 23 and 24 that are in your packet.

MR. MATHEWS: The minutes are under Tab 2. If I may interrupt, if you want to look at that, what I did was basically sent out the various groups and agencies, some of them are still here, submitted comments on. Additions are red lines, kind of a gray hashing is deletions or strike-outs. You all received a copy of this, also, early on. I don't remember what date I sent them out to you.

MR. COLLINS: Additions or corrections to the minutes? Hearing none, is there a motion to adopt or approve as submitted?

MR. DEACON: So moved.

MR. COLLINS: Moved by Henry. Is there a second?

MR. SIMON: I second.

MR. COLLINS: Second by Pollock Simon. Any discussion? All those in favor, signify by raising your right hand. Your other right hand, Pollock. Yes votes for all six members present. Motion carries.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, do you or any of the members have any suggestions on minutes? Please let me know if you want, but if you're comfortable with them, I'll continue the format.

It was kind of lengthy, I understand that, but let me know if you want any changes or whatever.

MR. COLLINS: Brings us down to election of officers. I thought we did that in the spring.

MR. MATHEWS: No, I think for a while there you were out of cycle. They're generally held in the fall, and your Chair is Harold Huntington. You are the Vice Chair and Angela Demientieff is the secretary. They serve year terms and they're up now and I'll wait till you guys decide what you want to do.

MR. COLLINS: What's your wishes? Shall we proceed with elections this time? Is there concurrence on that? Is that -- all right, then, I guess we'll just open each one, take a nomination and close. Do you have a paper we could pass around?

MR. MATHEWS: We can do that. You want to go through that, a ballot?

MR. COLLINS: If we need them, just be ready in case we need them. Nominations are now open for Chair.

MR. REAKOFF: I nominate Ray Collins.

MR. DEACON: Second. I move we close the nominations.

MR. COLLINS: Was there a second to the move to close?

MR. MORGAN: I'll second it.

MR. COLLINS: If you object to closing, then you can nominate someone else. We don't want to cut this off.

Okay, I was nominated. There's been a motion to close the nominations, been seconded. All those in favor signify by raising your right hand? All right, five yes votes; I abstain. So thank you.

MR. MATHEWS: For the record, then, you are now the Chair.

MR. COLLINS: For next year -- well, through spring, Vince.

Nominations are now open for Vice Chair.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Nominate Pollock Simon for Vice Chair.

MR. REAKOFF: Second.

MR. COLLINS: Other nominations?

MR. DEACON: Herman Morgan.

MR. COLLINS: Herman has been nominated. No, you don't need a second on nominations. Are there more nominations?

MR. DEACON: Move to close the nominations.

MR. COLLINS: Move to close. Is there a second?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Second.

MR. COLLINS: Second by Angela. We can use aye and nay. All those in favor of the proposals.

(Unanimous response).

MR. COLLINS: Okay, pass these out and we've got two,

each voting member. Gail's just going to watch this thing. Nominees were Herman and Pollock.

Could I ask somebody to gather these? Can you do a quick tally there? I think we should have that before we proceed. How late are we going to go tonight?

MR. MATHEWS: That's up to you guys. Well, we have three for Pollock, two for Herman and one for P, which I would assume is for Pollock. So then that would be four to -- four for Pollock and two for Herman.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, Pollock.

MR. MATHEWS: Pollock will be the Vice Chair.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you. Nominations are now open for position of secretary. Is that the term we're using for that?

MR. MATHEWS: Right. Angela can back me up on this, we don't really utilize that position as it's usually defined, but if for instance you weren't here and Chair wasn't here, then it -- the duties would -- the secretary could activate more into that position.

But right now, even if you proceed --

MR. MORGAN: I nominate Angela.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. Angela's been nominated.

MR. REAKOFF: Second.

MR. DEACON: Nominate Jack.

MR. COLLINS: Jack has been nominated.

MR. MATHEWS: Did he accept or not?

MR. COLLINS: Hearing nothing to the contrary, I guess he accepts it.

MR. DEACON: I move we close the nominations.

MR. COLLINS: All right, there's a motion to close nominations. Is there a second to that?

MR. MORGAN: Second.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, seconded by Herman. All in favor signify by saying aye.

(Unanimous response).

MR. COLLINS: Okay, nominations are closed.

MR. MATHEWS: Do you want to proceed and I can inform you later on that?

MR. COLLINS: Okay. Well that brings us down to old business. I would assume its -- let's see if there's a clear winner so that we don't have to decide what next to do.

DAVE YOKEL: Four for Angela and two for Jack.

MR. COLLINS: We can proceed then, old business. First of all, how long do we want to go? It's now nine. What are your wishes?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Could we close for the evening and start up again tomorrow morning? Some people have traveled all day just to get here.

MR. COLLINS: You want to start early? Do you think we can handle the agenda tomorrow if --

MR. MATHEWS: I think you guys can handle the agenda tomorrow in that much time. We have some logistical things to work out for tomorrow also which will take up time individually, as well.

We need to figure out lunch for tomorrow and then give out your travel advance checks, which doesn't have to be when you're in session, but it would be nice to give those to you tonight.

MR. COLLINS: All right, let's stand adjourned until tomorrow morning at what time, 8:30?

MR. MATHEWS: Recess till tomorrow morning.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, recess.

(Proceedings recessed at 9:06 p.m.)

***** CERTIFICATE

I, JOY S. BRAUER, RMR-CRR, Registered Merit-Certified Realtime Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place herein set forth; that the testimony and proceedings were reported stenographically by me and later transcribed under my direction by computer transcription; that the foregoing is a true record of the testimony and proceedings taken at that time; and that I am not a party to nor have I any interest in the outcome of the action herein contained.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this _____ day of _____, 1995.

JOY S. BRAUER,

RMR-CRR

Notary Public for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 5/10/97