

00001

1 WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL COUNCIL MEETING

3

4

VOLUME I

5

6

Aniak, Alaska

7

March 18, 2003

8

9:00 o'clock a.m.

9

10

11 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

12

13 Ronald Sam, Chair

14 Ray Collins

15 Angela Demientieff

16 Benedict Jones

17 Carl Morgan

18 Emmitt Peters

19 Jack Reakoff

20 Michael Stickman

21 Robert Walker

22

23

24 Regional Council Coordinator; Jerry Berg (Substitute)

00002

1 PROCEEDINGS

2

3 (Aniak, Alaska - 3/18/2003)

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: To get started, I'd like
6 to take care of minutes and all that other small stuff.

7 So at this time I'll call the meeting to order, it is now

8 9:12. Jack, could you take the roll call.

9

10 Yeah, for your information, we got a big
11 room with reverbs so make sure you state your name and
12 use the mic for Tina.

13

14 MR. REAKOFF: Ron Sam.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Here.

17

18 MR. REAKOFF: Ray Collins.

19

20 MR. COLLINS: Here.

21

22 MR. REAKOFF: Jack Reakoff. I'm here.

23 Angela Demientieff.

24

25 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, called
26 yesterday and said she'd be in today, sometime this
27 afternoon.

28

29 MR. REAKOFF: Angela is late and will be
30 here later. Benedict Jones.

31

32 MR. JONES: Here.

33

34 MR. REAKOFF: Carl Morgan.

35

36 MR. MORGAN: Here.

37

38 MR. REAKOFF: Robert Walker.

39

40 MR. WALKER: Yes.

41

42 MR. REAKOFF: Michael Stickman.

43

44 MR. STICKMAN: Here.

45

46 MR. REAKOFF: Emmitt Peters.

47

48 MR. PETERS: Here.

49

50 MR. REAKOFF: And so we got plenty for a

00003

1 quorum.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Angela's coming in
4 later on this morning. So at this time I would like to
5 welcome all of our guests out here so if you could stand
6 up and state your name, I would like you all to state
7 your name and agency, please.

8

9 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Pat McClenahan.

10

11 MR. WOLFMAYER: David Wolfmeyer with
12 AVCP, Partners Fisheries biologist.

13

14 MR. CANNON: Richard Cannon with Office
15 of Subsistence Management Fisheries Information Services.

16

17 (Other introductions - but did not come
18 to microphone)

19

20 MR. BERG: I'm Jerry Berg. I'm normally
21 a fish biologist -- Jerry Berg with Office of Subsistence
22 Management -- I'm normally a fish biologist for the
23 Kuskokwim but I'm standing in for Vince Mathews as the
24 coordinator for this meeting since Vince is attending a
25 leadership management program this week and was unable to
26 attend. I'm glad to have everybody here this morning.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jerry. The
29 record will show that we have a quorum with one absent,
30 right, and she will be here later.

31

32 Welcome members, Council members. And I
33 see that we have recognize all members, which we did to
34 establish a quorum, and opening remarks, I would like to
35 hold that under number 4 -- under Regional Council member
36 concerns. If this is fine with the members, is there a
37 consensus.

38

39 (Regional Council Nods Affirmatively)

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. We'll have some
42 people on line about 10:00 so we'll just go ahead and
43 take care of a lot of our small stuff before we go into
44 proposals because we do need ADF&G and Pete DeMatteo on
45 line to go through the proposals. Even though when I
46 looked that these proposals, a lot of them are just in
47 alignment with the State, some of them are already passed
48 and there's just some minor changes. And so until we get
49 Pete DeMatteo and ADF&G here and on line, I'd like to
50 begin with invocation by a local elder.

00004

1 I talked with Carl just now and he said
2 it would be fine if Ray Collins, one of our older members
3 from the Western Interior Council go ahead and give the
4 invocation if you're ready.

5
6 MR. COLLINS: Heavenly father we thank
7 you for this opportunity to gather and discuss issues
8 that relate to people living in our region, and we ask
9 for your guidance and direction in this meeting and pray
10 that the decisions we make will be beneficial for
11 ourselves and for our children.

12
13 We ask your blessing upon this time
14 together, in Jesus' name. Amen.

15
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: As you will note on number
17 2, we did establish a quorum, and we introduced ourselves
18 and as other people come in we will introduce them. And
19 make sure that if you want to testify you have to fill
20 out one of these blue slips and hand it to either Jerry
21 Berg, Jack, or Tina.

22
23 Regional Council member concerns.
24 Robert, are you willing to start it off.

25
26 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
27 Yes. One of the concerns that we still have at this
28 time, I had to talk to Pat here, McClenahan, and
29 emphasize that our C&T for the lower portion of Unit
30 21(E), we're still trying to get testimony from our
31 elderly people in our area to go with this, and, in fact,
32 I will work with Pat and our elders in our area to try to
33 get this.

34
35 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

36
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Robert. Carl.

38
39 MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At
40 this time I really don't have any concerns but I'm sure
41 we'll hear them later on from different people coming in
42 to testify or -- yeah, to testify. I see we got one,
43 maybe two or three more. But I'm here to listen and
44 learn and act.

45
46 Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Carl. When we
49 want input out of Juneau, you know we'll call you. Here,
50 you're not getting off easy. Again, thank you, Carl, and

00005

1 we do have one request for testimony now and that's
2 Herman Morgan and so we're starting out okay.

3

4 Jack.

5

6 MR. REAKOFF: Right now my main concern
7 was the commercial harvest on chinook on the Yukon River
8 and the lack of escapements that occurred after that and
9 the reduction in subsistence harvest. That's one of my
10 main concerns for this meeting, is the Alaska Department
11 of Fish and Game prematurely having a commercial harvest
12 on the Yukon without providing for adequate escapement
13 and subsistence.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. I see
16 two members -- two new people walk in, if you want to
17 testify you have to fill out these blue slips. And if
18 you want to go ahead and introduce yourself for the
19 record we'd like to recognize you for being here.

20

21 MR. MORGAN: I'm Leo Morgan from here in
22 Aniak.

23

24 MR. ALLAIN: I'm Harry Allain, also from
25 Aniak.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Thank you for
28 showing up at this time on this cold morning. Ray.

29

30 MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have
31 no concerns that aren't on the agenda. I think they're
32 covered in there so I had no special issues to bring to
33 the group, thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Ray. Emmitt.

36

37 MR. PETERS: I have one concern that is
38 if we -- does anybody check on the harvest of the king
39 salmon going up the Novi -- Elozi River, that's right
40 across Ruby there. We get a lot of chums up there and it
41 goes up, we know that, because there's a lot of them that
42 comes -- after they spawn, they kind of drift out of
43 those Elozi River. So I'm just curious if anybody has
44 gone up there and checked on the kings. That's my
45 concern right now.

46

47 And I'd like to see if we can follow up
48 on the wolves and the bears killing off the moose in the
49 spring and that's another concern of mine and that's
50 about it.

00006

1 Thank you very much.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Emmitt.
4 Appreciate your concerns. And I think we will try to
5 address them as best we can through the agenda.
6 Benedict.

7

8 MR. JONES: Good morning. Benedict
9 Jones. I have a few concerns about the chinook and the
10 fall chum. I brought up in the meeting in Anchorage
11 about the -- the subject about that climate change in the
12 last 50 years that I've seen the whitefish, they don't
13 have the nutrition that they used to have 50 years ago --
14 and due to the glacier, the erosion and vegetation and
15 the streams have changed as -- and the spawning grounds
16 for the chinook and the other salmon species also changed
17 due to the glacier and erosion and the spawning area.

18

19 I went up the Gasasa last year and there
20 was a lot of salt in the spawning area. And I brought up
21 this subject with the Middle Yukon Advisory Committee
22 meeting that we had last month in Galena and I -- my
23 testimony was to close off the commercial fishing on the
24 lower Yukon for a five year period. But one of the fish
25 biologists from the Commercial Fishing Division opposed
26 me on account of that because he said the fish processor
27 would move out of there but if we do -- what we want to
28 do is rebuild our salmon stocks in the whole Yukon
29 drainage for a five year period and this would rebuild
30 the chinook and the fall chum. So -- and if they
31 rebound, the fish processors will immediately move back
32 for the commercial division.

33

34 Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Benedict.
37 Micky.

38

39 MR. STICKMAN: My name is Micky Stickman.
40 I'm from Nulato. I got several concerns. You know, this
41 might not be the forum to bring it up in but the new
42 Governor is doing away with the Alaska Department of Fish
43 and Game and he's going to be turning over all the
44 responsibilities to the Department of Natural Resources.
45 So you know, right now the Department of Fish and Game
46 and the Office of Subsistence Management have a
47 memorandum of understanding or a memorandum of agreement
48 so, you know, I wonder if they're going to come up with a
49 new memorandum of agreement with DNR, you know, are you
50 just going to slide over, you know, because I have some

00007

1 grave concerns with those kind of moves in our State
2 government.

3

4 And the other one I had is, you know, our
5 five day winter moose hunt in February, you know, one of
6 the concerns I had with that is the maintenance workers
7 at the Air Force Base in Galena, they work for -- you
8 know, they work for the Louden Tribal Council -- they
9 have a profit making arm up there -- off their tribal
10 council called Ucana Development Corporation, but Ucana
11 and Chugach Development Corporation together operates the
12 Base but during the five day winter moose hunt this
13 winter they were bringing their friends from Anchorage
14 and Fairbanks and because they're -- they spend more 30
15 days in Galena they're residents of Galena so they're
16 eligible as locals so -- you know, but these guys are fed
17 by their company, they're paid good money but still
18 you're giving the locals competition for the moose in the
19 winter moose hunt, you know, and I always thought that
20 moose hunt was put in place for the local people to
21 sustain themselves throughout the winter.

22

23 And also the extension of the driftnet
24 area, you know, maybe this would be for Jeff and whoever
25 wanted to look into, but I think the tribal council in
26 Nulato already passed a resolution supporting the
27 regulation change.

28

29 That's about all I have right now, Ron.

30 Thanks.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Micky. Thank
33 you, Micky, for those concerns, again, just for your
34 information, I'll make a short Chair's report along with
35 my concerns.

36

37 As you all know one of my major concerns
38 was and always will be the creation of three new seats on
39 our Western Interior Council for commercial interests. I
40 had talked with a couple of our local guides further up
41 on the Yukon and the Koyukuk and some of them feel that
42 they are too busy right now to even apply because they're
43 pursuing a lot of their own interests and trying to take
44 care of local interests at the same time. Because they
45 -- like many of us, they sit on about three or four
46 councils, not only this one.

47

48 And that is one of our major concerns but
49 every time I sit down in front of this Council I feel
50 quite sure that we can handle anything that comes our way

00008

1 and vote it up or down as we see fit. I have great
2 confidence in this Council. Many of them have served a
3 good many years. I did bring this up at the Chair's
4 meeting a couple months ago. I came out pretty strong on
5 that and that was before -- more than a couple of months
6 ago, and that was before both Ray Collins, Jack Reakoff
7 and myself were reappointed. At that time, after all my
8 outbursts I didn't get expect to get reappointed.

9

10 (Laughter)

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: So along with that I would
13 like the people from Aniak and Holy Cross and that area
14 to get a hold of me and Vince, if you know of any
15 interested parties to fill these three commercial seats.
16 You can be a guide, sportfisherman, or recreational. All
17 those will fit under the commercial interest.

18

19 And at our last meeting, I was talking
20 with both Robert and Micky Stickman, all three of us were
21 appointed as officers for the Western Interior even
22 though we were up for reappointment. I'd like to thank
23 both Robert and Micky for making that quick move to
24 enhance our chances of being reappointed, which all three
25 of us were. So that was pretty quick thinking there and
26 quick action.

27

28 Throughout the last year and a half I
29 think all the Council members know that I've begun to
30 delegate authority, delegate travel to all our different
31 members. I depend heavily on both Micky Stickman,
32 Benedict Jones, Robert Walker and Jack Reakoff to cover
33 the Yukon River Fisheries. In fact I specifically asked
34 that Jack attend the Board of Fisheries meeting which he
35 will leave from here and attend down at Anchorage on the
36 21st.

37

38 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, the committee
39 meeting that I was supposed to attend is going to be
40 taking place on the 20th so I'll have to leave this
41 meeting by noon tomorrow and that's kind of a problem,
42 I'll have to miss the end of this meeting here.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, that's fine.
45 Because a lot of these committee meetings are very
46 important to us. As I said I have complete confidence in
47 this Council, and they've done their work and their
48 homework very well and they will continue to do so.

49

50 And just for your information, by the

00009

1 time I get home, about a week after I get home I will be
2 working nine hours a day, six days a week throughout the
3 summer so be ready to cover all these meetings for myself
4 and for Western Interior. You've been very good in doing
5 that.

6
7 And as many of you know we've been trying
8 to get Ruby seated on here, and as our last effort we got
9 Emmitt Peters and just loosely we were talking about
10 having all our meetings down this area for the last few
11 years, so he's doing -- he's going to go home and do his
12 best to set up our next meeting at Ruby. So that will
13 come up again on the agenda but that's how diligent and
14 dedicated these Council members are, to try to bring
15 these meetings out to the local area.

16
17 And I know that we depended on, both,
18 Robert, Carl, Angela and Ray to cover the Kuskokwim and
19 the moose problems in McGrath and this area, so they've
20 been meeting and I have been traveling for quite some
21 time. Again, I would like to thank these members for
22 attending these meetings and addressing local issues.

23
24 And that pretty much concludes my
25 Chair's report because I have been traveling that much.
26 People do get a hold of Vince because he has an 800
27 number and he gets a hold of me and then I call these
28 people that do express concerns.

29
30 So at this time I would like to conclude
31 my Chair's report and thank you all for the good work the
32 Council members have been doing.

33
34 I see quite a few new people just coming
35 in the building. So I would like all of you to introduce
36 yourselves starting with Bob Schulz.

37
38 MR. SCHULZ: Hi. I'm Bob Schulz, Refuge
39 Manager for the Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge.

40
41 MS. MCSWEENEY: I'm Ingrid McSweeney from
42 the Bureau of Land Management.

43
44 MR. CRAIG: I'm Tim Craig and I'm from
45 the Northern Field Office of the Bureau of Land
46 Management.

47
48 MR. DELANEY: I'm Roger Delaney, Northern
49 Field Office as well.

50

00010

1 MS. BROWN: Wennona Brown, subsistence
2 coordinator for the Kanuti Refuge.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: I see we have some new
5 people in the back.

6

7 MR. SIAVELIS: I'm George Siavelis. I
8 live in Aniak here, hunting, guiding.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Way in the back.

11

12 MR. CANNON: I'm Dave Cannon, Partners,
13 fish biologist from KNA.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, all. Welcome
16 to our meeting. We're just taking care of the small
17 stuff right now. Again, for the new people that walked
18 in, if you have any commercial interests please file for
19 membership on this Council, if you're interested because
20 we're having a hell of a time trying to fill these seats.

21

22 Jerry.

23

24 MR. BERG: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I
25 just wanted to remind everybody, if we could get
26 everybody to sign in back there so we have a record of
27 everybody that was at the meeting so we can get it on the
28 record.

29

30 Thank you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Not only that, if you wish
33 to testify fill out this blue form. I think Pat
34 McClenahan has them. So if you want to testify go ahead
35 and fill this out.

36

37 Jerry, would it be appropriate if we do
38 go into this general testimony right now. Because one
39 guy filled out general. Would it be fine with the
40 Council?

41

42 (Council Nods Affirmatively)

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. We got three people
45 wishing to address this Council. And for your
46 information, I would like you to come up here and use the
47 microphone and, again, state your name and the topic you
48 want to address. So to begin with I'd like to call on
49 Leo Morgan, Aniak. Again, state your name and your
50 business and your issue, concerns.

00011

1 MR. L. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2 My name is Leo Morgan. I'm in various organizations,
3 mainly I'm going to voice my concerns.

4
5 I'm the executive director of Kuskokwim
6 Native Association. Chairman of the Kuskokwim
7 Corporation, the profit making village corporation in
8 this area that takes in villages from Stoney River to
9 Lower Kalskag. And the same with the KNA. I'm also a
10 tribal council member here for Aniak.

11
12 I'd like to make a comment. I like your
13 set up here. This is the best set up of a meeting I've
14 seen here in Aniak, we're able to hear, you're facing the
15 public, I just want to comment and give you praise on
16 that part.

17
18 I'd like to talk about the moose and the
19 fish here in this area, just give you a little
20 perspective on my side. I'm very concerned about the
21 moose, have been for most of my life. More so in the
22 early '80s on the moose part. Having sitting on the
23 corporation board, we own about a million acres of land
24 here and we've been hammered a lot by our shareholders to
25 do something about the high impact of hunters in our
26 area. The complaints were that, you know, Kalskag used
27 to hunt around their area, Aniak here around our slough,
28 right here, behind here, and people were having to go
29 many miles to go for moose hunting because of the high
30 impact of hunters here in this region.

31
32 So in the late '80s, the Kuskokwim
33 Corporation instituted a permit system to address -- we
34 realized that we couldn't say no trespassing because we
35 didn't have the funds to monitor that so we instituted a
36 permit system just to address the high impact of hunters.
37 We instituted a \$400 permit charge. That worked for
38 awhile and I think the board and our shareholders have
39 been pressuring us to either do away with that permit
40 program or up the stakes to a thousand dollars a permit.
41 But we realized that we wouldn't be able to get a
42 thousand dollar permit system so we're really looking at
43 possibly doing a no trespass, no use of our lands because
44 of the high impact and because our people can't get any
45 of their moose now days.

46
47 And as you can see from the river here,
48 it's smooth I know last year I went down -- we have a
49 fish camp about halfway to Kalskag and last year I
50 counted 13 moose between here and my dad's fish camp down

00012

1 there, not the same moose, they're all different areas.
2 They were browsing in the willows. This year I don't
3 know how many trips I've made down there, I haven't seen
4 one. Not a cow moose. I don't know where they are. I
5 haven't traveled a lot, as you can see that we have no
6 snow here. I usually travel over to the Pike Lake area.
7 My brothers and I and a few friends from Kruger Creek
8 kind of hunt wolves, you know, we make sure that we check
9 on the pack around the White -- Pike Lake area, Horn
10 Mountains, Whitefish Lake and try to get them, not for
11 sport, you know, we don't have a plane so we have to
12 track them and things like that. But we've been able to
13 go -- my son and I have been able to go out towards
14 Whitefish Lake this year and we haven't seen any moose.
15 There's usually a lot of moose tracks in Brown Bear
16 Slough, what we call back here, back and forth. With the
17 few snowfalls that we've had we've just seen very few.
18 So we're really concerned about the moose levels here in
19 Unit 19(A), and the whole region.

20

21 So something -- you know, we saw about
22 five wolves and we tried to track those, but, you know,
23 to blame it all on wolves for the lack of moose is just
24 -- it doesn't sit right with me. The thing that I've
25 been able to see over the years, is really a big high
26 impact of our area by hunters from down the river, drop
27 off hunters, guided hunters and a lot of horns leaving
28 the area. This is a hub here and we see a heck of a lot
29 of horns leaving this town here.

30

31 The other concern we had in KNA has been
32 on the forefront, the fishing. We depend on our -- all
33 our people depend on our fish -- we call it our fish, but
34 the fish that come up to put away. And we've been on the
35 forefront since commercial fishing started opening in the
36 '60s and we seen -- you could look at the newspapers, the
37 Tundra Drums, they had record catches for five to 10
38 years. It was always front page news. You know, a
39 million pounds of fish. And our question was, well, gee,
40 we need escapement. Something's going to happen where
41 we're not going to have any fish for none of us, not for
42 the commercial fishing and not for the people who depend
43 on it, not for the sport fisherman. So we were yelling
44 quite loudly here. I think Carl was in it, too. And,
45 you know, our voices were but a whisper to these people,
46 we weren't biologists.

47

48 We were telling them through our
49 traditional knowledge and knowledge of elders, and using
50 the terms like the Aniak River, it used to stink, that's

00013

1 all that I used to remember because of the rotting fish
2 and it came to a point that it quit stinking. And when
3 we mentioned that to some of the people, some of the
4 biologists, they tend to laugh about it and, you know,
5 they're, this is what we know. And when I question them
6 about -- lately been questioning them heavily on their
7 data that they use and I'm beginning to find out that
8 they're guess work. You know, they do a little sample
9 and then most of it is a big guess. So I'm questioning
10 them and saying, well, the people that live here and able
11 to see it on a year-round basis tend to have some
12 knowledge about the fish and game in their specific
13 areas, and to respect that knowledge. Because along with
14 the scientific data, that traditional knowledge is very
15 useful and will help along tremendously with the
16 scientific data that they get when they come in for a few
17 days.

18
19 So those kind of things I'm concerned
20 about. The fish, you know, I made a point to our staff
21 meeting yesterday, that we have to become more proactive,
22 and I even suggested that we close -- I was glad to hear
23 from the Yukon side, a proposal, to maybe close off
24 commercial for five years. Why don't we just make a
25 proposal to close off commercial fishing on the river,
26 here on the Kuskokwim, because of the concern about the
27 fish and the things that we want to see, what happened to
28 the chum and our kings and our silvers here on the river.
29 We want everyone to have use of it, the people that live
30 up and down the river here.

31
32 So those -- we're concerned about the
33 fishing schedule. Our villages from Kalskag on up to
34 Stoney River, data shows that we don't use very much of
35 the fish for subsistence, when you consider the whole
36 take of the Kuskokwim River. So we're putting a proposal
37 to the Fish Board to do away with the four day, three day
38 off fishing schedule for this area at least. Because it
39 really creates a havoc for our subsistence people up
40 here. We don't have very many commercial fishermen up
41 here. We may have about six to a dozen. But the
42 distance is too far to Bethel to process and things like
43 that.

44
45 So I just wanted to give you my concerns
46 on those two very important uses that we have, our moose
47 and our fish. So thank you for listening to me today.

48
49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Leo. Just a
50 minute. Any questions for Leo.

00014

1 MR. COLLINS: I just had one here.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Ray.

4

5 MR. COLLINS: In your years here have you
6 ever seen a winter like this one, with so little snow.

7 It seems to be a different winter and I'm wondering if

8 that isn't impacting the moose, in that, they're more

9 dispersed this winter. It seems to be the case in the

10 upper river. I don't question that they're probably

11 declining but it's a very unusual winter. Do you think

12 it has an effect?

13

14 MR. L. MORGAN: Yeah, I haven't seen it

15 this bad. But I know that there was a time, I forget

16 what span of years, in the late '70s. I think we had

17 about a three year span where it would rain, snow, melt

18 and freeze, rain, snow, melt, freeze, but this one is

19 just staying no snow, so it's unusual. I've never seen

20 it like this here before.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

23

24 MR. STICKMAN: Ron, I have one.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

27

28 MR. STICKMAN: You know, Doyon, the

29 corporation for the Interior, we have 12 million acres of

30 land and we have a no hunting policy on our land. But

31 one of the ways that we do it is I'm the president of the

32 village corporation for Nulato and we have 500,000 acres

33 and we have a no hunting policy on our land, too, but

34 like you, you know, it would be kind of hard to monitor.

35 But what I do, is during the moose hunting season I do

36 the monitoring as an officer of the corporation. I go

37 out and patrol the corporation lands and ask people who

38 are not members of the -- or are not shareholders of the

39 corporation to leave our land. But I also get permission

40 from Doyon to do Doyon land. And Doyon kicks in money

41 for gas, for food, so I'm spending all my time on the

42 river chasing people off our private property.

43

44 So you know, maybe you guys can partner

45 up with the village and the regional corporation because

46 that's the way it seems to work for us on the Yukon.

47

48 MR. L. MORGAN: Thanks.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions for

00015

1 Leo.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, thank you for
6 testifying before us Leo.

7

8 MR. L. MORGAN: Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: I've seen you at a lot of
11 meetings. And as far as the set up goes, I think you can
12 thank our recorder Tina. Thank you for those comments on
13 the set up.

14

15 MR. L. MORGAN: Uh-huh.

16

17 MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, Emmitt.

20

21 MR. PETERS: I really want to thank Mr.
22 Morgan because he's got the point, understand, he's been
23 up here all his life and his ancestors have been here
24 before him, he realizes the hardship of our game is very
25 scarce. And he's got a point there, we got to research
26 all this and make sure we stand to it.

27

28 Thank you very much, Leo.

29

30 MR. L. MORGAN: Thank you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, thank you again,
33 Leo. It's always a pleasure to meet and see and listen
34 to you people. I'd like to ask the Council to bear with
35 me because the reason I put them up so early this time,
36 is that a lot of them come in here fill out this form and
37 we get so wrapped up on proposals and stuff that they
38 come and go that when their time on the slot or the
39 agenda comes up and they're not here. So at this time
40 one of our priorities is to recognize and listen to our
41 people. Especially if they're not going to be here for
42 the whole duration of the meeting.

43

44 Herman Morgan. I know he's been to a lot
45 of our meetings, he filled out a form right away. I see
46 him out here in the audience so I'll call Herman Morgan.

47

48 MR. H. MORGAN: Thank you for allowing us
49 to testify. My name is Herman Morgan. And although I'm
50 testifying as a subsistence user, I've been on the

00016

1 Central Kuskokwim Fish and Game Advisory Committee for
2 about 20 years and I can tell you now that we are facing
3 a crises right now with our moose and our salmon.

4
5 And I'll start off with the moose. For
6 the past, like 10 years, we've seen this climate change,
7 where the weather's getting warmer and there's less snow
8 and we see a lot of caribou. We never used to have
9 caribou but along with the caribou there came a lot of
10 wolves. And then the State, the animal rights people,
11 they cut off aerial wolf hunting and we're seeing huge
12 packs of wolves, a huge increase of wolves.

13
14 I'd like to read a statement here from an
15 elder in Lime Village, it was about five years ago.
16 You'll have to excuse his broken English but his name is
17 Pete Bobby.

18
19 He say pretty near wolves finish all the
20 animals, soon there's nothing. Not since
21 I'm a kid we never seen so many wolves as
22 now. Pretty near we starve that time.

23
24 That's how bad it's getting. And then
25 about five years ago up here in Chuathbaluk, the wolves
26 came to Chuathbaluk and they ate 12 dogs right out of
27 their dog houses, right in front of their homes. And
28 right now the State, they're having predator control
29 around McGrath but it seems like that's a little late,
30 they should be having it down here and monitoring the
31 wolves down here because the wolves seems like they've
32 moved down here. And I told the Board of Game, I don't
33 know how many times, you know, when do we initiate
34 predator control? When do we control the amount of sport
35 hunters, after there's a biological emergency? That
36 seems like where we're at, at that point right now.

37
38 I know it's mostly State land around here
39 but there's getting so many guides and there's no
40 control. They just come in here and they just take, you
41 know, mostly for the horns, and it's not fair. When does
42 that rural subsistence priority come in in ANILCA, it
43 seems like it should be enacted now. Because we're
44 seeing more and more user groups and subsistence is
45 supposed to be a priority.

46
47 I'll talk about fish. It seems like this
48 warm weather, too, maybe it's affecting the salmon, you
49 know, lack of snow, that's when the salmon come down, the
50 fry during the springtime, and it seems like since it got

00017

1 warmer we've been seeing less and less salmon. And that
2 El Nino out in the ocean. But I'd like to read -- well,
3 I'll start off, last year, the Federal government, they
4 closed the spawning grounds up in the Aniak River to
5 commercial sportfishing operations but the State didn't
6 and I'd like to read a comment from the State biologist
7 here, it's about these boats.

8

9 Their use on the shallow waters of the
10 Korguraluk, Chuckwan (ph) inflowing
11 creeks could serious disrupt spawning
12 salmon and reduce their ability to
13 reproduce.

14

15 Because these commercial guiding
16 operations -- sportfishing operations on the spawning
17 grounds, when you had a biologist -- a State biologist
18 here at the last meeting, he was saying the same thing,
19 there's a certain week period when you drive over the
20 salmon on their eggs there, they crush their eggs and
21 they're really easy to damage. And it seems like the
22 State or the Federal government, they should protect the
23 spawning areas. Because when they close subsistence and
24 they don't close sportfishing it seems like it's not
25 fair, it's not fair to us sport -- commercial -- or to us
26 subsistence users. We haven't commercial fished here in
27 how many years, and we don't want to, it seem like they
28 shouldn't be on the spawning areas because what we're
29 seeing now days is some people, they're saying they're
30 going to boycott these closures, the four day closures.
31 They're not going to go along with it, it's not fair and
32 we hate to see that. I hate to sit on the bank and can't
33 fish with no fishing by fish rod and see these boats go
34 up to the spawning grounds and it's just not fair.

35

36 And there's another thing, I know the
37 Federal government could do is out in the ocean, these
38 trawlers, they catch a lot of pollock and cod and they're
39 taking a big bite out of the food chain and they should
40 be regulated to find out and also these hatcheries in
41 Southeast and Japan and Russia. They're putting out
42 billions and billions of chum salmon. And there's really
43 so much food out in the ocean for those salmon to eat and
44 when does it exceed the carrying capacity of the ocean
45 for our wild salmon. You know, maybe you could do
46 something about that.

47

48 But it's going to be harder and harder to
49 manage our moose and our salmon because there's more and
50 more user groups and that's just the way it's going to be

00018

1 and it seem like subsistence and sustained yield should
2 be a priority. And I hope you guys consider our
3 subsistence users and sustain yields in your
4 deliberations.

5

6 Thank you.

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Herman. Do we
9 have any questions for Herman.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Oh, one thing I omitted
14 from my Chair's report, I sat down with North Pacific
15 Fisheries and we talked about the high seas fisheries.
16 And the way they patrol their own people is by the honor
17 system. So they move them out by satellite
18 communications and stuff but they did admit that they do
19 have some bad apples out there that just don't listen.
20 They just slaughter -- if they catch so many salmon that
21 they're not supposed to take, they're supposed to move,
22 but some of them just don't move. So they're still
23 trying on their own and they say they're getting better
24 with the honor system but they just can't control all
25 these.

26

27 Any questions for Herman.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, thank you for
32 testifying. Again, we've seen you at a lot of our
33 meetings and thanks for expressing your concerns.

34

35 Carl.

36

37 MR. MORGAN: One of the advantages of
38 being in the Legislature, you've heard about the Salmon
39 Task Force that's been created last year. One of the big
40 complaints that, I guess, that we're getting -- well, the
41 task force was getting, there was nobody there from
42 Western Alaska, because of Gary Stevens moving to the
43 Senate, we've got an opening in the House side for a
44 member for the Salmon Task Force. And I've been
45 approached by the president of the Senate and the Speaker
46 of the House, that I'll probably get the seat. There's a
47 lot of competition for that one seat left. So I'm pretty
48 confident that I will be appointed and I will be looking
49 out for the best interests of Western Alaska.

50

00019

1 Thank you.

2

3 MR. H. MORGAN: Carl, maybe since you're
4 in the Legislature, maybe you could do something about a
5 commercial enterprise board to limit the number of
6 guiding -- operating guides, both sports and fishing. It
7 seems like even the guides are asking for it, they're
8 saying it's just a big free for all, and maybe you can
9 work to -- or you as a board could work to have a
10 commercial enterprise board to control the number of
11 guides that are operating. Because if we don't, you
12 know, it's going to hurt everybody.

13

14 MR. MORGAN: I know there is that concern
15 down there is to limit all non-residents to be guided.
16 And I agree with that statement. We're still working on
17 it, it's a work in progress, but I do agree with it --
18 all resident -- big game.

19

20 MR. H. MORGAN: What these guides are
21 doing is when we control the non-residents, what they're
22 doing is they're getting more clients from Kenai and
23 Anchorage to make up the difference. And so unless you
24 can have a limited entry system for number of guides,
25 number of clients they can bring in, you know, that would
26 really help us out here.

27

28 MR. MORGAN: Thank you.

29

30 MR. H. MORGAN: Thank you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Herman. You're
37 always welcome at our meetings.

38

39 Next person to testify is Harry Allain.

40

41 MR. ALLAIN: Good morning. Thank you for
42 having me testify before you. Like you said, my name is
43 Harry Allain and I was born and raised here.

44

45 I work for KNA and I've been there for
46 going on 18 years as a housing and tribal operations
47 officer. I build houses and work with tribal governments
48 under tribal laws. I've lived on the Aniak going on 35
49 years but I was born and raised and on it.

50

00020

1 And without sounding redundant to what
2 Leo said, I have pretty much the same concerns he has.

3
4 Before the commercial industry, the
5 fishing industry started here on the Kuskokwim, the Aniak
6 River, they estimated a million fish going up the Aniak
7 River. I'm really concerned how the State's managed the
8 fisheries, because they've managed it into this situation
9 we're in now. Where we're having to restrict our
10 subsistence take because we're trying to rebuild the fish
11 stocks.

12
13 We've hollered for years, at KNA, to --
14 they were having record catches and not making escapement
15 goals and they wouldn't listen to us. So that's
16 something to say about traditional knowledge here.

17
18 On the moose, I'm a little more critical
19 about why -- we're in a crises. The pressure from all
20 over. Predators. The influx of drop-off hunters and
21 non-resident hunters, down river pressure. It has been
22 detrimental to the moose population. And I just hope
23 that there's something that the Federal Board can do here
24 to try to do something to help restrict this. Because if
25 we don't there is going to be nothing left for our
26 children, for my grandchildren.

27
28 You know, I don't like the word,
29 subsistence, I eat moose meat and I eat fish. You can
30 tell I'm not a bad hunter.

31
32 (Laughter)

33
34 MR. ALLAIN: And I'm really -- I don't
35 know, you could say I'm emotional about this, but I have
36 seen it all up and down the river. I have a cabin up the
37 Kuskokwim a ways and we go there every chance that we
38 get. And in that area, especially in the fall or every
39 time we went there there was moose all the time. There's
40 nothing left. You don't see a moose anymore.

41
42 We're to the point to where in the last
43 two years I've hunted, for a certain amount of time, and
44 I saw, maybe -- I mean at my house, when I walk down, I
45 have to come to work in a boat every day and in the
46 summer time when I walk down to the beach, I have three
47 or four moose, cows sitting in the water eating right by
48 my boat, all summer long I see them. You know, for the
49 past two years I haven't saw one bull all summer long and
50 that really concerns me as far as our population is going

00021

1 to be able to sustain, what's -- what's happening to it
2 now.

3

4 That's all I got.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Harry. Any
7 questions for Harry.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Robert.

12

13 MR. WALKER: Harry, you know, that --
14 maybe you think that maybe we're not asking you no
15 questions but, you know, we're taking under consideration
16 all what you are testifying here to, it will be
17 deliberated later and we will discuss it. So if you
18 think that we're not going to ask you questions or we're
19 not concerned, we are concerned. You know, it's one of
20 the things that we just take in stride, everybody
21 testifies and ask a few questions and we'll go from
22 there.

23

24 MR. ALLAIN: I understand.

25

26 MR. WALKER: So, you know, just please --
27 you know, all of you just please bear with us, okay.

28

29 MR. ALLAIN: All right.

30

31 MR. WALKER: All right, thank you, Harry.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Robert for
34 clarifying that point. Many of you know that's the
35 reason that we ask you to state your name and use the
36 mic, it's being recorded and it will be transcribed later
37 on. And some of these issues will come up on the agenda.
38 I don't know how far we'll go on them but we are here to
39 listen to you and that's why we have these village
40 meetings.

41

42 Thank you for all that testimony. I'd
43 like to call George Siavelis.

44

45 MR. SIAVELIS: Good morning. Thank you
46 for this opportunity. I wasn't going to -- I didn't have
47 any specific testimony today on any of the proposals but
48 after hearing some of the testimony I felt compelled to,
49 at least, formally let this Council know a few of the
50 things that is going on.

00022

1 I presently am on the Board of Directors
2 of the Alaska Professional Hunters Association. And
3 that's a big game association. And I just want to say
4 that there are guides in this state that are very
5 concerned with the overhunting of State lands,
6 especially. Really, what it is ends up in State lands
7 because the wildlife Refuge system and the National Park
8 system has a pretty good system in place. You know, they
9 basically took it from the State, way back when the State
10 had exclusive guide use areas also.

11
12 There's a bunch of guides that are
13 responsible guides that want controls and there's also --
14 we're working hard as we possibly can. There is a APHA-
15 sponsored Bill, and I believe, and I could be wrong, but
16 I believe it's Seekins, that we've gotten to -- he's
17 going to introduce it, and if he's not going to move on
18 it we've talked about approaching Beverly Masik with it.
19 But at any rate, the APHA is a group of -- it's probably
20 the minority of guides, possibly but it's an active group
21 of responsible guides who are seeking control soon and
22 are very concerned about the moose and ungulates,
23 statewide, you know, sheep and caribou and everything.
24

25 But I just wanted to let this Council
26 know about the Bill, the Big Game Commercial Services
27 Board Bill that we've drafted and that we're trying to
28 push through the Legislature. And more rural -- and the
29 more rural support we get, you know, the more chance we
30 have of getting that through. And that Bill is something
31 that's going to address transporters also. It's going to
32 address resident hunters from Anchorage and from Kenai or
33 from anywhere also because it's going to place the
34 transporters that we've never had before under the same
35 umbrella of controls and this board will be able to tell
36 transporters how many hunters they'll be able to take
37 into a particular rural region. We've had hunters from
38 Anchorage, Kenai, Fairbanks or China, it doesn't matter,
39 and also guides, too. And most of us in the APHA,
40 eventually -- this Bill right now is a pretty bare bones
41 bill to get it through but once the board is created,
42 what we want to see is a similar system to what's on the
43 wildlife Refuge system now, where they have one guide in
44 each area. He has exclusive use areas. And pretty much,
45 you have to go through a very competitive process to get
46 that area, based upon his past history of violations, his
47 safety record, his experience, his impact on the wildlife
48 Refuge system. They have a -- a big part of the scoring
49 system is what his impact is going to be on subsistence
50 activities in that region.

00023

1 So it's a pretty good system. And we'd
2 like -- there's a bunch of us guides who want to evolve
3 towards back to that. We once had it and we want to have
4 it again.

5
6 And I also want to just offer myself as
7 one that's in this industry for any questions or to, you
8 know, offer any insight if I could help for this Council,
9 you know, as a member of that industry.

10
11 Thank you.

12
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, George. Any
14 questions for George.

15
16 MR. STICKMAN: I do.

17
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

19
20 MR. STICKMAN: My name is Micky Stickman.
21 I just wanted to let you know that you know with the new
22 regulations in place there's a seat open on our Council
23 for guides and you know.....

24
25 MR. SIAVELIS: I applied months ago.

26
27 MR. STICKMAN: So just so you know, you
28 know.

29
30 MR. SIAVELIS: My name's in the hat.

31 Thank you.

32
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

34
35 MR. REAKOFF: I would like George
36 Siavelis to know that this Council, last year, requested
37 the Federal Subsistence Board to endorse a commercial --
38 or write to the Legislature or petition the Legislature
39 for a commercial services board. And we, in our annual
40 report, requested that the Bureau of Land Management
41 produce a guide area, exclusive guide area criteria for
42 Bureau of Land Management lands and make guide areas.

43
44 Now, we have a response from the Director
45 that I was very displeased with, and the Director says
46 that they have some kind of an evaluation of over
47 saturation, well, nothing is being done on that. I'm not
48 satisfied with that response. At this meeting I intend
49 to submit another letter through this Council that the
50 Bureau of Land Management should have a guide area just

00024

1 like the US Fish and Wildlife and Park Service.

2

3 So this Council is very concerned with
4 that issue of these State no guide -- this big free for
5 all and it's very detrimental to the resources and this
6 Council is very concerned about that issue.

7

8 MR. SIAVELIS: Thank you. One other
9 additional note, I would like to advise the Council to
10 look for and watch out for on this big game commercial
11 services board, there's some sound already coming from
12 the Legislature to drop just the transporters out of it.
13 And in effect what you're going to have -- if you do --
14 if you go back to the old way and you have only guides in
15 there, it's just not going to solve the problem. You're
16 just going to regulate the little guys that are in the
17 APHA that are small and responsible now, you know, I
18 limit myself to four ungulate hunters a year. That's all
19 I've ever taken. I do that voluntarily. The law doesn't
20 dictate that to me, I do it voluntarily. But that's just
21 an example of the guys, some of the guys in the APHA,
22 that's running the APHA right now that control
23 themselves. But if we drop transporters out of it it's
24 just not going to have any effect. You end up with a big
25 game commercial services board without transporters and
26 the problem isn't solved.

27

28 So I just want to warn everybody to look
29 out for that to be coming, because the transporters just
30 want their industry dropped right out of it, you know,
31 and they have a powerful lobby.

32

33 Thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, George. Again,
36 we've been addressing that transporter issue a good many
37 years now. It's been about -- when was Carl elected to
38 Juneau -- quite some time.

39

40 (Laughter)

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: We've been addressing this
43 issue through him and a whole bunch of other people.
44 It's just that they don't come under fish and game, a lot
45 of transporters and stuff like that comes under
46 Department of Commerce and that's why we can't touch
47 them. And we are concerned, and we will stay concerned
48 about this issue.

49

50 Any further questions.

00025

1 Benedict.

2

3 MR. JONES: Yeah, my name is Benedict
4 Jones. Have you seen an increase the last three years of
5 your moose harvest during your guiding and also increase
6 in clients for the hunting in this area?

7

8 MR. SIAVELIS: I probably -- probably --
9 I don't believe -- you know, I don't have the numbers
10 from Toby, you know, here with me or certainly not in
11 front of me, but I believe in like the last three years,
12 I don't think there's been an awful big increase. There
13 has in the last, probably 10 years or so, you know,
14 there's been some increase.

15

16 You know there's a lot of debate in that
17 area. I'm not sure -- you know, certainly the biggest
18 impact on the moose has been the predators, you know, in
19 this area. I mean they're -- they're taking ani --
20 they're taking 90-some percent of the calves so you got
21 no recruitment. But there's been some -- certainly some
22 increase in non-local hunters, not to the percentage to
23 equal the detriment of the moose, no, of course. You
24 know, the moose have been annihilated and there's just a
25 modest increase in the non-local hunters.

26

27 But irregardless of the moose health, we
28 think there ought to be a guide use area anyway. Just it
29 provides a higher quality experience for the public. It
30 -- and it has less impact -- has potential impact on
31 subsistence activities that way.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, George. And
38 thanks for forewarning us about that application.

39

40 Again, pass the word that people who want
41 to testify in general, they can go ahead and fill this
42 form out any time and if you look at our booklet on how
43 we operate and work, deliberate on proposals, we open the
44 floor for public comments, but those comments will be
45 strictly for the proposals that we are discussing.
46 Again, if you know of people that want to testify, let us
47 know, let them know. And thanks for all the testimony
48 right now.

49

50 It woke me up. We didn't get much sleep,

00026

1 our little stove in our room was like a fire siren. It
2 just goes on and off and screams sometimes.

3

4 (Laughter)

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: So pardon the four of us
7 if we look like we're sleepy, we didn't get much sleep.

8

9 Review and adoption of agenda. I think
10 we've all had time to review the agenda so at this time
11 the Chair will entertain a motion to adopt the agenda as
12 presented.

13

14 MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, I think we
15 should take a little break here, what do you think, is it
16 almost recess time, what do you think Collins?

17

18 MR. COLLINS: Well, I think we could
19 adopt the agenda pretty quickly I think. I'll move to
20 adopt the agenda as presented.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

23

24 MR. WALKER: I'll second it.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Robert Walker.
27 Any questions, corrections, additions.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, all those in favor
32 of the motion signify by saying aye.

33

34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

37

38 (No opposing votes)

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. The next
41 item on the agenda is the minutes -- okay, now, we'll
42 take a 10 minute break, a smoke break, and we'll try to
43 set up our -- or find out -- what I would like to find
44 out during our break is where ADF&G people. We need them
45 here for our proposals. Plus we got to find out if Pete
46 DeMatteo out of Anchorage will be on-line teleconference
47 for proposal deliberations.

48

49 Thank you.

50

00027

1 (Off record)

2

3 (On record)

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Please take your seats. A
6 question just came up on what do we want to do for lunch.
7 We do have a menu that we can order out on from the
8 Dimond Willow Cafe. And Jerry will start passing it
9 around so we can make our own orders and just have it
10 delivered here. I guess we could get all the Staff
11 present if you want to be involved in it. So go ahead
12 and try it that way, let's just have it delivered and
13 we'll take a break when it comes because we got to break
14 sometime.

15

16 One other question that I had was that I
17 was just wondering whether we were legal without ADF&G on
18 these proposals? But I think that we can work through
19 some of these proposals because we're just aligning with
20 the State, they do have some written comments and
21 recommendations here.

22

23 MR. REAKOFF: They're not showing up?

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: They are. A few of them
26 are, right, are they coming up at all?

27

28 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I believe
29 that there are some Fish and Game folks going to show up.
30 I'm not exactly sure what flight they're on but hopefully
31 they'll be here by this afternoon. And we could go ahead
32 and proceed, because we do have their preliminary
33 comments submitted as written comments in the book and
34 then, you know, the Council can go ahead and take their
35 action if they'd like. And then if Fish and Game wants,
36 they can ask the Council to readdress the issue if they
37 want to and then it would be up to you whether you wanted
38 to readdress it with their comments or not. But you'd be
39 perfectly legal to go ahead and proceed without them
40 here, if you wish.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any comments from the
43 Council, how do you want to handle this because I don't
44 really feel comfortable without them here?

45

46 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Carl.

49

50 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I think if it's non-

00028

1 controversial I think we can go ahead and hear it but if
2 it's got some controversial issues, then I think we
3 should table it until they're here.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray.

6

7 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I was just going to
8 say the same thing.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Is this a general
11 consensus of the Council?

12

13 (Council Nods Affirmatively)

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: It looks like it's a go,
16 because we have a lot of alignment stuff anyway.

17

18 Okay, we'll proceed on that matter. But
19 the first item on our agenda now is the approval of the
20 minutes from the October 8th and 9th meeting, this is
21 under Tab B.

22

23 I know this came out quite awhile ago. I
24 did not go through it then, I didn't go through it very
25 thoroughly. So how does the Council want to handle this?

26

27 Jerry.

28

29 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I do have
30 -- we have received a few comments from Staff that were
31 at that meeting for some changes. Most of them are just
32 editorial changes but I do have a few significant changes
33 for you to be aware of before you adopt your minutes.

34

35 Those are on Page 3 on your
36 recommendations during your fall meeting regarding the
37 fisheries proposals. At the top of Page 3, the Western
38 Interior Regional Council's recommendation on the first
39 one No. 28, under recommendation it should be support the
40 proposal as recommended by Staff rather than support the
41 proposal as written. It should be support the proposal
42 as recommended by Staff. And that would go for the same
43 for Proposal 02, the recommendation of the Western
44 Interior Council was to support the proposal as
45 recommended by Staff instead of as written.

46

47 And then just a clarification under
48 Proposal 3, that the requested change only affected
49 District 2 of the Kuskokwim River. So it would now read
50 under requested change, allow the use of rod and reel to

00029

1 subsistence fish for salmon in District 2 of the
2 Kuskokwim River and tributaries within District 2.

3

4 So those are the only significant changes
5 that I have received from various agencies.

6

7 MR. WALKER: Jerry.

8

9 MR. BERG: Yes.

10

11 MR. WALKER: Robert here. I got a
12 question here, when you say District 2, what do you mean
13 District 2? Is it W-2 or what is the term that's used by
14 the AF&DG [sic]?

15

16 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chair. Robert, it is
17 District W-2 of the Kuskokwim River, correct.

18

19 MR. WALKER: Okay, thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, at this time the
22 Chair will entertain a motion to adopt the minutes as
23 presented -- I mean as amended.

24

25 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, Robert Walker.
26 I'll do the minutes as amended.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

29

30 MR. COLLINS: I'll second that. Ray
31 Collins.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. And now we go
34 back to deliberations, corrections. Did you have any
35 more significant ones?

36

37 MR. BERG: (Shakes head negatively)

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead and go through
40 them for another minute or two, if you find any let me
41 know.

42

43 (Pause)

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Just for the public's
46 information, this is the second meeting we are having
47 without our full-time coordinator. We had a tough time
48 in Fairbanks where we had that last meeting because we
49 were meeting in conjunction with Eastern Interior. And
50 that's the only time we could get all the Staff there.

00030

1 So we've been having a tough time the last couple of
2 meetings.

3

4 (Pause)

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: I've got one question,
7 this is on Page 1, for Benedict, under 4C1, did you ever
8 come up with a Council resolution that was supposed to be
9 addressed at this meeting?

10

11 MR. JONES: Are you talking about the
12 driftnetting extension?

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

15

16 MR. JONES: Yes. The village council
17 drafted a resolution, I don't have the copy with me but
18 we did propose it to this committee here and we're about
19 to propose it to the Alaska Commercial Fishery Division
20 next month. So we're trying to get support from Nulato,
21 Kaltag, Galena and Ruby and possibly Huslia to submit
22 similar proposals.

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack, do you remember if
25 we took any action on this? Did we approve of the
26 content or -- okay, Jerry, go ahead.

27

28 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I believe
29 that Vince was working with Benedict on drafting that
30 proposal and Vince did forward me a copy of that draft
31 proposal and we have it on our agenda under VIIG3 for
32 discussion of that proposal. I do have copies of the
33 proposal that Vince was working on with Benedict for the
34 Council to review later on in the agenda.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, that's all I was
37 after. Then we do have something in writing to
38 deliberate on?

39

40 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we do.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, that's the only
43 question I had on that.

44

45 (Pause)

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further changes,
48 additions, amendments.

49

50 (Pause)

00031

1 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Carl.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, hearing no additions
6 or corrections, I call for the question.

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called on
9 the motion, all those in favor of the motion to adopt the
10 minutes as amended, corrected, signify by saying aye.

11

12 IN UNISON: Aye.

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

15

16 (No opposing votes)

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. The next
19 item on the agenda is to review and take action on some
20 of our proposals. We did come to a consensus that if we
21 see n controversy we will go ahead and take action and
22 for those that we have questions on we will wait until
23 the AK Department of Fish and Game shows up.

24

25 Okay. Under proposal review procedure,
26 is this the correct order?

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is that the correct order,
31 Jerry, under proposal review procedure?

32

33 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman. If you'd
34 like to go ahead and proceed on proposals, all the
35 proposals are listed starting under Tab C. And Proposal
36 1, I believe will be addressed by Pat McClenahan and that
37 proposal would adopt -- it's a statewide proposal. You
38 guys will have two statewide proposals in front of you
39 today. This one is a statewide provision allowing the
40 taking of wildlife for traditional funerary or mortuary
41 ceremonies.

42

43 The proposed regulations would simplify
44 and standardize existing regulations and provide an equal
45 opportunity to all Federally-qualified subsistence users.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: It's been our standard
48 operating procedures to go ahead and introduce the
49 proposal as presented and introduce a motion to adopt it;
50 is that correct? Is that the way we've been doing it?

00032

1 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

4

5 MR. COLLINS: I'll move to adopt WP03-01.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

8

9 MR. PETERS: I second it.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Ray Collins and
12 seconded by Emmitt Peters.

13

14 Okay, regular procedure, Jerry.

15

16 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I believe

17 Pat McClenahan is ready to move us into the analysis

18 portion of Proposal 1 for the statewide proposals. Pat,

19 I'll just turn it over to you.

20

21 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

22 I'm Pat McClenahan, Staff anthropologist.

23

24 The draft Staff analysis for Proposal
25 WP03-01 can be found at Tab C, Page 36 and following.

26

27 Proposal WP03-01 was submitted by the
28 Office of Subsistence Management and requests that the
29 Federal Subsistence Board establish a statewide
30 regulation allowing the taking of wildlife for religious
31 and ceremonial potlatch purposes.

32

33 Federal Subsistence regulations allow for
34 the taking of wildlife for outside of proposed seasons
35 and harvest limits for ceremonial purposes. Adoption of
36 this proposal would standardize and simplify Federal
37 Subsistence wildlife regulations and it would extend an
38 opportunity to all Federally-qualified subsistence users
39 to harvest wildlife for use in traditional religious
40 ceremonial potlatches.

41

42 Proposed regulations require that the
43 harvesting does not violate recognized principles of fish
44 and wildlife conservation and prior notice must be given
45 to the delegated local Federal land manager.

46

47 Existing regulations are varied around
48 the state. They can be found in Appendix A of this
49 analysis. Approval of this proposed regulations would
50 revoke the current general wildlife regulation for Region

00033

1 6 but the existing regulations for the Nuchalawoyya
2 Potlatch and the Kaltag/Nulato Stick Dance in Unit 21
3 would be retained.

4
5 The specifics can be found on Pages 41
6 and 42 of your Council book.

7
8 You may take wildlife outside the seasons
9 or harvest limits for traditional
10 religious ceremonies for funerary or
11 mortuary ceremonies. The person
12 organizing the ceremony must contact the
13 Federal land management agency with
14 information about the species and
15 location it will be taken.

16
17 There cannot be any violation of
18 principles of fish and wildlife
19 conservation.

20
21 A report must be filed to the Federal
22 land management agency within 15 days
23 after the harvest.

24
25 No permit or harvest ticket is required.
26 But the harvester must be an Alaska rural
27 resident with C&T for the resource in
28 that particular area.

29
30 With respect to State regulations. This
31 proposal would bring Federal regulations a bit more in
32 line with State regulations that were passed in November
33 of 2002, those can be found in your analysis on Page 37
34 of your Council book.

35
36 State regulations allow for the taking of
37 big game for certain religious ceremonies. A written
38 permit is not needed, but prior notification through a
39 tribal chief or village council is required. A written
40 report after the harvest is required. On an annual
41 basis, the State lists areas where specific large mammals
42 in specific areas cannot be taken for ceremonial purposes
43 because of shortages of that resource.

44
45 With regard to Federal regulatory
46 history. Since 1991 Federal Subsistence regulations have
47 contained provisions in subpart B allowing the Board to
48 authorize the taking of fish and wildlife outside of
49 prescribed seasons and harvest limits for special
50 purposes including ceremonies and potlatches. The Board

00034

1 has, on a case by case basis, implemented unit-specific
2 provisions either through regulatory changes or special
3 actions allowing the taking of wildlife for the cultural
4 educational and religious programs and ceremonies.

5
6 As of the 2002/2003 regulatory year, such
7 provisions exist in 13 of the 26 Federal wildlife
8 management units have provisions like this one.

9
10 While unit-specific regulations vary, the
11 Board has required that the harvesting of the resource
12 does not violate recognized principles of fish and
13 wildlife conservation and that the requester must give
14 the following to the appropriate Federal land manager.

15
16 Information about the activity, and in
17 the case of funerary or mortuary
18 ceremonies, the name or names of decedent
19 or decedents. Reporting of the species
20 sex, number, location and timing of the
21 harvest. And the name and address of the
22 harvester or harvesters.

23
24 The Board also has required:

25
26 That the harvester be a qualified rural
27 subsistence user for the species and area
28 in which the harvest occurs.

29
30 Also in most cases the appropriate
31 Federal manager must be notified prior to
32 attempting to harvest the resource.

33
34 The organized communal consumption of
35 wild or Native foods is a central feature of Alaska
36 Native cultural gatherings. The serving of fish and
37 wildlife reaffirms ethnic identity and ties to the land
38 and the resources. Participation in such feasts
39 serves to transmit, sustain and reinforce cultural
40 values, beliefs, practices, traditions, social order and
41 group solidarity.

42
43 While all Alaska Natives ceremonially
44 recognize the passing of group members, not all of
45 Alaska's people hold funerary, mortuary or mortuary
46 potlaches. This fact was recognized during the Regional
47 Advisory Council's contemplations of FP03-27 that
48 proposed allowing the use of fish for such ceremonies
49 statewide.

50

00035

1 The effects of the proposal under
2 consideration. Adoption of this proposal should have
3 minimal impacts on wildlife populations. It would
4 standardize and simplify Federal Subsistence regulations
5 pertaining to the taking of wildlife for use in
6 traditional religious ceremonies. It would afford all
7 Federally-qualified subsistence users an opportunity to
8 take wildlife for use as food in traditional religious
9 ceremonies that are part of a funerary or mortuary cycle
10 including memorial potlatches and may not be applicable
11 to local customs in some areas of the state.

12
13 IT would revoke the general provision in
14 current wildlife regulations for Region 6, but would keep
15 the two ceremony-specific regulations currently in place
16 in Unit 21.

17
18 Our preliminary conclusion is to adopt
19 the proposal with modifications as presented in the
20 Council book on Pages 40 and 41.

21
22 These modifications adopt language and
23 some provisions contained in FP03-27 that was adopted in
24 December 2002 pertaining to the same issue for fish.

25
26 For your information, at their recent
27 Council meetings, the North Slope, Seward Peninsula
28 Yukon-Kuskokwim, and Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional
29 Advisory Council approved this proposal with an
30 additional modification. They were concerned about the
31 requirement to give the name of the person who has died,
32 and they requested that that portion be removed from the
33 proposal.

34
35 This modification would help align the
36 proposed regulation with the similar recently adopted
37 proposal for fish.

38
39 Our justifications are, adoption of the
40 proposal would recognize the importance of wildlife in
41 Alaska Native ceremonial and religious activities
42 statewide. The modified proposed regulation is a product
43 of combining portions of the various unit-specific
44 regulations and the newly adopted statewide fish
45 regulation. The goals of the proposals included
46 standardizing regulations and more extending equal
47 opportunity to all Federally-qualified subsistence users.

48
49 The proposed regulatory change would not
50 impose additional requirements on most units.

00036

1 This flexibility removes the burden from
2 the hunter and provides protection from undue harassment
3 by law enforcement personnel. The potential for such
4 occurrences has increased with recent changes of State of
5 Alaska hunting regulations. The regulatory language
6 provides for the conservation of wildlife populations.
7 However, little additional harvest is anticipated as the
8 practice has been ongoing under State of Alaska, and in
9 some cases, Federal provisions.

10
11 Unit-specific, species-specific or
12 ceremony-specific would not be changed.

13
14 I think, Jerry, that you'll give other
15 Council recommendations, won't you?

16
17 MR. BERG: (Nods affirmatively)

18
19 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman, that
20 concludes my report.

21
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: So if I read this proposal
23 review procedure, it seems like it changes every time.
24 The next step would be the agency comments, Jerry.

25
26 MR. BERG: Unless we have any other
27 agency representatives here in the room that would like
28 to provide any comments, I know Fish and Game is not
29 here. I don't know if any of the Refuges that are
30 represented here -- I don't see anybody moving to the
31 front of the room.

32
33 I do have some written comments that you
34 can find on Page 35, Fish and Game did support some
35 written comments and they did present this same
36 recommendation just last week at the Chevak meeting, or
37 two weeks ago for the YK-Delta Council meeting.

38
39 They feel that in order to minimize
40 confusion and achieve consistency with the State
41 ceremonial harvest regulation, that goes into effect July
42 1st, that the Department recommends the proposal be
43 amended to mirror the action taken by the State Board of
44 Game at its November meeting in Juneau, just this past
45 November.

46
47 They feel that if the State -- if the
48 Federal statewide regulation is adopted, the Federal
49 Subsistence Board should clarify how existing unit-
50 specific ceremonial harvest regulations will be affected.

00037

1 And there is some discussion about the actions taken by
2 the State Board of Game just on the -- in the analysis on
3 Page 38, about the middle of the page, it talks about a
4 summary of what the Board of Game did. Their actions
5 indicate that prior to notification stipulations -- a
6 written summary of the Board of Game actions indicate
7 that prior notification stipulations have been added to
8 the regulations that already exist under State
9 regulations with the exception that the Koyukon
10 Athabascan hunters wanting to harvest wildlife under the
11 State's new provisions must comply with the following
12 options, and then there's two options down there.

13
14 So that's the State's comments at this
15 point. They'd like to -- they feel like there's a lot of
16 effort that went into the Board of Game process and
17 they'd like to see the Federal regulations align with
18 their efforts so far.

19
20 And then we also received public comments
21 that are also listed on Page 35. We received three
22 written public comments. One from the Alaska Native
23 Brotherhood, which I believe is in Southeast Alaska. And
24 they feel that the Native residents should be included
25 when making regulations for the taking of fish and game,
26 or for funerary or mortuary cycle celebrations, including
27 40-day parties and pay-off potlatches.

28
29 We also received a comment from the
30 Asa'carsarmiut Tribe of Alaska, I believe that's the
31 tribe in the St. Mary's area, unless anybody knows -- I
32 believe they're from St. Mary's, and they wrote that this
33 regulation should be reserved only for Alaska natives if
34 possible, since Alaska natives are the ones who have been
35 doing this for generations.

36
37 And then we also received comments from
38 the Denali SRC. They took this action up at their
39 meeting in late February or middle February and they
40 unanimously supported Proposal 1 to establish a statewide
41 regulation allowing the taking of wildlife for religious
42 and ceremonial and potlatch purposes for the reasons
43 stated in their justification -- in the justification.

44
45 I do have one thing further to add to
46 what Pat mentioned for the YK Council meeting in Chevak
47 two weeks ago. They did, in fact, pass a resolution
48 saying that they did not want the decedent listed on the
49 permit. They also wanted to make sure -- or their
50 recommendation was to allow for either sex of the animal

00038

1 to be taken rather than a specific sex and right now the
2 regulation reads that a sex needs to be identified on the
3 permit and they want it to be for animal, the first
4 animal they encounter when they're out on this hunt. And
5 that they also wanted the report that's due back to the
6 regional manager to be a responsibility of the local
7 tribal office rather than the individual hunter. Because
8 they felt like the individual hunter was just supporting
9 that local tribe and they didn't feel like the individual
10 hunter should be responsible, it should be the tribal
11 office responsibility to report back to the local
12 manager.

13

14 So that's all the information I have on
15 this proposal, Mr. Chairman.

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Pat.

18

19 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

20 I just wanted to let you know that the Bristol Bay
21 Subsistence Advisory Council very strongly stressed that
22 they would support this if it was for traditional, well-
23 established traditional potlatches and ceremon --
24 religious ceremon -- or ceremonial -- pardon me,
25 funerary ceremonies, but not for something that was just
26 starting up.

27

28 Thank you, sir.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: So, Jerry, on Page 35,
31 with the exception of the Koyukon Athabascans, that means
32 that they are pretty much left out of all the other
33 requirements - Page 38?

34

35 MR. BERG: Right. Under State
36 regulation, we don't have the specific State regulation
37 that the Board of Game adopted in November. I guess, at
38 the time that this was being put together they didn't
39 have the specific regulation in place. But because there
40 has already been ceremonial potlatch permitting process
41 established for the Koyukon Athabascans, they didn't want
42 to remove all the efforts that have gone into that
43 process that was developed throughout the years. So they
44 left that in place, which is listed there on Page 38.
45 But they made modifications, basically to the rest of the
46 state and then left that portion in place because there
47 was so much effort put into those regulations initially.

48

49 That's my understanding, Mr. Chair.

50

00039

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jerry. Ray.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. The
4 regulations as written, Jerry, as I understand it, they
5 do say that you have to specify what sex you're looking
6 for. I think that's an important point because from what
7 I've heard traditionally that is in opposition to the
8 idea that when you go out you take whatever game presents
9 itself to you, becomes available. You don't choose ahead
10 of time what you're going to go hunting for and I'm
11 wondering if that should be modified. Because there is a
12 stipulation that it has to be according to wildlife
13 principles so there's a real -- if that animal is
14 endangered or something you would pass it up. But other
15 than that, I don't think you should have that restriction
16 in there.

17

18 That's my comment.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further comments.

21 Robert.

22

23 MR. WALKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. On Page
24 35 under written public comment, support by Alaska Native
25 Brotherhood. It says here on the bottom sentence here it
26 says include the 40-day party. I think it should be a
27 potlatch, we have potlatches back on the Yukon, we don't
28 have parties. So I don't know how the State is going to
29 look at this or how we're going to look at this. I mean
30 it should be something that we should discuss here before
31 it gets further before somebody else takes a different
32 idea, like we have a 30-day [sic] party and we'll go kill
33 a moose. I mean there should be a little more -- little
34 more definition here.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Robert. So
37 we're already looking at a couple of changes on these
38 recommendations. But if I read that ANB recommendation,
39 that's all it is at this time, is a recommendation,
40 right, Jerry?

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Right?

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: It's just a recommendation
49 from ANB? And I would dare say that it would be area-
50 specific because we are looking at a statewide one,

00040

1 right?

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is that right?

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Boy, we need some help
10 around here. I should quit all the proposals, I think
11 our procedures are a little bit wrong, too, they're not
12 like we did before.

13

14 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I
15 think Robert's correct in, you know, I have not heard it
16 called a party. The 40-day is celebrated, I know, in the
17 villages like Nikolai and Telida in our area, it's part
18 of the Orthodox tradition of having a 40-day ceremony,
19 but I don't think they call it a party.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

22

23 MR. WALKER: Yes, that's the same way
24 Ray. It's the Catholic church, it's a 40-day, kind of
25 like a potlatch feast combined with the Catholic church
26 and the tribal government.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Pat.

29

30 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman. In
31 addition to these general provisions, if you elect to
32 support these provisions or modify them and support them,
33 you can add area-specific provisions in the future. That
34 doesn't preclude your having area-specific provisions.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: So that -- since they
37 already recognize the Koyukon Athabascans, or Koyukuk --
38 or Koyukon Athabascans, they could go area-specific for
39 the rest of them, right?

40

41 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman. That's a
42 State provision, and that applies to State lands and
43 State regulations. We can do something like that and
44 have done in the past for Federal lands.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: So maybe I was premature
47 in presenting a motion to -- entertain a motion to adopt
48 -- we can change it. So if we adopt this one, what we'd
49 be adopting is the proposed regulation on Page 31, right,
50 and that is the only thing that we would be adopting,

00041

1 right?

2

3 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman. I suggest
4 you look at Page 4 -- oh, boy, hold on just a second.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Page 31.

7

8 MS. MCCLENAHAN: No, look at Page -- at
9 Page 40, where it says preliminary conclusion. The Staff
10 recommendation is to support the proposal with
11 modifications. And then I suggested that you might want
12 to further modify it by removing the name of the
13 decedent, the request for the name of the decedent.

14

15 And then after that is the language, the
16 specific language, would you like me to read the specific
17 language, that we propose?

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: What's the pleasure of the
20 Council?

21

22 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman. You know,
23 we're looking at WP -- well, on Page 31, I agree, but if
24 we adopt this we're also adopting the recommendations
25 from the Staff, from the ADF&G, and I think the written
26 comments, the public written comments, we can change that
27 first modification from party to.....

28

29 MR. WALKER: To potlatch or feast.

30

31 MR. MORGAN:potlatch or feast.

32

33 MR. WALKER: Yes.

34

35 MR. MORGAN: Because I think when we do
36 adopt this we are adopting the modifications already
37 because Staff recommendation and ADF&G's comments support
38 with modifications.

39

40 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Pat.

43

44 MS. MCCLENAHAN: You're adopting the
45 language on Page 40 if you adopt with modification,
46 however, if you want to take into consideration removing
47 the requirement to list the decedent, the name of the
48 decedent, you have to, in addition, make another
49 modification. That's entirely up to you.

50

00042

1 I can read you the language that you
2 would be adopting if you'd like me to at this time. Is
3 that your pleasure?

4
5 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'm just wondering why
6 they want it to go statewide, because it's all different
7 and we'd have to modify, modify, modify, amend, amend,
8 amend because when we introduced this to the State and
9 had it passed 20 years ago we fought them tooth and nail
10 to get the prior notification, fought them on naming the
11 decedent, we fought them on number, the sex and
12 everything, that's why they just leave us out, I'm just
13 wondering why do we have to be different?

14
15 Jerry.

16
17 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman. And you're
18 correct. And you can see that the existing Federal
19 regulations start on Page 41 and there are regulations
20 currently in place in Federal regulations for Unit 21, 24
21 and then if you follow over to Page 42, you can see
22 specifically there are regulations for Unit 21
23 specifically for the Kaltag/Nulato Stickdance. For the
24 potlatch in Unit 21. So there are a number of
25 regulations statewide. And the attempt here was to try
26 to -- that the Federal Board was getting these requests
27 all over the state and they wanted to just come up with
28 one regulation so they didn't have to keep setting
29 specific regulations region by region.

30
31 And you know, your Council has dealt with
32 this issue numerous times in the past and you have set
33 regional regulations and if you'd rather leave those
34 regulations in place then that can certainly be your
35 recommendation. But this, you know, that's just the
36 Staff recommendation that you see there in front of you
37 and if you support that with modifications, you can
38 otherwise you can go ahead and just recommend to leave
39 the existing regulations in place.

40
41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any other comments from
42 the Council. Robert.

43
44 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
45 Jerry, when you get back to Unit 21, are you discussing
46 Unit 21 in whole, all the way from A through E or are you
47 just discussing 21 like up in Tanana, 21(D) up Nulato,
48 Kaltag, does it concern -- does it run all the way down
49 to Holy Cross 21(A), or it says, you know, when you go
50 look at -- go to Page 41 it says harvest of wildlife

00043

1 traditional religious ceremonies in 21, does that mean
2 all of 21?

3

4 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman. Yes, for
5 that portion it does mean all of Unit 21, and it means
6 all of Unit 24. It's a general regulation for those two
7 units. And then there are some specific ones, okay, that
8 are on the next page. The potlatch in Unit 21 and the
9 stickdance in Unit 21 are specific and have specific
10 regulations for those two. So you have two things on the
11 books.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further discussion by
14 the Council.

15

16 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray.

19

20 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. In
21 looking at this on Page 40, maybe my comments about the
22 species was out of order. It says that in the
23 notification of the Department there, you're not required
24 to list -- the species and numbers to be taken is to be
25 listed in your notification but you don't have to tell
26 the sex. The sex only comes in down under two, it looks
27 like, that the Federal manager will establish the number,
28 species and sex or place if necessary for conservation
29 purposes.

30

31 So generally they would not specify the
32 sex unless there was a conservation reason. And it's not
33 -- I was thinking the individual had to state it and
34 that's not the way it reads, it's just the manager, if
35 it's required for conservation. So I kind of withdraw my
36 comments on the other.

37

38 But do you need a motion then to add to
39 -- our motion was to adopt, I guess we need to modify
40 that to strike out the name of the decedent if that's the
41 wish of our group, right, is that what we do, move to
42 modify our existing motion?

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, with the -- who made
45 the motion? Tina.

46

47 MS. HILE: Ray did.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: And.....

50

00044

1 MR. COLLINS: I made it.
2
3 CHAIRMAN SAM:seconded by Robert?
4
5 MR. WALKER: Nobody did.
6
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Tina.
8
9 MS. HILE: Emmitt.
10
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Uh?
12
13 MS. HILE: Emmitt.
14
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.
16
17 MR. PETERS: I seconded it.
18
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. I think the correct
20 procedure here would be to amend the motion to adopt with
21 modifications and then we'd have to list the
22 modifications. With the consensus of the second.....
23
24 MR. COLLINS: Oh, yeah, I see.
25
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Uh-huh.
27
28 MR. COLLINS: I would be willing to
29 change my original motion to add that wording then. So
30 we would be following -- I think there was two other
31 groups that have passed it with modified.....
32
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.
34
35 MR. COLLINS:we'd be following
36 them, wasn't there, somewhere there was.....
37
38 CHAIRMAN SAM: It's on Page 32.
39
40 MR. COLLINS: Well, 49. Seward Peninsula
41 and North Slope on 39.
42
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.
44
45 MR. COLLINS: They supported with
46 modifications removing.....
47
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.
49
50 MR. COLLINS:the requirement, so

00045

1 that would be that wording.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

4

5 MR. COLLINS: I'll agree if the second
6 agrees to follow that wording?

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is that fine with you
9 Emmitt?

10

11 MR. PETERS: Yes.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further
14 deliberation.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: I see Randy Rogers is here
19 so we're legal now.

20

21 (Laughter)

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Does the State have any
24 comments on this other than your -- go ahead, come up
25 here. With the pleasure of the Council, I'd like to hear
26 AD&F&G's [sic] comments, that way we'll all be legal, I
27 think.

28

29 (Laughter)

30

31 State your name and use the microphone.

32 Thank you.

33

34 MR. NOWLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My
35 name is Roy Nowlin and I'm with the State Department of
36 Fish and Game, Division of Wildlife Conservation out of
37 Fairbanks and I'm the management coordinator there.

38

39 I have very little to add here. You have
40 our written comments on Page 35. There were actually
41 three points in there that the State would just like to
42 bring to your attention. We support this proposal with
43 modification but there were three points there, just of
44 course to bear in mind that what you're considering here
45 applies only to Federal lands, while State regulations
46 apply across others as well.

47

48 The second point, Mr. Chairman, the
49 proposed Federal regulation provides that wildlife can be
50 taken for food in traditional, religious ceremonies while

00046

1 the State regulation authorizes the taking of big game,
2 rather than -- so the State regulation is more specific
3 to big game only than what you have in front of you. And
4 of course, we always recommend to try to achieve as much
5 consistency there as possible.

6

7 And the third point there is that the
8 Federal regulation does not exempt the Koyukon potlatch
9 ceremony from prior notification requirements, while the
10 State does not have a requirement for prior notification.

11

12 Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: So if we passed this with
15 modification then the Koyukon Athabascan would have to
16 follow up on that prior notification?

17

18 MR. NOWLIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That's
19 my understanding and we would rather have consistency
20 with State regulation if at all possible.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: So if we were consistent
23 with the State regulations then we would just leave the
24 Koyukon Athabascan's out, period, because we do not have
25 that prior notification clause and agree with what the
26 State already, don't we?

27

28 MR. NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman. In answer to
29 your first question, I would guess, with some of your
30 experts here with OSM could give you some advice on that,
31 but we would rather have the prior notification
32 eliminated for the Koyukon potlatch ceremony so that
33 there would be consistency between the two regulations.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jerry, what's your take on
36 this?

37

38 MR. BERG: Well, if you move forward and
39 you take -- you support the motion that Ray made with his
40 changes it will create some differences between State and
41 Federal regulations. It will make, you know, all the
42 Federal regulations the same and I believe it will
43 incorporate existing efforts that you've made in the
44 regions in this area, it will include those with the
45 changes that you've included on Page 40. But it will
46 create some differences between State and Federal
47 regulations so they will not be consistent if this passes
48 through to the Federal Subsistence Board, if they go
49 ahead and approve it.

50

00047

1 So if you feel like this is appropriate
2 for your area then I would say go ahead and move forward
3 with it knowing that it is going to create some
4 differences between Federal and State regulations.

5
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Well, with that in mind I
7 just wouldn't want to see it pass then. Utilize the
8 existing regulations already in place by the State. And
9 that's just my feeling.

10
11 Any other comments from the Council.
12 Robert.

13
14 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. I think we
15 should table this and we can discuss this later here
16 after we get a little more understanding here because I'd
17 like to hear a little bit more before I say we throw it
18 out.

19
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack, you had something to
21 add.

22
23 MR. REAKOFF: I would prefer that this
24 Federal regulation mirrors the Koyukon aspect to the
25 greatest degree. And I would also agree with the other
26 Councils that the deceased name not be mentioned. But I
27 would like to see the most mirrored regulations so
28 there's the least amount of confusion. The tribal
29 councils are going to have to try to comply with these
30 regulations and the least amount of confusion would be
31 the better.

32
33 So I would like to see this pass through
34 the Federal program, but I would also like to see that
35 it's as close to the State regulation as we can get it.

36
37 MR. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, if we
38 voted against our existing motion then we could make
39 another one that would direct -- that would advise the
40 Federal Board to align it with the State with the
41 exception of mentioning deceased. We could have another
42 motion to that effect. And then allow them to do the
43 work there of aligning it up with the State, at the
44 Federal level, the Board level, with that one exception.

45
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: So you would -- what would
47 that motion -- amendment read?

48
49 MR. COLLINS: Well, I would just vote
50 this existing one down to get it off the table and then

00048

1 somebody could make a motion if they -- as Jack said, if
2 you want to align -- you want the Federal Board to align
3 with the State, we could recommend that with the
4 exception of naming the deceased. Would that do it?

5
6 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I agree.
7 Because I think if I can remember in a lot of our
8 deliberations and our approach in trying to make the two,
9 the Federal and the State align each other and plus we
10 always look at, does this make it more inclusive or does
11 it restrict, and we usually tend to try to make it more
12 user-friendly.

13
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Carl. So in
15 effect, Ray, you would be, with the consent of Emmitt,
16 withdraw your motion?

17
18 MR. COLLINS: Well, we could do that but
19 we could just vote it down, I mean just a vote.

20
21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further
22 deliberation.

23
24 MR. STICKMAN: I would rather just table
25 it instead of voting it down. I wouldn't -- I would have
26 reservations on voting anything down. Because usually
27 you're supposed to vote in favor of things. So I would,
28 you know, exercise some caution there.

29
30 MR. COLLINS: Okay. I'm willing to
31 withdraw if the second is, I will withdraw my motion.

32
33 MR. PETERS: Yeah, me, too. Because I
34 think like Robert said we got to table it and get a
35 better understanding about this. So I withdraw.

36
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you Ray and
38 Emmitt. Jack.

39
40 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to
41 make a motion to adopt an endorsement of this principle,
42 but that the Federal Board adopt regulations that mirror
43 the State language with the exclusion of requiring the
44 deceased name to be mentioned.

45
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

47
48 MR. STICKMAN: I second.

49
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Micky Stickman

00049

1 for the record. Any further discussion.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 MR. WALKER: Question.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called.

8 All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

9

10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

13

14 (No opposing votes)

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. So much

17 for zipping through, uh?

18

19 (Laughter)

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Before we go any further,

22 it is now 11:30 so I would like the Council to place some

23 orders or lunch. Take just turn off the mic for about a

24 minute or two. We are ordering lunch and we do intend to

25 take a break when it arrives so please bear with us

26 again.

27

28 (Pause)

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: It is now 11:45 by my

31 watch. Do we have everyone we need to proceed -- okay,

32 I'd like to work until the lunch comes in and then take a

33 good lunch break. So proposal introduction. So proposal

34 introduction but before we do that our standard procedure

35 has been to go ahead and make a motion to support, with

36 modification or support the proposal outright, so at this

37 time the Chair will entertain a motion to adopt WP03-02,

38 provide for a designated hunter provision for most

39 species and hunts.

40

41 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I make a

42 motion to adopt WP03-2.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

45

46 MR. MORGAN: I second it, Mr. Chairman.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you, Carl.

49 For most of you, we usually make a motion to adopt all

50 proposals or support all proposals because we feel we do

00050

1 not want to put a negative spin on anything right off the
2 bat and we do make a motion to adopt this proposal and
3 second it, we then go into deliberations.

4

5 So Proposal introduction. Pat.

6

7 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 Proposal WP03-02 was submitted the Office of Subsistence
9 Management. It proposes to change the general provisions
10 for all units to standardize the designated hunter
11 regulations.

12

13 We're on Page 56, by the way, under Tab
14 C.

15

16 This standardization gives a uniform
17 opportunity for subsistence users to harvest or benefit
18 from the harvest of ungulates in all areas of the state.
19 In the Federal Subsistence Management Program, the term
20 ungulate refers to any species of hoofed mammal including
21 deer, elk, caribou, moose, mountain goat, dall sheep and
22 muskoxen.

23

24 Currently designated hunter provisions
25 are allowed on a unit-specific bases. Regulations are
26 not consistent in how the regulations address the
27 designated hunter system.

28

29 These unit-specific provisions are listed
30 in Appendix A Page 66 through 68. Region 6 has no unit-
31 specific regulations. Unit-specific provisions have been
32 adopted for 21 hunts in 17 different units. In some
33 cases certain hunts have been overlooked for this
34 provision creating a possible hardship on subsistence
35 users.

36

37 Under the proposed regulations, which you
38 can read on Page 56, designated hunting for ungulates
39 would be recognized for all units. Any regulations
40 restricting designated hunting would then be through
41 unit-specific provisions.

42

43 The proposed general Federal designated
44 hunter program has the following provisions:

45

46 Any Federally-qualified subsistence user
47 recipient may designate another
48 Federally-qualified subsistence user to
49 take wildlife on his or her behalf.

50

00051

1 The designated hunter must obtain the
2 designated hunter permit.

3
4 The designated hunter may hunt for any
5 number of recipients.

6
7 The hunter may not have more than two
8 harvest limits in his or her possession
9 at any one time.

10
11 The designated hunter may not charge the
12 recipient for his or her services in
13 taking the wildlife or for the meat or
14 any part of the harvested wildlife.

15
16 This proposal would allow designated
17 hunting of all ungulates on a statewide basis with the
18 option of unit-specific exceptions to these provisions.

19
20 With regard to the regulatory history,
21 the proposal history is listed on Table 1 on Page 59.

22
23 The Alaska Department of Fish and Game
24 regulations, the State of Alaska provides for the
25 transfer of harvest limits from one person to another
26 through its proxy hunting program. The State system
27 differs from the Federal designated hunter provisions in
28 the following ways, in its statewide application. In
29 that it applies only to caribou, deer and moose. It's
30 available only to residents who are blind or 70 percent
31 disabled or 65 years of age or older. Either the
32 recipient or the hunter may apply for the authorization.
33 No person may be a proxy hunter for more than one
34 recipient at a time.

35
36 And that last dot in your book there
37 where it says the recipient is responsible for harvest
38 and permit reporting was called into question at some of
39 the other meetings by the State. They said that that
40 might not be correct. That this bullet should perhaps
41 say both State and Federal systems assign responsibility
42 to the recipient of the harvest for all harvest permit
43 requirements.

44
45 With respect to harvest history, 21
46 designated hunter provisions are in the unit-specific
47 regulations. Permits have been requested for 18 of these
48 hunts. The three hunts where no one has applied for a
49 permit are Units 11, 17 caribou and Unit 25(D) moose. A
50 total of 2,106 permits have been issued and 1,902

00052

1 harvests have been reported. Permit history is shown in
2 Table 2 on Page 60.

3

4 For the 2000/2001 season under the
5 Federal system, 387 designated hunters harvested 408
6 animals. For the same hunts all hunters harvested 15,519
7 animals. This is shown in Table 3 on Page 60. The
8 largest designated harvest, 322 was for deer in Units 1
9 through 5. This harvest represented 3.1 percent of the
10 10,500 deer harvested in those units. The 53 deer
11 harvested by designated hunters in Unit 8 is the next
12 highest for 2001 and represents 2.1 percent of the total
13 harvest.

14

15 Annual designated hunting harvests, the
16 designated hunter program is shown by annual harvest in
17 Figure 1 on Page 67. This shows that these two deer
18 hunts in Units 1 through 5 and Unit 8 have the highest
19 harvest annual levels. All other hunts had less than 50
20 and in most cases less than 25 animals harvested
21 annually.

22

23 With respect to customary and traditional
24 uses, on a statewide basis findings from a comparison of
25 household harvests in a community documented that it is
26 not uncommon for about 30 percent of the households in a
27 community to produce about 70 percent or more of the
28 community's wild food harvest. The report by Robert
29 Wolfe, an anthropologist, went on to recommend designated
30 hunter or community harvests as being more compatible
31 with the customary harvest patterns of particular rural
32 Alaska areas.

33

34 With respect to the effect of the
35 proposal. Currently there are 66 Federally regulated
36 ungulate hunts throughout the state shown in Table 4 on
37 Page 62. Designated hunter provisions are available in 21
38 hunts of these hunts. The 2002 moose hunt in 6(C) was a
39 special action and is under review during this regulatory
40 cycle.

41

42 The designated hunting program is not
43 expected to cause any significant increase in
44 participation or any delay in reporting of harvests.

45

46 It should also be noted that the permit
47 form which is in your Appendix C on Page 70 that was used
48 by the Office of Subsistence Management is being
49 modified.

50

00053

1 The harvests by hunters using designated
2 hunter provisions in 2000/2001 represents 2.6 of the
3 harvest by all hunters. Extending the designating hunter
4 provisions to the remaining 45 ungulate hunts allowed by
5 subsistence regulations should not have a significant
6 impact on these resources. And I think that the figures
7 that are in this analysis would tend to support that
8 argument.

9
10 This action would provide a uniform
11 opportunity to subsistence users to harvest or benefit
12 from the harvest of ungulates in all areas of the state
13 and it will facilitate the customary and traditional use
14 of wildlife for sustenance, bartering and for the
15 continuation of traditional ceremonies.

16
17 Our preliminary conclusion is to support
18 the proposal. The proposed regulation should read:

19
20 All units, wildlife. A Federally-
21 qualified subsistence user recipient may
22 designate another Federally-qualified
23 subsistence user to take ungulates on his
24 or her behalf unless the recipient is a
25 member of the community operating under a
26 community harvest system or unit-specific
27 regulations in Section .26 preclude the
28 use of the designated hunter system.

29
30 The designated hunter must obtain a
31 designated hunter permit and must return
32 a completed harvest report.

33
34 The designated hunter may hunt for any
35 number of recipients but may have no more
36 than two harvest limits in his or her
37 possession at any one time unless
38 otherwise specified in unit-specific
39 regulations in Section .26.

40
41 The designated hunter may not charge the
42 recipient for his or her services in
43 taking the wildlife or for the meat or
44 any part of the harvested wildlife.

45
46 Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks.

47
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: That concludes the Staff
49 analysis. Federal comments, or did you -- was that taken
50 as the Federal comments?

00054

1 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman, that
2 included the Office of Subsistence Management
3 recommendation.

4
5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. State comments.

6
7 MR. NOWLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
8 Council members. The State on this proposal can support
9 it but believes that there's some additional work that
10 needs to be done before it's implemented and we'd like to
11 see it deferred pending some of that additional work.
12 And what we're concerned about is that there may be some
13 potential here for overharvest in certain situations.
14 And there's ways to, you know, overcome those concerns,
15 certain to protect the resource. But we feel that there
16 is some additional work here that needs to be done and we
17 would like to see some more details here on improving
18 permit hunt administration and how compliance with
19 reporting requirements are going to be done. And these
20 are administrative tasks that we think need to be
21 completed before we could feel comfortable with this.

22
23 We'd like to be sure that permit data
24 from these hunts would be received in a timely manner at
25 the Office of Subsistence Management for entry into their
26 data bases. And what that would do is allow us in
27 specific cases to monitor the harvest closely enough that
28 we wouldn't get into a situation where you had
29 overharvest of species.

30
31 For example, some of the -- are specific
32 comments are here on Page 54, as well, of your books, 54
33 and 55. But our main concern that has mentioned by
34 Department staff statewide on this proposal is we could
35 potentially -- that this regulation is for -- would allow
36 a harvest of all ungulates and that could potentially
37 lead to some overharvest of species like goats, sheep and
38 muskox, that is, those that concentrate in the late
39 season and if they occur in small groups they would be
40 particularly vulnerable. And we would prefer that if
41 this were passed, that the designated hunter regulation
42 apply only to moose, caribou and deer. And that would
43 also be consistent with State proxy hunting regulations.

44
45 Also the designated -- getting back to
46 concern about the animals themselves, these designated
47 hunter provisions would probably also have the greatest
48 potential for impact on animal harvests in units, of
49 course, that have large amounts of Federal land. And we
50 would just -- we would like to see that there be some

00055

1 safeguards in place with this, as I said, with reporting
2 and with procedures here so that we could guard against
3 this potential for overharvest where we have limited
4 numbers of animals or where the animals could be
5 particularly susceptible to harvest under this.
6

7 And, you know, as part of that, if you're
8 -- you know, if you have -- you're going to be increasing
9 success, you know, I would suspect that some hunters who
10 are particularly successful will be those who will be
11 asked to do this more and of course, there's not a
12 problem with that but we would like to be sure that the
13 reports come in in a timely fashion and that they're --
14 the populations of animals themselves are carefully
15 considered so that we don't get into an overharvest
16 situation.
17

18 And I would call your attention, I won't
19 read through those but the second paragraph on Page 54 of
20 your books, there's a series of questions that we ask
21 specifically about this particular proposal and, once
22 again, it's not that we're -- you know, we are supporting
23 this proposal but we would like to see some additional
24 work done and some assurances that we're not going to see
25 overharvest of animal populations before this is passed.
26

27 Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any questions.
30 Robert.

31
32 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
33 Roy, when you talk about overharvesting animals, how does
34 this impact the Alaska Department of Fish and Game under
35 any license, would that -- are you saying that Alaska
36 Department of Fish and Game, that it would impact on
37 their non-resident hunters coming in and saying that,
38 well, okay, you already depleted this, we're not going to
39 come here? How does that impact that Department there?
40

41 MR. NOWLIN: Through the Chair. I'm not
42 sure I understand your question, you may have to clarify
43 it for me. But the concern here is that the harvest
44 might essentially get away from us, you know, while it's
45 occurring. If we don't have enough reporting so that you
46 could get the report of harvest into the decision-making
47 process, whether it's Federal or whether it's State, so
48 that the information is in there on how many animals have
49 been taken. And so that if it starts looking like
50 particularly for those species that tend to congregate in

00056

1 groups, like muskox for example, that you could -- if --
2 if some action needed to be taken because you had too
3 many animals harvested, that we'd know about it in a
4 short enough time period so that the decision-makers, or,
5 you know, the managers could take action to prevent any
6 additional harvest on those animals, if that was what was
7 necessary.

8

9 Does that answer your question?

10

11 MR. WALKER: Yes, it answered my
12 question, I just said it in the wrong sort of phrase
13 here.

14

15 My second question is, Alaska Department
16 of Fish and Game, with their big game guides, is that
17 going to interfere with subsistence here, what we're
18 talking about, Proposal 02?

19

20 MR. NOWLIN: Through the Chair. If
21 you're talking about whether the harvest -- if non-
22 resident hunters were taking too many animals or if what
23 would happen under those circumstances?

24

25 Of course we have priorities under both
26 Federal and State law to guarantee minimum amounts
27 necessary. I don't know if that's what you actually call
28 it under the Federal law, but you certainly have
29 priorities for subsistence that are in place both on the
30 Federal and the State side.

31

32 MR. WALKER: Yeah, you kind of answered
33 my question there, thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.
36 Micky.

37

38 MR. STICKMAN: You know, Ron, I'm just
39 wondering about this -- you know, it's -- you know, you
40 may with the regulation that we're -- what if we adopt
41 it, it's going to be, you know, another Federally-
42 qualified subsistence user, you know, I'm wondering --
43 you know, we have some Federally-qualified subsistence
44 users that are big game guides, you know. I'm wondering
45 what effect this would have in that regard because, you
46 know, the guides and the -- well, the guides that I talk
47 to, you know, they tend to use proxy hunting or
48 designated hunting as an excuse to increase their limits.
49 So I would be -- you know, I'm just wondering, you know,
50 would these guides that are Federally-qualified, would

00057

1 they be able to go out there and talk to the elders and
2 say, you know, well, designate me as your hunter and
3 you'll get all the eat, you know, but -- you know, I'm
4 just wondering does this leave the door open for a little
5 bit of abuse?

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Do you have anything to
8 add on that, because from what I read on this, this is
9 strictly for Federally-qualified subsistence user to
10 another Federally-qualified subsistence user. And it has
11 always been Western Interior's policy to provide for all
12 subsistence, not only users, but provide opportunities to
13 provide for Federally-qualified subsistence recipients.
14 And I think that's always been our policy.

15

16 While I can still see a possible abuse
17 case, I don't know that it would be that widespread.

18

19 Jack.

20

21 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, this is just strictly
22 for subsistence users to subsistence users, there would
23 be no non-resident hunters included in this designated
24 hunter thing. I agree with the principle of this
25 designated hunter regulation. In regards to the State's
26 comment, sheep should be excluded, in the area that I
27 live in there's Gates of the Arctic Park and there's --
28 well, that would be Federal land and a designated hunter
29 into the Gates of the Arctic Park is not a problem. I
30 mean sheep are a subsistence animal within the Park
31 lands. I think that would apply to the Denali Park area
32 also. So I don't think that sheep should be excluded
33 from this proposal.

34

35 But I do feel that there should be a list
36 of animals that are looked at, submitted regionwide and
37 reviewed through the Councils that are of concern and
38 that could be overharvested, and I think that that should
39 be incorporated into this proposal.

40

41 There may be some additional work to be
42 done on this proposal, you know, as far as reporting and
43 so forth. I don't feel real comfortable with passing it
44 blanket right now. I do feel that there is some
45 additional work to be done on this proposal that would
46 satisfy some of the State's concerns and also some of my
47 concerns about in regards to the State's comment that,
48 you know, sheep shouldn't -- or certain animals should be
49 excluded. And I feel they should be included but not --
50 but looked at within the region and designated to as

00058

1 populations of concern.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. I think
4 that when you talk about muskox, too, I think it's
5 already been addressed by the specific regions,
6 especially NANA and the North Slope. So I think, again,
7 we can address this quite similar to the one we just
8 addressed. This is only our second proposal, second
9 statewide proposal.

10

11 And when you start listing all the
12 ungulates, you know, darn well that some or most are just
13 strictly area-specific and that alone should designate
14 what and who harvests them.

15

16 Do we want to get that in the motion?
17 What was our motion?

18

19 MR. REAKOFF: Motion to support.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, we do have a motion
22 to support, do you want to make any amendments. Carl.

23

24 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
25 Speaker. You know, I have the same concerns as you, did
26 mention, that's the first thing that jumped out was the
27 muskox because the muskox was transplanted to Alaska back
28 in the early days. Doesn't the State have a limit you
29 only give just an X amount of permits?

30

31 MR. NOWLIN: Yeah, the proxy hunters are,
32 I'm sure, allowed only one at a time.

33

34 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Two.

35

36 MR. NOWLIN: Two.

37

38 MS. MCCLENAHAN: They can have two in
39 their possession.

40

41 MR. NOWLIN: Okay. Evidently two in
42 possession at one time. Our -- we do have an established
43 reporting procedure with that, though, that the concern
44 that I expressed earlier about needing to keep track of
45 harvest, is that, you know, the State has the benefit of
46 having had years of these reporting systems in place.
47 And so we -- and we're also not issuing proxies for
48 muskox, you know, those kind of species, the ones that I
49 mentioned that could be very vulnerable to, if you got to
50 overharvest, because they group up together.

00059

1 So those two things. We feel more
2 confident in the proxy system because we can get the
3 reporting right away. And if the -- if it looks like
4 there's a problem with taking too many animals, then we
5 can take corrective action and that. If we need to issue
6 an emergency order even, to close the season or reduce
7 the bag limit, you know, we can do it right then, if some
8 sort of a problem crops up. But what we would like is to
9 see capability within the Federal system if this is
10 launched, to take action quickly in that same way, to
11 protect the animals, if it's needed. And you know,
12 hopefully it won't be, but there's -- you know, there's
13 other things as well and on that Page 54, if you look
14 down there at those -- on that second paragraph, you
15 know, there's villages, there's places where we don't --
16 where these could be used where there isn't a Federal
17 presence, how is that going to be handled? Has anyone
18 thought through those kinds of things? How are those
19 permits going to come back to the Federal managers so
20 that they can look at them and say, well, okay, we've
21 already taken this many animals out of this herd or in
22 this area and do we need to, you know, do we need to take
23 some action here to prevent any additional harvest to
24 protect these animals?

25

26 Those kinds of things.

27

28 We also have hunts that are administered
29 by Federal and State joint permits. We got those on the
30 Fortymile caribou, for example, and of course there's
31 lots of them now, but the point is that we have some of
32 these administrative details that we would like to see
33 worked out more closely before and get answers to these
34 questions before this were implemented.

35

36 MR. MORGAN: I know it did say ungulate,
37 so that would include bison, too, wouldn't it?

38

39 MR. NOWLIN: Yeah, through the Chair.

40 Yes.

41

42 MR. MORGAN: Thank you.

43

44 MR. STICKMAN: Ron.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Micky.

47

48 MR. STICKMAN: I think somewhere in --
49 well, somewhere in the proposed regulation there should
50 be, you know, the commercial guides and their assistants

00060

1 should be excluded from this designated hunting.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: So you want to -- do you
4 really want to incorporate that by modification or
5 amendment?

6

7 MR. STICKMAN: Yes.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: I still would have a
10 problem with that because I think that all the numbers
11 for these ungulates are out there and we -- and darn sure
12 that we already have the emergency closures ready to be
13 put into effect immediately in any area because I think
14 that even the muskox issue, which we have little
15 knowledge or little harvest of, I think that NANA and
16 North Slope sure are watching it.

17

18 But do we still want to -- if we want to
19 go area specific in moose again. I'm still having
20 trouble trying to understand how registered guides and
21 assistants could be really qualified as subsistence
22 users.

23

24 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

27

28 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I have a question I
29 need to try to clarify where we're at. It seems to me
30 that the Federal regs only apply to Federal subsistence
31 hunts on subsistence lands, they don't apply to all the
32 hunts as I understand it. And on those it would be only
33 somebody taking an animal for subsistence for someone
34 else. Now, if this was applying to all of the State area
35 then you'd get into those others. But we don't have any
36 muskox, for instance, on any of the Federal units within
37 our Western Interior. The only one exception of any of
38 the concerns was sheep as mentioned, but, again, it's a
39 subsistence hunt and when they allow that subsistence
40 hunt then they would need specific regulations maybe to
41 protect that population.

42

43 But in general adopting this to allow
44 them to do a all ungulates in the Federal area, it seems
45 like that could be adopted and then you would come in
46 with a reg where there is a concern, like with the sheep
47 that would be area-specific.

48

49 So we're not approving, I don't think,
50 somebody to be operating under the State season for

00061

1 guiding or for muskox or something else. Does this help
2 in your concerns from the State level, or not? Do you
3 see what I mean?

4
5 MR. NOWLIN: Through the Chair. Member
6 Collins. Our comments were made within that context,
7 that is, that it's only Federally -- it only applies on
8 Federal land and only applies to qualified Federal
9 subsistence hunters.

10
11 But -- so the -- even within that, our
12 concern still exists about reporting. And we're not
13 opposing the concept of this proposal at all. And we're
14 just -- we feel that there's some work that needs to be
15 done, administrative work in the Federal system just to
16 make sure that these harvests can be tracked, and that
17 decisions can be made by the managers if problems with
18 overharvest develop. And it would be in localized
19 situations, no doubt about it.

20
21 And are we being cautious about this,
22 absolutely. And I would suggest that it's a -- from our
23 perspective, once again, with a system that allows us to
24 react quickly if we see that there's overharvest, you
25 know, that's the way we're looking at it. We're
26 cautious, yes. And we feel that the Federal system
27 should be cautious as well with tracking harvest and
28 making sure that if a problem does develop that action
29 could be taken to prevent any overharvest of animals or
30 damage to animal populations.

31
32 Thank you.

33
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, I really think that
35 everything that the State and Feds do is under the
36 sustainable yield concept; am I right?

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: And I think that all the
41 recipients, Federally-qualified recipients and Federally-
42 qualified subsistence hunters are aware of these. If the
43 numbers are low they just don't hunt, I don't think.
44 And, again, one of our priorities as a subsistence
45 Council is to provide for subsistence activities. It has
46 always been that way and I believe it will stay that way.

47
48 Carl, did you have something to add.

49
50 MR. MORGAN: I was just going to say that

00062

1 this proposal, it does not include commercial anybody.
2 It specifically mentions Federally-qualified subsistence
3 users. It mentions it over and over. And to start
4 excluding, and I don't know what kind of door what we're
5 opening up or something, but this is very specific, it's
6 only for Federally-qualified subsistence users, it's not
7 for anybody else.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Micky.

10

11 MR. STICKMAN: You see, Carl, that's
12 where I have a problem with it, though, because we, in
13 our area, we have commercial guides that are Federally-
14 qualified users.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray.

17

18 MR. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hear
19 that concern about reporting. I guess that's where we
20 could get into trouble in terms of we're supposed to
21 protect the resource and maybe we could adopt this with
22 the recommendation that the Federal Board look at the
23 timely reporting to ensure that they have the information
24 they need to make good management decisions. Some
25 statement like that might help, because it's true whether
26 sheep up there or moose or any of them, if there, for
27 some reason, is an intensive harvest that would threaten
28 the resource we would be concerned about that.

29

30 But I think they should look at that
31 within their -- within the management of this hunts and
32 permits to make sure that they do have timely reporting,
33 that might take it.

34

35 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

38

39 MR. REAKOFF: Other problems that could
40 happen is like if the moose population is stressing here
41 and we have a designated hunter program, there could be
42 lots of hunters that could come to this area from down
43 river, especially if they go on a moratorium down river.
44 So I feel that populations should be reviewed that can
45 tolerate the designated hunter program.

46

47 But I would like to see this proposal
48 pass with amendments, and the amendments would be that
49 each species would be reviewed within the regions to
50 tolerate the designated hunter. That there would be an

00063

1 emergency order capability incorporated into the program
2 and the reporting, timely reporting aspect be
3 incorporated.

4
5 As far as the exclusion of guides, that's
6 more or less a mute subject because the guides cannot
7 harvest game for a hunter, they're under regulations not
8 to harvest game for a hunter, and they can't transfer any
9 kind of permits to their hunters, not resident hunters.
10 So that doesn't really can't happen.

11
12 So I would like to see those amendments
13 to this proposal that I stated.

14
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. Jack
16 made some amendments, is there a second.

17
18 MR. STICKMAN: I second.

19
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Do we have to
21 clarify that amendment or -- yeah, go ahead.

22
23 MR. MORGAN: Could I ask a question of
24 the Federal level. There's a section here I don't really
25 understand, unless otherwise specified in unit-specific
26 regulation. What is Section .26?

27
28 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman. Carl,
29 this is the current -- this is a current regulation in
30 place. And it says, unless otherwise specified in unit-
31 specific regulations. You heard me use Section .26
32 earlier today as well. We have general regulations that
33 can be found in this reg book and then we have unit-
34 specific regulations and I've read you a number of them
35 today, and that's all it refers to.

36
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Are we clear on the
38 amendment. Okay, Don, go ahead.

39
40 MR. RIVARD: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
41 Members of the Western Interior Council. My name is Don
42 Rivard, I'm with the Office of Subsistence Management in
43 Anchorage. I just wanted to maybe help clarify things a
44 little bit.

45
46 Right now as regulations stand, there is
47 no general provision for designated hunters in the state,
48 but there are unit-specific ones and that's what you're
49 seeing under your subsection .26. And those are found on
50 Page 66 to start out, Appendix A. They show all the

00064

1 specific designated hunter provisions throughout the
2 state for specific units.

3

4 What this proposal would do, is give one
5 blanket designated hunter regulation and as you have
6 already discussed a little bit, any future regulations
7 would then restrict in specific units, if that's what's
8 needed. So, for instance, I know of cases of goats in
9 Southeast Alaska, where there's a registration permit,
10 and so that may be something that's needed in the future,
11 if this regulation that you have before would go into
12 effect.

13

14 And I think we're kind of getting at what
15 Jack is also saying about there would have to be a
16 review. I think those proposals would come up as a
17 natural course of events. If there's a certain
18 population that cannot handle a certain level of harvest.
19 But I think everybody is sort of making the assumption
20 that if there's a designated hunter permit for any
21 particular hunt, that that automatically means that the
22 harvest level is going to increase. That could happen, I
23 suppose, if there's a very good hunter who a lot of
24 people in one community want to go ahead and have them --
25 have that person hunt for them. But, again, they can
26 only go out and they can only have two -- under this
27 regulation, they can only have two bag limits in their
28 possession at any one time. So they couldn't have one
29 guy go out and, you know, hunt for six people all at
30 once, and therefore maybe really cause a big impact on a
31 local population.

32

33 And I also heard the term, emergency
34 order, I think, Jack, you mentioned that. Well, that's a
35 course of events anyways. If during the hunting season
36 it looks like hunters are really impacting a local
37 population, we already have special actions that can be
38 invoked so that still would be in effect. You wouldn't
39 necessarily have to have that in your recommendation
40 because that's already something that happens if there's
41 going to be a pretty heavy impact on the local
42 population. So I hope that helps clarify things a little
43 bit.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Don. There
48 might be some questions, but I think that's what I was
49 getting at. All we're doing is, if we support this
50 without the amendment, all the procedures for you and

00065

1 emergency orders stoppage is already in place, right,
2 that's what I was trying to say. And if we adopt this
3 without the amendment, it's always been our priority to
4 provide for subsistence activities. And again, this is
5 clearly specified in here, Federally-qualified
6 subsistence user for recipient and may designate another
7 Federally-qualified subsistence user.

8

9 I think that in itself clarifies
10 everything. And I may be wrong but I think all we're
11 doing is just adopting the concept of providing for
12 designated hunter.

13

14 Any further comments.

15

16 MR. STICKMAN: Mr. Chair.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Micky.

19

20 MR. STICKMAN: I just don't want my
21 comments to be misconstrued, you know. I agree with the
22 concept of designated hunting, you know, but I just don't
23 want it to get so out of range that we have commercial
24 guides going out there and getting -- being designated
25 hunters for 20 or 30 elders in five or six different
26 villages and saying, well, I'm hunting for the -- I'm
27 subsistence hunting, you know.

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, again, this is
30 already addressed as to numbers. You can only have two
31 in possession at any time, right?

32

33 MR. STICKMAN: But you have to remember
34 that the commercial guides have four or five assistants
35 so they can have one guide with two and five assistants
36 with 10.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: If they are commercial
39 guides, does that qualify them for Federally-qualified
40 users? Go ahead, Don.

41

42 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. Don Rivard,
43 again. Again, they would have to be a Federally-
44 qualified user themselves, subsistence user themselves.
45 So I would imagine there are some commercial guides that
46 are Federally-qualified subsistence users and so you can
47 only -- you have to be a Federally-qualified subsistence
48 user in order to hunt for a Federally-qualified
49 subsistence user.

50

00066

1 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

4

5 MR. COLLINS: But, Mr. Chairman -- oh,
6 sorry.

7

8 MR. REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.

9

10 MR. COLLINS: Well, I think when they're
11 operating as a guide, though, they're not allowed to hunt
12 for themselves or someone else; isn't that right, by
13 regulation? I don't think you can be hunting. So the
14 only way they could be hunting as a subsistence user for
15 somebody else would be if they were hunting on their own
16 and it couldn't be during the same time they're guiding.
17 So the idea is they're taking a client out and allowing
18 the client to take for themselves. I don't think that
19 could be done with the permit.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: That's what I've been
22 trying to clarify, I think. I don't think it's legal.

23

24 Jack.

25

26 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, you can't hunt
27 yourself while you're in the field guiding. And under
28 this designated hunter you can't be paid or receive
29 enumeration so the worries about guides abusing this
30 designated hunter thing is -- there's really lots of
31 regulations that would stop that, so those are already in
32 place.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further comments.

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: It gets us back, do we
39 really want to include an amendment in this?

40

41 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes. Go ahead, Jack.

44

45 MR. REAKOFF: Since Don Rivard has
46 clarified some of those issues I will retrack those
47 amendments and we'll just vote on the proposal as
48 written.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: With the consent of the

00067

1 second, Micky, would you retract -- would you be willing
2 to retract your second on that amendment?

3

4 MR. STICKMAN: Yes.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you. There is
7 a motion before us, we've deliberated a good 40 minutes
8 or so on our second statewide proposal and this is to
9 support WP03-02. Jerry.

10

11 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just for
12 the record to note that there were no public comments
13 received for this proposal. We do have three different
14 Regional Council recommendations from other Councils that
15 have addressed this proposal if you'd like to hear those,
16 we can give you that information.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Just briefly.

19

20 MR. BERG: Okay. We had for both North
21 Slope and Seward Peninsula Regional Councils, they both
22 supported this proposal as it was submitted and
23 recommended by Staff. And then for the Yukon-Kuskokwim
24 Regional Council, they also adopted this proposal as
25 recommended by Staff.

26

27 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jerry. Any
30 further comments. Deliberations.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Hearing none, all those in
35 favor of supporting WP03-02, signify by saying aye.

36

37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

40

41 (No opposing votes)

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. As to
44 lunch time, Leo Morgan brought in some strips and I
45 believe -- is that lunch back there?

46

47 MR. BERG: (Nods affirmatively)

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Lunch is back
50 there. Robert brought some strips too, and some fish.

00068

1 Robert also provided us with water, so thank you
2 everybody for donating to our lunch.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 What time do you want to come back, 1:30?

7

8 MR. PETERS: 1:30.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: 1:30.

11

12 (Off record)

13

14 (On record)

15

16 (Ms. Demientieff arrives)

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, the Chair will call
19 the meeting back to order. For the record the Chair will
20 show that we have a quorum, eight present. Do we have
21 Proposal 54 in the book or was that withdrawn?

22

23 MR. BERG: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, that
24 proposal has been withdrawn, so I believe.....

25

26 MR. WALKER: No wonder we can't find it.

27

28 MR. BERG: That's why you can't find it.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

31

32 MR. BERG: Proposal 54 and 37 have both
33 been withdrawn, and Pete can probably give us more
34 information on why they were withdrawn if you want more
35 information on those or we can move on to Proposal 30 if
36 you wish, either way.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: At this time I would like
39 to move on to Proposal 30. The Chair will entertain a
40 motion to adopt or support Proposal WP03-30.

41

42 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Micky. Is there
45 a second.

46

47 MR. WALKER: Second.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Second by Robert. Next
50 item, Staff analysis.

50

00069

1 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. This is Pete
2 DeMatteo with the Office of Subsistence Management, Staff
3 biologist for the Western Interior.

4
5 Mr. Chair, at this time I would like to
6 request that we start with Proposal 34 as Proposal 30 and
7 34 are analyzed together because of their similarity and
8 both are from the same proponent. The analysis are on
9 Page 81 of your book.

10
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Pete, are you wanting to
12 take up Proposal WPO3-30 and 34?

13
14 MR. BERG: I'm not sure he was able to
15 hear that question but that is the case in this
16 situation. Proposal 30 and 34 were analyzed together
17 because there are similar issues and I think Pete's ready
18 to go forward with the analysis that he developed for
19 both of those proposals.

20
21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

22
23 MR. BERG: Go ahead, Pete.

24
25 MR. DEMATTEO: I'm having some difficulty
26 hearing your end there, where are we with this?

27
28 MR. BERG: Yeah, sorry about that we're
29 having to move the speaker away each time so that we
30 don't get feedback, but, yeah, I think we're ready for
31 the analysis here. They were just asking if 30 and 34
32 were going to be presented together and then so I guess
33 we're ready for you to go ahead then.

34
35 MR. DEMATTEO: Okay. Mr. Chair. Members
36 of the Council. Proposal 30 was submitted by the Western
37 Interior Regional Council and this would require that all
38 edible meat of a caribou harvested in Unit 24 prior to
39 October 1st will remain on the bone of the front
40 quarters, hindquarters and ribs until the meat is removed
41 from the field or is processed for human consumption.

42
43 Proposal 34 was also submitted by the
44 Western Interior Council. This would require that all
45 edible meat of a moose harvested in Units 21 and 24 prior
46 to October 1st must remain on the bone until the meat is
47 removed from the field or is processed for human
48 consumption.

49
50 Mr. Chair, the analysis begins on Page 81

00070

1 under Tab C as in Charlie, and on the first page here on
2 Page 81 you can see the existing Federal regulations.
3 Under Federal regulation there's a definition for the
4 term edible meat, there's also a definition for the term
5 salvage.

6
7 The proposed Federal regulation for Unit
8 24 caribou appears on Page 81, and the proposed Federal
9 regulations for moose in Unit 21 and 24 appears at the
10 top of Page 82. It's pretty straightforward.

11
12 Unit 24 for caribou, residents of 24,
13 Galena, Koyukuk, Kobuk, Stevens Village and Tanana have a
14 customary and traditional use determination for caribou
15 in Unit 24.

16
17 For moose in Unit 21, residents of Units
18 21(A) and (E), residents of Takotna, McGrath, Aniak,
19 Crooked Creek have a customary and traditional use
20 determinations for moose in Unit 21(A). Residents of
21 Units 21(B) and (C) and residents of Tanana, Galena and
22 Ruby have customary and traditional use determinations
23 for moose in Units 21(B) and (C). Residents of Unit
24 21(D), residents of Huslia and Ruby have a customary and
25 traditional use determination for moose in 21(D). And
26 Residents of Unit 21(E) and Russian Mission have a
27 customary and traditional use determination for moose in
28 21(E).

29
30 For Unit 24 moose, residents of Unit 24,
31 Koyukuk, Galena have a customary and traditional use
32 determination for moose in that unit.

33
34 Mr. Chair, looking at some of the
35 regulatory history, recent regulatory changes made by the
36 Alaska Board of Game require users to salvage all edible
37 meat from caribou harvested in Units 21 and 24. The
38 Federal Subsistence Board adopted a meat-on-bone
39 regulation for moose in other units which include Units
40 9(B), 17 and 19(B). Additionally, Proposals WP03-29 and
41 34 request the adoption of meat-on-bone requirements for
42 moose in Units 18, 21 and 24.

43
44 Also the Alaska Board of Game adopted
45 similar requirements for salvage all edible meat for
46 moose in Units 21 and 24.

47
48 The adoption of the proposed regulations
49 would favor reduction in meat spoilage during transport
50 from the harvest site and would align the State

00071

1 regulation. A meat-on-bone requirement would also comply
2 with local harvest and traditional methods that refrain
3 from de-boning meat. Local residents traditionally
4 transport harvested meat on the bone from the harvest it
5 and hang the front and hindquarters until processed for
6 human consumption. Because of this, adoption of the
7 proposed regulations would not adversely affect
8 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

9

10 Current Federal regulations do not
11 provide a definition for the term field which appears in
12 the proposed language. Adoption of the proposed language
13 without a regulatory definition could create confusion
14 for Federally-qualified users.

15

16 Mr. Chair, with that the preliminary
17 conclusion for Proposal WP03-30, support the proposal
18 with modification.

19

20 Proposal WP03-34 is to support the
21 proposal with modification.

22

23 And if you look on Page 86 under
24 preliminary conclusion, the proposed regulation would
25 read for WP03-30:

26

27 All edible meat of the front quarters,
28 hindquarters, and ribs from caribou
29 harvested in Unit 24 prior to October 1,
30 must remain on the bones until the meat
31 is removed from the field or is processed
32 for human consumption.

33

34 For WP03-34 the regulation would read:

35

36 All edible meat of the front quarters,
37 hindquarters, and ribs from moose
38 harvested in Units 21 and 24 prior to
39 October 1, must remain on the bones until
40 the meat is removed from the field or is
41 processed for human consumption.

42

43 Also, Mr. Chair, you'll note that the
44 Staff preliminary conclusion is to support the proposal
45 with modification. Staff recommends that you adopt a
46 definition for the term field as it appears in your
47 proposed language. And if you look halfway down the page
48 I just simply adopted the term of the definition that the
49 State uses for something to work off of, and that is:

50

00072

1 Field - means an area outside of
2 established year-round dwellings,
3 businesses, or other developments usually
4 associated with a city, town or village;
5 field does not include permanent hotels
6 or roadhouses on the State road system or
7 State or Federally maintained airports.

8
9 Mr. Chairman, that is all I have. Thank
10 you.

11
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Pete.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not we'll go into
17 Federal comments.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN SAM: I think Pete took care of
22 all the Federal comments. State. Thank you, Roy.

23
24 MR. NOWLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25 Roy Nowlin, ADF&G.

26
27 On both Proposal 30 and 34, I don't have
28 anything to add to the Federal Staff comments other than
29 we support both of these proposals. It would align the
30 State and Federal seasons. And we support them both as
31 modified by the Federal Staff.

32
33 Thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Roy. Any
36 questions.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, we have regional
41 comments, tribes, I think.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Public comment. Go ahead,
46 Jerry.

47
48 MR. BERG: Mr. Chairman, there were no
49 written public comments received for either of these
50 proposals.

00073

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jerry. We'll
2 go to Council deliberations. Jack.

3

4 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, this proposal
5 came forward for alignment with the State regs. The
6 State regs were proposed last year by the Koyukuk River
7 Advisory Committee and reflects customary and traditional
8 use by leaving the meat on the bone and reflects the
9 displeasure by rural residents to a lot of spoiled meat
10 coming out of the field by non-local hunters.

11

12 This proposal is just to align with what
13 is normal practice for most residents of the area. And
14 I'm in full support of the Staff recommendation for the
15 definition of field and the Staff's proposal here, it
16 fulfills alignment with the State's regs.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, for the Council's
19 clarification, I think our motion just read to support
20 with modification for Proposal 30, right?

21

22 MR. REAKOFF: (Nods affirmatively)

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, so the Chair will
25 entertain a motion to amend it to include Proposal 34.
26 Is there an amendment, or friendly addition by the motion
27 maker and the second?

28

29 Micky, a friendly amendment to just
30 include Proposal 34 in this support with modification?

31

32 MR. STICKMAN: Okay, I agree. I have some
33 questions though. You know.....

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, before we go any
36 further, is this with consensus of the second, whoever it
37 seconded?

38

39 MS. HILE: Robert.

40

41 MR. WALKER: (Nods affirmatively)

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: All right, consent of the
44 second. Micky.

45

46 MR. STICKMAN: You know, it says
47 customary and traditional use determinations, under the
48 caribou I was wondering, you know, I'm not clear what
49 unit Nulato is in but you know Nulato is -- you know, if
50 you go way back a hundred years ago, Nulato was the

00074

1 caribou clan, so we have traditional use determinations
2 for the caribou. Just because the caribou don't come to
3 Nulato anymore doesn't mean we should be excluded.

4
5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Further additions or
6 comments.

7
8 (No comments)

9
10 MR. WALKER: Question.

11
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question has been called
13 for but I'm not quite sure what Micky was asking, was
14 that a friendly amendment to include Nulato or what?

15
16 MR. STICKMAN: Yes, I want to include
17 Nulato in the customary and traditional use
18 determinations for both moose and caribou.

19
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Don Rivard.

21
22 MR. RIVARD: Thank you. Mr. Chair. Don
23 Rivard with the Office of Subsistence Management. This
24 is not a customary and traditional use determination
25 proposal. If the community of Nulato would like to be
26 considered for caribou in Unit 24, I believe, then they
27 would, someone -- and possibly even this Council could
28 then make that proposal for the next wildlife cycle. But
29 that's a different issue than what's in front of you
30 right now, so that would be a new proposal.

31
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Don. I think
33 that clarifies quite a bit. Any further questions for
34 Don.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Would that be satisfactory
39 Micky.

40
41 MR. STICKMAN: Okay.

42
43 MR. JONES: You got to make a correction,
44 that's Unit 21.

45
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, I didn't get Micky's
47 answer, was that satisfactory that we'll introduce it as
48 a separate proposal for the next wildlife cycle?

49
50 MR. STICKMAN: Yes.

00075

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Micky. The
2 question was called to support with modification adoption
3 of Proposals 30 and 34, as amended, with the field
4 notation. Is that how you read it?

5

6 MR. REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Further questions.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, the question was
13 already called for. All those in favor of the motion,
14 signify by saying aye.

15

16 IN UNISON: Aye.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

19

20 (No opposing votes)

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. 30 and 34
23 adopted. Proposal 31. The Chair will entertain a motion
24 to adopt or support Proposal WP03-31.

25

26 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Micky.

29

30 MR. PETERS: Second.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Second by Emmitt Peters?

33

34 MS. HILE: (Nods affirmatively)

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Emmitt, yeah, okay. Staff
37 analysis.

38

39 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, Proposal 31 was
40 submitted by the Western Interior Regional Council. This
41 would eliminate the antlerless moose season and change
42 the February 1 through 10 to February 1 through 5 in Unit
43 19(A), that portion north of the Kuskokwim River upstream
44 from but not including the Kolmakof River drainage and
45 south of the Kuskokwim River drainage but not include the
46 Holokuk River drainage.

47

48 Mr. Chair, on Page 92 the analysis begins
49 and halfway down the page is the proposed regulation,
50 which says proposed Federal regulation for moose. What

00076

1 your proposal would do, essentially is eliminate the
2 language; moose, however, antlerless moose may be taken
3 only during February through February 10 season. And it
4 would put one bull instead of one moose.

5
6 And on the opposite side where we have
7 the seasons and the change, February 1 through 5 instead
8 of February 1 through 10.

9
10 Mr. Chair, residents of Unit 18 within
11 the Kuskokwim River drainage upstream from and including
12 the Johnson River and rural residents of Unit 19 have a
13 customary and traditional use determination for moose in
14 Unit 19(A).

15
16 Agency and public concerns of continued
17 declines in area moose populations substantiate the
18 proponent's request to eliminate the provision for
19 antlerless moose harvest and to shorten the February
20 season. The proposed changes follow the concerns that
21 prompted the Alaska Board of Game to place similar
22 restrictions in State regulations.

23
24 So Mr. Chair, this proposal would align
25 with current State regulations.

26
27 Based on results from data collected in
28 the Holitna and the Hoholitna trend count areas, the
29 density estimate for a portion of the Aniak River
30 drainage the Unit 19(A) moose population is stable to
31 declining. Based on results from trend counts conducted
32 in 1996, 1997 and 199 to 1998 there has been a steady
33 decrease in total number of moose observed during
34 surveys.

35
36 Based on the analysis of bull/cow ratios
37 from 10 fall surveys conducted between 1976 and 1997 in
38 the Holitna River drainage, there has been some
39 deterioration of the bull component of the Unit 19(A)
40 population. Intense hunting pressure in the Holitna
41 River drainage along with predation on calves, yearling
42 bulls, and the winter adult population were probably
43 responsible for some of the long-term decline.

44
45 Results from further analysis showed that
46 fall calf/cow ratios fell precipitously in this area and
47 that there was poor calf survival. Analysis of results
48 from this survey reflected that nine-month old calves in
49 this drainage had a survival rate of less than five
50 percent which is very low. Factors influencing the low

00077

1 numbers include poor calf survival through the fall
2 season, low yearling bull recruitment and poor over
3 winter adult survival.

4
5 The reported annual moose harvest in Unit
6 19(A) declined from 1996 through the year 2002. Analysis
7 of reported total harvest for this period revealed a 20
8 percent average annual decrease.

9
10 Shortening the February season would
11 decrease inadvertent cow moose harvest during the period
12 when a bull moose have shed their antlers. a reduction
13 in the total cow moose harvest would contribute to an
14 increase of productivity.

15
16 The proposed changes follow the concerns
17 that prompted the Alaska Board of Game to place similar
18 restrictions in State regulations. The proposed
19 regulatory changes also follow ongoing cooperative
20 management efforts between the agencies, State Fish and
21 Game Advisory Committees and the Western Interior
22 Regional Council. Adoption of the proposed regulatory
23 change would support these efforts and would help to
24 manage the Unit 19(A) moose population for continued
25 subsistence users.

26
27 Mr. Chair, with that the preliminary
28 conclusion is to support the proposal.

29
30 That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

31
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any questions
33 for Pete at this time.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, State comments.

38
39 MR. NOWLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

40 Roy Nowlin with ADF&G. On Proposal 31, the State
41 supports this proposal. And as indicated here in the
42 Staff analysis, and just we are -- the State's very
43 concerned about the situation in 19(A) and (B), and as
44 many of you know we've started a planning effort here
45 that includes a variety of users. And looking at the
46 situation, in fact, we have a meeting here next week
47 again to continue to do that.

48
49 And we're concerned about the indicators
50 that were already mentioned of declining moose

00078

1 populations. We are attempting now, and have been on
2 hold for some time, several weeks now, to try to get some
3 additional surveys done in 19(A) and (B), population
4 estimate that should help the decision-making process.
5 We're getting further into the winter and becoming
6 increasingly concerned about not having that.

7
8 But we think that this is a good move at
9 this point to reduce this antlerless moose hunt during
10 the winter as a conservative measure, and we expect that
11 as this planning group continues to do its work that we
12 will have additional proposals, State and Federal
13 proposals that will come out of that process. And I
14 believe Randy Rogers will give us an update on what's
15 happening with that planning process as we go on with
16 deliberations.

17
18 Thank you.

19
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: My question then is have
21 you been out to these villages and talked to the locals
22 from this area?

23
24 MR. NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman, we have
25 representation on the planning group by the villages and
26 the advisory councils, the advisory committees, the State
27 advisory committees as well. And I think we have a
28 pretty good cross section of folks that are going to be
29 sitting down and, of course, when this was passed -- this
30 proposal was passed initially on the State side to
31 eliminate this antlerless season, that was discussed with
32 the advisory committees and I believe that we had pretty
33 agreement that this was really something that was needed,
34 and I'm sure that there's going to be other things
35 following here in addition as we have a better
36 understanding of the result of discussions with people on
37 the planning committee and on the advisory committees.

38
39 Does that answer your question?

40
41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes. And I think my
42 biggest concern was getting consensus from the local
43 residents. Carl.

44
45 MR. MORGAN: So is this count going to be
46 an actual aerial survey and not looking at X amount of
47 moose in a square mile, that this is really that you're
48 going to go out there and try to count actual moose?

49
50 MR. NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman. Member

00079

1 Morgan. This is our standard population estimate. We
2 are counting moose, yes. And I hope we're going to be
3 able to. I mean the snow situation is not looking good
4 but we're going to continue to be ready to do this and
5 launch it, either we'll get it done or we'll run out of
6 winter, one of the two.

7

8 But this is the best that we've got for
9 estimating moose populations. And you know, you don't
10 try to see every moose. You know, we could personally
11 talk later about the technique and maybe, you know, I
12 could provide some additional information if you need it
13 about, exactly how we're going about this. But, you
14 know, the technique is recognized nationally and
15 internationally as being the best that we can do to get
16 good estimates.

17

18 Thank you.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, thank you Roy.
25 Regional, tribal comments.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, public comments.

30 Leo Morgan.

31

32 MR. L. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
33 My name is Leo Morgan from Aniak.

34

35 I haven't studied this too much but based
36 on the -- I always look at the data and the bull per cow
37 ratio disturbs me, six bulls per 100 cows, eight calves
38 per 100 cows. That's an awful lot of cows. And to say
39 that, you know, we're wiping out the cows, this data
40 doesn't show it.

41

42 I'm against this proposal because of
43 that.

44

45 It doesn't justify it. You know, where I
46 see justification is don't kill any more bulls. You're
47 running out of bulls, that's where it makes the calves,
48 with the cows. Something doesn't right with me.

49

50 That's all I had.

00080

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, are you involved
2 with this planning process?

3
4 MR. L. MORGAN: Yes, I am.

5
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Are you meeting with them
7 out here -- you're meeting with them next week, too?

8
9 MR. L. MORGAN: Yeah.

10
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any other questions
12 for Leo.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16
17 MR. L. MORGAN: Thank you.

18
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Leo Morgan.
20 Public comments.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Further public comments.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, written comments.

29
30 MR. BERG: Mr. Chairman, we received no
31 written public comments for Proposal 31.

32
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jerry. Council
34 deliberation. Any comments. Deliberations. Questions.

35
36 Go ahead, Micky.

37
38 MR. STICKMAN: I was just listening to
39 Leo's comments about the bull to cow ratio. You know,
40 when we were doing our intensive moose management plan
41 for the Koyukuk River, Ron, you remember that the bull to
42 cow ratio that we thought was the breaking point was 30
43 bulls to 100 cows, and they're way below that breaking
44 point, you know, so that's something that we have to
45 think about.

46
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Micky. Further
48 comments. Carl.

49
50 MR. MORGAN: Yes. And I tend to agree,

00081

1 and just looking at the calves per cows, you got only
2 eight calves per 100 cows. Like these little numbers
3 coming up, I just feel uncomfortable with -- it seems
4 like we've got a shortage of bulls instead of a shortage
5 of cows.

6
7 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

8
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Ray.

10
11 MR. COLLINS: Actually you would have a
12 shortage all the way around. If the cows are not
13 surviving, you've got a survival problem there. So there
14 may be need to close the season. But I think we've got
15 to keep our purpose in mind, what we were trying to do is
16 just line up with the State, we weren't trying to
17 reauthorize a proposal -- so maybe a proposal to close
18 that winter season then would be in order at some point.
19 But I don't think that was the intent of this, it was
20 just to line up with the State so that there wouldn't be
21 confusion between State and Federal seasons.

22
23 So I guess that's my question, if it's
24 just an alignment thing or is it a proposed -- at what
25 point will the hunt be authorized or not or is that a
26 separate issue, I guess that's my question.

27
28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, thanks for that
29 clarification Ray. Any further comments -- yeah, go
30 ahead Jack.

31
32 MR. REAKOFF: I, too, am fairly concerned
33 with the bull/cow ratio, that's a pathetic bull/cow
34 ratio. And that shows an overharvest of the bull
35 component. And we need to -- what I would like, comment
36 from the State, I'm not quite familiar with, in the
37 planning process, is there a permit hunt or something
38 coming around to where they're going to reduce this bull
39 harvest down to get these bull/cow ratios back together
40 again?

41
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead Roy.

43
44 MR. NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman. Member
45 Reakoff. Roy Nowlin with ADF&G.

46
47 To answer your question first, I would
48 expect that the planning committee could very likely come
49 up with proposals for changing the seasons in 19(A) and
50 (B), and you know, we fully expect that, along with a

00082

1 range of other things, you know, including we've asked
2 the committee to look at habitat, such things as fire.
3 The committee is very anxious to look at predation and
4 perhaps there would be some recommendations to boards,
5 the State Board in this case, about potentially something
6 to manage predators out there. But I expect there will
7 be a range of things.

8

9 And with your permission, I could make a
10 few comments about these ratios that are in here that
11 have been discussed, that were brought up.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

14

15 MR. NOWLIN: Yeah, this is a -- these
16 ratios came from a trend area which is a slice of the
17 entire unit, it's right along the river, the Holitna and
18 Hoholitna. And at the time this was done, I know Toby
19 Boudreau, our area biologist has some concerns about
20 these numbers because he felt that the snow conditions
21 were a little bit different during that time. You'll
22 notice that the other numbers in that table, for example,
23 the bull/cow ratios are quite a bit higher in other
24 years. And to have it drop down to six was really
25 unusual and so -- but it's not -- right along river
26 corridors we often see situations where bull/cow ratios
27 are reduced in localized areas. Like right near McGrath,
28 the bull/cow ratios are very low, I think they're maybe
29 even in the neighborhood of around 10 or something, right
30 near McGrath because the bulls do get harvested pretty
31 intensively along the river, but you just go off of the
32 river, the bull/cow ratios are quite a bit higher. And
33 that could be the case here as well.

34

35 The thing that really concerns me in all
36 of this data from 19(A) and (B) is the calf/cow ratios.
37 And you can see how low those are there, those could have
38 been influenced by snow conditions as well, but we have
39 some other indications, and this is what's -- I know what
40 is really weighing heavily on the minds of the planning
41 group members is how low this calf/cow ratio is. Because
42 that means, you know, calves per 100 cows and you got
43 eight there it just means there's simply, you know, eight
44 calves for every 100 cows out there, and that's extremely
45 low. And that is a real source of concern.

46

47 We were hearing during the planning
48 meeting, the last one we had, from various planning group
49 members who had experience out there, that they were
50 seeing what they thought was a reduction in numbers of

00083

1 moose and also real poor calf survival. And this
2 indicates real poor calf survival and when you get down
3 this low, it's real -- if you continue to take antlerless
4 moose it really hurts you. I mean that's really the
5 bottom line for this proposal and why the State Board of
6 Game passed the regulation eliminating that antlerless
7 season in February to begin with. Because they just felt
8 that with the data we have, and we certainly need more,
9 but with the data that have, we just should not continue
10 to take moose, antlerless moose, take cows, during that
11 winter season. And, you know, that's the reason why we
12 support this because we would like to get this season
13 changed in the Federal regulations as well as -- you
14 know, it's already been changed in the State regulations
15 but we feel that harvest of cows is just not justifiable
16 out there at this time, during that February season.

17

Thank you.

18

19

MR. MORGAN: Ron.

20

21

CHAIRMAN SAM: Carl.

22

23

24

MR. MORGAN: Yes, I just want to raise my

25 concerns because, you know, for the record, but I'd like
26 to note that this data is two years old. It was in
27 November of 2001 that this data was compiled. I don't
28 know what was the snow conditions then, if there were a
29 lot of snow or no snow. But, you know, if we're that
30 concerned, I think we've got to make that -- and I'm glad
31 you're trying to make this big effort in trying to get
32 the aerial survey, we've got to know it. Making
33 decisions on two year old data is fine, but it's not up
34 to date.

35

Thank you.

36

37

CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Carl. Jack.

38

39

MR. REAKOFF: I'm still looking back at

40 that data there and there's a gap there and then there's
41 14 moose and all moose management literature that I've
42 read, any time you start dropping below 20 red lights
43 should start lighting up. And I see that there was a 22,
44 then 14 in '94, there's been some real poor bull/cow
45 ratios for multiple years. It's my opinion that when you
46 drop down into those low bull/cow ratios the pregnancy
47 rates fall off and the late estrus occur, those light
48 calves are under higher predation factors. I'm very
49 concerned about those bull/cow ratios. The six is maybe
50

00084

1 an anomaly but I'm still very concerned about those. I
2 can see the stop gap measure to get -- to stop killing
3 cows right now.

4
5 I'm not opposed to this proposal, but I
6 do feel that some kind of a vast reduction in bull
7 harvest is necessary to bring these bull/cow ratios back
8 around. Something looks bad here.

9
10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. Getting
11 back to Ray's clarification, we're just aligning with the
12 State for the present. But any time you get this low of
13 bull/cow ratio you're in trouble. This is going on out
14 in the states as far as elk and deer and everything else
15 out there. And I'm kind of having some mixed feelings on
16 this now. I believe, Harry Allain, did you want to say
17 something?

18
19 MR. ALLAIN: Do I need to go up there?

20
21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

22
23 MR. ALLAIN: I just need a clarification
24 if I could.

25
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Come up here to the mic.

27
28 MR. ALLAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
29 just need a clarification if I could. In this proposal
30 here, the language, the State has their language, as far
31 as I know, that from the Kolmakof on the upper side of
32 Kolmakof on up and then from Alugra, on up, you can catch
33 a cow moose in the winter. Now, that's according to the
34 State, right, is that the regulation the State has?

35
36 MR. NOWLIN: I don't think we have any.

37
38 MR. ALLAIN: It's antlerless. Antlerless
39 from there on up unless it's been changed and I don't
40 know about it. If you're going to come in line with that
41 then the rest of the language is not in here as far as --
42 I don't know what this is, one bull -- one bull where?
43 One bull all over or in the drainage below -- or in the
44 Kolmakof or the Alugra River, what are we talking about?

45
46 MR. COLLINS: Well, it'd be all of 19(A)
47 is in this proposal, it says Unit 19(A) it would be one
48 bull, so it would be for the whole unit.

49
50 MR. ALLAIN: Okay, but as far as I know

00085

1 now, unless it's been changed, the State reg says that
2 from the Kolmakof on up you can catch antlerless moose or
3 from the Alugra River, they call it Kolmakof. That's as
4 far as I know. If you're adopting that, you're adopting
5 the same proposal as the State, all the wording is not in
6 here. Someone should caution.....

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: You got it Ray?

9

10 MR. COLLINS: Well, that river, the
11 Kolmakof River is mentioned in the proposal here, but not
12 including the Kolmakof River and south of the Kuskokwim
13 River upstream from, but not including the Holitna so
14 there is an area that's not in 19(A) that's not covered
15 by this reg.

16

17 MR. ALLAIN: Okay, because that's the
18 point I'm looking at because this is the same wording at
19 the beginning of the State reg right here but it doesn't
20 complete all the wording.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Could you get Pete on
23 there.

24

25 MR. BERG: Pete, do you want to define
26 the position for the Council.

27

28 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, if you look at
29 your map on Page 94, you'll see there's a patchwork of
30 Federal land there. Unfortunately the patchwork does not
31 match up with the description that the State has, and
32 because of that there's going to be some variation
33 between the Federal language for the hunt area, Page 92
34 and the State hunt area that's defined in the State
35 regulations that that gentleman just brought up. The
36 boundaries are not going to be exactly the same, no. But
37 the closest we can identify, Unit 19 (A) that portion
38 north of the Kuskokwim and upstream from -- and so forth,
39 as it says on Page 92 there.

40

41 Does that make sense?

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: So when we say we're
44 aligning with the State, we're not exactly aligning with
45 the State then, is this true Jerry?

46

47 MR. BERG: Did you hear that Pete?

48

49 MR. DEMATTEO: No, I didn't.

50

00086

1 MR. BERG: Ron was asking, when we say
2 we're aligning with the State, we're not aligning exactly
3 just because of the jurisdiction issue, right, Pete?

4
5 MR. DEMATTEO: Because of the
6 jurisdiction issue, the boundaries do not line up and
7 overlap exactly with the State, no.

8
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions for
10 Pete -- I mean Pete DeMatteo.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: That didn't help you very
15 much.....

16
17 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, may I make
18 another point at this time?

19
20 CHAIRMAN SAM:did he? Because as a
21 Federal Subsistence Council, we always have this problem
22 of who has jurisdiction and we forever have this problem
23 unless you really identify it on giant-sized maps and
24 even then we still have some problems.

25
26 Any further questions for Pete.

27
28 (No comments)

29
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, again, we're just
31 trying to align with the State and then we got into
32 deliberation and arguments over the contents. Yeah.

33
34 MR. ALLAIN: Mr. Chairman.

35
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, go ahead Harry.

37
38 MR. ALLAIN: Mr. Chairman, I mean what
39 I'm hearing is there's like three problems here, three
40 items. One is regarding the State, in effect right now,
41 antlerless moose beyond these two boundaries, these two
42 rivers, that I am aware of. The other is we're talking
43 about one bull period. And then we're talking about
44 jurisdiction as far as location, and jurisdiction, right.

45
46 I mean there's three issues here, I see.
47 What are we tackling?

48
49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, get Pete on
50 there.

00087

1 MR. BERG: Go ahead, Pete.

2

3 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. I think the
4 best way to approach this is, is look at what the
5 proposal is asking for. And what this proposal asks is
6 the February season and the provisions -- line up with
7 the State's recent changes, State regulations.

8

9 The intent behind the State change in
10 regulations was to address the production size of the
11 moose population and that is looking at the antlerless
12 harvest in the wintertime. Because what that does,
13 antlerless harvest affects the production of calves and
14 also affects the recruitment rate of yearling bulls.
15 Now, generally hunters do not target calves and yearling
16 bulls but we have high predation rates in these areas.
17 And unfortunately on the Federal side, predator control
18 is an issue that we're extremely limited on what we can
19 do here.

20

21 What that leaves us in our toolbox is,
22 we're able to affect the season and the harvest limits
23 with respect to hunters. And what this proposal aims to
24 do is just, for now, look at the production side of the
25 moose population. Other components will have to be
26 addressed through the planning process that Mr. Nowlin
27 laid out for you. This just looks at the production
28 side, the amount of cows that are harvested during the
29 season.

30

31 What they would like to do is limit that
32 number by eliminating the antlerless moose season during
33 the winter. Later through discussions, if the -- well, I
34 guess it'd be called the planning team, or whatever the
35 management effort is, other components of the population
36 will have to be addressed.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Harry.

39

40 MR. ALLAIN: Yeah, that's good. Thank
41 you, Mr. Chairman. I think we're -- at least we're
42 focusing on one thing now.

43

44 Thank you.

45

46 MR. MORGAN: Could I ask you something,
47 Pete, this is Carl.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

50

00088

1 MR. MORGAN: So then this is -- you're
2 saying then all of 19(A) one bull, right?

3
4 MR. DEMATTEO: In 19(A) under the Federal
5 regulations it splits the area into 19(A), that portion
6 that's mentioned in the proposal and then the remainder.
7 So what this would do is make it one bull for all of
8 19(A) or it eliminates the antlerless harvest in all of
9 19(A) if that makes better sense.

10
11 MR. MORGAN: Okay, thank you.

12
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

14
15 MR. REAKOFF: I will support this
16 proposal but primarily because to give time for the
17 planning team to address that bull problem. But this
18 moose population is in a crises if we don't stop
19 harvesting cows here pretty soon. So I personally will
20 support this proposal and the Staff recommendation.

21
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, when is this
23 planning team meeting?

24
25 MR. ROGERS: I put up some announcements,
26 we're going to have this meeting in this room next week.
27 We had one meeting a couple weeks ago and I'll give you a
28 little bit of information on the progress but, you know,
29 we're geared up to try and meet the Board of Game cycle
30 for.....

31
32 MS. HILE: Randy, you need to come on up.

33
34 MR. RIVARD: You need to.....

35
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Randy come up to the
37 microphone.

38
39 MR. ROGERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have
40 a Central Kuskokwim Moose Committee meeting planned for
41 next week. We're looking at these issues and others. I
42 fully expect that you'll see many other changes come
43 before you as, you know, we're going to look to keep
44 alignment between State and Federal regulations unless
45 there's a specific reason why that would not make sense.

46
47 You know, one thing that you're not
48 seeing here, too, because it doesn't involve the Federal
49 regulations is part of the action that the Board of Game
50 took last year, to try to minimize conflicts between

00089

1 subsistence users and the guided hunts, was to set up a
2 system of corridors along the major rivers that are
3 closed to non-residents here now. So that's one change
4 that was put into effect that doesn't necessarily address
5 the issue of what that total bull harvest component is.
6 But our committee is going to have to take a close look
7 at the bull harvest, the cow harvest that's going on and
8 the levels of predation, et cetera, to come up with, you
9 know, hopefully a package of recommendations that makes
10 -- you know, addresses it in a comprehensive way. You
11 know, is going to look at harvest, predation, habitat
12 management and all the components to try and come up
13 with, you know, the best recommendations possible for an
14 overall moose management program for this area. And the
15 committee's hard at work to do that.

16

17 So this is really just the beginning of
18 what you'll see. I anticipate, you know, a lot more
19 discussion on this, and we would hope that by your next
20 fall meeting we've actually got some draft plan or ideas
21 for regulatory proposals to be thinking about then.

22

23 That's probably more than enough for now.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: You are coming up on the
26 agenda then, right?

27

28 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, you've got me
29 scheduled for tomorrow afternoon.....

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

32

33 MR. ROGERS:to give a little update
34 on this planning process.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, fine. With that in
37 mind, I, too, tend to support this proposal. However, I
38 would like you to introduce to this planning team what
39 Middle Yukon Advisory Committee and the Koyukuk River
40 Advisory Committee did, we didn't eliminate the
41 antlerless season, we just reauthorized it but put it
42 under emergency closure because we don't think you can
43 get it back if you totally eliminate it.

44

45 And I would like you to discuss that with
46 your planning committee for the Kuskokwim. Because I
47 think, like Carl said, these numbers are a little bit old
48 but they are alarming.

49

50 Any further questions. Go ahead.

00090

1 MR. BERG: Mr. Chairman, I think Pete has
2 something.

3
4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Pete.

5
6 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, if you look at
7 Table 1 on Page 95, if you look at those numbers I agree
8 with you that the 2001/2002 bulls per 100 cows number
9 six, could very well -- I'm not saying -- but they very
10 well could be inaccurate because it says -- it even says
11 in the analysis that snow conditions were not favorable
12 that year. Therefore, the numbers could have been
13 higher. So let's forget 2001/2002 just for discussion
14 purposes.

15
16 If you go up in there and if you look at
17 the period from 1994 through 1998 -- I'm sorry -- yeah,
18 1994 through 1998, you have 14, you have 22, and you have
19 14 bulls per 100 cows, certainly that looks a lot higher
20 compared to that six, but I got to tell you, Mr. Chair,
21 that that is reason for a red flag right there. That is
22 low. We certainly would like to have that higher. And
23 if you go across the board there, those numbers are also
24 low, particularly when you get to the number of calves
25 per 100 cows.

26
27 So it's true we do not have faith in the
28 2001/2002 figures, but those numbers between 1994 and
29 1998 and you have favorable survey conditions because of
30 snow cover, those are the ones that we're looking at.
31 Now, we're seeing consistent drops compared to the
32 numbers above that.

33
34 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Pete. Robert.

37
38 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
39 Questions for Pete here or probably Roy, too, also. But
40 you're showing so many bulls here per 100 cows, but how
41 many bulls were killed in that period, too, in this
42 portion of the river, that would be my question to be
43 brought up, not only in this meeting but when they have
44 the meeting next week here in Aniak with the Department
45 of Fish and Game. You have an answer for that Pete?

46
47 MR. DEMATTEO: The figures that I have,
48 to answer his question, are that the period 1996 through
49 2001, 90 percent of greater of the reported harvest for
50 this period were bull moose, with a light cow harvest

00091

1 occurring only during the February season. I know that's
2 a general comment that I'm making and I'm sure that the
3 Department of Fish and Game, when they get into the
4 planning process, with the planning team, I'm sure
5 they're going to start splitting these numbers apart.
6

7 But again, this proposal just looks at
8 the production side of the population. Because these
9 number, particularly yearling bulls and calves are
10 dangerously low, you have to help the production side of
11 the population by eliminating antlerless moose harvest.
12 That yearling bulls area recruited with adult population
13 and (indiscernible - phone cuts out) more calves be
14 produced.
15

16 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, Pete, this is Carl
17 again. If you turn to Page 96 you got harvest by hunters
18 in 19(A), it starting in '94 through 2002. And if I look
19 at you analysis, I guess that M means bull, and F means
20 female, right?
21

22 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes, it does.
23

24 MR. MORGAN: Then in '96/'97, 174 bulls
25 and if you look at the subsequent years, that rate of
26 successful bull hunts has dropped.
27

28 MR. DEMATTEO: In talking with the
29 Department of Fish and Game biologists, what they're
30 hearing from local residents are they're saying that
31 (indiscernible - phone cuts out) bulls are available for
32 harvest. One thing you also have to consider, even
33 though that the reported is low, you have to consider for
34 every one cow being shot, what does that mean as far as
35 the number of calves that will not be produced down the
36 line and the number of yearling bulls that won't be
37 recruited. You got numbers that are dangerously low, you
38 have to start looking at things at a threshold level.
39

40 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair.
41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.
43

44 MR. REAKOFF: I wanted to clarify, I
45 asked Roy if there's any State cow hunts, there aren't
46 any State cow hunts except in Lime Village. So the State
47 has eliminated the cow harvest already.
48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. That was
50 for clarification. Any further comments, questions.

00092

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: We do have a motion before
4 us. Was that amended or not -- it was to support
5 Proposal 31. Any further deliberations, comments.

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, the Chair will
10 entertain a motion to support Proposal 31, that's not
11 modified right, just to support it.

12

13 MR. COLLINS: Don't we have the motion
14 already?

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, it's already there.

17

18 MR. REAKOFF: I call for the question.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: The question has been
21 called for by Jack Reakoff.

22

23 All those in favor of supporting the
24 proposal, signify by saying aye.

25

26 IN UNISON: Aye.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

29

30 MR. MORGAN: Aye.

31

32 MR. WALKER: Aye.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Five -- six -- four and
35 two, against. Motion failed. Unless you want to clarify
36 it by a roll call vote. There was two against, motion
37 fails, all I heard was two. Right.

38

39 That will....

40

41 MR. REAKOFF: The motion passed.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, motion carried to
44 support. Okay, with that clarification -- yes, passed.

45

46 I would like to address all local people
47 and this Committee to really work on these numbers.

48

49 We know there was a problem here. We
50 started deliberating and asking for help in this area,

00093

1 the meetings have been going on so please continue going
2 to these meetings.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 Proposal 32. The Chair will entertain a
7 motion to adopt Proposal 32.

8

9 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Micky. Is there
12 a second.

13

14 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Jack. Staff
17 analysis.

18

19 MR. DEMATTEO: Proposal 32 was submitted
20 by the Western Interior Regional Council. This would
21 change the Unit 19(C) moose season from September 1
22 through October 10, to September 1 through September 20.
23 The proposed regulatory change would shorten the fall
24 season by 20 days, while the harvest limit would remain
25 as one antlered bull.

26

27 Mr. Chair, the analysis is on Page 102,
28 the proposed regulation is halfway down the page. And
29 quite frankly, the harvest limits stay the same but the
30 season would be September 1 through September 20.

31

32 Residents of Unit 19 have a customary and
33 traditional use determination for moose in Unit 19(C).

34

35 Agency and public concerns of continued
36 declines in area moose populations substantiate the
37 proponent's request to shorten the fall season. The
38 proposed change follows the concerns that prompted the
39 Alaska Board of game to place the same restrictions in
40 State regulations for Unit 19(C) moose.

41

42 Mr. Chair. Members of the Council. The
43 same concerns that you heard in the previous proposal
44 also fall in this one as well, I'm afraid.

45

46 Based on analysis of results from data
47 collected in the Farewell trend count area, notable
48 increases in the moose herd were seen during the 1987
49 through '88 and through '96/97 regulatory years.

50 However, declines were also observed in some of the

00094

1 population components.

2

3 Mr. Chair, since we have to survey the
4 moose over vast expanses here in Alaska, the only real
5 true indicator we have of what's going on inside the
6 moose population is the components, in other words, bulls
7 per 100 cows, and calves per 100 cows and so on.

8

9 Analysis of results from trend count
10 survey data also revealed that the bull/cow composition
11 had declined throughout this period. A general decline
12 in the number of bulls per 100 cows was observed during
13 the 1997/98 through 2001/02 regulatory years. Results
14 from data collected in the same trend count area also
15 reflect that the yearling bull/cow and calf/cow
16 components remained relatively stable during the 1990/91
17 through 1999/2000 regulatory years. While the yearling
18 bull and calf components appear to have remained stable
19 during this period, a sustained decline in the ongoing
20 decrease in the bull component could lead to a decline in
21 the overall population and subsequent declines in other
22 population components.

23

24 The average annual harvest in Unit 19(C)
25 during 1996/97 through 2001/2002 regulatory years was 139
26 moose. Further analysis of the reported total harvest
27 for this period revealed an 8.2 percent average annual
28 decrease. The reported hunter success rate for Unit
29 19(C) averaged 523 percent for 1996 to 2002.

30

31 Documented declines in components of the
32 area moose population and hunter harvest warrant the
33 necessity for the proposed regulatory change. Agency and
34 public concerns for this population substantiate the
35 proponent's request to reduce the fall season by 20 days.
36 Shortening the season would alleviate hunter pressure on
37 the bull moose during the breeding season and help to
38 stabilize this component of the population. The proposed
39 changes follow the concerns that prompted the Alaska
40 Board of Game to place the same restrictions in State
41 regulations for this unit. The proposed regulatory
42 change also follows ongoing cooperative management
43 efforts between the agencies, State Fish and Game
44 Advisory Committees and the Western Interior Regional
45 Council. Adoption of the proposed regulatory change
46 would support these efforts and would help to manage the
47 Unit 19(C) moose population for future subsistence users.

48

49 Mr. Chair, with that, the preliminary
50 conclusion is to support the proposal Unit 19(C), one

00095

1 antlered bull, and the season would be September 1
2 through September 20.

3

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

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Pete. That
7 just shortens the season by 20 days, that's about it,
8 right?

9

10 MR. DEMATTEO: That's right.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thanks. State.

13

14 MR. NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman. Roy Nowlin
15 with ADF&G. We share and support this concern about this
16 season in 19(C). And with these declining bull/cow
17 ratios we've seen in that area we believe that a more
18 conservative season is the correct thing to do here and
19 we support adoption of this proposal.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Regional, tribal comments.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seeing none, public
28 comments.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: None. Written comments.

33

34 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we do have
35 one written public comment submitted by the Denali SRC.

36

37 The Denali Subsistence Resource
38 Commission did support Proposal 32 to shorten the fall
39 season by 20 days, basically for the reasons used in the
40 Staff recommendation in your book.

41

42 Thank you. That's all the written public
43 comments.

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Further deliberations.
46 Council deliberations. Comments. Yeah, Ray.

47

48 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. The
49 McGrath Fish and Game Advisory Committee is the one that
50 went along with this last year when the State adopted the

00096

1 shortening of the season and they agreed with that.

2

3 The area that impacts hunters in the
4 Western Interior is that shaded area around Farewell,
5 that's the only Federal land around here and that is an
6 important area because it's the only part of 19, upper 19
7 that has a reasonably healthy moose population still.
8 19(D) right to the north of there is much lower numbers.
9 So we wanted to shorten that season to try to maintain
10 the health of that population around Farewell there.

11

12 So I'm in agreement with this proposal
13 and the local Fish and Game Advisory Committee is.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Ray. Any
16 further comments.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: IT always helps when the
21 home advisory committee comes up with these proposals and
22 support for these proposals.

23

24 Any further comments.

25

26 MR. STICKMAN: I have one comment before
27 we vote, Ron.

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Micky.

30

31 MR. STICKMAN: The only comment I have
32 is, you know, we're a subsistence but we're shortening
33 days but, you know, just for the record I want, you know,
34 I want it to be known that we're shortening it because of
35 conservation. I just wanted that to be on record.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Micky. Thanks
38 for that clarification. Any further comments.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Hearing none. All those
43 in favor of supporting Proposal 32, signify by saying
44 aye.

45

46 IN UNISON: Aye.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

49

50 (No opposing votes)

00097

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. Sorry,
2 Angie, but the record will show that when Angie walked in
3 a few hours ago, that she has been present, okay?

4
5 MS. HILE: (Nods affirmatively)

6
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Tina.

8
9 You guys want a short break?

10
11 (Council Nods Affirmatively)

12
13 Okay, 10 minute break and then we go into
14 another long one, 35.

15
16 (Off record)

17
18 (On record)

19
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'd like to reconvene now.
21 While we still got Pete DeMatteo on line I'd like to call
22 the meeting back to order. Proposal 35 is coming up
23 next, but at this time I would like to -- I guess our
24 vans want to know when we want to quit today. And some
25 people have to get out of here by 5:00 or 6:00 to go have
26 dinner; is that right -- yeah, what time do we want to
27 quit so they can call the vans right now, the ONC van and
28 all that.

29
30 MR. REAKOFF: 5:30 would be good.

31
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: 5:30, yeah. 5:30 fine
33 with everyone?

34
35 (Council Nods Affirmatively)

36
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: We'll go until 5:30. At
38 this time I don't see any need for an evening session
39 unless the Council wants it.

40
41 (Council Shakes Heads Negatively)

42
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: No evening session, okay.
44 I think all the Council members are leaving on the 20th.
45 We do have some Staff leaving tomorrow and maybe one or
46 two Council members.

47
48 So without further adieu, Proposal WP03-
49 35. The Chair will entertain a motion to support, adopt
50 Proposal 35.

00098

1 MR. STICKMAN: I make a motion to adopt.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: There's a motion to adopt
4 by Micky Stickman, is there a second.

5

6 MR. PETERS: I second it.

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Second by Emmitt Peters.
9 And do we have Pete DeMatteo on line, Staff analysis.

10

11 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, Proposal 35 is
12 submitted by Josh Olin of Huslia. And he requested the
13 Federal Subsistence Board close Federal lands within the
14 Koyukuk River drainage in Units 21(D) and 24 to the
15 hunting of moose except by Federally-qualified
16 subsistence users.

17

18 Mr. Chair, if you look on Page 112, 112,
19 the analysis, halfway down the page is the proposed
20 Federal regulation.

21

22 Under 21(D), the bold print would appear,
23 Federal public lands within the Koyukuk
24 River drainage in Unit 21(D) are closed
25 to the hunting of moose except by
26 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

27

28 That would be the proposed language. And
29 then the same thing would appear under Unit 24, the next
30 page, for Unit 24.

31

32 Residents of Unit 21(D), residents of
33 Huslia and Ruby have a customary and traditional use
34 determination for moose in Unit 21(D). Residents of 24
35 and residents of Anaktuvuk Pass, Koyukuk and Galena have
36 a customary and traditional use determination for moose
37 in Unit 24.

38

39 Mr. Chair, this proposal, other proposals
40 very similar to this have gone before the Council for
41 several years, probably about five times.

42

43 This proposal is different in that it
44 adds National Park Service lands to be closed by the
45 Federal Subsistence Board. In the past you've only seen
46 proposals that dealt with Fish and Wildlife Service lands
47 and BLM lands. This one closes all Federal lands along
48 the Koyukuk River drainage.

49

50 The Koyukuk River Moose Hunters Working

00099

1 Group and the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan are
2 ongoing processes that will continue through the year
3 2004/2005 regulatory year. Annual assessments of harvest
4 and population status will be reviewed by the working
5 group, the Council, Alaska Department of Fish and Game
6 and Federal agencies and Office of Subsistence Management
7 Staff. Adjustments in allocation will be made by
8 proposals and recommendations made to the State and
9 Federal Boards by the working group and the Council.

10

11 The working group was officially
12 disbanded following the completion of the management plan
13 but it remains authorized to periodically review and make
14 recommendations to the Alaska Board of Game concerning
15 changes to the management plan and also to regulations.

16

17 The working group met in December of
18 2000, also the winter of 2001 and the winter of 2002 to
19 review results of the fall hunting surveys, or hunting
20 seasons.

21

22 State and Federal regulations and
23 management and harvest objectives are based on the
24 management plan.

25

26 Mr. Chair, results from three large scale
27 population estimation surveys that were done in 1987,
28 1997 and 2001 and annual trend count area surveys on the
29 Koyukuk and northern unit of Innoko National Wildlife
30 Refuges indicated an apparently stable moose population,
31 however, declining recruitment parameters were evident in
32 all three count areas since 1998 and then the 2001
33 population estimate survey. Peak densities in moose were
34 apparently reached between 1993, 1997. The 2001
35 population estimation survey of bull/cow ratios were well
36 above the minimum needed for breeding while the calf/cow
37 ratio was lower than the minimum needed to maintain a
38 stable population.

39

40 Data from the trend count areas show even
41 lower recruitment parameters suggesting that the
42 recruitment was higher and the low density areas which
43 were not surveyed annually and may have acted to moderate
44 any decline of the population. As a result of the low
45 recruitment, here may be a series of weak cohorts of
46 moose entering the breeding population this year and in
47 subsequent years.

48

49 Predation appears to be to be the primary
50 factor limiting recruitment.

00100

1 Mr. Chair, as we've heard before that
2 predation levels are high and this takes its toll on calf
3 survival and also takes it toll on yearling bull
4 recruitment. And it appears that predation appears to be
5 the primary factor limiting bull recruitment.

6
7 Harvest data that was collected by the
8 Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of
9 Subsistence, supports the conclusion that moose harvests
10 in Units 21(D) and 24 have not declined for any local
11 resident hunting for subsistence purposes. Results from
12 household surveys conducted in 10 Middle Yukon and
13 Koyukuk River communities reflect that local subsistence
14 harvest rates for moose remain high.

15
16 Although local residents are concerned
17 with the declining moose population trends and with
18 competition with non-local hunters in Unit 24 and the
19 northern part of 21(D), moose population numbers still
20 appear generally healthy and local hunter success remains
21 high. Area wildlife managers believe the population is
22 able to sustain the level of current harvest. The
23 overall existing moose populations and hunter harvest
24 levels fall within the acceptable parameters set forth
25 under the existing management plan and the management
26 objectives.

27
28 The proposed closure in Federal lands and
29 the affected areas to non-Federally-qualified users may
30 not resolve local resident concerns with non-local
31 hunting effort. The proposed closure of Federal lands
32 during the Federal moose season could have the
33 undesirable effect of increasing hunter congestion and
34 user conflicts within the adjacent areas where other
35 local residents hunt and moose numbers are substantially
36 lower compared to the proposal area. Because of this, an
37 adoption of the proposal would result in a redistribution
38 of non-Federally-qualified hunters within Units 21(D) and
39 24, and would cause subsequent adverse impacts to local
40 users of the adjacent areas.

41
42 Current harvest levels, local user
43 success rates and the moose population status with the
44 effected area do not warrant the proposed restriction at
45 this time.

46
47 Also it's important to mention that for
48 these reasons the proponent's request does not meet the
49 criteria of Section .815 of ANILCA, which allows the
50 restriction of non-subsistence uses where wildlife

00101

1 populations are of concern.

2

3 User conflict concerns and other Koyukuk
4 River moose management issues should be considered by the
5 Koyukuk River Moose Hunters Working Group and addressed
6 as appropriate through revisions to the Koyukuk River
7 Moose Management Plan and regulatory proposals.

8

9 Mr. Chair, with that Staff recommends
10 that the same hold true that since the existing moose
11 populations and hunter harvest levels continue to fall
12 within acceptable parameters, Staff recommends that the
13 proposal be opposed, and that the Council continue to
14 support the management plan and the current management
15 efforts.

16

17 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thanks, Pete. Any
20 questions for Pete.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: State comments.

25

26 MR. NOWLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
27 Roy Nowlin, ADF&G. The State also opposes this proposal
28 because it is not consistent with the terms of the
29 Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan.

30

31 It's true that we have had some declines
32 in harvest. We do have concerns about declining calf
33 survival in Unit 24 and 21(D). But we have some very
34 specific guidelines or we have some good guidance from
35 the Koyukuk plan about how to deal with those declining
36 recruitments and we have implemented the provisions of
37 the plan to deal with that.

38

39 We have closed the fall antlerless hunts,
40 the State hunts and we've done that by emergency order.
41 They do remain on the books as the advisory committee's
42 requested. And so we feel that -- and also even though
43 total harvest has declined, the subsistence harvest in
44 those units has been maintained as was prescribed by the
45 terms of the plan.

46

47 So in summary we oppose this proposal and
48 support continuing application of the plan in 21(D) and
49 24.

50

00102

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Roy.

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Roy. Regional,
8 tribal comments.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, public comments.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: None. Written comments.

17

18 MR. BERG: Mr. Chairman, there were no
19 written public comments received for Proposal 35.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jerry. Council
22 deliberations, comments.

23

24 Jack.

25

26 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair, as Pete stated
27 the .815 of ANILCA does not allow us to close the season
28 if there's more than the subsistence users can use so the
29 Federal Subsistence Board cannot adopt this proposal.

30

31 And then the other aspect is, even if
32 they did it would push all the moose hunters onto the
33 State land and then we'd have really high competition
34 near villages like Koyukuk and Galena and places where
35 there's State land real close to them, Allakaket and
36 Bettles.

37

38 So at this time I'm opposed to this
39 proposal because it can't really pass and it's not --
40 we've worked pretty hard with the Koyukuk Moose Hunters
41 Planning Group to -- and the State to come up with ideas
42 to control those hunters in the Koyukuk Controlled Use
43 Area. There may be need for expansion of the drawing
44 hunt -- not the controlled use area, but the drawing
45 hunt, expand that drawing hunt outside of the controlled
46 use area. But that would be under the regulatory
47 proposals for next year in 2004.

48

49 But right now I can't support this
50 proposal because it violates the ANILCA law which we have

00103

1 to work under under this Council.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. Any
4 further comments. Micky.

5

6 MR. STICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
7 just made the motion to adopt the proposal even though I
8 was a member of the Moose Hunters Working Group, and I
9 see that the five year intensive moose management plan
10 working, I feel that as a Council member it's my
11 responsibility to put all the issues on that table,
12 that's why I made the motion.

13

14 Like Jack -- I agree with Jack, if we
15 pass this here, it's not going to go anywhere because it
16 has to pass the Federal Subsistence Board like Jack
17 explained, but the reason I made the motion to adopt is
18 because, well, if I didn't I'm not doing my job.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Micky. Any
21 further comments, Council deliberations. Ray.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: Well, yeah, I, again, urge
24 us to oppose this and vote this down because we worked
25 pretty hard to get that moose management group going and
26 I want to do whatever we can to try to keep it going
27 because it's the solution. We had, prior, tried to adopt
28 a solution that only applied to Federal lands and it
29 wouldn't have done what we intended it to do. It just
30 won't work. If you can get both Federal and State
31 working together it's a lot better -- just like we're
32 trying to do in the planning effort down here, to look at
33 the whole picture and solve the whole problem, not just a
34 part of it.

35

36 So yeah, I would urge to vote against it,
37 too.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

40

41 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
42 could see where Josh Olin is coming from on this, too.
43 You know, he has a concern, a person who lives in Huslia,
44 and not only him but a lot of other people to, so he
45 presents it to the Federal Board and, you know, we're
46 supposed to act in good faith, well, you know, something
47 like this like what Ray says and what Jack says, that a
48 five year plan, the moose management plan, you know,
49 there is a priority here and I can see a priority here.
50 So I think that you know, somebody should get back with

00104

1 Josh Olin and advise him on this, also, why we did this,
2 you know, why we're not going to vote for it. But there
3 has to be a reason to make this action, satisfaction to
4 give to him, where he would be satisfied where we would
5 say, well, you know, these guys, I don't trust them,
6 that's going to be the attitude that's going to come out
7 of this whole issue.

8

9 So I would recommend, Mr. Chairman, that
10 we have somebody do draft him up a letter and this
11 working group that is working with it also.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Robert, that
16 makes perfect sense. And I think that since Vince isn't
17 here, we have utilized Pete DeMatteo to draft a letter of
18 explanation on why we did some other stuff concerning the
19 same issue. As Pete DeMatteo stated, this issue comes up
20 every time we deliberate on wildlife proposals in one
21 form or another. But we also hollered and screamed at
22 everybody in the State and the Feds to get that working
23 moose management group working and it has been successful
24 to quite some extent.

25

26 Any further deliberations.

27

28 MR. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, would
29 you make sure that that letter gets drafted then and sign
30 it and send it from the Council. I think it would be
31 good to come from the Council to him as to why we voted,
32 even if you have Pete or somebody else draft it, send it,
33 you know.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Could you get that message
36 to Pete, does he hear it?

37

38 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we'll work
39 on getting that letter drafted and make sure that we run
40 it by the Council for Ron's signature before it goes out.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray, did you want the
43 whole Council to sign it?

44

45 MR. COLLINS: No, I think just to come
46 from the Council with your signature so that we're
47 responding to him, it isn't the Federal agency that's
48 responding.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you for that

00105

1 clarification. Any further deliberation.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question.

6

7 MR. WALKER: Question.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called
10 for. All those in favor of adopting Proposal 35, signify

11 by saying aye.

12

13 IN UNISON: Aye.

14

15 MR. COLLINS: No wait a minute, say that
16 again, that's to adopt.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, there is a motion
19 before us, strike the last one Tina.

20

21 There is a motion to adopt Proposal 35
22 before us. Because we've always worked in the positive
23 instead of the negative to introduce our proposals.

24

25 So question has been called for, all
26 those in favor of passing, adopting Proposal 35 signify
27 by saying aye.

28

29 (No aye votes)

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Those against, signify by
32 same sign.

33

34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion fails. Did I get
37 that right for the record -- yeah, okay. We will draft
38 that letter then as soon as we can reasonably explain it,
39 and get that .815 of ANILCA in that letter, too.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 I intend to sign it and pass it on.

44

45 Proposal 36. The Chair will entertain a
46 motion to adopt Proposal 36.

47

48 MR. MORGAN: Motion to adopt Proposal 36.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Moved by Carl

00106

1 Morgan.

2

3 MR. WALKER: Second.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Robert Walker.

6 Staff analysis.

7

8 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, Proposal WP03-

9 36 was submitted by the Western Interior Council. This

10 would extend the coyote hunting season in Units 19, 21

11 and 24 by 20 days opening the season on August 10th

12 instead of the current September 1 opening and allow the

13 existing harvest limit of 10 coyotes to be taken

14 throughout the season. This would align Federal and

15 State seasons and harvest limits and would eliminate the

16 current restriction of no more than two coyotes may be

17 harvested prior to October 1.

18

19 The existing Federal coyote season dates

20 for Units 19, 21 and 24 are currently more restrictive

21 than State regulations. The intent of the proposal is to

22 provide the qualified users of Units 19, 21 and 24 with

23 more opportunity to harvest coyotes. The proposed change

24 would provide an additional 20 days of hunting

25 opportunity from the current dates of September to April

26 30 to August 10 to April 30 and would allow the harvest

27 of 10 coyotes to be taken throughout the entire season.

28 It should also be noted that adoption of this proposal

29 would increase opportunity to harvest coyotes with a

30 rifle on National Park Service lands.

31

32 Mr. Chair, on Page 130, 130, of your

33 book, the proposed regulations appear at the bottom of

34 the page and the propose language strikes however no more

35 than two coyotes may be taken before October 31st and

36 this does so for Units 19, 21 and 24. And it also would

37 strike the September 1 opening date and add the August 10

38 opening date.

39

40 The existing restriction of no more than

41 two coyotes may be taken before October 1st was

42 originally implemented under State regulations prior to

43 the Federal Subsistence Management Program. Because

44 furbearer pelts are generally not prime during the fall

45 season, regulatory provisions that allow for the harvest

46 of coyotes before October 1st are more conservative than

47 the late fall and winter regulations. However, the

48 existing regulation does allow hunters who wish to take

49 coyotes the opportunity to harvest two coyotes during the

50 fall hunting season prior to October 1st.

00107

1 Mr. Chair, all rural residents have
2 customary and traditional use determination for coyotes
3 in Units 19, 21 and 24. It's also important to mention
4 that the resident zone communities that are eligible to
5 subsistence hunt and trap in that portion of 24 within
6 Gates of the Arctic National Park are Alatna, Allakaket,
7 Ambler, Anaktuvuk Pass, Bettles/Evansville, Hughes,
8 Kobuk, Nuiqsut, Shungnak and Wiseman. The resident zone
9 communities that are eligible to subsistence hunt and
10 trap in that portion of 19 within Denali National Park
11 are Cantwell, Minchumina, Nikolai and Telida. The
12 resident zone communities that are eligible to
13 subsistence hunt and trap in that portion of Unit 19
14 within Lake Clark National Park and Preserve are Iliamna,
15 Lime Village, Newhalen, Nondalton, Pedro Bay and I think
16 the last one should say Port Alsworth, but it didn't
17 print on my page.

18
19 The status of coyote populations in Units
20 19, 21 and 24 are not fully known due to the lack of
21 surveys and sealing requirements, however, all
22 indications suggest that the populations in these units
23 are naturally low. Coyote harvest along with fox,
24 marten, mink, muskrat, squirrel and weasel are not easily
25 documented since sealing is not required in Units 1
26 through 5, 7, 13(E) and 14 through 16.

27
28 No specific coyote harvest data for
29 Federal lands are available. Coyote harvests during 1990
30 through 1995 totaled 47 for Unit 19, however, there are
31 no data available for Units 21 and 24. Harvest data are
32 based on trapper questionnaires conducted by the Alaska
33 Department of Fish and Game but do not differentiate
34 between trapping and hunting.

35
36 Expansion of the Federal seasons and
37 removal of the restrictions on the harvest limit for
38 coyote in Units 19, 21 and 24 would provide some
39 additional opportunity for qualified users on National
40 Park Service lands. Additionally, the proposed Federal
41 harvest limit would align with the existing State harvest
42 limits. Because qualified users who hunt coyote in these
43 units currently have the opportunity to harvest coyotes
44 during the proposed dates and at the proposed harvest
45 levels under State regulations no additional harvests of
46 coyote are anticipated. Alignment between Federal and
47 State regulations would be less confusing for the user,
48 as it would eliminate the need to determine Federal and
49 State jurisdictional boundaries.

50

00108

1 Mr. Chair, the preliminary conclusion is
2 to support the proposal.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions for Pete.
7 Robert.

8

9 MR. WALKER: Yes, Pete, Robert Walker.

10 I'm just curious here. I looked at the map here and is
11 this normal for coyotes to range this far north and west
12 from Anchorage here or is this something that just has
13 happened in the last 20 years or so?

14

15 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Walker -- Mr. Walker I
16 can say that judging by the information I have before me,
17 a lot of this information was collected from the like
18 mid-1980s from trapper questionnaires, and again the
19 information we have from trappers is that, you know,
20 these animals are seen far and few between even in 21 and
21 24. This is something that's seen incidentally, maybe
22 they get caught in a wolf snare and that's how they know
23 they're there. But this is not something that happens
24 very often.

25

26 We just know the presence, that they do
27 occasionally occur in these areas but we have no idea on
28 how many or the density.

29

30 MR. WALKER: Thank you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Benedict.

33

34 MR. JONES: Yeah, this is Benedict Jones.

35 On your survey I think it's incorrect, because 21 and 24
36 hasn't seen a coyote tracks in the last 50 years since
37 the pack of wolves moved into the area, so the wolves
38 have cleaned out the coyotes in 21 and 24. They never
39 been harvest of any coyotes since 1940.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions or
42 comments for Pete. Jack.

43

44 MR. REAKOFF: In the northern Unit 24, I
45 seen a coyote last fall and they're real rare -- rarish,
46 and people of Anaktuvuk, they catch one once in a while
47 up there, but they trap wolves quite a bit. So there's
48 some around up there but not hardly very many but there
49 seems to be more than there used to be.

50

00109

1 There was an old-timer who trapped for
2 many years and he caught one in 1967, and that was the
3 first time he had ever seen one and he was 75 years old.
4 So I see them almost every year now, I see tracks of
5 coyote, and I visually seen one last fall. So they are
6 increasing and that's where this proposal came from,
7 they're increasing around the Tanana and Alaska range
8 country. So that's where this proposal originated, was
9 under the State proposals.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack.

12

13 MR. COLLINS: And, Mr. Chairman,
14 regardless of what the population is, if there is a State
15 season that's more general we would not want to be more
16 restrictive on subsistence users so that's the reason to
17 liberalize.

18

19 But I guess I have a question, a
20 biological question, Pete, is there any information on
21 the rate of their expansion of warming, is the warmer
22 winters contributing in any way to the expansion of that
23 population, do you think?

24

25 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Collins, that's an
26 excellent question, however the occurrence of warmer
27 winters is more or a recent trend. And unfortunately
28 with limited funding for the agencies, survey of coyotes
29 kind of ranks out towards the bottom simply because pelt-
30 wise they're less value compared to other furbearers and
31 also quite simply, people do not eat them. So quite
32 frankly that information has not been looked into.
33 Whether it will or not I don't know. I'd be willing to
34 bet that we'll learn more about that dealing with
35 trappers, through trapper questionnaires and household
36 harvest surveys. Maybe Mr. Nowlin has additional
37 information, you may want to ask him.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Roy. State.

40

41 MR. NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman. Member
42 Collins. Roy Nowlin, ADF&G. We really don't have
43 anything more either. It's just these trapper
44 questionnaires are our primary source of information and
45 other observations, incidental, but they do appear from
46 what people have told us, our own staff, that they are
47 increasing in the Alaska range. It was discussed at
48 length at the Board meeting because there was a couple of
49 proposals there to liberalize coyote seasons in 20(A) and
50 perhaps some of the other Alaska range units.

00110

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes. This regulation
4 already exists on the State side, right?

5

6 MR. NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman, that's
7 correct. And we support this proposal. It would align
8 the seasons and we think it would not really have a
9 significant impact on harvest at this point.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Did you have
14 something else.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Regional corporations,
19 tribes comments.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Public comments.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written.

28

29 MR. BERG: Mr. Chairman, we do have one
30 written public comment submitted by the Denali
31 Subsistence Resource Commission. They unanimously
32 supported this proposal to lengthen the coyote season in
33 Units 19, 21 and 24 to match the State regulations for
34 the reasons stated in the Staff recommendation. And that
35 was all the written public comments submitted for
36 Proposal 36.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jerry. And as
39 Ray so ably stated that we find more and more that a lot
40 of the Federal regulations are more restrictive than the
41 State and that's one of the reasons that we do try to
42 align with the State whenever possible.

43

44 Any further Board deliberations.

45

46 MR. WALKER: Question.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question has been called
49 for. All those in favor of adopting Proposal 36, signify
50 by saying aye.

00111

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

4

5 (No opposing votes)

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried.

8

9 Proposal 37. The Chair will entertain a
10 motion to adopt Proposal 37 -- oh, okay, 38.

11

12 MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt
13 this regulation proposal. I also would like to amend
14 that.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Which one?

17

18 MR. REAKOFF: This Proposal 03-38. At
19 our meeting in Fairbanks I submitted this for the Western
20 Interior to be evaluated and I had worked with the
21 National Park Service on this proposal but it was during
22 moose season and it was a telephone conversation and the
23 Staff member that typed it up actually gave me two
24 proposals and I thought they were duplicates of one and
25 what I had thought I was submitting and the one that I
26 retained was a bag limit increase to 15 wolves, and so I
27 would like to make an amendment to this proposal to allow
28 the increase to 15 wolves.

29

30 And then I've had quite a bit of
31 telephone conversation with various people and they're
32 not happy about that many wolves being harvested in
33 August so I'd like to amend this proposal to stay at five
34 wolves from August 10th to November 1st, after November
35 1st an increase to 15 wolves.

36

37 And that's my amendment.

38

39 CHAIRMAN SAM: And that was a motion to
40 adopt Proposal 38 as modified?

41

42 MR. REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Did everyone get that
45 modification. Is there a second first.

46

47 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Micky. Staff
50 analysis.

00112

1 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, for
2 clarification sake I'd like to just repeat what Jack
3 stated in his amendment. If I captured that right he
4 would like to see a change to five wolves August 10
5 through October 31st, and then 15 wolves November 1st
6 through April 30th; is that correct, and this is under
7 wolf hunting for Unit 24?

8
9 MR. REAKOFF: That's correct.

10
11 MR. DEMATTEO: Okay.

12
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: So then that....

14
15 MR. DEMATTEO: So, Mr. Chair, I'll begin
16 the Staff analysis.

17
18 Proposal 38 was submitted by the Western
19 Interior Regional Council and would increase the existing
20 Unit 24 wolf hunting harvest limit from five to 10 wolves
21 was the original, and now it's been increased from five
22 to 15, 15 wolves November 1st through April 30th, prior
23 to that the August 10th through October it will remain as
24 five wolves during the wolf hunting season for Unit 24.

25
26 Rural residents of Units 6, 9, 10, which
27 is Unimak Island only, 11 through 13 and residents of
28 Chickaloon and Units 16 through 26 have a positive
29 customary and traditional use determination for wolves in
30 Unit 24. For National Park Service Park lands, only
31 residents of resident zone communities of Alatna,
32 Allakaket, Ambler, Anaktuvuk Pass, Bettles/Evansville,
33 Hughes, Kobuk, Nuiqsut, Shungnak and Wiseman may hunt and
34 trap within the Gates of the Arctic National Park
35 boundaries.

36
37 The total area population estimate for
38 Unit 24 was 374 to 541 wolves, and that's distributed in
39 58 to 66 packs, and the overall population appears to be
40 healthy. And that's according to the Alaska Department
41 of Fish and Game analysis from the year 2000.

42
43 The average annual reported harvest of
44 wolves in Unit 24 over the past 10 years, 1991 through
45 2000 has been 80 wolves taken by hunters and trappers.
46 An estimated total of 130 to 140 wolves are harvested
47 each year within the unit.

48
49 Through preliminary discussion with area
50 trappers, hunters, Department of Fish and Game and Fish

00113

1 and Wildlife Service Staff the wolf population in Unit 24
2 appears to be stable to increasing. Fur reports provide
3 a record of commercial transaction, however, furs kept
4 for home tanning are not documented in fur reports and do
5 not contain numbers of furbearers harvested in a given
6 regulatory year. Harvest estimates information may be
7 augmented by the information from trapper questionnaires,
8 hunter interviews and fur acquisitions and export
9 reports. Furbearer harvest data should be interpreted as
10 indicators of harvest, not actual harvest numbers.
11 Fluctuations in fur transaction numbers from one year to
12 the next do not reflect harvest fluctuations or
13 population trends but could be the result of weather
14 conditions, fur prices or the cost of trapping supplies.

15
16 The trapping regulation for wolves in
17 Unit 24 has no harvest limit with season dates of
18 November 1 through April 30th. Most firearms are allowed
19 while trapping. However, trappers on National Park
20 Service lands are not allowed to use firearms to take
21 free-ranging furbearers.

22
23 Adoption of the proposed regulation would
24 meet the proponent's intent to increase opportunity for
25 qualified users who want to harvest additional wolves in
26 Unit 24. If adopted, additional harvest of wolves is
27 not likely in most of Unit 24 because rural subsistence
28 users who hunt wolves in Unit 24 may currently do so
29 under trapping regulations. Most area hunters have a
30 trapping license and so are able to harvest an unlimited
31 number of wolves during a shorter trapping season. Most
32 wolves are harvested during the trapping season, as I
33 mentioned November 1st through April 30th due to the
34 better fur condition and the better transportation
35 conditions. The additional opportunity would have the
36 greatest impact in the Gates of the Arctic National Park,
37 where hunting regulations are the primary means to
38 harvest wolves with a firearm. This additional
39 opportunity in the Park may slightly increase wolf
40 harvest within the Park boundary but it is not likely to
41 have much, if any, impact on the overall wolf population
42 for Unit 24. The number of hunters eligible to hunt
43 within the Park is also limited by existing National Park
44 Service eligibility regulations that were mentioned
45 previously.

46
47 Adoption of this proposal would create a
48 difference between Federal and State regulations. A
49 proposal could be submitted to the Alaska Board of Game
50 for consideration to realign the regulations should this

00114

1 proposal be adopted.

2

3 Mr. Chair, considering Mr. Reakoff's
4 amendment to the original proposal and considering the
5 existing wolf population, what's known about it, the
6 Staff would support the proposal in their preliminary
7 conclusion, beings that the proposed harvest limits
8 should not adversely affect the wolf population for Unit
9 24.

10

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

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thanks, Pete. State.

14 Roy.

15

16 MR. NOWLIN: Roy Nowlin, ADF&G. Thank
17 you, Mr. Chairman. We can support this proposal. We
18 originally had it support with modification and Member
19 Reakoff has made the modification. And so I believe we
20 can -- or we can go ahead and support this proposal
21 including the increased bag limit.

22

23 I don't believe that there would be any
24 adverse effect on the wolf population as a result of this
25 increase. This is mostly incidental take under hunting
26 license with -- of course, there's the increase take or
27 the take in the Gates of the Arctic which is limited to
28 qualified subsistence users, so we support this proposal
29 with the modification.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any questions.

34

35 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

38

39 MR. MORGAN: So, Jack, that will be a
40 total of 20?

41

42 MR. REAKOFF: No, it's a step, it will
43 start with five up through October 31st.....

44

45 MR. MORGAN: A total of 15?

46

47 MR. REAKOFF: A total of 15. Some
48 supplemental information. The people in Anaktuvuk Pass
49 have been harvesting wolves with a firearm from day one,
50 it's not until the last 10 years that the Park Service

00115

1 has even discussing that they had a regulation that
2 people couldn't take wolves with a firearm on a trapping
3 license. And the Park Service has not been enforcing,
4 it's like the hunting spring ducks. This is to try to
5 accommodate a customary practice that's been ongoing and
6 make it legal. This is the same bag limit that they have
7 in Unit 26. Unit 26 has a 15 wolf harvest limit. And so
8 this is our -- we've gone round and round with the Park
9 Service on this issue and we've come -- we're at a total
10 impasse, we have to change the hunting regulations to
11 somewhat accommodate customary and traditional use.

12
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. Any
14 regional, corporation or tribe comments.

15
16 (No comments)

17
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, public comments.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.

23
24 MR. BERG: Mr. Chairman, we did receive
25 one written public comment from the Defender's of
26 Wildlife. They feel -- they oppose the proposal. They
27 feel that the current wolf and wolverine hunting
28 regulations are adequate to provide subsistence needs in
29 Unit 24 where most furbearers are taken by trapping with
30 no bag limits. ADF&G objectives here are for sustained
31 harvest of no more than 30 percent of the wolf
32 population. They feel that these levels are probably now
33 reached or exceeded, even though it's impossible to
34 accurately measure because sealing reporting is so
35 chronically low. In addition, planned aerial wolf
36 population surveys in winter 2001 and '02 did not occur
37 due to weather conditions. Similarly, wolverine
38 reporting is low and population data is scarce requiring
39 that hunting regulations remain conservative.

40
41 And that's all the public comments we
42 received on Proposal 38, Mr. Chair.

43
44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jerry. Council
45 deliberations, questions, comments. Benedict.

46
47 MR. JONES: Yeah, the regulations, this
48 just says wolf it doesn't include wolverine.

49
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, Proposal 39 deals

00116

1 with wolverine, next, that's coming up. Any further
2 comments, deliberations. Micky.

3

4 MR. STICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
5 only comment that I have is if you look at the current
6 harvest and you look at the moose management plan and we
7 talked about it at our advisory committee meetings, even
8 with the current harvest we haven't really made a dent as
9 far as preservation of the moose population, so I would
10 speak in favor of this proposal.

11

12 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, also in favor
13 of this. Actually you can sustain a harvest of about 40
14 percent and still not see much change in the population
15 because of their ability to replace that with the birth
16 rate each year. So anywhere from 35 to 40 percent, all
17 you're doing is just cropping and if you want to maintain
18 that we're going to have to continue harvesting if we
19 want healthy wildlife populations.

20

21 The other thing I see happening out there
22 is there seems to be fewer people engaged in this
23 activity. There's not very many trappers out, and so by
24 increasing individual bag limits, those who still
25 continue to do this would be able to take more but it may
26 not necessarily result in a higher harvest, just fewer
27 people doing it. So I think that's a good reason to have
28 a higher individual limit.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Ray. Benedict.

31

32 MR. JONES: Yeah, in Unit 21 we allow the
33 hunters to harvest during that moose hunting season so
34 they've been successful about 10 wolves per season in
35 that area.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Benedict. Any
38 further deliberations. Comments.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Hearing none, all those in
43 support of Proposal 38 as modified, signify by saying
44 aye.

45

46 IN UNISON: Aye.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

49

50 (No opposing votes)

00117

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. Proposal
2 39. The Chair will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal
3 39.

4

5 MR. STICKMAN: Move to adopt.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Micky, is there a
8 second.

9

10 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Second by Jack Reakoff.

13

14 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, go ahead.

17

18 MR. REAKOFF: I've got the same
19 opposition of those kind of limit that early in the fall
20 season. And so I would like to also amend this to allow
21 one wolverine up through October 31st, after November
22 1st, step that up to five wolverine in Unit 24 between
23 November 1st and March 31st. And that's an additional
24 amendment to that motion.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Modification.

27

28 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: One from September 1
31 through October 31st and then five total for the rest.

32

33 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, uh-huh.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Pete, did you get that.

36

37 MR. DEMATTEO: Proposal 39 submitted by
38 the Western Interior Council to increase existing Unit 24
39 wolf [sic] hunting harvest limit from one to five
40 wolverines so noted that Jack Reakoff amended the
41 original proposal to read the total of five wolverines
42 may be taken during the wolverine hunting season for Unit
43 24, however, one wolverine prior to November 1st --
44 September 1 through October 31st will be one wolverine;
45 is that correct?

46

47 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, that's correct, Pete.

48 It'd be five wolverine after November 1st through March
49 31.

50

00118

1 MR. DEMATTEO: Okay.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I'll second

4 that.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Didn't we have a motion

7 already and it was seconded?

8

9 MR. REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Continue with Staff

12 analysis, Pete.

13

14 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, the existing

15 Federal and State subsistence harvest limit for hunting

16 wolverines in Unit 24 is one wolverine during September 1

17 through March 31st. The proponent's intent is to

18 increase opportunity for qualified users who want to

19 harvest additional wolverines in Unit 24.

20

21 All rural residents have a positive

22 customary and traditional use determination for wolverine

23 in Unit 24. For National Park Service lands only

24 residents of resident zone communities of Alatna,

25 Allakaket, Ambler, Anaktuvuk Pass, Bettles/Evansville,

26 Hughes, Kobuk, Nuiqsut, Shungnak and Wiseman may hunt and

27 trap within Park boundaries.

28

29 Mr. Chair, there have been no formal

30 surveys for wolverine population levels in Unit 24. As a

31 result there is little biological information available

32 other than from reported furbearer sealing records. State

33 sealing records have documented 18 and 10 wolverine were

34 sealed in the years 2000, 2001 respectfully. Fur reports

35 provide a record of commercial transactions and do not

36 contain number of furbearers harvested in a given

37 regulatory year. Harvest information may be augmented by

38 information from trapper questionnaires, hunter

39 interviews and fur acquisition and export reports.

40

41 The average annual reported harvest of

42 wolverine in Unit 24 over the past 10 years, 1991 through

43 2000 has been 26 wolverines taken by hunters and

44 trappers. Increasing the wolverine harvest limit for

45 Unit 24 will provide additional opportunity but would not

46 expected to adversely impact existing healthy wolverine

47 population even at the amended level that Mr. Reakoff has

48 proposed.

49

50 Most area hunters have a trapping license

00119

1 and so are able to harvest unlimited number of wolverine
2 during the shorter trapping season. The majority of
3 wolverine harvested occurs during the trapping season.

4
5 Mr. Chair, with that Staff would offer
6 the preliminary conclusion and support the proposal.

7
8 Thank you.

9
10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Was that support as
11 modified?

12
13 MR. BERG: Is that support as modified,
14 Pete?

15
16 MR. DEMATTEO: Sorry, Mr. Chair, yes,
17 correct. That would be support as modified by Mr.
18 Reakoff. It would be -- the proposed regulation would
19 be:

20
21 Unit 24 wolverine during the hunting
22 season would be 15 wolverine September
23 1st through March 31st, however, only one
24 wolverine -- I'm sorry -- five wolverines
25 September 1st through March 31st,
26 however, one wolverine may be taken prior
27 to November 1.

28
29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Was that right, Jack?

30
31 MR. REAKOFF: Yes.

32
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

34
35 MR. COLLINS: He said 15.

36
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: But he said 15 instead
38 of.....

39
40 MR. REAKOFF: Well, he changed it back to
41 five.

42
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Oh, he did change it okay.

44
45 (Laughter)

46
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, Roy. State.

48
49 MR. NOWLIN: Roy Nowlin, ADF&G. Our
50 position on this proposal is to support it with the

00120

1 modification that Member Reakoff has proposed. We feel
2 that this is sustainable. We did have concerns about the
3 pelt primeness during that early period but it's been
4 addressed in the amendment so we can support this
5 proposal.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Regional,
10 tribal comments.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Public comments.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.

19

20 MR. BERG: Mr. Chairman, you can find on
21 Page 145 the same comment was submitted by the Defender's
22 of Wildlife, they submitted the same comment for both
23 Proposal 38 and 39. So without reading it into the
24 record again, it was just the same comment that was just
25 read into the record for the previous proposal.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. I was going to
28 ignore it anyway.

29

30 (Laughter)

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Robert.

33

34 MR. WALKER: Roy, Robert Walker.
35 Proposal 38 and 39, wolf and wolverine, they're both
36 considered big game, right, because you have to seal
37 them?

38

39 MR. NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman. Member
40 Walker. These are classified as furbearers for hunting
41 -- this is furbearer hunting. I guess I feel a little
42 insecure without checking the regulations to make sure
43 but I don't think they're considered as big game animals,
44 I think they're considered furbearers, we have a hunting
45 season on furbearers. I can verify that for you just to
46 make sure that's a correct answer though.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Jack.

49

50 MR. REAKOFF: They're considered a big

00121

1 game animal for non-resident hunters and they have a
2 locking tag for them for non-resident hunters, but as far
3 as I know for residents they're taken under the furbearer
4 category under hunting. But you would have to check your
5 -- I got your reg book I could check it real quick.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jack. Any
8 further questions.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Council deliberations. Go
13 ahead, Carl.

14

15 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I'm in favor of the
16 regulations, however, I would rather see it eliminated in
17 the September, because that's when our guides are landing
18 up in these hills and catching the caribou and moose up
19 in the hills and it's -- you get all the gut piles and I
20 -- but I will not oppose the change. But I just wanted
21 to bring up that comment. And I've heard some concerns
22 about when they're hunting -- because we get caribou
23 hunting here in August and you've got -- like you got the
24 furbearing, it does open in September, I believe, around
25 this part of the country, too.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, believe this
30 proposal just addresses Unit 24. Okay, Jack.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: And this is for Federal
33 qualified subsistence users. To change that, to move
34 that back would be done under State regulations.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is that clearer Carl.

37

38 MR. MORGAN: I'm good.

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further
41 questions.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, all those in favor
46 of adopting Proposal 39, signify by saying aye.

47

48 IN UNISON: Aye.

49

50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

00122

1 (No opposing votes)

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. While we
4 have Pete DeMatteo on line, we would like to utilize him
5 for Staff analysis on Proposal 29 and 28 and then we can
6 come back to Pat McClenahan, is that fine with you?

7

8 MS. MCCLENAHAN: That's fine.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead and we'll utilize
11 Pete and jump around the agenda again.

12

13 Proposal 29. The Chair will entertain a
14 motion to adopt.

15

16 MR. WALKER: Where is it?

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Quite a ways back, Page
19 151 -- Page 175. Okay, the Chair will entertain a motion
20 to adopt Proposal 29 on Page 175.

21

22 MR. COLLINS: I so move.

23

24 MR. PETERS: Second.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Emmitt Peters
27 and moved by Ray Collins. Staff analysis, Pete, while
28 you're on line.

29

30 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, this proposal
31 is being presented to the Council today because it
32 overlaps with your region. It's primarily for Unit 18,
33 but because of the C&T, also residents of Upper Kalskag,
34 Aniak and Chuathbaluk also are eligible to harvest moose
35 in Unit 18 south of the Yukon River. So because of those
36 three communities you are reviewing this today.

37

38 Proposal 29 was submitted by the
39 Yukon/Kuskokwim Delta Regional Council. And this would
40 require that all edible meat of a moose harvested in Unit
41 18 south of the Yukon River prior to October 1st must
42 remain on the bone until the meat is removed from the
43 field or is processed for human consumption.

44

45 Mr. Chair, this proposal is very similar
46 to Proposals 30 and 34, which you took action on
47 previously.

48

49 On Page 178, 178 of the analysis you'll
50 see the proposed regulatory language about halfway down

00123

1 the page and it would read as follows:

2

3 All edible meat of the front quarters and
4 hindquarters from moose harvested in Unit
5 18 south of the Yukon River prior to
6 October 1st must remain on the bone until
7 the meat is removed from the field or is
8 processed for human consumption.

9

10 Mr. Chair, recent regulatory changes made
11 by the Alaska Board of Game require users to salvage all
12 the edible meat from a moose harvested in Unit 18 south
13 of the Yukon. And again, the Federal Board adopted
14 similar meat-on-bone regulations for moose in 9(B), 17
15 and then 19(B).

16

17 And ongoing agency and public concerns of
18 meat spoilage from moose harvested during August and
19 September warrant added transport restrictions. For
20 reasons of cutting weight and/or reducing bulk non-local
21 hunters who access public lands in Unit 18 by boat or by
22 airplane sometimes find it necessary to de-bone the meat
23 of a harvested moose. While this reduction in weight and
24 bulk favors weigh limitations and the return trip home,
25 be it boat or airplane, the boned meat naturally induces
26 spoilage and unfavorable temperatures or when transported
27 in non-breathable bags or containers.

28

29 Adoption of the proposed regulation would
30 favor reduction in meat spoilage during transport from
31 the harvest site and would align with State regulations.
32 The meat-on-bone requirement would also comply with local
33 harvest and transport methods that refrain from de-boning
34 harvested meat. Local methods traditionally call for
35 transporting meat on the bone from the harvest site and
36 hanging the front and hindquarters until processed for
37 human consumption. Because of this, adoption of the
38 proposed regulation would not adversely affect Federally-
39 qualified subsistence users.

40

41 And again, the proposed regulation calls
42 for the term field and, again, as before there is no
43 definition for it in Federal regulations and this could
44 cause confusion.

45

46 With that, Mr. Chair, the preliminary
47 conclusion is to support the proposal with modification
48 and if you look at Page 182 -- 182, the proposed
49 regulation would read:

50

00124

1 Unit 18, south of the Yukon River, all
2 edible meat of the front quarters and
3 hindquarters from moose harvested in Unit
4 18 south of the Yukon River prior to
5 October 1st must remain on the bone until
6 the meat is removed from the field or is
7 processed for human consumption.

8
9 And Staff also recommends that the
10 modification of that you add the language to include a
11 definition for the term field and, again, I borrowed it
12 from State regulations which you reviewed before.

13
14 With that, Mr. Chair, I will stop there.

15
16 Thank you.

17
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Pete. For the
19 Council's clarification, I would like to see a friendly
20 amendment right now instead of supporting or adopting
21 Proposal 29, to read as modified with the addendum of
22 definition of field. Would that do the trick? Friendly
23 amendment from the motion-maker and second.

24
25 MR. COLLINS: Yes, I would agree with
26 that.

27
28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Emmitt.

29
30 MR. PETERS: (Nods affirmatively)

31
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, we've got consensus.
33 State.

34
35 MR. NOWLIN: Roy Nowlin, ADF&G. Mr.
36 Chairman, the State supports this proposal with the
37 modification that's already been suggested here about
38 definition of field, and that would mean that it would be
39 consistent with State regulations.

40
41 I'd also like to suggest that, and,
42 again, this would be an alignment with State regulations
43 that you include caribou as well as moose in this
44 proposal. And again, that would provide some additional
45 alignment with State regulations.

46
47 So not only we're supporting this
48 proposal with the modification that you already have on
49 the table, that is the definition of field, plus we're
50 suggesting that caribou be added to this so that it would

00125

1 be both moose and caribou with this meat-on-bone
2 requirement.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Roy. Would
7 that be.....

8

9 MR. COLLINS: I would agree with that if
10 that's allowed, Pete, may be able to -- or somebody could
11 comment, is that changing the proposal too much?

12

13 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. Mr. Collins,
14 what you'd be doing in effect is you'd be recommending to
15 the Federal Board that modification. Being that this
16 proposal belongs to another region you could not modify
17 the original proposal but you could recommend that the
18 Board take action concurrent with what you're
19 recommending.

20

21 MR. COLLINS: Thank you. Yeah, I'll agree
22 with that in the motion then, that we recommend that this
23 be aligned with the State season on caribou as well or in
24 addition to.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Recommend that Unit
27 18.....

28

29 MR. COLLINS: No, recommend it to the
30 Federal Board to add caribou to the proposal for moose.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: There's a friendly
33 amendment, is that okay with the second?

34

35 MR. PETERS: (Nods affirmatively)

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, it is. Any further
38 questions. Modifications.

39

40 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Pete.

43

44 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, I'm looking at
45 the Federal regulations on Page 103 and it says, Unit 18,
46 that portion south of the Yukon River, five caribou and
47 then it says edible meat must remain on the bones of the
48 front quarters and hindquarters until the meat is removed
49 from the field. I'd ask you to ask Mr. Nowlin, is he
50 saying to adopt that to the regulations which is already

00126

1 there or is he saying adopt the term field, which is
2 missing already?

3

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Roy.

5

6 MR. NOWLIN: Roy Nowlin, ADF&G. Mr.
7 Chairman, we're suggesting or we'd like to see the field
8 language and supporting the definition of field in there.
9 And I'm sorry, I didn't understand the question that was
10 asked, could I get a repeat on it, please.

11

12 MR. DEMATTEO: Okay. Mr. Chair, to
13 further clarify for everybody's benefit, the term field
14 would not appear in the regulation, that would appear at
15 the beginning of the book where the Federal definitions
16 are for wildlife. It would not appear in the unit-
17 specific regulations for the taking of wildlife. It
18 would appear on like on Page 13, 14 and 15 of your green
19 Subsistence Management Regulations Book. It would appear
20 in the beginning and that would -- that definition of
21 field would pertain to all regulations.

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: So even if it's missing
24 from our language it would still be in effect?

25

26 MR. DEMATTEO: Well, for the caribou
27 specific (telephone cuts out) you're just recommending
28 that the Board adopt this definition for the term, field,
29 for all regulations?

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: We're still on Proposal
32 29, aren't we Jack?

33

34 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah. And I want to be
35 clear. You were just reading from the Federal regs and
36 they're already requiring the meat-on-bone so that State
37 request is not really warranted?

38

39 MR. DEMATTEO: (Telephone cuts out)
40 modification as written there. That definition would
41 appear at the beginning of the book and would pertain to
42 all Federal regulations. It would not be species
43 specific. Does that make sense, Mr. Chair?

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Then this friendly
46 amendment we were about to make is not needed then,
47 right?

48

49 MR. COLLINS: But where is caribou
50 addressed? That was the question, whether caribou was

00127

1 addressed as well as moose in terms of leaving the meat
2 on the bone.

3

4 MR. DEMATTEO: That's already in Federal
5 regulations, Mr. Collins. If you look in the Federal
6 edible meat under Unit 18, south of the Yukon River it's
7 on Page 103, 103, upper right-hand corner, it's already
8 required in Federal regulations that that portion south
9 of the Yukon River, Unit 18, that the meat must remain on
10 the bone.

11

12 MR. BERG: For caribou?

13

14 MR. DEMATTEO: For caribou, yes.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: So then we could go ahead
17 and drop that caribou provision?

18

19 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Is that fine with
22 all the Board?

23

24 (Council Nods Affirmatively)

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

27

28 MR. DEMATTEO: The proposed regulation,
29 with the modification would meet Mr. Nowlin's intent,
30 yes.

31

32 MR. REAKOFF: Okay, yeah. We'll just
33 adopt their Staff.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Staff recommendation and
36 modifications?

37

38 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, is that clear to
41 everyone now, except me.

42

43 (Laughter)

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further deliberations.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'm glad we're trying to
50 clarify everything to everyone. Any further comments.

00128

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, all those in favor
4 of adopting Proposal 29 as modified, signify by saying
5 aye.

6

7 IN UNISON: Aye.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.

10

11 (No opposing votes)

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. Proposal
14 28, the Chair will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal
15 28. This is on Page 183.

16

17 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to
18 make a motion to adopt Proposal 03-28.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

21

22 MR. JONES: Second.

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Benedict.
25 Motion moved by Jack Reakoff. Pete, Staff analysis.

26

27 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, Proposal WP03-
28 28 was submitted by Willard Church of Quinhagak, and he
29 requests that there not be a trophy devaluation
30 requirement for subsistence brown bear transported or
31 removed from the Western Alaska Brown Bear Management
32 Area.

33

34 The proponent believes that the current
35 management area trophy devaluation requirement is
36 disrespectful to the integrity of the hunt, disrespectful
37 to the spirit of the bear and also to the hunter to whom
38 the bear gave its life to.

39

40 Mr. Chair, if you look on Page 187, about
41 halfway down you'll see the proposed Federal regulation,
42 on page 187. Proposed Federal regulation, it would
43 strike out:

44

45 At the time of sealing, the Alaska
46 Department of Fish and Game
47 representative shall remove and retain
48 the skin of the skull and the front claws
49 of the bear.

50

00129

1 It would eliminate that requirement for
2 brown bear regulations for the management area.

3
4 Brown bear harvest for food still remain
5 an important part of the contemporary subsistence pattern
6 for the Yup'ik communities in Unit 18 and 18(A).

7
8 Mr. Chair, if this proposal were adopted,
9 the intent of this proposal is to allow subsistence
10 hunters to send or removed their complete brown bear
11 hides from the management area without any trophy
12 devaluation. Also the proposal would remove the Federal
13 trophy devaluation requirement but not the State sealing
14 requirement. The State sealing requirement would still
15 be in place. Sealing is required by the State for brown
16 bear hides before they can legally be sent from the area.
17 When a hunter has a brown bear taken under the management
18 area regulations for sealing under State law, the Alaska
19 Department of Fish and Game requires that the skin of the
20 head and front claws are removed and kept by the
21 Department of Fish and Game.

22
23 The adoption of this proposal could also
24 create confusion and also creates law enforcement
25 problems. In addition, the transportation of brown bear
26 parts between states and countries is subject to both
27 State and Federal permits. The Fish and Wildlife Service
28 requires Alaska Department of Fish and Game certification
29 as part of the Federal permit process.

30
31 Mr. Chair, there is concern that people
32 would hunt for trophy bears using the more liberal
33 subsistence regulations and that brown bear harvest would
34 increase and create a conservation concern. The proposed
35 regulatory change still would not meet the proponent's
36 objectives and would create problems with enforcement of
37 the management area regulations.

38
39 Proposals to change regulations for the
40 Western Alaska Brown Bear Management Area should be
41 addressed through the Western Alaska Brown Bear
42 Management Area working group.

43
44 Mr. Chair, with that the Staff
45 recommendation is to oppose the proposal.

46
47 That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

48
49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Pete. Roy,
50 State comments.

00130

1

2 MR. NOWLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
3 Roy Nowlin, ADF&G. The State also opposes this proposal
4 and we believe that it would really be contrary to this
5 working group that put together these brown bear
6 management areas to begin with and the concept of these
7 brown bear management areas was to allow for a
8 subsistence harvest. And because it's a subsistence
9 harvest, then it seems inconsistent to us that you would
10 be maintaining the trophy value of any bears that leave
11 the area. So we're in opposition to it for that reason.

12

13 Plus the fact that the plan that
14 established or the groups that worked together to come up
15 with these brown bear management areas had specifically
16 requested in the plan that the group would meet to
17 discuss regulatory proposals before those changes were
18 made and we'd like to see that kind of thing done before
19 a change like this is made.

20

21 So we basically have two reasons. I mean
22 we feel it's inconsistent with the purpose of these
23 management areas, plus it would be -- well, essentially a
24 violation of trust on the part of the people that came
25 together to create these things to begin with. And not
26 only that, but if someone desires to hunt trophy bears,
27 they can still do it under State regulations and they can
28 still have their trophy. They'd have to pay some more
29 money and they'd have to meet the requirements to hunt
30 trophy animals but they can still do it. No one's being
31 --this opportunity to hunt trophy bears is not being
32 eliminated by this.

33

34 That's all I have, thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, just for my
37 information who makes up or what does that Western Alaska
38 Brown Bear Management Team comprise of, what residents
39 and how big an area?

40

41 MR. NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm at a
42 disadvantage in answering that question because it was
43 put together by Region 5 out of the Nome office and so I
44 wasn't a part of that and so I can't give you the
45 specifics on it. I can find out for you if you'd like.

46

47 Thank you.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any questions. Go
50 ahead.

00131

1 MR. DEMATTEO: If you look on Page 188 of
2 the analysis, if you look under customary and traditional
3 use determinations, all of these regions and communities
4 are eligible to harvest within the management area. You
5 see it's far reaching because of the C&T. I do know that
6 that planning group or the management team comprises
7 representatives for these various regions. I couldn't
8 say exactly from which communities they are but I do know
9 that the representation does meet all these regions.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Pete. Any
12 questions.

13

14 MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I had a
15 question, maybe you can answer Roy. The customary
16 practice, as I understood was used to be to leave the
17 skull in the field where the bear was harvested and not
18 bringing it in, this is only talking about if it goes out
19 of the area, so they're not required to mutilate a skull
20 or something if it's left out in the field, are they, in
21 the area?

22

23 MR. NOWLIN: Mr. Chairman. Member
24 Collins. I would -- lets see, since sealing isn't
25 required out there, they have a permit, and I don't
26 believe that they would be required to bring in the skull
27 but, again, I could verify that in regulation.

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

30

31 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, it's a
32 similar regulation to the Northwest Brown Bear area and
33 if you kill the bear in that unit you can keep the bear
34 hide with the claws and head on it and you can keep the
35 skull. But if you want to -- if the hide's going to
36 leave the unit then the Department chops the feet and the
37 head off. So if somebody just keeps it at home they can
38 keep all that. If they try to take it out of the unit
39 then they have to have it cut off.

40

41 MR. COLLINS: Okay.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions for
44 Roy.

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, thank you.
49 Regional, corporations, tribes. Dario Notti.

50

00132

1 MR. NOTTI: Yeah, Dario Notti with the
2 Association of Village Council Presidents. And we had a
3 discussion with Willard Church, the maker at the YK-RAC
4 meeting in Chevak. And he agreed that maybe it wasn't
5 the best proposal. If, as in the Northwest, if you're
6 just keeping it at home, there's no problem, and if you
7 want to send it out to get it commercially tanned which
8 was really part of his original thoughts, then you can
9 take one under the sports regulations, and you wouldn't
10 have to remove the claws and the skull. So this does
11 limit the take of non-residents and yet residents have
12 the option of hunting under either regulations, depending
13 on what they want to do with the hide.

14
15 So we would oppose it.

16
17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Dario. Coming
18 from you and your corporation clarifies a lot of things
19 for us, too. Any more public comments.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we had four
28 written public comments submitted to our office and of
29 course, these comments were submitted when the proposal
30 was sent out for review, and so there has been some
31 meetings that have occurred since then.

32
33 But basically the Native Village of
34 Quinhagak supported the proposal to delete the
35 requirement to remove and retain the skin and skull,
36 front claws of brown bears before allowing subsistence
37 hunters to remove them from the management area.

38
39 The Asa'carsarmiut Tribe, excuse me for
40 my pronunciation, again, I think that it is the tribe that
41 represents the area, the village of St. Mary's. They
42 also support the proposal. They agreed that the claws
43 that's stated in current regulation should be removed
44 from regulation for Units 9(B) -- a part of 9(B), 17, 18
45 and a part of 19 for brown bear.

46
47 The Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge
48 opposes this proposal. They felt like the Western Alaska
49 Brown Bear Management Area was created to increase the
50 harvest of brown bears from one bear every four years to

00133

1 one bear per year and to accommodate traditional
2 subsistence use patterns. Additionally the required \$25
3 tag fee was removed and replaced with the no cost
4 registration permit as long as the bear skin was not
5 removed from the management area. If the harvested bear
6 is truly for subsistence uses, then removal of the claws
7 and the skin of the head does not reduce the value of the
8 bear skin for traditional sleeping mats or boat covers.
9 There are current regulations for those subsistence
10 hunters who wish to hunt bears for their trophy value
11 which require a \$25 tag and one bear every four years.
12

13 We also received some comments from the
14 Alaska Defender's of Wildlife. They oppose the
15 regulation and feel there is concern about the impacts
16 this proposal would have on law enforcement efforts, in
17 addition, there is concern about the low productivity
18 rate of brown bears and the need for a high degree of
19 accuracy and reliability of harvest information for the
20 sake of continuity of harvest information, current
21 sealing requirements should remain in place.
22

23 That's all the written public comments.
24

25 I would like to add that as Dario said
26 the YK Council took this proposal up in Chevak two weeks
27 ago and we did have Willard Church, the proponent on line
28 and the YK Council passed a motion to defer this proposal
29 to a further date as recommended by the proponent at that
30 meeting.
31

32 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jerry. Council
35 deliberation.
36

37 We do have a motion on the floor to adopt
38 Proposal 28.
39

40 MR. WALKER: Question.
41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: All those in favor of
43 adopting Proposal 28, signify by saying aye.
44

45 (No aye votes)
46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed, same sign.
48

49 IN UNISON: Aye.
50

00134

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. Thanks
2 for your testimony Dario.

3

4 Next -- does that -- can we let Pete go
5 now or are we done with all the proposals?

6

7 MR. BERG: Pete do you have anything to
8 address the Council or is that it for you today?

9

10 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, I just want to
11 add that Staff apologizes for the incompleteness of the
12 analysis of 35. I know you're used to better work than
13 that and also deserve better work than that, but due to
14 some health concerns we haven't got there yet. But
15 everything I presented to you today has been concurred
16 with (microphone falls off table).....

17

18 (Laughter)

19

20 MR. DEMATTEO:what you voted on
21 based on the current information, even though it did not
22 appear in the analysis, but I can promise you in the next
23 week that will be finished.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, for the promise
26 and we'll hold you to it.

27

28 (Laughter)

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: And we'll hold our
31 coordinator to it, too, whenever he gets back. There was
32 some feelings of frustrations but like I said, I do have
33 great faith in this Council and how they deal with the
34 issues. Again, thanks for your help, Pete.

35

36 Proposal 33. What page is it on?

37

38 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman.

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: 151.

41

42 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman, before you
43 begin, could I hand these out to you?

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Oh, go ahead, go ahead and
46 hand those out and while you're doing it the Chair will
47 entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 33.

48

49 What's the feeling of the Council, do you
50 want a five minute break because we don't.....

00135

1 MR. COLLINS: It's the last one today,
2 isn't it?

3
4 CHAIRMAN SAM: I think there was a couple
5 other ones.

6
7 MR. COLLINS: Oh, is there?

8
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Well, we've got some
10 fishery action items that I'd like to take care of for
11 Jack before he takes off tomorrow. Take a five minute
12 break?

13
14 (Council Nods Affirmatively)

15
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes. Five, 10 minute
17 break.

18
19 (Off record)

20
21 (On record)

22
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: We'll call the meeting
24 back to order. The next item before us is Proposal 33.
25 At this time the Chair will entertain a motion to support
26 or adopt Proposal 33.

27
28 MR. WALKER: I'll make a motion to adopt.

29
30 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Second.

31
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved and seconded by
33 Robert Walker and Angie Demientieff.

34
35 Staff analysis. I understand you were
36 going to introduce some modifications, too.

37
38 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
39 I've handed out an addendum to the analysis which I'll
40 explain as I go along with the analysis.

41
42 The Draft Staff analysis for this
43 proposal can be found beginning on Page 155 at Tab C.

44
45 Proposal WP03-33 was submitted by Peter
46 Peterson of Mountain Village. It modifies Proposal WP02-
47 31, which was deferred last year by the Federal
48 Subsistence Board, that was in May 2002. This current
49 amended proposal requests expanding the existing positive
50 customary and traditional use determination for moose in

00136

1 the southern portion of Unit 21(E) to add the rural
2 residents of the lower Yukon villages. The existing
3 customary and traditional use determination is Unit 21(E)
4 moose residents of Unit 21(E) and residents of Russian
5 Mission.

6
7 In your book you'll find the proposed
8 Federal regulations to be:

9
10 Unit 21(E) - South of a line beginning at
11 the eastern boundary of Unit 21(E) near
12 Tabernacle Mountain, extending easterly
13 to the junction of Paimiut Slough and
14 Innoko Slough and southeasterly in the
15 direction of Molybdenum Mountain to the
16 juncture of Units 21(E), 21(A) and 19(A)
17 - Residents of Unit 21(E) and Nunam Iqua,
18 Alakanuk, Emmonak, Kotlik, Mountain
19 Village, Toklik, Pitka's Point, Saint
20 Mary's (including Andreafsky Town Site),
21 Pilot Station, Marshall, Russian Mission,
22 Scammon Bay and Hooper Bay.

23
24 At a recent Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta RAC
25 meeting on March 6th and 7th, the Council brought to my
26 attention that the community of Chevak was inadvertently
27 left out of this proposal and out of my analysis, and
28 that's what this addendum is about.

29
30 Additionally, the Council requested that
31 I express to you that this request is for the fall season
32 only. That it does not include the winter season.
33 Normally when we do customary and traditional use
34 determinations we don't find for a particular season but
35 they insisted that this be part of the proposal.

36
37 Map 1 on Page 156, and in particular Map
38 2 on Page 158 clearly shows the proposal area located on
39 Federal lands in the southern portion of Unit 21(E).
40 They're a portion of the Yukon Delta National Wildlife
41 Refuge and BLM managed lands. In the southern portion of
42 Unit 21(E), that is the subject of this proposal,
43 approximately 71 percent of the lands are under Federal
44 management, 25 percent are Fish and Wildlife Service
45 administered lands, 46 are Bureau of Land Management
46 managed lands and 29 percent are administered by the
47 State of State or are Native corporation lands.

48
49 I'd like to thank the Bureau of Land
50 Management for providing us with this wall map that you

00137

1 see over there which illustrates the Unit 21(E) moose use
2 by UCU's and you might want to study that.

3

4 The existing customary and traditional
5 use determination was adopted from State regulations at
6 the beginning of the Federal Subsistence Management
7 Program in 1990. Appendix I, beginning on Page 171 gives
8 you the regulatory history of the requests to change C&T
9 determinations for moose in Unit 21(E). You'll find that
10 it has a long history or requests.

11

12 When WP02-31 was deferred last year, the
13 Federal Subsistence Board directed Staff to work with the
14 Western Interior and the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta
15 Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils to resolve the
16 issue. At their request and direction, we convened a
17 workshop in October 2002 at which some of your members
18 attended. The modified proposal and this analysis were
19 developed from the results of that meeting.

20

21 Table 1 on Page 160 provides information
22 showing that the proposal communities have relied on
23 moose as an important subsistence resource for a long
24 period of time. The proposal communities are made up
25 predominately of Yup'ik speaking people who have historic
26 roots in the Lower Yukon River region. Maps provided by
27 Jim VanStone and Snow, two anthropologists show that
28 these groups, and the Ingalik use the proposal area in
29 the 19th Century.

30

31 Tables 2 and 3 on Pages 164 and 165 give
32 information on cumulative moose harvest from the ADF&G
33 harvest database. According to reports by subsistence
34 users, the subsistence moose harvest in the region is
35 very underreported. Additionally, formal harvest studies
36 of moose and brown bear by Anderson, Utermohle and Brown
37 in 1998 and 1999 also found that established harvest
38 ticket systems underestimated harvest in rural
39 communities in the Middle Yukon and Koyukuk River region.
40 And this fact was also confirmed by Regional Council
41 members to me.

42

43 For those moose that were reported, the
44 tables provide the information that the southern portion
45 of Unit 21(E) is and has been a primary subsistence
46 resource use area for moose for the proposal communities
47 for at least the past 20 years. Anthropologists believe
48 that the hunting pattern and subsistence use area
49 patterns have remained relatively stable in the region
50 since the 19th Century with shifts from time to time due

00138

1 to increases or decreases in the animal populations.

2

3 Moose hunting in southern Unit 21(E) by
4 the Lower Yukon River communities now takes place almost
5 exclusively in the fall during September according to
6 ADF&G harvest records and according to reports of
7 subsistence users.

8

9 If adopted, the proposal will provide
10 residents of the proposal communities the opportunity to
11 hunt moose during the Federal seasons on Federal lands
12 within the southern portion of Unit 21(E).

13

14 Our preliminary conclusion is to support
15 the proposal with the modification to add Chevak. The
16 proposed regulation can be found on Page 168 and as
17 modified it will read, this is slightly different from
18 what's in your book because of the Chevak situation:

19

20 Unit 21(E) - South of a line beginning at
21 the eastern boundary of Unit 21(E) near
22 Tabernacle Mountain, extending easterly
23 to the junction of Paimiut Slough and
24 Innoko Slough and southeasterly in the
25 direction of Molybdenum Mountain to the
26 juncture of Units 21(E), 21(A) and 19(A) -
27 Residents of Unit 21(E) and Nunam Iqua,
28 Alakanuk, Emmonak, Kotlik, Mountain
29 Village, Toklik, Pitka's Point, Saint
30 Mary's (including Andrafsky Town Site),
31 Pilot Station, Marshall, Russian Mission,
32 Scammon Bay, Hooper Bay and Chevak.

33

34 Unit 21(E) - Remainder - Residents of
35 Unit 21(E) and residents of Russian
36 Mission.

37

38 Members of the Western Interior
39 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council who attended the
40 Board directed committee meeting in our OSM offices in
41 Anchorage in October might like to speak to this issue as
42 well.

43

44 Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any questions
47 for Pat.

48

49 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

50

00139

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, Ray.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, again,
4 when we look at the summary of the number of permits and
5 so on that was over what period of time? You gave us a
6 page, 155 was it you had us looking at?

7

8 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
9 Collins, Page 164 has a table on it.

10

11 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

12

13 MS. MCCLENAHAN: And Page 165. The time
14 period was from 1983 to the present, where those records
15 have been available.

16

17 MR. COLLINS: Okay, so we're talking
18 about 17 years. So when we see 60 permits, that means
19 that there were 60 licenses bought during that period of
20 time, right, so it would be an average of -- well, let's
21 see just looking at the first one on there, the
22 population of the community is 164, there were 6- permits
23 but it's not 60 people out of the community getting
24 those, it's an average of the number of years divided
25 into the number of permits, is that right, so it's like
26 10, whatever the math is.

27

28 I guess my question is, is in your
29 analysis did you consider now, for customary and
30 traditional use, a community has to show a community
31 pattern, not an individual pattern, how many individuals
32 do there have to be in the community to show a community
33 pattern? That's what I'm saying, I guess.

34

35 And I question the math on some of this,
36 when it's only a fraction of the community over a long
37 period of time. Did that enter into the analysis?

38

39 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
40 Collins, this is difficult to get at with ADF&G records
41 because unless we go and find individuals names we can't
42 tell who or how many, we only have permits to go by.

43

44 It is, however, and has traditionally
45 been a pattern in many communities that some people hunt
46 and hunt certain things and others do not and this is
47 true across Alaska.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

50

00140

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, State.

4

5 MR. NOWLIN: Roy Nowlin, ADF&G. Mr.

6 Chairman, I have a statement here from -- generated
7 primarily from our Subsistence Division that I'm going to
8 relay to the Council with the proviso here that I'm
9 really not -- since this is outside of wildlife
10 conservation I'm not really in a good position to answer
11 questions on this so you'll need to bear with me.

12

13 The Department supports the approach
14 taken in this C&T analysis to focus on a portion Unit
15 21(E) rather than on the entire subunit. Some of the
16 communities proposed for addition to the existing C&T
17 finding have a very low level of use of moose in the
18 area. We also believe that there are other communities
19 with a history of hunting moose in this area that's
20 similar to the pattern described for communities included
21 in the analysis.

22

23 Consequently the Department recommends
24 that the analysis be expanded to include evaluation of
25 all communities that have hunted moose in the area. If
26 this is not done, the analysis should at clearly indicate
27 that this C&T finding, if adopted by the Federal Board
28 may be incomplete and will require consideration of
29 additional communities in the future.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Questions for Roy. Go
34 ahead, Jack.

35

36 MR. REAKOFF: Did you confer with the
37 Subsistence Division about their records of the various
38 villages that they had -- and did they submit an entire
39 list or they submitted an incomplete list or what?

40

41 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Yes, we have been
42 consulting with ADF&G quite closely. They understand why
43 we've taken this approach. It's at the recommendation of
44 our two Councils that we're taking this approach because
45 a broader approach, which we took last time did not work
46 at all. And we're trying to do this incrementally and
47 hopefully any proposals that come forward in the future
48 will be -- it will take place within some sort of a
49 planning framework where we can do it in a very reasoned
50 way. If we don't do this, I'm afraid that Unit 21(E)

00141

1 might have an .804 situation on their hands in the
2 future.

3

4 So, yes, we are consulting with ADF&G,
5 they are aware of it. I will add to this analysis, the
6 statement that indicates that this finding that our --
7 that my efforts are not complete, that there are other
8 communities in Unit 18 that, according to ADF&G records
9 have used Unit 21(E), the southern part, and that this is
10 part of an ongoing planning process. If that's found
11 favorably by you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: What does .804 consist of,
14 meaning, just for the record?

15

16 MS. MCCLENAHAN: I'm referring to what we
17 do in a time of shortage when we have to choose among
18 qualified subsistence users and narrow the number of
19 people who are using that resource, either for a short
20 period of time or long period of time. We don't want to
21 create that kind of situation for this unit.

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: From what I've heard today
24 there is quite some shortages here and there so that will
25 have to be dealt with, too, whether it's area specific or
26 not, I have no idea right now.

27

28 Any further questions for Pat.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, regional -- Jeff,
33 come up, could you.

34

35 MR. DENTON: Jeff Denton, Anchorage Field
36 Office, BLM.

37

38 I guess I have a little bit of questions.
39 We did some analysis with this harvest data which is on
40 the poster over there but the whole picture isn't
41 represented in the tables here of the harvest in 21(E)
42 because one of the biggest community users is Bethel and
43 it's totally left off the picture. The Bethel area
44 actually has nearly as many hunters as the GASH area
45 villages up here, so there's a major part of the harvest
46 that's not even mentioned here.

47

48 And often the data that we have here --
49 often in this Council itself has been mentioned, when
50 this big change, and increase in down river hunters

00142

1 occurred, was actually prior to a lot of this database
2 here. And so GASH village people's accounts of when this
3 big surge of hunters coming up from the Lower Yukon and
4 Lower Kuskokwim country is not reflected in the data here
5 and the only records of that are would be from GASH
6 village people and I have yet to see the repeated mention
7 of this, even through this Council, show up in these
8 analysis over the years.

9
10 And this kind of concerns me because it
11 appears that it's somewhat selective. Some of the real
12 important things are left out. You know, we're not -- I
13 don't feel the full picture is being represented here
14 relative to all the users and how it's being used and
15 where it's being used. There's definite holes in the
16 data. And now there's kind of -- the listing of
17 communities that use 21(E) is incomplete now, even based
18 on Nome Fish and Game harvest data that's on record.

19
20 I'm real uncomfortable with it and I
21 guess I need some clarification of what constitutes long-
22 term traditional use by -- consistent use, Chevak has two
23 hunters and one hunter over three year over a 20 year
24 period, is that consistent use? Does that qualify an
25 entire community as traditional and customary use of an
26 area?

27
28 If you'll see Kotlik is another community
29 that's listed there that really doesn't have -- that
30 really doesn't warrant a lot of consideration as to
31 customary and traditional use on those lists. It's such
32 an insignificant amount of use, it's almost an incidental
33 hunt that one person made one year in 20 years.

34
35 Somewhere there's got to be a break point
36 that it is or it isn't. It's a proportion of a community
37 that consistently uses an area up river or some kind of
38 measuring thing of what constitutes for an entire
39 community. What constitutes customary and traditional
40 use?

41 And the definitions need to be, and my thought is, there
42 needs to be some quantitative way of determining that.
43 One percent of the population each year, one person
44 coming up here and hunting each year may or may not
45 constitute traditional use for an entire village.

46
47 And I think that we've really got to come
48 to grips with this. This has been an ongoing conflict
49 for a lot of years now and there's still things being
50 left out of the formula here to make good decisions. And

00143

1 that's part of what our working group for 21(E) is
2 supposed to be trying to line out and we're not doing any
3 better than you folks are trying to get some of these
4 things settled like this. And I really think we've got
5 to resolve these things with some real information and
6 talk to everybody and look at the entire picture.

7
8 From BLM's standpoint our concern is we
9 have a lot of areas, a big proportion, 46 percent of some
10 of these areas and -- but 50 percent or more of that
11 never sees a person. Most of it is very poor moose
12 habitat and most of it's back country, high country, it's
13 not even along a river bank, it's not accessible, it's
14 not useable. Those lands shouldn't be leveraged against
15 a Federal program.

16
17 And so I'm just -- I've watched this
18 develop for so long now and it's not developing to an end
19 point here and it's quite disturbing that all the pieces
20 of the puzzle aren't put in place. And I think everybody
21 making these decisions should be given the benefit of all
22 the pieces.

23
24 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

25
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, Jeff, are you
27 participating in that working group that we asked Randy
28 Rogers to form.

29
30 MR. DENTON: Yes, I am.

31
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any further
33 questions for Jeff.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, we go to Dario
38 Notti, regional corporations.

39
40 MR. NOTTI: Dario Notti from Association
41 of Village Council Presidents.

42
43 And TCC as well as myself was at that
44 meeting in October when this compromise was proposed.
45 And AVCP would support this as a summer hunt only. And
46 there was one thing that I wanted to point out to
47 everybody, the only map that's in this part of the book
48 shows a blow up of the area that's included, but if you
49 were -- I was hoping you could turn to Page 84 and see
50 that map there, and then just take your thumbnail or your

00144

1 small fingernail and put it down at the southern most
2 part and that's all the area of 21(E) that's included --
3 or 21 that's included in this area, it's a very small
4 portion. That map would show all of 21 and it's just the
5 smallest portion. And some people did hunt above that
6 area but not very many. It was concluded from all the
7 people at that meeting anyway, that very few people went
8 above that area.

9
10 And another thing that came out in the
11 meeting is that even though the records may show one
12 taken there was probably 10 times that many hunting
13 parties and -- or 10 times that many animals taken and
14 probably groups of maybe three to four people in each
15 party. So where you have a record of one it was probably
16 10 times that, times three so 30 times a record of one.
17 So the records don't show it very -- if there was only
18 one in the area, the people from Holy Cross wouldn't be
19 raising heck about all those down river people coming up.
20 And I'm sure the amount of friction between the upriver
21 and down river people is a stronger indication of how
22 many people were actually there than what the written
23 record shows.

24
25 And again, I just wanted to say that we
26 support the proposal as a summer hunt, C&T -- yeah, fall
27 hunt C&T.

28
29 Thank you.

30
31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Dario. Robert.

32
33 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
34 Dario, you know, I and Ray were also sitting at the
35 meeting when we sat there with Pat and the two characters
36 from down river. All of a sudden when they add to the
37 original proposal, they added Scammon Bay and Hooper Bay
38 to this issue, all of a sudden. All of a sudden we were
39 like confronted with two more communities. And we really
40 didn't say anything because we wanted to see the record,
41 what came up so this is what came up right here.

42
43 And this is the case that here Chevak
44 moose harvest 21(E) says '85 to present, you can see '86,
45 '99, year 2000, I mean permits two, hunters killed two,
46 one, I mean we're adding some place here that didn't
47 really hardly partake in this lower portion. And that's
48 one of the things where the GASH Board when we did
49 discuss it, wanted to know why this was added to it, was
50 this political or is this something that you guys just

00145

1 kind of like threw in there for extra people. That's my
2 question to you.

3

4 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I
5 just.....

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead, if you're
8 planning to answer that question -- go ahead.

9

10 MS. MCCLENAHAN: No, I just wanted to
11 clarify that you're looking at the sheet that I gave you
12 for Chevak, Scammon Bay and Hooper Bay is in the analysis
13 already. Chevak was inadvertently left out, it was
14 supposed to be added as well along with Scammon Bay and
15 Hooper Bay.

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Dario.

18

19 MR. NOTTI: You know, I don't know what
20 you want to support for the villages. There is some
21 record here. Chevak, even though it looks like a long
22 ways away, the Kashunuk River is a slough or a river that
23 goes from the coast at Chevak and has two areas where it
24 actually feeds into or drains from the Yukon at Pilot's
25 Station and I believe it's Mountain Village. And people
26 from that area, from the time of, at least, outboards,
27 have been going up that way. There's been very poor
28 recordkeeping -- well, they head that way, if they catch
29 a moose before they turnaround and go home, if they get
30 there, you know, they may or they may not report, but at
31 least those villages have always, in the past felt that
32 the less you report the better because if you start
33 making a record that you are taking those animals, some
34 White man's going to make a law that will make it
35 illegal.

36

37 So that's always been their feeling.

38

39 Now, that maybe Natives have more power
40 in making the rules then that past thinking ends up
41 working against you. But I'm sure there's some sentiment
42 in all of your villages that goes along that same
43 feeling. And, you know, I don't know what you want to do
44 about Chevak and/or Hooper or Scammon, we all came to a
45 handshake agreement that this was a good alternative to
46 all the villages getting all of 21(E). You know this
47 will protect a majority of your area or of 12(E) from all
48 of the down river hunters, yet it will give C&T for a
49 portion of the down river hunters to a portion of 21(E).
50 So if there is ever a population crash, a good portion of

00146

1 21(E) is protected from the other hunters.

2

3 I don't know if I answered your question,
4 you know, it's sort of up to you to decide whether you
5 want to accept Chevak or not. It wasn't in the original
6 proposal, the YK-RAC supported it, of course, and we were
7 meeting at Chevak so maybe that had something to do with
8 it.

9

10 MR. WALKER: Okay, well, the question was
11 when it got back to the elderly people back home from the
12 original -- from two years to now, it changed quite a
13 bit. So one of the issues here that I want to see is
14 that why was it thrown in here, and we did handshake,
15 sure, we did agree on it, but a lot of people back in
16 21(E) didn't agree with it just because I agreed and Ray
17 agreed with your people there. But still, there's going
18 to be an issue here where when I go home I'm going to
19 have to answer to the GASH Chairman and say, well, you
20 know, we kind of like had it thrown again out here and
21 we're going to have to refer it back to the drawing board
22 again.

23

24 I'm not going to sit here and argue with
25 you or confront you or anything, but just the point of
26 view is that we're going to have to take another vote on
27 it and that's it.

28

29 MR. NOTTI: Mr. Chairman, may I.

30

31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Dario.

32

33 MR. NOTTI: We would take a seven to two
34 vote if the GASH people wanted to vote against it.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: You had something Ray.

37

38 MR. COLLINS: Well, this may help Robert.
39 At the recent meeting in Holy Cross, I think it was in
40 early February when the moose -- what was the date of
41 that meeting, Randy, that we were in Holy Cross.

42

43 MR. ROGERS: It was the last week of
44 January.

45

46 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, the last week of
47 January, the GASH board met at that time and they
48 approved this with the modification. In other words,
49 they looked at that and when they saw where that line was
50 drawn they said as long as it did not go above that they

00147

1 would not contest it because it is a small area below
2 Holy Cross where these customary and traditional findings
3 are being made.

4
5 I think we have a problem saying whether
6 all of those communities customary and traditional, but
7 whatever customary and traditional use there was, I think
8 there was consensus at that meeting that it was taking
9 place below that line is where the majority of that use
10 was and so therefore even GASH board that was meeting in
11 Holy Cross accepted that, the line where it was drawn.

12
13 So that may help in us deciding how we're
14 going to vote.

15
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Carl.

17
18 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I tend to agree, if it
19 was written that way here. It's not written that way.

20
21 MR. COLLINS: The line?

22
23 MR. MORGAN: The line. It just says
24 21(E). The whole.....

25
26 MR. COLLINS: No, no, no, it's described,
27 it's from a certain mountain.....

28
29 MR. MORGAN: Oh, okay. Okay. Okay,
30 right here, got it. Yeah.

31
32 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, the customary and
33 traditional use that is being discussed is just applied
34 to that small area, that was the compromise, below that
35 line and not above. And that's the one that GASH board
36 looked at when they looked at the map at that meeting in
37 Holy Cross, the end of January, they were able to concur
38 that -- they didn't have a problem with that, with the
39 line.

40
41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further comments.
42 Micky.

43
44 MR. STICKMAN: I don't know, just looking
45 at the information, you know, I'm not from the area but
46 just looking at the information and the timeframe, you
47 know, it seems like it only became a custom and a
48 tradition for them after they became rich at commercial
49 fishing. It seems like before and after fishing went
50 down participation went down. So I would have a problem

00148

1 saying that it's customary and traditional because they
2 only practice it when they have a lot of money.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: I still have a problem on
5 what constitutes a C&T for the whole village when there's
6 only one or two people that might use it. That's what
7 I've been having problems with.

8

9 Did you have something to add, Pat.

10

11 MS. MCCLLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I think
12 that my analysis speaks to the issue of how long -- you
13 know, what time period. It goes back a couple of hundred
14 years, it's not just recent. It's in the analysis.

15

16 The people from the Lower Yukon villages
17 have been coming up there for a long, long time and it's
18 in the ethnographic record. We don't have numbers from
19 that ethnographic record but we do have the statement of
20 those researchers that those people did.

21

22 MR. COLLINS: Pat, I have a question
23 about that, I don't think that the 200 years would stand
24 up because moose only showed up around the turn of the
25 Century in that area, at least, from the records that we
26 have.

27

28 MS. MCCLLENAHAN: You're right about the
29 moose, but I'm talking about using that area, in general,
30 as a subsistence use area.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: We are addressing moose.
33 Any further questions for Pat.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, public testimony.

38 Leo.

39

40 MR. L. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
41 Again, I'm not an expert, nothing, I'm not a biologist,
42 but one thing I got going for me I live here all my life.
43 I was born in Kalskag and to consider me, from Aniak to
44 be a traditional use of Unit 18, I think that's wrong, I
45 haven't used it in my life.

46

47 To say 40 -- I'm against this proposal.

48 I agree with the previous speaker on the concern that he
49 had on where you put the line, where does the line stop
50 on the customary and traditional uses. When you say 40

00149

1 years ago, '63, people were riding dog teams, that's how
2 you were able to go from here to there. You couldn't go
3 70 miles, you'd have to camp in between and people had
4 their trapping lines and I never run into anybody or my
5 father never told me about any other people that he ran
6 into and he trapped from here to Stoney River.

7

8 If you put it 20 years ago, 1985, around
9 thereabouts, then maybe you'll see some tremendous change
10 in terms of influx into the area by boat, snowmachine and
11 all of a sudden we have traditional and cultural uses.
12 And my question is when does it stop?

13

14 I remember going through here to Unit
15 21(E), I didn't know it was 21(E), I only know it was
16 Pike Lake, we had to go up there to do some pike fishing,
17 nobody had a trail, we made a trail. And it snowed, you
18 have to make another trail or you'll be lost. Now
19 there's a highway today.

20

21 So you know, I have real big trouble with
22 customary and traditional use and how it gets justified
23 and when does it end. I mean is there a cut off time?
24 Is it 1970? '60? 1999? 2001? You know, it seems like
25 it goes on and on. And that's the reason I'm against
26 this proposal because I have big concerns about the
27 cultural and traditional use justification for use
28 areas. Because I grew up hunting around Kalskag, we
29 never seen anybody, not even Aniak people. I moved up
30 here when I was in the seventh grade and did hunting
31 around the Slough here. I hardly seen any of my friends
32 from Kalskag because they had their own hunting area and
33 I finally went above Chuathbaluk when I was in a freshman
34 in high school, you just couldn't get around. You had to
35 be rich or be a State worker or something to be able to
36 travel, travel was minimized to certain locations.

37

38 So I think you know we have to be really
39 careful in determining cultural and traditional uses on
40 these important, you know, decisions that you have to
41 make.

42

43 That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Leo. Any
46 questions for Leo.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 MR. L. MORGAN: Thank you.

00150

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any further
2 public comments.

3

4 (No comments)

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Written comments.

7

8 MR. BERG: Mr. Chairman, we received no
9 written public comments for Proposal 33. Thank you.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thanks, Jerry. Council
12 deliberation, comments. We do have a motion on the
13 floor.

14

15 Ray.

16

17 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, yeah, the
18 motion is to approve, I believe. I think I'd feel more
19 comfortable if we approved the line that was established
20 and say that we are in agreement that the customary and
21 traditional use took place south of that line but that we
22 cannot speak definitively one way or another about which
23 villages out there have that customary and traditional
24 use.

25

26 I guess if we pass it as is we're saying,
27 yes, those have, I would feel uncomfortable about that,
28 saying of all those villages, that's -- somebody else to
29 determine because it's outside the area, but at least at
30 Holy Cross we did reach consensus that where that line
31 was, whatever the customary and traditional use was had
32 taken place below that line. And if there's some way to
33 get that incorporated in our motion then I could vote for
34 it.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: But if we did that, you
37 know, all the villages would still be there and you have
38 limited amount of hunters and, you know, that's where I
39 have that problem. Do we grant the whole village C&T
40 because there's one or two hunters that state that they
41 hunted up in that area. I still have a problem with
42 that, and that's been my biggest problem, I think.

43

44 I wish we had Ida Hildebrand, how do we
45 just address what Ray just addressed? Carl.

46

47 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I do have a problem
48 with that and I'm just doing the quick math here. In 18
49 years, you know, just looking at Chevak, the data that
50 was sent out from '86 to 2003 and in 17 years, in 1986 we

00151

1 had two people, two hunted, two kill. Seventeen or 18
2 years later 2000, two people, two hunted, one kill. I
3 mean there was no increase. I mean -- and if you average
4 that out, average out how many a year, you're going to
5 come up with some minus numbers. If that was traditional
6 use then I think we'd see that number increase. Some
7 kind of data should support it.

8

9 Thank you.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further deliberations.
12 Ray and then Micky. Go ahead Micky.

13

14 MR. STICKMAN: No, Robert first.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, Robert.

17

18 MR. WALKER: Yeah, if I was going to vote
19 in favor of it I would have to withdraw my motion and do
20 another motion if I was going to vote in favor of it. I
21 would have to -- like I'd have to go with the statistics
22 that we have in our book and on the paper that Pat gave
23 us to the communities that really did hunt traditionally
24 in our area. That's what I'm going to say, you know, if
25 it's going to be an issue where we're going to vote -- if
26 I'm going to vote in favor, I'm going to have to vote and
27 withdraw some of these communities from the original
28 proposal, either that or I'm just going to vote no.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray, then Micky.

31

32 MR. COLLINS: Well, I was just going to
33 point out as I did at the Holy Cross meeting, we have to
34 be very careful about the reported harvest and kill
35 because if you use that statistic it works against some
36 of our own villages, too, because at times, let's say, in
37 Anvik, Robert can tell us, there's 149 moose have been
38 harvested over -- from 1983 to present, well, I don't
39 think that represents, the kill was probably two or three
40 times that at least over that period of time. You see
41 that's only an average of less than what a year, it would
42 be in 17 years, that's 10/15 moose a year or something
43 like that.

44

45 MR. WALKER: That's not counting the
46 illegal ones.

47

48 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, that's what I mean.
49 In the statistics it doesn't reflect true harvest so we
50 have to be careful about that when we look at the

00152

1 villages down below, too, it doesn't necessarily reflect
2 the true harvest because there is underreporting.

3

4 MR. MORGAN: I do agree some of this data
5 is -- I'm sorry.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

8

9 MR. MORGAN: Some of this data is
10 unreliable, what you're saying, but I think just living
11 in the proximity or living in the area has a lot to do
12 with it. And I think a lot of these people did witness
13 the increase or the lack of increase of hunters up this
14 way or when it -- I think, you know, people are being a
15 little bit modest here and not trying to get into too
16 controversial issues, but I think if you take them aside
17 and say, well, what do you think, how long, who have you
18 been talking to, you know, I just got to -- I have to
19 agree with one thing when my brother came up and kind of
20 revealed that, he is my brother, and my dad said, yes,
21 there was no moose, you know, when they say, that
22 traditionally they did come up or to time -- I think
23 there's a good word for this, time and memorial, I think,
24 but there was no moose. I talked to people up in
25 Sleetmute, up in Stoney, they had to go all the way to
26 the other side of the Alaska Range to get moose.

27

28 And moose was a, you know, talking to
29 some older folks, it was a very sought out -- sought
30 after meat because it was rare that they'd catch moose in
31 the '30s, as late as the '30s and we just got caribou in
32 my time here, we had no caribou until '60 or '70, '72 or
33 something like that, the first time I ever see a caribou.
34 And you know, it goes in cycles.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Carl. Do you
37 have something Micky.

38

39 MR. STICKMAN: You know, well, I would
40 just feel uncomfortable voting in favor of something like
41 this without really speaking to the elders from the Holy
42 Cross region. You know, if you really want to get a feel
43 of customary and traditional use, those are the people
44 that know.

45

46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Micky. It is
47 now 5:20, we got a van coming in in about five or six
48 minutes, what's the pleasure of the Board -- the Council.
49 Go ahead, Robert.

50

00153

1 MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, I would
2 recommend that we do a roll call vote here.

3
4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, just a second, Mr.
5 Rivard.

6
7 MR. RIVARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Don
8 Rivard with the Office of Subsistence Management.

9
10 I'm going to start off by saying that,
11 you know, I've only been here in Alaska about three years
12 so I'm not knowledgeable about all the things that have
13 gone on in this particular region, in the GASH area, but
14 I'd like to remind the Council of a couple of things.

15
16 This was an effort that was directed by
17 the Federal Subsistence Board, that this group of people
18 would get together, representatives from the YK Council,
19 from your Council, from AVCP, from TCC, and were there
20 any others Pat?

21
22 MS. MCCLENAHAN: I think that's it.

23
24 MR. RIVARD: That's it. Was there Seward
25 Penn?

26
27 MS. MCCLENAHAN: No.

28
29 MR. RIVARD: No, okay. And they're going
30 to look at the consensus recommendation that came up and
31 they're going to weigh that quite a bit, I would think,
32 because this was something that they asked to have happen
33 and there was a group of people that came together and
34 came up with this recommendation.

35
36 I'm hearing from Mr. Collins that the
37 area that was mapped out, this portion of 21(E), this
38 southern portion of it, there seems to be general
39 agreement that that's where the people in Unit 18 have
40 come up to use in 21(E). So I'm trying to -- I think
41 what I'm hearing you guys struggling with is do the
42 people that really -- the people that have, from 18,
43 which communities from 18 really come up and use this
44 area. That's what you're struggling with from my
45 perception.

46
47 We heard oral testimony two weeks ago in
48 Chevak of these certain communities that do come up there
49 and use it. So the people, as you sometimes rely on with
50 elders and that, we heard that from Unit 18 folks, that

00154

1 they do, in deed, come up here and use this area. What
2 I'm trying to just see is where there's area of agreement
3 and it seems like there is agreement of this small
4 portion of 21(E) is utilized by residents of 18. So
5 there's some area of agreement. I haven't heard anybody
6 say, no, we don't believe that's the case.

7

8 And I guess my thoughts are, for what
9 they're worth, is to trust the people of Unit 18 as
10 knowing who, from their -- what villages or what people
11 from villages utilize that area.

12

13 That's all I have, thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any further
16 deliberations. If not, roll call vote has been
17 requested. My thoughts and feelings are that we do what
18 we think is best for Western Interior and that is why we
19 voted it down before and I'm still not comfortable with
20 supporting this issue because Jeff stated it clearly
21 that, what constitutes a C&T for a whole village when one
22 or two -- we can accept that one or two but until we find
23 a way to deal with it, I think that's the only way we can
24 go at this time. With the formation of that moose
25 working group that Randy Rogers is heading in this area.

26

27 So at this time I'll ask Jerry Berg to
28 call a roll call vote.

29

30 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on the
31 motion made by Robert Walker to adopt this Proposal 33 as
32 recommended by Staff and seconded by Angela. The vote
33 for Ron Sam.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: No.

36

37 MR. BERG: Ray Collins.

38

39 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

40

41 MR. BERG: Jack Reakoff.

42

43 MR. REAKOFF: No.

44

45 MR. BERG: Angela Demientieff.

46

47 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: No.

48

49 MR. BERG: Benedict Jones.

50

00155

1 MR. JONES: No.

2

3 MR. BERG: Carl Morgan.

4

5 MR. MORGAN: No.

6

7 MR. BERG: Robert Walker.

8

9 MR. WALKER: No.

10

11 MR. BERG: Micky Stickman.

12

13 MR. STICKMAN: No.

14

15 MR. BERG: Emmitt Peters.

16

17 MR. PETERS: No.

18

19 MR. BERG: Mr. Chair, the motion fails.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Jerry. Carl,

22 do you know of anything that's going on in this hall

23 tonight?

24

25 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, could I try

26 an alternate motion that we might -- I don't want to see

27 us lose what we did gain. I would like to make a motion

28 that we recognize that the line that was established,

29 that whatever customary and traditional use in 21(E) took

30 place below the line that was established but we cannot

31 agree on or we're not -- what do I want to say, we're not

32 certain or we can't agree on which communities have

33 customary and traditional use, but I'd like to see us

34 recognize that boundary because that was something that

35 was gained over a period of several meetings, a

36 compromise of where that line should be, before it was

37 all of 21(E) when we first opposed.

38

39 Is there a motion that I could make in

40 that area that people would agree with so we would at

41 least get that into the debate, that we recognize

42 traditional use took place south of that line. Do you

43 feel....

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Don.

46

47 MR. RIVARD: Just some thoughts on that.

48 Don Rivard, with Office of Subsistence Management.

49

50 I think you could have that as part of

00156

1 your comments to your recommendation that you just made.
2 You wouldn't necessarily have to have another proposal or
3 motion to that effect. I mean you still could have that
4 option if you so choose. But I think we can capture with
5 those comments, they're already on record, that there is
6 agreement that that portion of 21(E) is where people from
7 Unit 18 do hunt.

8

9 I'll just leave it at that, thanks.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: But then there was an
12 agreement, right, and that's what Ray is trying to
13 recognize, right?

14

15 MR. COLLINS: Yes. Even at the Holy
16 Cross meeting where GASH was there, when they looked at
17 the map they -- when they met in Holy Cross, just the end
18 of January, the GASH committee that was meeting there did
19 look at the map and agree on that line. So there was
20 consensus on that point even by the residents, at least
21 the ones that were in that meeting at Holy Cross.

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: So then your motion would
24 read that the line that was agreed upon at Holy Cross be
25 recognized by Western Interior and that we recommend to
26 the working group that was formed, that we try to
27 identify what uses would be legal -- would that be fair
28 or no?

29

30 MR. COLLINS: That we recognize that line
31 as the boundary of customary and traditional use by
32 residents of Unit 18.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Micky.

35

36 MR. STICKMAN: I don't think we can do
37 that, we just -- you know, the motion failed. You know,
38 I think you can recognize the facts in the
39 recommendations but as far as making proposals, I don't
40 think you can. Once it's -- once the Council voted it
41 down it's voted down.

42

43 MR. COLLINS: I would agree as long as
44 our comments show that there was consensus on that line
45 then, that our point of contention is whether or not all
46 of those communities have customary and traditional use.

47

48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Robert.

49

50 MR. WALKER: Yes, that was my whole

00157

1 intent to start with here, Mr. Chairman, Ray. Is that, I
2 wasn't satisfied with all the communities that were put
3 in and all of a sudden added to, you know, when we had to
4 sit down and have this meeting here we agreed to some of
5 these communities that really -- you know used the
6 portion but not all of them, all of a sudden we got -- I
7 mean Jeff come up and say Bethel's one of our bigger
8 users of your -- of your Unit 21, now, wait a minute
9 here, this is getting more blown out of proportion than
10 when it was originally started. So I would recommend
11 that, you know, the Board or something, they go back to
12 them and say, hey, let's get right back to where we
13 started instead of adding on, adding on, adding on and
14 then maybe we could take another look at it, you know,
15 and recognize that boundary line. But still, you know,
16 we're adding more communities.

17

18 You know, it's nothing personal, it's
19 just purely business.

20

21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes. And if you do add,
22 what, how many, a hundred people out of Bethel that could
23 be a huge number, too.

24

25 Okay, so with that we'll leave Proposal
26 33, and when we convene in the morning I would like to
27 start off with some fisheries proposals that we do want
28 Jack to address in the morning -- first thing in the
29 morning because he's leaving in the afternoon. So with
30 that we'll just jump around on our agenda again, because
31 of people leaving.

32

33 Is that fine with everybody?

34

35 (Council Nods Affirmatively)

36

37 And I was just wondering if, can we leave
38 all this stuff right here?

39

40 MR. MORGAN: Yes, you can.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. All right, thank
43 you. 8:30 or 9:00 -- 9:00 -- 9:00 o'clock in the
44 morning.

45

46 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

00158

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for
the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix
Court Reporters, LLC do hereby certify:

 THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 157
contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the
WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY
COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II taken electronically by Salena
Hile on the 18th day of March 2003, beginning at the hour
of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at Aniak, Alaska;

 THAT the transcript is a true and correct
transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter
transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to
the best of our knowledge and ability;

 THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party
interested in any way in this action.

 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 30th day of
March 2003.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 04/17/04