

WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL

ADVISORY COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING
ANIAK COMMUNITY HALL
ANIAK, ALASKA

October 11, 1995, 8:30 A.M.
Pages 1 - 152, Inclusive

BOARD MEMBERS

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

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 again at 8:56, and note that Harold Huntington has arrived and other members are all present. We are down under old business, Item A, report of the Federal Subsistence Board action since the last council meeting. Vince?

MR. MATHEWS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me just grab my notes real quick here. You need to turn to Tab 3 and I'll go briefly through it. If you have questions or if I'm giving you too much, then just stop me. If you go to Tab 3, Gail's not here, but you've seen this chart before, this one here with the table. This is the actions you took last time, and what the board did. So I'll take an example.

For Proposal 39, which was in Unit 21(A) and 21(E) for moose, this was your proposal, I believe, to move the season earlier in the year and remove the requirement for antlers. You supported it. Region 5, YK Delta opposed it and it was adopted -- staff committee supported it with modification. The board adopted that proposal with modification, which was 5A which is Unit 21(A), one bull moose, August 20th through September 25th and November 1st through the 30th, and then Unit 21(E), one moose -- and you can read the rest of it there. So you get the idea on that.

Then on the back of that, if you're wondering which ones, you commented on eight proposals and out of those, six of your recommendations were adopted by the Federal Subsistence Board. Two of them, other actions were taken on, but in a way, your action was no action, which would have been Proposal 53, the deal with that Kantishna -- wasn't it Kantishna closure? Yes, Kantishna area closure. But anyways, if you have questions on last year's proposals, I or Conrad or someone can answer questions, but that gives you a brief summary of your action, the staff committee action and the board decision.

Now that Gail's back here, I need to just brief her real quickly. The process is proposals are generated at this meeting or proposals are submitted by others to the process. The council gets a copy of those proposals, so do all the public. They can submit comments. By their next meeting, your next meeting on this council, you get those proposals plus draft analysis.

You can see in the third, fourth column in, you'll see regional council recommendation. This is the actions this council took, and then from there, those recommendations are submitted to the board and to the staff committee.

The staff committee is made up of agency representatives that support the board members. Their actions are in column five, and then you see the board decision. That's really, in a nutshell, how it goes, but this is how you get feedback on your proposals.

I tried last year, I'll try again this year and actually what we'll do is to call you in particular if it's a proposal in your area to tell you what happened with the board, so you'll know in April what happened before the fall season.

Any questions on proposals that you took action on last year? If you do have questions at another time, Conrad and I can answer them. Conrad may not know, but I have the board book here and he can dig into it and we can walk you through on breaks or whatever, if you have a particular question. Then I'll move on,

then, if there's no questions on that.

And that would be the same with the public, if you have a question about a proposal.

Okay, the next thing is if you remember in Mitch's opening comment he talked about designated hunter permits. You were exposed to the designated hunter task force report and this is just a summary of what's happened since then, and I'll just briefly do it, unless you guys want to read it, whichever you're more comfortable with. I can summarize it. It's there in front of you.

MR. COLLINS: Go ahead and do a summary. Maybe we can respond with questions.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. If you remember back with the designated hunter task force, and someone may have to fill in on this, there were several options that were brought up. One was a designated hunter, the other was community harvest limits and quotas, and I'm trying to think of what the other was. There was three, and but anyways, those were the two major ones, and there's been no proposals submitted as a community harvest quota since this, that I know of.

These here are three of them that were submitted. They were submitted before the task force and resubmitted again. One was for deer and moose for the Southeast Region and one was for deer for the Kodiak Aleutian area. All were approved by the board and so federal designated hunter permits are available and from the land managers and local vendors.

Just to make it clear what a designated hunter is, is it's a system in which a hunter can attain a federal permit and then use another person's state game tags or permits to harvest animals for them. And you can read the last paragraph. Few permits have been issued, but there would be more issued later in that season.

MR. COLLINS: Which method is in effect in our area?

MR. MATHEWS: All the methods would be available for you if you submit proposals.

MR. COLLINS: So we have to actually have a proposal to initiate that?

MR. MATHEWS: You submit a designated hunter permit proposal, you could submit a community harvest proposal. I'm not saying it'll get passage, but the option is now there, based on this support by the board of the task force report. Any questions on that?

MR. REAKOFF: I was wondering why they didn't make a blanket designated hunter policy for the whole state.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, I think the reason they didn't go with a blanket one -- I don't know why. It was because proposals generated -- I know it was discussed at length at the task force about doing it. The canned answer would be that there are different -- well not actions, different areas it would not work in a certain way. But I don't remember what that was. But they didn't go that direction to have a blanket designated hunter task force -- designated hunter option.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I was at that task force meeting and I thought they were going to come up with solutions, not just options. If they'd adopted, let's say, a general one and then you wanted to change it, I mean, you wanted something more, you'd think that at a minimum you would have been able to have somebody just give you theirs to fill for them or something like that. There is a state

option, too; isn't there?

MR. MATHEWS: The state option is the proxy hunt, but that has a whole bunch of different qualifications. I don't think Jack's here -- no. That, in my opinion, without it right in front of me, is a little bit more restrictive. This one you just sign it over. The other one, there was some requirements of disability and it was to elders, seniors. Mr. Chair, maybe someone else can --

GREG ROCZICKA: I just wanted to ask about that. Are you saying that the federal proposal process that's in place, then, is essentially open for anyone to get a designated hunter?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

GREG ROCZICKA: The state is, like you said, the blind, totally disabled or 65, over 65.

MR. MATHEWS: Your region could submit a proposal to have a designated hunter system set up for their area, or community harvest quota. And pretty much -- and Jeff can correct me -- the Lime Village one is an example of a community harvest, but that was done prior to this whole discussion, and I can't think if there's another one, but that's one that is existing.

MR. DENTON: Yeah, that's the only one that has the village quota situation.

MR. COLLINS: So we need to consider whether we want proposals from our area, because now the only option we have is during the fall and regular season we can use the state, but in the subsistence seasons, we don't have any options open, or we don't have anything in place for people in our area right now. So we have to figure out which one would work best for our area.

We have a chance to do that under generate proposals, I guess, which is later here.

Other things to report?

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, the other things to report would be you have this next chart on special actions and Requests for Reconsiderations. Remember yesterday I laid out the whole sequence for proposal through the Request for Reconsideration. Special actions, if you're more familiar with the state system, are emergency orders or emergency requests. There was one for your area, and it was 95-02. That was a request from village of Anaktuvuk Pass to have an emergency opening for sheep and moose in 24, and the board established a permit hunt for moose -- no, wait a minute. That's a misprint there. Well, maybe it isn't. I was on leave at that time. I think it should be moose and sheep.

STEVE ULVI: I can explain that. Just quickly, Steve Ulvi with Gates of the Arctic National Park. We did respond with the locals there and set up a special hunt for moose and sheep in the Anaktuvuk area. That asked originally that it be in the northern part of Unit 24, which is just south bend through the pass here and the portion of GMU that you folks deal with. We also extended it to GMU 26 to the north of that. It was open from I believe July 17th to August 1st when the normal sheep and moose season is open. It was due to a lack of caribou coming through in any substantial numbers for about a year, and so we went ahead and opened that, and I believe we had seven hunters sign up for both species, both permits, and no sheep or moose were taken.

However, some caribou in small numbers did move through during that period and they were able to catch a few, so kind of relieved some of the pressure, but everything went pretty well and

I think we all learned something from the experience. The community and the Park Service were fairly satisfied with the way the board responded and the way it worked out, and we learned some things in the process. It worked.

MR. MATHEWS: And I also want to apologize, I didn't -- I forgot they were here and I appreciate Steve reminding me.

MR. ULVI: Sitting behind you.

MR. MATHEWS: Just keep hitting me in the head. I'm just trying to ramble through this stuff.

MR. COLLINS: Any questions?

MR. REAKOFF: I was wondering how long did it take from when they applied for that till when it was finalized?

MR. GUENTHER: It was about two weeks, I believe.

MR. ULVI: I believe it was just over two weeks.

Mayor Hugo's letter was about two and a half weeks prior to the 17th of July, the opening. So actually it was fairly rapid, all in all.

MR. MATHEWS: I was involved with that before my neck blew out and what slowly -- what kind of slowed it down, if there was any considered slowing, is that there was negotiations between the mayor and representatives of the Park Service to look at a variety of ways and that added on a day or two or three, and this required the board; right? The board actually did full action on this, so it was pretty rapid.

But that's the special actions. Make it clear to you, special actions, if time allows, are sometimes run by the regional councils, but just because of their title, it's an emergency request, pretty much, so sometimes it's not -- there's not time available to get ahold of councils.

Then we get into Requests for Reconsiderations, which is the board took action at one of its meetings, generally it's its April meeting, and someone feels that that action needs to be reconsidered, looked at again. One in particular that you took action on, I don't remember the proposal number, but I can find out. It's the one that you dealt with with the closure of federal lands north of -- and Steve may want to plug in on this, too -- north of Gates of the Arctic to non-subsistence harvest of caribou. You supported that closure. When it went to the board, the board modified the closure and added in the Dalton Highway corridor. The state submitted a Request for Reconsideration and to reverse that closure, and the board retained closure in Unit 26(A) and rescinded closure in 26(B), which would have been the Dalton Highway corridor.

So that's just an example. You can see the other ones. There's not -- I don't think there's another one for your region there listed, but the reason I bring these up is that some of these issues may require that we have a meeting. I just want you to be aware of what the reconsideration is, and then what happened with your action.

So if there's no questions on Request for Reconsideration, you will receive copies of Requests for Reconsiderations for your region when they come in. And when you get those, if you have any questions, call me immediately and then we can discuss it and then see if the council wants to meet to pass a recommendation.

MR. COLLINS: On these special actions, are those initiated by a community?

MR. MATHEWS: They can be an individual, community, or

agency.

MR. COLLINS: Do they come through the board for concurrence at all? We don't have to get involved in the meeting, or they go right to the board?

MR. MATHEWS: You don't have to be involved. The councils and regulations are not mentioned in special actions. But I'm letting you know that because like in your area, this Anaktuvuk Pass one happened. As an example, maybe down river, up river, there may be some other actions, but you need to be aware of them. And a special action is only in effect for that season. It disappears after that.

MR. COLLINS: I think there was something like this in Allakaket area, wasn't there? But that was the state because you people weren't able to hunt because of all the flooding in the fall. Didn't they ask for an extension of the moose season?

MR. SIMON: Yes.

MR. COLLINS: You could have requested that of the federal board in the federal lands area; right?

MR. MATHEWS: Right. The request did go to the federal board for an emergency one. Conrad can correct me on this, but I think because the state could take action that covered the area, I don't think the board had to take action, but the board was being prepared to take action to extend the moose season due to the flooding on the Koyukuk. So that was also a pretty rapid response.

Okay, any questions on RFRs, Requests for Reconsiderations? There's a lot there, but it's just to keep you informed. This is the whole state.

Okay, if there's no questions, the last thing in that tab, whatever it was, 3, is in your regulation book -- Harold doesn't have one. But your salmon colored book has this sheet inserted. These are additions and corrections to that. The one that did slip through everybody's hands was the Unit 21(E), which will be discussed today in another viewpoint, another aspect of it and that's listed here, and that was the August 20th season and then the half mile closure along the Innoko River.

Okay. Now, let me see where we are on the agenda. I think I covered -- yes, I covered all the recent board actions except one and that one the board is going to go in executive session on November 16th and 17th. On the 16th, they're going to meet. On the 17th, the board would like to meet with all the chairs on the afternoon of the 17th and I'll talk to Ray more about this, of November 17th, and what the board would like to do is meet with the chairs and discuss what each other expect of each other.

So we're going to try to have all ten chairs there with the Federal Subsistence Board and I'm informing all of you, and this is the first time that any of the officers have heard of it, but then you know that the board now is trying to work out how there can be better communication between the chairs and the board at the board meetings and probably throughout the process.

I can't think of any other -- they're going to meet in November, but I don't think it affects you guys at all, and so their next meeting will be the November one I mentioned. And then it'll be April, unless some kind of action requires them to meet before that time.

MR. COLLINS: That's just one day in November they're proposing?

MR. MATHEWS: Right, but to get you in -- yeah, it's going to require to get you in probably the day before and then out the next day. That's all I have for the agenda item on recent board actions.

MR. COLLINS: Questions or comments? Hearing none, then we'll move on. The next item, I believe, is response to correspondence.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, Mr. Chairman, that's under Tab 4.

First I'll ask, the way I've been doing this in the past, and I kind of want to get your approval again, is I don't send all of you all the correspondence the minute it's done. I do provide copies to the Chair. This is your copy showing what's been done, if that's all right with you. If you want, I can -- option would be when it's generated, send you it, but you may end up with ten different mailings.

MR. COLLINS: We will all get them at the meeting, though?

MR. MATHEWS: Right, you all get them at the meeting and the Chair has to sign them or approve my signature for the Chair, so you're safeguarded there. I'll summarize what, but I'm taking that no discussion on it, that this is okay to continue this way?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, I don't see any hands up.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. All of you were here -- Angela, were you in Huslia? Okay, the Huslia meeting was really a very good meeting. Behind the scenes, there was a lot of work done and the main person working behind the scenes was Cesa Sam. So I worked to get the regional director to send a letter of thanks to her and this is the letter before you. That's the first one of recognition for the tribal council involvement and her in particular. If you remember, she cashed your checks, I hope gave you all your money, took you to the airport, waved you good-bye. She did everything. I can't remember all of it, but that meeting would have been a lot more difficult.

So that's the first letter. The next letter you have was from the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission, and I don't know if Paul's going to talk about this later or not, but this is dealing -- Paul Hunter with the Park Service, this is dealing with the regulations on taking furbearers under a trapping license. The Denali Subsistence Resource Commission unanimously opposes that restriction, so this is a copy of their letter.

The next letter is also from Denali, and stop me if you need, you know, more information on this. I'm trying to keep us on track. Okay, the next letter is to the Federal Subsistence Board.

This is dealing with the later agenda item, but it's dealing with customary and traditional use determinations, and they want the customary and traditional use determinations for moose and caribou along the Parks Highway between Mile Post 216 and 239, is asking the board to review that for prompt consideration, and they copied you and the South Central regional council.

MR. ULVI: Did you say Denali Highway?

MR. MATHEWS: Parks Highway. Did I say Denali? Sorry, it's Parks, Parks Highway.

Okay, the next letter is your letter to, I believe it -- I'm not sure what his title is. I may have gotten it wrong there, but Regional Director, Robert Barbee of the National Park Service, and it was your action concerning, let's see, it's -- again, it's

back to the regulations dealing with trapping license and trapping regulations. This is the letter that was sent to Mr. Barbee. If there's questions on that -- I'm not sure if it's going to come up under agency reports. It might.

MR. ULVI: Yeah, we can talk about that under the Park Service report.

MR. MATHEWS: Then I'll move on. So it's noted that it'll probably -- it will be under reports from the Park Service.

Okay, then you asked at your last meeting in Huslia that you wanted all the land managing agencies in Western Interior to look at wolf population studies, and this is the letter, the same letter but addressed to different people and in there you have all the copies. First one you see is Tom Allen, State Director of Bureau of Land Management. David Allen's in there, Mr. Barbee's in there, and I don't know -- oh, Frank Rue, Commissioner of Fish & Game.

So that's the letter that was sent. We haven't received a response, but it's not that long ago that it was sent.

MR. COLLINS: Is this an error in the letter? This one, says, let's see, we hope this letter will provide support to your agency in obtaining additional funding to have wolf populations for the above area. Was it a population census that you meant to ask for?

We're not asking them to make sure -- it sounds like we're asking them to make sure they got wolf populations all over.

MR. MORGAN: This letter's not really asking for the right --

MR. MATHEWS: That's not the intent.

MR. COLLINS: It sounds like a Yellowstone proposal.

MR. MATHEWS: I didn't have my vacation plans laid out. It should be studies on there. I apologize for that omission here, but it's clear earlier that you were asking for a wolf population study.

MR. MORGAN: Way we have it now, is serious. Talking about here doing something like this in contrary with what we're saying, exactly contrary. We can all laugh about it now, but the moose are suffering right now.

MR. MATHEWS: This was an action you took at your last meeting and I followed up, other than I left out "studies". And there's been no response, but I believe there will be responses.

MR. MORGAN: Could you write to them and correct it and tell them that that letter was in error?

MR. MATHEWS: I can do that if you so desire.

MR. COLLINS: I think probably it'll be clear through the rest of the letter what he's asking for. It was just that one sentence.

MR. MATHEWS: I can, if you --

MR. MORGAN: Better make sure, because you know, this is contrary to what we're asking.

MR. MATHEWS: If that's what the desire is, I can send a corrected letter. Is that the desire of the council or -- the only concern I'd have, again it is misleading, that sentence, I understand that, is then the agencies could say well we're waiting -- you know, there may be a delay. But just give me direction on it. I mean, it's on the computer. All I have to do is add it in.

MR. MORGAN: I'd like to see -- you know, you read it, it's like we're supporting having more wolves in the area. That's

exactly the opposite what we're asking for. This is serious what you've got. Follow up on it, make sure they understand what we're asking for. That's my viewpoint on it.

MR. COLLINS: I'll work with Vince on that.

MR. MATHEWS: I'll send out another letter on it.

MR. COLLINS: It may be there'll be more we'll have to say after the end of the meeting and hearing from Jack Whitman on the issue and part of this area.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

The next letter is again to Mr. Barbee at the National Park Service. This is dealing with concerns of this council that agencies can submit regulations for their areas or their -- yeah, for their areas through the federal register process and get them implemented that affect subsistence without going through the Federal Subsistence Program. So this is the letter saying that they would request that regulations that affect customary and traditional subsistence practices utilize the Federal Subsistence Program.

Next one is also to Mr. Barbee, and that's the wolf study, and he'll get a corrected copy if you desire to do that and then Dave Allen, Frank Rue and then --

PAUL HUNTER: Vince, yeah, I can comment on how the Park Service received that letter, and we understood what you meant.

MR. MATHEWS: But I can --

PAUL HUNTER: At least for the Park Service, we don't need to get a corrected copy.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. For the last letter, again, the Chair agreed that the council wanted to send a letter of thank you to the Huslia Traditional Council and to Cesa Sam. So that's a follow-up of that.

That's all the correspondence that I was involved with or your council was exposed to that I know of. If there's any others, please let me know.

MR. COLLINS: Is there additional comments on correspondence other than Harold -- Herman we take note of that. Hearing none, then we'll move on.

MR. SIMON: I have a question on is there any response to these letters to the chairs of the committees?

MR. MATHEWS: No, there has not been a response to these letters. But if you look at the dates, they went out late because I wasn't able to get them out earlier because of medical leave. So I am going to design a tracking system to track these letters, and I'll be able to follow them through. As an example, I believe you guys passed -- tell me if I'm wrong -- you passed a resolution dealing with factory trawlers. I think you guys did.

Okay, well, Department of Commerce hasn't responded to that. So now I need to do a follow-up letter. So I need to do a tracking system. There's just too many letters to follow. So you'll be getting another chart at your next meeting showing all these -- no, I'll have this myself so we can track this, so we can send a friendly reminder, saying on such and such a date we sent you such and such a letter. We're still interested in the subject. When can we expect a response to you -- response from you, excuse me.

I wouldn't be concerned about these letters, Pollock, because they only went out on September 13th or 15th. That's not that long ago.

MR. REAKOFF: Is it my understanding that the Park

Service is going to address the free ranging furbearer letter of May at this meeting?

PAUL HUNTER: Yes.

MR. COLLINS: Any other questions on correspondence?

MR. MORGAN: That's kind of late from the meeting in February to have them go in September. How come it's taking so long to get these letters out?

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, on that, the only thing I can do is be honest. I was working two jobs up until July. I'm still doing two jobs, and that plus my medical problem, which took me out of work for five to six weeks, but essentially, I was performing the duties of regulation specialist, in addition to being your regional coordinator. Now I'm withdrawing from the regulation specialist duties and concentrating on the other.

MR. MORGAN: In the future, I'd like to see the letters go out right away so we have time to get a response and discuss it at our meeting and we get -- we've got a response to talk about. Especially this saying the wolf population to increase; that's not correct.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, moving on, next item on the agenda is Customary and Traditional Determination process.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, on that, we'll go over the process that is now before you. The federal subsistence process dealing with customary and traditional use determinations, so everyone's clear. I'll probably be calling those C&T determinations from now on. That means Customary and Traditional use determinations, which is who can hunt and where they can hunt, okay.

MR. COLLINS: Is there a tab on this?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, that's under Tab 5. And the new -- the process we're in now is called the annual process. So like if you want to change a moose season in Unit 24, you submit a proposal, and go through the annual process. The C&T will be the same way, that you could submit a proposal to modify, change a standing C&T determination. That process, I'm not sure if you guys got -- yes, you did. You did get a copy of the federal register on it, but the reason -- well the process before, if you remember, we talked about Kenai, we talked about the other one. That was a process where as a staff and as a process we were marching around the state, and I think your region was up in '98 or something like that. That process became too cumbersome and too time consuming that the board decided by request from various councils to go to an annual process. Harold will remember that. That was the February 12th and 13th meeting where all the chairs were brought in and had a discussion on C&T.

So now we're under an annual process. What we have before us is the standing existing C&Ts, for your area, and we have backlog C&Ts that were submitted through the environmental impact statement process, and then since then. So my recommendation to the council is we're looking at the issue of C&Ts for Western Interior. Do any of the council members have any issues dealing with C&Ts for Western Interior?

MR. COLLINS: You mean the front end proposals now or commenting on the proposals that are in there?

MR. MATHEWS: There's no proposals in there. I mean, the standing C&Ts are before you. There's been no proposals. There will be some floated, I believe, by the public here but there's no proposals in front of you to change any of them.

So what we need from you is are there any issues? Then we need to look possibly at the existing C&Ts if you don't know of any issues, and then from there, we're going to ask you out of those ones that you've discussed, which are your ones you want acted on within this year, or within the near future.

So we're asking you, are there any C&T concerns in your area, and of those, which -- how do you want us to prioritize them? Because we cannot address all of the C&Ts for the area. The staff that you have also works Eastern Interior, so we're covering theirs, and so we need a prioritization. But first thing is you'll have in your Tab 5 a sample C&T proposal. I'm hoping it's in here. Yeah.

If you go to Tab 6, that's the letter I sent you earlier listing -- no, it isn't. That's another one, I'm sorry. I'm back in Eastern.

If you go to Tab 6, you'll see a chart that lists the C&Ts for your area. If that'll help you, look at them, or if you know of issues, and then I'll just be quiet and let you -- let us know which ones may need your -- need attention.

MR. COLLINS: Why don't each of you review those for your area and we'll raise questions with whether you have problems or concerns.

MR. MATHEWS: You also have the same information in here, too. I just made that chart so it was a little bit easier. If it's not, then you turn to here and it's in there, also.

MR. COLLINS: Any members, are you ready to go through these now? Keep us going here. I'll open it up if any of you members want, if you have any concerns with any of the determinations in your area. Yeah, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Looking at the Unit 24 area that I'm from, there's priorities of -- there's no determination on caribou in Unit 24 and also in -- we have C&T in the Unit 26(B) and there's Unit 26(B) on the North Slope.

MR. MATHEWS: For what species, for which --

MR. REAKOFF: Caribou.

MR. MATHEWS: That goes by the herd, if I got it right.

MR. REAKOFF: Caribou in Unit 24, there's no determination, but there's with the highway going right through a large portion of Unit 24, it's -- from the Western Arctic returns in the area and the area that I can foresee a pretty major problem with right now, and I would prioritize that as a higher priority for Unit 24.

There's also no determinations under trapping, but if we're going to prioritize, there's two animals that are -- right now they only have wolves that have a C&T, but lynx and wolverine, if you're going to prioritize C&T determination by species, lynx and wolverine I feel should be one of the first in the furbearer category to be worked on for C&Ts.

MR. MATHEWS: I lost the first part. Are you saying that the no determination for caribou in 26 --

MR. COLLINS: 24.

MR. REAKOFF: 24 has no determination. 26(B) has a herd determination, but it's my understanding that they want to get away from herd determinations, by herd.

MR. MATHEWS: I think maybe for the record and for

those present here, I need to make it clear what a no determination means and no subsistence mean. Is everyone clear on that? No determination means all qualified rural Alaskan residents can hunt.

No subsistence means there's no subsistence ever been documented in that area for use, okay. And the other ones are there, as you understand.

So the other thing that I failed to do is that this prioritization, the board will take your recommendations, public requests, and federal land managing agency input and then the availability of personnel and work to look at which ones are going to be up before you in April. And the last one that if you're still looking and wondering, you should definitely look at the ones that say no subsistence, because if you know of people that feel that that's a problem, that they do have subsistence in that area, they're being denied.

Under no determination for Unit 24, it just means all rural Alaskans, which could be a problem, I understand, with Jack, but they're not being denied. Under no subsistence, they're being denied. There's no subsistence.

MR. COLLINS: Example would be 19(D) under bison. The state determined that there was no subsistence record on the bison because it was an introduced herd but I would -- and it wouldn't make any sense to find that it was subsistence because in the state, it's open to any resident of the state. But part of that herd is on federal land, I believe, in the federal areas.

MR. DENTON: Yes, that's correct.

MR. COLLINS: And I think that federally they may want to revisit that. The reason being is the moose are in trouble in our area and if local people are not able to get the moose, traditionally, in subsistence, you took what was available. You shifted your activities according to your need. And the fact that there was no subsistence because there was no bison there before, now there are bison and they're available during the winter by snow machine.

Now, the one time the state did have a season, what they did is they issued a certain number of permits, I think in the spring. So there could be a way of hunting that that would meet both needs, like they open it up in the fall and if they don't take the number of animals, then they could allow a subsistence in the spring -- I mean, in the spring.

The problem is access. In the fall, local people put in, but it's very difficult. It's expensive to get up there. But in the spring you can get up there easily by snow machine. So people in McGrath or elsewhere that did not get a moose would be able to go hunt somewhere else. So I'm just raising that now, saying it's not an issue right now, but if the moose continue to decline, it may be an issue and may need a determination on federal level, because they could just make it for residents of that unit. That's the only one I saw in here.

Any others have determinations in their area that concerns them or no determination?

MR. MORGAN: I have some, caribou, Kilbuck only. Sometimes that herd goes over there by --

MR. COLLINS: Which one?

MR. MORGAN: Unit 18. And with all these villages, lists like Akiak, Akiachak, Kwethluk, but doesn't list Aniak. And

it's my feeling that they should be included on there, too.

MR. COLLINS: He's looking at the reports book.

MR. MATHEWS: We're talking about Unit 18?

MR. MORGAN: Unit 18 caribou.

MR. MATHEWS: For the Kilbuck?

MR. MORGAN: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: According to the letter that I received from Mike Coffing -- well it's actually -- anyways, initiated by him, it's an interim determination by the Federal Subsistence Board of 12/18/91, if we're talking Kilbuck herd, Unit 18, correct, and it's saying residents -- well, I'll -- I apologize if I get the pronunciations wrong of these villages, Tuluksak, Akiak, Akiachak, Kwethluk, Bethel, Oscarville -- and you can read the rest before I -- and it's on page 98 in your salmon colored book. It's in the upper left-hand corner. That's the existing C&T, and Herman, I didn't catch your discussion on that. Were you intimating that --

MR. MORGAN: I think that Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Napaimiut should be included in that.

MR. MATHEWS: That Aniak should be added to that? Mr. Chair, I think Jeff has a comment.

MR. DENTON: Yeah, the particular caribou you're talking about by the lake over here are Mulchatna animals, not Kilbuck. The Kilbuck are more over in the, like the Eek River, all south of Tuluksak River, and actually, those are merging this last two years a great deal with large influxes of Mulchatna animals, as well.

MR. MORGAN: You're talking the difference between Kilbuck herd and Mulchatna herd, in this area.

MR. DENTON: In the last couple years they've been enter mingling a great deal. When the Kilbuck clan was made, the Kilbuck herd was a small herd, mostly in the south end of the Kilbuck mountains, a localized herd. A plan was developed over several year period with Fish & Wildlife Service, Fish & Game and these particular vintages and the animals that come up here by Whitefish Lake and across to the Aniak drainage the last few years have been exclusively Mulchatna animals. So it's not the same group of -- not the same herd of animals.

MR. MORGAN: Well there's some to the --

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, also, once the animals get into -- I think we're talking about the area you're interested in is 19.

MR. MORGAN: No, Unit 18 over by Whitefish Lake.

MR. GUENTHER: No comment.

MR. COLLINS: There's a comment back here. Please identify yourself again for the record.

ANGIE MORGAN: Angie Morgan. I was just wondering, Vince was saying something about getting a letter from Mike Coffing on unit C&T for 18. How does the council or how does the board make determinations on the different units using the customary and traditional use? Was that determination for Unit 18 because of Mike Coffing's recommendation, or is it because he got the recommendations from the local people in that area?

MR. MATHEWS: No, no. If I may answer that --

MR. COLLINS: Yes, go ahead.

MR. MATHEWS: I just slipped. The letter that we're discussing is from Mr. Pospahala but Mike wrote it. What is there,

what the whole question you're asking about is how are C&Ts done. So let's address that and minus all the names attached.

The way it was done when this program was established, the federal adopted all the state standing C&T determinations, so -- I'm still ducking the question. The way that is done is that under the state system, there may be a proposal for season and harvest limits and I think Ray will correct me if I'm wrong because he's been on advisory committees a long time. If there's a question in making that out, they need to look at what are the customary and traditional uses for that area. So the state boards would have a briefing on those C&Ts, and then from there, they would adopt them, modify if there wasn't one there, or have a no subsistence. Those were adopted into the federal.

Those are based on -- I don't know if we have a copy, but I can get you a copy on the eight factors and I'm going to just summarize them, but I can get you a copy of this and that's customary and traditional uses are exemplified by eight factors, one is long-term consistent pattern of use excluding interruptions beyond control of the community or area; two is a pattern of use reoccurring in specific seasons for many years; three is a pattern of use consisting of methods and means of harvest which are characterized by efficiency and economy; four is consistent harvest and use of fish and wildlife as related to past methods and means of taking; five is -- and I'm briefing here, there's a little bit more to them -- five is a means of handling, preparing, preserving and storing fish and wildlife which has traditionally been used by past generations; and six is a pattern of use which includes handing down of knowledge, basically sharing of skills, traditional skills; seven is a pattern of use in which the harvest is shared and distributed within the community; and 8 is a pattern of use which relates to reliance on a wide diversity of resources.

So the state used those factors to determine its C&Ts.

The federal system adopted those. We are going to use the same factors when a request comes in on a C&T, but we're not asking the submitter to address each of these eight questions, let me make that clear -- or eight factors. But that will be what the board will look at when a request is submitted.

So then what happens with that is if there's a request, it comes in, this analysis is done, it's done in draft form. It goes to the regional council and others to look at. The regional council then will pass a recommendation. The staff will be present here that have done the analysis. They'll hear comments and council action. They can revise their recommendation, and then that goes to the interagency staff committee.

They pass a recommendation and that goes to the board, then the board decides if there's enough evidence there to take action. If there isn't, they can defer it or they can take action to accept the proposal or not.

So that's the process. Where this letter came from which is -- they have a copy of is that the process prior to this annual one, the next one up or the next one following the next one was YK Delta. So they were doing the preliminary background research on that. So a letter was drafted to Western Interior asking if -- to look at the C&T determinations for 18, because people go up and down river between the two units, and asked if they had any comments about those.

ANGIE MORGAN: The reason why I asked is I just started working in KNA natural resources almost a year ago and I was looking through their files. When I was -- when I was looking through the files and stuff, I found a file full of, like, a survey for all the people from Lower Kalskag up to Stony River, and it's a survey where they're asking questions about moose hunting and how long they've been moose hunting and all this, and I wondered if the board would use that as recommendations. Maybe what I can do is make copies of those, because I can make, you know, it's a big stack, but I can make a copy of it and it's from -- it's from like -- this was done I think in '90 or '91 and this is from 18 year olds on up to as old as 70, 80, and if you'd like a copy of that, I'd be more than happy to give you a copy of it.

MR. MATHEWS: I will get ahold of her. Mike will be involved in this also, but yes, we will be taking, during analysis, different subsistence harvest studies that were done. I'm not sure if that was one, but it sure sounds like it, and that data will also be put in there. And then -- I don't see George here from TCC -- there's been other projects that have been done through 638 contracts to correct data, and we'll have that information on some of the C&T usage. So that is incorporated to look at if there's a pattern of use there, and where that use occurs.

Then it has to be tested in the public light, and that's through the council system and the board process, and my understanding is if the board takes action on a C&T, it will be subject to Request for Reconsideration. So there may be a few proposals that are going to take a while to work through, because some people will disagree that others have used their area, or something to that effect.

MR. COLLINS: The other way I think that could be used is if you -- communities in your area disagree with a finding, they might be able to go and prepare a case using that and submit just that information. Or if they don't like the decision and they want it reconsidered, like if it was against them, again, they could go to that. So you could use it, yourself, to prepare a case to give to us when we consider it, and also to the federal board, I think. Conrad?

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, just so that it's -- everybody realizes, George Harrod (phonetic), who is a social scientist for the Western Interior, can't be here because of health problems within his family. So we do have an individual specifically that will be taking the lead on any C&T analysis for this region.

GREG ROCZICKA: Yeah, Herman mentioned about a point that I saw when I was looking through the C&T determinations pretty much right off the bat, in that at the risk of understatement, I guess, there's quite a few housekeeping I would see, as far as C&T determinations go, at least for 19(A) residents, and for, like you mentioned, GMU 18 for caribou, at least, from the Paimuit on down ought to be included in that. Holy Cross ought to be included for 18, sitting on the border. Holy Cross at a minimum, things of that nature. For moose, as far as like for 21(E), it's just right over the hill over there. That's residents of 21(E) and recognition of 21(A) says Aniak and Crooked Creek, I think. What about the other residents in between there for this region?

So I would think you might want to do some housekeeping in that regard as far as submitting proposals, just to cover those areas that have been missed. In the past, it was

essentially the C&T determinations that we have now are those villages or organizations that jump through the paperwork hoops over the past years, and that's why they're there, but there's a lot they're missing and some that maybe shouldn't be there, too.

MR. COLLINS: Then they're using the state procedures and sometimes the state -- well, I happened to be there when they were going to have everybody from clear out to the coast, even Nunivak Island because they were in that unit were going to have subsistence rights up in the head of the Kuskokwim River, because they were going to say all of Unit 19. And I said, hey, wait a minute, there's nobody that's ever traveled all the way from there up there.

So I think then they went down to subunits and now they're using villages. So some of the state determinations were very broad when they said all the residents of a unit had -- and that's going to cause us problems, or is causing problems now I think. So there's really need for fine tuning.

GREG ROCZICKA: We can do that on 21(E), deferred proposals.

MR. COLLINS: Other areas of concern that you noticed in here?

MR. MORGAN: I'd like -- Mr. Chairman, like Greg was saying, Unit 19 on page 99 it says public land, public lands in Unit 18 are closed to the hunting of moose except by rural use, rural Alaskans' use in Unit 18 and Upper Kalskag. Like Greg was saying, I think it should include all from Paimuit on down to Unit 18. There's some areas over here that people hunt. So if we can get that changed to include Napaimuit and Chuathbaluk and Aniak.

MR. COLLINS: Keep note of that. We have to draw up a proposal is what we need to do.

MR. MORGAN: To change this?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, that's the way it would be used.

MR. MORGAN: And 21(E), too.

DEBBIE LEE: My name's Debbie Lee. I had a question. I know that Fish & Game does a yearly survey and they do a radio collar. I was wondering if they completed one in 19, Unit 19 on caribou.

MR. COLLINS: I had a little trouble hearing that question.

GREG ROCZICKA: I can answer.

DEBBIE LEE: I was just curious on whether a survey or a radio collar with a caribou has been completed within Unit 19.

MR. COLLINS: Can any of the staff answer?

MR. DENTON: I guess I can comment in general terms to that. The Mulchatna herd has a number of radios on them and they are monitoring distribution, movements of the Kilbuck -- or of the Mulchatna herd. The other small herds, the Sunshine herd, Beaver Mountain herd, there's several other herds that are in Unit 19, have not been monitored with radio collars.

I think Jack Whitman can probably tell you what he's done on those. I know he does some calving surveys and some other generalized surveys on the smaller herds, but as far as an intensive radio monitoring program on those herds, no, there's nothing done. Mulchatna's the only one receiving any intensive monitoring, and that's being done by Larry Vandale (phonetic) out of Dillingham.

ANGIE MORGAN: I was just going to say, yesterday I

heard Frank talking about in Holy Cross area they start moose hunting like August 20th. I don't think it would be a bad idea for the Kuskokwim up-river people to be able to have something like that, because August -- I mean, September 1st to September 20th, a lot of the people in this area have a hard time getting their moose because they not only get from, like down river, but they get people from all over. We get people not even from Alaska. We get people from the states, we get people from out of the United States, from Japan and Norwegian, and all those other places. They all come around this way, and I think it would be a good idea for this region to have an early moose hunt before everybody else comes in.

A lot of people don't catch their moose by September 20th, and they end up spending a lot of money going further up river where it's still open, and I think that would be a super good idea for this region to have an early moose hunt.

MR. COLLINS: What we need is an actual proposal, then, from this area, I think, and it has to be just on the federal lands. That's the problem. The state, you can't open early on the state because it's every resident subsistence on the state. So it probably would behoove the people in the local area to look and see if there's federal land there that they'd want to propose that and come to us, because if you turn it in, we would consider it at the spring meeting, as I understand it.

MR. MATHEWS: Right, and then the closure for submitting proposals is October 27th. So you could write up a proposal and send it that way, or if you knew enough of it now, bring it up to this council. The council here would just listen to it and be educated about your concerns and then we would submit it to the board. They would take the recommendation at the next meeting. But the key factor is you have to look at the distribution of land in that area and see if where you hunt is federal land to make that advantageous for you or not. I'm looking real quickly, and it's pretty scattered in that area.

MR. COLLINS: The other thing you'd have to look at then is who has customary and traditional determination, because if there's a customary and traditional unit for everybody in 18, then it wouldn't be just your communities that would be able to go out early, it would be everybody that has been determined to have a use. So that could not help, but it would help the problem with some of the foreign and others, but it may not help with increased pressure just from others up and down the river.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: So I take it that if you -- whether it be a proposal to be opened earlier, the same, the same would go if you wanted a proposal at a later date, not only the proposal with documentation and proof, that would be the proper way to submit a proposal.

MR. COLLINS: Yes.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: Whether you wanted it earlier or whether you wanted to extend it to be later, the only input would be a proposal along with documentation and proof of C&T happening; is that the proper way to do this?

MR. COLLINS: I think if you -- you could attach it to the proposal and then the other opportunity is that you would get the documentation to us when we consider it, or to the state board when they consider it.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: By October 27th.

MR. COLLINS: No, I think the proposal is the only thing that would have to be in on the 27th. You can follow up with the other information, because we won't hear it till spring.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: The other information doesn't have to go along with the proposal?

MR. MATHEWS: It would be best if it did. It would make life a lot easier, but Katherine has sample copies back there. There's a series of questions. If you can answer those and if you know of additional information but you can't meet that 27th deadline, submit it after that to the same address and get it to us and then make sure it gets to the council also.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: That's correct, because I was thinking a proposal without any documentation or proof is not really a very good strong proposal. So I was just making that recommendation and finding out whether it would be a better idea to attach along with the proof.

MR. MATHEWS: It would make the whole process work smoother if you can, but we realize that the deadline is close, that you may not be able to, but that's what we're striving for. But some people do not have those resources to put it all down there at that time, but then we try to get them on the phone or other ways and then through the public process, hopefully that information surfaces. But we've had a series of proposals it did not, and in analysis, we went the right fork and the proposal was really going to left fork, and until it got to the board level did we realize we may not have been in the right river. So we're trying to get people to tell us clearly in the beginning what they would like.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: Because I heard the lady here speaking, the reasoning behind it was more hunters and more people coming in to hunt and no time to get there or getting short of time.

So I figured put a proposal in for an earlier date, along with somebody putting a proposal in for an extended date, that would justify, you know, the length, with all the information within, reasoning behind it.

MR. MATHEWS: Right, but I don't want to mislead anybody. The conservation of the resource has to play a factor in that.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: I understand.

MR. MATHEWS: So if the lengthening or changing of the dates threatens that conservation of that resource, moose, caribou, whatever, your proposal is going to be tested against that, just so you realize that.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: But we would get feedback on that.

MR. MATHEWS: Right, right.

MR. COLLINS: I've had a request for a break. Let's take five minutes now and then we'll come back to the customary and traditional.

(Brief recess).

MR. COLLINS: Okay, where we were at? We were reviewing the existing C&T determinations and the other task we have before us here is to prioritize those. If we identify some that we want them to look at, then we need to prioritize. So first of all, are there any -- we've identified some. I think, Jack, you mentioned some up there that you felt we needed to look at. There was discussion on this one on caribou. Now, should that be on the list here?

MR. MATHEWS: I don't know.

MR. COLLINS: Or is that --

MR. MORGAN: I think we -- he clarified.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

MR. MORGAN: The one on moose should be on there in Unit 18 to include Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Napaimiut. I'm writing up a proposal.

MR. COLLINS: Oh, okay, okay. So that'll take care of that. The one I mentioned on, I'm not proposing we get into the one on 19 yet. I just pointed out the fact that there had been the finding by the state that we may need to revisit.

MR. MATHEWS: That's clear that you're just noting it now but not asking it to be an issue at this time.

MR. COLLINS: Right. Now, are there others, other findings within your area that you want to note? The reason these are so important, I want to stress this again, is when you come in to set bag limits -- I mean, well, bag limits, but when you come in to set seasons, somebody wants like this early opening, you have to know what C&T is, because whoever has customary and traditional use of that area will be able to take advantage of that season. So sometimes locally you may want to have an early season and you find you're creating more problems because there was too many people that have a customary and traditional use of that area and they could all come in, not just that local community. That's why these are very important.

DEBBIE LEE: Yeah, Debbie Lee, I just wanted to comment what Angie was saying. She may be proposing it right now, but it may not come in effect five years from now, but does the board or council itself have any authority to support her request to the state board? I mean, do you guys have the authority to do that?

MR. COLLINS: To the state board of game?

DEBBIE LEE: Yes. For example, if she wanted, let's say, 19(A) to change the dates and most of the land is covered by state property, there's a little portion of federal land there, can the federal here support the individual in changing those moose hunting dates?

MR. COLLINS: We could possibly do it, but you wouldn't want to do it under the state season, because under the state regs now, every resident of the state is a subsistence user. They have no customary and traditional anymore. That was what happened in there. So if they open an early state season, it's not going to help you, because everybody in the state can come. The only one it would exclude would be non-resident hunters. That's why these are -- we're dealing with federal lands and proposals for federal lands, because the federal can restrict it to residents of certain communities, so on, based on these customary and traditional findings.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: My question is, once you do submit a proposal, proposal with the documentation along with it, how long do you think that will take for that proposal to come into effect? I hope not five years.

MR. MATHEWS: No, no.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: Golly.

MR. COLLINS: As I understand it, and we'll ask staff to correct me if I'm wrong, we'll be looking at proposals next spring. We make recommendations on it, the board will meeting to act

on those this next year. So it could be in effect in the fall, unless they decide to postpone it or delay a decision because they don't have enough information or something. So it could be that fast.

MR. MATHEWS: It would go in effect July 1st, if the board passed it. So July 1st, 1996, it would go into effect, okay, and then the question that she had about can this council make recommendations to the state board system, they can and you have done that and the Eastern Interior even got a beaver season established under state, but I also tell you that your comment to the state will be equal to an individual comment, because this is a federal council. It doesn't carry the same weight that if this was a state council, per se, or a state advisory committee, but obviously they'll listen.

So they can, but there's not jurisdiction, so they need to weigh their time out and concentrate on federal lands and that's generally what all the councils have been doing.

MR. COLLINS: The best way to go with state proposals is use your local Fish & Game advisory committee, which you have one here, because the chairmen of those get sent in when they're actually deciding them. They'll often take extra comments. So they have more voice than we would. Ours would just be a letter or something that would be read there on the state paperwork.

GREG ROCZICKA: I got a question there. I don't know if it would be appropriate, but I wonder if it might be a possibility to put something into place, we talked about it before, as far as providing additional or extra opportunity for taking moose, for example, for their season to open earlier. It would essentially be creating another class of subsistence users under the regulatory process, but if you had the primary and secondary C&T use, something of that nature, there would be a possibility of doing something like that and opening the door for it. Granted, most of the land here is state land, but who knows, good lord willing and whatever else, if we get the amendment to the constitution down the line where they can put regulations in effect, take into consideration residency or geographical areas rather than the whole state, you know, we could put something into the mill now and have it worked out through the system and provide that additional opportunity for more localized hunting seasons.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

MR. COLLINS: I don't know what's going to happen. Jack, you have a comment?

MR. REAKOFF: It's my understanding that -- I hear the same problem all over down in this country -- that there's too much state land and not enough subsistence opportunity to compete with the urban hunters, but on state land, the local advisory, state advisory committees can propose a tier-two hunt, which then gives more of a local, closer to the resource priority, and at this point, I think that's what would address Gail and different people's problems here, asking for a tier-two type hunt, because they're closer to the resource, the higher the priority, and that's the lead. That's the most you can get out of the state right now.

GREG ROCZICKA: Right, right now. But tier-two hunt, you also have to have a limited population, some sort of a population, and from what the biologists or management, per se, is saying for this region, that doesn't apply.

MR. COLLINS: Under the federal, you were talking about a two-tier customary and traditional. There is nothing like that.

GREG ROCZICKA: I know there isn't right now.

MR. COLLINS: It would probably take congressional action. They're following the state's. Customary and traditional has to meet the five points, and it doesn't say anything about -- either they have a customary and traditional right or they don't. But these customary and traditional are very important to you and if they're too broad, you could have a proposal to say that it would narrow it down and say that it would be just this part of a subunit has customary and traditional in this unit or part of this unit.

MR. ULVI: Mr. Chairman, just one comment, there is the method for allocation for otherwise eligible federal subsistence units would be the 804 process, where in this case, if there was a resource shortage -- again, you're saying that management says there's not -- but if there was a resource shortage, then you can go on federal lands to Section 804 allocation process, which is laid out direct here, you know, three factors. But again, what you've said wouldn't allow you to get to that point, I don't think.

MR. COLLINS: That would be like the tier-two. In federal they have an 804 process to further restrict.

MR. ULVI: Within the pool of eligible subsistence users, if there's a need to restrict based on long-term dependency and other sources, but again, only federal lands and when the resource, there is a shortage.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. Again, back to the C&T then, are there any others you want to comment here?

Okay, then the second thing would be to prioritize, I guess. The only one we've got now is the one that Jack mentioned.

MR. MATHEWS: Jack, and Herman's submitting or going to try to get the council the proposal.

MR. COLLINS: On caribou.

MR. MORGAN: Moose.

MR. MATHEWS: And moose. That's the only two I've heard so far. So it would indicate that's the priority in this unit.

Let's make it clear. This is the first time we've gone into this annual process. This may become clearer as you get proposals in front of you and next fall you'll have a better idea how to prioritize and what needs to be prioritized.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, I have a question at this point, because there are some proposals that I saw in here that were going to question the customary and traditional in the Holy Cross area up there. Now, I think these people would feel that has priority, I mean, to look at that issue if it comes up, because they're very concerned. It's asking to expand that. How do we deal with that?

MR. MATHEWS: Well, if the council's indicating that that's a priority, then that'll tell us that those -- if you're referring to the past, requests that came in the past, you're saying those are ones that the staff and the board should look at.

MR. COLLINS: Oh, okay, so those aren't automatically coming up next spring?

MR. MATHEWS: My understanding is they're not automatic, but where that cut's going to happen is we're kind of asking the councils, but I'm not going to mislead you that some of those may surface because -- I don't have it in front of me, but it's

based on recommendations from others, councils and land management agencies, as well as staff availability, and obviously, if the adjoining region places one higher, they're going to get that one bumped in there. So that one might be before you if it overlaps. So until we get through a year or two, it's going to be a little rough for a while.

MR. DENTON: Yeah, and I attended the Yukon Delta council meeting and that's their top priority, is to get C&T use in 21(E). That's their highest priority. That's why they've also sent a letter. They actually want to have joint meetings with you folks to discuss it. So that is their highest priority on the YK Delta, so to give you an idea the perspective to put on it, I guess.

MR. COLLINS: It's not a priority here. I think you want it the way it is.

MR. MATHEWS: Is that the understanding from Holy Cross representatives, that you kind of like the C&T as it is?

MR. COLLINS: You don't want to expand that? Do you understand what I'm talking about? Right now it's residents of 21(E) and Russian Mission, I think is the only one that can come under that subsistence use.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: In Holy Cross, people are concerned because they are having a lot of down-river people come up and trying to establish C&T in our area, and it only became customary and traditional after big time money and commercial fishing, because you see a difference. When there's big money down-river, we have a lot of people come in. If there's not, then they don't show up in our area.

The objections I was hearing at home was that they don't want to see them establish customary and traditional use in our area, because it never was customary and traditional for them to travel until they got big money in commercial fishing.

MR. COLLINS: It's happening under the state seasons, under the regular hunting seasons in the fall.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Right. Comment here. Frank first.

FRANK TURNER: Mr. Chairman, may I speak to that? The February season that we speak of, which is subsistence season for residents of 21(E) and Russian Mission, that would certainly cause problems if it was open to the rest of the people that are applying down river, Alakanuk and AVCP. What we're seeing up there is first it's -- they have not traditionally hunted up there. Second, during the February season, the moose are very vulnerable. The deep snow, you can drive right up to them and get them and drive away. So that's important.

Third, the federal land is not defined yet. It's not defined on -- so enforcement is almost impossible, you know, unless you caught a guy right there. So we would like to -- to hold off on this. We suggest or recommend holding off on this. I represent not only the Traditional Council at Holy Cross, which is claiming jurisdiction over all the corporation lands, and our constitution says that we protect the land and preserve the game. So that is our duty to do that, and that's why I'm speaking here today, that and also representing Shageluk and Anvik as a board member from that region. They all have the same concerns.

What's happening with the influx of hunters in the fall season, they get into our area first and they're pushing our hunters up into lands that we don't traditionally hunt. We've got to move closer to Shageluk. We've got to get up in the Anvik area, and

that isn't right for us to do that to them also.

So there are -- there are all these little problems to work out, I think, and it looks to me like even though it won't come into effect until for another year or so, but it needs to be worked out and we need to sit down with the people that are proposing this, and you know, work it out in a good way. So thank you for listening.

MR. COLLINS: There's comment?

GREG ROCZICKA: I got a letter here that basically a carbon copy of the one that we submitted to the Yukon Delta council, and asking for essentially deferral on any recommendations regarding the 21(E) C&T determination until we can sit down, get the two regional councils together to sit down and talk with the residents from the different tribal councils that are affected, and we're holding a meeting on October 26 of Lower Yukon Moose Management Committee, which is a cooperative agreement that we put together under Section 809 of ANILCA with the feds, and the state is also involved in that as well, but those people are going to be there in Russian Mission on the 26th. I've talked with George Yaska, Tanana Chiefs. I haven't as yet gotten through to Holy Cross Tribal Council, but I certainly hope they would come, whether the whole council would come to that meeting or more appropriately probably just the representatives from those villages that are most immediately affected, would be Angela and Henry, the YK Council agreed with that, as well, and they appointed, they wanted their two representatives from the Yukon and people from the Kuskokwim to come to that meeting.

Along the same lines, we're also organizing a meeting in roughly the second week of December, either in Kalskag or here, someplace on one of the border villages where you can get Kuskokwim people together to do the same thing, and then after those meetings take place and we start to air some of this out, you know, maybe we'll come to some resolution of some of it. If the councils could get together again and make their recommendations at that time -- as I understand it, your meetings are in February.

As far as like the C&T in 21(E), when the proposal went in, they were put in back in 1990 when the EIS first came out and the feds were doing the take-over and so forth, kind of putting in blanket proposals, all residents will have customary and traditional use for all lands they use, and that translated into GMU 18 or 21(E), when in reality, you're not talking of, you know, everybody from Kuskokwim or out on the coast or whatever, and you're not talking about all of 21(E) either. So you're not talking about all the residents of GMU 18. You're not talking about the entire 21(E). So just the Paimuit area or the Paimuit slough, but anyway, that's where people got to sit down and talk together and hash things out.

MR. COLLINS: So this is a letter from --

GREG ROCZICKA: If the council will consider that.

MR. COLLINS: -- from AVCP, okay. In terms of action of this group, then, what we may want to recommend is rather than give it priority, that before considering these proposals they do what has been suggested, that there be a joint meeting between the affected communities. So we could do something like that, I assume, couldn't we, under this prioritizing that we -- that we would request that there would be joint meetings between the affected communities before they consider that proposal again.

MR. MATHEWS: That's an option. I think what he's requesting is that the Lower Yukon Moose Management Committee, that meeting, that representatives from both councils come. That's what I was checking, because I wasn't at the YK meeting and what I'm getting indication is that there was tentative approval for members of this council to go to that meeting on October 26th. I think that's what Greg was saying is that's when that meeting is. Your discussion is that there should be between the communities, indicates that, but I'm not clear if you're talking about a separate meeting or what.

MR. COLLINS: We could deal with that under, then, future meeting plans.

MR. MATHEWS: You can, or you could deal with it now if you wanted to. I don't want to -- yeah, you could deal with it any time. It would be -- I think what they're requesting is that members of this council go. I don't think they're saying the whole council, but the members that go are just representatives, and that's clear to the people organizing this, that it still has to go back to the council for their approval, either council, both councils.

GREG ROCZICKA: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: So I'm thinking they're talking like two people, and the obvious ones would be your closest members to the area that's affected and that would be Mr. Deacon and Angela. But it could also be the Chair in addition, or something to that effect. It's in Russian Mission.

MR. COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: This has been effective on another issue, and Harold can wake me up on this, but when he was Chair, he met with the Chair of the Yukon Delta and they were able to resolve some issues, I think it was the early season, on that. So a lot can be accomplished face to face. I'm not sure it will be resolved at this meeting, but it's a better step than essentially one council passing one recommendation, the other one passing one against it, and keep marching along that way.

MR. COLLINS: So in order for members from here to go, we should have action authorizing them to go and then you could spend funds to get them there?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, so it's clear to me that this council wants to send members and who those members are, and if they agree. If they don't, then other members may want to go in their replacement.

MR. COLLINS: Comments from Angela and Henry? Would you be willing to attend this meeting down there when they're discussing?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I'm waiting for Henry to speak.

MR. DEACON: I have another meeting to attend, the meeting is the 26th of this month.

MR. MATHEWS: Correct, one day.

GREG ROCZICKA: One day meeting.

MR. DEACON: I wouldn't mind having the chairman go. He has more understanding for this; he understand our areas.

MR. COLLINS: I'll have to look at the calendar. If that's the case, I'll consider it. Would you be willing to attend?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I'd be willing to attend.

MR. COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: So if I understand it correctly, it would be then possibly the three of you going, Henry and Angela and

--

MR. COLLINS: Henry says he has another meeting, he has a conflict, he can't, and he was asking if I could, and I'll have to check the calendar, too, because it's getting to a busy month. Okay then, maybe a motion authorizing two members of this group to attend the -- do you have a title for it?

MR. MATHEWS: The title is -- correct me if I'm wrong, Greg -- it's the Lower Yukon Moose Management Committee meeting.

GREG ROCZICKA: Correct, made up of Fish & Game, both the management and the regional subsistence, same on the federal level, management and Yukon Delta staff and their subsistence division, and then also representatives from the tribal councils of the 14 Lower Yukon villages.

MR. COLLINS: Is someone willing to make that motion then?

MR. REAKOFF: So moved.

MR. COLLINS: Jack moved. Is there a second?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Second.

MR. COLLINS: Seconded by Harold. Any discussion on that?

MR. MORGAN: The people before they go if they can get some direction as how this council feels about that, about that, you know.

MR. COLLINS: Well, they won't be speaking for the council. They'll be speaking probably more for their communities, I guess.

MR. MORGAN: I kind of had a comment on this, if I may.

MR. COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MORGAN: You know, we hear things like opening the season earlier, we hear things about having designated hunters and now we hear you want to include Unit 18 residents to hunt Unit 21(E), you know, and there's increased pressure from sport hunters and there's increased wolf predation, you know. I think our bottom line should be protecting the resource. There's only so much moose out there and if we do something like this, we include residents of Unit 18, it'll further hurt the moose population, you know. Pretty soon we'll have nothing. I think that should be addressed. That should be our bottom line, protecting the moose population, is the way I look at it.

MR. COLLINS: I agree with you, and if I should be the one that is going, that would be my concern, because I've heard from you people at Grayling and Holy Cross, I know what they're concerned about. There's just too much pressure.

MR. MORGAN: There's only so much moose out there, you know.

MR. COLLINS: And Angela I think is hearing what he's saying, too. You probably concur with that.

All right, are there any other?

GREG ROCZICKA: Mr. Chairman, yeah, I wondered if you could possibly take action at the same time, would you be willing to also have some of your appropriate council members come to the meeting that we have for the Kuskokwim, as well, on the same type of issues? That's the bottom line. What we're dealing with is increase not only resident population, but the other populations, everybody got to deal with that around the state. Got to start dealing with it

now, not five years ago when we could have and should have. But anyway, for the Kuskokwim, as well, the meeting we're holding in December, I wondered if you might be willing to authorize members to come to that meeting also.

MR. COLLINS: What is your feelings? You want to authorize a couple members to attend that also? I think that would probably be one that you would want to attend; wouldn't it? Meeting here to discuss the issues.

MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I guess we could have some communications and if I get sent to these and maybe hearing, have a better understanding of how to vote.

MR. COLLINS: I think, Gail, you would probably be interested?

MS. VANDERPOOL: In the Kuskokwim, yes, I would, definitely would.

MR. COLLINS: If there's a motion authorizing it, we could work it out for two members to attend, up to two members to attend the Kuskokwim meeting.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: So moved.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, moved by Angela. Is there a second?

MR. REAKOFF: Second.

MR. COLLINS: Second by Jack. Further discussion? All those in favor identify by saying aye.

(Unanimous response).

MR. COLLINS: We did vote on the other one; didn't we? We got a motion before us. Let's hold it off. Authorize two members to attend the meeting in --

MR. MATHEWS: Lower Yukon Moose Management at Russian Mission.

MR. COLLINS: At Russian Mission, October 26th. That motion is before us. All those in favor, signify by raising your right hand.

(Unanimous response).

MR. COLLINS: Okay, it's yes votes for seven members, motion carried. Now, I think you can straighten this out in the minutes. So now we have a motion and a second before us to allow two members to attend the Kuskokwim meeting in December. All those in favor, signify by raising your right hand.

(Unanimous response).

MR. COLLINS: I suggest, as Chair, that possibly Gail and Herman would attend that one on the Kuskokwim, if possible.

MR. MATHEWS: And the other one was going to be Henry and Gail?

MR. COLLINS: No, Henry is the one that has the conflict with the date. He was asking if I could attend and it's --

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, that's right.

MR. COLLINS: And if I can't, then we can possibly bring in another member.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, comments?

ANGIE MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I just wanted to make a comment on this customary and traditional use thing. The reason why I asked how you guys go about determining that is exactly what Angela and Frank were saying. All these testimonies that I read that I found in the office from the people from Kalskag on up to

Stony River and Lime Village, majority of them are saying that the people down river claim customary and traditional use when commercial fishing started, and that's how I was wondering how far back do you go or you determine customary and traditional use.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I'm not sure what the federal board is doing in that, because I know that issue has come up before, how long does it have to be to be customary and traditional, and --

ANGIE MORGAN: Especially all the elders are the ones that mention it on the survey, that the only time they started seeing people from down river coming up this way was after commercial fishing started.

MR. COLLINS: I think economically that allowed bigger boats and motors, so they had the means.

ANGIE MORGAN: More money to get gas and come up this way.

MR. COLLINS: That's certainly part of the issue, I think. Is there someone wants to speak more about what -- how long? I'm sure that issue has come up, but I don't know what has been stated on how long.

MR. MATHEWS: The board, to my knowledge, has not adopted any specific number. I think what has been discussed is at least one generation. Now, you can ask how long one generation is. I'm ready for all these questions, I just don't have the answers. I don't know. There's different figures floating around on that, but that's going to be -- this will be an interesting discussion on this, because the area will have balance in different ways.

The other areas it's been discussed, it's been more from a non-native viewpoint, a high population of non-natives, and so I -- I don't know where the board has stood on that, as far as the depth of time. It would have to be at least one generation.

MS. VANDERPOOL: I don't know, maybe just to -- something of my view, what I saw, I was born and raised in Bethel and I was raised on reindeer and things like that, and I'd never really eaten a lot of moose meat until I moved up river 23, 24 years ago. I see where Angie's coming from. I want to preserve the rights of the people down river and I want to help the people up river, too. I'm just speaking the fact which I agree with Angie, I guess, after commercial fishing when they could afford it is when they really started coming up river, I mean, what I saw in my short life span so far.

MR. MATHEWS: These will be the issues that will be back before this council as to weighing those out, and the board's going to have to -- I just know on the state side we spent days on this subject, and I don't remember what we came out with. I think it was 32 years is what they came out with.

MR. COLLINS: I think in presenting testimony, you would argue, as the people did there, that it was not -- since it's open to question how long ago, you would want to testify what you think. They haven't determined it yet. Then you'd testify what you think, this ought to be excluded because, and then give your reason or something that you're saying, because they haven't made up -- if there isn't a fixed answer.

GREG ROCZICKA: Mr. Chairman, we've asked for that specific criteria and the way it seems to be now is almost if somebody went up there, if their grandfather went up on a dog team 50 or a hundred years ago, that would automatically establish it for the

community, and it's kind of how it was adopted and the people that are there now came into play.

MR. COLLINS: I guess my concern is if they do pin down an answer, then it becomes the words on paper that determine. So some of these things, maybe you want it more flexible, depending on the issue and the discussion, because then pretty soon, we're governed by, okay, 22 years, okay, that's it, okay, or 30 years, okay, that's it. And that's not a very good answer sometimes on these issues.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Mr. Chairman, will it be coming up in one of our meetings as to what each council thinks of the years or generations? Is it going to be a discussion for us?

MR. COLLINS: Well, I don't think that the federal has put that on the board. I think they -- they have to weigh that when it comes up, just like the state would. I don't think the issue of how long is before them.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, it is, but it isn't. The eight factors -- let me check.

MR. COLLINS: One of those talks about time.

MR. MATHEWS: The eight factors are part of Subpart C, I think, or if it's D, then they're open. So you could comment on it. I'm not sure when the board will take up those eight factors. So you could delve into it now, and then go from there, but it will be interesting once you start walking into that. That's all I'm saying. I don't know if -- if you're far enough along into doing that, but you could now say that under factor one, long-term consistent use or something, that you would say it's -- and I'm being facetious here -- 500 years. Because I don't want to give you a year, because then you'll be working on that.

MR. MORGAN: I think one of the determinations would be before the introduction of outboard motors and snow machines would be one way. That would be one way.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Ray, I have a few comments on that.

MR. COLLINS: Harold?

MR. HUNTINGTON: On our last regular board meeting in July, I think it was, that we discussed a C&T for Kenai, and there was a lot of discussion on the time that should be considered customarily, and a lot of the towns on the Kenai Peninsula have different times that they really originated and some go back for 75 years or so and they still couldn't figure out, you know, put a time limit on, I think, the residency or the customary use. So I still, you know, it's never came up really, really any clear decision on the time so far, that I know of. So it's probably still, you know, probably still debatable for a while.

MR. MATHEWS: You could comment, it's under Subpart B that's not open right now, but you could comment on the length. My advice would be to wait until you see proposals that will allow you to understand what length may affect when you go for it. And there may be other councils that are taking a proactive stand on these eight factors. That'll give you options there to look at.

This was discussed at the February 12th and 13th meeting. I don't know if Harold was there or not, and all the chairs discussed about the eight factors and about the concerns, but there was none floated as to change those eight factors. But you could comment on it if you wanted to.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. I just remind you we want to try

to finish today if possible and I see we're on the first run here, we're going to use most of the morning. If possible, we should move on.

ANGIE MORGAN: I just have one real quick question to ask you. Harold talked about the customary and traditional use in Kenai. Does that mean like I lived in Anchorage for 15 years, can I go, you know, if I find it cheaper with the airfare to go to Anchorage and then go hunt in Kenai, can I do that, because I can claim that as customary and traditional because I lived there for almost 20 years?

MR. MATHEWS: No. Anchorage is not recognized as a rural community.

ANGIE MORGAN: No, I mean Kenai.

MR. COLLINS: They designated specific communities on the Kenai that had rights. So you'd have to live in one of those communities.

MR. MATHEWS: It wasn't Anchorage and it was not Kenai. Soldotna, Ninilchik, Nanwalek. I don't have all my notes from it to make it clear.

MS. BURSE: Port Graham was on there.

MR. MATHEWS: But the regional council on that issue took a different stand and said that they recommend that the whole Kenai Peninsula be considered rural.

MR. DENTON: I was also in attendance to that meeting. It was not a pleasant meeting for a lot of folks there. It has basically split the communities and families up and down the Kenai and it doesn't set well with anybody. So we haven't seen the end of the Kenai discussions at all yet.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. We flagged some of them for priority. We had two, I think, listed.

MR. MATHEWS: Caribou and trapping and then 21 moose.

MR. MORGAN: 18 and 21, 18 and 21(E).

MR. MATHEWS: 18 moose also, okay. Where we can go from here is with consultation with Conrad, I'm quite comfortable where you've proceeded in the C&T discussion. You did receive all those backlogged ones. If there's any in there that you think we should bump up, now would be a time to do that.

MR. COLLINS: Is there a list in here now?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, that's under tab -- I don't remember the tab. It's under Tab 6. Yes, it's under Tab 6, but again, if you've set your priorities on those three, those ones -- those issues, then, we will go back to these that are backlogged and pull up those that are connected with them.

What I did, and you may have caught wind of it, is tried to keep you away from the backlogs until we had discussed C&T.

Once you jump in these backlogs, we could be here a couple of days, because there's little nuances here and there, and it's -- so you may want to look at them, you received them earlier, and go from there.

I have a cross reference list that I developed, which tells me that Unit 24, there was no past C&T request for Unit 24. For Unit 21(E), was a very hot one. There was two, four, six, seven backlogged requests on 21(E) moose. And for 18 moose, I don't have that broken out, but I think there's some backlogged ones there. I would need a few minutes.

MR. COLLINS: I think that what I heard before was on the 21(E) now, actually the people would prefer that those were not

opened up, although out of these meetings there may be something that comes up there. So we're not giving them priority, terms of -- isn't that correct?

MR. MATHEWS: The priority is caribou and trapping in 24 for lynx and wolverine, and 18, it's moose.

MR. COLLINS: Any other comments on these backlogs? I think we're ready to move on then.

MR. MATHEWS: I think it would be best to move on and then these internally will be back with you as you proceed through this process in the next year or two. It does not mean that these are going to be ignored, but they will be taken up as the priority system goes through.

MR. COLLINS: The next item on the agenda is the update on the requested regional boundary changes for Western, Northwest, Arctic and North Slope regions.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, on that, you can turn to Tab 7 and I'll ask Steve to interject, if he wants to do it, whichever way you want to go, but this was before you in the past, and you took action supporting this boundary change and I think Steve can give you an update, but you have materials in front of you for that update.

MR. COLLINS: Steve, you can summarize.

MR. ULVI: Quick summary, Mr. Chair. Originally, this was a request a year and a half ago or so by the mayor of Anaktuvuk Pass and our Subsistence Resource Commission for Gates of the Arctic National Park which Jack and Pollock are both members, supported further consideration by the Federal Subsistence Board of some small changes to the northernmost portions of the boundary of the region that you represent here, and some small changes to the easternmost portion of the Northwest Arctic region and the North Slope region, here in this area where they're all coming together as you can see.

What basically the proposal was by some residents of Anaktuvuk Pass was that they, since they originally were in GMU 24 and represented by this council, they asked early on, a couple years ago, to have the boundary drawn around the community to make them part of the North Slope and the federal board accepted that. So they feel like since they can -- as residents, they can only be nominated to be on the North Slope regional council and they can't be directly on your council or on the Northwest Arctic council because of the residency. They felt nervous and wanted to see this boundary changed slightly so that all of their customary and traditional use areas for trapping and hunting would be in the North Slope region.

Now that's an issue that a lot of you have that are on boundaries in these federal regions. So we went ahead and pushed that along, sent letters out and asked for comment from you folks and other regional councils, the three regional councils, local advisory commissions, everybody else. The board wanted to hear from everybody.

What the latest is, and I think the letters you have there in your packet are letters resulting from tribal council meetings in villages like Noatak, Kobuk, Shungnak, those villages in GMU 23 basically here represented by the Northwest Arctic region, basically saying, as you can see there, we see no reason why the people in Anaktuvuk can't continue to hunt and trap on lands that we consider we share with them in this area, but we don't think it's a wise idea to attempt to change the boundaries of the federal regions, the federal regions. And so the mayor of Anaktuvuk Pass, my

understanding is that he has -- he heard that and accepted that, and that basically it's a non-issue at this point.

So I think the system worked. I mean, the deal was is that it eventually came back down. I felt originally the mayor should have contacted the mayors of these communities or tribal councils of those communities and talked about it. Perhaps we wouldn't have had to elevate it through the system the way we did. But he chose not to do that and eventually it filtered back down and the local people thought about it, talked about it, and made their views known, and everyone seems, you know, relatively accepting and at ease with that.

So I think now unless there's something coming that I haven't seen, that it's really a non-issue now.

MR. MATHEWS: Steve, you're indicating that Anaktuvuk's going to withdraw that request then?

MR. ULVI: I believe so.

MR. MATHEWS: That's news to me, but it was before Northwest. It's the only council that hadn't logged in on it.

MR. COLLINS: Questions or comments on the update? Okay, thank you for that.

The next item is E, brief update on the status of navigable waters, fishery management and NARC petition.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, you had the NARC petition which is the Northwest Arctic Regional Council and others petition. You discussed it at your last meeting. You have under Tab 7, if you page beyond the letters he was talking about, you'll come to a listing on NARC, the NARC petition. You supported it. Eight of the ten regions supported it. The other two councils are going to have it on their agenda, and Bristol Bay's meeting as we speak, and I don't remember when Northwest is going to meet, but I think it's later.

So for those that need to know, the NARC petition was that the Secretary of Interior and Agricultural initiated rule making to establish authority to regulate fishing and hunting on non-public lands to protect subsistence priority afforded on public lands. The second part of it was that lands selected but not conveyed to native corporations in the State of Alaska be treated as public lands. That means federal public lands, subject to ANILCA subsistence priority.

So there was a federal register notice. You guys commented on it. The board is deferring action on that until it hears from the two remaining councils. So that's the NARC petition.

Update on fisheries, the Katie John case is getting complicated or more complicated, but essentially, the district court said that the federal government had jurisdiction over navigable waters. The ninth circuit court -- was appealed to the ninth circuit court. The ninth circuit court preliminarily indicates that they feel maybe with reserve water rights, and reserve water rights deals with the water that is necessary to meet the objectives of the conservation unit.

So it is now in the ninth circuit court to take action -- well, actually to direct the district court to take action on it.

So it's still pending. There's draft regulations have been drafted dealing with fisheries regulations and hopefully they'll -- they will be coming before this council once this works its way through. So right now the existing jurisdiction is not -- not navigable waters

for this program.

The navigable waters, if this passes, would be within the conservation unit and then some determination beyond the conservation unit. So we'll just have to keep you advised. If it does go through, I'm predicting we're going to have a lot of very interesting meetings, and we may have to have additional meetings, because we'll be dealing with issues that are thorny and maybe even be more thorny than terrestrial animals. So start taking your vitamin pills if we do go in that direction.

That's pretty much it, unless someone else has questions. I'm not an attorney. That was my estimation of it. If I got it incorrect, it's due to my knowledge, and I'm not an attorney.

ANGIE MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What I'd like to ask from the board, maybe, I know I talked with Vince about this some time ago on fishing, the Department of Fish and Game in Bethel is proposing for 1996 that they have an early opening for commercial fishing, and as a subsistence representative on that group, I'm maybe asking for your support to not have an early opening, because what they're going to be doing is they're going to be targeting the kings, and like it was mentioned earlier, in Bethel, there's -- or down river, there's over 700 commercial fishermen, and you can imagine what'll happen to the people up here and further up river if they have an early opening.

People here don't start fishing until maybe after the 15th, and they want an opening as early as the 10th or the 15th, and that's going to totally cut us off, our subsistence, and that's one of the proposals that the Fish & Game is going to be proposing to the working group this winter when they're having their meetings, and I would like your support not to have an early commercial opening for the subsistence of the people up here, because we won't get anything. Kings are the major, major subsistence fishing that we do around here.

MS. VANDERPOOL: May I comment on Angie's thing? I strongly support Angie on that. Four or -- I can't remember how many years back, they had a closed season on reds in Bethel. They wouldn't let them commercial fish them, and was it last year or year before, we were just plentiful on reds up here in the upper river area. We've never had so many red salmon come through this area because of the escapement they had in Bethel on that.

Like Angie said, now, if they do have an early thing on kings, an early opening, we won't have any kings. You know, up here in this up river region, the subsistence lifestyle is very important because up in the up river villages, at least I know from Crooked Creek on up to, you could say, Lime Village is that there is very little means of income up there for the people. They have no -- there is no big jobs, there's no big businesses, you know. They don't go to work from nine to five. We work nine to five -- we don't work nine to five, we work 24 hours a day during the summer season preparing for winter for our subsistence food, and that's how we survive. So I just -- I really support Angie's thing there.

MR. COLLINS: I think I would ask, then, that you keep that in mind when we get down here maybe under new proposals or something, since that's a proposal that's going to come up. Right now we're just getting kind of an update on the Katie John. So we're a little bit out of place, I think, to take action right now. So watch that as we come down the agenda, maybe, an appropriate time.

Any questions now specifically about the -- these cases, either the NARC petition or the navigable -- Katie John case?

Okay, thank you for that update, Vince. And I guess we're ready to move on then. The next one would be F, draft wolf proposal, 2/95 meeting. Who was reporting that?

MR. MATHEWS: I can tell you where it's located and we can go from there. It's under Tab 8 and it was council action at your last meeting. It wasn't action, it was -- well, it was to have draft proposal sent out and you could review it before your next meeting, and now it's before you. So that's in there, and it's all on one page, and I think Herman can discuss it because he was the one that was -- that brought it up from his region and discussed it at the last meeting.

MR. COLLINS: Herman?

MR. MORGAN: Maybe you can read it and --

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, I'll read it into the record. Not word for word, but enough to get it across.

This is a draft proposal. In the last meeting and the questions that we have to answer are six for a proposal. Question one is existing regulation. There is none on this one. For two, the proposed regulation is on federal public lands have a two hundred dollar bounty on wolves for all units within Western Interior region, which would be units 19, 21 and 24, within the regular federal subsistence hunting and trapping seasons, and their restrictions. The bounty program would be reviewed within two years of passage. Funding would be provided by the federal government.

Three, reasons for changing the regulation, the wolf population in the Western Interior region is steadily increasing, thereby having an adverse effect on moose populations, which the subsistence users depend on to feed their families. Something needs to be done, since the State of Alaska's wolf control management program has been suspended. This problem has brought -- has been brought up by regional council members at various times and the regional council has requested a cooperative predator/prey study for Unit 21(E) showing their concern about protecting moose population, as well as wolf population.

Four, the effect of the proposed change on fish and wildlife populations, it would be an increase in the harvest of wolves to obtain the bounty and potential increase in the moose population due to the lessening of predation pressure.

Five, effect of proposed changes to subsistence users, subsistence hunters and trappers will gain a much needed source of income and the problem of declining moose populations will be addressed, as well as the lack of predator control in the region. If nothing is done, further wolf predation on moose will continue resulting in additional restrictions on subsistence users who depend on moose to feed their families.

Additional information, in order for this proposal to have the full intended effect, a similar request for bounty program should be submitted for state and private lands through the State Board of Game. An effective bounty system should be set up under co-management concept with the state and federal agencies, as well as local users, including the local fish and game advisory committees and regional councils. If we wait until the wolf predation on moose populations result in the moose becoming endangered, it will be difficult to bring the moose population back up.

That's the entirety of the draft proposal.

MR. COLLINS: Herman, you want to comment further?

MR. MORGAN: Yeah, and really, number three, it says the last sentence, prey study for unit to show concern about protecting the moose population, as well as the wolf population, it should be as well as the growing wolf population. We need that "growing" on there. There's getting more and more wolves. There never used to be too many wolves around here until the caribou started coming around, and if there's no caribou, there's no wolves. They're not only killing the caribou, they're killing the moose, too.

I wish Jack Whitman was here. He did -- at our last meeting, he said there were about 50 wolf packs in this area. Those wolves kill about a moose every three days. You can understand how many moose are being killed, you know. If we don't do something about this, we're going to lose a lot of our moose.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Mr. Chairman?

MR. COLLINS: Yes.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Can I ask something? Is there a problem with having them like they used to a long time ago, they used to shoot wolves out of the planes and stuff, land and shoot. Is there a problem with that? What is the problem? Tell me, educate me.

MR. COLLINS: Well, on federal lands I think they've declared there will be no land and shoot and the state has more or less put a stop to it, too. Because of pressure from environmental groups, courts and so on. They've backed off. Isn't that right on federal? Isn't there a federal -- on some of the agencies, at least, there will be no land and shoot.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Plus that, too, you know, up river, you know, we never used to see wolves in the villages or on the snow machine trails and stuff. You can't even travel anymore on the snow machine without running into wolves or a pack of wolves. There's lots of moose kills, because that's where the moose go is to the river when the snow is so deep, and it's very dangerous for the people who -- we live in the villages and stuff.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the rule of thumb, the federal and state control over fish and wildlife, on federal we have more protection of subsistence but they're always telling us we can't do anything about the wolves. People down Lower 48, they don't live up here. They don't see how bad, how bad it is, how many moose are being killed, you know. The only problem I see in federal management, you can't do anything about the wolves, and the wolves are killing a lot of moose, but something has to be done before it's too late, you know. You have a comment over there?

MR. COLLINS: Comment back here?

ROBERT HOFFMAN: I have a question on this. I understand Herman to say Unit 19, 20 and 21, this wolf problem; is that true? I had a little input on that. We identified that the wolf problem is a real factor and they are very devastating to the animals here.

The question was on this -- on this two hundred dollar bounty, as you well know, Unit 18 is one of the great -- one of the big factors here that do a lot of hunting around this area here, and everything is directed on Unit 18 because of the great big vast population that is now, with modern technology, bigger motors and all

that stuff, are coming up this way to hunt. Is the bounty directed only for Unit 19, 20 and 21? Because if it is, there's just -- I'm just saying, Unit 18 may be involved in this, or Unit 19, 20 and 21 are just doing a job for Unit 18.

The question I'm trying to say is, the bounty on these wolves must be done, but is Unit 18 involved in this bounty hunt or is it just 19, 20 and 21? And if so, Unit 18 is being given a helping hand by just these residents doing their job, or would they request more help from the residents of 19 who do come up here and do all the majority of the hunting? That's just a question I have.

MR. COLLINS: Herman, I think the intent of this was that any wolves taken within this area would be bountied; wouldn't it?

MR. MORGAN: That Unit 18 area, Unit 18.

MR. COLLINS: Oh, you mean do a program -- are you asking for a program in 18 or are you asking residents of 18 be able to get the bounty if they take wolves here?

ROBERT HOFFMAN: Correct, the second question, that the residents of Unit 18, if they are not allowed to do a wolf predation control here, if it is -- it does pass, that the residents of Unit 18 are being, you know, babied along in the moose and caribou hunt that they do in fall and the winter, and that the people down there, the question is, are they allowed, if this wolf predation thing goes through, are they allowed to hunt in Unit 19 or is it just the residents of 19, 20 and 21 be allowed in this predator control thing? That's my question.

MR. MORGAN: You didn't have any restrictions on there. Just within the Western region, within the Western Interior regions, 19, 20 and 21. Doesn't say who can hunt or not.

MR. GRISSOM: Was that proposal for 24? I didn't hear. Unit 24 also or 20?

MR. MORGAN: 19, 21, 24.

MR. MATHEWS: Now Mr. Chairman, I just need to advise you, which I've done with Herman, that you need to weigh out the risks on cost of going forward with a proposal like this. And then I need to advise you the likelihood, in my opinion, of this ever being passed is -- is nil. But please realize when I say that, you do not have to have our blessing to submit proposals, but I feel compelled as your coordinator to advise you on that. And the costs associated with this, if it does go further on, are tremendous.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, what are we risking here? We're risking an entire moose population in this area. That's the risk, a risk I'm willing to take.

MR. MATHEWS: I'm not going to debate that, because I'm not a biologist, to begin with. The risks involved with this is opening up your area to scrutiny from sources all over on this, and it's not going to pass. But you can pursue further. The state attempted to do a program and was literally shut down, and that was not even a bounty. That's all I can say. I just feel compelled to do that. I know you don't want to hear that, but I feel that's my job to tell you that.

MR. COLLINS: I think I hear what Vince is saying, in terms of where it'll cause problems politically, in the sense that it's like raising a red flag for every conservation group out there, saying that in this area of Alaska, they're now trying to get rid of all the wolves again. It focuses one attention. But I guess one of

the questions I have is how will a bounty help reduce the population?

Because there's -- are there people that aren't hunting them now that would hunt them with the bounty? Because there's already a pretty high price on pelts and so on. So will this -- would this do, if it was in effect, what we want done? You think it would make a difference? Any comments on that by anyone?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I think probably open it up for a lot of -- lot of enforcement problems, as far as outsiders coming in planes and shooting the animals. All that stuff goes unnoticed. I think there'd be -- I just think it would be problems that probably wouldn't be able to handle.

MR. COLLINS: I don't think this would allow the use of planes under that, but I hear what you're saying. You're saying it will attract a lot of outside people.

MR. HUNTINGTON: They wouldn't actually use it for planes, but if they used it in the area beforehand and there are violations going on for years and hasn't really been kept in check and there's movement of more and more of that.

MR. SIMON: I'd like to comment on this. I'd like the moose, meaning meat. In some areas, the operation is not up and they were getting hunting pressure from the urban hunters, sport hunters, allowed the wolves increasing, and we're asking for bounties. I guess what we're looking for is ways to protect the moose population, because any time moose population goes down, it can go and it will be hard to come back up again, and that would hurt us in the rural areas. We've depend on our moose so much for our meat.

MR. COLLINS: Other comments? Frank?

FRANK TURNER: Yes, I think that they should at some time maybe take another look at wolf control. I was a bounty hunter. I had aerial hunting permit, taken hundreds of wolves in my area. At the same time, Galena was taking hundreds, McGrath was taking hundreds with airplanes, and we thinned the wolves out, but also after a couple years, I noticed the -- the wolves took care of themselves. They started throwing big litters. There'd be 12 or 15 pups, and when there was a lot of wolves, the litters were smaller, you'd see packs of maybe six or eight. Now the airplane pilots are telling me in our area what they're seeing is 20 in a pack. They're back up to where they used to be a long time ago when we were hunting them.

And so these environmentalists are saying don't shoot the wolves. We can't eat the wolves. What those people should see is what I've seen from the air. The wolves are dragging down those moose and they're eating those moose while they're still alive. Now if those guys would think a little bit again, if they say hey, if they seen that or even heard about it, I think they would think again about wolf control. We need to preserve our moose, and wolves will take care of themselves in the end. Thank you.

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, just to reiterate what Vince has said, I think what's going to happen first of all, my impression, is that first of all, the federal board would never consider a bounty, period. We don't consider it part of subsistence activity. It's just something that politically is not going to happen.

I think also the federal board has already stated at I believe it was the April '93 meeting that there would -- that control of any animal for the benefit of another was outside of the purview

of the -- of subsistence of ANILCA, and it was not part of a subsistence activity.

So I agree with Vince. The chances of a proposal such as this going through, under federal subsistence law, is probably zero. So you have to look at other alternatives. You know, trapper education has been done in the Fairbanks area and they increased the wolf harvest fairly substantially in a couple areas after they had a trapper education, how to trap wolves and how to be a more effective wolf trapper. Maybe those are some of the alternatives that need to be looked at.

If you have a wolf problem in your area, you have to look at other ways of doing it. You have to look at more local activity of those going out and solving the problems. It's a difficult situation, but there has to be other alternatives looked at.

You know, again, you have the -- you can put a proposal in to the Federal Subsistence Board to deal with what you're talking about, but it may be not a good use of your time. A better use of your time may be to come up with other alternative approaches.

It's the same thing that's going to happen with the state with a proposal going to the state. Politically, it's just not going to be accepted right now. With the wolf control that was going on, it was stopped by the state on three caribou herds. At least two of those herds had fairly good biological bases to stop the -- to do wolf control on. I think biologically in this area at this time, because you've got relatively high moose populations, even if you have high wolf populations at the same time, it would be very hard to support going in and doing wolf control, as the state looks at wolf control.

So I think it's a very difficult situation right now, and probably the best way to approach it, from my perspective right now, would be to look at trying to increase local trapping and educate local trappers so they do a better job at taking wolves. It doesn't really give you a very good answer, but that would be my thoughts on it at this time.

MR. DEACON: Mr. Chairman, could -- in the regional corporation, could those areas give permission to shoot wolves or something like that on that area?

MS. VANDERPOOL: That would be under private lands, corporations?

MR. DENTON: Be under state management.

MR. DEACON: That's the private lands.

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, under, you know, under the current existing regulations, there's no limit on trapping of wolves at all. I mean, you could have -- people could take as many wolves as they want in a relatively long trapping season, on November 1 through March 31 during the time when the wolf pelts are worth anything at all. So there's really a wide open wolf season out there a good portion of the year.

MR. COLLINS: Rifle can be used. In fact, we had something in on that. They were going to exclude the use of rifle and we argued and they concurred with that; is that correct?

MR. GUENTHER: Wolf trapping right now in this area can be done with a rifle or with traps. That's all under the trapping regulations. So it really seems like what has to happen is, you know, putting a bounty on it, sure, makes it worth a little bit

more money, but wolf pelts are worth a fair amount of money right now and I don't know exactly what they're worth right now but Jack could tell you that. It's just matter of getting more people actively involved with taking wolves, if you have a wolf problem in the area.

I don't think the wolf harvest in this area is very high right now, but I didn't look up the figures before this meeting, so I really am not sure.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I think Henry's question was can the private corporations on the private land, can they allow aerial wolf hunting?

MR. GUENTHER: Aerial wolf hunting, no.

MR. MORGAN: It's private land.

MR. GUENTHER: No. It doesn't matter, it's a state regulation. You cannot aerial wolf hunt right now, doesn't matter whose land it's on.

MR. MORGAN: You were talking about alternatives. I read in the paper where there were you know, the wolf packs, they all have a leader, alpha male and alpha female. What they're doing is sterilizing the alpha male and seemed like that was starting to work, it was working. Do you think it would be possible to do that?

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, that's -- you're talking about the Fortymile caribou herd and I've just been involved with the planning team that came up with that plan that you read about. It's purely an experimental item right now. It's only been tried in two other places. Canada has one wolf pack of two wolves that they tried it with. They did a vasectomy on the male. This was done just a year ago to see if those -- it's very experimental. In Minnesota, there is some research going on with a couple of small packs, just started. They have no idea if it's going to work or not.

In the Twentymile caribou herd, which is over in Unit 20(E) along the Canadian border, we're looking at ways to try to get the herd to grow at a faster rate. The herd used to be a herd of about a half a million animals. In 1960 it got as small as four to six thousand animals from 500,000, and by the way, 500,000 was around 1920. Wasn't very long ago.

Now it's about 22,000. It's been growing, gotten up to about 22,000, sort of stayed there a couple years. They're looking for ways to try to increase the herd. They know politically they can't go in and do wolf control where they're going in and killing wolves, so the planning team tried to come up with other methods. The experimental use of vasectomies to sterilize the male is something that they're going to try to see if it has any effect.

My recommendation as a biologist would be wait and see if that works. It's a five year plan. If they start getting substantial results in the next three to five years on that, that's, you know, definitely an opportunity.

One other thing that's just started to be tried with some wild canids, dogs, wolves, that sort of thing, is they've just started doing some studies on implanting birth control implants in female animals to see if they can stop an alpha female from having pups for a year or two years. That's something brand new, and that may be something that's coming down the road.

So there are a number of other things that are being looked at right now, but we're just starting to look at those things. Nobody's really looked at them before. So it's possible.

MR. MORGAN: You mentioned educating trappers. How

about the state advisory committee, you know, we put a proposal in to hire professional trapper to come in and, like, teach the high school kids new ways to trap, better ways to trap. Could we pass a proposal on that instead, or seeing this isn't going to pass, could we do something like that?

MR. GUENTHER: You could make --

MR. MORGAN: Do they have money to bring somebody in to teach kids how to trap? You know, there's no alternatives.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion. I'm a very optimistic person anyway. I really believe in wolf control, myself. If it was up to me, I would just put a proposal right in and see where it came from, but speaking on the lines with Herman, there, on educating, well like you said, the more trappers and things like that, maybe with AVCP, ONC, KNA, Kuskokwim school district, TDC and any other organization that would like to help, probably most likely would be a nonprofit organization, I think, that would step in and help is to help and educate and hold a -- you know, it'll probably be difficult at first, but hold some type of workshop and work with the schools an whatnot and educating all these people and bring in some people, I think, from TCC, you said, up in Fairbanks or Fairbanks area to help deal with this program or this problem we're having on wolf control. Maybe we can ask the organizations to step in and help. Just a suggestion. I don't know.

MR. COLLINS: I could comment on those workshops, because McGrath has requested a program for years in aerial control or something. We weren't getting that. We weren't getting any control. So they did have a workshop down there a few years ago, and it was effective. They brought in an experienced fellow from -- I think he'd been in the Tok area first, or the Fairbanks area.

MR. MATHEWS: Was it Sammy Grandar (phonetic)?

MR. COLLINS: I think it was. I'm not sure. They have a videotape now, but what I wanted to comment on, it was so effective that a couple of the local people went out and started trapping then and caught four or five that winter. But it's not a lot of people got involved, but at least for them it was effective.

The other thing is that with the increase of wolves that you mentioned are closer to the village, there's more opportunities to trap now than in the past. They don't have to go very far, and the moose kills you're getting in the spring around, by using those, if you learn how to effectively set those, you can catch some. And in fact, the biologist in McGrath has been doing that, been locating kills and setting some on his own, just doing trapping. So it may be that an education program would assist.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Like I know, I hear, I read about Kalskag, you know, they have these excellent programs through the school, they take the kids out trapping and hunting and they go out and do all kinds of things. It's something that the school could try to work in with the kids maybe and try to -- like part of a grade or help educate them or whatever, or with the tribal councils, you know.

MR. COLLINS: Do you have comments on that, Jack? You've probably got more experience in trapping wolves.

MR. REAKOFF: It's my feeling that trying to implement a bounty system is a dead end street. The bounty, they haven't had bounties for years. Bounty is -- basically, it initiated wolf hunting but you have to exceed 75, 80 percent of the wolves to suppress the wolf population. With ground trapping, a bounty system

doesn't -- ground trappers don't historically catch between 15 to 30 percent of the wolves. That's just the wolf capacity, and all it does, it doesn't really do anything. Wolves can maintain their population with that kind of trapping pressure.

So the bounty system is not -- what would be considerably more effective -- besides the political pressure that would just cascade against the subsistence, we would then take what the Fish & Game -- the subsistence, Federal Subsistence Program would then take the cascade that the state program initiated when they had a wolf control program.

I feel that the local subsistence users -- a friend of mine told me that if you kill the moose, it's your obligation, as a subsistence user, to kill one wolf or one bear to equalize the take, you know. You take a ungulate resource, you should take a predator resource, and I feel that it's the subsistence user's obligation, at a grass root level, to go out and trap wolves or if you see a bear to eat, to kill it to eat, but you're saving a moose calf, in an equilibrium thing.

I feel that training young people -- you know, kids or young adults are normally the trappers. They have a lot of energy and they work harder trapping, so training young kids how to trap wolves, if you're training 20 kids and only one goes out and traps wolves, then I know there's villages -- well, over at Lime Village, Phil was telling me nobody knows how to trap wolves there. They don't even know how to set traps at all for wolves and they aren't very effective.

I think if you just trained people, had training programs, it would be considerably more effective on the grass root problem. Near the villages, people should go out and trap wolves, like Sidney was telling us in Galena, he's catching wolves right across the river. No one was trapping there. I mean, there should be local people going out and doing the job. That's my feeling. I think we initiate two hundred dollar bounty, all we'll get is a bunch of flak and it won't really pass and it really won't be effective. I think that a training program would be way more effective. That's my personal feeling.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Go ahead.

MR. DEACON: I hate to leave without this thing really considered, because it's true to the regions. This is the region. A lot of resolution has been passed between the state about the wolf sort of business and a lot of people just talk about it and say they couldn't do anything about it. I'd like to see something be done about this and not just talk about it every year. It's a problem. I know it's a problem in our area. So we have to do something, put some kind of resolution or something in this, in here, because the people are complaining about this and we're representing people here. So I think we should -- something should be done about this.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, before we move on, the last comment, we shouldn't worry, shouldn't care about what the guys in the 48 states might think. They don't live here. They don't depend on moose to feed their families, and we do. And we have to answer to these other people, what have you done to protect the moose. Well, we didn't want to kill the wolves. They started the things, the people down in the states. That's not right.

Our bottom line is to protect resource and provide for the people. I don't care what them guys say, saying, "Won't pass,

won't pass." At least we're trying to do something about it.

MR. COLLINS: Harold?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I really believe the solution to the wolf control is in the trappers. I think the trappers, ground trappers, can pretty well maintain the population of wolves for the moose, but I think education is going to have to take a -- going to have to come in somewhere where the trappers are more educated on taking, easier taking, because I've heard some stories on Healy Lake area where one trapper caught over 20 wolves on just one moose kill, and you know, that's -- you probably don't heard of things like that, but if you're a serious enough trapper, I think you can manage to take a good chunk of the wolf population.

In my area, there's more and more -- more and more the younger adults that's going out after wolves now. They didn't used to hardly go after wolves, but now that's one of the main animals that they're trapping now in the wintertime. It's making a little dent in our area. I just don't think it's enough education to the trappers.

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, a couple of thoughts that came to my mind. The trapper training program that was set up in the Fairbanks area was sponsored by ADF&G and the Alaska Trappers Association, I believe. Isn't that what the group is called? There's an organization in Alaska, it's a trappers association. Possibly if the council is interested in passing a resolution to promote education, those would be a couple of sources to contact for where the funds came from relative to that. There may also be federal funds through individual land management units in the area. I'm not sure, I can't really speak for them, but I know we did have some funds for certain aspect of education.

And even though I don't know what funds might be available through subsistence branch, it certainly wouldn't hurt for the council to request that from the subsistence division, you know.

If you don't request or don't ask for, it you'll never know for sure if there are some.

Also, you want to think, you know, Jack made a really good point. I know some of the people I talk to in some of the villages say there's very little trapping going on in some villages, it's something that's really being lost, and this would help to continue the whole subsistence lifestyle. I mean, that's part of what this whole subsistence, ANILCA subsistence regulation's about, is to maintain a lifestyle. Congress mentioned that a number of times when the act was being passed, and training people to trap would be definitely beneficial in that.

And the last thing that came to mind while you were talking was that by going to the local trappers, you're putting the money from wolves back into the community, so that subsistence users are getting the profits from these wolves being taken.

One of the concerns if a bounty went into effect that I would have is that it would bring in people that have enough money to have planes and had a fair amount of money from outside to come in and to take advantage of that bounty. Even though it might decrease the wolf population, it certainly, other than that, doesn't benefit the local communities very much at all. That would be my perspective.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, why can't they do both?

MR. COLLINS: Do both?

MR. MORGAN: Do both the trapping education and these bounties? Something has to be done. We can't talk about it every meeting and never do nothing about it.

MR. COLLINS: Well, we need to come down to a vote. I don't think I personally could vote for the bounty, but I could certainly support an education program and I could also support that federal agencies, where appropriate, implement some kind of a management plan, put some pressure on them. I mean, to not manage, to my mind, is just ignoring the problem, and I think there is -- they do need to be managed just like anything else. We can't just manage moose and caribou with seasons and bag limits and ignore this.

Any other members comments? I'm hearing that there's a lot of concern there. So at a minimum, a motion expressing our concern with the growing wolf populations, and maybe requesting that agencies involved review appropriate management strategies and maybe a third one would be implementing some kind of an education, local education program on trapping, something like that. Comments?

ANGIE MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just agree with what he was saying earlier, is we need to educate also those people that are against, you know, those save-the-animal type people. We need to educate them. Maybe what we need to do also is invite them to our subsistence meetings when we have them in our villages and have them see what we're talking about and how it affects, how it affects our lives. Maybe you know, we can invite one of their members from Anchorage or from even from out in the states, those people that don't know how to live in the village to come and actually see what it's like when we have our meeting, when we have our subsistence meeting. Even one member may come and tell those people exactly what it is we're talking about. At least it will go from one to a couple there and maybe some of them, maybe they might listen to it and hear what we're trying to say.

I don't know, just seems like they're so ridiculous in saving them, doesn't make sense, and maybe when they do come to the meetings, it will open their eyes up a little bit, and have them actually come to our winter meeting, even.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: Everything, everything you said is really nice, you know, that's the way we probably get closer to coming to an end to this, but I would like to recommend one thing, that this wolf predation problem is going to generate a lot of big bucks, and I would rather see the local residents have a little bit of -- have a little bit of this revenue, whether it be education, or whether it be their own trapping funds or bounty, whatever. I would rather see the local residents of that area participate in these -- this -- this funds, because if they don't, the state, and I have watched this all my life, the state is going to get the -- wait and wait and wait until the problem gets so big that they will take the funds and generate and fix the problem themselves.

You know, it -- if people would really start realizing that in all the problems that are created, funds are generated, and all I'm saying is if it would be try -- to keep it into the residential area, too you know, because not only the problem in the moose population will grow, we can also help generate funds for the local people in the areas also, rather than splitting them back up again.

Sure, the people will get the moose, but the funds are generated someplace else, you know, and if the state is focusing on

that problem to get so vast that they take over, it happens everywhere, walrus, moose, if they got the problem, they take the funds in, they do it themselves, but the residents, the local residents never seem to get involved in this, and if they realize that the funds that are generated are vast and big in quantity, that the local people get involved in that, and I can see where the most of the reasoning behind it is. It's also the fund issue, you know, two hundred dollar bounty here, education here, we're all generating funds, and if it be done into the residents, that would be fine, too, rather than just let the state take over everything all the time. That's my personal view.

MR. COLLINS: Jack?

MR. REAKOFF: I concur that if there was an education program that the educators should be from this region, if possible. I know there's some very excellent wolf trappers at Huslia and in that Koyukuk region that could teach some very good trapping techniques and that, you know, wherever the best wolf trappers are, if they're within this region, they should be utilized as the resource.

MR. DENTON: Just a comment, Mr. Chairman, is one, wolves are determined to be a subsistence species in these areas. So what I'm hearing is that a traditional and customary use of wolves, the knowledge of that, is actually being lost, and that's -- that's really what I'm hearing here, and so what you folks may be looking at is to reclaim some of that lost tradition.

And the other thing is the subsistence board has an obligation, because this is a subsistence species to maintain an opportunity for taking wolves in the long-term. So we have to maintain healthy populations of wolves for your use, for subsistence use.

And so you see, the board is caught between a rock and a hard spot. You don't control wolves to subsidize moose hunting with a species, but they're also obligated to keep a healthy population for your use, as well. You see the bind you're putting them in? You know, it's kind of robbing one species to give you the other and then they're -- you know, that's going to swing back and forth and back and forth through town -- or through time. Realizing, in fact, the demand for moose is much greater than probably for wolves but wolves are also recognized as a subsistence species. Determinations are all through the books here, you know. Healthy populations apply to predators as well as prey, and you know, the guys on the staff here are caught in the middle, too, with making their analysis with that sort of thing.

MR. COLLINS: It's true. I think you don't have to do anything to supply healthy wolf populations. If you keep a healthy population of caribou and moose, as Frank said, wolves will take care of themselves. They'll -- because I was also here at the end of the federal fly and shoot in the McGrath area and I saw up to 200 wolves lined up there where they'd brought them in from flying. In fact, one year about a hundred of them they didn't even bother to skin them. All they got was the bounty because they just couldn't keep up and the skins weren't worth very much at that time, and at the end of that, we saw the game populations surge, but since there has been no harvest, now, we've really seen the growing wolf population, so --

MR. DENTON: We don't know -- I don't know if the subsistence staff folks have a good grasp of what subsistence demand

for wolves is. I would doubt whether there's any information on that, because it's mostly a fur sales thing rather than use in the villages. There is use in the villages, but I don't think there's a good grasp of that at all either, or whether a bounty system would actually impact local use of wolves.

MR. MORGAN: I think we should --

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: May I -- Mr. Chair, I agree with what we've said, and I would like to see an education program started in the area especially, for the Aniak and on the other side we have a lot of wolves between Anvik, Shageluk and Holy Cross. Have something done in each village, because not everyone in those villages has the money to travel on their own, and if trapping could be shown in the village, they'd have more people participate from each village.

And not call it wolf control. Call it something -- you know, you guys are good with words. Give us another term instead of "control" that people would be able to use, and if the people down the Lower 48 hear of it, they won't see it as wolf control, and they won't jump on our backs about killing off our wolves.

I don't know about the bounty. I remember the time there was a bounty, my dad used to go out and kill wolves. Sit here and tell stories for hours about wolving, I wish he was here to tell you, but I remember those days. I used to see him come in from wolves, we used to have them in the cache and they controlled them, but now there's lots of wolves in the areas.

If you come to our town in the middle of winter, right in front of our village, we have a herd of anywhere from 30 to 45 moose staying near us so we could mind them to keep the wolves away from them, so they don't get eaten up out there. But the ones that don't come to our town, they stay out in the winter, wolves get them.

I really am for wolf control, but an advanced word.

MR. COLLINS: Harvest.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Harvest, wolf harvest.

MR. REAKOFF: Wolf harvest education program.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, someone needs some time to draw something up, then, to bring to us maybe over lunch or something like that. Has there been enough discussion that we could write up something about stating your concerns and which route to go? What is the plans for lunch? We're up to noon.

MR. MATHEWS: The plans for lunch are I need to get someone to drive over there and pick it up and collect money. But it's ready for us, those that selected last evening.

MR. COLLINS: Let's do that, then, let's recess for lunch and get it over here and maybe I could ask that some of the members would, some of you could work on something over lunch and we could have a motion.

(Luncheon recess).

MR. COLLINS: Call us back into session at 1:05. We're on Item F, draft wolf proposal from the 2/95 meeting. Further discussion of this or --

MR. REAKOFF: I drafted a recommendation -- I'm not sure what heading to put this under, a recommendation for the present subsistence board in regards to a subsistence wolf harvest education program. Should I read that at this time?

MR. COLLINS: Okay. You would substitute under add -- let's see -- go ahead. You want to do this in the form of a motion?

MR. REAKOFF: I could read this and then it could be acted on. This title is Subsistence Wolf Harvest Education Program to the Federal Subsistence Board, with a carbon copy to Region 5 from the Western Interior regional council.

After deliberation again on the increasingly large population of wolves in the Western Interior region, the council has made the following determination: It is our feeling that a subsistence wolf harvest education program should be instituted by the varying federal agencies, school districts, regional corporations, and non-profits, et cetera.

The wolf harvest education program is deemed necessary because wolf harvest techniques are very complex and have been lost in many villages. The loss of this knowledge can be directly attributed to children staying in the village for western schooling.

The harvest education program should utilize Region 6 trappers, if possible, who are recognized as experienced wolf harvesters. The co-administrative aspect would help reach every village area that has a wolf harvest problem.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. One way would be I guess to have a motion and second to adopt that, if that's -- discuss it first. Comments on it, first?

MR. MORGAN: I would like to see it put to a vote, and like, I think that's what we're on and if we vote on this, maybe we can bring out this. So I guess when we're discussing this, proposal on bounty, I'd like to put a motion and put it to a vote.

MR. COLLINS: Okay.

MR. DEACON: Is that a resolution? I'm not sure.

MR. MORGAN: I make a motion to -- since I'm from here, I believe put it to a vote for this wolf to put in for a bounty.

MR. COLLINS: You have to move to adopt.

MR. MORGAN: I move to adopt.

MR. COLLINS: Is there a second to that motion?

MR. DEACON: Second. I second.

MR. COLLINS: Second by Henry. Okay, this is the one on the bounty. Okay, discussion of that motion.

MR. MORGAN: I will tell my personal view. How you vote on this, you know, will depend on whether or not you think the resource and the people who depend on it are more important than what somebody down in the states would think, think about it, you know. Now and in the future, that's how we're going to do business, whether it's good for the resource or the people or whether or not how somebody down in Lower 48 think. I think the resource and the people here are more important, and that's how we're going to vote on this.

MR. COLLINS: Other comments on the motion? I personally can't support that, for some of the reasons stated before, because I think it might do us more harm than good in terms of what it'll cause, the political flak that it may raise. So I think there's other ways that we can best address it, but I understand what you're saying, but that's personally the way I plan to vote. I'd have to oppose.

Any other comments before we vote? All those in favor, signify by raising your right hand. Excuse me, one, two -- two yes votes.

Those opposed, same sign. Five, motion fails, five to two.

Okay, now Jack, you had read something, do you want to make that into a motion that we adopt that recommendation or that we --

MR. REAKOFF: Yes, I make a motion to adopt this. I'm not sure about the title as whether it's a recommendation or what the agency -- how would you address this, as a recommendation?

MR. GUENTHER: Yes.

MR. REAKOFF: I move to adopt this recommendation on the Subsistence Wolf Harvest Education Program.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Second.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, moved by Jack, seconded by Harold.

Discussion of that motion?

MR. MORGAN: We all have the leg-hold ban. How would that affect that? Would you be able to trap like that? And it's up to a vote or something, and I -- again, we keep running into this. I don't think it's --

MR. COLLINS: As I understand, right now the leg-hold trap ban has to do with sale of furs in Europe, and I guess it goes into effect in January, I think, that after that date, they -- in Europe, you can't sell furs that are caught, you can't import furs that were caught, but they're still salable here. And the education may mean that snares, not a leg-hold, necessarily, and so there are other -- there are other methods that could be taught, I think, in trapping that would be better.

Are we ready to vote on that motion? All those in favor signify by raising your right hand.

(Unanimous response).

MR. COLLINS: Okay, yes votes for all seven members present. Motion carried.

Anything else to come out of this discussion, then?

Okay, we'll move on. The next item is new business, review of federal regulation proposed rule and generation of proposals. Is there a tab?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, there is a tab for that. It's under -- it's listed in the front. I don't know the number. It's Number 9, but you may be more comfortable looking at, you know, the salmon one, but the full proposed rule is under Tab 9, which is in the federal register format, which to me is hard to read.

And this would be a time for public members, council members and that to bring up possible proposals for the council to author as their own or to educate the council about it.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. This first one now we're reacting to -- this is an actual proposal; is that right?

MR. MATHEWS: Which?

MR. COLLINS: Instruction for completing proposal form and -- oh --

MR. MATHEWS: That's just to give you a sample one, a sample form.

MR. COLLINS: What is this review of federal regulations proposed rule.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, the way it goes is that the proposed rule, to make it easier, is like the call for proposals under the state.

MR. COLLINS: Oh, okay.

MR. MATHEWS: And the proposed rule is essentially all the regulations that are in Subpart D and now include C&T

determinations which you worked through earlier. So that's what I'm saying, the proposed rule, I gave you a full copy so you would have the exact wording, but it might be more convenient for you to, if there are issues that require changes in the seasons and harvest limits, to look at the salmon colored book. We're in the call for proposal phase, if you're more comfortable with that.

MR. COLLINS: So season and bag limits are open to consideration on all of our area for moose, caribou, all of those?

MR. MATHEWS: Along with C&T, but we addressed C&T a little earlier.

MR. COLLINS: So the request up river, the one if you wanted an earlier season, would come under this, to change the current subsistence season, have an earlier one. That would be one.

MR. MATHEWS: It would be time now to see if the council wants to deal with that.

MR. COLLINS: So I guess the question is, are you having any problems with the federal seasons as they were in this? If you want to change them, we have to make a proposal for your area, if any of the seasons -- last year, we had the one on early opening that was passed for that area.

MR. DEACON: May I speak? You know, the ones we passed last year, I suggested that we had from August 20th to September 10th, but it failed due to the state, have to go by state regulation, and I still don't think that's the right way to go about that.

MR. COLLINS: I thought that was in effect, it did open this year.

MR. DEACON: It's open, but it's open to the 25th.

MR. MATHEWS: And it's open to the 25th and --

MR. DEACON: What we wanted, we passed, was from August 20th to the 10th of September, and that failed you know, and I still think that should be there.

MR. COLLINS: What that would impact, all they're doing here is setting the federal season. So what you would be saying was that federal or subsistence hunters could only hunt from August 10 to -- or I mean from August 20th to September 10, but the state seasons, that wouldn't change that. So everybody else would be hunting after that till the 25th. I think that's probably why they left it concurrent, because you -- in other words, you would be closing it to subsistence, but it still would be open to the other.

MR. DEACON: I got pretty good feedback from the local areas. They like it, but they didn't want it to run too long.

MR. COLLINS: So you have to go to the state for that, though.

MR. DEACON: There's too much, too much impact of outside hunters. So the longer seasons you have, the more people you invite. That's the problem.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Ray, maybe I could say something on that. I think it was brought up before the federal board and the discussion on that was it would restrict the subsistence users to a shorter time to hunt. That's why they feel that part of your responsibility is not to restrict the subsistence user of their opportunity. That's why it failed.

MR. DEACON: I know you talked to me about it, and I just still think --

MR. HUNTINGTON: What it would have did is it would

have shortened our hunting season to subsistence users. Even though it would have opened earlier, it would have closed earlier, too.

MR. COLLINS: So what you would have to do would be put in a state proposal, because the state is the only one that can speak to the non-resident hunting and sport hunting. If that's what you want to do is to shorten that season, it would have to be in the state proposals, and we couldn't, I mean, we have no jurisdiction over that. See what I mean? It's through the state advisories.

MR. DEACON: That came up pretty strong at our meeting and I hated to be here without speaking of it from our region, Shageluk Anvik, from the region meeting we had last Sunday.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, my question is, is the moose population so low that the federal board could close the federal lands beyond the September 10th?

MR. GUENTHER: I don't -- Mr. Chairman, I don't have all of the information right now on what the populations are, but as I remember it, I think it would be extremely hard to justify, with the current population levels of the moose, closing down federal lands to sport hunting. It would be very hard.

MR. REAKOFF: Not closing it period, just shortening the season.

MR. GUENTHER: That gets really -- the way the regulations are written right now, it would be really difficult to do that. It's to some extent almost an all or nothing. It's possible to make some exceptions to that. So far, the only way there's been an exception made, it's in Southeast with deer seasons where there was a five deer limit. The population of deer went down and they reduced the sport harvest, the number of deer that would be taken under the sport harvest on federal lands, so reduced the total bag and didn't close the area specifically.

Here I think it would be difficult to justify shortening the seasons based just on the population. I think the board would look at it as a total closure of federal lands or not a total closure. I mean, I can't say for positive, but I think the way things have gone so far, that's what they'd look at.

And I'd really have to look at the data again, and you know, with the specific area we're talking about, to see where that would fall out. It's not a very good answer to your question.

MR. DEACON: You know, the state and the federal, the say they have no money to really regulate these violations, and I kind of believe that, too. Nobody managed that, the Innoko Refuge, or whatever, for hunting that's going on up there. You know what's going on up there. I know you've seen how many bags of hunting and all the kind of violation and hunting violations.

When we call the local refuge, "oh, we'll check it." That's the end of it. We call Aniak, I call Aniak Fish & Game and leave it on the answering machine, and that's it. That's how far you go in the violations. So this longer season would have to be checked in, really, and also management district be checked into by this region. That's what I'm here for. You know, I'm not here just -- I want to present the people's point of view, the local people. So you know, management is the problem.

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, just one comment, kind of reiterate what Harold had said, when the Federal Subsistence Board dealt with that proposal to start the season August 20th, and I don't remember what the closing date was, but to close it earlier, they

looked at it and they felt it was justified to give you, the subsistence users, an earlier opening, but then when they looked at the earlier closing date and said what Harold had said, if we close it now, the state season is still open, so we're restricting the subsistence user season, and so they kept the season, the closing date the same length.

Now what really has to happen -- and I thought that proposal had gone into the state board from somewhere out in your area to shorten the area, the state season. If it didn't, then what needs to happen is you need to put in a proposal to the Board of Game to close the season in your area earlier, and at the same time, put in a proposal to the Federal Subsistence Board to close it earlier, because I don't think you're going to get the Federal Subsistence Board to make -- to close a season earlier than the state season, because then the Federal Subsistence Board would say, we're going to restrict federal subsistence hunters but there's still a sport season that's allowed to go on, and the board's going to say that's not fair to the subsistence user.

If you can get the state to shorten their season through the Board of Game, I can -- I would feel fairly comfortable that the Federal Subsistence Board would agree to shorten their season also. So that really is the way you'd need to approach that.

MR. DEACON: One more thing, that meeting we had there, they suggest from our area a enforcement, a state enforcement should be at this meeting, too. It was requested that they be here. I don't see any here.

MR. COLLINS: Do you know if they turned in a proposal to the state? They would be the one to do that, the state.

MR. DEACON: And they didn't. In our area, especially, they're not handling it. They're not really listening to the people, local people.

MR. COLLINS: Any other comments on this or any other seasons in here?

MR. MORGAN: There's Unit 18 and 21 proposal.

MR. COLLINS: You want to speak to these, Henry -- or Herman? Excuse me.

MR. MORGAN: Maybe you could just read them out.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. Herman has written a proposal here and listing our organization as the one responsible.

MR. MORGAN: I put my name on it.

MR. COLLINS: But he put his name on it. What do you want to change, Unit 18 moose, include residents of Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Napaimuit. Now, where do you want them included?

MR. MORGAN: Unit 18, Unit 18.

MR. COLLINS: I'll go on to read here. How would you like to see the proposed change. Okay, include residents of Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Napaimuit to hunt moose in Unit 18.

Why should this change, because the residents of Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Napaimuit have traditionally hunted in Unit 18. Slightly more moose possibly being harvested in Unit 18 is how it will affect populations. How will the change affect the subsistence use, give the residents of Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Napaimuit a chance to harvest moose in Unit 18.

What communities have used this resource, and mentions the same communities, for 5,000 years. Where was the moose harvested, indicate a specific area, if possible.

You might want to think about that because I don't -- from what I've read, the moose haven't been over in this area for that long. I mean, they're fairly -- at the turn of the century or something some of them got way down there. At least that's the stories I've heard from Holy Cross.

What was the resource harvested, moose -- you want to speak to this? I'm not sure -- you're not allowed to hunt moose you're saying now?

MR. MORGAN: They're not listed as a customary user under this regulations here.

MR. COLLINS: So you want to change the C&T determination in Unit 18?

MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

MR. COLLINS: I think you need a little work on the writing there, but let's get to the right page, then, if you could refer to pages.

MR. MATHEWS: It would be page 98, 99.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, 98, 99.

MR. MATHEWS: Would be the bottom of 98, if I understand correctly. The present C&T determination for moose in Unit 18 is rural residents of Unit 18 and residents of Upper Kalskag. If I understand Herman's proposal, it would be to add Aniak, Paimuit and Chuathbaluk, if I pronounce it right, to that C&T determination for 18.

MR. COLLINS: Okay.

MR. DENTON: Just looking at the map here, Paimuit is in Unit 18. So they're already --

MR. MORGAN: There's two different Paimuits, there's one Yukon and one up here.

MR. DENTON: Right. It would be good to differentiate which one exactly you're talking about. The Paimuit that I'm aware of on the Yukon is basically an abandoned village, for all intents --

MR. MORGAN: That's Paimuit up here. There's two different ones.

MR. YOKEL: It's on the Kuskokwim River, it's Napaimuit.

MR. COLLINS: Actually, we'll draw one up modeled on the other ones so it's a C&T determination, just as they were asking for C&T.

MR. MORGAN: On page 99 it says there's public lands in Unit 18 are closed to the hunting of moose except by rural residents of Unit 18 and Upper Kalskag, to include Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Napaimuit.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, I understand.

MR. MATHEWS: And we're in the annual cycle for C&T, so this would be a C&T requested change, similar to --

MR. COLLINS: Okay, you want to move introduction of that proposal, then?

MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

MR. COLLINS: Is there a second to that?

MR. DEACON: Second it.

MR. COLLINS: Seconded by Henry. Discussion of that? All those in favor signify by raising your right hand.

(Unanimous response).

MR. COLLINS: Okay, yes votes for all members present, motion carried. And I think we'll work on the wording. I think we

need to refer to pages or something and put the words C&T in there.

MR. MORGAN: Also 21(E), too, that other report I gave you.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, I've got the other one.

MR. MATHEWS: I can --

MR. COLLINS: Is that clear enough, our action now? You can draft that properly?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, I can draft that as a C&T request.

And I can use his wording there and then --

MR. COLLINS: Pass the proposal down and I'll give it to Vince. The one we just passed.

Okay, the second proposal is on what regulation do you want to change. Okay, this is, again, a C&T determination, customary and traditional?

MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

MR. COLLINS: And do we have a page number here? Where does it come up? It's on unit -- maybe I'll -- it's Unit 21(E).

MR. YOKEL: Page 118, 119.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, page 118 I think, is that --

MR. YOKEL: Next page has 21(E).

MR. COLLINS: 119, oh, okay. Okay, that would be at the top of page 119 there, where it says -- currently it's residents of 21(E) and residents of Russian Mission. And you want to include the residents of Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Napaimuit to be able to harvest moose in 21(E). Traditional hunters have hunted moose in 21(E) from Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Napaimuit. That's how it should be -- that's why it should be changed.

How will it be changed, slightly possible increase in harvested moose in Unit 21(E). That's the affect on wildlife.

How will this affect subsistence use, provide more opportunity for residents of Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Napaimuit to be able to harvest moose in the customary and traditional manner.

Which communities have used this resource, same, Aniak, Chuathbaluk, Napaimuit. Where was it harvested, 21(E). What months, fall. You want to move that?

MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, is there a second to that for discussion purposes?

MR. DEACON: Second.

MR. COLLINS: Seconded by Henry. Okay, now, this would do the same thing by listing these communities in here and this is the issue that's going to come up at the meeting that's coming up in October, because all of the communities in 18 want to also be included in this area. I guess what I'd want to ask is 21(E) is pretty big. Is it that whole area that you've hunted on, or the fact that that is adjacent to you here that makes you concerned?

Because I've heard that the concern from Holy Cross was that there's too many hunters coming in over there.

MR. MORGAN: I'm concerned with this right over here.

It's close by, mostly that, the lower portion, would be the lower portion of that.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, there's probably a map.

MR. MORGAN: They used to travel all over the country, and who knows how far they used to go, but it's primarily right across the river. That's where mostly -- not around Holy Cross.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, page 115 is a map that you can look at. You can see where it is.

MR. MORGAN: Do we need to make that distinction right now?

MR. COLLINS: I'm not sure. The way it reads, though, it would be all of 21(E) but that's not what concerns you. You're concerned that just across the river here there is some area that's in 21(E), I guess, huh?

MR. MORGAN: Sometimes they go by the Russian Mountains and they're quite a ways up there. That wouldn't result in that bringing more moose meat, that would maybe qualify about five. Lot of people hunt around here, but some people go there, too. I don't think it's really a big -- if they're on here, they might get saying they can't hunt here or something.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Mr. Chair, if Herman could tell us exactly where they've been hunting, like by this river or along this, so we know exactly where they have been hunting.

MR. MORGAN: They're not hunting down the mountain there.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Your proposal is -- give us something we can find it on the map. Give us some boundaries that you want to hunt on.

MR. MORGAN: From here to head of the Iditarod River. It's hard to make the boundary.

MR. COLLINS: You're talking about the part of 21(E) that is adjacent to or comes close to the Kuskokwim River from the head of the Iditarod to the west?

MR. MORGAN: Yeah, right around there, yeah. Just the Iditarod River, the head of it is on the map, from there on down.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, well 18 here is this boundary.

MR. COLLINS: There's a map over here. Perhaps you could point it out on that.

MR. MORGAN: This area right here.

REPORTER: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I'm not able to hear the discussion at this point. Do you want to go off the record?

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I think that would be good, if we go off the record and then we'll go back on.

(Off record).

MR. COLLINS: Okay, I think we've got it.

MR. MATHEWS: Are we going back on the record then?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, go back on the record now. What Herman is proposing is that a C&T determination be made on moose in the southern portion of 21(E), drained by Paimuit Slough and that the communities listed, Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Napaimuit be granted C&T determination for that portion of 21(E).

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Mr. Chair, I'd like to see the limit be five, the limit of five moose, no more than five.

MR. COLLINS: Oh.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: You know, three or four, but five in case --

MR. COLLINS: You'd have to do a bag limit. You'd have to have another proposal to deal with the limits, I think.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: But that's included, they would take no more than five.

MR. GUENTHER: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. Angie, C&T isn't set up so that it can be limiting unless there's a resource problem.

So the number of moose would have to be so low there that before you could limit, based on C&T. So it creates somewhat of a problem. The only other way you could deal with it is to set a limit for that area, but then that limit would be for everybody, anybody that hunted there, no matter where they were from that had C&T.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, Herman moved that. Is there a second to that?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Second.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, seconded by Harold. Any discussion of the proposal now?

MR. MORGAN: The reason being that people used to hunt there. If they go hunt there now, it's like they're breaking the law, you know, and it's not fair if they used to hunt there before, and so they should still be able to hunt.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. Are you ready to vote then?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: It's what season again now, just the winter one?

MR. MORGAN: Yeah, winter season.

MR. COLLINS: Well, it wouldn't be -- all this is doing is giving them C&T determinations. Then any time there was an open season in there, they would be eligible. Any time there's a federal subsistence use there, they would be eligible because they have C&T determinations.

There's two different processes. One is to say that they have a customary and traditional use and then the seasons and bag limits are set. So it would be any time there was a federal season in there, subsistence season, then they would be able to go over there.

MR. MATHEWS: And that season now is August 25th through September 25th and February 1st to February 10th for 21(E) where bulls can only be taken from September 5th to 25th.

MR. COLLINS: Do you want to speak to that?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Well, when it comes to vote, I'll have to say no, because I cannot go home and, you know, go back to my own people and say, well, they've let in the lower part of our 21(E) there and they're going to open it to the residents of Aniak and the other two little villages, and they'll be jumping on my back when I get home.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I think that's where what he was saying before when we had the whole study where they had to document that. That's where they collected some of that. They'll have proof of it, you know. I'd be -- I wouldn't be doing my job if I didn't put this in there, because that's where people used to hunt.

MR. COLLINS: Herman, would you feel comfortable in submitting this to the meeting at the 26th where they're going to be discussing this whole thing, and then you could still put it in. As I understand, an individual can turn it in to the federal board and then it would come up for discussion at our spring meeting.

I'm a little reluctant to vote myself right now. I don't know all the issues of it and I think at that meeting there's going to be all these communities impacted that they'll be talking about it.

MR. MORGAN: I would be there, I would be able to be there to defend it and say why? You can't deny people that, where they hunted before. You can't say you can't hunt there. I think that's it.

MR. COLLINS: I think they're planning a meeting here in December on this issue. They're going to have one at Russian Mission and then one in December, is that my understanding.

DEBBIE LEE: Sometime during the December council meeting is my understanding.

MR. MATHEWS: But the proposal time period closes on the 27th of October.

MR. COLLINS: Oh, okay, okay.

MR. MATHEWS: We have to remember that.

MR. COLLINS: Right. So it's been moved and seconded that we submit this proposal. All this is doing is to put it in the book and we'll take a position on that in the spring meeting when it comes up. But this would put the proposal in the proposal book.

MR. MATHEWS: This would put it in the proposal book as a Western Interior proposal.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, Conrad?

MR. GUENTHER: Just one additional comment that might be helpful. Right now the state season for 21(E) for moose is September 5 through 25th and a winter season of February 1 through 10. The federal season is August 25th through September 25th, and February 1 through 10. So the winter seasons are exactly the same. So you could hunt under state regulations in that area now. The subsistence season, the state, the federal season opens August 25th and the state does not open until September 5th. So the only advantage at this time would be from August 25th to September 5th for federal subsistence hunters. Otherwise, they can hunt up there during a state season.

MR. COLLINS: But if the state season closed in the winter, then they would be excluded.

MR. GUENTHER: That's right, that's correct.

MR. COLLINS: Is everyone ready to vote? All those in favor signify by raising your right hand.

(Response).

MR. COLLINS: Opposed? Motion failed, four/two -- four/three. Was it four/three? Let's count again. In favor?

MR. MATHEWS: I only saw two on that.

MR. COLLINS: Two, okay. Now opposed?

(Response).

MR. COLLINS: Are you abstaining, Pollock?

MR. SIMON: Yes.

MR. COLLINS: Four yes, two opposed, one abstention.

MR. MORGAN: Can someone second a motion and then oppose it?

MR. COLLINS: Sure, yeah, yeah. You second it for discussion.

MR. MORGAN: I don't understand this.

MR. COLLINS: It still can go in as an individual proposal, and it can be brought up at this meeting. Any other regulation proposals?

MR. MATHEWS: There were some discussions -- I don't know where they are now -- on the Nowitna. I don't know where that proposal is at the moment.

MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chairman, George Yaska was just here, he ran an errand real quick, and he'll be back shortly.

MR. COLLINS: I'll just expand it then to the generation of proposals and that had to do -- wasn't there a couple

proposals we wanted to generate or not?

MR. REAKOFF: There was a proposal to allow the hunter, designated hunter option. I'm not sure how that designated hunter option is proposed to the board by the council. That's in a proposal form or recommendation for the -- to allow the designated hunter program.

MR. MATHEWS: We just submit it. You're going by unit or area or whatever to say that you'd like a designated hunter permit be established for units whatever, or subunits whatever.

MR. REAKOFF: It would include units 24, 21 and 19, the Western Interior.

MR. MATHEWS: So you're saying the whole Western Interior?

MR. REAKOFF: The whole Western Interior. I personally feel that there's elderly people that can really benefit from this, or somebody gets hurt and can't hunt, their families have a tough time or something.

MR. COLLINS: They can do that in the state season, though. You realize there is a state program doing that, too, right now?

MR. REAKOFF: Does the State of Alaska regulation hunter, designated hunter recognize special federal permits? Sometimes there's special federal hunts and would they designate -- like where I live, we can hunt with a firearm and the state says they have to use bows and arrows. If we use the state permit, would the state allow the designated hunter to use a firearm? That's why I feel that the federal program should have the designated hunter also.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, other comments on that? Henry.

MR. DEACON: I question that. You mean I can go out and hunt for you if I want to kill something? If that's the -- that's the thing behind that, I question that quite a bit, because anybody could say I could hunt for so and so. That's not right. Native people, they used to -- they shared the catch, and they don't have to say I'm going to hunt for so and so. You do it out of your kindness and share what you catch. That's a tradition. That's the real -- real way to hunt, share. Designated hunter, I'd have to watch that because they'll go --

MR. REAKOFF: Where I live, we have large caribou bag limits and the reason that there's large caribou bag limits is the limit was increased to 15 caribou or something. Well, the reasons for those large bag limits are because there's young people that go out and kill -- they don't need 15 caribou, they can't keep 15 caribou a day, but they have to be able to harvest for themselves plus older people, or to give away the meat like you're talking about.

MR. COLLINS: But they can do it under the bag limit.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, they do it under the bag limit, but with the moose season, there's limited, you know, you're only allowed one moose. So it's -- if you've got a big family and your mom needs a moose or whatever, it gets kind of tough for them. That's the way I'm thinking about it.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, further comments?

MR. MORGAN: I have a comment, Mr. Chairman. Like what Henry's saying there's a lot of potential for abuse on that. A lot of them, the resources, there's wolf predation, sport hunters, now you going to put this on the there, too. You'll have nothing

pretty soon. The hunters say share it, talking about getting the first moose, give to the others. We share, that's how we do it. If you have this designated hunter, he could say he's hunting for anybody. It could get out of hand.

MR. COLLINS: I think I would have to concur at this point. I initially thought that it might be something needed in our area, but until we get a handle on who has C&T and in the various areas, I could see where there could be a lot of abuse, because someone who was traveling a distance to hunt could just gather up permits and maybe take even more than they personally would need to go back and share, but it would complicate the problem of overhunting in some areas right now. And I think that's what they're thinking from the area over there. I hadn't thought of that aspect of it, but it could just compound our problem, shifting hunting pressures around, because now you have not only your own, but you can also be hunting for somebody else.

Other comments on that issue?

MR. MATHEWS: I don't think there's been a motion.

MR. COLLINS: There hasn't been a motion, no. So what we're questioning, do we need to generate a proposal about designated hunter, so people were commenting what they thought about designated hunters. Yes, Pollock.

MR. SIMON: He could introduce what he has to the board to support, and the board take action, vote it up or vote it down.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, somebody could draw up a proposal and I think if there is concern in your area -- these proposals seem to be related to game management units, so it wouldn't have to be Western Interior wide. If there is an issue up there, you could put in a proposal for that area and then we could discuss it at our spring meeting and then it wouldn't -- wouldn't impact the areas down here.

MR. SIMON: What I'm trying to point out is that, you know, he could bring us that there and at this time, we would vote on it. It's like it's not in there now. He could bring it up now.

MR. COLLINS: Right, right. That's right, yeah. Any individual or any community or area can submit proposals, as long as it's done by October 31st.

MR. MATHEWS: 27th.

MR. COLLINS: Are there any other areas where we need to generate proposals?

MR. SIMON: You going to bring up the proposal?

MR. REAKOFF: Not right now.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Can we come up with some other proposals before the meeting's over after we discuss moose, discussion of -- I don't know if it's a proposal, the form of it.

MR. COLLINS: Well, we've got other new business. I guess somebody could move to amend the agenda and add something under other new business if they felt they needed. That's kind of the last item there, but it's not listed there now so you'd have to move to amend by doing something as number one under other business. That would be a way.

MR. MATHEWS: I think the way it's been going so far, you could float your idea out like Jack did. There wasn't a motion, see, and go from there. I think what I'm indicating to you, it would be the best time to do it now, if you have some, and that's why I'm

looking around for the one.

MR. HUNTINGTON: That's what I was waiting on. I was waiting on the moose discussion.

MR. MATHEWS: What he's discussing is there was a request which was approved by the Chair to add the Nowitna moose discussion, the Nowitna River moose discussion. There's a proposal associated with that. If that would surface now, we would cover them. I would assume we would cover the Nowitna River moose discussion, just move it up or dispense. I don't see him.

MR. COLLINS: If there is a proposal coming out of that, we could act on it at that time, because it is an agenda item on there, and so this I would take to be generation of proposals that aren't coming up under one of the topics below.

MR. MATHEWS: He's right. I stand corrected.

MR. HUNTINGTON: What I had in mind is I want to bring up a proposal that dealt with that. Not the same really, but different river.

MR. COLLINS: That should probably be brought up now.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I think so, but he's not here.

MR. COLLINS: Well, the other one would be what I suggested before, under this other new business you could move to amend the agenda, if people agreed here, and put something on at that point.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Okay, I'll do that.

MR. COLLINS: Any other proposals we need to generate then?

MR. MATHEWS: May want to ask the public. I don't know if --

MR. COLLINS: Anyone here want to bring a proposal to us, introduce it?

Hearing none, we'll move on then. Discussion of regional council's training needs.

MR. MATHEWS: Maybe this one will be a little bit more lively, because I know you guys were balancing out different issues and values and concerns. This one is basically within the program. We're asking what does the council feel it needs for additional training to make you perform your duty to be a local forum for people to submit subsistence concerns. That can be a full range of ideas. It can be training on Roberts Rules, how to conduct a meeting, basic statistical analysis to whatever else you could think of that would apply to this. So it's kind of to give us an idea if you feel you need additional training in the area and then from there, we'll look at how that could be met. Conrad may have more on that.

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, this may also be an appropriate time to discuss the possible training that I had mentioned earlier, that would be if the council would be interested in that, in expanding this as to a regular part of future meetings.

MR. COLLINS: Member comments?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Maybe I have something to say on that. I've been on a corporation board for about seven years now and until about three years ago, we never had any training, and we started having training during our board meetings, at least three times a year, you know, official educators, and it's really -- it's really done our board, our corporation board a lot of good. We've really gotten a lot of things done and really helped everybody on the board, and I kind of see it the same situation here, you know. We've

got a lot of good intentioned people, but it seems like we're just kind of not really organized and going in the same direction.

I think maybe should try to come up with some kind of a plan for training for the future, future board members. I think it would be -- I think it could be accomplished but we'd have to squeeze the funds out of the --

MR. MATHEWS: Well, Mr. Chair, there is no discussion of funds attached with this, so I wouldn't limit yourself by funds. I would think what you need and then we'll go from that direction to what is out there, and I failed to mention it would be -- one would be like we said for new members, and et cetera, that way, and then like Conrad was mentioning, bringing in professional people that deal with issues similar to this and how do they handle them.

MR. HUNTINGTON: That's been one of you guy's biggest excuses is not having Chair or other council members at the meetings that they should be attending. So also, the lack of funds, you know. All of the sudden you got a lot of money there?

MR. MATHEWS: No, we don't have a lot of money.

MR. HUNTINGTON: That's what the excuse you guys always been coming up with before, anyway, is lack of funds to do anything. So I kind of want to see what funding is there in place to see what kind of training.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, I think the funding question, not to belabor it, is that we did crack open the door and were able to get funding for the chairs of the Western and Eastern Interior to attend a knock-a-noggin meeting. So there is avenues to do that. I think what we need to look at is what do you really need and approach it from that way, and then see how the planning goes on that and that's -- that's where it's at.

I think Harold gave a very good summary of how the professional training helped in their setting and it would help here, I would assume also. If that's what, you know, the council desires, we can pursue that and see what limitations we have, but don't limit yourself now. I know I may come back next meeting and say, "There's no funding," but don't limit your discussion now on that.

MR. COLLINS: Harold, do you have any specific recommendations on the kind of training you think we could benefit from, what you'd like to see here?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, one thing that comes to mind is ANILCA, the whole, the whole of that, itself. I don't think most -- a lot of these members are aware of all the things that ANILCA, you know, passed. I think that's one of the important things that all these members should be aware of, that our purpose here is to protect the subsistence users' lifestyle and somewhere along the line, a lot of people have their own interpretation and working with a lot of the state people, it always seems like they're going against your -- your goals, for the subsistence goals. So I think it should be one of the things that everybody is made aware of, ANILCA.

MR. COLLINS: So that would be as it relates to subsistence, you mean how these councils came into being under the federal system, how ANILCA brought us to --

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, our purpose for being here.

MR. MATHEWS: I think he's incorporating what the genesis for ANILCA was and how that related to Title VIII, and as a matter of fact, that's what I've done for the Yukon Delta and a couple other refuges, gone out and provided courses on that.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Mr. Chairman?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, Gail.

MS. VANDERPOOL: When you're speaking about the training for the regional councils and things, well, probably a lot of us have served on boards before and all kinds of committees. Generally, on most boards you come into or committees that you come into, they have what they -- when you're first -- they have the first change-over of council members and whatnot and they have what they call a workshop session and you attend it. It's a mandatory deal. You attend it a couple days and they kind of brief you on everything. It's been my experience, even though I've sat on councils and boards and everything, every time I attend another workshop, you learn something else because there's always new regulations and rules that come out.

That might be a way to solve that problem, is just have like a mandatory workshop that they attend when they first come on line or even for those ones who have been on for many years. Sometimes people need to be reminded why they're there.

MR. SIMON: Yes, can I ask a couple questions of what kind of training the agency thinks that we need and if there's money available? If not, then if there's no money available, no need to train. But I think why not use the money in other areas, more areas that we could use the money for? Like, before I got on this service, on this board, I was on the State Fish & Game board for -- since 1972, and like most of us on this board, we live in a village and we're subsistence users. We know the country and we know how to survive off the land. We don't need much more education in how to be a better member than that, you know. So if you give us training, have lots the money, go ahead, but if not, use that money someplace else.

MR. COLLINS: Other members? I don't have a comment on training, specifically, but it's related to it, I guess. We haven't been getting too much biological information. Maybe because we're not dealing with proposals, but like there is a perception on the part of a lot of members here that moose are in trouble or that there is too many different groups out there harvesting and also that the wolf population is growing, but I guess we need to hear from some of the agencies maybe on some of that so we have a better biological picture of what's happening as you do counts and so on.

Yeah, did you want to comment?

MR. GUENTHER: That, you know, that definitely could be something that could be considered as training and added into the agenda, where we'd do something like I'd take a particular unit or give an update on what happened throughout all of the Western Interior Unit dealing with moose or any particular other species, or all species. We could put together some materials that show what the data that's been accumulated over the last ten years would show.

I mean, there's lots of ways we could do that if the council was particularly interested in it, and I would take that upon myself as a task to incorporate, but it's somewhat important that we get some direction and guidance from the council as to what we should do because we all have a lot of other tasks that we're required to do as part of our job. If the request comes from the council that we provide that sort of thing, it's much easier to justify to our supervisors, this is a council request and therefore, I can spend a week or two weeks pulling that data together for the council, that

information.

MR. MATHEWS: And that's why I was discussing earlier, if I may add, and also I won't be able to find it quick enough, but in ANILCA 805 it says an annual report, that you would look at that.

I am striving towards meeting the letter of that law in that report, and one is the assessment of the resources.

Other councils have decided not to do that because of the level of time involvement. My feeling, if you don't have a baseline to start from, then you are -- you don't know where the floor is or the ceiling was. So I need direction here. I hear these ideas. Are these ideas -- I don't know if any are motions, but is the council in general supporting the ANILCA training in effect, a workshop for new members and that? Can I take that as that?

What Conrad is saying, both him and I, him more than I, have been pushing for this within our office and I'm not saying the office is against it, but it sure would move it along a little quicker if we had the council and other councils behind us saying we need this, especially like the workshop one. That's been discussed at many, many meetings. We haven't gotten much support in our office to do that.

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, just a comment to Pollock. These trainings don't necessarily cost a lot of money, specifically, what we're talking about. It's more a designation of our time to put this material together for some of the things that we think about as training so that we have some direction, that we just have so many other tasks to do, in setting priorities with our own tasks.

MR. MATHEWS: It would be with -- we have, and others in the room have graphic -- it would not all be lecture type or printed, but we didn't go to the graphic part because we couldn't justify the time away from other duties to do that. So if you feel that's a priority, then we can readjust ours to do graphics that'll make a lot of this verbiage a lot clearer, as far as biology and et cetera. It's something to think about.

MR. COLLINS: Member comments on any of this?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I feel that I'm not -- I don't know a lot about the biology of the moose down in this area here, 19 and 21. It seems to be a contention area between the down river and up river areas. I feel that it would be to our advantage to understand more about moose densities and harvest levels, whether they're in the parameters of the -- of what the moose population can take, as far as is it approaching maximum sustained yield or whatever, whether it's within our prerogative to make recommendations to reduce outside hunting pressure. So we would have to know some more firm numbers as to what the densities of the moose are and what kind of harvest they're sustaining right now. So maybe at our next meeting, I would like to know more about that.

MS. VANDERPOOL: I feel, since I'm new to this and everything, if I attended a workshop that was put on, when I come to a meeting, I want to know what I'm going to be listening to rather than, you know, just going through an agenda really fast. I want to know -- if Jack is going to say something, I want to know something about his area before I could even make a comment or anything on it. Is it the same as our area? Or with Pollock, I want to know what their area is like and this is what -- something I feel that we could learn. It would benefit all of us, with these workshops and stuff, so we don't have to prolong these meetings and drag them on and stop

and have to identify everything and do everything, just have to understand more, you know what I mean?

If somebody says something about one region, I might say, well gee, I don't know about that region, let me read on it first before I can even vote or before I can voice my opinion. I want to know something of what we're dealing with when I come to a meeting. I just don't want to sit here and be lectured on one little part, you know. I want to know about that region.

I think if we all attended some type of workshop, even a discussion workshop with it, not with all this stuff we have to take care of, we'd be more aware of what was happening in everybody's region. Do I make sense? To me I make sense. I don't know about anybody else.

MR. MATHEWS: Not that I as a staff have to -- or not bless your thing, but you make great sense to me and what it sounds like -- and I'm not trying to put words in your mouth, please stop me --

MS. VANDERPOOL: I will if you do.

MR. MATHEWS: That if we had a meeting like this, there may be a part of a day or not a full day when you have a work session. When you have a work session, though, just to make it clear to everybody, you can only take official action when you're on line.

When you're in the work session, you couldn't say, darn, we're going to pass this proposal, et cetera. I would have to stop you, unless we do it in this type of forum. Just that little bit we could do that in fall and spring and maybe down the road, your staff would have generated enough condensed material that we could almost provide you what I would call a cheat sheet beforehand. We may still have to update that and review it before we discuss the issue, but I hear you, that --

MS. VANDERPOOL: To me, it makes more sense, and we don't prolong anything or, you know, I mean, it's all done and taken care of after you have these sessions or whatever.

MR. COLLINS: Maybe the area, then, to target for spring, since it will be coming up, is the 21(E) and the others here that if we had more -- and the Kuskokwim River, too, the more of the biology of what's happening in this area, the hunting and so on, and then there'll be the report on the October 27 and December meetings when the two groups are discussing that, and I assume you're going to have to report to the board on some of the biology of the issue, too.

If we can see all that stuff first, then there might be a chance for local input, because sometimes it's a little frustrating, we don't have too much a chance to pass information on except the comments because we don't look at an area. And I know all these people have more in-depth knowledge about what's happening in their area, so that would give them a chance to contribute to the workshop, too, by helping familiarize us with your area and what's happening in the area and hunting, what concerns there are.

MR. MATHEWS: The only thing I would say on that, if we're in the workshop session, if it relates to proposals that you or the staff would say, let's just discuss the overall situation, and not get into the proposals, because then we're tipping in different directions there, and I looked at Conrad and he was shaking his head yes, there's a time constraint on that also, and so I'm not -- I'm just stating a fact. We're going to be analyzing proposals that come through this and others, plus the C&T proposals. So if Conrad feels

we can pull this off for 21(E) and 19(A) and (B), I believe it was, then we -- I just want a confirmation from him if that seems to be -- and there'll be other staff we're going to be tapping that work in the area, but we'll be the leads on it.

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, from my perspective, I think this is extremely important and I'll make a commitment to have this to you, and Vince is right. You know, we -- depending on the number of proposals that come in, sometimes we get just extremely busy between now and April when the board meetings come up, but this is very important. Jeff has a lot of information and there's a lot of other information around, so I'd have a lot of help.

Also, I think it's really important with something like this that you get an opportunity to look at the sort of information we're looking at and tell us things that may have a direct impact on that or where we may be wrong. For example, things like was mentioned over the lunch break, that when you're on the Innoko and Yukon Rivers and there's a bad flood year that there's a tremendous number of moose and other species that die as a result of that flooding. Those are really important things that haven't been incorporated in any of the data that I've looked at from this area for moose yet. So we need to make sure we think about those things in this, too. So you have a lot to contribute to my knowledge of the area, in addition to what I can show you that the data that's been collected from surveys, harvest data and that sort, which you may not have.

This is a two-way education, really.

MR. COLLINS: The other thing that an example of where you could add information, Ed, for instance on the Innoko, you do some information on the number of guides and outfitters and what they're doing out there and so on in the refuge.

ED MALLEK: Yeah.

MR. COLLINS: People here have perception on how much of that's going on. Maybe an actual report at that time, what's happening in that area, will give them factual information, too, of what you're observing. Then they could comment on abuses or problems that they see.

ED MALLEK: We have the information on what the guides report.

MR. MATHEWS: I take everybody's head's somewhat nodding that that's approval to do that and we're going to go ahead.

MR. COLLINS: Does that sound reasonable to you?

MR. MATHEWS: It would be before you go into session and it would be kind of open to the public, but there's no decision making during that time, just discuss and learn about the area so everyone is up to the same level of knowledge, so then when you go into the meeting, you make the decision based on that knowledge level. Okay.

MR. SIMON: Mr. Chair, just on the training, how often do we need to come to have a workshop and training session? It's like we're meeting twice a year, this board does, and maybe we need a workshop twice a year, too, or --

MR. MATHEWS: You mean in addition to the two meetings?

MR. SIMON: I mean, like we're talking about training needs for the council. How often does that take place?

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, again, this would be up to

the council. One of the things that we -- we talked about all sorts of training similar to what you were saying, and that sort of thing, for quite a long time and because of the cost involved with the travel and everything, one of the things we were considering was incorporating it into the council meetings. So there would be a set amount of time that was established with the two meetings you have a year or have one meeting a year, depending on what your interests are, and whatever training would be done would be done at that time.

There's also options you could recommend to the federal board that there would be separate times set apart for training. So it really is up to the council what their recommendation would be. We're looking for that.

MR. COLLINS: I think one of the issues that will come up is how much time we can commit. I think some of us have time restraints, too. If you try to add extra meetings, it might get difficult. But certainly a work session in the evening -- like last night, the whole thing could have been a work session and we might have moved faster today then, and wouldn't have had to have so much discussion on some, if the work session was related to the business.

MR. MATHEWS: It would assist us greatly when you target areas, and that may be difficult in the future, it may not be, but that is helpful because then we can target and pull in the key people, where if we do the whole region, which I mentioned earlier, it's a lot of people to pull in. They may say well we'll wait till an issue comes up before we come in. But I think we're -- if I can say, I think we're -- unless there's some other additional training needs, that we could address that. This doesn't close this off just because it's on this agenda. My phone number's an 800 number. I can transfer you to him or whoever else you want, the refuges also, if you think of something later that you need to know, law enforcement, whatever it happens to be. Call me or one of the other ones. This is not the close-all of it. This is just to let you know that the process is asking you how can we help you do your job better.

MR. SIMON: Mr. Chair, I have more comments here. I come to these meetings, we do a volunteer service. Some of us, we have to leave the village or leave our work to come to this meeting, and we feel so strong of the situation of what our jobs that we left back home, and what I'm saying is that, well, if I come to a meeting, then I don't -- if there's a training or a workshop, I don't have time to take that training or workshop. So I have other things to do at home. That's my point of view.

MR. COLLINS: Certainly something we'll have to take into consideration when we set the meeting up. Now it would be possible, I suppose, if we knew what the work session was going to be in an evening that someone who was pressed for time, if they couldn't get there, could arrive the next morning for the business, but I think --

MR. MATHEWS: Right. There is that option. The only thing is is that if many didn't show up for the work session, then it's not worthwhile. And Pollock, there are others throughout the councils that other councils have expressed the same concern. So I'm not playing a deaf ear with you, I just don't have a response at this time.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, with that in mind, we want to keep moving and try to finish today so we're a day ahead and we can travel tomorrow instead of having to go home Friday. Are you ready to move

on?

Okay, the next one would be the federal and state agencies, and I guess as we go through these, if we can pass the time around, yes.

GEORGE YASKA: Can I go first? Is it possible I could go first? I have some time concerns.

MR. COLLINS: Okay.

GEORGE YASKA: If you guys don't mind, Conrad.

MR. GUENTHER: No, not at all.

MR. COLLINS: Did you have the Nowitna proposal coming up down below?

GEORGE YASKA: No, I'd like to discuss a proposal, though. That's information, and again, for the record, my name is George Yaska I'm director of wildlife for Tanana Chiefs Conference for Galena -- rather the Yukon sub Alaskan regional board for Tanana Chiefs Conference, has requested Lower Koyukuk moose management plan working group. The centerpiece of this plan, the cornerstone of the plan would be a reduced registration hunt in the Lower Koyukuk area.

It's roughly from the mouth of the Koyukuk up 150 miles to the juncture of the upper end of the Threeday Slough with the Koyukuk River. It gets fairly confusing.

In the past few years, we've had 200 hunters, 300 hunters, 150 moose being taken out. This year we've had 485 hunters and 285 moose taken out in the first roughly 100 miles of the river.

I don't believe the area could sustain that for very long. We see moose, there's a check station right at 15 mile, the first 15 miles at the mouth of the Koyukuk River, much smaller antler size racks, smaller moose, and probably too many moose.

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game and biologists in the area have discussed the reduced registration hunt. I don't believe we could close the area, and it's not my intention to close the area or for local subsistence only. I think we could get by with a reduced registration hunt and the registration station available only at Koyukuk and discuss some numbers. Again, this work group is just beginning and forming and we need to work with the Office of Subsistence Management to discuss the procedure, and so on, protocol, who is going to be on this group, whether this group would become involved, at which point do they become involved, what number of permits, what are the objectives of the work group that we need to figure all that out.

I do want to advise this group, though, that the planning process has begun. Because this is more of a work session and a discussion time than a time where we don't necessarily take action, and that actually isn't very clear, Mr. Chairman. Would you be taking action on such items in the spring and not today?

MR. COLLINS: We're not acting on any proposals today.

They're just being discussed and submitted. It would be in a booklet for next spring to take position, before they come to the board.

GEORGE YASKA: So I can't necessarily ask for your blessing on the formation of this group, that would probably be too much, I'm not sure. I'm not sure exactly what to ask you here. That's what I thought I was going to do when I came here, and ask you guys to authorize such a group to discuss this issue. Otherwise, the next step for us is to close the area and have only local subsistence needs met there.

So again, I'm not really sure where to go on this one.

MR. COLLINS: You want to take questions or comments at this point, because there may be some on -- any of the members here have questions or comments?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, I do, I guess. It seems to me like Tanana Chiefs is pushing this but they're not really aware of everything, you know, as far as ANILCA goes. Under ANILCA, regional councils were created to take up proposals and any concerns that the subsistence users have. When you have an outside -- outside organization that comes in and start trying to push stuff down your throat, you know, without your acknowledgment, I think you'll have some problems.

It should be closely coordinated between all the different organizations. So I'd advise, you know, maybe Tanana Chiefs, whoever's behind this proposal, to make sure they know what they're getting into before they start, you know, pushing the buttons, because there's a lot under ANILCA that even I don't understand.

GEORGE YASKA: Again, it would be the work group that determines all of this and they'd be the people from Koyukuk, Galena and a lot of U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and Alaska Department of Fish and Game that would determine what they need in the first section of the river.

Right now, what they want is to close the area completely and just have local subsistence needs met. I don't think that's the answer and I don't think you guys can do that.

MR. HUNTINGTON: As far as the regional councils go, that's the way to go, to do, closing anything. As far as a better answer, to be -- try and push something you have no jurisdiction over, you know, you're going to create more problems, I think.

GEORGE YASKA: And again, the Yukon Koyukuk subregional board has asked me to bring this to you guys. They're forming this group. They want help from you guys. They'd like a member, at least one member from this council on their working group, and I'd like to ask you guys to do that today if you could.

MR. HUNTINGTON: They've asked me, it was I think about three or four days ago, to be at their meeting, coincide with this meeting.

GEORGE YASKA: Yeah, they're meeting just now.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I think they're having meetings today and tomorrow.

GEORGE YASKA: They started at 1:00.

MR. HUNTINGTON: There was no way anybody could miss council to attend that meeting.

GEORGE YASKA: No, the work group will be meeting over the winter, producing not necessarily even a product for the April meeting. They may be working it for two years, and they have a lot of work to do. We really don't have much information on the number of moose in the area.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I think it's something that, you know, that should be done, you know, but it should be organized where everybody involved has got the concerns in there and --

GEORGE YASKA: And we'd like the blessing of this group to form that group and again, we'd like one of the council members here, Mr. Chairman, to be appointed to that group, again, the Lower Koyukuk moose management plan working group.

MR. COLLINS: We'd have to put it down on the agenda further here if we would make that appointment. I don't think -- it's not appropriate to appoint while a report's going on. You see what I mean?

GEORGE YASKA: I'm sorry?

MR. COLLINS: What's that?

GEORGE YASKA: I didn't catch that.

MR. COLLINS: I say, I don't think it's appropriate for us to make an appointment while we're hearing a report right now. It would have to come up further.

GEORGE YASKA: Oh, sure that's fine, that's fine.

MR. COLLINS: Conrad?

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, if it would be appropriate, this -- I haven't been involved in this really at this point, but it sounds very similar to the Fortymile plan that was developed with the Fortymile caribou herd in the Eastern Interior, where there was action taken by outside groups and they came to the council and asked for council support and the council appointed a council member to be part of that planning team. It sounds like somewhat of a similar thing. So that sort of thing has already happened at least one time with the Fortymile herd, that I've been directly involved with.

MR. COLLINS: It also sounds similar to the two meetings that will go the end of the October and the other, to bring local groups together to talk about allocation issues and C&T determinations, too.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chair, but it's clear that those representatives, again, I'm just repeating myself, are only there to represent the council, that they bring back to the council and the council takes action. So they're not empowered to --

MR. COLLINS: Make decisions or speak for us.

MR. MATHEWS: Just so it's clear on that. That's the same with Fortymile and with the river, they were sent as representatives. They could say as individuals they could support it, but it went back to the council and the council voted up or down on the plan.

MR. COLLINS: Anything else to report, George?

GEORGE YASKA: No, that would be about it.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Didn't you have something on the Nowitna?

GEORGE YASKA: I could discuss it here.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, if you want to report.

GEORGE YASKA: And I do have something unfortunately blew up in my face in Washington, D.C. and I have to act on something with National Federation of Natives and Senator Stevens, I have to get back on the phone again, but Tanana, Ruby and Galena have submitted the proposal. I'm not sure, Vince, do you have the proposal?

MR. MATHEWS: I don't have it here.

GEORGE YASKA: I have a copy, but I don't have access to a copier. I could go to the school and make some copies. I'll be back, but very roughly, though, we've had a substantially reduced subsistence opportunity and the opportunity is thought no longer to be reasonable for subsistence hunters to take and harvest moose within Game Management Unit 21(B) for the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge, including the Nowitna River for local residents. Again, that

would be Tanana, Ruby and Galena. They have a proposal into the Office of Subsistence Management.

Again, I'll make a copy for you. I have my own copy here. It would close the area to all hunting except subsistence by local residents. Numbers would probably lend itself quite easily to such a closure. Just numbers off the top of my head, number of moose per square mile for comparative purposes, roughly 9 to 13 moose per square mile in the Lower Koyukuk River. In the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge and Game Management Unit 21(B), we have numbers of .42 moose per square mile, quite low numbers.

In the past, from the check station reports, 1984 to present, we have roughly 70 to 95 moose being taken out of the refuge every year. It's been going down. This year there were 35 moose being taken, partially because of warm weather, but I believe that the moose numbers are very low, certainly. The opportunity is almost nonexistent.

There are many sport hunters in the area who have the luxury of time and money to stay in there for an extended period. The subsistence hunters generally don't have that luxury of time or money or gasoline to stay in there for a long time. It would be too much of a gamble to stay in one area that's not very productive and where you have a lot of competition. They have to focus on other areas.

Those other areas available to Tanana, Ruby and Galena are now depleted. They need a closure for a period of years, probably at least three years within the refuge. Again, a closure to all hunting except subsistence uses.

And I'm sorry, I thought when I discussed it with Vince yesterday that he had a copy and he was going to circulate a copy to you.

MR. COLLINS: If you could get that to him for copying or get copies for us, that's good.

GEORGE YASKA: I'll take more questions though now, if

--

MR. COLLINS: Any questions?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I have comments, not questions.

That's about the same kind of proposal that I wanted kind of done for the Lower Koyukuk River, too. Well, all the biologists are saying that yeah, there's 13 moose per square mile in the Threeday Slough area. That's a hundred and some miles up from the mouth, you know, but the first hundred mile, you know, there's practically no moose. And that's where we traditionally hunt, you know, and all those moose are getting pretty well shot out from hunters that's on the way up to Threeday Slough area, and I kind of wanted to put some kind of restriction on the first hundred miles, you know.

GEORGE YASKA: And this is strictly a political consideration for the Lower Koyukuk River, and it's unfortunate we have to deal with the politics. It's a situation we're close to a subsistence management solution, close to a constitutional change in Alaska's constitution and agreements on changes to ANILCA with Senator Stevens' office. We're about 85 percent there. When we're so close, the timing is becoming so tight, the political forces don't need to be changing now. If we close the Koyukuk River with seemingly such healthy numbers, Senator Stevens is --

MR. HUNTINGTON: That's where the problem is. The biologists, I think I can believe them when they say there's 13 moose

per square mile in one area, but as soon as you get out of that small area, you know, it's back to dead country from then on, and I'm trying to restrict that dead area, you know, to subsistence users only, because I think it's -- they're cleaning that hundred mile stretch of river out to where you can't see anything now. And I think that something should be done to restrict it to subsistence users only. That area -- Threeday Slough area, that's where most hunters are destined for anyway.

GEORGE YASKA: The sport hunters have considerable sway over Senator Stevens. He could decide not to solve the problem, based on the level of testimony from the sport hunters who hunt in that area.

MR. HUNTINGTON: But on this council, you know, it carries a lot of weight on federal lands.

GEORGE YASKA: Oh, yeah, I think you could close it. I just need you to close it later, not now.

MR. COLLINS: If you want to --

MR. HUNTINGTON: I just want information on that. I didn't want to take any action on that. I just want to wait and see. I'm in no rush to shut anything down.

MR. MATHEWS: You're indicating that you don't want the council to submit a proposal on that and that there may not be a council before --

MR. COLLINS: We're in the reports right now. It's not appropriate to do it.

MR. MATHEWS: All right, sorry.

GEORGE YASKA: That would be all that I have, unless there's anymore questions.

MR. COLLINS: Any more questions?

MR. SIMON: It's a good report, but give them five minutes each, limit it to five minutes each.

GEORGE YASKA: Don't give me much time, because I'm not going to quit if you give me a chance.

MR. COLLINS: Let's move on, then. National Park Service.

MR. ULVI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make a couple of quick comments here and then my friend, Paul Hunter there from our office in Anchorage can speak to the NPS reconsideration of the firearms use under a trapping license, and also an overview in response to the question of this council about wolf studies that came up in Huslia that you discussed earlier today.

But just quickly, the map behind you, Gates of the Arctic National Park, is the purple area at the very northernmost end of the upper end of your Western region here, and it's connected to the other purple area to the west there, which is the Noatak National Preserve and Cape Krusenstern and out that way.

One of the things -- although Anaktuvuk Pass is now outside of your region and in Region 10, it of course is right on the northern boundary there and there are many concerns with what goes on in the northern part of GMU 24, things that you folks discussed, but just quickly, those of you that have heard before we reported on the Anaktuvuk Pass ATV agreement which has been in the works for about ten years, and it's sitting in congress and going to be acted on very soon. We've heard that for a year now, but it looks as though they are going to get to it fairly soon here and I think you are familiar with the subject or talk to people in Anaktuvuk Pass or with the

Park Service, you find that it's kind of a win/win situation. Most people feel like it's a very good solution to a very difficult problem. So it's a very complex land exchange, not worth getting into. If anybody has any questions about that, I'd be happy to entertain those on a break or something like that. But we hope that congress will finally act on that soon.

We have Subsistence Resource Commission meeting for Gates of the Arctic National Park coming up November 7th through the 9th in Fairbanks, and we're very fortunate to have Pollock Simon and Jack Reakoff on our Subsistence Resource Commission. So we have -- so I'm sure that applicable discussions from this group will be carried over to their meeting and they'll be talking about many similar concerns up in that northern end of this region.

We did talk about earlier about the special permit hunt for sheep and moose in Anaktuvuk Pass and I want to just also point out that that was designed as a community run hunt. The community maintained a roster of hunters. All we were really concerned with is that they were local residents there, that they had a hunting license, and we left it up to the community, more or less, to keep a roster of those people and decide if there were to be any limitations on the number of people involved or anything. We tried to step back and let them do that. We're trying to move toward community harvest limits and bag limits with communities like Anaktuvuk Pass, and we felt it was a successful endeavor, even though there were no animals harvested, because as I say, caribou came into the area.

We are -- there are no wildlife studies, to my knowledge, fish or wildlife studies going on that pertain to northern GMU 24, which concerns this council, except that we're attempting to work cooperatively through the North Slope Borough Department of Fish and Game, to do some moose surveys in the extreme end of your region here around Anaktuvuk Pass and on the North Slope there where you may have heard there's been a number of moose carcasses discovered in the last three months or so on drainages primarily running out of the North Slope there, and it appears from initial investigation that starvation is not a major factor and apparently they're looking into disease right now. We're talking something that's on the order of, from what I've heard, of 25 to 30 healthy adult moose carcasses were found in a couple of drainages. So it's gotten a lot of peoples' attention. We don't know what's going on. I don't think anybody does at this stage, but it may also have an effect on the northernmost part of the GMU Number 24. That's the reason I bring that up. And Conrad or others may have more information about that if you need more information.

So we're going to try to work on that, the trend count, setting up some trend areas there so we can monitor that population and also take a look at the sheep populations around Anaktuvuk Pass in the northernmost GMU 24, again primarily because it's clear that sheep populations have declined in the Brooks Range over the last several years. There's some hard winters and some other factors involved, so we would also like to monitor that sheep population a little closer. That would be in conjunction with the Department of Fish & Game and the community of Anaktuvuk Pass.

We have -- with some of our local hire native and non-native folks that work with us, we have developed some slide programs and have been working with our resident zoned communities up

there both to try to better explain to the visiting public what the local communities and cultural concerns are with visiting, with sport hunting pressures, with all sorts of things that may be going on, and so that people can better understand some of the local people, the -- and some of the concerns in and around Gates of the Arctic Park, as well as taking more information to the local communities about the National Park Service as a national agency, and the kinds of things we do in the Lower 48 and the kinds of things we're doing up here and what we're trying to do differently, hoping to increase the level of information, both within the agency and for local people to build some bridges and have a higher level of dialogue and communication about these kinds of issues that you're discussing here, which are very complicated and have serious implications for both wildlife managers and certainly for the people that depend on those resources.

So again, a two-way education.

And as far as appointments go, just wanted to remind you that this council, we have three regional councils for Gates of the Arctic Park, the Northwest, the Western Interior and North Slope. Each council now, as you may remember in the past, has -- we've agreed so that each council has one appointment to our Subsistence Resource Commission. Pollock Simon is currently sitting in that appointment for this council, and his appointment would be up in November of '96, and it is completely up to this council to act on that, and just wanted to bring that up well ahead of time here.

You may also, although it wasn't in the agenda and Vince hasn't brought it up, you also, I believe Vince received a copy of our Subsistence Resource Commission's Hunting Plan Recommendation Number 11, which has to do with C&T determinations for those GMUs and for all of those communities that are within the resident zone of Gates of the Arctic National Park. Basically because under the old federal system that has now changed, as you've heard today, where you can go in with C&T recommendations on an annual basis, it was starting to look like we may not all live long enough to see those northern arctic regions considered by the federal board. So I think our Subsistence Resource Commission took a step forward and said, hey, let's just figure that most of us understand about 90 percent of the species and the communities that have common -- someone with common sense would understand have been customarily and traditionally used and get past those and deal with the few species that there may be questions about.

Well, it turns out that that recommendation has been out for public comment. When we meet in November, they'll take that up again. I think now with the change in the federal way of doing business, then they'll have to revisit that and perhaps prioritize some species and get it back to the board so that the board will have to pay some attention, because I know the board's not going to pay attention to it now because it calls for all species and all communities.

And really that's all I have. I'll turn it over to Paul. The only other thing I wanted to do was to really extend appreciation for you folks taking time out to come and volunteer to do this. It's very important business and I can't -- I can't even imagine trying to do my job without having an opportunity to hear from you folks and understand something of your areas from your own personal perspectives. Really appreciate you coming and doing this, and if there are no questions, I'll turn it over to Paul.

MR. COLLINS: Any questions? Okay, Paul.

PAUL HUNTER: Mr. Chairman, council members, my name's Paul Hunter. I'm a subsistence specialist in the National Park Service support office in Anchorage, and what our office does is provide assistance to the various national park areas in the state as needed, and in addition to that, we also work as direct liaison to the subsistence board and we have a staff committee member as part of our staff and get involved quite heavily in that, as well, in Anchorage, because of the location, close to the other agencies.

The two letters that you referred to yesterday dated September 13th and addressed to Bob Barbee, our regional Park Service Regional Director, they landed in my in-basket last Thursday, and I can assure you that we'll have an answer to you well before your next meeting. I expect to work up the initial draft response on these as soon as I get back from this meeting, and so they should be on their way to you within a matter of weeks.

On the first one of those, the letter that you wrote expressing your interest in additional population studies for wolf and moose, we understood what you intended in there. We understood that it was for wolf control, and we'll respond accordingly. I should point out that the Park Service budget, in general, is being reduced, along with most other federal agencies. So the likelihood of there being any additional funding for population studies is probably low.

However, the good news, in the areas that you talked about, Units 19, 21 and 24, Denali National Park and Preserve is -- parts of it are included in that area and that's probably the most studied wolf population in the state. So we have, for several years, had research projects on wolf populations there, and we are continuing monitoring programs on the wolf packs at Denali. Nearly all, if not all, of the wolf packs at Denali have at least one collared wolf and we're continuing to monitor the trends there. So you know, that's the good news, because that's an ongoing program and it doesn't require additional funding, because it's one of the key programs, natural resource monitoring programs at Denali.

So the other two park units in the -- in the Western Interior region, Gates of the Arctic, Steve mentioned a little bit about the monitoring programs there, and then the other park is Lake Clark National Park and Preserve, and they have about the same level of activity as Gates does. It's not the same level as Denali, but they have ongoing population monitoring programs there as well. I'll mention -- the Park Service reply to your letter will mention that.

I should point out, though, that the bad side or the down side to that is that, as Conrad mentioned yesterday, along with the other federal agencies, and perhaps more so than some of the other federal agencies, National Park Service does not manage wildlife populations, does not use predator control as a wildlife management technique, except in very extreme cases where there's an endangered species that needs protection or something along that line. So while the information may be available in our Park Service areas, you know, some of the data in our areas, we don't use that data to control predators. So that's like -- that's a national policy of the National Park Service and unlikely to change.

On the other hand, we have cooperated with Fortymile caribou planning group, which is an interagency effort, and while within the Yukon Charley, area which is affected by that, there won't

be sterilization and you know, predator control, essentially I guess, although at a modern level, we still have cooperated and support that on a regional basis, as a proper management tool for the region wide trends there. We would do that, as well, in the Western Interior, if such a management plan were put together on an interagency basis.

That's about all I can say on that. The other letter that you sent us is -- it I believe was a consequence of our firearm restriction for trapping proposal and it pointed out the council's position that federal agencies should not take regulatory action, except through the -- that affects subsistence except through the federal board process, and unlike the other letter, which I believe you addressed to the other agencies, this one apparently came just to us. I might suggest that it might be appropriate to address your concerns on that to the board, because the Park Service only is one member of the board, and any kind of decision on that issue would be an interagency decision and a couple of examples where the board -- recent examples of where the board has declined to take issues that were agency specific issues for the Park Service were the Denali Park initially made a proposal to close the road area adjacent to Kantishna, a mile or so either side of the road at Kantishna for public safety reasons during the overlap of the hunting season and the tourist season, and the board declined to take it as a subsistence issue and it was thrown back to us to handle on our own.

Another example of that was the off road vehicle issue at Katmai National Park in which the board declined to take a proposal from I believe it was the Bristol Bay Native Association on that issue, and consider it a park specific issue.

So it's a broader issue than just the Park Service doing that. It's kind of a Federal Subsistence Board interagency issue that -- to be -- that might be appropriately discussed in that interagency context, but I'll mention or I'll put that in the draft and see where that goes, if Mr. Barbee includes it in the draft back to the council. So as I said, those two are in the works and should be back to you shortly.

And then finally, I'm the person that's coordinating the proposal regulatory action we're taking on the firearm restriction for trapping, and I can give you an update on that. It started out as a combination of the same day airborne proposal in November of 1994 and included with that was this clarification action. The reason that they were put together is that the Park Service had, over the years, relied on our interpretation of the regulations, our trapping regulations, to -- as a restriction on the land and shoot method of trapping wolves and when we -- when that first came out, I believe it came out in 1986 at a Board of Game meeting where there was some discussion about land and shoot trapping of wolves and numbers taken and where they were taken was being discussed and it was clear that certain number had been taken in Park Service areas and Park Service representative at that meeting commented in response to the report indicating that to the Board of Game that it was -- that this practice wasn't allowed in Park Service areas and that was like a real surprise to everybody involved, and that's kind of where the information started, where the public dissemination of the information started. Although at that point, it didn't go much beyond agency people and wildlife management people to a general awareness in the public. So at the point at which we put out a separate, same day airborne restriction for hunting, we sought

to clarify what we consider our existing restriction on the use of firearms for trapping, which in effect did the same thing for same day airborne trapping of wolves.

For public clarification, the two had to be tied together in order to form a complete package. As we went through the rule-making process for that same day airborne restriction for Park Service areas in fall of '94, after the public comment period, there was requests for additional time to discuss the trapping restriction, and whereas there was quite a bit of support from local areas, local subsistence areas for the same day airborne restrictions, we separated the two and the same day airborne restriction went forward to a final rule in April of '95 and it went forward as a -- not just a hunting restriction, but as a same day airborne restriction on taking the specified wildlife, including wolves, which then eliminated the dependence that the Park Service had on the firearm restriction for trapping to prohibit same day airborne trapping, land and shoot trapping of wolves.

So it's no longer as -- it's no longer a necessary component of the same day airborne issue at this point. We did take additional comments on the firearm restriction trapping, for trapping, and received -- well, I can let you know what -- we received opposing comments from several, about a dozen organizations, Alaska Department of Fish and Game opposed it, AVCP sent in a letter of opposition, the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission opposed it, the Eastern Interregional Advisory Council sent in a letter opposing it, the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission opposes it, the Kobuk Valley National Park Subsistence Resource Commission opposes it, the Koyukuk River Fish & Game Advisory is in opposition, Manilak Association, North Slope Borough Department of Wildlife Management, and a separate letter also from the North Slope Borough office of the mayor, Northwest Arctic Borough is in opposition, Tanana Chiefs Conference, and then your council as well.

We didn't receive any letters in opposition from organizations during that extended comment period. There was a general letter of support for the same day airborne and indirectly, I guess, for the trapping restriction from the Defenders of Wildlife and the Alaska Wildlife Alliance, but then we also received quite a few comments from individuals in opposition.

So the comment period expired -- the extended comment period expired on June 13th and we are now reviewing those comments, and I anticipate within perhaps a month that we will probably have completed our -- the review and discussion. I should indicate that within our agency, there's people both pro and con, and so there's a very strong internal discussion going on about this firearm restriction, and I don't know, you know, I'm kind of the coordinator in between, so I can't predict what the answer will be, but I want to assure you that whereas at the beginning there hadn't been much public input on the firearm restriction, it happened back in the early '80s when all the ANILCA Part 13 regulations for the new national park units were adopted, there wasn't any public comment. Even though it was included with the -- all of the regulations that were adopted at that time, there wasn't any specific public comment on that or even -- I don't even think understanding that it was there.

That's also true within the National Park Service because it wasn't a rule that was -- I'm not aware of any instance of

it being enforced and at the same time. I'm not aware of any instances of it being reported that there was widespread violations and it was a big problem. So there was no internal discussion generated by it, and then when the wolf controversy kicked up in the late '80s and early '90s, the use of that interpretation as a way of restricting same day airborne land and shoot trapping of wolves is where it got its use, and nowhere else, and there wasn't much discussion of that, because it was just kind of known among the agencies. And so this extended comment period is the first time that there has been a vigorous discussion from the public and within the agency, and so because of that, I think there's going to be a well thought out and rational review of the rule to just see what its place should be, if any, and in the future management of trapping for the Park Service.

So I want you to know that your -- the comments that the council sent in and the other comments that came in, as well as comments from some individuals, including council member Jack Reakoff, have led to a real careful review of the rule and we should have something out for, you know, a decision, you know, by the end of the year, I would think.

That's where we stand at this point on that.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, thank you. Quickly, do you have any comments, anyone?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, in regard to our statement, in regards to federal agencies promulgating seasons and bag limit changes through the federal register, we didn't address that specifically. We addressed a letter specifically to the Park Service on that issue as they brought it up, but we also, it's in our minutes on Page 6, there was a annual report statement that was to be included generalizing all federal agencies. So it's -- that's addressed in the annual report, supposed to be in the annual report and that, is that annual report due from this meeting?

MR. MATHEWS: I'll have to check and see on that.

MR. REAKOFF: This was to be included in the annual report. This was the minutes that were approved, and they're on Page 6.

MR. COLLINS: We can check on that and certainly if that was our intent, we can make sure that similar letters are sent to the others or to the federal board.

MR. REAKOFF: This annual report is to the board, so they would be aware of this agency concern.

MR. MATHEWS: I can answer real quickly. It is in your '95 annual report, or your '94 annual report, excuse me. It's on Page 3 of that. It's in your annual report, addressing federal agencies doing that through the federal register. It's on Page 3. When we get to annual reports, we'll look at that. The only question I had that I need to ask Jack, so Paul, it's clear to him, because Jack and I wrote this letter concerning the use of the federal register to do this, did we intend to send the message to them that they could only go through -- only go through the Federal Subsistence Program, or did we mean that actions that they take through the federal register should also go through the Federal Subsistence Program?

MR. REAKOFF: Well, it was my understanding from the council that if it affected seasons or bag limits, any problem with the register still has to go through the process. If there's a

federal subsistence concern, it should go through the federal process, not because their publication and meetings for the federal register occur in cities, and we want, as a rural Federal Subsistence Board --

MR. MATHEWS: Because I think you said except through the federal program. I don't think that was the intent that it only go through this process, but that this process be utilized in addition to the other. Am I -- I'm not trying to put words -- he was the main drafter of that and the council adopted that. So does that make it clear that we didn't say they can only go through the Federal Subsistence Program, but if it addresses subsistence uses that it should utilize that channel in addition to what it's doing presently; correct?

PAUL HUNTER: Well, we're definitely committed to doing that. We were just reacting to the sentence in your letter which said that federal agencies shall submit proposed regulations that may affect subsistence activities to the Federal Subsistence Program to be reviewed by the affected regional councils and acted on by the Federal Subsistence Board.

Now, my point was that we have done that on some issues and the Federal Subsistence Board declined to act, saying it wasn't their jurisdiction. So there will be regulatory actions occurring that the federal board just will not, you know, accept jurisdiction over.

MR. MATHEWS: The thing on that, though, and I'm not debating it, but the clarification on that with the Denali one is, yes, the board didn't take action on that but the regional councils affected were able to comment. If you had gone through the other process, it's possible that they would not have been able to comment. So the board, went ahead with that. If I remember correctly, they felt that issue could better be addressed once they were aware of it by the individual agency, and I think that's what Jack and the council is saying, let us have a look at it and the board, and then the board will decide that it's out of the jurisdiction or the council will decide it's out of their jurisdiction, but anyways, I just wanted to clarify that on that one. And I don't know the Katmai issue, so I can't address that.

PAUL HUNTER: I think I'm safe in saying that we agree with that, the National Park Service agrees with that and what happened on that, on the trapping clarification wouldn't happen if we were initiating it now. That was, you know, a mistake on our part.

MR. MATHEWS: I just need a real quick clarification, because I want to make sure. He intimated, and I think the council agreed, that the letter sent to the Park Service should go to other agencies, or not? It is in the annual report. The annual report is not presently reviewed by the full subsistence board. So I need direction from you, are you intimating that that same letter should not be addressed to the other agencies? I can do that, I just need your charge on that.

MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion that you make that letter available to all federal agencies.

MR. COLLINS: Is there a second to that?

MR. DEACON: Second.

MR. COLLINS: Seconded by Henry. Discussion on that? All those in favor signify raising your right hand.

(Unanimous Response).

MR. COLLINS: Okay, it's yes votes for all members present, motion carried.

MR. MATHEWS: Thank you for the direction.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you. Any other questions? Let's take a ten minute break.

(Off record).

MR. COLLINS: The next one will be the Fish & Wildlife Service, and we've got Ed from Innoko here. Who else do we have? Okay. And I just ask you to limit your comments as much as you can and maybe see if there's questions or concerns. Ed, start with you.

ED MALLEK: I really don't have anything specific to report upon, but I can take any questions or comments.

MR. COLLINS: Identify yourself for the record and let the people know who you're representing.

ED MALLEK: Ed Mallek for Innoko National Wildlife Refuge.

MR. COLLINS: Any questions for Innoko?

MR. MORGAN: Are you Fish & Wildlife protection, do you deal with that?

ED MALLEK: No. As in federal?

MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

ED MALLEK: No, I personally am not.

MR. COLLINS: Share what happened this year, what you were telling me.

ED MALLEK: Yeah our enforcement, law enforcement on this year was quite a bit less than other years due to the main enforcement person moving. Our pilot biologist normally is in enforcement out there. He was in the process of moving to the 48 this year, and so we didn't have very much enforcement out there at all for full -- for the season.

MR. DEACON: What concerns I have is that for that sport fishing, is that sport fishing issued by the Department there?

MR. COLLINS: Do you regulate sport fishing at all?

ED MALLEK: Yeah, we do give out guide permits for the sport fishermen and the guiding services.

MR. DEACON: How many? How many have you given out this year?

ED MALLEK: I think there was either two or three permits.

MR. DEACON: How long does that last.

ED MALLEK: I think they have to be renewed every year.

MR. DEACON: It should be limited to a month or two during the moose and hunting season. You know, they -- they take off fishing and come back with moose. So I'd like to see a change.

ED MALLEK: Yeah, this was the first time I've heard of that when you were talking earlier.

MR. DEACON: Yeah, I see it myself.

ED MALLEK: See what we can do about that.

MR. COLLINS: Anything else for Innoko? Question?

DEBBIE LEE: Yes, is that dealing with all commercial permits that you're talking about or like for instance guide permits, is that hunting or --

ED MALLEK: That's fishing only. Yeah, the guiding permits, there's four, four permit units for hunting permits. For the fishing permits, they're separate.

DEBBIE LEE: When you distribute a permit, is that permit for a certain area or just within the -- like for instance for this region, I asked for a fishing sports permit and I want to go up the Aniak River, you document it as Aniak River or can it just be used within the whole --

ED MALLEK: I believe the fishing permits are open to anywhere. All the hunting permits are in specific units.

DEBBIE LEE: I guess the reason I'm trying to say, that's because we have a lot of hunt and sports permits up the Holitna and I'm just curious how they're distributed.

MR. COLLINS: But they're not issuing permits for the Aniak River.

DEBBIE LEE: I was kind of curious on how they distribute their permits. Does it work like regular harvest tickets, like if I was a guide and did up the Holitna drainage, would I have to specify that I use that drainage or can it be any other place within Unit 19(A)? See what I'm getting at?

ED MALLEK: Yeah, you talking specifically about the guides or just the air taxi operators?

DEBBIE LEE: The guides, the guides.

ED MALLEK: On the refuge, which would be different in the area, might be different in the area you're talking about -- I guess I don't quite understand your question.

MR. COLLINS: Gail, you have a comment?

MS. VANDERPOOL: I think I know what you're asking, I'm not too sure. Like, you take one area, do you guys kind of split it like in corridors or however many areas and just one game guide work one whole area or does he do the whole thing or does he just have a specific area he works in, same with the sport fishing, or is that what you're asking?

DEBBIE LEE: Yeah.

ED MALLEK: Yeah, the sport fishing, this is what I understand for sure, or I think it is, the sport fishing, there's not really a limit on the number of guides we have or specific areas, where with the hunting, the hunting guides is a different allocation process.

MS. VANDERPOOL: The hunting guides, they go -- they kind of like apply for an area or say they use a certain area for a certain amount of time, so they get to use this one whole area from here to here.

ED MALLEK: Yes.

MS. VANDERPOOL: And another guide comes and takes in an area and uses that, and only one guide per area.

MR. COLLINS: On federal lands. On state system, that was thrown out. So the state, the guides can keep coming.

MS. VANDERPOOL: They go wherever they want, as long as they pay the bucks.

MR. COLLINS: They used to have guide areas. They lost that but the federal government has been able to continue that by designating areas.

ED MALLEK: The Innoko Refuge has four areas, hunting guide units, and the one area along the Yukon across from Grayling has been open for several years and hasn't been filled.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Before you issue these sport fishing permits, how come we in Holy Cross or Anvik or Shageluk or Grayling weren't aware that such permits existed? All of the sudden there's

these sports fishing permits and it's really a hunting permit that they're receiving. How come you didn't come to our villages and tell us those things instead of issuing those permits and all the sudden we have this big influx of hunters coming into our country.

ED MALLEK: They're not supposed to be hunting. And we actually did make some visits. We did talk to Henry and we went to Grayling and Anvik. I think we went to Anvik. I know we stopped by Grayling and talked to Henry and some other people. I don't know for sure if they stopped by Holy Cross or not, but I can't answer that.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: No, I know anybody who comes in. I make it my business to know what they're doing there. I'm nosey, but if you had told the people what these board fishing permits were for and asked for their opinion on it and explained to them, you know, really clearly what it was for, we wouldn't have all these people upset now over all these hunters coming in. You guys should have come over and warned us first you were going to issue the permits for sports fishing.

ED MALLEK: I can't answer your question for sure, but I do believe we did stop by Holy Cross, but they actually shouldn't be hunting in that unit, guiding for moose. If they're doing that, they're actually breaking the law.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: So next year you'll have to redo their permits?

ED MALLEK: The fishing, yes.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Have you notified villagers that the permits are being renewed?

ED MALLEK: What's that?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Could you notify villagers that the permits are being used? Just say Box Holder, Holy Cross, Box Holder, Shageluk, and see what the people say about it before you issue those permits again.

ED MALLEK: Okay, yeah, inform the manager of that, I'm sure --

MR. COLLINS: I might suggest that if you have specific complaints about the action of one of these fishing guides, that you write that to Innoko and they might consider that when they issue the permit next year. If it looks like they've been violating the terms of that, they're going to have to have information when they act on those or reason for turning them down.

MR. MATHEWS: That could be the number of the plane, that could be time and date. You may not know the name of the guide or whatever, but any type of identification, when that permit comes up, they'll have that letter from you to look at, or from the communities.

ED MALLEK: Today was the first day I've ever heard of the fishing guides acting as illegal hunting guides.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, we'll go to the next.

MR. GRISSOM: A couple questions.

MR. COLLINS: Oh, yes.

ANGIE MORGAN: The residents here in Aniak and the local people have seen a great increase in number of sports fishing guides on the Aniak River, and they've expressed -- all summer long they been expressing concerns regarding that. I found out that just on the Aniak River alone, just right over here on the Aniak River alone, there was maybe about 20 plus permits that were issued this year, and they're all on the Aniak River, and a lot of them are from

Anchorage or Dillingham or even we have fishing guides from out in the states that are on the Aniak River, and this is one of the big issues that came up all summer long was the misuse of the Aniak River. Only because the Aniak River right now, according to Fish & Game, is the main tributary for the salmon spawning for the Kuskokwim River, and a lot of them are saying, well you know, they have the sonar that counts the fish that goes into the Aniak River and they're saying well, with all these sports fishing people, how do we know that all the escapement that they count is, you know, is escapement.

Maybe they're not anymore, after all these fishing guides are there.

There's a lot of rafters, too, that are coming on the Aniak River, and I was wondering, is there a way that you can control the number of people in such a small area, or do you, like you said, you don't have --

MR. COLLINS: I don't know how the Aniak is regulated. Is that a refuge? Can you speak to that?

MR. DENTON: No, the Aniak River is, in essence, is all state. There's no federal lands involved with the Aniak River. Probably, I guess, we're the wrong group to deal with. There are native lands and allotments along the Aniak, but the water, itself, are state waters, basically. So the state is the one that does the -- is doing all the permit issuance and so on for that. None of our agencies have anything to do with it, basically, I guess is what -- all I can say.

ANGIE MORGAN: But then it seems to me like they should have something, especially -- they're looking at the Aniak River as the main tributary for the chum and salmon spawning. Something ought to be done about it, seems to me.

MR. DENTON: Yeah, probably best to bring your concerns to the Board of Wild Fisheries, I guess, the state board, and I'm assuming you have advisory councils, local advisory councils for the state fish.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, we have a meeting on October 4th -- I mean, next month on the 4th in Crooked Creek and maybe we could bring that up if you attend the meeting.

ANGIE MORGAN: November 4th?

MR. MORGAN: They're having the second Kuskokwim State Fish & Game advisory meeting in Crooked Creek on November 4th. That would be a good time to bring that up.

MR. COLLINS: Was there another question over here?

DEBBIE LEE: Yeah, I was just going to make a comment, because you've always said that if you did see any kind of illegal hunt or illegal fishing to document. For instance, if you saw illegal hunting, they should document what kind of boat it was or describing the person, then call Fish & Wildlife. Well, I've dealt with that before and call Fish & Wildlife and they said that they'll be there within ten minutes, from the start of ten minutes to 30 days. So you know, it's just -- what's the use of calling them if they're not going to be --

MR. COLLINS: Well, this had to do with issuing permits. They have to issue a permit to them every year.

DEBBIE LEE: What I'm saying is you always say report to Fish & Wildlife Protection, but you can't expect them to be there within a day's time or 24 hours. They take 30 days at most, so --

ED MALLEK: There is a difference between the Fish & Wildlife law enforcement and Fish & Wildlife Service federally and

Fish & Wildlife protection in the state.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, next agent.

MR. GRISSOM: My name is Perry Grissom. I'm representing Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. Tom Early (phonetic) apologized for not being able to attend today, but he gave me a brief list of things going on. Studies in progress, concerns express that whitefront geese are on the decline in the refuge and they collared a few and that was started this year, so no results. Also, concern about contaminants that waterfowl might be picking up in the Lower 48, so they collected a few last spring and also some young of the year to see what they're picking up on the refuge, but there's no results back on that yet, either.

Also, they're doing a beaver catch survey to monitor beaver, but they've completed a wolf study, wolf/moose study and the draft just got issued. They're not quite done with it, but it will be done soon, be able to give it to subsistence management to put in with all the others. Briefly, they found that wolf are increasing on Kanuti after a period of heavy aerial hunting like in the late '80s.

Also, the moose are increasing also. They found that some packs ate -- pretty much all they ate was moose, especially larger packs. There was one pack that ate all caribou. After the caribou moved into its range, that's all they ate. There were some, especially the smaller packs, ate a lot of beaver, spawned out salmon and hare, so it kind of depended, but generally the larger the pack, the more moose and caribou they ate. Rough figure was about one moose per square mile on the refuge and about one wolf for every three to five hundred square miles and that the wolf are eating about -- one wolf would eat about one moose every 50 to 60 days. So like a pack of ten would eat a moose every five to six days, or kill. The ones that were seen, anyway, and that's just average how it came out.

There's still a fair amount of wolf mortality by trappers. They're estimated about 20 percent of the wolf population on the refuge being killed by trappers within the two and a half years of their study. Let's see. That was about the main summary of that.

The refuge, there's proposal to complex it and put it under another refuge operation probably out of Galena, but they're not sure. That's mainly to save money and eventually those positions would kind of disappear. Also, budget cuts in all areas, not sure, and also squeezing law enforcement further. So the more news we can get from people in the field, the more effective what little money we have, and like they said, the squeaky wheel gets the grease. So if the regional office in Washington thinks there are no problems, they'll just dry up that money.

Another project, there's proposed to change about 400,000 acres on Kanuti for modified protection and fire protection to limited protection in the south from the southeast part of the refuge. The pipeline corridor is being -- a lot of it's being changed from full to limited and the lands around it are being converted also, but just started talking about that this spring and summer, really, and we haven't talked to the villagers yet and we'll be going out and talking to people to identify sites and hear what they have to say this winter so we can have it decided by next summer.

And that was about all that I had to report.

MR. COLLINS: Questions for Kanuti? Thank you. Pete?

MR. DeMATTEO: Pete DeMatteo. I'm with the Koyukuk and Nowitna Refuge, based out of Galena, assistant. My boss, Tom Eley, not to be confused with Tom Early, apologized he couldn't be here but he asked me to share with you a few things going on.

First of all, we'd like to thank you for taking time out of your personal lives and work and what have you to give us an opportunity to hear what you have to say. We feel this is very important and we hope this will continue simply because in these days, as issues become more and more complex and co-management between state and feds, the most important thing we have going for us is open communication. It's got to be a two-way street. That's why these meetings are so important. I guess this is our fifth meeting, I believe, right? We have a relationship, I think, that's improving and we plan to work even closer with you.

With that, I hope you will continue to call our office as you have in the past, Harold and Pollock and of course William, who's not here today. Anything that pertains to your areas the people you represent, I hope you'll share with us. Even if it's something that we're doing you don't particularly like, we want to hear about it. It's as simple as that.

In the past, I've always asked you to call collect. You don't have to do that now. Just put 1-800 in front of the phone number and call us for nothing. So we hope to hear from you.

As far as information is concerned, biological surveys and the reports on biological surveys or harvest information that we have, of course it's our job to share with you. Any of that information. In a sense, we work for you and the council. It is our job to assist you in forming a draft proposal or making decisions, and you need information from us to make well informed decisions. It's our job to make sure that you have the information that you need to have to do this.

As time goes on, we don't know the direction of budgeting, funding that is, and you heard from several accounts today that the government is downsizing. Quite simply, we've been told that it's going to be less people and less money to do the job we're supposed to do. And one of those jobs, of course, is to gather information and that'll make it even more difficult to share that information if we don't have the money to do our job.

You were supposed to submit an annual report. I would hope that one of your concerns would be decreasing budgets in the agencies and if it's possible or appropriate, I would hope that that would be reflected as a concern in that report. As Perry mentioned, the squeaky wheel gets the grease. That's very true in Washington, and sometimes no news means that there's no problem in Washington. We, the people that work in these agencies, are not in a position to call up the federal board and say, we need more money. Private citizens are. And a group as yourself, a council, you hold a lot more power than you probably realize at this point. I hope as time goes by, you grow into that power and use it effectively.

The other way, the other aspect of communication is a two-way street is we need more harvest information in this state. No matter where you go, there are -- there are voids in harvest data. Harvest data is very important, particularly when you want to propose a change in seasons and bag limits. When that proposal goes to the board, what validates the need for that change often is numbers, other than just dialogue and narrative, okay, and we need better

harvest data. There's various agencies collecting the information. The state's collecting information, TCC collects information. I encourage you to ask your people to support those efforts, whatever village it may be. Also, in turning in your harvest report card, harvest ticket after the hunting season to the state, that information is very important.

Wildlife surveys that we have going on in the Koyukuk and Nowitna refuge, you've heard me say in the past, every year we do moose trend surveys. We're finishing up wolf surveys we've done in conjunction with the state. That is we have radio collars on the wolves. At the Huslia meeting in February, and I heard from several of you today, we need to do more wolf population studies. We agree, we do need to do more wolf population studies, but the money's probably not going to be there and that's a fact of life. The money's probably not going to come for it. These are expensive surveys and budgets are shrinking. It's as simple as that.

You've heard me say government's downsizing and now we're entering a new program called compacting, which I don't know the whole story of compacting. You'll probably hear more of that but the result is there's going to be less to go around.

And that's all I have. Any questions, concerns?

MR. HUNTINGTON: How much effort are you guys putting into law enforcement on the Koyukuk Wildlife Refuge?

MR. DeMATTEO: I'm sorry, Harold, how much what?

MR. HUNTINGTON: How much effort are you putting into law enforcement?

MR. DeMATTEO: This past September, the moose season runs from September 5th to 25th, as you know, we had two refuge law officers up on that river during that time. They were working --

MR. HUNTINGTON: Got any results or any violations on record?

MR. DeMATTEO: Tell you the truth, I don't know at this point.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Because there's a lot of waste of meat on the Koyukuk River. I been getting a lot of complaints from mostly the people in Galena that's been saying that there was ten, fifteen boats go by at least in a couple hours and most of those boats are going up river with just the horns, and there's a lot of complaints but nothing being done, that I noticed, and I'd like to see maybe a little more results, as far as catching some of the violators. You probably know what I'm talking about, as far as --

MR. DeMATTEO: Yeah, I'm with you, Harold. As you know, I don't have law enforcement authority myself. I could have possibly Paul Leebruck (phonetic) call you and he can discuss that more in depth, what they found up there and since I wasn't there. I'm not -- in the fall time, I run the Nowitna moose check station, so I'm totally separated from the Koyukuk River situation and Paul works on the Koyukuk River. I think he's the person you need to talk with, so I'll have him call you.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I'd like to see a little more results as far as catching some of the violators. It's not only happening in that area but probably all over the state. People are just wasting meat.

MR. DeMATTEO: And as you heard before, the same applies to us. Law enforcement is downsizing as well, and law enforcement tends to be a high expenditure program simply because

they use boats and airplanes and whatnot.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I was thinking, I notice the number of guides and assistant guides are almost doubled in the last couple years on the Koyukuk River. Seems like there's -- that's running a bit loose, too, as far as anybody that wants to go and be a guide. Is there any control over it by your office?

MR. DeMATTEO: Looking into the guides on the Koyukuk River?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, uh-huh.

MR. DeMATTEO: Offhand, I don't know. There again, I don't have law enforcement authority, so I'm not availed with that information but I will look into it and I'll have Paul call you. He can tell you the detail of what you need to know.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I'm not too up on how the guiding system works in the wildlife refuge. Seems like there's no control of it right now. I don't know, I think we're just kind of defeating our purpose, as far as, you know, subsistence.

MR. DeMATTEO: Basically what I can tell you is that three years ago we were ordered to offer up the entire refuge to guiding. What that simply means was divide the entire refuge into sections, zones. Potential guides then had the opportunity to submit prospectuses on their operation and from there, they selected one guide from each zone, okay, and as we mentioned before, that guide can operate anywhere within that zone, just one guide per zone.

MR. HUNTINGTON: What about like, say, ten guides go up the same river, how you going to -- how you going to differentiate between who's hunting where?

MR. DeMATTEO: See, then the other side of the coin is there's state sanctioned guides, if you will, who don't, you know, they operate on state lands, you see, and they go up state waterways and whatnot.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Most of the area I'm talking about is federal lands and guides have been going up there.

MR. DeMATTEO: In the meantime, between now and next week, can you jot down any thoughts you have about this, any recollections and share them with Paul?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I'm not going to come up with no names because a lot of the people I know is out there. I'm against guiding, no matter who it is.

MR. DeMATTEO: At least share with him maybe how many parties and what areas.

MR. HUNTINGTON: That's not my job. Would take me too much time.

MR. DeMATTEO: Just as long as everybody understands two guys working out of a boat can't cover the entire Koyukuk River. It can't be done, see.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I just wanted to be aware of the amount of violations going on. That's about it.

MR. COLLINS: Do you communicate with the state on the check station down there so you get the results on that, terms of people coming out of that?

MR. DeMATTEO: The Koyukuk River, yes.

MR. COLLINS: Are they seeing the same thing Galena is, that boats are coming down with horns or no meat, or you can speak on your own on Nowitna? How close to you check and how well are people doing in terms of accounting for the moose they're taking.

PETE DeMATTEO: Any boat that goes up the river you can bet we have contacts with. There are law enforcement people both state and also federal that work on the Nowitna River, visit with hunters in camp and check into these sorts of things.

MR. COLLINS: They check out when they leave? I mean, every one of those, you're catching every one that comes down, in general?

MR. DeMATTEO: I'd say almost all of them. The difference between the Koyukuk River check station and the Nowitna check station is Koyukuk is mandatory and Nowitna is not. We ask people to cooperate, and in general, all of them do.

MR. COLLINS: What are you seeing coming down? Are you seeing the meat or seeing it spoiled or --

MR. DeMATTEO: I personally am seeing it bring all the meat. This year was a mad dash because of the warm temperatures but personally, removing the meat from the site.

MR. GRISSOM: I helped on the law enforcement last weekend and every boat -- they said there were a couple boats went past not stopping, but there were also a couple people running back and forth with meat, but every boat they saw, said 98 percent was legal with meat. Lot of boats that would take meat to town and get it shipped out and go back while some of the rest of the party was still hunting, and then they would bring the antlers and everybody else. So like at the end, there were probably boats without meat but they had already hauled their meat to town. So it probably looked worse than it was, and there were no boats caught without any meat that hadn't shipped it out already.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: I have a question. Mr. Chair, I have a question to you. Where you mentioned transporting meat all over the place, in the logbook, in the logbook I just saw two pieces of paper in there, two available pieces of paper in there that you could transport meat, you know. Law enforcement stopped us up there and said, "How come you got some meat in the boat," he said, "Where's your paper," he said, "Where's the killer."

We say, "He's up ahead." He says, "Where is your paper," and you mentioned that like you're doing it freely on your end.

Is it possible that somebody could make a mistake here? You know, transporting meat without the hunter or without the guide or portions of the meat being transported without this and that --

MR. GRISSOM: Yeah, it does get --

ROBERT HOFFMAN: You sound like it's a taxicab service and in the log book, there's only two forms that says you can transport and prove. Is it possible that somebody was wrong somewhere?

MR. GRISSOM: Yeah, there are ways to cheat, but --

ROBERT HOFFMAN: Say that again, sir?

MR. GRISSOM: There are ways that people can cheat.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: There's ways people can cheat?

MR. GRISSOM: By filling out wrong paperwork, but there's ways, legally, people can transport meat for other people or take their meat out and be back out in the field. But that's what the harvest ticket is for, and it's hard, but the threat of enforcement is as good as enforcement sometimes, and the more we're out checking people, even if we're not catching them, we're deterring

people hopefully from doing bad things. Or you know, we would talk to people -- really we need to publicize the people that do get caught, because then more people are afraid, and there was a case made by the state before I got there that a local person turned in somebody for shooting a cow before the cow season opened. So we were telling everybody, oh, boy, the local people are really being helpful and it makes -- turns everybody into a game warden that the people figure everybody's watching them, but --

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, a question for him, do they mark, do they limit the number of clients they can bring out, or there's no limit to how many they can take out?

MR. DeMATTEO: Number of clients they can take into an area?

MR. MORGAN: Is there some kind of limit set or they can take anyone?

MR. DeMATTEO: Depends on that particular zone, how many moose in that particular zone can be harvested. The sustain or the yield as Jeff mentioned, how many moose that that area can handle through a harvest, you see. So yes, it is managed. It's not just a free-for-all where they can take 15 dozen people in there.

MR. SIMON: I got a comment to make. In that area does have a lot of moose, you know, local people is depending on the moose, and what I'd like to see, see that area monitored so that you know how much moose is taken every year, know whether they overharvest it, fear the number start dropping and take a while for it to come back and I'd like to see you check, see if hunters comes back as to antlers and the meat, but past your -- after they get past the check station, they dispose of the meat and smooth sailing home from there. You know, if peoples down river says, this boat goes with the horns, that could happen. But my point really is to perhaps monitor it good so that the moose population doesn't decline too rapidly in the harvesting.

MR. DeMATTEO: Pollock, and I agree, we need to monitor harvest better. We've been saying this right along. It has to be done from the local people, non-resident people, what have you.

There has to be a better monitor of harvest, not just number of moose, but more specifically, when and exactly where it was taken, and that's not to nail anybody. That's just simply good biology. We just say that we took 15 moose out of the Nowitna River, that's a whole lot of country. That doesn't tell me as a biologist anything, but if you want to do effective management, you have to say exactly where, which place you killed that moose and that's what we all have to work toward, and that's one of the things I was saying about open communication, improving communication. We have to work toward that.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, there's been a lot of discussion about guides and that. I think maybe when you get down to topics for the next meeting, maybe we ought to have an open discussion on that and each refuge could give a report on the guiding and that, because that's come up over and over again and it might be easier to explain, because I'm quite confused now on some of it, and so I think we need to use that -- and I don't think it would take that long, and that way you may want to look at the next meeting of requiring each refuge to give a small report, either in paper form or verbal on the guiding and the refuges that would answer your needs, and I don't remember the other needs that were over here. Maybe when we get to topics, we can add that on.

ED MALLEK: I would think it would be beneficial to add in air taxis to that also.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, if you want to do that, that would be good, too.

ED MALLEK: In a lot of areas they have more of an effect than the guides, by far, in some areas.

MR. COLLINS: I agree. Okay, are we ready to move then to the next? I guess BLM. Alaska Department of Fish and Game is not here.

MR. MATHEWS: Jack was supposed to make it. I gather he was weathered out or something. Okay, BLM.

MR. DENTON: Okay, my name's Jeff Denton. I'm the subsistence specialist and wildlife biologist for the Anchorage District BLM and basically our district goes from like Unalakleet straight across the north end to Innoko, to McKinley down to Prince William Sound and the Southeast. So 21(E) and 19 of the Interior here are the major areas within the Anchorage district, to give you an idea of what we deal with.

Some good news and bad news. BLM lands, which all the statehood selections came out of, all the native selections come out of, the ANILCA conservation units came out of, and so our land status and land ownership pattern is really in a stage of flux. Over the last 12 months, in 19 and 21(E), we've had about a million acres relinquished back to BLM from the state selection. So there's actually a million more acres of federal public lands that are actually eligible for subsistence uses. Unfortunately, most of those are spruce bogs and probably the lowest value of land you can possibly find, and most of it's extremely remote. So that's the bad side to that.

I gave Ray to hand out there Lime Village harvest report. You recall Lime Village has gone through kind of a series. They have a special situation where they have a village quota for caribou and moose, rather than individual limits, and by regulation, they are required to have a harvest reporting system because there's no means by which the harvest can be reported under the state system.

What's being handed out there is the first year of their harvest reporting system and a great deal of credit needs to be given to those folks that have done an outstanding job of harvest reporting. The agreement we have with them now is for five years. So this data is only one year, so there's no conclusions or nothing really drawn from one year's information. It's not enough, but they've given very specific outstanding harvest reporting. They give a sex, relative age, very specific location of kill, date of kill, species of kill. Just from a biologist's standpoint, the kind of information we're getting from them will really and truly aid them in making very good decisions down the road. I would like this to be a model for other villages to look at to do. We are implementing the same sort of thing outside your region but with Unalakleet this year, and we'd like people to take a look at that and -- because this is really a model that will really work for all harvest reporting. Most of the subsistence harvest reporting is, by and large, very poor. That's probably the biggest part of the harvest we do not know what's being taken, and so it makes it very hard to make management decisions.

I'll let you go through that at your leisure and see what you think, get back to me whenever.

Surveys that we've been doing, we anticipated Unit

21(E) was going to have some conflicts several years ago, so we tried to implement over a series of years because of dollar restrictions, tried to bite off a little bit each year to do some general surveys.

We've done those the last two years.

Last year, we covered basically the area between the Innoko River and the Yukon River in the bottoms there. The previous year we covered the Anvik, Bonasila and Chiroskey drainages. Basically we've got all of nearly 21(E) completed with not an intensive survey, but a moderate type survey to get distribution and relative abundance within that area.

We were looking at other things besides just numbers of moose. One was distribution of moose relative to available habitats, distribution of moose relative to the burn, wild fire burn areas in there, because we're finding some of the biggest limiting factors in some of these areas are the actual suppression of wildfires is really restricting moose habitat in many, many areas. We've got some extremely large areas in 21(E) in the hill country. There's virtually what I call a black spruce desert. There's nothing there. They haven't burned for 40 and 50 years, and 50 years ago, they had been burned and there were, you know, actually good brush fields, and when you do find a burn, you find moose. Other than the river bottoms, the uplands have moose where there's burns. If they haven't had burns, the moose densities are extremely thin.

This information also, these reports I talked to Conrad and we'll try and get a conduit of our information through him back to you folks and back to the villages, and back to the council here, because I think it's real important, this is basically, from my standpoint, a starting point, because where we are looking at them say early winter, there's you know, it's the first time some of the these areas have been looked at in a comprehensive manner. Most of the surveys, like in 21(E) to the west of the Yukon River, there's virtually never been any work done there. Ours is the first comprehensive work that's been done there and that's just a starting point. It's a one point in time survey. We want to go back at least once every five years and redo it. And if conflicts reach a certain point, we'll do very intensive surveys there, but I think it needs to be brought to the attention of the councils that not only is subsistence dependent upon numbers of animals but dependent upon habitats available. It's dependent on a lot of other actions going on out there.

Probably the biggest one in Alaska is fire suppression and fire management and it actually limits numbers of moose in very large regions of Alaska, of which we deal with in the Western Interior to a very large degree.

We've worked with the game and fish and the fire management service and BLM to modify fire plans to allow for more burns in some of these remote areas, actual different fire management categories than just put it out as soon as they see it. There's many other opportunities to actually enhance subsistence and moose populations, and so on, through a little more natural fire regime here. So just to bring that to your attention, it's all not just numbers of moose. There's some other issues involved.

MR. COLLINS: Did you survey wolf at the same time? Did you have any --

MR. DENTON: We write down everything we see on these surveys, but the kind of surveys we do for moose aren't very

effective for wolves. Yes, we do see wolves incidental to what we're seeing for moose. I don't -- the value of those, other than incidental observations -- they're incidental observations, that's what I consider them as, because wolf surveys need to take a lot more specialized techniques to really do a good job with them.

We also pick up the caribou distribution when we do this. We're doing a tight enough survey that we pick up most of the ungulate concentrations and they're not exact. We're not giving population estimates out of these, like it's relative abundance and relative distribution, where they're at at a certain time of the year, and we have an idea, and we do have probably the highest moose densities in the state in 21(E). I don't think -- you know, we've seen on some of the islands over 200 moose in less than a square mile island. It's like a horse farm down there. It's unbelievable.

And Frank's not here but Frank also has seen the same thing on the same islands. We were talking about the same island earlier today, and it's right across from town. Well, Angela's probably seen them there, too.

MR. COLLINS: That's during the winter?

MR. DENTON: That's in early winter. The surveys I'm trying to do right now are early winter to pick up, get some semblance of the ratio of the bulls and bull population, age structure, as well as overall densities. So that's what we attempt.

If weather beats us, we have to go to March when we have some day length again so we can get enough time to do some work. So from a standpoint of communications, like I said, Conrad, I think if that's what the council here thinks is adequate conduit of information from the agencies, I'll give my reports basically through Conrad and have the subsistence staff there distribute it to you folks, if that's a reasonable thing, and then if you have comments, go ahead and I'll be your contact with the BLM. I'll give you a toll free number and so on.

Enforcement wise, BLM in this area has had virtually no presence whatsoever. This year, we have just picked up a ranger, who is also a pilot. And so what we need to do, I guess now to help set priorities, is your feedback to us on incidences and we'll have to probably build a record for a couple years to see where our real trouble spots are so he can concentrate on those spots at the appropriate time to try to get a handle on it down the road. That's -- those operations are extremely expensive, and to get the best bang for a buck, we really have got to get kind of a front end idea of where the real trouble spots are and start working through it. I don't see that it can work any other way. He's one guy and he'll have 17 million acres from Juneau to Unalakleet to cover. He's just like the rest of the BLM. We got half the world to cover and it's -- we realize it's impossible. We have to pick our spots.

So that's it, in a nutshell. Any questions?

MR. COLLINS: Thank you. I think that concludes the reports. Are there any --

MR. YOKEL: There's another BLM. Dave Yokel with the BLM in Fairbanks. I don't have any subsistence issues to bring up today, but I would like to just very briefly tell you about what's going on with the organization of BLM in Fairbanks. Three of the five BLM districts in the state were in the Fairbanks office. As of last week, we have reorganized into one district in Fairbanks. There were three BLM districts out of the state that overlapped with your

region, they were the Arctic district that I worked for, the Kobuk district that Ann Morkill (phonetic) worked for, and she came to these meetings, and then Anchorage district that Jeff works for.

Now the Kobuk district and Arctic district have joined with the Steese White Mountains district into one that's called the Northern district, and I will be your representative to that Northern district, any issues you have up there.

The Northern district in your area covers the Dalton Highway corridor in Unit 24, Hogatza River region of the middle Koyukuk up there in 24 and then some of the central Yukon BLM lands is the yellow lands in 21(C) and 21(D).

I have one comment to what Jeff said about the new ranger. He said we've picked up a pilot ranger. Well, that was our pilot ranger. The BLM didn't pick up any pilot rangers in the state, and according to my understanding of the deal, that pilot ranger is still working for BLM throughout the state, not just Anchorage district. So he'll be -- he'll be flying from Barrow to Juneau, not from --

MR. DENTON: I stand corrected.

MR. YOKEL: Not from Unalakleet to Juneau. He'll be busy during hunting season, so don't expect to see him every day in your area. That's it, unless you have questions for me.

MR. REAKOFF: I have one question. Were you still going to have a ranger on the road, Bob Posey?

MR. YOKEL: We have the same number of rangers that we have and have had. He'll still be working in that area.

MR. DENTON: Where the Anchorage district did not have a ranger before, we at least have somebody assigned in Anchorage, but he'll also be serving all the districts.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, thank you. That concludes reports.

Item D, regional council nomination process. Oh, all right.

ANGIE MORGAN: Mr. Chair, thank you. I would just like to say for KNA subsistence, we have a subsistence committee and I am the director for the subsistence committee, and I mentioned to you earlier this morning about the fishing issue. There's a couple other issues that I wanted to bring up to you.

Yeah, the other one is I know you're all probably well aware that the Holitna 40 horsepower, horsepower limit on the Holitna, there has been talk on the radio and newspapers and everything that those people that are trying to lift the ban on the 40 horsepower are going to be soliciting petitions and stuff from -- these people that are trying to lift this ban on the 40 horse are the people that are making the big bucks. They're the ones that have the money to travel up to the Holitna area and the KNA subsistence committee is supporting Sleetmute in keeping the 40 horsepower, because we're looking out for the interests of our people. If we don't, nobody else will. If we just let it be, we'll have -- we'll have everybody just walking all over us, and we don't want that to happen.

We're supporting Sleetmute with their 40 horsepower, and I know that they probably would like me to ask if, as you people are subsistence people also, if you can also support them in keeping that 40 horsepower on the Holitna.

MR. DENTON: Real interesting side light to that, at

the YK Delta subsistence council meeting, those very same people you're talking about are actually submitting recommendations to limit motor size and type of boats on their local rivers down there.

MR. COLLINS: But they want it open up here.

MR. DENTON: That's right. It struck me real odd here.

DEBBIE LEE: That's, what he's talking about is for a different purpose. The reason they're doing that for down there, in Kwethluk is because they're concerned about spawning and erosion on the banks, but the one she's talking about, could you go maybe a little more background on the way it started off? The village of Sleetmute submitted a proposal to the Board of Game to ban fly-in hunters and rafters because they felt that there was a lot of meat being wasted up the Holitna drainage and by sports fishers and rafters.

They presented that to the Board of Game, lot of testimonies that were given by the village of Sleetmute. The Board of Game just played around with it and put a restriction on the whole interim of the Holitna with 40 horsepower because testimonies were given by sports hunters and rafters indicating that the hunters' high powered boats into Holitna were the ones that were wasting and scared the moose away from the river frontage. It had nothing to do whatsoever with spawning or putting any kind of lines from having lower people coming up.

In other words, the state has banned the subsistence users, other than -- I mean, they went to more of the sports hunters than subsistence. They knocked off subsistence users and went more for the state. I mean, there's a whole line of stories on, like, 40 horsepower.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: Just one correction on what -- not a correction, a little bit more background on what the lady said here.

First of all, these are not rich people with big bucks. I can testify to that, because first of all, the majority of these people, they save all summer fishing to buy enough gas to get up that river, and the reason why they have big motors and big things is they got 300 miles to travel, and if they don't get their meat down there properly, the Fish & Game will throw them in jail for wanton waste, for one of the reasons.

The second reason is I say that these are not rich people, I am a field distributor down there and this year alone, we had 30 people, residents, charge gas just to get up there. So these are not rich people. These are -- these are low income, the majority of these people are low income. Yes, there are some, you might say, rich people, but they're not all rich, no. They're not. They're poor like us, you know. They save all summer and the only reason that they got big motors is they're fisherman that got to load their boats. They got rough water in the Kuskokwim and below to the mouth of the Kuskokwim. That's why they utilize these big boats and need big motors and they use these to get up the river and get down the river before the weather gets bad, weather holds them up or the weather spoils their meat. That's about the three things that, you know, why they have these things. But you know, anything else, their problem about going up the 40 horse, yeah, we'll agree with that. That's all I have to say.

MR. COLLINS: I don't think, though, those proposals will be going through this system at all, because I think it's the

state that regulates that.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: I was going to ask you about that.

MR. DENTON: Yes, that's correct.

MR. COLLINS: It doesn't come to the federal board.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: When do you think that -- excuse me, Mr. Chairman, when do you think this 40 horse meeting or when should it be brought up?

MR. COLLINS: Well, it would have to be the local advisory committees and then going to the state boards would be the ones who would adopt it. The state board of Fish & Game, State Board of Game, you know.

ANGIE MORGAN: I just want you to know that that's where we're going to stand and that's what we're going to continue to support those people, and then one other thing that I wanted to bring up that I almost forgot about, when we were talking about moose hunting and people looking for the papers or whatever, there's this one man that lives out in Discovery, out in the woods. He has been living there for years. I was really surprised to see his name in the Tundra Drums for illegal gillnet. He lives there. He lives off the land. Apparently, what happened or this is what I heard, anyway, I was hoping that one of the Fish & Game police -- whatever you call those --

MR. COLLINS: One of the agencies?

ANGIE MORGAN: The --

MR. COLLINS: Oh, enforcement people.

ANGIE MORGAN: Yeah, yeah were here to --

MR. COLLINS: They're not here.

ANGIE MORGAN: Anyway, what I heard happened, one of the Fish & Game enforcers stopped at his camp. He had a leg of moose hanging that was given to him by one of the local people in Kalskag and the guy was asking him for his tag, moose tag or whatever, and he was looking for horns and I don't know what happened or I don't know what conversation went on between those two, but the guy left and then two planes came, five enforcers came with guns looking around for antlers, and apparently, I guess, they couldn't find any so they got him for illegal gillnet. And he's -- he lives there and the creek that he -- I mean, his gillnet is maybe from here to over here, and that's how he eats every day, you know, other than the moose that's being given to him. And to me, that's really bad for them to do something like that for somebody that don't even have a store. The nearest store is, I don't know, how far is Dooney Maguluk (phonetic) from here to Aniak or Kalskag? He don't have no motor. He don't have a boat and motor. He goes by canoe, or if somebody comes by to visit him, then he'll jump on their boat and come to the village for a visit. You know, that's -- it made me feel bad for him because they shouldn't do that to him.

MR. COLLINS: I hear what you're saying, but again, it's probably something that's outside, because if it's not on a federal refuge or something, it's probably outside of the issues we deal with. But I hear what you're saying. Yeah, I know -- then we hear about other people that are getting away with it that have a lot more money than this individual.

ANGIE MORGAN: He don't even have a house. He lives in a tent.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you for that report. Okay, I'm still hoping that we're going to finish here. It's now 4:30.

Regional council nomination process, review and comment. How does regional council want to be involved in the selection of new members?

MR. MATHEWS: I can address that. I just need to get a phone number to Katherine. We're still working on some travel.

Essentially, that's asking the council what level of involvement do they want in the selection of members to this council.

As you know, three members or three seats, I should say, are up each year, and that process is kind of laid out pictorially under Tab 1, this box diagram, and Katherine, I can give you the -- or Conrad can give you this. I'm sorry to be trying to do five things at once here.

What it's saying, they're asking what level of involvement you'd like. I want to inform you right off the bat that the Secretary of the Interior is not delegating his or if it becomes a her authority to the board or to the council to select members. Okay, so that -- don't even bring up the suggestion to say that you want to select your own members. That authority is not being delegated.

The question is, is in this process which starts December 1 and has an application period to like the end of February, and then it goes to federal panel review and then from there to the board passing its recommendation, and that is forwarded to the secretarial review and approval, where in that would you like to have your level of involvement? Your present level of involvement has been we try, if you meet and we have the names available at your spring meeting, we give you a list of those that have been nominated or have applied and then you, as individuals, can endorse that person or send in recommendations or whatever, or the council can. That's where you have up until now. This is asking you do you want any increased involvement within those side boards.

MR. COLLINS: That would be in the first box, what we're doing now? They come in and we go through them.

MR. MATHEWS: No, you do not go through them. The application period ends in the end of February. You guys' meeting, window package -- when you could meet back is between January 29th and March 1st. So in theory, we don't have them all in yet. So it's under Tab 1, both the calendar and this box diagram.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. Comments from members about involvement?

MR. MATHEWS: I suppose another way of phrasing the question that's in front of you, are you comfortable with the present process that selects the members to your process? If you are comfortable with it, then maybe you don't want an additional involvement. If you're uncomfortable with it, how would you like to be more involved?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Would you go through maybe a process that we could go through?

MR. MATHEWS: Sure, I can.

MR. HUNTINGTON: The level of involvement.

MR. MATHEWS: All of you went through this, I believe.

You have the -- the steps that go on, again a person applies. Those then are submitted to a nomination panel or team. That team then takes those applications and calls each individual that applied, asks them a series of questions and calls each of the references, if they're available, and asks them a series of questions and the regions that I work in, we take the answers to the 15 questions that

each applicant answered and give a ranking on that which goes from highly qualified plus which is six points to not qualified, which is zero, and we go through and try to get a ranking from that. Then from that, we look at the geographic distribution across the region, is the whole region being equally represented, and out of that, candidates start falling out.

. We generate our recommendations for the three seats and alternates and we forward that to the staff committee. The staff committee forwards its recommendation to the board. The board, then the secretary, and the secretary appoints. So we have this ranking system that we use either through questionnaires or qualifications. That's how we --

MR. COLLINS: So we're only involved directly if we happen to be listed as a reference then?

MR. MATHEWS: You only would fall in as a reference or if the list of names come up and you are in session at that time, the council says we really want this person, and passes a -- some kind of action that way, then that would be incorporated into that process. Jack has a question.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, my question is, is there a problem with the number of applicants to our region? Is that one of the reasons you're asking for the council to be more involved in the nomination process or you're not getting enough applications now?

MR. MATHEWS: We're not getting enough applications in some areas of the region, to be honest with you. This region I haven't analyzed as close as Eastern Interior because of the intensity of the C&Ts here, but as an example, we have holes in that region where we don't have representation. Remember, when I say holes in the area, we have to look at the land make-up. If there's not a lot of federal land there, then why have a representative there? If there's a lot of federal land there, why don't we have a representative there?

So those have to be weighed out. So I didn't bring all the notes on that, but I think for Western Interior we had 14 applications, 12 or 14. Now, you tell me if that's a lot or not. I would tend to think there was very qualified candidates in there, but I would expect more people applying.

MR. COLLINS: That's for three seats?

MR. MATHEWS: That was for three seats. But again, we've only been in operation three years. There's still a lot of confusion between this and the state system. You guys are living examples. How many boards do you guys serve on? Please don't tell me. You guys serve on at least three. There's only so much leadership out there, but I think it will change, but this is asking you, what do you feel about the process so far and any way you could add more people would be great to apply.

MR. SIMON: I think that number of applications you received before, I think that's enough. You only need how many, what members you get out of that number?

MR. MATHEWS: Three, but you have a proposal or you supported a suggestion to have alternates. So if you have alternates, and I believe you passed one for the North, one for the South, or some kind of breakup like that, then we're talking 11 members in actuality, and then I would be questioning, asking you later on, well if we go to alternates, they can only be effective if they know what's going on, so they have to attend somehow or another

to keep up to speed. Can't bring them in out of the cold. So in actuality, then, we would be bringing in 11 members, but a quorum would not be based on that 11. So they would be -- we wouldn't be twisting your arm as hard to come to the meeting if you were an alternate, but we then would be looking at 11. I mean, be looking at 11 members, three up, and something with those alternates. So in reality, you might be looking at three to five per year because your alternates may disappear either into slots or say, "I'm too busy, I have other things to do."

MR. SIMON: There hasn't been any problems with peoples that fill out the applications, though. If they were not qualified, they would never consider filling out on applications from each, if they're from any village or region. If they fill out application, I'm satisfied with that.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

MR. COLLINS: My comments are if we look around, I think we're getting good -- the process is working. We've only got one absence this time. There was a little concern a time or two before at the beginning we didn't get a quorum, we were marginal a time or two, but now we seem to be getting good participation, so it looks like it's working. Other comments?

MR. REAKOFF: It would be my comment that it's hard for me to think of nominating someone else from villages, because the interior's so large, I -- I have a hard time knowing people at that distance from my village. So it's hard. As representatives from certain villages, we're -- for me, at least myself, to think of people to nominate from other areas. I think the process that's in place is -- it seems to me that the -- at the onset of the federal program, there was federal agencies were attending advisory committee meetings and handing out applications and I felt that was pretty good method of getting recruits to the regional council is by going, attending the state advisory committees and handing out applications there. Those people are interested in attending meetings and so forth, rather than making applications available at meetings, at the regional council meetings for people that may attend that might be interested in being on the council.

MR. MATHEWS: You do have a copy of the application in your packet, and I -- the holes that are in Eastern Interior, as an example, I'll be attending those local advisory committees to encourage some to apply and others, but --

MR. COLLINS: And the deadline now for the next go round is?

MR. MATHEWS: December 1st. It starts and ends February 29th for applications and for those that are up, you know, your seats are up, if you don't reapply, you're out. So you have to reapply if you want to stay on.

MR. COLLINS: And the three that are up, just for point of information again are?

MR. MATHEWS: The three that are up are the '96 seats, which is your seat, Mr. Chair, Pollock Simon, Sr., and Jack Reakoff. All that said how great the nomination process is are up. I hope you guys reapply so we can really apply that process.

MR. COLLINS: December 2d.

MR. SIMON: Do we have nomination seats or opposition seats?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, the application is in your packet

here. It's right next to that next sheet with the boxes. You don't have to use that, as far as if you're going to recommend somebody. You can just jot it down in a letter and say, I as an individual or I as the representative of the tribal council or whatever, support the nomination of so and so.

We have not had a lot of those in this region. In other regions, they do get a lot of letters of recommendation and reference, and that does help with the selection also.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, thank you.

MR. MATHEWS: I think we're done with that issue, Mr. Chairman. Then we're down to annual federal report to subsistence board.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, that's under Tab 10 and I think in the interest of time, I'll go over the last item I was going to say to you, the last item I was going to say to you is you've written a report for '93 and '94. Before you is report number '95. Due to my medical situation that happened this summer, I was unable to take the response to your '93 report and compare to -- compare it with the '94 report to see what still did not get addressed. And so I didn't have time to do that, to show you the difference, and the whole discussion of the annual report is being discussed by the board as to what -- how that's going to be reviewed and what the board process is and involvement with that.

So I would -- I'll just ask, I'll just share my recommendation would be to allow me to take the -- make the '95 report out of what was not addressed in the '94 report from the response from the -- from the Federal Subsistence Board and make that your '95 report and then you tell me now or by some process what other issues should be added to that report. We've already talked quite a bit about the additional factors we'll be talking about with the training and et cetera that we would incorporate that information in the next year's report, when we get to next fall. I'm stumbling along here, but I think you're getting what I'm saying is that let me compare the response to your '93 report and see what's left in the '94 report that needs to be addressed by the Federal Subsistence Board, you tell me now if any additions have to be made, and that'll be your '95 report.

MR. COLLINS: Things you'd like added, further comments on how he -- how Vince suggested he proceed using '94?

MR. MATHEWS: And I --

MR. COLLINS: I think one area of concern, I think it's come up here a number of times, has to do with the monitoring of the activities on federal lands by guides, air taxis and others, if we could get better information, because there is like the fishing issue, and some of the others, just a reminder, and maybe if it's a budgetary constraint, as somebody mentioned, that they have money to do that, because without, we don't have good information to -- and those activities could be impacting subsistence. At least there seems to be growing concern.

Is that what you -- would you concur with that? At least that's what it thought I was hearing here. So maybe there should be at least some statement in there.

MR. MATHEWS: Would the council agree that either you create a little subcommittee or just allow me to draft this up and use your Chair as the approving person on the wording on that? Otherwise, we'd have to look at talking about it at the spring

meeting and approving it at the spring meeting. Then we're back out of cycle again, which is not a big deal, but it delays it. Is that agreeable, that I would draft this up, run it by Ray and then if he feels it's appropriate then it would go out with the signature of the Chair?

MR. COLLINS: If they agree with this, I would want you to send copies to them at the same time you do me, and if I don't hear from them, I can work out with you but it if raises concerns on their part, they can get hold of me on something like that, because I wouldn't want to speak just for the whole group.

MR. MATHEWS: Is that comfortable? And you could also, if -- because the phone calls, whatever, you can --

MR. COLLINS: Call you, too.

MR. MATHEWS: -- call me and then what I've been advised, I don't know exactly how it works, you can charge that call to the number in Fairbanks for this office, which I don't have right in front of me. Supposedly that's been working. If you call Ray up, you would say to the operator, please charge this to 456-0406, I do remember it, and the operator's been doing it. I don't know how they get that authority, but they've been doing it.

MR. COLLINS: Put it in the letter when you send it out and say they can either call you or me.

MR. MATHEWS: I'll have to set a date so he knows to close out. Seems like everybody's in agreement.

MR. MORGAN: Could we add the wolf problem on there, too?

MR. MATHEWS: The problem of what?

MR. MORGAN: Decreasing wolf population and increasing the moose.

MR. COLLINS: Some mentioned they are monitoring that, but again, statistical information in monitoring wolf.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Any other issues? I suppose we should -- and if you do have other issues, then you would have to voice them to Ray and then we can get on the phone if it appears to be that we need to touch base with others on it. The annual report is very important. It explains there about it. I'm not trying to water that down. I'm just trying to catch up to that gap that happened due to my personal situation.

MR. COLLINS: That took care of it and we would be down to the Nowitna River moose discussion and we talked about this proposal to close for three years, and I guess that proposal is going to be submitted; is that right?

MR. MATHEWS: This is the Nowitna? Yeah, I have it in front of me now. I don't know if you want --

MR. COLLINS: Now, if they're submitting it, we don't have to take a position.

MR. MATHEWS: It's been submitted already. I got it, but I didn't have copies here for you, but it's been submitted to the board.

MR. COLLINS: You want to pass those out?

MR. MATHEWS: I only have one copy. I can send you copies or I can brief you on it. I don't know which is effective at this time. You're going to see the same proposal in the proposal book and then you're going to see it again in your council book with analysis. I'm not trying to deter from this point, but maybe --

MR. COLLINS: Harold wanted to look at it because he

was thinking about submitting one to his area before.

MR. MATHEWS: That's the one on the Nowitna and I just received Koyukuk -- Yukon Koyukuk Subregional Advisory Board Resolution 95-15. This is dealing with the Lower Koyukuk moose management working group. I'll just pass it around and you tell me what to do with it.

MR. COLLINS: What they were asking on that was in relation to these other meetings, they were asking if we could authorize somebody to attend those meetings, I think, is what they needed from us, that working group, yeah, to participate. So how does the board feel about participating in that?

MR. MATHEWS: To my knowledge, there would be no problem to authorize -- there may be later on, but the way I understand it now, we would try to -- we would find funds to authorize somebody to attend. I gather it's this Lower Koyukuk moose management plan working group, but this is the first time I've heard of this group. So I'm kind of at a loss here. If you feel that it's necessary, give me direction either through a motion or something, and then we will figure something out on this.

MR. COLLINS: Is there one of our members interested in attending, at least one?

MR. MATHEWS: This is the Lower Koyukuk moose management plan working group.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I would be.

MR. MATHEWS: So Harold would.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I've got a lot, but I need to.

MR. COLLINS: You live there, okay, it's your -- okay, does the members feel comfortable in having Harold represent us and he's there to listen and bring information back to us and you can speak on your own, but just not for us, I guess.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. Any action would have to come back to the board anyway.

MR. COLLINS: We probably should have a motion like we did on the others to authorize one of our members to attend.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I so move.

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

MR. REAKOFF: Second.

MR. COLLINS: Jack, okay. And any comments? All those in favor signify by raising your right hand.

(Unanimous response).

MR. COLLINS: Okay, it's yes votes for all members present, motion carries, and we'll ask Harold to do that. If it's in your hometown, it may not cost anything, but at least you'll be there with our blessing. Okay, I think that takes care of that. Any other new business?

Future meeting plans.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, at this time, you need to decide of a location and place for your next meeting and give me some topics, but let's first deal with place and then time. You have been in various locations, Galena, McGrath -- I'm drawing a blank -- Huslia, Huslia and now Aniak. There's other locations. Your next meeting will be the time when you pass recommendations, so you may want to look at an area where you need to get input on proposals. We don't know what proposals are before you totally, but I think you can gather there's going to be a lot down in this area, so --

MR. COLLINS: Some of the more controversial I think

are going to be those ones down -- well on the outcome of those two meetings over there. What about meeting in a place like Holy Cross where I know there's a lodge and where those issues would come up, customary and traditional.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Mr. Chairman, I met with the mayor before I came over and he asked if we could have the meeting there next, just give him advanced notice, he'd be willing to open the hall and make the arrangements for it.

MR. MATHEWS: So it will be Holy Cross then? And then I'll need to work with you on locations and stuff like that, assistance.

MR. COLLINS: Well, we haven't got a motion yet. Let's see, are there any other places people are concerned about. If there's a couple, we could debate, but -- okay. Then do we have a motion to meet in Holy Cross?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: So move.

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

MR. REAKOFF: Second.

MR. COLLINS: Second by Jack. Any discussion? All those in favor signify by raising your right hand.

(Unanimous response).

MR. COLLINS: Yes votes for all seven members present. Motion carries. Time?

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, if you look at under Tab 1, you'll see this calendar. Your window of time is January 29th, it looks like this, and it ends on March 1st. Eastern Interior, your sister or brother region to the east, is meeting on February 7th through the 9th, or in that general area.

I'll just put my two cents in. We need a week or so between those meetings for staff to catch up, if at all possible. If it isn't, then we will go ahead, but it is difficult with logistics and weather sometimes to have them back to back, so --

MR. COLLINS: 7, 8 and 9 is the Eastern Interior?

MR. MATHEWS: They're meeting in Fort Yukon.

MR. COLLINS: You're saying back to back is hard?

MR. MATHEWS: It's harder on us, especially what you've asked us to do. Eastern Interior met last week and I think you can see the meeting just about wore me out. It was a great bunch of people, but my neck is killing me. I'm just saying -- but don't let that be the only factor in selecting your dates. If it's possible, put some distance in between it. If it's not, then we'll go ahead.

MR. COLLINS: Does anyone have dates that they know of that are out for them in that area?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Fur Rondy for me.

MR. COLLINS: Which is when?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Third week, I think, 12 through 17, I think, but I'm not too sure. About 16th, 17th, 18th.

MS. VANDERPOOL: How about February 21st or somewhere around there?

MR. COLLINS: How do you feel on a Friday, Saturday or something like that, so we don't have to make -- middle of the week is kind of bad for me. I'd rather have it at one end or the other, so I don't have to miss so many days.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Like Friday, Saturday, Sunday then we wouldn't leave till Monday, or you want to go Saturday, Sunday --

MR. COLLINS: We've been trying to meet in less than three days.

MS. VANDERPOOL: So if you met on a Saturday, Sunday, would that give you sufficient time, and be gone Monday.

MR. COLLINS: I don't mind being Friday, Saturday, and Sunday can be travel, travel Thursday or something. I just don't like to have it in the middle of the week because in travel you end up losing most of your week, like this time, traveling on Monday night and were going to get back on Friday.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, if you're looking at weekends, just the other side is it's harder to get flights on Sunday.

MS. VANDERPOOL: That's what I was thinking.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: MarkAir can be on Sundays.

MR. COLLINS: That's right, from Anchorage, so you can catch a flight out of there and go right back to Anchorage. They come here and then go to Holy Cross, I think.

MR. MATHEWS: Come here to go to Holy Cross?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: When they put the St. Mary's run, they'll have two flights daily except Sunday, always the one flight on Sunday.

MR. MATHEWS: Not to change your direction here, but the other ones from the other part of the region have to go through Fairbanks to Anchorage and back up. So the flights for them out of their communities to Fairbanks in general don't fly on Sundays.

MR. SIMON: Any day, days don't matter to me. The thing is that through the time of the meeting, I want to go home, so if I can leave right after the meeting, it's okay with me. I don't need to stay the half day or a day later than I have to. I have a lot of things to do at home.

MR. COLLINS: How about if we set a window, then. Let's say, instead of pinning down everything right now, somewhere between February 22d and 25th, or something right in there, try to -- and try to keep it as compact as we can, so we can get home. Because we may have to look at the schedule to see what would be the quickest way to get in and out for those of you in the north. For example, do you know now what is the schedule for the Sunday flying?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: They leave in the afternoon, they leave back to Anchorage.

MR. COLLINS: So it would be better if it was like Saturday afternoon or something get back there and still make connections.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: If it's on Saturday, you have to be out of there by at least 2:00 to get the evening flight here.

MR. MATHEWS: That puts you into Anchorage at 3:34 and you got to get a flight to Fairbanks, which locks out all the people from there. They're stuck in Fairbanks, which we can provide lodging, but then they're stuck in Fairbanks because their flights shut down at that time around four or five o'clock due to light. See, the two hubs are working against us. Their hub is Fairbanks, your hub is Aniak and Anchorage. So someone's going to end up overnighing somewhere. I'm just informing you that it is nice, I understand your feelings about flying around the weekend or on the weekend or that, but your options on the weekend get less.

MR. COLLINS: Well, the options during the week are the same problem, though, on some of these.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: They can charter back to Fairbanks

that day.

MR. COLLINS: On the Huslia one we used charters.

MR. MATHEWS: Charters -- just as an example, to pick up Jack once was five to eight thousand dollars to get him to the meeting.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: If Jack can get to Fairbanks, get to Fairbanks --

MR. MATHEWS: I know, but to get him to Fairbanks requires a charter at times. So the service, as we get more in the northern part of this region, gets a little bit more challenging. All I'm saying -- we can still work it out. I'm just saying when you say charters to pick up these people, they were quoting us prices of five to eight thousand dollars to get three people into a meeting.

It's cheaper to put you up in Anchorage than it is to get everybody in, which doesn't make much sense. But again, pick some dates, we'll work this out. If we can't make it, then we go to another plan. I get back to you and say, whatever.

MR. COLLINS: One member is reminding me he's got a plane he can catch in just a few minutes. So you understand if he has to leave. All right, what block of time that we can work with and that he can check on. Actually it would be easier to meet in Anchorage in terms of everybody getting home, but that misses being in one of our communities.

MR. MATHEWS: You can also meet in Fairbanks, too. I'm just throwing out these options.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Fairbanks sounds good.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I don't mind having the meeting in Anchorage.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, the North Slope is meeting in Anchorage.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Let's go to Anchorage or Fairbanks then. It's easier.

MR. MATHEWS: One of the duties is to hear from the locals. If this meeting is now in Anchorage, the people here at the beginning of the meeting, about one-tenth of them would have been there, so I'm just cautioning you. It would make my life a lot easier if you met in Anchorage, no doubt about it.

MR. COLLINS: Well, we've got the motion to meet in Holy Cross, so we need to deal with that first to see if it's feasible to get people in and out reasonably.

MR. MATHEWS: I think we can do that. I'm just giving you some ideas when you brought up weekend travel.

MR. COLLINS: About the time again, we're looking at that fourth week of February, 22 through 25, somewhere in that period of time.

MR. SIMON: I'd like to make a suggestion, two meetings a year and it's important that we meet with the villages, so the meeting we should try to make an effort to have at least one meeting in the villages and the other in Anchorage. That could work out, too.

MR. COLLINS: So you're saying we wouldn't have to go to a village next time because we went to a village this time?

MR. SIMON: Uh-huh.

MR. COLLINS: Well, we've got our action before. What have we got now? We've got the meeting in Holy Cross and an invite.

MR. SIMON: Holy Cross is no problem. It's just a

suggestion.

MR. COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: If I heard you, it was Holy Cross and you had a window of February 22d through the 25th. I'm comfortable with that if you guys are, and then I can get back to all of you and say if there's any problems.

MR. COLLINS: I think after you look at all the schedules you may be able to figure out which would be the easiest so there isn't long delays on either end in travel.

MR. MATHEWS: I'm comfortable with that and we can work it out from there. We'll try to tighten up the agenda. I didn't know how long it would take for C&T. That's why we had this extra day added on. There was no way to predict how long we would spend on C&T.

The next thing is just topics, and I mentioned earlier it sounded like one topic that in addition to the proposals would be I think I got it right here fishing and hunting guiding reports from the refuges so you get an idea how that system works and what level is going on, and you know, is there agreement that that would be a topic in addition to the proposals? I think the drift -- Conrad's left on me here for another idea, but I think the drift was that when we discuss issues in an area you may want some background information before we go into the proposals, and that we will do a target one on 21(E) and 19. I believe it's the Kuskokwim River area. I wrote down 19 but it's Kuskokwim River area which is 19 also, but other than that, I don't remember other topics that you wanted in addition. I don't want to add anymore to you, but I don't want to miss any.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, can you get an update on the writing letters to the corporations, get funding for education, trapper education, maybe we could update and response on the letters.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. So I'm clear on that that you would want a report, an update on the letters that had been sent, and that will be sent from this meeting.

MR. COLLINS: And since we'll have proposals, that alone can take quite a bit of time because there should be discussion of each proposal.

MR. MATHEWS: You'll be dealing with the C&T proposals from both Region 5 and your region, and I don't know what the other regions are doing that might affect you, Region 10 and 8.

MR. COLLINS: Okay, good. Topics are done. Closing remarks? We don't have Elder here to address us.

MR. MATHEWS: As staff, I just want to make it quickly. I appreciate all your time and effort and my number is there to call if you have any suggestions, and also the public approached me on several ideas. Please keep in touch and call. I am going to, if time allows, develop a newsletter and that'll be available also for you. Please give input on the effectiveness of that, and thanks again for spending all this time.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. I'd like to thank the community for having us here and for your comments and inputs, too, and if there are proposals that are in our jurisdiction, as I said, get them in and then they would come before us next time. But unfortunately, a lot of the things that you're concerned about, we can't do anything with.

ROBERT HOFFMAN: In these proposals that we would like to have in, are they -- should they be in before October 27 or is

that -- in order to make this spring?

MR. COLLINS: That's the deadline that's been set. We don't set that. It's the federal board that's setting it. Anything they're going to consider at the spring meeting they want to be in by October 27. It has to do with customary and traditional findings on federal lands, seasons, and bag limits, and so on, to the federal lands, those kinds of things.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. Have a motion to adjourn?

MR. HUNTINGTON: So moved.

MR. DEACON: Second.

MR. COLLINS: Moved by Harold, seconded by Henry. All those in favor signify by raising your right hand.

(Unanimous response).

MR. COLLINS: Okay, we stand adjourned.

(Off record at 5:27 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.

RMR-CRR

JOY S. BRAUER,
Notary Public for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 5/10/97